

韓國的區域經濟發展： 對經驗分享的意義

金元鎬

國際與區域研究研究院教授
韓國外國語大學

關鍵字：韓國、區域經濟、鄉村發展、地方發展

中文摘要

經濟發展的問題一直是許多發展中國家必須專注的基本課題。由於缺乏足夠經驗與中長期目標以及經驗豐富的人力資本與中央政府的相關領導能力，大多數發展中國家都難以落實他們區域經濟發展的計畫。也由於全國經濟與社會發展的嚴重不平衡，發展中國家面臨地方發展政策制訂的挑戰。在過去六十年裡，透過數個不同政策提案，儘管有所波折，韓國在國土、鄉村與地方發展上已達成相當有效率的成果。本文主旨即在探討韓國地方發展計畫的經驗對政策的意涵與教訓。

Regional Economic Development in Korea: Implications for Experiences-Sharing¹

Won-Ho Kim²

Abstract

The economic development issue has always been a fundamental preoccupation for many developing countries. Most of them have difficulties to execute on the regional economic development plans as well due to the lack of sufficient experiences, lack of a mid and long-term vision, experienced human capital and the central government's relevant leadership. They face challenges for local development policy-making as there are huge imbalances in economic and social development across the country. For the past six decades, Korea has achieved an efficient territorial, rural and local development by several different policy initiatives, though with ups and downs. This paper explores policy implications and lessons of Korean experiences for local development planning as follow. First, the Government agencies in efficient coordination with one another will be indispensable. Secondly, although the role of the local community/authorities is important, their capacities should be strengthened in advance. Thirdly, specialization in accordance with local endowments

¹ This work was supported by the research fund 2013 of Hankuk University of Foreign Studies.

² Professor, Graduate School of International and Area Studies, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies.

(tourism included) and resources may not be the best strategy, but will be a second-best for the medium and long-terms. Fourth, due to Korea's rural modernization, developmental progress is possible while learning lessons. Fifth, while local development should be emphasized, the large cities themselves as local economies should not be disregarded. Sixth, any prioritization of localities could entail further political cost.

Introduction

Territorial development, rural development and local economic development may be different concepts for different targets and purposes. But if successfully combined, they may produce rather efficient outcome in terms of regional and national economic development. Territorially small countries may be better equipped with such missions, and territorially large countries can be faced with bigger challenges not only because of logistical difficulties, but also of socio-political constraints. However, good experiences-sharing should be helpful in any case for future development planning. If limited, the Korean experiences in this regard may carry some useful implications.

For territorial development policy, the Korean government laid in fostering a balanced regional growth across the country. Korea's industrialization and modernization was inevitably accompanied by the growth of cities. Cities provide large markets for labor, intermediate and final goods, and knowledge. Workers, firms and consumers gather to the cities to exploit the

advantages offered by large markets. As the literature on economic geography illustrates, this agglomeration process is often self-reinforcing and results in the growth of large cities and falling population in rural areas. The government is incapable of controlling the process completely, at least in a free market economy. Nonetheless, in Korea, the increasing gap between urban and rural areas in terms of education, jobs and other opportunities generated public demand for government intervention. From the early years, the Korean government has taken various steps to promote balanced growth, especially between the capital region and other areas. Korea's territorial policy over the past sixty years has carried out these responsibilities in close relationship with the country's economic and social policy. And this brought along rural development and local economic development outcomes though not designed in a sophisticated way in the beginning.

This paper explores policy implications and lessons of Korean experiences for the tri-pod development planning. It will first review Korea's territorial development policy-making, and then move on rural development policy-making, and local economic development policy-making. Finally, some policy implications will be drawn. This research project was originally undertaken to compare Korea's and Colombia's experiences, but this specific paper would not refer to any other specific case than Korea.

