

**Critical Cities: Volume 3**

Myrdle Court Press, London, 2012

**Hong Kong: The Property Regime**

Wing Shing Tang in Conversation with

Ashley Wong & Yuk Hui

YH & AW: Hong Kong is widely known as a financial city and trading hub. However, looking back at the history in the 1970s and 1980s it appears as though Hong Kong's economy was mainly sustained by the manufacturing industry. In the 1990s and up to the present, Hong Kong moved towards becoming a global financial centre. In this period new industries, including high technology, logistics, and creative industry were introduced to broaden the city's economic base. These industries draw mainly from the process of financialisation, and their final goal is to be listed in the stock market. According to the reflections from some critics such as Leung Man Tao, this demonstrates certain features of colonial modernity, which results in the development of a single economic culture. The consequence of this is that the economy becomes too homogenous to produce a heterogeneous culture. What is your view on this?

WST: I find the statement that attributes the current development in culture to financialisation imprecise. Yes, from economic statistics, we did see the growing importance of the financial industry. But, in the case of Hong Kong, that growth must be understood together with the growth of the real estate sector. A land (re)development regime has developed since the late 1960s when Chinese real estate developers started to become more influential in the economy and society than their British counterparts, later gained further momentum since 1979, when the British realised that Hong Kong was to be returned to China. The growing dominance of Chinese capital was premised on the financialisation of the real estate market in the late 1960s. Since then, the boom and bust of the two markets of real estate and stock equities are intertwined. At the private level, when people gained money from the stock market, they re-invested in the real estate market, and *vice versa*. At the urban societal level, while the real estate market can obtain from the stock market the indispensable capital for expansion, the former must raise the profit margin recorded in the

company's annual ledger prepared for the latter. This can best be achieved by increasing the level of commodification of the real estate market, the sales volume of flat in particular. The dominance of exchange value over use value has constructed the ideology that economic prosperity, property development in particular, is the norm, and the government is meant to pursue it on behalf of the people. Once the government has implemented relevant actions, the latter form the 'rational' practice of the society. It is expected that society and economy should not deviate from this 'rational' course. Any course other than the designated procedures is dismissed as irrational and therefore slated to be rejected out of hand. All walks of life, including government, private entrepreneurs, town planners, architects, engineers, housing managers, legal experts, social workers, community organizers, local and legislative councillors, the middle class, and a considerable part of the working class, should support it. All tended to favour the *status quo*, meaning property development almost at any cost. The dominance of the land (re)development regime is the root cause of a heterogeneous culture.

YH & AW: In the recent years, we see more and more resistance emerge to contest the misuse and regeneration of space, for example on the Lee Tung Street, Star Ferry Pier/Queens Pier<sup>1</sup>, and the recent Tsoi Yuen Chuen movements<sup>2</sup>. These movements all resonate with what happens in the West - especially in the concept of conservation, which is largely based on a specific conception of history. As we can see that these movements propose to preserve either the historical sites or rural villages, which already establishes its own tradition and communities. In the film *Nøspace* (2009)<sup>3</sup>, architect Alvin Yip suggests that perhaps Hong Kong shouldn't follow the same conception of history and preservation. What are your thoughts on this? And how do you approach the significance to such an understanding of space?

WST: I don't know the argument of the architect Alvin Yip. My understanding, however, inform that the concept of historical conservation has very little to do with the discernible resistances to urban redevelopment in the recent years. If my point in the above is valid, it has a lot to do with the

---

1 A movement in 2006 and 2007 against the demolition of the Star Ferry and Queen's Pier and for heritage conservation in resistance to the constant rapid redevelopment of the city with a disregard to older cultures and histories - relating to the issue of memory and the problem of forgetting its colonial past in exchange for a rootless and amorphous modern culture. The Queen's Pier was demolished and rebuilt in 2008 several hundred metres onto the harbour as part of the Central Reclamation Project.

2 A movement that peaked in 2009 and early 2010 lead by media activists and the 'Post-80's Generation', against the development of the Guangzhou-Hong Kong Express Rail Link, a is a high-speed train that links travel between South China and Hong Kong that has been criticised for the displacement of village communities, disruption of the environment and being extremely costly.

