ACCUMULATED AND ACCUMULABLE CULTURES

The Case of Public and Private Initiatives toward K-Pop[1]

Jimmyn Parc
Seoul National University and Sciences Po Paris
jimmynparc@gmail.com

Hwy-Chang Moon
Seoul School of Integrated Sciences and Technologies and
Seoul National University
cmoon.snu@gmail.com

Abstract

When it comes to the promotion of culture, many tend to highlight the vital role of public initiatives. This idea is based on the common perception that culture is part of the nation-state. This belief also stems from the confusion between two types of culture. To address such misperceptions, this paper emphasizes a distinction between accumulated and accumulable cultures: The former is associated with the nation-state and local conditions. Given that it has formed over a long period of time with the accumulation of related cultural practices, the need to protect it is strong. On the other hand, accumulable culture is less associated with the nation-state and is more universalistic. As it has only formed relatively recently, it can be further improved and enhanced. Alongside this, it should be well understood that accumulated culture was also once accumulable and has survived over time. Furthermore, this paper argues that in order to promote accumulable culture, private initiatives would have a more significant impact than public efforts. For example, the role of the Korean government has usually been credited by several media outlets and scholars in explaining the emergence of K-pop; however, a rigorous analysis of K-pop clearly demonstrates that private initiatives have actually been more effective in promoting K-pop internationally. This perspective intends to provide important implications for policy makers to formulate more effective policies that would help promote their national culture as a source of soft power.

Keywords

accumulated culture; accumulable culture; cultural policy; public initiatives; private initiatives; K-pop; *Hallyu*

About the Authors

Jimmyn Parc, Ph.D. is Visiting Lecturer at the Institut d'Études Politiques de Paris (Sciences Po), France and a Research Associate at the EU Centre, Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University in Korea. He is also a Research Associate of the European Centre for International Political Economy (ECIPE), Brussels, Belgium. He has published numerous academic articles and conducted a number of research projects related to the competitiveness of organizations, industries, and countries. For his main topic of research on the cultural and creative services industries, Dr. Parc uses historical and comparative approaches to understand international business strategies. In particular, he has a special interest in the film and music industries as they face a changing business environment and new challenges from digitization.

Hwy-Chang Moon, Ph.D. is Chair Professor at Seoul Business School, Seoul School of Integrated Sciences and Technologies and Professor Emeritus in the Graduate School of International Studies at Seoul National University, where he served as the Dean. He has delivered special lectures at various institutions, including Helsinki School of Economics, Keio University, and Stanford University. He is currently the editor-in-chief of the *Journal of International Business and Economy*, and has published numerous articles and books on topics covering International Business Strategy, Cross-Cultural Management, Foreign Direct Investment, and Economic Development in East Asia with a focus on Korea. He has served as consultant for several multinational companies, international organizations, and governments.

When Korean pop music, or K-pop, first emerged in the mid-1990s, many believed that it was a fad and that it would not be sustainable. Several media outlets in South Korea (hereafter Korea) have expressed similar opinions. For example, the Korean journalist Kwaak Je-yup disparaged K-pop—calling it, "disposable fast music." However, after two decades, its popularity has only grown further, with its influence extending from East Asia to Europe, the Americas, and even Africa. Despite this global success, there has been a significant level of misunderstanding, prejudice, and even backlash toward K-pop (Ainslie, Lipura, and Lim; Choe and Russel; Lhatoo; Lindvall; Solery; Wang). One prominent criticism is the belief that the Korean government has actively supported K-pop and the exportation of its products to other countries, although Amy Wang states that this assertion is not based on any concrete evidence.

Reflecting such negative perceptions, the French journalist Claire Solery has employed militant words such as "soldier," "arms," "conquer," and "border" to describe K-pop's expansion around the world. Her view gives the impression that, through their international activities, K-pop groups seek to promote the brand of Korea and support the Korean government, and vice versa. She further raises an issue about the cultural appropriation of K-pop by highlighting the fact that there is significant input from a number of international talents—such as Swedish songwriters, and American and Japanese choreographers—to produce K-pop. Her conclusion, then, is that K-pop simply collects all of these elements and repackages them together as brand of Korea. In other words, she closely associates culture with the nation-state.

In order to dispel this view, some examples from French cultural history that parallel the expansion of K-pop may be worth considering. It is well known that France often glamorizes its cultural expansion under the broad umbrella of *mission civilisatrice* or "civilizing mission," while diminishing similar behavior by other cultures, notably from America, as a form of "cultural invasion." Yet from the view of those who are neither French nor American, both are identical in their desire to "expand" cultural power. Echoing this prevailing attitude toward cultural expansion, Solery's efforts to cast a negative view of K-pop may come as no surprise. However, the problem with this view is that it is based on misconceptions and prejudice, and it is often easily accepted without any rational consideration. In fact, history shows a great number of interesting examples that call on us to rethink the linkages between culture and the nation-state.

One of the most prominent cultural symbols of France is the Louvre Museum, which has collected cultural and historic relics from around the world. Interestingly, the majority of them are not originally French, although they are presented as part of the French national culture. In this museum, the most popular attraction

is Leonardo da Vinci's *Mona Lisa*. This world-renowned painting was originally acquired by King Francis I during da Vinci's stay in France. It is important to note that, while da Vinci was commissioned by the French king, there has been no evidence that da Vinci moved to France in order to promote Italy or its "brand." Alternatively, as the victor of wars against several Italian city-states, Francis I had no reason to admire the "culture" of those who had surrendered to him. Rather, what he took interest in was the Renaissance style that was prevalent in the Italian region at that time, with little linkage to the nation-state. In fact, the term "Renaissance" only began to appear in the nineteenth century to label a specific period that epitomizes a distinctive spirit and style (Johnson). This example highlights the idea that, during this period, "culture" and the nation-state were not considered to be associated with one another—a view that is very different from the one today.

