

Exporting Urban Korea?

A detailed examination of the “Korean development model” from its urban dimension, evaluating its sociopolitical contexts and implications for international development cooperation.

There is an increasing tendency to use the development experience of Asian countries as a reference point for other countries in the Global South. Korea’s condensed urbanization and industrialization, accompanied by the expansion of new cities and industrial complexes across the country, have become one such model, even if the fruits of such development may not have been equitably shared across geographies and generations. The chapters in this book critically reassess the Korean urban development experience from regional policy to new town development, demonstrating how these policy experiences were deeply rooted in Korea’s socioeconomic environment and discussing what can be learned from them when applying them in other developmental contexts.

This book will be of great interest to scholars and researchers in the field of urban studies and developmental studies in general, and Korea’s (urban) development experience in particular.

Se Hoon Park is Director of the Global Development Partnership Center, Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements (KRIHS), Republic of Korea.

Hyun Bang Shin is Professor of Geography and Urban Studies in the Department of Geography and Environment at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), UK.

Hyun Soo Kang is President at the Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements (KRIHS), Republic of Korea.

Routledge Advances in Korean Studies

41. Megacity Seoul

Urbanization and the Development of Modern South Korea

Yu-Min Joo

42. Korean Adoptees and Transnational Adoption

Embodiment and Emotion

Jessica Walton

43. Digital Development in Korea, Second Edition

Lessons for a Sustainable World

Myung Oh and James F. Larson

44. The State, Class and Developmentalism in South Korea

Development as Fetish

Hae-Yung Song

45. Development Prospects for North Korea

Edited by Tae Yong Jung and Sung Jin Kang

46. The Road to Multiculturalism in South Korea

Ideas, Discourse, and Institutional Change in a Homogenous Nation-State

Timothy C. Lim

47. Healing Historical Trauma in South Korean Film and Literature

Chungmoo Choi

48. Exporting Urban Korea?

Reconsidering the Korean Urban Development Experience

Se Hoon Park, Hyun Bang Shin and Hyun Soo Kang

For more information about this series, please visit: www.routledge.com/Routledge-Advances-in-Korean-Studies/book-series/SE0505

Exporting Urban Korea?

Reconsidering the Korean Urban
Development Experience

Edited by

Se Hoon Park, Hyun Bang Shin
and Hyun Soo Kang



ROUTLEDGE

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published in English 2021
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2021 selection and editorial matter, Se Hoon Park, Hyun Bang Shin and Hyun Soo Kang; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Se Hoon Park, Hyun Bang Shin and Hyun Soo Kang to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

With the exception of Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 12, no part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 12 are available for free in PDF format as Open Access from the individual product page at www.routledge.com. They have been made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 license.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-0-367-49840-5 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-04759-9 (ebk)

Typeset in Galliard
by Newgen Publishing UK

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	vii
<i>List of tables</i>	viii
<i>List of contributors</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xv
1 Introduction: reconsidering the Korean urban development experience for international cooperation	1
SE HOON PARK, HYUN BANG SHIN AND HYUN SOO KANG	
PART I	
Outlining the urban transformation of Korea	13
2 Transformations in the governance of urban and regional planning in Korea: from (neo-)developmentalism to civic democracy, 1965–2020	15
MIKE DOUGLASS	
3 Korea’s regional development policy: understanding its context and drawing implications for international development cooperation	35
WON BAE KIM	
4 Urban transformation “Korean style”: lessons from property-based urban development	58
HYUN BANG SHIN	
5 From commodities to community engagement: localities and urban development in Seoul, Korea	81
BLAŽ KRIŽNIK AND SU KIM	

PART II

Modeling the Korean urban development experience 101

- 6 Export urbanism: Asian emerging donors and the politics
of urban development knowledge sharing 103

JAMIE DOUCETTE AND FARWA SIAL

- 7 A multitude of models: transferring knowledge of the
Korean development experience 119

CUZ POTTER AND JINHEE PARK

- 8 International urban development leadership: Singapore,
China and South Korea compared 131

HYUNG MIN KIM, JULIE MIAO AND NICHOLAS A. PHELPS

PART III

Policies and institutions of Korean urban development 147

- 9 Exporting new city developments? From new towns
to smart cities 149

YU-MIN JOO

- 10 Housing policy and urban redevelopment in
contemporary Korea 165

SEONG-KYU HA

- 11 Land development schemes in South Korea: background,
structure and outcome 182

SEOHWAN LIM

- 12 Knowledge-policy nexus: policy research institutes and
the urban development regime in Korea 202

SE HOON PARK

- 13 Engines for development: public development corporations
and their role in urban development in Korea 218

JIEUN KIM

- Index* 232

Figures

2.1	The political dynamics of urban and regional policy in Korea, 1960–2020	16
2.2	National development corridor, 2011	19
2.3	Population growth by county, Korea 1995–2000 and 2000–2005	22
2.4	Spatial distribution of industrial complexes before 1990 to after 2010	23
3.1	Regional disparity in Korea (per capita gross regional product)	42
4.1	Housing Purchase Price Composite Indices (each year index is based on January 2019 = 100.0)	71
5.1	Property-led urban redevelopment and localities, Wangsimni New Town	86
5.2	Community struggles against forced evictions in Haengdang-dong	90
5.3	Community engagement in planning, Seowon Maeul	92
11.1	Housing Supply Ratio and Urbanization Rate	187
11.2	Land Price Fluctuation Rate (% on year-on-year basis)	188
12.1	Composition of KRIHS budget (2017) by source (left) and the types of research projects between 2009 and 2018 (right)	211
13.1	Location of land reclamation projects	222
13.2	KHC debt and capital 1999–2008	228
13.3	LDC debt and capital 1999–2008	229
13.4	Construction orders: domestic vs. overseas	229

