

The Performative Turn in Living History Tourism in Korea

Jeong, Ok Hee*

- | | |
|---|--|
| I. Dance, Tourism, and Performance | IV. Contemplations on the Performativity
in Tourism |
| II. Authenticity, Liminality, and
Performativity in Living History | V. Conclusion |
| III. Three Cases of Living History in Korea | Bibliography
Abstract |

I. Dance, Tourism, and Performance

Passing through Deoksugung Palace and Gyeongbokgung Palace in the bustling city of Seoul, I see many tourists taking photos alongside guards in folk costumes in front of the palace gates or taking photos of themselves dressed up in Hanbok against the palace walls. The contrast between the tourists in folk costumes and city commuters and that between historic buildings and skyscrapers in metropolitan Seoul create a fascinating scene juxtaposing old/new, holiday/every day, and tradition/modernity. Given that the number of the actors and tourists seen wearing folk costumes has been growing over the years, it seems reasonable to assume that tourism has become livelier and more experiential in nature. Interestingly, the forms of tourism adopted many conventions of performing arts—e.g., the concepts of stages, performers, audiences, and characters. As a dance researcher, I was intrigued by how history, culture, and heritage were embodied, experienced, understood, and enjoyed in these forms, and curious about how they are intertwined with the conventional way traditional dances are consumed in tourism.

Dance is an integral part of the tourism industry. Dance images fill out numerous postcards, booklets, and advertisements, while folk/ethnic dance repertoires form an industry of “song-and-dance tourism.”¹⁾ Dance anthropologists examined how indigenous dance forms adapt to new

* Lecturer, Sungkyunkwan University, okheejeong1@gmail.com

1) J. Desmond(1999), *Staging Tourism: Bodies on Display from Waikiki to Sea World* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press), p.xv.

cultural conditions such as proscenium stages and shows for tourists. In her groundbreaking book *Staging Tourism* (1999), Jane Desmond analyzed how bodies authenticate identity and anchor systems of knowledge on sociocultural differences. The contributors to *Dancing Cultures* (2012) also discuss globalization, tourism, and identity from the vantage point of anthropology of dance.²⁾

When it comes to dance academe in Korea, however, tourism is narrowly conceptualized as performing traditional dance repertoires for foreign visitors in theaters, festivals, and tourist sites. Most studies on dance and tourism tend to be conducted quantitatively and are economically oriented, focusing on how to commodify Korean dance as a commodity for consumption for local or foreign visitors.³⁾ Yet, the intersection of dance and tourism is more than a collection of traditional dance repertoires because both of dance and tourism involve bodily presence and enactment that create social meanings and ideologies. Dean MacCannell, a pioneering scholar in tourism, contends that “tourism is not just an aggregate of merely commercial activities; it is also an ideological framing of history, nature, and tradition; a framing that has the power to reshape culture and nature to its own needs.”⁴⁾ Thus, interlocking the discourse of tourism and dance research in Korea is the initial goal in this study.

Since the emergence of socio-anthropological research on tourism in the 1970s, the relationship between tourism and performance became an important theme. In his seminal work *The Tourist* (1976), Dean MacCannell adopted Erving Goffman’s concept of performance and distinction between a front stage and a back stage to the mechanism of tourism industry.⁵⁾ Today, many scholars point out that tourism transformed from the act of consuming as spectators to the act of participating and experiencing.⁶⁾ Given the emergence of terms such as ‘embodied tourism’ or ‘tourism as performance,’ performance became not only a metaphor but also an analysis tool to examine multifaceted aspects of tourism. I perceive that performance and performativity are useful lenses to understand the emergence and popularity of a new type of tourism, and to bridge dance and non-dance activities within a broader scope of discourse in tourism.

In this research, I examine performativity of three different tourist attractions in South Korea: Korean Folk Village, the royal guard-changing ceremony, and the Hanbok experience. Focusing on

2) Hélène Neveu Kringelbach and Jonathan Skinner, eds.(2012). *Dancing Cultures: Globalization, Tourism, and Identity in the Anthropology of Dance*(New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books).

3) Chung-Han Kim(2011), A Study on Success Factors and Developing Strategies in Global Culture Brands of Korean Dance, doctoral dissertation, Dankook University; Yu Mi Kim(2016), Plans for creating cultural values in Korean Dance through the analysis of Korean Wave, doctoral dissertation, Sejong University; Ji Young Yoo & Hyun Soon Baek(2014), Familiarity Recognized by Foreigners and Estimation of Intention of Watching Performance for Korean Traditional Dance, *Journal of Korean Dance*, 32(3), pp.163-184.

4) D. MacCannell(1992), *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers* (New York: Routledge), p.1.

5) D. MacCannell(1976), *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (New York: Schochen Books).

6) F. Hughes-Freeland(2012), Movement on the Move: Performance and Dance Tourism in Southeast Asia, *Dancing Cultures*, p.102.

cases that seldom catch the attention of dance scholarship, my goal is threefold.

First, I identify Korean Folk Village, the royal guard-changing ceremony, and the Hanbok experience as living history with a strong connotation of performativity. Living history is a genre of cultural tourism that is characterized by the presence of costumed performers at historic sites. If the Village fits to the standard model of living history, the other two cases seem rather a far cry from the model. Nevertheless, contemplating on the elements of the embodiment, experience, participation, simulation, and performance in these cases, I contend that tourism in Korea gradually underwent a performative change, transforming into a field of ideology and commodification with a more nuanced approach.

Second, I introduce anthropological and discursive approaches to tourism and dance. Dance is not just a bodily movement since it embodies and encapsulates many social issues. Given the perception of dance as exotica as well as heritage in the tourism industry, tourism can be a vantage point to investigate the ideology of culture, globalization, and authenticity in dance.

Third, I argue that dance and non-dance phenomena should be contextualized since moving bodies are cultural constructs. Scholars argue that the distinction between dance and non-dance movement is not clear-cut, as “the performative and experiential aspects of the various formal genres of patterned movement, ritual, marching, and dancing are not just a spillover from the ‘ordinary’ habitus, but derive their power partly by speaking against, resonating ironically with, this very base.”⁷⁾ Thus, the dialectical relationship between dance and non-dance provides the rationale to discuss these events that are seemingly unrelated to dance in this volume of the journal that devotes to the theme of “dance and culture.”

This study is only a preliminary approach to three cases, each of which requires in-depth and fieldwork-based research. The rationale for choosing to discuss from a broad perspective at the expense of explicating concretely is that these cases have neither been discussed in tandem with each other nor contextualized with dance discourse. As an interdisciplinary inquiry, this study interconnects what has been discussed in the realms of anthropology, tourism studies, history, performance studies, and dance studies. Therefore, the significance of this study lies in its centrifugal attempt to expand the boundary of dance research.

II. Authenticity, Liminality, and Performativity in Living History

Gaining popularity in the mid-twentieth century, cultural tourism became a predominant form of

7) W. James(2003), *The Ceremonial Animal: A New Portrait of Anthropology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.78-79, quoted from H. Kringelbach and J. Skinner(2012), *The Movement of Dancing Cultures, Dancing Cultures*.

tourism around the world. Cultural tourism is “a form of recreation in which travelers spend significant leisure time and money on cultural activity.”⁸⁾ In other words, it promotes culture, instead of promoting nature or animals. The domestic and international tourism industry has vastly increased since the 1960s with the advent of highways and leisure classes, and the interest in more engaging or experiential forms of tourism fueled the diversification of tourism industry, in which the cultural component became a key feature.⁹⁾

The nature of cultural tourism is both educational and entertaining, as cultural tourism gears towards “customized excursions into other cultures and places to learn about their people, lifestyle, heritage, and arts in an informed way that genuinely represents those cultures and their historical contexts.”¹⁰⁾ The pursuit of pleasure and educational mandates hints that cultural tourism has much resemblance with the Grand Tour. Popular in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, the Grand Tour is a form of tourism in which European elite traveled to witness the legacy of Western civilization. The fact that the Grand Tour consisted mostly of visiting high art museums, galleries, and theatres indicates that culture is viewed as somewhat elitist and virtuous. Yet, being educational and being entertaining are not always concomitant, and tours often can be boring. This is why living history/living museum was so popularized with the use of reenactment.