Some may argue that the case of da Vinci is not a suitable example since Italy was not a unified country at that time; it instead consisted of many city-states and principalities, thus exhibiting a weaker sense of national identity. Given this, the case of the famous Dutch painter Vincent van Gogh may provide a more convincing case. In 1886, he came to Paris, which at that time was the art capital of the world. At this time, the Netherlands had already experienced several major conflicts with other European powers and thus the sense of national identity among the Dutch was well established. However, Van Gogh did not seek to promote the Netherlands in France. This is evident in the series of letters that he exchanged with his brother Theo and other acquaintances. Although he mentions "Dutch," "Netherlands," and "Holland" approximately 195 times (Van Gogh), there is little indication that the artist was interested in promoting the Netherlands or his nationality.

The same principle applies to other artists. Consider the examples of Pablo Picasso's and Salvador Dalí's stay in Paris, the Beatles' visit to the United States, John Lennon's residence in New York, and K-pop groups' tours of the United States. None of these artists were associated with promoting their nationality or their nation-state. Rather, their global fame and popularity stemmed mostly from audiences' appreciation of their work; thus, these artists looked to expand their sphere of activity abroad by moving to the international cultural centers of their time. It is especially worthy of notice that these artists gained their popularity without public support from their homelands and that their countries had not been promoting these artists in their early years. Instead, the government preferred to use well-established artists in order to promote the national brand and exploit their works to show off the superiority of their country.

Given this reality, why do critics insist upon associating culture with national identity? Because such a view persists, many believe that the public sector, which includes the government, should promote culture while overlooking the efforts

of the private sector. This raises the question: Which initiatives promote culture more effectively—public or private initiatives? A meaningful effort to address this question would now require the examination of pop culture, which has recently gained more attention.

This paper is organized in the following way: the first section examines the existing literature that supports either public or private initiatives. The second section analyzes the association between culture and the nation-state based on the literature review. The third section proposes a new concept of culture and explores the effectiveness of both public and private initiatives for supporting these two types of culture. The fourth section focuses on pop culture by using the case of K-pop in order to extract policy implications that would help promote pop culture in other countries. The fifth section deals with a discussion that reflects upon the main points of the analysis. Lastly, the concluding section summarizes the main implications to be drawn from this study.

CRITICAL LITERATURE REVIEW: PUBLIC INITIATIVES VS. PRIVATE INITIAVIES

Broadly speaking, the definition or distinction of culture is too indeterminate and difficult to pin down. Throughout a number of his works, Michel Foucault has often focused on the needs and importance of government policies regarding culture ("Technologies of the Self"; "Governmentality"). In assessing his work, Timothy Mitchell and Paul Rabinow argue that Foucault's concept is more associated with the social environment in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries where culture was shared within enclosed spaces—a region or a nation-state—with an array of institutions, such as corporations, state agencies, and markets (Barnett 389). In addition, David Scott evaluates Foucault's concept as one that involves the shaping of the general conditions within the daily lives of people; this approach is closely related to the conventional notion of culture. On the other hand, Clive Barnett argues that Foucault's model is not suited toward understanding "ongoing" culture that is mediated electronically, such as radio and television, and culture that has less territorial restraints. In other words, Barnett hints at a need to distinguish the different kinds of culture that have evolved with technological advancement.

Jon Hawkes follows the conventional concept of culture. He argues that it is derived from society's values that are the basis upon which all else is built. Values and the ways they are expressed are society's culture. As cultural vitality is essential toward establishing a healthy and sustainable society, in this view, public planning and culture are very much intertwined; thus, Hawkes acknowledges the need for public initiatives to form culture. Similarly, John Holden highlights the importance

of government intervention—including initiatives to assess, develop, and further enrich culture and its value upon which an improved quality of life can flourish. While it is rather limited for public initiatives to be extended to the conventional type of culture because it has already been well established.

McGuigan classifies cultures into two general fields: first, the arts and higher learning; and second, ways of life (5). The first is relatively close to the concept mentioned by Barnett in terms of the formation period. The second is the traditional object of anthropology and is too broad of a notion to deal with in the scope of social science; it is also closer to Foucault's approach. Raymond Williams further delimits the concept of culture as a realized signifying system which refers to practices and institutions ("Culture" 207). Since the practices and institutions place emphasis on the means of production, dissemination, consumption, and other functions, it is believed that culture and its industry should be regulated and controlled by the public sector (McGuigan 6-7). However, these functions are more visible in ongoing culture rather than the conventional type of culture.

Nicholas Garnham suggests two definitions for culture: one is a site of individual excellence (and/or art) and the other is focused on popular culture and media (23); both are treated as subordinate to ongoing culture. He emphasizes that, for individual artists, if their works do not create an audience, "the market is blamed and the gap is filled by subsidy [from the public sector such as government]" (4). He also argues that popular culture and media need intervention from the public sector due to their growing economic importance and their having functions such as production, distribution, consumption, and other commercial forces (35). This provides a good explanation for why a number of governments have intervened in culture and cultural industries through various measures.

While the aforementioned literature deals solely with culture and advocates the needs for public initiatives conceptually, there exists other literature that focuses on culture and cultural industries—as explained in Barnett's ideas on culture—with concrete evidence to emphasize the importance of private initiatives. Thomas Guback, for instance, explains how public initiatives have distorted the European film industry. He delineates the ways that various protectionist measures, such as quotas and subsidies, were misused and became ineffective in strengthening this cultural sector. Contrary to its original aim, most European film subsidies have in fact helped Hollywood studios maintain their strong hold on the European markets. Sean Pager echoes Guback, by showing examples from the film industries of Hong Kong, India, Korea, and Nigeria; he provides a contrast between the negative aspects of public initiatives and the positive aspects of private initiatives.

Susan Hayward refers to the history of the French film industry and points out the detrimental impact of public initiatives. Patrick Messerlin and Isabelle Vanderschelden further highlight the ineffectiveness of these public initiatives in the French film industry. The French government has established a large amount of subsidies in order to foster a strong national film industry; however, these efforts were not properly oriented and were eventually manipulated by vested interests among the industrial participants. Patrick Messerlin and Jimmyn Parc compare the French and Korean film industries in order to emphasize the roles that private initiatives play in fostering a healthy business environment versus that of public initiatives alone ("The Effect of Screen Quotas;" "The Real Impact of Subsidies").