Tables

3.1	Distribution of population in metropolitan cities and provinces, 1960–2017	37
3.2	Regional distribution of production and population	41
3.3	Skewed distribution of large corporations, professionals and R&D personnel in Korea	43
3.4	Evolution of regional policy in Korea	44
4.1	Distribution of redevelopment flats per use in designated redevelopment districts in Korea	66
5.1	Evolving place-based grassroots struggles in Seoul	88
5.2	Comparison of community movements in Songhak Maeul and Seowon Maeul	94
6.1	Examples of bilateral KSP consultations concerning urban development	105
7.1	Relative importance of apartment characteristics in Hanoi and Korea	126
7.2	Housing priorities in Hanoi and Korea	127
9.1	Korea's ten innovation cities	153
10.1	Indicators of housing conditions (1980–2015)	169
10.2	Current status of housing stock by type in 2017 (in 1,000s)	174
11.1	Urbanization rate in South Korea, 1950–2010	183
11.2	Land development by LR (project completion, km ²)	186
11.3	Compensation in PPD, a comparison between two projects in different times	194
11.4	Land development methods in South Korea	196
12.1	Policy research institutes under the NRC in Korea	205
12.2	Types of policy research institutes in Korea	207
12.3	Changes in the governance of KRIHS	210
12.4	Roles of actors in the MAC Construction Project	214
13.1	Legal basis for PDCs	219
13.2	Total assets of Top 10 <i>chaebols</i> and Top 10 PDCs (2015)	220

Contributors

Jamie Doucette is Senior Lecturer in Human Geography, Department of Geography, The University of Manchester, also serves as Chair of the Cities, Politics, Economics Research Group and is a member of the senior leadership team of the Manchester Urban Institute. His interests include the geographical political economy of development and democratization, the nexus between developmentalism and urban space, and labor geography. He teaches courses on geographies of globalization and Asian labor studies. He has published widely in geography and Asian Studies, with articles in *Progress in Human Geography*, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *Political Geography*, *Journal of Asian Studies*, *Journal of Korean Studies*, *Critical Asian Studies*, and elsewhere. His research has won awards, such as the Journal of Contemporary Asia Prize 2017 and a Leverhulme Trust Research Fellowship. He is the editor (with Bae-Gyoon Park) of *Developmentalist Cities? Interrogating Urban Developmentalism in East Asia* (Brill, 2019).

Mike Douglass is Emeritus Professor and former Chair of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Hawai'i, and former Director of the Globalization Research Center. He received his PhD in urban planning from UCLA. From 2012–2018 at the National University of Singapore, he was Professor and Leader of the Asian Urbanisms Cluster in the Asian Research Institute and Professor of Sociology in the LKY School of Public Policy. He has held senior positions in the United Nations and has been a consultant for major international donor agencies as well as national and local governments in Asia. His recent publications include *The Rise of Progressive Cities East and West* (Springer Singapore, 2019), *Cities in Asia by and for the People* (Amsterdam University Press, 2018), *Disaster Justice in Urbanising Asia-Pacific* (Springer Singapore, 2018) and *Disaster Governance in Urbanising Asia* (2016).

Seong-Kyu Ha is Professor Emeritus, Department of Urban Planning and Real Estate, Chung-Ang University, South Korea. He also serves as President of the Korea Research Institute of Housing Management. He received his PhD in urban planning from University College London and an MSc from the London School of Economics. His current research interests have centered on low-income housing policies, urban residential regeneration and housing

management. He has authored numerous publications on housing policy and urban and community regeneration, including *Housing Policy, Wellbeing and Social Development in Asia* (with Rebecca L. H. Chiu, Routledge, 2018). Recently he was elected Chairman of the Korea Housing Service Society, a housing expert consulting and research group in Korea. He is on the Board of Directors of the Korea Land and Housing Corporation.

Yu-Min Joo is Associate Professor, KDI School of Public Policy and Management (KDIS) in South Korea. Prior to joining KDIS, she was an Assistant Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore, from 2012 to 2019. She holds a PhD in urban and regional planning from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a Master's in urban planning from Harvard University. She researches and publishes on urban development and policy issues in Asia, particularly on the topics of urban governance, smart cities, megaprojects and mega-events. Her latest books include *Megacity Seoul: Urbanization and the Development of Modern South Korea* (Routledge, 2019) and *Smart Cities in Asia: Governing Development in the Era of Hyper-Connectivity* (co-edited with Teck-Boon Tan, Edward Elgar Publishing, 2020).

Hyun Soo Kang is President, Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements (KRIHS). He holds a PhD in urban planning from Seoul National University, Korea. Before he joined KRIHS, he was a Professor at Jungbu University, President of the Chungnam Research Institute (2013–2018) and President of the Korean Association of Space and Environmental Research (2010). Working as a commentator on regional policies in Korea, he talks and writes about various planning issues in Korean cities, such as regional balanced development, local autonomy and the right to the city. He has authored *The Urban Policies in an Age of Austerity* (Hanul Academy, 2013) and *The Right to the City* (Chaeksesang, 2010), among other publications.