As an umbrella term, cultural tourism can be further divide into experiential tourism and heritage tourism. If the former promotes the visitor’s participation based on “being involved in and stimulated by the performing arts, visual arts and festivals,” then the latter is more geared towards “visiting preferred landscapes, historic sites, buildings or monuments and seeking an encounter with nature or feeling part of the history of a place.”¹¹⁾ If the original meaning of cultural tourism is more suitable to define experiential tourism, with a connotation of high art, the current trend of cultural tourism is more appropriate in defining heritage tourism, with a strong connotation of subjective experience.

Interestingly, the distinction between experiential tourism and heritage tourism parallels the distinction between authenticity and liminality, which many scholars discern as the dual-goal of tourism. First, MacCannell argues that tourism is a search for the authentic other, “a desire to experience that which is not us.”¹²⁾ This is well shown in what is called ‘ethnic tourism,’ ‘scientific tourism,’ or ‘anthropological tourism,’ in which stereotypes and categories of ethnic and cultural difference across the globe are consumed by tourists playing anthropologist-for-a-day.¹³⁾ Yet, the

8) D. Kennedy(1998), p.176.

9) J. Craik(1997), *The Culture of Tourism, Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*, edited by Chris Rojek and John Urry(London and New York: Routledge), p.114.

10) J. Craik(1995), *Is cultural tourism viable? Smarts*, 2(6): 6-7, quoted from J. Craik(1997), p.121.

11) M. Hall and H. Zeppel(1990), *Cultural and heritage tourism: the new Grand Tour?*, *Historic Environment* 7, p.87; Quoted from J. Craik(1997), p.118.

12) D. MacCannell(1976).

13) N. Salazar(2013), *Imagining Otherness: Anthropological Legacies in Contemporary Tourism*,

pursuit of Otherness is not confined to an exotic culture, as it also applies to the imagined past of one's own culture. Authenticity functions as a rationale to revisit the premodern of one's own culture. MacCannell refers to the artificial preservation and reconstruction of the non-modern world within modern society as "museumization of the premodern."¹⁴ The temporal and cultural discrepancy between modern and premodern is a condition sufficient to imagine Otherness—and this explains much of the boom of living history amongst local people, especially when a society undergoes rapid modernization and urbanization.

Along with the 'salvage paradigm' that enabled imperialist anthropologists to research and preserve non-Western indigenous cultures, the concept of tradition as rare and endangered is most valued in the tourism marketing. Concepts such as heritage and authenticity are highly revered in historical/anthropological tourism. Yet, many anthropologists problematize the premise of authenticity that culture or tradition is somehow static, homogenous, unchanging, pure, and essential (MacCannell, 1976; Hobsbawn and Ranger, 1983; Cohen, 1988; and Kirchenblatt-Gimblett, 1994), and suggest 'hybridity' (Clifford, 1997) or 'invented tradition' (Hobsbawn and Ranger, 1983) as its alternative.

Yet, tradition is recent and artificial, in that "many seemingly venerable traditions were the conscious products of modern state formation and were not very old at all."¹⁵ Hobsbawn believed that tradition is rather invented as a strategy to construct a national identity and collective memory. This belief gave rise to the recognition that the pursuit of authenticity in tourism is merely illusory, as it relies on what MacCannell calls "staged authenticity."¹⁶ In his seminal book *The Tourist* (1976), MacCannell discussed why the back stage is considered more authentic than the front stage in tourism, how the backstage is, in fact, as thoroughly fabricated as the front stage, and how difficult it is to acquire authenticity in tourism in which everything is meticulously commodified for easy consumption.

Second, along with the illusory pursuit of authenticity, tourism also pursues liminality. Liminality is a term used by anthropologist Arnold van Gennep and theater scholar Victor Turner to refer to anti-structural and disorderly activities removed from daily activities and structures of normal cultural operation.¹⁷ John Urry (1990) indicates that tourism is not so much fueled by authenticity, but by the pursuit of liminality. According to Urry, "tourism is different from, separate from, our day-to-day lives; we tour in order to see and experience something different."¹⁸ Out of everyday life and work, tourists seek to experience the Other. Yet, aware of the superficiality of cultural tourism,

Anthropological Quarterly, 86(3), pp.669-696.

14) D. MacCannell(1976), p.xii.

15) L. Kendall(2011), Introduction, *Consuming Korean Tradition in Early and Late Modernity*, p.4.

16) D. MacCannell(1976), p.98.

17) While influenced by van Gennep's term the liminal, Turner developed his own term the liminoid. M. Carlson(1996), *Performance: a critical introduction*, 2nd ed. (New York and London: Routledge), pp.18-19.

18) J. Urry(1990), pp.2-3.

tourists do not care so much about authenticity as about whether they are having fun. Experience, play, event, participation, and fun are the words that outweigh authenticity in tourism, in which liminality governs tourists' experience and satisfaction. Dennis Kennedy emphasizes the significance of experience while saying that, "tourists are modernity's paradoxical consumers who seek not merchandise but experience."¹⁹⁾ Here, a touristic site is a mere occasion for experience, and performance happens in the mind of tourists.

Liminality is a key concept that explains the contradictory traits of living history. Living history is defined as "an attempt by people to simulate life in other time," or "an attempt to live as other people once did."²⁰⁾ It re-creates the socio-historical-cultural sites in which daily lives of the people at a given point in time in the past are enacted with the presence of performers in regional costumes. If tourism pursues liminality by escaping from one's own everyday life, living history enables it via plunging into others' everyday life in the past.

Living history is a genre of cultural tourism emerged in the 1970s in Europe and North America. With a growing interest in folklore, many European government-supported institutions collected and researched folklore in local provinces. In North America, outdoor museums exhibiting historical buildings and artifacts became popular. For example, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. supported the restoration of Williamsburg, the colonial capital of Virginia. Soon there emerged many outdoor museums focusing on the daily lives of ordinary people. In America, the most typical form of a living history museum is in the form of farms, while villages, historic houses, forts, ships, urban neighborhoods, and archeological sites are also accepted as living history.²¹⁾

Notable examples of living history museums in North America include Plimoth Plantation, Old Sturbridge Village, and Colonial Williamsburg²²⁾. Plimoth Plantation focuses on the colonization era as early as 1627; Old Sturbridge Village offers the history of rural New England from the 1830s onward; Colonial Williamsburg reconstructs colonial Virginia. Different from each other in terms of conceptualization and commoditization of the past, these museums are outdoor museums retelling history by incorporating the lively reenactment of costumed performers. The reason why the living history museum is popular is because the traditional museum is critiqued for being boring and static. While museums tend to exhibit collected objects in bounded spaces, living history provides liveliness and entertainment with costumed interpreters.

Living history's characteristics can be summarized as follows. First, living history has an interest in the folk and their everyday life.²³⁾ Whereas the traditional discourse of history tends to focus on the

19) D. Kennedy(1998), p.175.

20) J. Anderson(1982), p. 291.

21) Ibid., p.291.