Jimmyn Parc demonstrates how the public and private initiatives have changed the Korean film industry ("Evaluating the Effects of Protectionism"; "The Effects of Protection"). In particular, there are two contrasting periods: one where public initiatives played a stronger role and the other where private initiatives featured more prominently. By contrasting these two periods, his works show which initiative has been more effective. Whenever the Korean government implemented protectionist measures, the private sector sought out loopholes in order to increase their profits in an environment not conducive to business, which resulted in unexpected detrimental effects. On the other hand, when the government removed regulations and left the film industry to the hand of the market function, private initiatives tended to enhance the competitiveness of the Korean film industry.

Jimmyn Parc, Patrick Messerlin, and Hwy-Chang Moon focus on the impact of copyrights on the Korean music industry. Although the government has tried to foster a healthy and sound music industry, at least from the view of policy makers and government officers, these public initiatives inadvertently led to more piracy. In contrast, when government intervention was limited, the industry began to blossom and even gained international popularity, which helped companies to overcome the piracy issue. In particular, Jimmyn Parc and Nobuko Kawashima compare the Japanese and Korean music industries—specifically those that produce J-pop and K-pop. Their work demonstrates how each music industry has responded to digitization. The Korean private sector has embraced digitization more actively and has developed various strategies by adapting to changes in the industry. The opposite has happened in Japan where the private sector resisted the changes caused by digitization and continued as it did before despite the provision of government support. These studies thus highlight the importance of the private sector in promoting culture.

While examining and contrasting literature that either advocates public or private initiatives, two different types of culture can be alluded to, traditional culture or cultural heritage as described by Foucault, and culture tied to industries like film

and music as indicated by Barnett. For either the Foucault-type or Barnett-type of culture, the attributes and differences have not yet been clearly distinguished, but are rather commingled and confusing. In order to find good answers to the two questions raised before—first, the association between culture and the nation-state and second, the effective promotion of culture—it is necessary to analyze the differences between these two types of culture. In establishing clearer distinctions, more accurate and persuasive answers can be presented.

CULTURE, THE NATION-STATE, AND EFFECTIVE PROMOTION

The Foucault-type culture describes one that is shared within an enclosed space, and it shapes the general conditions of the population's daily lives. This concept is therefore much closer to the conventional concept of culture and is derived from society's values, as Hawkes argues. It is also more in line with the second definition of culture classified by McGuigan—culture as a way of life. Since this Foucault-type of culture is already well established in society, it should be carefully preserved for the identity of the nation-state. In this regard, Hawkes and Holden insist on the need for public initiatives to design plans for culture in order to maintain a healthy and sustainable society. However, it can be a rather controversial idea that public initiatives should be involved in planning—that is, assessing, developing, and enriching—well-established cultures that have survived throughout history. In addition, the feasibility and effectiveness of managing such an endeavor are questionable.

By contrast, the Barnett-type culture evolves with technological advancement, such as radio and television, and it has fewer territorial restraints. Furthermore, unlike the Foucault-type culture, this one can be easily assessed, developed, and enriched because it is constantly progressing toward a more concrete form, or it can undergo evolution that would allow this type of culture to be further disseminated and consumed. In particular, the processes of production, dissemination, and consumption, indicated in the signifying system that Williams raised, are more visible in the Barnett-type of culture. Knowing that the Foucault-type culture is linked with society and the nation-state, it is often removed from the idea of individual excellence as suggested by Garnham. Hence, Garnham's definition of culture should be classified under the Barnett-type, although the issue of consumers and/or consumption that Garnham raised should be understood as a matter of supply-and-demand mismatch. It is noteworthy to mention that the Barnett-type culture and its practice can be widely accepted and prevalent regardless of its origin. However, this type of culture comes to be tightly associated with the nation-state

as time goes by. In other words, when the Barnett-type culture survives, it becomes integrated in the Foucault-type of culture.

The issue of technological advancement should be understood carefully. Throughout history, culture has always embraced new technologies; among these include perspectives and industrial paints for paintings, various musical instruments and the development of scores in music, metal printing blocks in publishing, and fermented and canned food in cuisine. What was once seen as "new" technology is now considered as everyday items. Furthermore, the signifying system and its functions, such as production, dissemination, and consumption, trace the same route. For instance, it is widely known that Louis XIV was directly involved in the creation of various codified techniques and systemized ballet through the Académie Royale de Danse in France (Christout).[2] During and after the Renaissance period, patronage was commonplace, and thus becomes part of a system of production and consumption (Kempers and Jackson). Compared to today, the system and functions also existed in the "old" culture and cultural practice, although there is a difference in sophistication. The system and functions disappear or slow down significantly as these cultures and cultural practices settle down into a well-systematized form.

In other words, much of the existing literature focuses too much on what we experience today but overlooks the history of progress in establishing culture and cultural practices. In addition, a great number of cultural elements are not from local sources but elsewhere, yet as they become prevalent and remain in a specifically enclosed location, they soon become associated with the nation-state. To name some examples, wine originated from the Near East, but in present time, France and Italy are more closely associated with the image of wine producers. Halloween today is automatically linked with North American countries such as Canada and the United States, but it is believed to have originally come from Celtic, Gaelic, and Welsh cultures (Santino). The origins of certain cultural practices are overlooked over time as a certain country takes over the associated image of a culture or cultural practice. Thus, it becomes relatively difficult to plan and manage these types of cultural practices in our time, but they can easily and often be exploited to highlight history, pride, or even the superiority of a nation-state.