Hyung Min Kim is Senior Lecturer in the Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning, The University of Melbourne. He was full-time Lecturer (equivalent to Assistant Professor) at RMIT University (Melbourne, Australia) and Xian Jiaotong-Liverpool University (Suzhou, China). He completed his PhD at the University of Melbourne, supported by the Endeavour Postgraduate Award, a competitive scholarship. His teaching and research activities focus on the economic and spatial dynamics of cities. His research has addressed globalization and global cities, urban and environmental economics, livability, land policy, planning issues in the Asia-Pacific region, foreign direct investment-led urban growth and international real estate investment. His research findings have appeared in prestigious peer-reviewed international journals, including *Progress in Planning, Cities, Habitat International, and Land Use Policy*.

Jieun Kim is Research Fellow, SH Urban Research Office, Seoul Housing and Communities Corporation and Principle Researcher at the SH Urban Research Center at the Seoul Housing and Communities Corporation, the largest

supplier of public rental housing in Seoul. She received her PhD in urban planning and policy from the University of Illinois at Chicago and a Master's degree in urban design from Seoul National University. Her research focuses on neighborhood revitalization, social housing policy, and international development. Her interests center on the contradictory role of public development corporations, policy-driven gentrification in low-income neighborhoods and the possibility of equitable urban development approaches. Throughout her career, she has participated in several international development projects in Algeria, Egypt, Mongolia and the Philippines.

Su Kim, holds a Master's degree in urban and regional planning from the Graduate School of Environmental Studies, Seoul National University. She majored in German studies, Political Science and International Relations from Yonsei University in Seoul, Korea. Her research interests include urban studies, community development, and civic engagement in urban planning. She is currently participating in the 2040 Seoul Plan research team at the Seoul Institute.

Won Bae Kim, Former Senior Research Fellow, Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements has worked at the Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements as well as the East-West Center in Hawai'i. He has taught at the University of Hawai'i, Dong-A University, Chung-Ang University and Yonsei University. He obtained his PhD from the University of Wisconsin and Master's degrees from the Graduate School of Design, Harvard University, as well as the Graduate School of Environmental Studies, Seoul National University. His research covers both intranational and international regional development. His recent publications include *Northeast Asia's Shaking Strategic Landscape: Searching for the Future of the Korean Peninsula* (Nanam Publisher, 2018, in Korean), *Collaborative Regional Development in Northeast Asia: Towards Sustainable Regional and Sub-regional Futures* (co-editor, Chinese University Press, 2011). His earlier works include *Culture and the City in East Asia* (co-editor, Oxford University Press, 1997) and *Asian NIEs and the Global Economy* (co-editor, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995). He has contributed many articles to professional journals and books.

Blaž Križnik is Associate Professor at the Graduate School of Urban Studies, Hanyang University, Seoul. He received his PhD in sociology from the University of Ljubljana. He has worked as Visiting Research Fellow at the IaaC in Barcelona, the Seoul Development Institute and the Seoul National University Asia Center. He is a researcher at the Institute for Spatial Policies and a member of the Centre for Korean Studies at the University of Ljubljana. His research work is focused on comparative urban studies, urban social movements and Korean studies. His books include *Local Responses to Global Challenges: Cultural Context of Urban Change in Barcelona and Seoul* (FDV, 2009) and *Community-Based Urban Development: Evolving Urban Paradigms in Singapore and Seoul* (with Im Sik Cho, Springer, 2017).

Seohwan Lim is Former Senior Research Fellow at the LH Research Institute and spent most of his career working for the Korea Land and Housing Corporation (KLDC), where he worked on site planning for apartment complexes and conducted research on housing and urban issues. After retiring from KLDC, he worked for an architectural design company and then for the Ministry of Housing, Construction and Sanitation of Peru as an advisor on urban development. He majored in architecture and urban planning at Seoul National University and studied urban development at University College London. He is interested in the political-economic aspects of housing and urban development and is currently involved in a study group on urban issues.

Julie Miao is Senior Lecturer in Property and Economic Development at the Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning, University of Melbourne, and an Honorary Fellow at Shanghai Jiao Tong and Henan Universities, China. In 2017, she held a Visiting Fellowship at Hong Kong University. Previously, she was a Lecturer in Urban Planning and Development at Glasgow University and a Research Fellow at the University of St Andrews. Dr. Miao studied economic geography and planning at University College London. Her research has developed along two innovative fields: the “intrapreneurial state” and the interface between housing, labor and the knowledge economy. In particular, Dr. Miao has explored the intersection between these two fields using multidisciplinary approaches, achieving several impactful research outcomes. Her publications include *Making 21st Century Knowledge Complexes* (Routledge, 2016), “The intrapreneurial state: Singapore’s emergence in the smart and sustainable urban solutions field” (*Territory, Politics, Governance*, 2019), and “Varieties of urban entrepreneurialism” (*Dialogues in Human Geography*, 2019).

Junhee Park is an independent researcher and holds a PhD in urban studies and planning from the University of Sheffield. She was a Postdoc Fellow at the Global Research Institute, Korea University, and a Visiting Scholar at the Centre for Global Development, University of Leeds, UK. She has also worked with the Korea Land and Housing Institute and the Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements. Her current research focuses on large urban developments under capitalism. In this research, she addresses the roles of real estate developers, cultural and institutional economy and transnational developments, and the ways in which they transform and shape urban life socially, spatially, economically, politically and culturally.