Territorial Development, Rural Development, and Local Development

The decades of the 1960s and the 1980s were spared to industrial development in Korea's modern history. As a strategy, industrial development was concentrated in specific regions and "growth centers," with the aim of using limited resources efficiently to support the country's rapid economic growth. This is very different experience from what many other, mostly large-territory countries have. They have not introduced the concept of territorial development, and rather left such initiative to regional governments not because of the lack of administrative interest, but mostly because of decentralization priorities. They at the same time promoted the measures to ensure a redistribution of resources to reduce the gap that had been created between the rich regions and the poor ones. Those efforts included public investment in education and healthcare services, the enhancement of agrarian activities to generate more jobs, and access to credits for all. However, little was mentioned about community engagement, grassroots development, and self-empowerment of the less privileged classes. Although there were schemes to enforce, but there were few to self-sustain. The concept of local development policy was not introduced. Additionally the private sector's participation in local development, and the government's large infrastructure investments distinguished the Korean experiences from others'.

In Korea, it was as late as the 1980s that introduced such concept for the first time. It was a reflection on the imbalanced development between regions. However, it was also a limited application of the concept because the fundamental paradigm still relied on the concept of "growth

centers.” It was 1990s that focused on national competitiveness and changing international environment when it came to local development strategy. At the same time, there was strong push for deregulation so that the private sector would take the lead in economic development. The private sector assumed a greater role in land development, which had once been the preserve of the state sector. Individuals were allowed to carry out land development projects in “semi-agricultural areas” as a result of changes to the national land use plan. In August 1994, the Act on Attracting Private Capital for Infrastructure Facilities was enacted to promote the financing by private capital of infrastructure investment projects. Consideration was given to selecting special economic zones to attract foreign capital. The Act on Foreigners’ Land Acquisition and Management was enacted to help foreign investors acquire domestic land easily. The Special Act on the Relaxation of Regulations over Business Activities was enacted to ease rules concerning land use associated with business activities.

One of the representative regional development projects promoted in the 1990s was the West Coast Development Project. As relatively backward area in terms of production and household income, the west coast area, comprising South Chungcheong Province, North Jeolla Province, and South Jeolla Province, was a major target for development in terms of achieving balanced regional development. The development project included the creation of the Gunsan Industrial Park (which would serve as a launch pad for trade with China), the Gunsan-

Janghang Industrial Complex, and the construction of the 352 km-long West Coast Expressway.

With increased local autonomy and the easing of various regulations that had been imposed under the National Land Use Zoning Act, local governments started vying with each other to attract high-tech businesses and international events. For example, the Pusan International Film Festival, which started in 1996, has joined the ranks of the world's top five film festivals.

Such new local economic development strategy in the 1990s, based on national competitiveness, may be similar to several other developing countries' recent strategies, which focus on local but global concept, and local people's participation. However, they were different in that Korean experience was accompanied by huge infrastructural investment for territorial development. It was also in the 1990s that Korea set the framework for decentralized territorial scheme.

Under the Third Comprehensive Territorial Development Plan (1992-2001), proposals called for a grid-shaped expressway system, known as the 7x9 network, comprising seven north-south expressways and nine east-west expressways. Plans also called for the building of radial or loop-shaped arterial expressway networks around the big metropolises, including Seoul, Busan, Daegu, Gwangju and Daejeon. With high-speed railway, called KTX, as of April 1, 2004, life in Korea fell into half-day access, as compared with two or three days to take to move from one point to an extreme one in 1945.

1. *Policy Objectives and Strategies*

Typical in the Korean experiences, several measures were taken to curb the concentration of population and resources in the capital city. However, they achieved only partial success and failed to respond in a flexible manner to changes in conditions. Government efforts to date to check the growth of the capital region or to promote regional development have not been very successful. They also lacked consistency over time.

For example, regulations governing business categories allowed to operate in the capital region have been eased, particularly for high-tech companies. Such *ad hoc* deregulation, however, has led to unorganized territorial development and damaged the environment. Some claim that policies on the capital region need a fundamental reorientation to better protect the environment on the one hand, and to properly accommodate economic realities on the other. In particular, attention should be given to the increasingly important role of big cities in the era of globalization and knowledge-based economies. It is also suggested that development policies for the areas outside the capital region be reformulated. Under the current economic structure, which depends on the service sector for 70 percent of its production and 60 percent of its employment, it is unrealistic to expect that a large-scale physical investment to promote the manufacturing sector in non-capital areas would generate economic growth there. Rather, the emphasis needs to be placed on fostering the service sector in major regional cities and building “soft”

infrastructure, *i.e.*, the capability of regional communities to adapt and innovate themselves.