3 A film produced by Ashley Wong and Nicolas Sauret featuring interviews with artists, architects, and academics on the notion of 'space' in Hong Kong as an exploration of its complex history, culture and identity. View the full film at: <http://vimeo.com/19287551?ab>

magnitude and mode of redevelopment taking place in Hong Kong, which I explained above. Regarding the particular mode of redevelopment, the requirement of the land (re)development regime is detrimental. The latter requires land availability at low cost. But, given the complexity of house ownership in high-rise buildings, land assembly is always a big problem to resolve. As a result, to expedite land assembly, the Hong Kong Government initiated the mode of public-private partnership of redevelopment by establishing the Land Development Corporation in 1988. The latter assembled land and sold it to the developer for redevelopment, while the affected residents had little say in this partnership model. As the land (re)development regime developed further in the 1990s, it became apparent that the Corporation had failed to excel in land assembly. The Government then introduced the Urban Renewal Authority, whose function of compulsory land purchase is only responsible to the Lands Development (not, as in the past, to the Executive Council). To minimise objection at the stage of ordinance enactment, the government promised that urban renewal would be ‘people-centred’. As experience in the late 1990s and the early 2000s informs us, the partnership model still places emphasis on exchange value at the expense of the people. It is this sad experience that has urged people to resist urban redevelopment in the past. Of course, in the process of deliberation and resistance, people did air their treasure of community network and the prevailing way of life. But, as explained above, labelling this development as being induced by the concept of historical conservation has completely missed the point. Nevertheless, the government has seized upon this opportunity to divert the resistance, emphasising the rhetoric of collective memory and historical preservation. I am hesitant to say that unluckily, the general public has, somehow, believed in this rhetoric and side-tracked the real issue.

YH & AW: According to your investigation on what you called ‘Shatin value’, you are trying to develop a theory into the construction of subjectivity, which if we can say also refers to a certain type of governmentality in the terminology of Michel Foucault. To Foucault, governmentality entails a sets of management techniques which correspond to a specific historical development, for example the control of populations<sup>4</sup>. Can you tell us more about how the creation of ‘Shatin value’ becomes a technique in your analysis? And as we know Shatin is a new town where middle class professional people gather, what is the significance of the middle class ‘Shatin value’ compared with the mainstream discourse of ‘the Central value’<sup>5</sup>?

---

4 Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, Population* (Lectures at the College De France). London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

5 Shatin is a new town in the New Territories of Hong Kong, Central is a financial district in the Hong Kong Island. ‘Central value’ refers to an elite culture, which is nevertheless based on economic values. The ‘Central value’ has been credited as the core value of Hong Kong, which also attributes to its economic success.

WST: I am against the employment of spatial metaphor in many cultural analyses of Hong Kong. My concept of 'Shatin value' is a confrontation of the once popular concept of 'Central value'. The latter employs the spatial metaphor of a district – central district in particular – to portray the dominant culture in Hong Kong as developed from the colonial past. In doing so, it has naturalised the development of colonial past. I employ the concept 'Shatin value' to argue that the dominant culture, which emphasises technicality, rationality and procedure, has its tempo-spatial root. It related to the massive governmental programme in response to the 1967 riots. The government must take the minimal remedies to regain legitimacy and ensure the functioning of authority power. In particular, I argue that cultural transformation was somehow achieved in the development of new towns in Hong Kong. In contrast to the 'old' way of life in the inner city, the everyday life in new towns is comparably legible and can easily be moulded and transformed in a way that the government would like. By placing houses here, offices and community facilities there, in designated zones, the government has incorporated the everyday life and desire of people into its desire and representation. Accordingly, hegemony can be achieved.

To push my point even further, if one is interested in grasping the development in Hong Kong, I would like to claim that the concept of middle class is dead as it lacks the tempo-spatial root and, therefore, the power of explanation.

AW & YH: You speak of a cultural transformation from the 'old' way of life that was introduced by the development of these new towns. Could you describe this transformation from your personal understanding and experience of the history and culture in Hong Kong?

WST: I think what happened in the case of Hong Kong if we start back in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the development was very Chinese in the sense that they had their own way of doing things. At the time, it had not gone through what we call in the West, the 'modern' revolution. It is in that process of development in the 1950's that we saw the slow introduction of the modern factory and that started to change things. Nevertheless a lot of the things still remain. For example, as we know that when the factory started, a lot of the workers came from mainland China and as a result, we would argue a lot of the 'peasant' way of life still prevailed. That has changed a little bit over time in the 1950s and 1960s. What had been happened in the 1970s is that we started to see these kind of changes. What were some of the changes we started to see? In the past people were more varied and people didn't see exchange value so fortunately, and as time proceeded they start to see it more. The people started

to narrow down and all or most of the differences became really dominated by one particular one.