22) These three living history museums are the subjects of analysis in Scott Magelssen's *Living History Museums: Undoing History through Performance* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2007).

dominant group and meaningful events, such as wars, inaugurations, and royal weddings, living history is based on the premise that the folk and their everyday life matter. Largely supported by folklore scholarship, living history asserts that “folklife of a region is historically significant and its material culture should be collected, preserved, studied, and especially interpreted.”²⁴⁾ Second, a living history museum is ‘interpretive’. The word ‘interpretive’ is used to convey the meaning that a living history museum aspires to provide a whole experience rather than providing authentic yet partial remnants. This is more relevant to the dispute over the priority of restoration versus preservation in preserving the historical buildings in the nineteenth century.²⁵⁾ Third, living history is theatrical, using costumed performers. Living history borrows several conventions and elements in theater, such as costumes, props, sets, role playing, and the designation of time and space.

Moreover, living history is performative. There is much resemblance between the trait of living history and that of performance. Living history and performance both value participation more than spectatorship. Here the concepts of history, tradition, and even heritage are embodied and enacted, instead of remaining abstract, distant, and immobile. Moreover, living history and performance emphasize the sense of here and now, the liveness of re-enactment, and the event. The shared experience amongst interpreters and tourists often creates ritual experiences.

Scott Magelssen particularly frames tourism in performance studies when he discusses second-person living history modality. Categorizing living history into first-, second-, and third-person living history, Magelssen argues that the shift from first- and third-person to second-person living history emphasizes experiential and embodied interpretation of tourists.²⁶⁾ According to Magelssen, first-person character interpretation is that costumed staffs speak in first-person present tense about the lives of the people they portray, and never break character. Third-person interpretation uses past tense, and costumed staffs are costumed tour guide. Meanwhile, second-person interpretation can provide educational and embodied experience and interpretation of history. Promoting participatory and critical agency of tourists, Magelssen argues that the history/heritage tourism industry does not guarantee objective history with a capital “H.” This shows that the performativity of living history allows individuals to engage in history as protagonists.

23) J. Anderson(1982), p.291.

24) Ibid., pp.293-294.

25) P. Rosen(2001), *Change Mummified: Cinema, Historicity, Theory*(Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), pp. 47-55.

26) S. Magelssen(2006), Making History in the Second Person: Post-Touristic Considerations for Living Historical Interpretation, *Theatre Journal* 58(20), pp.291-312.

III. Three Cases of Living History in Korea

1. Korean Folk Village

Founded in October 1974, Korean Folk Village is the most classical and popular outdoor museum in South Korea. Under the goal of representing the folklore of Joseon Dynasty from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century, it simulates the everyday life of ordinary people in the form of village. Benchmarking outdoor museums in Europe, America, and Japan that emerged in the 1960s, the Village was conceptualized as both a heritage museum and a tourist attraction.

Whereas museums tend to commemorate monuments and architectures of the ruling class, folk villages render ordinary buildings and lifestyles of the middle- and low-classes as proper objects of collective commemoration. Since the early 1970s, the Park Jung-Hee administration has built folk villages and folk tourism belts all around the country. Going through the procedure of investigation-designation-protection, five traditional villages were nominated in 1977, whereas Korean Folk Village focused on promoting the tourism industry. Located in Yongin province near Seoul, the Village showcased traditional buildings and clothes, folk life, craft, and food for domestic and foreign tourists. The Village consisted of a farming village, a fishing village, and a mountain village, all of which consisted of smaller villages that represented different regions of the Korean peninsula. Kim and Jeon (2010) indicate that the Village reconstructed folk houses as the epitome of the Joseon dynasty, yet the way the houses were represented was rather a sampling of prototypes rather than a faithful restoration of those in a specific region or era.²⁷⁾

Scholars point out that what is presented as “Koreanness” reveals South Koreans’ anxiety over the rapid industrialization and urbanization in the 1960s and 1970s.²⁸⁾ In this sense, Korean Folk Village was built to showcase rural housings and lifestyles as a national identity to the domestic and international tourists.²⁹⁾ Considering that the Park administration also promoted Saemaeul Movement—which literally means a new village—that modernized outworn houses in rural areas at that time of pursuing the Village, we can see that Korean Folk Village functioned as an antithesis of modernization by providing the symbol of tradition. Indeed, many scholars perceive the Village in line with Hobsbawn’s concept of “invented tradition.”³⁰⁾ The Village functions as a justification for the government to have the controlling power over the people, in which tradition is used as an

27) Ji-Hong Kim & Bong-Hee Jeon(2010), Development of Korean Folk Village in 1970s and its Historical Meaning, *Journal of The Korean Housing Association*, 21(6), pp.31-42.

28) L. Kendall(2011), p.11.

29) Kim & Jeon(2010).

30) Young Ae Kim(2010), The Changing Place Identity of The Korean Folk Village, master thesis, Korea National University of Education; Kim & Jeon(2010); Jin-Kyo Lee(2014), Cultural implication of consumption of commercialized ‘tradition’: A case study of ‘Korean folk village’, *The Study of Practice Folkloristics*, 23, pp.193-224.

ideological means to build the identity of a nation.

While acting as a heritage museum, the Village is also highly commoditized as a theme park. From the establishment, it embraced not only traditional buildings and objects, but also recreational facilities such as a playground, a zoo, a botanical garden, and even a skate link. Nowadays, it adopts systematic and operational traits of other commercial theme parks in Korea, such as Lotte World or Everland, in terms of admission, amusement, advertisement, goods, mascots, etc.

As a heritage museum and theme park, the Village conceptualizes history in terms of space and architecture. The Village provides a spatial imagination of the way ordinary folk lived in the form of villages, landscapes, and old buildings. Due to its material and stable nature, the architecture of the Village was scrutinized for authenticity. From early on, committees disputed whether a specific building or its arrangement is authentic enough.³¹⁾

Given this emphasis on material authenticity, performance became marginalized. Of course, the Village regularly presented traditional performances in its performing areas, and even had 16 households to live in the Village along with approximately a hundred commuting craft persons to showcase diverse traditional craftsmanship.³²⁾ Yet, the concept of performance underneath these traditional art performances and craft showcases was a special and professional enactment that was totally separated from the daily life. The overall emphasis on hardware (architectures and objects) instead of software (performance) tended to render the Village a “life-size diorama”, an empty space of the past in which the folklore was reanimated via reconstructed buildings and objects.

Despite the popularity of the Village in the 1970s and 1980s, the enthusiasm gradually dwindled in the 1990s as the village was regarded as an old, outdated, and stale destination for field trips. Then, a turning point occurred in 2012 as the Village hired part-time actors for the event titled “Welcome to Joseon.” The presence of part-time actors and their humorous and ironic acts rapidly made the Village more appealing to tourists, especially to the younger generation. The actors embodied diverse characters in the past, including a beggar, a corrupt officer, a ghost, a crazy girl, and a guard. Without a script to follow, they act ad lib, freely interacting with visitors. Some characters such as a beggar and a crazy girl created enormous popularity on social media. Described as “ggul-alba (sweet part-time job),” their ironic labor of idling was controversial, questioning the dichotomy of work/leisure, actor/tourist, and cultural production/consumption. Due to the soaring popularity, there soon opened contests for the actors, and some actors even got promoted to full-time employees in the Village, a symbolic gesture for the young generation in the economically depressing era. Moreover, the popularity soared due to social media. Short video footages capturing the actors comically improvising and interacting with the visitors were circulated online. In 2014, the Village began to

31) Ibid.