As a result, the Foucault- and Barnett-types of culture can clearly be distinguished by temporal difference through the accumulation of many cultural practices. Often the values of the past emerge in the presence of older culture and cultural practices. Few people considered Vincent van Gogh as a great artist while he was alive; the works of Pablo Picasso were not considered as art, and neither was he considered as an artist during his early days. Andy Warhol and other pop artists experienced a similar situation, and today we consider them all to be great. In light of this,

temporal accumulation plays a critical factor in distinguishing between the two types of culture. The distinction is worth making, since the connotation of the Foucault-type culture has been so strong, and the association between culture and nation-states appears as natural in our lives.

In this paper, the Foucault-type culture is renamed as "accumulated" culture whereas the Barnett-type culture is termed as "accumulable" culture.[3] This new typology of culture becomes useful in answering the second question: Which initiatives promote culture more effectively, public or private initiatives? Accumulated culture takes a relatively long time to be developed, which is why it exists as a well-established form in our time. By contrast, accumulable culture is relatively new and recent. It is not as well-established from a historical perspective, although it *appears* well formed in our time. When these two kinds of cultures are compared, accumulated culture covers only a limited market (or territory), either substantially or conceptually. By contrast, accumulable culture is often broader in terms of consumption because it is disseminated to various territories, and it is more universalistic. In order to promote accumulated culture, it should be well preserved to maintain its originality; whereas accumulable culture should be further enhanced or improved in order to be better disseminated and have a wider appeal. This distinction is presented in Table 1:

Table 1. A new typology of culture

	Accumulated culture	**Accumulable culture**
Formation period	relatively older and longer	relatively newer and shorter
Consumption territoriality	limited and local	broader and universalistic
Action to promote	to preserve	to enhance (or improve)
Association with the nation-state	strong	less strong (or weak)
Examples	traditional performance (operas, ballets, etc.), classical (or traditional) music, traditional food, traditional fashion	contemporary performance (films, musicals, dramas, etc.), pop music, fusion food, contemporary fashion, as well as a number of non-cultural activities

When arguing in favor of government support for culture, proponents will often highlight the soft power concept proposed by Joseph Nye. This approach toward culture is, in fact, closer to the notion of accumulable culture. Nye describes the characteristics of culture as universalistic, instead of unique and localized.

Furthermore, culture encounters less resistance and enjoys a close following if it is attractive. It also possesses widespread appeal, being embodied in products and communications (164-169). For example, he mentions American-style fashion, TV programs, music, and films that have been widely accepted around the world. More interestingly, he points out the openness of [American] culture to different ethnicities (170). This fact signifies that a culture could be more open to adopt other influences in order to form a more advanced one that can be more widely disseminated and consumed. This kind of culture is differentiated from accumulated culture that seems currently unique and localized without much foreign input and exists as a relatively more concretized form.

In particular, Nye argues that "power means an ability to do things and control others" (154); this concept is in fact closely related to maintaining a leading position in the world (Li; Nye). With accumulated culture that has a strong linkage with the nation-state, controlling others and having a strong position means the nation-state will have to confront opposition from others. Furthermore, given that the history of the United States is relatively shorter than many Asian and European countries, it cannot be expected to maintain leadership in accumulated culture. Thus, the power and ability that Nye refers to is more closely related to accumulable culture such as popular culture (169).

It should be underscored that accumulated culture was once accumulable, and it has survived over time. In other words, accumulable culture is a forerunner of accumulated culture; hence, much effort should be given to enhance and develop accumulable culture in order for it to prosper. Additionally, accumulated culture—regardless of nativeness or foreignness—can be a good source of inspiration and reference to foster an accumulable one. For example, works from the Renaissance period were inspired by the accumulated culture of Greece and have existed as an accumulable culture in a transitional form in Italy. The temporal accumulation transformed this accumulable culture to an accumulated one. Sometimes, the same cultural practice can be understood differently across contrasting geographical locations. For example, making and drinking wine can be considered as accumulated culture in France; its well-known wineries maintain their traditional methods. However, the same practice can be seen as accumulable culture in California, with the introduction of American practices to oenology. Interestingly, this cultural "appropriation" happens not only between accumulated and accumulable culture, but also between accumulable cultures as illustrated by the case of K-pop.

In contrast to the Foucault- and Barnett-types of culture, these accumulated and accumulable cultures have a much broader but clearer sense in terms of their definitions by highlighting temporal accumulation, which transforms a non-cultural object into a cultural one. A good example is the Great Wall of China.

The construction of this wall was initially for defensive purposes, therefore it was not considered as a site of cultural heritage at the time. However, as this wall has survived and the value of the past has been accumulated, the Great Wall now holds cultural value. Furthermore, its symbolic connotation has changed from invasion and adversity caused by enemies to a symbol of China's history and pride.

As shown in the examples above, there is a constantly changing dynamics between accumulated and accumulable cultures. However, not all accumulable cultures can be transformed into accumulated ones. One of the prerequisite conditions for accumulable culture to survive is that it should be competitive, widely accepted, and open to technological advancements; in this regard, today's information, communication, and technology (ICT) should be seen as a potential catalyst, not a threat. Therefore, accumulable culture should not be protected and preserved, but rather be open to improvement and enhancement. By understanding these differences and distinctions clearly, better policies to promote both accumulated and accumulable cultures can be formed.

EFFECTIVE PROMOTION: THE CASE OF K-POP

Ideally, it would be more beneficial to examine the effectiveness of the public and private initiatives for both accumulated and accumulable cultures. However, this paper chooses to focus solely on accumulable culture because of its status as culture as something constantly evolving, and because of the many examples that can be easily found. K-pop is a particularly good case study since it has two distinctive periods: before and after the mid-1990s. Before the mid-1990s, K-pop and the Korean music industry were not well developed; it was only after this period that they began to emerge more successfully to the extent that they now enjoy international popularity. In this case, how have the public and private initiatives affected the emergence of K-pop? Which one has had a more positive impact on the promotion of K-pop? This section examines comprehensively the effectiveness of the public and private initiatives in promoting K-pop by focusing on production, consumption, and related sectors, as well as the business context. The study adopts Michael Porter's diamond model and its extension, namely the generalized double diamond model, to provide a more comprehensive perspective (For further details, see Porter; Moon, Rugman, and Verbeke).