AW & YH: What is this old peasant way of life ? Was there more a sense of community or sense of civic life as oppose to now?

WST: In the past, from the Chinese perspective, we were very much concerned about family and peoples' lives revolved around their family. People didn't have notions of 'rationality' in mind, for instance things like whether it feeds the family, then it's OK. People didn't do in a calculated way, like in the way we would call the 'modern man' would do it in the Western society. Even so back in the 1950s and 1960s people lived in the so called 'inner city'. In the inner city they were building and building, and there were simply crowds of people. I wouldn't speak of it as a community network or as a feeling like that. It was simply that people cared about each other more, and people would know what people were doing as a whole. Now this is not the case when we start to see in the development in the 1970s.

What I am arguing is and I think more importantly, is the dominance of one particular value system in Hong Kong, which is very much dominated by the notion of 'exchange value'. People are now very much concerned about the exchange value of their flat, and related to this, people started to do whatever they could to try to ensure that the exchange value really counted. We then start to see the value of other things not related to exchange value, start to decline.

Recently there have been a lot of debate about Hong Kong's financial budget. Financial budget in a lot of cases, people like to talk about it. For example, young people now in their 20's start to wonder how can they really buy a flat? In a debate with the Ministry of Housing, one boy said "I couldn't get married because I couldn't buy a flat". Now this logic is really dominating in the case of Hong Kong. Everyone only cares about that and the valuation of their flat. Now this was not the case in the past. We started to see this change basically at the end of the 1970s and accumulate in the 1980s, and then more so in the 1990s. It has become very much dominated with the *right to property*, and not so much to the *right of living*. Everyone cares about it and all the discussions centre around that. For example, one person will be valued by whether one can afford to buy a flat, and then by how much the value of the flat is, and because of that whole culture, when we talk about anything, it is very much relate to that. So the Hong Kong society has become so to speak, and to put it in quotes, "so simple".

AW & YH: You say this is changing now? How is it changing?

WST: It has started to change. I think some people started to reflect upon it. The numbers have been growing, but not to the extent that we would see qualitative change in a society. This is how I interpret it. Hong Kong has not proceeded to have developed to such a stage of qualitative change.

AW & YH: There has been more reaction against the privatisation of space like in Times Square where there has been hi-jackings<sup>6</sup> of the space by artists such as Luke Ching. They have started to put benches down there now, and they have less rules on the use of the space. Do you see things changing towards the development of green spaces and more public spaces?

WST: I don't know, maybe I'm too pessimistic. Until now I haven't seen it. We might have qualitative change only when we start to see the careful articulation of spatial representation by the people. Until we start to see spatial contradiction, then we will start to see change.

Right now, what is prevailing in the society is the emphasis, in the case of Hong Kong on diversity. For example on the Wedding Car Street (Lee Tung Street)<sup>7</sup> people have dramatised the case. What they have been arguing is diversity. What they are doing is not challenging the regime. They are asking for diversity, and then they keep on proposing for example in the case of Shun Ning Road, they follow the technical rationality. They still go through the stipulated application, and try to do things. In the Shun Ning<sup>8</sup> proposal we are proposing houses for the poor, now they emphasise that we need to allow the developers to make profit. So we are now not going to shut them down. We allow them. The only concern is that we have diversity.

What's really important is that we need to change the whole attitude of the society. That's why the regime has to be changed. That's why I use the concept of the regime.

AW & YH: Where do you see the points of resistance?

---

6 In 2008, there was a movement against the privatisation and over-control of space in Hong Kong that resulted in a series of performances by artists and activists in the hi-jacking of Times Square in an attempt to reclaim public space. Since then, there have been efforts to include a regular programme of public artwork in the space to pacify reactions against the lack of truly public spaces in the city. <http://hijackpublicspace.wordpress.com/>

7 A street located in Wanchai on Hong Kong Island that has been under redevelopment plans since 2003, where small local businesses namely print shops for items such as wedding cards are being pushed out by rising rents and larger commercial businesses.