32) Ibid., p.38.

have an audition for actors; in 2016, the rate of competition for this part-time job was 20:1. Nowadays, the presence of actors became the most critical factor in attracting a large crowd of tourists, as seen in the Village's public website promoting events with the actors.³³⁾

The Village still offers traditional performances and crafts showcases. Currently, programs such as 'a farmer's music and dance', 'acrobatics on a tightrope walking', 'equestrian feats', and 'traditional wedding ceremony' are performed regularly. Yet, the performative focus shifted from these formulated, closed-form demonstrations to more dialogic and interpretative interactions between actors and visitors. Combining a unit of bounded space with a unit of well-trained actors, the Village transformed itself from being an outdoor heritage museum to a living history museum. Furthermore, various events and themes in campaigns strengthened the lively and whimsical nature of acting. Adding the theme of "rural life" to that of the Joseon era, these events, such as Geuddae Geunori(Old-time Favorite Plays) or Subak Seori(Stealing Watermelons) point to nostalgia rather than authenticity. The popularity of the actors made a shift in emphasis from space to experience, from observation to participation, from authority to fun, and from authenticity to liminality.

Shifting focus from authenticity to performance, the logic of tradition and authenticity is loosened to embrace nostalgia. The Village developed themes and characters not only from the Joseon era but also from the mid-twentieth century. Juxtaposing and hyperlinking historical elements with liminal play, the actors embody modern characters, such as the unemployed, the good student, and the town foreman in the early- to mid-twentieth century costumes.³⁴⁾ Moreover, the actors interact with visitors and other actors, ad lib, referring to many topics and expressions in vogue in TV series, movies, and current affairs. It shows that Korean Folk Village chose to place liminality over its original pursuit of authenticity.

2. The Royal Guard-Changing Ceremony

In the metropolitan area of Seoul, the five adjacent palaces from the Joseon Dynasty—Deoksugung Palace, Kyeongbokgung Palace, Changdukgyung Palace, Changgyeongung Palace, and Jongmyo Shrine—are ones that tourists routinely visit. Easily accessible from Seoul metropolitan city, these palaces serve as tourist attractions because they have inherent cultural value while simultaneously offering amusement through the events that are offered to the tourists.³⁵⁾ Interestingly, the palace tours encouraged the emergence of new kinds of living history tours such as the royal guard-changing ceremony and Hanbok experience.

33) The homepage of Korean Folk Village. <<https://www.koreanfolk.co.kr/>, 2017-7-7>.

34) Ji Hyun Kim(2015. 3. 23.). The Korean Folk Village Getting Younger Due to the Part-time Actors, *Weekly Donga* <<http://weekly.donga.com/List/3/all/11/99055/1>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

35) Since 2015, Cultural Heritage Administration has organized the Royal Culture Festival at these palaces in May. <<http://www.royalculturefestival.org>>.

The idea of having a royal guard-changing ceremony at palaces in Seoul, first suggested by a Seoul city official No-Geun Lee, emerged in 1996.³⁶⁾ Blatantly duplicating the guard changing ceremonies in England and Vatican City, the ceremony started as a mere imitation, often derogated as pure fabrication. However, after gaining popularity from tourists, it increased in size and expanded to include wider regions and was authenticated with historic records.

The archetype for the guard changing ceremony in Korea is the Changing the Guard at Buckingham Palace, England, that was initiated in 1887 to honor the Golden Jubilee of Queen Victoria. Many commentators refer that the ceremony in England was used as the bench mark model and many details were closely observed, ones such as the appearance of the Queen's Guards in red uniforms and tall black hats, the perfect standstill and focus of the Queen's Guards in front of the bustling crowd, and the precise and elaborate choreographic ceremony. In fact, these elements were faithfully duplicated and embodied in the guard-changing ceremony in Korea: the guards wear Hanbok uniforms with traditional hats and swords/clubs and are accompanied by marching flags and band. Like the English soldiers, they behave solemnly and still while enthusiastic tourists take pictures with them.

Some of the most famous ceremonies in Seoul take place in the Deoksugung Palace and the Gyeongbokgung Palace, while other cities (e.g., Huasung, Gongju, Naju, Gongju, and Jeju) have similar comparable ceremonies in palaces and other different historic sites. Intriguingly, the ceremony at the Deoksugung Palace was first organized by Seoul City in 1996, and the one at the Gyeongbokgung Palace was organized by the Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation in 2002.³⁷⁾ Run by two different stakeholders, these ceremonies interpret and actualize the concept of guard-changing quite differently from each other, the differences including the guards' costumes, ceremony procedure, illustration, souvenir, and even the English translation of the titles of the events.³⁸⁾ Due to different interpretations of the ceremony based on scarce historical records, the disparities indicate that, no matter how thoroughly they are authenticated, the royal guard-changing ceremony is a modern invention reflecting the desire for heritage, prosperity, and dignity. Moreover, both Seoul City and the Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation perform these ceremonies differently according to their geographic conditions and assets. Seoul City runs the guard-changing ceremony along with 'tolling a Boshingak Bell event', 'Namsan Bongsudae (Beacon Tower) Lighting ceremony', and other special events such as traditional martial art and performance demonstration. Conducted at historic sites

36) Royal guard changing ceremonies are conducted by various local and governmental entities all over the country, and named differently whether in English and Korean. Thus, this study does not italicize it in order to refer to its typical format instead of specifying a particular event.

37) The homepage of Royal Guard Changing Ceremony by Seoul City Government, <<http://royalguard.kr>, 2017. 7. 1.>; The homepage of Korean Cultural Heritage Foundation, <<http://www.chf.or.kr>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

38) The ceremony at Deoksugung by Seoul City is translated as "the changing ceremony of the royal guard; the ceremony at Kyeongbokgung by Korean Cultural Heritage Foundation is translated as "the royal guard-changing ceremony."

scattered in Seoul, these events have the implication of defending the capital from the foreign military power. Meanwhile, the Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation categorizes the royal guard-changing ceremony as the revival of ancient ceremonies in the royal palace, including Sangchamui (a reconstruction of a daily morning meeting between the King and the principal official), Giroyeon (a royal ceremony to honor the elderly), Jongmyodaeje (a ritual commemorating the monarchs of the Joseon Dynasty in Jongmyo) as well as other events at palaces. The Foundation's focus is on reconstructing and recreating rituals and royal lives of the Joseon Dynasty. Despite having diverging focuses, these ceremonies reveal that the interest shifted from specialized events to daily lives and works of the past—whether being at the palace or the military base.

However, recreating the daily life in the past is illusionary and elusive. Just as the Changing the Guard ceremony in England is only a modern invention to unite the divided people in a society experiencing class conflicts and rapid urbanization, the guard-changing ceremony in Korea reveals little about the historical authenticity that it desires. Although no document on the guard changing ceremony *per se* exists, fragmented records mentioning the presence of the guard at the gates in the palace was used to substantiate the existence of the ceremony. Rather causally emerged as a pure simulacre, the ceremony presently acquired authenticity, and the authenticity is strengthened by the meticulous restoration of the costume, procedure and choreography based on historic records. This fits the concept of “emergent authenticity,”³⁹⁾ when a phenomenon initially considered inauthentic acquires authenticity with the passage of time.

The significance of the royal guard-changing ceremony lies not in authenticity but in its performance. As a pseudo-ritual, the ceremony is performative in terms of choreography and embodiment. First, the ceremony is all about choreography, as its temporal and spatial configuration creates meanings and symbols of history. Temporally, the ceremony's procedure is elaborated meticulously and conducted orderly. Spatially, the ceremony's choreography resembles the ideology of ballet with its emphasis on discipline, line, harmony, and geometric formation in space.⁴⁰⁾ The ceremony's royal and military connotations indicate that the ritualization itself endows dignity and authority, rendering the tourists the ritual participants as well as its witnesses.