In this regard, developing countries may get a lesson not to enforce too much control of concentration on the capital region. They may need a strategy to develop a couple of major cities as global ones. They may have certain merit in that, given the limited resources, those major cities will grow as epicenters of administration, financing, human resources, infrastructure, science and technology, and economic power. They may develop all the way at the price of balanced development, but the potential to grow as global cities should not be underexplored. More importantly, they still will need to build infrastructure for better connectivity within the region and between regions, and for better production networks with their peripheral areas.

Korea's local development policy objectives and strategies have evolved by decades, not only to reflect complementary measures to cope with those problems raised during Korea's economic and social progresses, but also to deal with international environmental changes (See Table 1). While south-eastern area was the focus of local development during the early stage, the western coastal area for the recent decades. Seoul, Incheon (1963), Ulsan(1966) and Jeju Island (1966) were designated as the political special areas for the economic development during the 1st five-year economic development plan(1962-66). And during the second five-year economic development plan period (1967-71), there were additionally designated the Taebaek Mountain Region

(1967), the Youngsan River Region (1967), the Asan-Seosan Region (1967), the Youngdong–Donghae Region, and the Kwangju region (1970) as the special areas for regional industrial development. In 1989, however, the Korean government created the special unit within the government to promote local economic development plans in southwestern Kwangju city and Jeonju city etc. in the west coast area, and pursued the activating strategy of the economic development in the Honam provinces. It may be a gradual, paradigmatic shift from focus on cooperation with Japan to one with China. This should carry important message for other developing countries, which may need to consider cooperation focus on newly emerging neighbors if any in this dynamically changing global world rather than their traditional partners.

One interesting point in Korea's experiences is who lead the development. If it was the state during the 1960s through the 1970s, it was the private sector challenging the dominance of the state since the 1980s. It was in this context that the inter-regional imbalanced development became an issue since the 1980s with the sense emerging that certain regions had been relatively excluded in the process of economic development since the 1960s. In 1990s, such trend was expedited and the large scale economic cluster zones and industrial complexes became on the horizon of policymaking with a new regional economic development led by the local governments emerging.

Table 1. Korea's Local Development Policy Objectives and Strategies

	1960s-70s	1980s	1990s	2000s
Objective	Industrialization/ Economic growth	Resolution of regional imbalances	Regions' international competitiveness	National balanced development; RIS; Endogenous local development
Investment Criteria	Efficiency	Fairness	Efficiency, Fairness (Regions' competitiveness)	Fairness, Efficiency; National competitiveness
Spacial strategy	Concentration on comparative advantageous areas	Decentralized concentration strategy	Large-scale integrated economy	Spacial decentralization; Public institutions' relocation
Local development strategy	Designated area development (7 areas including Seoul-Incheon)	Balanced regional development; 20 industrial parks	Mega band development; Western regions for China	Choice & Concentration; Economic mega band development; Global city & "Self-reliant regions"

Source: Kim, Yong-woong, Mi-sook Cha, and Hyun-soo Kang. *New Theories of Local Development*. Han-wool Academy, 2009. (in Korean)

2. *Grassroots Development Transformation*

The so-called Saemaul Movement was launched in 1971 with the aim of increasing the income of the rural population by expanding various forms of economic activity. The Saemaul Movement sought to reinvigorate the country while serving as a national morale-boosting movement. It stressed the principles of self-help, self-reliance and cooperation, and the movement was later adopted by factories in urban areas. The core contribution of this movement to the local development relied upon self-sustainability. The leadership training for the Saemaul Movement was designed for this purpose.

The experiences from the Korean Saemaul Movement as a local community program could be shared with other developing countries. It is not unusual that while local economic development planning is carried out by each local authority, differences of development among regions occur not only because of the different endowments and material infrastructure, but also because of the different administrative capacity and local people's mentality and attitudes toward development. Thus, the policy coordination to capacitate local administrations and communities can be the key to success.