8 A road in the Sham Shui Po area on the Kowloon side that has been developed into low-income public housing blocks such as Cronin Garden. <http://www.hkhs.com/eng/business/21.asp?contentid=1&estid=21>

WST: We need to articulate the social issues together and form a social question, in Henri Lefebvre's term from minimal to maximal difference<sup>9</sup>. What has been the problem with numerous previous attempts by other social movements is that they have concentrated on a single issue. For the homeless issue, we should not concentrate on housing alone. The problem requires us to tackle social insurance, right of citizenship, health, job, public transport, etc together. In this way, the technical rationality behind the land (re)development regime cannot be uprooted.

In the Shun Ning Road redevelopment project, people are fighting for the right of abode. That means new immigrants in Hong Kong who were so far not allowed to stay as citizens. If we can unite all this front and then try to formulate ideas, we might be able to do something. If we just simply just stick to diversity as a concern, I don't think it can work. The Hong Kong government's response to the people fighting for diversity is "yes, you love collective memory, you love historical preservation? I'll give it to you." That's why recently we have all these projects on historical preservation. That simply dilutes the resistance, and as a result we see originally, there was a lot more people resisting against the regime. Now some people have stopped resisting because they say the government has already done something. If you fall into that trap, then we are in trouble. We shouldn't take all this rhetoric.

I think the problem with the thinking is the hegemony of the regime. The regime that all the people, the developers, the government, individuals participate in. They have done a lot of things to try to stop all these differences from developing into what I would like to call, 'counter-hegemonic actions'.

AW & YH: How have you seen Hong Kong change in the past 14 years since the handover? During this time we have seen many changes, particularly the rise of the Chinese economy. Now there are new developments around the 'Pearl River Delta Economic Zone' that attempts to economically unite the region in South China. How will this development shape Hong Kong?

WST: In the first few years of the handover, basically, Hong Kong was alright. I would argue, things would only really change after the resignation of the first executive. To put it this way, the administration of the first executive started promoting the integration of Hong Kong into mainland China. He had been doing a lot work trying to promote Hong Kong as a part of China, but he did

---

<sup>9</sup> Lefebvre, Henri. *The Urban Revolution*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

not succeed in doing so. As a result of his failure and all the accumulation in 2003, he was finally forced to step down in 2005. Following that, we started to see a lot more integration. Not really integration, first of all only economically. If we talk about people in 1997 the hostility towards mainland was greater. Now if you are going to do a survey, the degree of hostility has declined. Economically there is a lot of integration through many measures to support Hong Kong capital to build their manufacturing, their services and their producers of personal services to do business in China. As a result of this integration a lot more people who were originally hostile to China are now more sympathetic. At the same time now, a lot of people are trying to put forward resisting integration as well. A lot them have been putting forward what they call 'locality'. They say you need to think from the perspective of Hong Kong locally. For example, some people resisted against the construction of the express train last year, and then this year, just after Chinese New Year, there was a movement against it being planned by China in regards to the development of the Pearl River Delta bay area together with Shenzhen, Guangzhou and some areas around it. There are all these things. The Hong Kong environment is changing. More people are integrating and hostility has been reduced. Although recently because of that, we start to see some kind of reaction trying to promote seeing everything from the perspective of Hong Kong, and then whatever is being promoted by the Hong Kong government together with the Guangdong government would be considered as a hostile project.

AW & YH: It is interesting to see the different economic forces operating in Hong Kong, from its rapid modernisation and susceptibility towards globalisation, a result of its former colonial relationship with Britain, and now, the return to China just as it rises as a major global economic power. What is the result of Hong Kong's unique history and geopolitical position and how do you envision the city developing in the future?

WST: I think Hong Kong has a great future. It takes full advantage of the one country two systems position. Since China wants Hong Kong to retain its one country, two systems so that it can do a lot of things, which it cannot do when Hong Kong is completely integrated into the mainland culture I see a lot of people giving in before they have fully explored the advantages of Hong Kong. I think what Hong Kong should be doing is have closer connection to the outside world. The connection to mainland China will be there. If we want to promote Hong Kong, I would consider the connection with the outside world would be best for its future.

AW & YH: We think in a lot of ways Hong Kong is very much connected to the outside world

because of its colonial past and its development as a global financial trading hub. We see a lot of highly qualified foreigners such as bankers who stay in the city to make lots of money for a short period of time and then leave. It creates a very transient culture, where the city could be easily abandoned and investment can be quickly withdrawn (as mentioned by Alvin Yip in the case of SARS in 2001 when many expatriates escaped the city). Hong Kong consistently sits in this place in-between its relationship with China and the global financial market. In your opinion, what effect has globalisation and global capital had on the city and society?