Se Hoon Park is a researcher and commentator on the planning and politics of Korea cities and is currently Director of the Global Development Partnership Center, Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements, Korea. He studied urban studies and planning at Seoul National University and the University of Tokyo. Having been involved in numerous national urban projects in Korea, he has talked and written on urban development, the cultural city and ethnic enclaves in Korean and East Asian cities. Recently he has focused on

development cooperation in collaboration with international organizations such as UN Habitat, the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank. His publications include *Beyond Creative Cities* (Nanam, 2014), “Can we implant an artist community? A reflection on government led cultural districts in Korea” (published in the journal, *Cities*, 2016), and “Seoul” in *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Urban and Regional Studies* (Wiley, 2019).

Nicholas A. Phelps is Chair of Urban Planning and Associate Dean (International) at the University of Melbourne. He was previously Professor of Urban and Regional Development and Pro Vice-Provost (Regional) at University College London. He is the author of over 80 international peer-reviewed journal articles. He is also author of the books *Sequel to Suburbia* (MIT Press, 2015) and *Interplaces* (OUP, 2017). His research interests cover the economic geography of multinational enterprises, urban economic agglomeration and suburban planning and politics. His research has been funded by the UK Economic and Social Research Council and the British Academy, among other funding agencies.

Cuz Potter is Associate Professor of International Development and Cooperation at Korea University’s Division of International Studies. He attained his MSUP, MIA and PhD from Columbia University and his current research focuses on the role of the Korean construction industry in the uneven spatial development of developing countries, especially Myanmar and Vietnam. His past research has focused on social justice in developing and implementing infrastructure services, particularly in regard to how technological change in the logistics industry has undermined the territorial foundation of port policy in the US. He has also coauthored work on Nairobi’s slums for the World Bank, US urban revitalization for the Korean government, urban entrepreneurialism in China and industrial districts. He is a co-editor of and contributor to *Searching for the Just City*, an interrogation of Susan Fainstein’s concept of the “just city.” He has consulted for a number of firms and organizations in New York City and Seoul. Prior to academia, he spent three years editing and translating for the Korean Ministries of Environment and Labor.

Hyun Bang Shin is Professor of Geography and Urban Studies, Department of Geography and Environment, London School of Economics and the Director of Saw Swee Hock Southeast Asia Centre at the London School of Economics and Political Science. His research focuses on the critical analysis of the political-economic dynamics of speculative urbanization, the politics of displacement, gentrification, mega-events and the right to the city, with particular attention to Asian cities. He has coauthored *Planetary Gentrification* (Polity, 2016), edited *Anti-Gentrification: What Is to Be Done* (Dongnyok, 2017), and co-edited *Global Gentrifications: Uneven Development and Displacement* (Bristol University Press, 2015) and *Neoliberal Urbanism, Contested Cities and Housing in Asia* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2019). He is a trustee of the Urban Studies Foundation, and is to serve the journal *International Journal of Urban*

and Regional Research as incoming editor from 2021. He currently sits on the international advisor board of the journal *Antipode* and serves on the editorial board of the journals: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *Urban Geography*; *City, Culture and Society*; *Space and Environment*, *China City Planning Review* and *Radical Housing Journal*.

Farwa Sial is Visiting Research Fellow and an Early Career Researcher, Department of Geography, School of Environment, Education and Development, University of Manchester. She holds a PhD in development studies from the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) and has over four years of teaching experience in the Department of Development Studies and Economics at SOAS. Her research interests lie at the intersection of political economy, industrial policy, economic geography, corporate power and international development. In addition to ongoing work on South Korea's emerging role in international development, she has undertaken research and policy work for various DFID projects in Tanzania and Pakistan.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank all the contributors who have shared their views on Korea's urban development experience in this book. It has been an exciting experience for the editors to work with these contributors with diverse academic backgrounds, ranging from urban planning and geography to international studies. Besides the contributors, this book is also indebted to numerous organizations and individuals. The Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements (KRIHS) supported the entire process from the inception of the project to its publication. They also generously funded the international workshop held on August 28–29, 2019, where the contributors had a chance to share their ideas and sharpen their arguments. We wish to thank Yehyun An, Serine Jeon and Jeong Yun Hwang at KRIHS for their assistance and commitment. Also, we thank Sameh Wahba, Peter Ellis and Philip Karp at the World Bank Group, and Tatiana Gallego Lizon, Andres G. Blanco and Hyuna Lee at the Inter-American Development Bank for their commitment to building the partnership with KRIHS, and consequently offering insights that this book builds on. Last but not least, we are grateful to Routledge for accepting our proposal, extending particular thanks to Simon Bates, ShengBin Tan and Zixu Fan for handling all the hassles of publication with eagerness and passion.