In Korea, the central government's Ministry of Internal Affairs played a leading role in the movement in the beginning of the Saemaul Movement, providing supplies such as cement for community road construction through the local administrative network. More ministries later became involved in carrying out Movement-related

programs, such as helping rural households find alternative sources of work in the off-season, forming cooperatives for the production of rice and barley, supplying electricity to rural areas, and building factories. Later, the National Council of the Saemaul Movement comprising central and local organizations was established to coordinate Saemaul activities carried out by the ministries. Although such centralized administrative feature of the Saemaul Movement would be later criticized due to several cases of false reports and distortions from its top-down nature, it could bring up more achievements than under the circumstances of inefficient administration and financial management, and mistrust of government among the local people leading to under-utilization of resources and economic informality. At least in the beginning of the project, the central government with leading administrative capacity should be the protagonist in planning and organizing the short- and medium- term local economic development schemes.

More specifically, the Saemaul Movement had three early objectives in promoting the modernization of rural areas, which was summed up in the “three liberations”: liberation from *jigae*, the A-shaped back-pack frame used to carry heavy loads (meaning improvements in farming tools and transport); liberation from candlelight (meaning power supply); and liberation from *chogajip*, or straw-roofed houses (meaning improvements in living conditions). Soon, the movement came to tap the community spirit among rural villagers to promote development practices in various areas, including dairy farming, fishing and local processing industries, in addition to farming.

For the Movement to be a grassroots development transformation, Saemaul Education was an important element. Although it continues today, the core part was the first stage (1971-1979), when the government concentrated on training Saemaul leaders and promoting specialists. The emphasis of this stage was to construct the bases and expand the Saemaul education which focused on people's awakening and national spirit development aimed at all public. In 1970, the president Park Chung-Hee emphasized the need to train promoting specialists and leaders in order to drive the Saemaul Movement into a success. Therefore, the efforts were dedicated to recruit community workers to develop talents and foster leaders through instruction and training. Consequently, the central government established the plan for the Saemaul leadership of the rural community and notified the National Agricultural Cooperative Federation. This gave place to the opening of the Leading Farmer Training Institute in 1971. The year after, it was renamed Saemaul Leadership Training Institute. The original Saemaul Education plan, designed for fostering the Saemaul leaders, steadily expanded its application to government officials and elites of the society. Beginning 1974, each ministries and related institutions allocated the task of the development program according to the objectives and function of the subject, sharing the resources for education. In few words, the Saemaul Education was spread nationwide.

The enthusiasm and creativity of Saemaul Leaders played a primary role in determining the success of the Saemaul movement. These leaders consisted of regional representatives who were chosen for their decisiveness

and leadership ability when the campaign was launched. It should be noted that Saemaul Leaders were not appointed by the Korean Ministry of interior: rather, they were elected by residents of the corresponding regional community. Hence, in the course of conducting their responsibilities, those elected were actually replacing the authority of the government officials. To maintain and develop Saemaul Movement continually, fostering next-generation Saemaul Movement leaders was necessary. In the process of modernization between 1970s and 1980s urban concentration of rural populace was conspicuous due to economic development. The exodus of the rural young populace with completion of at least secondary education resulted in decrease in youth population who would have been future-leaders of Saemaul Movement. Under these circumstances, it was needed to encourage youth to have a mindset to settle in rural area and give education targeting them as next generation farmers. "Saemaul Youth Committee" was organized targeting the youth from 19 to 24 of age in the rural area, and special training program was offered such as Saemaul spirit education, farming technique, and managerial skills to them. "Agricultural high-school" was established to foster next-generation leaders in rural area and they received subsidy from government.