1. Production

As mentioned before, accumulable culture can also be further developed by incorporating influences from overseas. Currently, K-pop is considered as a unique genre due to its strong association with Korea, but it actually absorbs and blends the styles of American hip-hop, J-pop, Euro techno, African dance music, and even Korean traditional music. In the past, government initiatives sought to prohibit the import of foreign music in order to protect the local music industry. This naturally hindered mutual cultural exchange with other countries. Many imported albums, with new genres and different styles, could not be released in their original format because songs were often censored and removed from an album (B. Kim). From the consumer's perspective, the only way to listen to the original album without censorship was through pirated albums, which increased the demand for them. As the piracy market grew, the recording labels began to produce pirated albums in order to overcome their financial difficulties in the underdeveloped Korean music market of the 1960s-1980s (B. Kim). This is why the Korean market suffered severely from piracy which had an impact on its music sales. Luckily, with the emergence of digitization, Korean entertainment companies were able to find a way to overcome this piracy problem by adopting a new business model. (Refer to Parc and Kawashima for details).

Due to a series of diplomatic conflicts, the Korean government also prohibited the import of Japanese cultural products. Under these conditions, copying popular Japanese content was the easiest way to produce "quality" products for Korean companies. Therefore, throughout the 1980s and 1990s, disputes over plagiarism in relation to copying J-pop continued in Korea, and hampered the ability of Korean producers to make creative quality content. Eventually, the Korean government opened up its market to Japanese culture in the late 1990s (Pager). This evolution was painful for the domestic music industry due to severe competition caused by the influx of foreign cultural products and companies over a short period; however, it was beneficial for the further development of creativity and diversity for K-pop by creating the need to differentiate them from their international counterparts in the long-term (Parc, Messerlin, and Moon).

2. Consumption

Following the 1997 financial crisis, the Korean government focused on upgrading its internet infrastructure in order for the country to enjoy greater competitiveness in the new era of ICT. Thanks to this policy, many industries were able to easily adopt digitization and strengthen their position. The music industry was no

exception. By embracing digitization, the Korean music industry found a more effective way to overcome its severe piracy problem (Parc, Messerlin, and Moon). As a result, these music companies significantly changed the process for producing and consuming music: from analog to digital, albums to songs, possessing to accessing, audio to visual, and end products to promotional products (for further details refer to Parc and Kawashima). This shows that these indirect initiatives by the government helped these Korean companies to embrace digitization, which led them to improve and enhance K-pop's attractiveness and its global popularity.

As Korea's cultural contents have gained their international popularity, the government has taken advantage of this development to promote the Korean brand. In this respect, the government set up strategic plans and used the success of *Hallyu* or the Korean Wave as the focus for its publicity campaigns (MCST). A narrative has evolved from this effort that considers the Korean government to be the key factor that helped K-pop's success. International media outlets and many scholars have quoted it almost verbatim without much criticism (M. Kim; Walsh), and the association of K-pop with the national identity of Korea became too strong. Consequently, Korean cultural goods became easy targets for boycotts during international political disputes.

When Korea and Japan clashed over several sensitive diplomatic matters such as territorial disputes and the issue of wartime sexual slavery in 2012, the popularity of K-pop in Japan decreased significantly. Almost immediately, K-pop band groups disappeared from Japanese television screens (Park). Such a backlash meant that it took several years for K-pop to regain its popularity in Japan. A similar situation happened in China. When the Korean government made the decision to allow the deployment of a US anti-ballistic missile defense system, known as Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) to defend the country from the threat posed by North Korea, the Chinese government unofficially "boycotted" Korean cultural contents in 2016. A great number of planned TV dramas and concerts were canceled and K-pop's popularity decreased significantly (Park). If K-pop did not have a strong image associated with the government, it would have been less of a target for these campaigns.

3. Related Sectors

When emphasizing the role of the government in the success of *Hallyu,* a number of academics and media outlets usually point out as evidence the government's support for concerts, music festivals, and Korean Wave conventions such as KCON (Kwon and Kim; Wang). This may appear to be a compelling case; however,

it is important to note that when the Korean government began to support these aforementioned events, K-pop had already gained a significant level of international popularity. Thus, it would be more accurate to say that the Korean government has been taking advantage of K-pop in order to promote the "national brand" of Korea (Cho and Kim; Oh and Lee; Parc, "The Effects of Protection"). Recently, the Korean government has even established a department dedicated solely to K-pop and the official position on its role is very telling. A government official in the department stated that the "Korean Wave, including K-pop, has been gaining a lot of international attention, and it is culturally beneficial to the national interests, so the state provides full support" (Kelly). This clearly demonstrates that public support is not seeking to promote K-pop, but rather the international popularity of K-pop is being utilized to boost the brand of Korea.

K-pop's success has also attracted the international private sector, but not because of the government's support. A key example is L Capital, the private equity arm of the French luxury goods giant LVMH, who invested approximately US$ 80 million into one of the leading K-pop companies YG Entertainment, Inc. (Lee; Parc, Messerlin, and Moon). This company manages a stable of top performers, including BigBang and Psy. Although Korea has actively tried to attract foreign direct investment for various sectors since the 1980s, it was only after K-pop's international success that LVMH and several Chinese companies decided to invest in the Korean music industry.

4. Business Context

From the 1960s to the 1980s, the Korean government tightly controlled public opinion and the media. As such, the authorities restricted songs that contained any decadent lyrics and/or critical words about society and the government. Along with this, its censorship distorted the business environment of the Korean music industry. Until the late 1980s, the government banned around 1,700 K-pop songs for various reasons: they mimicked Japanese style, or were deemed vulgar, graceless, decadent, and too grieved (National Archives of Korea). Some rock songs were banned due to their "untrained" vocal style—based on the listening tastes of people in the public sector when they compared with the vocal style of existing songs. Songs such as "Lie" were prohibited because the government believed that it promoted distrust in Korean society. These public initiatives with "good" intentions were not very helpful for the development of K-pop.