Se Hoon Park
Hyun Bang Shin
Hyun Soo Kang

1 Introduction

Reconsidering the Korean urban development experience for international cooperation

*Se Hoon Park, Hyun Bang Shin and
Hyun Soo Kang*

This book builds on the collective efforts of the scholars and researchers who have studied the dynamics of urban development in the Republic of Korea (hereafter Korea) against the backdrop of increasing Korean Official Development Assistance (ODA) spending. The Korean government, armed with its developmental success, is now seeking an enhanced role in the world of international aid by building “the Korean model of ODA”. In particular, the area of urban development has been playing an important role in this model-building effort, with Korea placing a special emphasis on the overseas infrastructure development market to boost its national economy. In this process, there appears to be a tendency to present the country’s development experiences as a reference point for other countries in the Global South to emulate. Korea’s condensed urbanization and industrialization, accompanied by the expansion of new cities and industrial complexes across the country, have become an attractive “model” to aspire to, even if the fruits of such development may not have been equitably shared across geographies and generations (Shin, Zhao and Koh, 2020).

Work for this book started in response to recent calls among some contributors to pay academic attention to current ODA programs in Korea, particularly those focused on the way urban development experiences are interpreted and formulated as a “model”. So far, there has been a substantial body of literature on the Korean ODA based on its economic and social development experiences (see Kim and Kim, 2014a; Yi and Mkandawire, 2014). However, the urban dimension of the Korean ODA has not been sufficiently charted, despite the fact that the Korean government has placed an additional emphasis on “model-building” to market the country’s urban development experiences in the Global South. Often, such experiences have been reinterpreted in a way that dissociates them from their historical, socioeconomic and political contexts, repackaging them in pursuit of the narrowly defined national interest. The size of Korean ODA spending on overseas urban development is already huge and is getting larger; however, academic reflections on what it means to learn from Korea have been lacking. Against this backdrop, the contributors to this book attempt to make critical reassessments of

the Korean urban development experience while shedding light on the contextual understanding of such experiences. In this way, this book hopes to ensure that Korea's contributions to the international cooperation to build more equitable, resilient and sustainable urban futures occur in a manner that does not impose Korea's decontextualized version of urban development on other countries.

Korea's unique position in international cooperation

To some extent, Korea represents a rare "success" story for an ODA recipient, transforming itself from a poverty-stricken and war-torn country to the world's 11th largest economy within five decades. Korea graduated from an aid recipient country when it paid off its final structural adjustment loan to the World Bank in 1995, and was removed from the OECD's list of recipient nations in 2000. Korea had joined the group of international donor countries when it established the Economic Development Cooperation Fund (EDCF) to provide concessional loans in 1987 and launched the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) in 1991 to deal with grant aids. After joining the OECD in 1996 and the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) in 2010, Korea became an influential emerging donor in the world of international cooperation. In this regard, Korea occupies a unique position in the landscape of international cooperation.

In fact, even among emerging donors, Korea enjoys an idiosyncratic position. The literature on emerging and non-traditional donors has stressed that the aid they provide is grounded in different motivations from those of traditional donors (Mawdsley, Kim and Marcondes, 2017). Unlike traditional Western donors, who have been motivated by geopolitical and/or humanitarian interests, the emerging donors, led by China in particular, have been concerned more with the economic opportunities afforded by ODA. US aid to Afghanistan is considered to be motivated by geopolitical concerns, whereas China's aid to Nigeria is often regarded as being driven by China's economic interest in the oil market. The Korean ODA also shares a common feature with emerging donors in terms of its emphasis on the role of ODA for trade promotion. Moreover, like other emerging donors, Korea shows a low ODA/GNI (Gross National Income) ratio, a high percentage of concessional loans and tied aid, and a large number of recipients (Chun, Munyi and Lee, 2010). On the other hand, Korea exemplifies interesting differences from other emerging donors. Unlike other emerging donors, after joining the OECD/DAC, Korea has made a consistent effort to emulate traditional donors by constantly increasing the ODA/GNI ratio and by trying to conform to the norms and rules upheld by traditional donors (Kim, 2019). The OECD Development Co-operation Peer Reviews 2018 indicated that "Korea deserves praise" in its efforts to follow the recommendations of the Peer Reviews 2012 (OECD, 2018).

The ambivalent position of Korea in international aid is attributable to the nation's two different—and sometimes poorly coordinated—motivations within its ODA strategy, namely, the mercantilist interest and the diplomatic interest. On the one hand, in line with other emerging donors, Korea has placed a strong emphasis on "aid for trade" and has tried to utilize ODA as a tool for expanding

business opportunities for Korean private firms abroad. This push has come mostly from the Ministry of Economy and Finance of Korea (MOEF)—responsible for the nation’s economic affairs and budget distribution—through the use of ODA programs such as EDCF and KSP (Knowledge Sharing Program). On the other hand, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) and its implementation arm, KOICA, have a different policy priority, which is to enhance Korea’s presence on the global diplomatic stage, often described as “middle power diplomacy” (Howe, 2015). This strategy involves finding a niche in the international aid market for Korea, which has fewer resources and less experience compared to its counterparts. All the efforts of the Korean government to follow the international norms given by the OECD/DAC and to take an active role in international cooperation—such as hosting Busan HLF-4 in 2011—seem to arise from this motivation.

These two different motives create a barrier to a more integrated and coordinated ODA policy, particularly the coordination between grant and loan programs. They are also a source of fragmented ODA programs in Korea where many agencies from central and local governments seek their own organizational interests in the ODA market (OECD, 2018). It should be noted, however, that the situation reflects the unique developmental position of Korea, which is situated between the advanced economies and the Global South. As an OECD member state, Korea seeks to increase its role on the international diplomatic stage by emulating the practices of traditional donors. However, at the same time, as a nation that is still catching up with the major advanced economies, Korea faces strong pressure, particularly from domestic politics, for its ODA to contribute to expanding economic opportunity.