WST: As long as it is still the base for international capital to invest in the mainland, Hong Kong will attract the in-flow of highly qualified foreigners. As long as international capital maintains a high degree of mobility, these foreigners will come and go. One real issue is whether these foreigners will consider Hong Kong their home. The other is whether Hong Kongers consider Hong Kong their home. In the recent past many have deserted Hong Kong for other cities in the mainland. The latter shows the lack of confidence in Hong Kong. Developments in the last few years show that they are wrong.

As I mentioned before, when the first Chief Executive took his office he tried to integrate Hong Kong into mainland, and the second executive was doing it even more. If we are not doing anything to integrate into the mainland, we will be warned of being marginalised. As a result what is starting to dominate in thinking is that our most important concern is to integrate with mainland China, while the connection to the outside world can be ignored. I think it's going to be like that in terms of thinking. I want to revert it. There is danger in the dominance of that kind of thinking that is growing and growing to such an extent that we can start to worry about it.

AW & YH: It seems in Hong Kong there is a movement towards the cultural and creative industries as a new model for economic and urban development, such as in the development of the West Kowloon Cultural District<sup>10</sup>, and other large scale projects like the Victoria Prison / Central Police Station<sup>11</sup>. As Hong Kong strives to be a 'World Class' city, it must develop culturally and often taking

---

10 A highly debated government-lead multi-billion dollar development project, which has recently in March 2011 selected Fosters + Partners' 'City Park' design as the master plan out of three proposals, in competition with Rem Koolhaas' OMA and Hong Kong based Rocco Design Architects. The site is primarily located along the Kowloon waterfront and aims to become the equivalent to London's Southbank Centre in the Asia-Pacific region. The project has experienced many criticisms and pitfalls including the resignation of Graham Sheffield (former Artistic Director of the Barbican) who was elected Chief Executive of the project in 2010, after five months in the post (the second to resign from the position due to suspected government bureaucracy). The project is expected to open in 2015. <http://www.wkcd.a.hk>

11 Another major development project in the guise of 'cultural development' in Hong Kong. The project is located in

the UK as a benchmark. However, as you mentioned previously, the local culture and community has been homogenised as a result of this emphasis on property and financialisation. Peoples' lives revolve around the need to own property and to acquire individual wealth – resulting in a very materialist culture that reflects very little independent, critical or creative thinking beyond working long hours to become financially successful, and participating in a highly accelerated shopping culture and buying luxury goods to reflect ones' wealth (which is where the value of never 'losing face' becomes so important). What are your thoughts on this?

WST: The way I see the development of West Kowloon and places like the cultural district of Fo Tan<sup>12</sup> is that they are artists are working very hard from the perspective of the Hong Kong government. From the viewpoint of a lot of people, all these are property development projects, including West Kowloon. The thing is we have never been promoting culture in Hong Kong.

In the past, a lot of people and families were very pragmatic, and if one of their kids wanted to do music or art, the parents would deter them from doing so. Now there are a lot of parents in Hong Kong that send their kids to learn piano, or take art, and drawing classes. What is in their mind is not necessarily to develop their kids critical thinking or creativity, but to allow them to have another qualification to excel in the future. This might place them in a better position to enter a leading university, for example.

AW & YH: To prove they participate in 'extra-curricular activities'?

WST: We have a lot of kids learning how to play the piano. There are a lot of kids who have written the exams for the Royal Conservatory of Music. All these exams seldom really reflect an appreciation for music or for art. I think because of that, the society has not reached the threshold to really develop culture and cultural districts. The government has not really encouraged or promoted it. The percent of GDP we spend on research on culture is minimal in comparison to a lot of other cities. The government has no intention to develop culture. I think all it is all rhetoric.