As K-pop has emerged internationally in the early 2000s, a great number of individual aspirants from other parts of the world came to Korea looking to use their talent to become members of K-pop band groups and/or to become part of the Korean Wave. Talents have come from Canada (Henry in Super Junior-M), China (Fei and Jia in Miss A, Victoria in f(x), and Zhou Mi in Super Junior-M), Chinese Taipei (Kuan-lin Lai in Wanna one and Tzuyu in Twice), Japan (Sana, Mina, and Momo of Twice), Thailand (Lisa in Black Pink), and the United States (EXP as a group). It is hard to argue that these individuals came to Korea solely for the purpose of promoting their nation-state or that the Korean government's initiatives attracted them to Korea. Despite international political disputes in the region, they came because the Korean entertainment companies would help them develop their talent and gain international popularity. Indeed, many of them have become successful thanks to the training programs offered by these entertainment companies. Furthermore, their presence in the Korean music industry makes K-pop more diverse and dynamic.

DISCUSSION

Facing the strong dominance of American pop culture, a number of countries have begun to protect their cultural industries. For example, import quotas, screen quotas, subsidies for film industries, and broadcasting quotas for radio have been introduced. Notably, with the increasing popularity for on-demand audiovisual media services, such as Netflix and Amazon Prime, the European Union now requires that these streaming service providers reserve at least 30 percent share for European works in their contents (Stolton). Many of these protectionist measures are pursued under the name of "diversity of cultural expressions." At first, they seem to be effective in order to protect cultural industries. However, these public initiatives do not distinguish between accumulated and accumulable culture. They may also bring about other unexpected side effects, which are ultimately unhelpful to cultural industries—notably accumulable culture.

The European film industry has already experienced these negative side effects. For example, after World War II, many European countries introduced regulations, such as Eady Levy in the United Kingdom, which made it difficult for American film production in Europe to take back profits to the United States. These regulations pushed American production companies to transform their subsidiaries into European companies in order to maximize the utilization of frozen funds caused by these regulations. Later, when Europe introduced subsidies for film production and international co-production, it was these American subsidiaries that benefited the most in Europe. Thus, these protectionist measures did not help promote

the European film industry, but instead supported the internationalization of the Hollywood film industry. In contrast, effective trade policies can be of help by lowering regulatory barriers and setting a proper level of tax relief and subsidies (Parc and Messerlin). Unfortunately, the private sector became complacent, and vested interests emerged in the competition for various public subsidies. As a result, the European private sector has been losing its international competitiveness when compared with other countries.

With regard to the issue of cultural appropriation in K-pop, it is argued that K-pop has often used talents from America, Japan, and Sweden, but has packaged them as Korean products. Such criticism is derived from ignorance about the dynamics of culture mentioned earlier in this text. The Korean music industry should instead be seen as a small museum akin to the Louvre that collects competent talents from all over the world and synergistically puts them on display. Seen from this perspective, it would imply that if K-pop groups do not choose to use French talent, it may well be because France does not possess the kind of internationally attractive and competitive talent that K-pop would be interested in. One should not forget that there have been many international talents who achieved success in France: Jacques Brel from Belgium and Céline Dion and Pierre Garand known as Garou from Canada. Instead of criticizing K-pop, it would be more beneficial to learn more from its strategy. The core message of K-pop's success is "if Korea can do it, so can everyone else."

CONCLUSION

Culture is often thought to be something that should be protected from others and carefully preserved as part of the country's national identity. This view may appear to make sense considering that culture has formed over the course of a long history and therefore becomes associated with the national image. This accumulated culture naturally calls for it to be protected and preserved. However, a different type of culture—accumulable culture—has begun to appear more recently; sometimes it is not even considered as part of culture. Accumulable culture is less associated with the nation-state, but a few countries have been competitive enough to take the lead in several specific aspects of accumulable culture. If an accumulable culture and its practices have been accumulated over a significant amount of time in a geographical area or collective group, it will transform into an accumulated one; therefore, a tight association with the nation-state materializes. Hence, this distinctive difference should be well defined in order to develop more effective policies that can further promote cultural industries. For these reasons, this paper distinguishes the concepts of accumulated and accumulable cultures and argues

that, whereas accumulated culture calls for some public initiatives, accumulable culture can be more effectively promoted by private initiatives as seen in the case of K-pop.

The history of K-pop has two contrasting periods: one in which it was struggling and far from enjoying global recognition and the other where it has achieved great success and international popularity. The public sector had good intentions to promote the music industry, but their approach was too limited and rooted in past practices. These public initiatives unfortunately created hindrances in the development of the Korean music industry and K-pop, which resulted in unexpected negative side effects. By contrast, when the public sector became less involved in the industry, K-pop gained its international competitiveness through private initiatives. This case clearly demonstrates the greater effectiveness of private initiatives over public ones.

The consumption side should also be carefully considered. There have been private initiatives to disseminate K-pop through the Internet, which has not relied greatly on copyright protection. As a result, K-pop has been readily available online and international consumers have had more opportunities to encounter it. More importantly, we need to keep in mind that K-pop has been consumed by international fans because it is appealing—not because it is from Korea. When this content is taken advantage of by the nation-state, K-pop can be negatively affected as seen in the cases of the political disputes with China and Japan.

The findings of this article have no intention to demonstrate that public initiatives are obsolete or ineffective, but that private initiatives are generally more effective in promoting accumulable culture. Public initiatives should then be more indirect in promoting the cultural industries—for instance, by improving the country's Internet infrastructure—something that has helped in the dissemination of K-pop. If a country benefits from the popularity of accumulable culture in a way that strengthens its national brand, the state may take advantage of it. However, directly intervening in this type of culture will bring about counterproductive effects. This paper highlights the importance of accumulable culture that can easily be utilized and improved in the context of daily life. By expanding a great deal of attention from accumulated culture to an accumulable one, more comprehensive and effective cultural policies can be established.