“Modeling” the Korean urban development experience

Self-referencing is, perhaps, the most distinctive feature of the Korean ODA strategy. The Korean government seems to regard the nation’s development experience as a valuable asset, particularly when it comes to its efforts to find a niche in the international aid world. A large part of Korea’s ODA programs builds on its reputation as a development success.

It is often noted that Korea emphasizes the role of knowledge in development cooperation (Doucette and Müller, 2016). For instance, the KSP, which started in 2004 as a key ODA platform for Korea, is focused on knowledge sharing with the Global South. KSP particularly stresses the Korean experience of economic development, highlighting that “Korea’s development experience contains practical solutions accumulated through trial and error, and its knowledge of successes and failures is a great asset for developing countries to help take on development challenges and promote sustainable growth” (KSP homepage, www.ksp.go.kr, last accessed March 30, 2020). KSP was launched by the MOEF and is implemented by three agencies, each one focusing on a different area of engagement: the Korea Development Institute (KDI) on socioeconomic development, the Export–Import Bank of Korea (EXIM Bank) on construction and infrastructure and the Korea Trade–Investment Promotion Agency (KOTRA) on trade and

investment. All these are government organizations that have played pivotal roles in the course of Korea's economic development. At the time of writing, KSP has reportedly conducted 427 projects with 76 partner countries across the globe so far (*ibid.*) and has consolidated its role as an iconic program of the Korean ODA (see Potter, 2019 for a critical assessment of KSP).

Shortly after joining the OECD/DAC in 2010, the Korean government attempted to improve its ODA strategy based on its own development experience. In 2012, the Korean government released a report, *the Korean Model of ODA Strategy*, in an effort to reorganize its development experience from an international cooperation perspective. The report pointed out that partner countries had allegedly been making strong demands for Korea to share its development experiences, which these countries would emulate Korea (The Korean Government, 2012). More importantly, however, the report emphasized that the Korean ODA should be more focused in terms of target areas and delivery processes in order to overcome the drawbacks caused by a lack of experience and the limited ODA budget. According to the report, the Korean ODA was to aim at “the sustainable development of partner countries, focusing on the demand and conditions of partner countries ... based on the comparative advantage of our development experience” (*ibid.*, p. 16). In accordance with this aim, the report identified the key features of the Korean development experience and provided principles, strategies, and major programs tailor-made for diverse regions (*ibid.*).

One of the efforts to build “the Korean model” can be seen in the interpretation of the *Saemaul* (New Village) movement, which was a government-initiated rural development campaign in the 1960s and 1970s. This movement was quickly adopted as a flagship ODA program in 2016. KOICA and other state agencies have embarked on a worldwide campaign to disseminate Korea's rural development experiences under the banner of “Global *Saemaul*”, which includes leadership training as well as other rural development practices (Jeong, 2017; Kim and Kang, 2015). The “Global *Saemaul*” strategy implies that this “model” can be applied in Global South countries regardless of their different social and economic backgrounds. The “Global *Saemaul* model” played a significant role in the recent history of Korean ODA under the previous government (2013–2017), which inherited a political legacy from the authoritarian regime (1961–1979) that organized the *Saemaul* Movement (Doucette and Müller, 2016).

In a similar vein, attempts to reproduce the “Korean model” can also be witnessed in the area of urban development, which has aimed at elevating the status of Korean urban development experiences to a pre-packaged commodity and a model that can be marketed to the Global South. Urban development—including infrastructure investment—has special importance in Korea, not only because it has played a crucial role in Korea's economic and social development, but also because the country's overseas construction market accounts for a significant share of the national GDP (around 4–6 percent 2015–2018, www.index.go.kr). As such, urban development is crucial for sustaining the national economy. Against this backdrop, the model-building of the urban development experience

for ODA has emerged alongside efforts to enhance business opportunities for the urban development sector in the overseas market (see Martin and Geglia, 2019).

One of the notable examples that epitomizes such practices is the ODA strategy to export the experience of new town construction under the banner of “city export” (see Chapter 9 in this volume by Yu-Min Joo). The phrase “city export” began to emerge in the mainstream media when Korean construction companies such as POSCO and GS Construction made an inroad into condominium complex development markets in Vietnam, Mongolia and Algeria in the mid-2000s, a process that has been dubbed the “Korean Wave in construction” (*Munwha Daily*, 2007). Soon afterwards, the concept entered into government discourses to become “the Korean model of urban development”. The Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport (MOLIT) and its affiliate Land Corporation were quick to use the “city export” concept to package their new city development projects, thus implanting “the Korean style of new city” in countries such as Kuwait and Azerbaijan (*Meil Daily*, 2009). The Seoul Metropolitan Government has also been active, under the slogan of “city export”, to share its urban policy innovations—ranging from public transportation to e-government—with cities of the Global South. The recent smart city promotion of the Korean government is a new addition to this “city export” strategy (Han, 2019; Noh, 2019).¹ Basically, while these are all public initiatives, they are obviously intended to boost overseas market shares for Korean private firms.