3. Rural Industrialization v. R&D Investments

If the Saemaul Movement was the start-up project for local/rural development, agro-industrialization was the follow-up concept, but not with many successes. The so-called industrial parks development boomed in the 1980s,

creating countryside industrial parks whose main purpose was to help rural households gain income from sources other than farming. Previously, there had been programs to create sideline jobs for farm households, such as building Saemaul-related facilities. But they had many problems since they were carried out in an uncoordinated manner and were not closely linked with the existing infrastructure. In response, the central government established small- and medium-sized industrial parks in rural areas, offering various incentives, such as offering land at cheap prices, tax and financial benefits, and streamlining approval procedures to attract businesses. The government launched the Planning Group for the Development of Non-Farming Income Sources in 1981 and enacted the Rural Area Income Source Development Promotion Act in 1983. As a result, works on the development of rural industrial parks started, with the selection of model projects in 1984. The number of rural industrial parks reached a peak between 1987 and 1990 before starting to decline. In the aftermath of the 1997 financial crisis, many businesses in rural industrial parks collapsed, leading to criticism that the parks had housed many unprofitable and marginal businesses.

The problem of the rural industrial parks scheme was that it aimed basically at absorbing the idle labor force during low agricultural season and helping generate non-agricultural income, and contributing to reducing the income gap between the rural and the urban. Such initiatives failed not only because the rural labor was not to be handily transferred as industrial labor in their expertise, but also because many of the young generation kept

rushing into urban areas, leaving the rural areas as increasingly aging communities, and leading to lack of labor force for those rural industries.

Table 2. Korea's Rural Development Strategies

	Objective	Programs	Characteristics
1945~1960s	Reconstruction; Basic environments	Local community development movement; Land reform	Foreign aid; Increased food production; Government agencies
1970s	Modernization; Production Infrastructure; Living infrastructure	Saemaul Movement	Top-down & bottom-up comprehensive development
1980s~1990s	Comprehensive development for permanent settlements	Permanent settlements areas development (jobs, education, social-cultural-welfare services); Rural industrial parks	Urban-rural integral development
2000s~?	Quality life; Local specialization	Small town development; Green rural experience-sharing	Higher quality of life in rural areas; Inter-agency duplications; Local capacity needed

Source: Sakong, Il and Youngsun Koh., eds. *The Korean Economy: Six Decades of Growth and Development*. Seoul: The Committee for the Sixty-Year History of the Korean Economy, 2010. (in Korean)

Thus, the new model coming up in the 1990s rather focused on high value-added local innovation strategy, which was to be more ambitious than the moderate industrialization project. Since the 1990s, Korea has promoted rural R&D investments, local innovation clusters, and local cultural festivals as local economy reinvigorating schemes, mega band leading industry development. This model must rely upon rural investments based on R&D. In general, Korea's policy focus on the diversification of R&D technologies began in the 1980s. The demand from the countryside specifically came to deter negative effect from natural disasters, and the so-called white revolution to secure year-round supply of fresh vegetables through plastic agriculture and irrigation. Since the 1990s, however, investments on R&D were expanded to prepare for the market opening in the occasion of the Uruguay Round multilateral negotiations and WTO establishment, and to promote the development and dissemination of high quality, low cost agricultural technology. This means the rural R&D needs this time were more practical and responsive to external challenges. The new agricultural technology focused on biotechnology, post-harvest management, and meteorological disasters. Such trend continued toward the 2000s, when market & consumer-friendly, high quality, environment-friendly, high value added, export agriculture were emphasized to enhance agricultural technology competitiveness in the context of globalization, localization and informatization

Such reorientation of rural development came along with a new territorial development program. During 1999-2010, the Korean government promoted three to four

strategic projects each region by investing 3.8 trillion won to increase local enterprises' technological innovation capacities. Among others, medical equipment cluster in Wonju area and optical industry cluster in Kwangju were successful although there also was criticism about duplication of investments, particularly in the field of biotechnology and electronics and informatics. The keys from those two success stories were understood as choosing differentiated and specified industry; focusing on locally manageable number of industry rather than comprehensive national strategic industry; preparing innovation infrastructure including universities, research institutions and industrial support services to entail economic externalities for the clusters; securing strong will and leadership of local communities on the strategic industries in the beginning; and collaborating with the central government for infrastructure building to stimulate the early stage of clustering. Since 2009, the Korean government has promoted mega band leading industry development programs. This is supposed to designate core leading industries on each mega band regions and expand the industrial bases with locally specialized resources. This would facilitate entrepreneurial investments on local economy, expansion of local industrial centers including free economic zones, and cultivate local SMEs.