In terms of the development of West Kowloon, the government has to do something to say that they

---

Central Hong Kong at the site of a historical police station that was built in colonial times and is to be converted into theatres and cultural spaces. <http://www.centralpolicestation.org.hk/>

12 An industrial district on the Kowloon side of Hong Kong that is occupied by a number of artists studios and has gained increasing attention through the annual Fotanian festival, which features open studios and tours of the area. <http://www.fotanian.com/>

are doing something for the good of the public. The WKCD project was banned almost 10 years ago because it was a property development project, and not a cultural project. We never had a cultural policy. The only thing they did was after the 1967 riot, the Hong Kong government felt that youth problems were serious, so they started to build libraries, exhibition halls and music halls, and still that was only minimal. Now in 1997, the Hong Kong government through the first executive, gave a whole tract of land to a developer to develop the Cyberport<sup>13</sup>, and because other developers were not privileged they tried to air their objection to the government. When the West Kowloon project came up, the government instead of giving it to one developer, they divided the project and gave it to three developers. Then the others started to ask, “how come that was the case?” They could not settle it, so the project was banned. All this talk saying that they're trying to develop the site for culture, it's all rhetoric. Everything in Hong Kong it's all about property, property, property.

A student of mine is doing a project on Fo Tan to see how the artists are working there and their relationship to the community. Basically, there is no connection at all. The artists in the Fo Tan area are just doing it on their own, and they have no effect on the community. We have in the West been talking about culture and creativity, and then use culture to try and stimulate the development and all this, but I don't see it in Hong Kong.

It's really pessimistic, but it's the reality.

AW & YH: Is there hope for Hong Kong? Do you have any new visions and alternatives to propose?

WST: I think in Hong Kong what we have been doing is to provide the incubator for the youngsters to develop alternative thinking and then alternative practices. In my case, I have been advocating not just the *right to property*, but *the right to housing* and *the right to learning*. Even when I was asked to do a future development study for WanChai that involves the Wedding Card Street, in my recommendation, I proposed to build public housing, and now they are doing that. Your trust starts to change the whole thinking, and then that will start to effect the whole practice in daily life. People start to think differently. Basically, what we have been trying to do is enlarge the mask to adopt an alternative way of thinking, and thereby they will start to put forward their ideas in different domains, and in different areas. Slowly we will then build up a better understanding and better practices that would be able to change the everyday life of the people.

---

13 Created as a hub for creative digital organisations and media start-ups located in Telegraph Bay in the Southern District of Hong Kong. <http://www.cyberport.hk/>

And, indeed a lot of people are doing things. Really small actions. All these efforts have to accumulate to a threshold to an extent, then we would be able to see possible changes. I don't want to exaggerate it, but maybe in 10 years we might be able to see something. As I said people are starting to resist against what I call the 'land redevelopment regime', but the numbers are small, so it will take time. The problematic thing is we must recognise the crux of the problem, then we would be able to do it.

There are always hopes for Hong Kong. The must-do option for the city's urban future is to resume the construction of public housing, preferably not in the periphery, but in the centre of the city somewhere.

## BIOGRAPHIES

Wing Shing Tang is currently Professor at the Department of Geography, Hong Kong Baptist University and Chair of the Hong Kong Critical Geography Group. His research interest is on the interrogation of Lefebvre, Foucault, Gramsci and others and local history to construct a better informed understanding of urban (re)development in Hong Kong and other Chinese cities. In response to a film 'Nønspace' (2009) screened during the TINAG festival, Wing Shing reflects upon the intrinsic value of property as a regime that governs all of the decision-making and social discourses in Hong Kong.

Ashley L. Wong is an artist, cultural worker and researcher based in London, UK. Originally from Canada, she completed an MA at Goldsmiths University of London. She has lived and worked in Hong Kong where she worked for on a number of cultural projects and for media arts organisations. She is founder of independent arts platform LOUDSPKR and co-founder of international research collective DOXA along with Yuk Hui. She co-directed 'Nønspace' (2009) with Paris-based filmmaker Nicolas Sauret. Her work has been presented in the Hong Kong & Shenzhen Biennale of Urbanism and Architecture (Hong Kong, 2009), Urban Nomad Festival (Taipei, 2009), Rencontre Internationale (Paris/Madrid/Berlin, 2009), New York (Asian Cultural Council, 2009), ARTe SONoro (Madrid, 2010), Clandestino Festival (Gothenburg, 2010), [Sound@Media](#) (Seoul, 2010), and This is Not a Gateway Festival (London, 2010).

Yuk Hui is PhD researcher of the Metadata Project (Leverhulme Trust) at the Centre for Cultural Studies, Goldsmiths, University of London. His research centres on the philosophy of technology and phenomenology, especially concerning the web and digital objects. He is the co-founder of DOXA, which is currently developing a research project on 'Creative Space' and generating critical discourse on cultural industries in cities like London and Hong Kong.