However, as pointed out by Chua (2011), efforts to export a country’s development experiences as a “model” are problematic because it is inherently difficult, if not impossible, to crystalize “the model” from historical and place-specific development experiences. Korea is not an exception in this regard. As pointed out by critics (for example, Kim and Kim, 2014b; Igbafen, 2014), it would be naïve to describe the Korean development experience as a singular and uniform narrative.² Korean development experiences can be differently interpreted depending on which timeframe one considers and which industrial sector or policy area one looks at. For instance, state policy toward the financial sector in the 1990s may be understood in a completely different way from that in the 1960s. The relation between the state and market in the manufacturing sector in the 1980s would have been different from the one in the social welfare sector during the same period. If one takes the political democratization of the late 1980s into consideration, one’s interpretation of the Korean development experience would become even more complicated. Historical context, therefore, matters when it comes to transferring a country’s development experiences elsewhere. In this regard, the aforementioned effort to export the rural development experience in the form of the “Global *Saemaul* model” can be said to have reduced the complex, multi-scalar experiences of rural development to a set of technical issues of resource allocation or a simple question of how the government successfully cultivates the spirit of development (Doucette and Müller, 2016). The complexity of the Korean development experience has made it difficult to construct a so-called “Korean model” that can be simplified and thus transferred or exported to the Global South.

We can see a similar difficulty in the Korean ODA strategy accompanying efforts to build “the Korean model of urban development”, which is the focus of this book. In this model-building discourse, the model presents itself as a one-size-fits-all solution to recipient countries. It is hard to see what components from past urban development experiences would constitute the “Korean model” and how they can be applied to the divergent socio-cultural and politico-economic conditions in the Global South. The problematic role of the “Korean model” is further exacerbated by the fact that the government’s and practitioner’s arguments have mostly focused on how public actors can contribute to expanding the overseas construction market for Korean private firms. Consequently, norms of international cooperation—such as aid effectiveness and local ownership—are largely disregarded. As such, the currently circulated narrative of the “Korean urban model” may inevitably be narrow, simplistic and of less cultural sensitivity, thereby calling into question the viability of exporting the model itself.

Interrogating the Korean urban development experience

Even though Korea’s urban development experience cannot be captured by a simple singular narrative, this does not mean that Korea’s experiences have nothing to offer to the Global South. To some extent, it is hard to dispute that Korea’s urban development during the past six decades has been a success story. Korea was a predominantly rural society in the early 1960s; however, after urbanizing and industrializing at a dazzling pace, it has become a highly urbanized and industrial country. At the beginning of the 1990s, more than 80 percent of the national population was living in urban areas, with living conditions and physical infrastructure (e.g., paved motorways, sanitation and communications) undergoing dramatic improvements. For example, the housing floor area per person expanded from 8.6 m² to 31.7 m² between 1970 and 2018, despite an explosive increase in urban populations (see <http://stat.molit.go.kr/>). As far as the policy response to rapid urbanization is concerned, Korea is a clear benchmark for rapidly urbanizing countries.

How, then, should we understand the Korean urban development experience and its implications for international cooperation in our urbanizing global world? How can we go beyond the narrow and simplistic interpretation of the Korean experience and move forward to reinterpret it for the benefit of the global community in general? These are the key motivating questions that this book was designed to address. Contributors to this volume have been given the space to respond to these questions in ways that speak to their own research expertise. Before delving into individual chapters dealing with specific issues, we will outline the common ground shared by the contributors as entry points into further discussion.

First, we attempt to contextualize the Korean urban development experience. That is, we attempt to understand such experiences against the underlying conditions that shaped the adoption and implementation of particular

policies. It has often been neglected in Korean ODA practices that there are important economic, social, political, and institutional conditions required for a particular policy to establish itself and start working. This is especially true when it comes to urban development, where the spotlight is more often placed on physical appearance, with the economic and institutional background that conditioned the production of the physical structure tending to be overlooked. For instance, Korea's new city development may look attractive to politicians and government officials in the Global South, and the urban strategy that led to it may appear simple and straightforward to transfer, when one only focuses on the construction work. What was important for the success of the policy of new city development, however, was that it was implemented under the specific politico-economic conditions of the 1980s and 1990s, which had high economic growth rates and an expanding middle class, as well as under particular institutional and legal arrangements according to which government, research institutes, public corporations, and private companies could work together, albeit with some friction (see Chapter 4 by Hyun Bang Shin and Chapter 12 by Se Hoon Park). Without understanding these specific contexts, efforts to transfer the new city development experience elsewhere will be wasted.

With regard to refocusing on the contexts of policies, two different dimensions can be identified. One is, of course, the context in which a particular urban policy was adopted and implemented, which may differ according to the different development stages of Korea. The country in the 1970s and 1980s was under the circumstance of the authoritarian state, weak civil society and high economic growth. Globally, Korea was situated in a "new international division of labor" and Cold War geopolitical tensions. All these elements, to varying degrees, influenced the development of Korea's urban policy and its implementation. It is also critical to understand the context of a country implementing lessons learned from the Korean experience. Many developing countries have a weak state, a fragmented society, high social inequality, a negative colonial legacy, low economic growth rates and are subject to the neoliberal world economic order. In addition, each country has unique social and economic conditions that are too diverse to be simplified, which limits the possibility of replicating certain development experiences (see also Chua, 2011; Shin, Zhao and Koh, 2020). In this regard, the current urban ODA in Korea is less sensitive to the diverse developmental contexts of the recipient nations, despite its emphasis on a demand-driven approach and local ownership.