One additional point of local specialization strategy was to promote local cultural festivals. Particularly this initiative was relevant where tourism resources are not abundant because it would cost rather than developing new tourism items. Profits from such local cultural festivals

revolve into income generation and job creation for the local economy. More importantly, such events have stimulated investments on local infrastructure and social overhead capital, and increased use of idle land and resources, leading to creation of high value added and to the better fiscal situation of local governments. However, these initiatives did not go without unexpected problems such as lack of creativeness and capital, low quality and poor preparation. Success stories from Mud Festival of Boryong, and Butterfly Festival of Hampyong emphasize differentiation. This was possible only when local people participated to the effect that financial problems were solved internally.

4. Policy Implications of Korean Experiences and a Suggested Roadmap

There are similarities and differences between policy experiences of Korea and other developing countries. But the first lesson was that government agencies in efficient coordination with one another will be indispensable. As far as there are less experience of inter-agency collaboration and coordination between central and local governments, it is questionable whether the central government has clear identification/definition of problems, objectives and strategies for local development.

Secondly, although the role of local community/authorities is important, their capacities should be strengthened in advance. It is questionable whether local economies (rich in diversity and natural resources) are capable to carry out multi-dimensional initiatives. Thus,

local leader' training may be urgently relevant, and central/local cooperation is indispensable. There may be several barriers to get lessons and benchmark the 1970s Korea's successful experiences with the Saemaul Movement and Saemaul Education. It can be denied that the Saemaul Leadership Training was born in the context of the cultural framework of military developmental state. Nevertheless, the Saemaul Leadership Training still carries an important meaning as a model local development strategy. Many developing countries' regions with various racial background, diverse cultures and value systems, and social gaps have not sufficiently mobilized and strategically utilized their human resources to create new economic activities and enterprises, develop technologies, increase productivity and income, introduce modern agricultural methodologies, and so on. The Korean Saemaul Leaders Training was a spiritual education, social enlightenment education, and lifetime education to escape from the poverty-ridden dilemma of the 1960s.

Thirdly, Korea's rural industrial parks experiences show that straightforward industrialization may not be a simple answer to local needs. Specialization in accordance with local endowments (tourism included) and resources may not be the best strategy, but will be a second-best for the medium and long terms. Any local specialization initiatives should be flexible to demographic changes and new policy environments.

Fourthly, with Korea's rural modernization and development, "catching up" is possible while learning

lessons. The fact that Korea's rural communities become a quality life space indicates that rural area should not be a simple support base for urban population, but should be a self-reliant economy. It should come out of the traditional core-periphery paradigm, and should be self-reliant and autonomous.

Fifthly, while local development should be emphasized, the large cities themselves as local economies should not be disregarded. A strategy for a global city and mega band is necessary because the importance of service sector, globalization, and high competition among countries may make traditional local-oriented development obsolete.

Sixthly, Korea's territorial development policy focused on several concentration localities from the beginning. It is questionable whether this strategy can be valid in this world of dominant service sector. Any prioritization of localities could entail further political cost. Instead, local self-help should be followed by any such concentration policies.

Seventhly, like Korea's Western regions development for China opportunities, the contemporary international political economic interests should be taken into consideration as new dynamics in international regional development should boost the country's international competitiveness, which is an urgent task.

Based on the discussion above, a roadmap for developing countries' local economic development policies

is suggested as shown in the table below. In this table, the short-term policies (within five years) mean what the government should undertake at the level of policy system, administrative scheme, corporate and local community cooperation, and representative projects. The medium-term policies (within ten years) include what should be consistently to continue in government transition, and the long-term policies (in fifteen years or later) are the future governments should aim at ultimately. It should be noticed that the weights and relationships between the central government and local government, and also between the state and the private sector desirably move from the central to local, and from the state to the private sector while the policymaking process moves from top-down to bottom-up as the time frame goes from short-term to long-term.