If the world truly wishes to enjoy cultural diversity and creativity, then there should be a clear understanding of what culture is: Culture is not inherited, but created.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Laboratory Program for Korean Studies through the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the Korean Studies Promotion Service of the Academy of Korean Studies (AKS-2015-LAB-2250003).

Notes

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 5th World Congress for *Hallyu*, in Seoul, Korea (20 Oct. 2017). This paper was further developed and updated. Some parts of this article have been examined by Jimmyn Parc ("Is Mona Lisa Smiling"; "Cultural Exception").
2. There should be a clear distinction between the nation-state and the kingdom under Louis XIV. During his time, the audiences for ballet were mostly members of the royal family and other figures of nobility. Thus, Louis XIV can be regarded as both a consumer and a patron. Furthermore, the Académie Royale de Danse can be seen as a system that is related to industry functions such as production, dissemination, and consumption (or exhibition).
3. As shown above in the case of wine and Halloween, this paper avoids the use of "traditional" culture since this is too much associated with the nation-state in general. In addition, in order to emphasize the importance of temporal accumulation and timing difference, the terms "accumulated" and "accumulable" are used.

Works Cited

Ainslie, Mary J., Sarah Domingo Lipura, and Joanne B.Y. Lim, "Understanding the Hallyu Backlash in Southeast Asia: A Case Study of Consumers in Thailand, Malaysia and Philippines." *Kritika Kultura*, vol. 28, 2017, pp. 63–91.

Barnett, Clive. "Culture, Government and Spatiality: Reassessing the 'Foucault Effect' in Cultural-Policy Studies." *International Journal of Cultural Studies,* vol. 2, no. 3, 1999, pp. 369–397.

Choe, Sang-Hun, and Mark Russell. "Bringing K-pop to the West." *The New York Times*, 5 Mar. 2012, p. B10.

Choi, DaeYong, and Pan Suk Kim. "Promoting a Policy Initiative for Nation Branding: The Case of South Korea." *Journal of Comparative Asian Development*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2014, pp. 346–368.

Christout, Marie-Françoise. *Le ballet de cour de Louis XIV, 1643-1672: Mises en Scène* [The Court Ballet of Louis XIV, 1643–1672: Staging]. Picard, 2005.

Foucault, Michel. "Technologies of the Self." *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, edited by Luther H. Martin, Huck Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton, U of Massachusetts P, 1988, pp. 16–49.

---. "Governmentality." *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality,* edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991, pp. 87–104.

Garnham, Nicholas. "Concepts of Culture: Public Policy and the Cultural Industries." *Cultural Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1987, pp. 23–27.

Guback, Thomas. "Film as International Business." *Journal of Communication*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1974, pp. 90–101.

Hawkes, Jon. *The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability: Culture's Essential Role in Public Planning*. Common Ground, 2001.

Holden, John. *Creating Cultural Value: How Culture Has Become a Tool of Government Policy*. Demos, 2004.

Hayward, Susan. *French National Cinema*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2005.

Johnson, Paul. "The Renaissance: A Short History." *The New York Times*, movies2.nytimes.com/books/first/j/johnson-renaissance.html. Accessed 17 Aug. 2018.

Kelly, Emma. "The South Korean Government Actually Has a Department Dedicated to K-pop." *Metro*, 19 Jan. 2018, metro.co.uk/2018/01/19/south-korean-government-actually-department-dedicated-k-pop-7242799/. Accessed 17 Aug. 2018.

Kempers, Bram, and Beverley Jackson. *Painting, Power and Patronage: The Rise of the Professional Artist in the Italian Renaissance*. Penguin, 1995.

Kim, Byung. "A Study on the Process of Bootleg Records Popularization in Korea during 1960-80s." *The Research of the Performance Art and Culture*, vol. 24, 2012, pp. 47–78.

Kim, Millim. "The Role of the Government in Cultural Industry: Some Observations from Korea's Experience." *Keio Communication Review,* vol. 33, 2011, pp. 163–182.

Kwaak, Je-Yup. "K-pop Grows on Disposable 'Fast Music.'" *The Korea Times*, 4 Dec. 2011, www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/biz/2012/02/123_100092.html. Accessed 14 Apr. 2018.

Kwon, Seung-Ho, and Joseph Kim. "The Cultural Industry Policies of the Korean Government and the Korean Wave." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 20, no. 4, 2014, pp. 422–439.

Lee, Joyce. "Bling Meets K-pop: LVMH Fund Invests in Psy Producer YG." *Reuters*, 20 Aug. 2014, reuters.com/article/yg-entertainment-investment/bling-meets-k-pop-lvmh-fund-invests-in-psy-producer-yg-idINKBN0GK0UL20140820. Accessed 18 Aug. 2018.

Lhatoo, Yonden. "K-pop Is an Infectious Disease, not a Cultural Export to Be Proud of." *South China Morning Post*, 30 Dec. 2017, https://sc.mp/2zPKrAV. Accessed 16 June 2018.

Li, Eric, X. "The Rise and Fall of Soft Power." *Foreign Policy*, 20 Aug. 2018, foreignpolicy.com/2018/08/20/the-rise-and-fall-of-soft-power/. Accessed 17 Sept. 2018.

Lindvall, Helienne. "Behind the Music: What Is K-Pop and Why Are the Swedish Getting Involved?" *The Guardian*, 20 Apr. 2011, theguardian.com/music/musicblog/2011/apr/20/k-pop-sweden-pelle-lidell. Accessed 15 April 2018.

McGuigan, Jim. *Culture and the Public Sphere*. Routledge, 2012.

MCST (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism). "Hallyu palchŏn chŏllyak [Strategies for Development of Hallyu]." mcst.go.kr/usr/kwave/plan/planMain.jsp. Accessed 15 Aug. 2018.

Messerlin, Patrick, and Jimmyn Parc. "The Effect of Screen Quotas and Subsidy Regime on Cultural Industry: A Case Study of French and Korean Film industry." *Journal of International Business and Economy,* vol. 15, no. 2, 2014, pp. 57–73.