Second, the embodiment of the guards is also performative. Like solemn English soldiers, each guard embodies heritage of the Joseon Dynasty. The half-human, half-mannequin feature of the guards creates an illusion of being in a time machine or an *in situ* museum, while the guards' parade and ceremony recreate the past vividly for the spectators. This is exactly why the rare instance when a

39) E. Cohen(1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(3), pp.371-386.

40) Jennifer Homans effectively demonstrated why ballet was welcomed by the ruling class as military discipline in French and Russian courts. J. Homans(2010), *Apollo's Angels: A History of Ballet*(New York: Random House).

Queen's Guard shouted at the troublesome onlookers is circulating on the news, breaking the distinction between the front and the back.⁴¹⁾ Here, as Philip Crang suggests, each person is not just a substitute of a mannequin as his solemn presence and precise movement embodies the heritage of the past. Philip Crang's comment on the significant role of the workers in the tourism industry is as follows:

Role of tourism employees, not just as producers of a product but as part of that very product, producing themselves as part of their jobs.... Producing their bodies; expressions, feelings, in sum their 'performed selves.' Identity politics are at the heart of tourism labour processes.⁴²⁾

Given the significance of the guards' presence and role, however, the way they are treated and represented undermines the dignity given to them. Whereas the royal guard at Birmingham Palace is real soldiers of high rank and social status, the guards at various palace ceremonies in Korea are mostly temporary workers. Working in brutal conditions facing various economic disadvantages, they must endure extremely hot or cold weathers in heavy costumes and work for subcontractors at a low wage. This reveals that, despite the superficial authenticity endowed to them via historical records and splendid costumes and props, they fail to get the social respect that is commensurate with their social status. The discrepancy between the external and internal status of the royal guard indicates that these ceremonies are thoroughly conceptualized as a visual attraction, only happening in what Goffman called "front region." In sum, the photogenic performativity that lacks sincerity creates fractures in the ideology of the glorious past of the strong and splendid dynasty that these ceremonies so arduously tried to establish.

3. The Hanbok Experience

Whereas scholars often examine Korean Folk Village and the royal guard-changing ceremony as 'tourism commodities', the act of wearing Hanbok at touristic sites, usually called as 'Hanbok experience', draws little attention in academe. Yet, I perceive that this act is one example of living history, and renders tourism more a playful performance.

In October 2013, Cultural Heritage Administration decided that visitors to palaces and historic sites in Hanbok be exempted from paying admission fees. Since free admission usually applies only to the senior and the disabled, this regulation drew the attention of young people, leading the number of

41) Sean Morrison(2017.3.27.). 'Get yersel' away!': Watch the Queen's guard shout at a tourist dancing outside St James' Palace, <<http://www.businessinsider.com/watch-the-queens-guard-shout-at-a-tourist-dancing-outside-st-james-palace-2017-3>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

42) Philip Crang(1997), Performing the Tourist Product, *Touring Cultures*, Chris Rojek and John Urry, eds. p.152.

Hanbok rental shops around the palace to grow rapidly. Considering that an average admission fee to a palace is 3,000 won and an average fee to rent Hanbok starts from 15,000 won for 4 hours with an additional fee for hairdos and accessories, wearing Hanbok to avoid paying the admission fee barely seems like a fair bargain, even if one can visit a few adjacent palaces in a day.⁴³⁾ This implies that the boom of Hanbok is not so much about monetary concerns as about the trend among the young generation in the era of social media.

Also, a majority of those who visit palaces in Hanbok are local residents rather than foreign tourists, most of whom are females or couples in their 20s. Renting Hanbok from a shop or wearing one from their own closets, young visitors take pictures of themselves against the walls and buildings of palaces and post them on the social network such as Facebook or Instagram. As taking pictures while wearing Hanbok in palaces and sharing those pictures on the social networking sites became in vogue, called “proof shots,” the fad rapidly spread to more diverse demographic sectors and regions. Jeonju Hanok Village and Bookchon Hanok Village are the most popular tourist sites where tourists are most often seen in Hanbok, and taking photos of wearing Hanbok when traveling abroad is also becoming popular among Korean people.

Responding to the Hanbok boom amongst local/foreign tourists, different governmental stakeholders set laws and regulations that publicly promote the beauty and heritage of Hanbok. The Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism established Hanbok Advancement Center in 2014 and commemorated Hanbok Day events since 2013, while Seoul City enacted a municipal ordinance to promote Hanbok in 2016.⁴⁴⁾

The boom of ‘the Hanbok experience’ among Korean people paradoxically signifies the distance between premodern and modern lives in Korea. Hanbok has been considered as ‘the ceremonial suit hanging in the closet,’ ‘traditional holiday clothes,’ and even as ‘the clothes that are more often worn by foreigners.’ This psychological distance is portrayed in the titles of the news articles targeting the Korean readers: “an unfamiliar face of Hanbok in downtown Seoul,” “Was Hanbok this beautiful?,” “Rediscovery of Hanbok,” and “Have you ever traveled in Hanbok?”⁴⁵⁾ Due to this distance, the Hanbok experience can be interpreted as costume play, a very liminal and festive action, as seen in the name of a Hanbok rental store, “One Day Hanbok.”⁴⁶⁾ The very act of taking photos of oneself in Hanbok is meaningful to people, as it signifies an escape from a daily life.

43) Byung Hak Lee(2015. 7. 22.), Have You Ever Travel in Hanbok? *Hangyoreh Daily*, <http://www.hani.co.kr/arti/specialsection/esc_section/701359.html, 2017. 7. 1.>.

44) The Homepage of Hanbok Advancement Center. <<http://www.hanbokcenter.kr>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

45) Byung Hak Lee(2015. 7. 22.); Hye Kyung Min(2017. 2. 9.), Rediscovery of Hanbok in Seoul City, <http://korean.visitkorea.or.kr/kor/bz15/travel/content/C03020100/view_2385541.jsp, 2017. 7. 1.>; Won Mo Yoo(2016. 7. 15.). Strange Faces of Hanbok Witnessed in Seoul, Donga Ilbo, <<http://news.donga.com/View?gid=79206978&date=20160715>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

46) The Homepage of Oneday Hanbok. <<http://www.onedayhanbok.com>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

Seoul City enacted the municipal ordinance in order to promote Hanbok as part of “our proud culture” instead of viewing it as an antiquated, uncomfortable clothing, to encourage people to purchase Hanbok instead of renting it, and to create an atmosphere of wearing Hanbok in daily life.⁴⁷⁾ However, I argue that these rationales undermine the very reasons that initially prompted the boom. The boom in Hanbok amongst the younger generation did not begin from the governmental campaign or patriotism, but from their voluntary involvement with the symbolic game, liminoid, and even self-orientalism. In other words, the boom in Hanbok occurred precisely because the young people rendered it a special and fashionable performance in which one plays as both a leading role and a supporting role for other tourists. Taking pictures of themselves and modeling for other tourists, tourists made the Hanbok experience an outdoor game of simulacrum with no baggage in the name of authenticity or heritage. This act of wearing Hanbok dismantles the premise of living history tourism that distinguishes the host (tourists) from the guest (actors/interpreters), as they become the agency that constitute and experience history.

Moreover, the Hanbok experience at palaces also disrupts the distinction between the front stage and the back stage. Simply speaking, Hanbok rental stores are the backstage where one gets fully costumed in Hanbok, with traditional hairstyle wearing head pieces, shoes, and other accessories, while the palaces are the front stage where one acts as a model for and impersonification of traditional culture. However, another layer can be added when considering that the purpose of wearing Hanbok is to share photographs on the social network. Then, the presence on the social network is the front stage, and the reality of walking around the palaces becomes the back stage.