Table 3. Recommendation: a roadmap for Competitive Local Development

	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification of problems, potential resources - Clarification of objectives, strategies, policy tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional innovation system building - Encouraging private sector/university participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Autonomous regional innovation system - Territorial identity building (New Cycle starts)
Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assign agencies - Develop each agency's programs - Formulation of central-regional/local collaborative model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review inter-agency collaboration - Review international cooperation initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decentralized/Local-led, civil society participating model - Review fiscal responsibility architecture (New Cycle starts)
Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reconstruction of devastated communities - Basic social services - Encourage local participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity-building training of local leaders - Modernizations & expansion of social services - Review local participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Endogenous local development - Local quality life promotion (New Cycle starts)
Major Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional/local specialization - productive infrastructure - pacific regions development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review industrial parks, technological parks - Strategic cluster-building - Inter-regional networking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Global city - Mega band economic areas - Urban-rural collaborative model (New Cycle starts)

REFERENCES

- Albuquerque, Francisco. "Local economic development and centralization in Latin America," *CEPAL Review* 82, April 2004.
- Baron, Juan David, Gerson Javier Perez V., and Peter Rowland. "A Regional Economic Policy for Colombia," *Revista de Economic del Rosario*, noviembre de 2004.
- Brook, Daniel. *A History of Future Cities*. New York: Norton, 2013.
- CEPAL. "Escalafon de Competitividad de los Departamentos en Colombia 2009(~11)," Santiago, 2009, 2010, 2011.
- Departamento Nacional de Planeacion (DNP). "Prosperidad para todos," Direccion de Desarrollo Territorial Sostenible, Semestre 1 de 2012.
- Fiene, Erin Michele. "Cali, Colombia: A Path to Economic Growth and Sustainability," University of Colorado-Denver. May 4, 2010.
- Gallo, Ignacio, y Alvaro Benavidez, "Obtener, sistematizar y analizar información sobre los antecedentes y necesidades específicas, así como para formular recomendaciones en relación con las doce iniciativas identificadas con potencial OVOP en Colombia" COMITÉ NACIONAL PROYECTO OVOP COLOMBIA, JICA, 30 de marzo de 2011.

Han, Do-Hyun. "Cyclical Expansive Reproduction of Saemaul Movement," *Park Chung Hee Review*, No. 34, January 1, 2013, pp. 22-49. (in Korean)

Korea Saemaul Undong Center. "Saemaul Undong in Korea," March, 2005.

Lim, Su Hwan. "Saemaul Movement and Rural Development," *Agricultural History Review* 6 Vol.1 (2007, in Korean), pp. 129-150.

Maeil Economic Daily. "Korean 'Balanced Regional Development' disease should be cured to make New York City-type global city," March 21, 2013, p. A5. (in Korean)

Republic of Korea Ministry of Strategy and Finance. "Press Release: Factors of Success for Regional Innovation Clusters and Policy Implications," August 3, 2011. (in Korean)

Republic of Korea Office of Prime Minister. "Press Release: Government to overhaul rural parks to improve mode of production" June 28. 2011. (in Korean)

Saemaul Research Group of Korean University Professors. *40 Years of Saemaul Movement*. 2010.

Sakong, Il and Youngsun Koh., eds. *The Korean Economy: Six Decades of Growth and Development*. Seoul: The Committee for the Sixty-Year History of the Korean Economy, 2010.

The Committee for the Sixty-Year History of the Korean Economy. *The Korean Economy: Six Decades of Growth and Development I. Consolidated version*. Seoul: KDI, March 2011.

The Committee for the Sixty-Year History of the Korean Economy. *The Korean Economy: Six Decades of Growth and Development IV National Territory & Environment*. Seoul: KDI. September, 2010.

The Guardian. "Medellin emerges as a Latin American trailblazer for local economic growth," April 3, 2012. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2012/apr/03/medellin-trailblazer-local-economic-growth>

UNDP. "APPI Human Development Programme: UNDP, in Colloboration with UNOPS International Services in Colombia," December 2003.

UNDP. "Colomiba: HDI values and rank changes in the 2011 Human Development Report," 2011.