Messerlin, Patrick, and Jimmyn Parc. "The Real Impact of Subsidies on the Film Industry (1970s–Present): Lessons from France and Korea." *Pacific Affairs,* vol. 90, no. 1, 2017, pp. 51–75.

Messerlin, Patrick, and Isabelle Vanderschelden. "France's Protected and Subsidised Film Industry: Is the Subsidy Scheme Living Up to Its Promises?" *Handbook of State Aid for Film*, edited by Paul Murschetz, Roland Teichmann, and Matthias Karmasin, Springer, 2018, pp. 311–332.

Messerlin, Patrick, and Wonky Shin. "The K-pop Success: How Big and Why So Fast?" *Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 45, no. 4–5, 2017, pp. 409–439.

Mitchell, Timothy. *Colonizing Egypt*. U of Cambridge P, 1988.

Moon, Hwy-Chang, Alan M. Rugman, and Alain Verbeke. "A Generalized Double Diamond Approach to the Global Competitiveness of Korea and Singapore." *International Business Review*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1998, pp. 135–150.

National Archives of Korea. "Kŭmgi wa tongche kŭrigo chayul [Prohibition, Control, and Freedom]." theme.archives.go.kr/next/tabooAutonomy/forbidenSongList.do. Accessed 15 Aug. 2018.

Nye, Joseph, S. Jr. "Soft Power." *Foreign Policy*, vol. 80, 1990, pp. 153–171.

Oh, Ingyu, and Hyo-Jung Lee. "K-Pop in Korea: How the Pop Music Industry Is Changing a Post-Developmental Society." *Cross-Currents: East Asian History and Culture Review*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2014, pp. 72–93.

Pager, Sean. "Beyond Culture vs. Commerce: Decentralizing Cultural Protection to Promote Diversity through Trade." *Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business,* vol. 31, 2011, pp. 63–135.

Parc, Jimmyn. "Cultural Exception vs. Cultural Openness: Back to Seoul, BTS!" *ECIPE*, 18 Oct. 2018, http://ecipe.org/blog/cultural-exception-vs-cultural-openness-bts/. Accessed 4 Nov. 2018.

---. "Evaluating the Effects of Protectionism on the Film Industry: A Case Study Analysis of Korea." *Handbook of State Aid for Film,* edited by Paul Murschetz, Roland Teichmann, and Matthias Karmasin, Springer, 2018, pp. 349–366.

---. "Is Mona Lisa Smiling or Laughing at the MEP's vote on Netflix?" *ECIPE*, 4 Oct. 2018, http://ecipe.org/blog/mona-lisa-vote-on-netflix/. Accessed 4 Nov. 2018.

---. "The Effects of Protection in Cultural Industries: The Case of the Korean Film Policies." *The International Journal of Cultural Policy,* vol. 23, no. 5, 2017, pp. 618–633.

Parc, Jimmyn, and Hwy-Chang Moon. "Korean Dramas and Films: Key Factors for Their International Competitiveness." *Asian Journal of Social Science,* vol. 41, no. 2, 2013, pp. 126–149.

Parc, Jimmyn, and Nobuko Kawashima. "Wrestling with or Embracing Digitization in the Music Industry: The Contrasting Business Strategies of J-pop and K-pop." *Kritika Kultura*, vol. 30/31, 2018, pp. 23–48.

Parc, Jimmyn, and Patrick Messerlin. "In Search of an Effective Trade Policy for the Film Industry: Lessons from Korea." *Journal of World Trade,* vol. 52, no. 5, 2018, pp. 745–764.

Parc, Jimmyn, Patrick Messerlin, and Hwy-Chang Moon. "The Secret to the Success of K-pop: The Benefits of Well-balanced Copyrights." *Corporate Espionage, Geopolitics, and Diplomacy Issues in International Business*, edited by Bryan Christiansen and Fatmanur Kasarci, IGI Global, 2016, pp. 130–148.

Park, Soo-Yoon. "Ilbonsŏ doisalanan hallyu bulssi… K-pab sedaekyŏch'e ro yŏngtohwakchang [Revived K-pop in Japan… Expanding its Popularity with the New Generation of K-pop]." *Yonhapnews*, 24 Feb. 2018, www.yonhapnews.co.kr/bulletin/2018/02/23/0200000000AKR20180223156400005.HTML. Accessed 25 Apr. 2018.

Porter, Michael. *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. The Free Press, 1990.

Rabinow, Paul. *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*. MIT Press, 1989.

Santino, Jack. "Halloween in America: Contemporary Customs and Performances." *Western Folklore,* vol. 42, no. 1, 1983, pp. 1–20.

Scott, David. "Colonial Governmentality." *Social Text,* 43, 1995, pp. 191–220.

Solery, Claire. "BTS, les Bons Petits Soldats de la K-pop Coréenne [BTS, the Good Small Soldiers of the Korean K-pop]." *Le Point*, 4 June 2018, http://w.lpnt.fr/2223867t. Accessed 7 July 2018.

Stolton, Samuel. "MEPs Vote for More European TV on Our Screens." *Euractive*, 2 Oct. 2018, www.euractiv.com/section/media4eu/news/meps-vote-for-more-european-tv-on-our-screens/. Accessed 3 Oct. 2018.

Van Gogh, Vincent. *The Complete Letters of Vincent Van Gogh*. 1896. Bulfinch Press, 2000.

Walsh, John. "*Hallyu* as a Government Construct: The Korean Wave in the Context of Economic and Social Development." *The Korean Wave*, edited by Yasue Kuwahara, Palgrave Macmillan, 2014, pp. 13–31.

Wang, Amy. "Hallyu, K-pop! Inside the Weirdest, Most Lucrative Global Frenzy in Music." *Quartz*, 3 July 2016, qz.com/725161/kpop-feature/. Accessed 14 Apr. 2018.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture*. Fontana, 1981.

—. "Culture and Society." *Essays in Criticism*, vol. 9, no. 4, 1959, pp. 432–437.