Subject to the wishes of the visitors, the palaces and historical sites become a mere background to take photographs to share on social media. Here, the authenticity and authority of history, that were emphasized at the royal guard-changing ceremony, are missing. There is no obvious historical authenticity that can be attached to the Hanbok experience. As a pure simulacrum, it does so dragging history, nostalgia, or heritage to recall and protect. Instead, unconstrained promenade into an imagined time/space became possible to individuals.

Although it may seem like a pure simulacrum, the Hanbok experience is still ideological as real people wear Hanbok. A notable case is the dispute on the gender stereotype and conservative criteria on how to wear Hanbok. The guideline for allowing visitors wearing Hanbok to get free admission to the palace states that men should wear Jeogori (upper garment) and Baji (trouser), and women should wear Jeogori and Chima (skirt).⁴⁸⁾ This means that the cross-dressing and partial wearing of either upper or lower piece of the two-piece clothes are banned. Moreover, the guideline also bans

47) Seoul Metropolitan Government. The municipal ordinance for the promotion of Hanbok. <<http://opengov.seoul.go.kr/sanction/8913898>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

48) <<http://www.royalpalace.go.kr:8080/content/board/view.asp?seq=370&page=1&c1=&c2=>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

excessively exposing the body, applied only to women, and wearing too-modernized Hanbok. This regulation was announced when some young people cross-dressed Hanbok to express their queer, transgender, and transvestite identity or only for fun, and when a couple shared a set of the clothes in order to save money. While the regulation purportedly restricted “ugly tourists,” many young people denounced its oppressive and dualistic view on gender that does not respect individual’s identity and dignity.⁴⁹⁾ Some feminist and gender activists organized a “Hanbok Crossdressing Parade” on Oct. 13th, 2016, questioning the ideology on Hanbok.⁵⁰⁾

Also, a less conspicuous yet problematic regulation is to define Hanbok with its wrapping Jeogori, banning wearing a V-necked T-shirt and V-necked modernized Hanbok. This problematizes a certain type of Gaeryang Hanbok (literally means improved Hanbok) that is favored by older generation for decades. The Kyeongbokgung Palace attempts to justify the ban by maintaining that the free admission is to preserve tradition, thus any act to distort tradition must be banned. The regulation on how to wear Hanbok means that, despite their aspiration to make Hanbok a way of life, Hanbok should be worn to signify tradition to foreigners and local people. In sum, by eliminating the cheerfulness in Hanbok, the government’s effort to encourage and establish regulations that will promote Hanbok contradicts the goal of making Hanbok become widespread in daily life and familiar to a wider audience.

IV. Contemplations on the Performativity in Tourism

Perceiving three cases of tourist attractions as living history, I argue that these can be interpreted as living history with the emphasis of performance. Noticing the performative aspect is getting more prominent in the passage of time, I perceive that tourism in Korea took what performance scholars refer to as the “performative turn.” Like the “linguistic turn” or the “cultural turn” in academe since the 1970s, the performative turn acknowledge the significance and momentous impact of performativity on the arts, academe, and the society.⁵¹⁾ In this chapter, I will elaborate on the consequences and changes that this shift brings about in the tourism industry and academe.

First, the focus of the cases of living history in Korea shifted from authenticity to performativity.

49) Sang Ah Kwak(2016. 10. 6.). The Reason for ‘Women Wear Skirts, Men Wear Trousers’ for Free Admission to Palaces, *Huffington Post Korea*, <http://www.huffingtonpost.kr/2016/10/06/story_n_12369486.html, 2017. 7. 1. >.

50) Se Ah Lee(2016. 10. 10.). Outraged Citizens Protest against the Regulation Prohibiting Men Wearing Skirts and Women Wearing Trousers. *The Women’s News* <<http://www.womennews.co.kr/news/98471>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

51) Tracy C. Davis(2008), Introduction, *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies*, edited by Tracy C. Davis(New York: Cambridge University Press), p.1.

Korean Folk Village, once devoted to creating spatial and material replicas, adopted the rhetoric of performance by hiring part-time actors. Shifting its focus from appearance to practice, the presence of the actors emphasizes the enactment of and multiple engagements with history. These actors are not the typical interpreters who plainly explain historical facts to the visitors at living history museums. Nevertheless, their role-playing and humorous interaction with the visitors enliven the narrative of history that the visitors encounter. In the royal guard-changing ceremony, performativity is enacted on the guards. Unlike the actors at the Village, the guards do not mingle with the visitors, using their solemn presence to attract the visitors. As in a traditional theater, visitors passively observe the performance. However, taking photos next to the still-standing guards on historic site, visitors can experience the ‘tourism as witnessing ceremony’ with a hint of backstage tour that is usually forbidden in the theaters. In the Hanbok experience, performativity exists solely among tourists as it lacks the presence of the host. Given no authoritative script or narrative to refer to, wearing Hanbok in old palaces becomes floating signifiers. In sum, the weakened authenticity made space for the host and the guests to become more performative.

Despite weakened authenticity, however, official-level entities still rely on authenticity and even consume increased performativity to strengthen the rhetoric of historical authenticity. Started as a pure simulacra, the royal guard-changing ceremony was authenticated with historic records. Popular among younger generation, the Hanbok experience was soon publicly supported by offices, governmental budget, and regulations. This has to do with the nature of top-down, government-oriented approach in promoting tourism and building national ideology. As seen in the case of folkdance and folk performances that are selected, formulated, and fostered as a form of competition sponsored by the government, heritage tourism is a task that government must fulfill for ideological and practical reasons.⁵²⁾

The re-fortification of authenticity seems to offset the very qualities that these forms of living history tourism get popularized for—the tourists’ voluntary participation and agency. The regained popularity of the Village has to do with the subculture humor amongst online communities and social networks such as Facebook and Instagram. Particularly, Namu Wiki, a rather lopsided, subcultural, and untrustworthy encyclopedia on the web, offers detailed information on the Village, elaborating on the playful phenomena of the part-time actors in detail.⁵³⁾ Similarly, the Hanbok experience also gained popularity online as a trend among the younger generation. The fact that the participants in the Hanbok cross-dressing parade are the very generation who started the boom indicates that creating regulations in order to advocate authenticity may suffocate and petrify the spontaneous, liminal, and

52) Kun-Wu Nam(2009), The Concours of Folklore, its transformation into art, *The Studies in Korea Literature*, 36, pp.289-326.

53) Namu Wiki. Korean Folk Village. <<https://namu.wiki/w/%ED%95%9C%EA%B5%AD%EB%AF%BC%EC%86%8D%EC%B4%8C>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

playful nature of living history.

Second, the cases show that the understanding of embodiment is confined to physicality. Living history is built upon embodiment in that the very presence of human performers can create and disseminate narratives about the past. In Korea, the term *Cheheom*—literally meaning embodied experience—is used everywhere in tourist attractions, from making Kimchi to participating a traditional wedding ceremony. When it comes to the three cases that I analyzed, embodied experience can be divided into the level of the performer and the audience. The performer-level embodiment centers on the part-time actors (the Village) and the guards (royal palaces), while the audience-level embodiment centers on tourists wearing Hanbok. Witnessing the overall increase in embodiment in tourism, however, I argue that embodiment is understood narrowly as a physical thing that it fails to envision the whole person. The actors and guards are living mannequins, wearing costumes and posing at a tourist photo zone. Despite their solemn presence, the workers provide part-time or temporary labor in a dehumanizing work environment. This irony poses no concern to the stakeholders, and the workers' agency or integrity is of no concern to the tourists.

When it comes to the audience-level embodiment, experiences are generally conceptualized only on a physical level. While wearing Hanbok costume for a photo shot, the tourists have no obligation for or engagement with the past. Here, Magelssen's concept of the second-person living history seems significant. Not as an unnamed everymen filling out the history, second-person interpretation enables tourists to become legitimate real players in historic discourse that allows personal growth as well as liberation state histories and grand narratives.⁵⁴⁾ I reckon the neglecting the significance of individual's agency in conceptualizing participation and experience in tourism resulted in the visual, external, and physical rendering of embodiment.

Third, the cases reveal the commoditization of tradition and the conflicting goal of living history. The past that living history refers to is not the past *per se* but a cultural construction meticulously selected and thoroughly commodified to create market value. Tourists encounter “carefully selected histories corroborated by written documents or material evidence that affirm the themes the museums wish to promote.”⁵⁵⁾ It is often called “Disneyfication of history”, in that “shaping of living museum environments to match visitor expectations and comfort, rather than to simulate accurate, or at least meaningful, reconstructions.”⁵⁶⁾

When it comes to living history that pursues both educational and entertaining values, the commoditization can bring about the tendency that the whole program is structured to highlight certain aspects of the past while shunning political or ethical issues. Only G-rated contents are

54) Magelssen(2006).

55) *Ibid.*, p.291.

56) Eric Gable and Richard Handler(1996), After Authenticity at an American Heritage Site, *American Anthropologist* 98(3), p.573; Quoted in *Ibid.*, p.293.

selected, organized, and commodified for easy consumption, usually forming familiar and nostalgic narratives of the past. For instance, we can see that the actors in Korean Folk Village render diverse members of the premodern society as rather caricature-like comic figures while satirizing the unjust and problematic customs, including hitting the bum of the accused at a local office and hiring a concubine for entertainment. Also, reconstructed royal events, either the recorded (e.g., reproduction of royal banquets) or the imagined one (e.g., the royal guard changing ceremony), reinforce the narrative of the dominant group with the power of historic authenticity and authority, while erasing the narrative of the oppressed.

More often than not, the attempt to go beyond the visitor's expectation faces strong resistance. In living history, "getting visitors to think [of American history] beyond entertainmentality more often than not induces rage, rather than cultivating reasoned reflection."⁵⁷⁾ This is a dilemma prevalent in the genre of popular anthropology. Critiquing Western biases on culture, popular formats such as TV documentaries tend to conform to what the audiences already know and want to see. Moreover, as Salazar (2013) indicates, cultural tourism constantly reproduces stereotypes and colonial thoughts, to which local tour guides conform and exoticize themselves in order to meet the tourists' expectation.⁵⁸⁾

This conflicting goal of living history suggests that cultural tourism provides a highly commodified and commercialized view of tradition in the name of education. A commentator lamented that the royal guard-changing ceremony crushed down the 600 years of history into a mere spectacle.⁵⁹⁾ Combined with consumerism and nationalism, the rhetoric of tradition and heritage produces "a sanitized view of culture."⁶⁰⁾ Tradition, heritage, and even education become a flag to die for in living history, yet what should be recognized is that they justify commoditization of the history. This leads me to gaze the tourism industry more critically, reflexively, and even ironically, as below.

The performative turn in living history tourism should be discussed more in terms of liminality, the playful nature of the way tourists engage with the destination. More and more tourists are aware of the synthetic nature of tourism and the invented nature of tradition on which tourism is based. While authenticity is still emphasized to achieve commercial and conceptual success, tourists tend to confront it with an irony and playfulness. Maxine Feifer suggests the concept of the "post-tourist", describing it as "people who revel in the inauthenticity of routine excursionary activities, taking fun in touristic games."⁶¹⁾ "[Consuming] the past with irony,"⁶²⁾ post-tourists do not buy the ideology of

57) T. Luke(2002), *Museum Politics: Power Plays at the Exhibition* (Minneapolis: Minesota University Press), p.16.

58) N. Salazar(2013), pp.674-675.

59) Yoon Soo Jang(2013. 10. 8.). The Frontage of Daehan Gate Mixing Reality and Surreality, *Weekly Kyunghyang*, 1235 <<http://weekly.khan.co.kr/khnm.html?mode=view&code=115&artid=201310011841371>, 2017. 7. 1.>

60) Myra Shackley(1994), When is the Past? Authenticity and the Commoditization of Heritage, a conference report, *Tourism Management* 15(5), pp.396-97, quoted D. Kennedy(1998), p.180.

authenticity but play with the very discrepancy that is exposed in the pursuit of authenticity.

In the end, the increased attention to embodiment, participation, and experience endowed tourism with performativity, yet performativity itself cannot guarantee understanding or satisfaction. Rather, performativity in living history transforms the nature of authenticity from the historical evidence to the status of mind. As Kennedy asserts, touristic sites are only the occasion for experience, and experience occurs in the mind of spectator.⁶³⁾ In other words, experience is happening not on a physical and visual level, but on an existential and sensual level. Indicating the limit of an object-related approach to authenticity, Ning Wang (1999) suggested that existential authenticity has more to do with emotions, sensations, relationships, and a sense of self.⁶⁴⁾ Reconceptualization of authenticity from the objective to the existential seems crucial to enhancing the performativity while increasing agency and integrality both of the performers and the audiences in living history tourism. This is a crucial point that has significant implications for dance research.

V. Conclusion

In this research, I examined the performativity of three cases of living history tourism in South Korea: Korean Folk Village, the royal guard-changing ceremony, and the Hanbok experience. Living history is a form of cultural tourism involving the presence of costumed performers at historical sites. Framing them as living history, I aimed to highlight their performative nature and to further contextualize it with the discourse of performance. Given that goal, Korean Folk Village and the royal guard-changing ceremony placed performativity on the role of the host by hiring the actors and the guards, while the Hanbok experience fostered the performativity among the tourists themselves. Emphasizing the performative quality, these cases show the decrease in the historical authenticity and the increase in liminality to the tourists.

The cases that I analyzed allude to the performative turn in tourism in Korea. They might imply that the shift from document and archive to performance and experience, or the shift from the object-oriented to service-oriented is an inevitable phenomenon. However, no matter how the performative turn in tourism may seem more educational, desirable, and even futuristic, it still has ideological and political issues that need to be further scrutinized, as discussed in the previous chapter.

61) Maxine Feifer(1985), *Going Places: The Ways of the Tourist from Imperial Rome to the Present Day* (London: Macmillan), pp.259-68; Quoted in D. Kennedy(1998), p.182.

62) M. Gibson and B. Trezise(2008), Book review: *Living History Museums: Undoing History through Performance* by Scott Magelssen, *Theatre Journal* 60(4), p.678.

63) D. Kennedy(1998), p.175.

64) Ning Wang(1999). Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(2), pp. 349-370.

In fact, the way history and culture are conceptualized and presented in the tourism industry is utterly ideological. We need to remind ourselves that, “the intertwined practices of performance, historiography, heritage.... reveals less about actual pasts than about the political and ideological preoccupations of the present.”⁶⁵⁾ This critical and reflexive stance should be taken when incorporating the study of tourism in dance research.

Embodiment not only shows but also does. We tend to envision embodiment only as a physical or even visual commitment, but it encompasses the mental, the social, and the ideological. Here is the vantage point that dance research can actively engage with the discourse of tourism and performance since dance scholarship dealt with numerous ways of embodied presence. What the performative turn in tourism implies to dance research is that we need to question the notions of authenticity, heritage, and artistry of dance and non-dance activities in settings that are either touristic or not touristic. The terms of body, embodiment, movement, performance, and experience are the bases upon which dance and non-dance activities exist. In a sense, the distinction between dance and non-dance may not be so obvious as we think it is.

65) M. Gibson and B. Trezise(2008), p.678.

■ Bibliography

- Carlson, Marvin(1996). *Performance: a critical introduction*, 2nd ed. New York and London: Routledge.
- Davis, Tracy C., ed.(2008). *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Desmond, Jane D.(1999). *Staging Tourism: Bodies on Display from Waikiki to Sea World*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hobsbawn, Eric and Terence Ranger, eds.(1983). *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Homans, Jennifer(2010). *Apollo's Angels: A History of Ballet*. New York: Random House.
- Kendall, Laurel(2011). *Consuming Korean Tradition in Early and Late Modernity: Commodification, Tourism, and Performance*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Kringelbach, Hélène Neveu and Jonathan Skinner, eds.(2012). *Dancing Cultures: Globalization, Tourism, and Identity in the Anthropology of Dance*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Luke, Timothy M.(2002). *Museum Politics: Power Plays at the Exhibition*. Minneapolis: Minesota University Press.
- MacCannell, Dean(1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schochen Books.
- MacCannell, Dean(1992). *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rojek, Chris and John Urry, eds.(1997). *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rosen, Philip(2001). *Change Mummified: Cinema, Historicity, Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Urry, John(1990). *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Society*. London: Sage.
- Wang, Ning(2000). *Tourism & Modernity: A Sociological Analysis*. United Kingdom: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Kim, Chung-Han(2011). A Study on Success Factors and Developing Strategies in Global Culture Brands of Korean Dance. doctoral dissertation. Dankook University.
- Kim, Yu Mi(2016). Plans for creating cultural values in Korean Dance through the analysis of Korean Wave. doctoral dissertation. Sejong University.
- Kim, Young Ae(2010). The Changing Place Identity of The Korean Folk Village. master's thesis. Korea National University of Education.
- Kim, Ji-Hong & Bong-Hee Jeon(2010). Development of Korean Folk Village in 1970s and its Historical

- Meaning, *Journal of The Korean Housing Association*, 21(6): 31-42.
- Lee, Jin-Kyo(2014). Cultural implication of consumption of commercialized ‘tradition’: A case study of ‘Korean folk village’. *The Study of Practice Folkloristics* 23: 193-224.
- Nam, Kun-Wu(2009). The Concours of Folklore, its transformation into art. *The Studies in Korea Literature* 36: 289-326.
- Yoo, Ji Young & Hyun Soon Baek(2014). Familiarity Recognized by Foreigners and Estimation of Intention of Watching Performance for Korean Traditional Dance. *Journal of Korean Dance*, 32(3): 163-184.
- Anderson, Jay(1982). Living History: Simulating Everyday Life in Living Museums. *American Quarterly*, 34(3): 290-306.
- Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(3): 371-386.
- Gibson, Melissa and Bryoni Trezise(2008). Book review: Living History Museums: Undoing History through Performance by Scott Magelssen, *Theatre Journal* 60(4): 677-678.
- Kennedy, Dennis(1998). Shakespeare and Cultural Tourism. *Theatre Journal*, 50(2): 175-188.
- Magelssen, Scott(2006). Making History in the Second Person: Post-Touristic Considerations for Living Historical Interpretation. *Theatre Journal*, 58(20): 291-312.
- Salazar, Noel B.(2013). Imagineering Otherness: Anthropological Legacies in Contemporary Tourism. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 86(3): 669-696.
- Taylor, Diana(2006). Performance and/as History. *TDR*, 50(1): 67-86.
- Wang, Ning(1999). Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(2): 349-370.
- Jang, Yoon Soo(2013. 10. 8.). The Frontage of Daehan Gate Mixing Reality and Surreality, *Weekly Kyunghyang* 1235 <<http://weekly.khan.co.kr/khnm.html?mode=view&code=115&artid=201310011841371>, 2017. 7. 1.>
- Kim, Ji Hyun(2015. 3. 23.). The Korean Folk Village Getting Younger Due to the Part-time Actors, *Weekly Donga* <<http://weekly.donga.com/List/3/all/11/99055/1>, 2017. 7. 1.>.
- Kwak, Sang Ah(2016. 10. 6.). The Reason for ‘Women Wear Skirts, Men Wear Trousers’ for Free Admission to Palaces, *Huffington Post Korea*, <http://www.huffingtonpost.kr/2016/10/06/story_n_12369486.html, 2017. 7. 1.>.
- Lee, Byung Hak(2015. 7. 22.), Have You Ever Travel in Hanbok? *Hangyoreh Daily* <http://www.hani.co.kr/arti/specialsection/esc_section/701359.html, 2017. 7. 1.>.
- Lee, Se Ah(2016. 10. 10.). Outraged Citizens Protest against the Regulation Prohibiting Men Wearing Skirts and Women Wearing Trousers. *The Women’s News* <<http://www.womennews.co.kr/news/98471>, 2017. 7. 1.>.

- Min, Hye Kyung(2017. 2. 9.), Rediscovery of Hanbok in Seoul City, <http://korean.visitkorea.or.kr/kor/bz15/travel/content/C03020100/view_2385541.jsp, 2017. 7. 1.>
- Morrison, Sean(2017. 3. 27.). ‘Get yersel’ away!’: Watch the Queen’s guard shout at a tourist dancing outsi de St James’ Palace, <<http://www.businessinsider.com/watch-the-queens-guard-shout-at-a-touristdancing-outside-st-james-palace-2017-3>, 2017. 7. 1.>
- Yoo, Won Mo(2016. 7. 15.). Strange Faces of Hanbok Witnessed in Seoul, *Donga Ilbo*, <<http://news.donga.com/View?gid=79206978&date=20160715>, 2017. 7. 1.>.
- Namu Wiki. Korean Folk Village. <<https://namu.wiki/w/%ED%95%9C%EA%B5%AD%EB%AF%BC%EC%86%8D%EC%B4%8C>, 2017. 7. 1.>.
- Seoul Metropolitan Government. The municipal ordinance for the promotion of Hanbok. <<http://opengov.seoul.go.kr/sanction/8913898>, 2017. 7. 1.>.
- The Homepage of Changing of the Royal Guard Ceremony. <<http://royalguard.kr>, 2017. 7. 1.>
- The Homepage of Cultural Heritage Administration. <<http://www.cha.go.kr>, 2017. 7. 1.>
- The Homepage of Hanbok Advancement Center. <<http://www.hanbokcenter.kr>, 2017. 7. 1.>
- The Homepage of Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation. <<http://www.chf.or.kr>, 2017. 7. 1.>
- The Homepage of Oneday Hanbok. <<http://www.onedayhanbok.com>, 2017. 7. 1.>.
- The Homepage of Royal Culture Festival. <<http://www.royalculturefestival.org>, 2017. 7. 1.>

Received 2017. 7. 15
 Reviewed 2017. 7. 26
 Accepted 2017. 7. 28

Abstract

The Performative Turn in Living History Tourism in Korea

Jeong, Ok Hee

Sungkyunkwan Univ.

This research examines the performativity of three cases of living history tourism in South Korea: Korean Folk Village, the royal guard-changing ceremony, and the Hanbok experience. Living history is a form of cultural tourism involving the presence of costumed performers at historical sites. Framing them as living history, it aims to highlight their performative nature and to further contextualize it with the discourse of performance. As an interdisciplinary inquiry, this study argues that dance and non-dance phenomena should be contextualized since moving bodies are cultural constructs.

Keywords: Living history(리빙 히스토리), Performativity(수행성), Korean Folk Village(민속촌), Royal Guard Changing Ceremony(수문장교대식), Hanbok Experience(한복체험)