Second, we intend to have a balanced view on the Korean urban development experience, recognizing both the positive and negative aspects of the government's interventions. The conventional approach in the Korean ODA mostly focuses on the bright side of Korean modern history while neglecting its darker side, such as spatial disparity and social inequality. As Howe (2015: 30) adeptly points out, the model claimed by the Korean government is a "sanitized" one. Even if we portray Korea's urban transformation as generally a success story, there is a less-spoken-about version of the story with a large area of hidden shadow. State-driven urban development was fast-paced and effective in terms

of quantified achievements, but it was made possible in the context of a weak civil society and inadequate welfare system (Shin, 2018). As described by Won Bae Kim in this volume (Chapter 3), the regional disparity between the Seoul Metropolitan Region (SMR) and the rest of the country has been exacerbated over time due to the continuous concentration of people and businesses in the SMR. The massive housing redevelopment projects of the 1980s and 1990s caused large-scale forced evictions and displacement, consequently marginalizing vulnerable people (see Chapter 10 in this volume by Seong-Kyu Ha and Shin and Kim, 2016). The 2009 Yongsan Incident—which resulted in the tragic deaths of six people in the aftermath of a violent clash between police and resisting commercial tenants (Kim, 2009)—demonstrated that the negative legacy of urban transformation still looms large. It should be noted that the difficulties facing Korean cities at the moment mostly result from those conditions that made it possible for the nation to develop in previous decades.

Third, we try to go beyond the conventional technology-oriented and business-interested approach, by reinterpreting urban development as social institutions embedded in society. In the Korean ODA, urban development has been predominantly viewed as nothing more than engineering and/or infrastructure projects. This reductionist interpretation prevails not only among government officials, but also among many academics in Korea. It is suggestive that the ODA program by MOLIT has been designed and managed by the Overseas Construction Policy Division as part of the ministry's promotional activity for the overseas construction market (Park et al., 2019). Furthermore, the smart city promotion, actively supported by the incumbent government, has focused mostly on technological improvement and infrastructure development, neglecting all other social, economic and political impacts on urban environments. One important problem in the technology-oriented interpretation of the Korean experience is that it cannot provide any normative value for international cooperation. Perhaps this approach could help persuade domestic taxpayers in the short run; however, this cannot be the best way to take advantage of the Korean development experience to strengthen the nation's position in international cooperation.

Since the adoption of the 2030 agenda by the United Nations in 2015, the international community has underscored the normative values in urban development by adopting the concepts of inclusive, resilient and sustainable cities. In addition, the concept of “the right to the city” has come to the forefront of discussions among international organizations such as the UN Habitat and Cities Alliance; this concept is said to represent an alternative view of an increasingly polarized global urban society (Parnell, 2016). These international norms were further developed by the UN Habitat when the New Urban Agenda was adopted as a guiding principle for the international community in Quito, Ecuador in 2016 (UN Habitat, 2016). However, these norms have not been adequately discussed and adopted by the urban ODA in Korea. Korea's urban development experience could perhaps be interrogated in line with this international movement, thereby allowing Korea to stake out a better role in the international community as a critical source of inspiration for rapidly urbanizing countries.

Structure of this book

This book is organized into three parts. In Part I, we outline the urban transformations in Korea since the 1960s and their implications for international cooperation to attain sustainable urban development. Mike Douglass (Chapter 2) offers a comprehensive overview of the Korean urban and regional development, focusing on major policy shifts that are closely associated with the changing configurations of the relationships between the government, civil society and the corporate economy. While acknowledging Korea's success in achieving a degree of national prosperity, Douglass also reminds us of the struggles and inequities that called for changes in governance at urban as well as national scales. Won Bae Kim (Chapter 3) examines the main concerns and elements of regional policy in Korea over the past six decades, highlighting the two major concerns of regional disparity and regional competitiveness. In doing so, he draws implications from Korean regional policy for international development cooperation. Hyun Bang Shin (Chapter 4) asserts that Korea's property-based urban transformation was pursued by the developmental state in its effort to nurture the growth of (real estate) capital and middle classes and that the property hegemony-based model of urban (re-)development is effectively a rent gap-based revenue-sharing model, which widens asset inequality and leaves little room for non-financial contributors. He calls for a careful treatment of the country's urban development experiences before exporting such a model of city-making to urbanizing societies elsewhere. Blaž Križnik and Su Kim (Chapter 5) offer an insight into the role of community and neighborhood in urban transformation in Korea, which is a rarely charted area in the existing literature. While highlighting the dynamics of state–community relations in the process of urban development, they claim that the state facilitated the commodification of localities through property-led urban redevelopment while, at the same time, localities challenged the state and struggled against the commodification of localities.

In Part II, we attempt to critically reassess the modeling of the Korean urban development experience and its implications for other countries from an international comparative perspective. Jamie Doucette and Farwa Sial (Chapter 6) argue that the self-referential model-building of Korea's knowledge-sharing initiatives risks replicating national state-centrism, a view that is often invoked in celebratory narratives of Korea's rapid economic development. Cuz Potter and Jinhee Park (Chapter 7) emphasize the limitations of a singular model for envisaging Korean urban development. By taking the example of a condominium complex construction project in Vietnam, they propose that “a multitude of models” is inevitable. Hyung Min Kim, Julie Miao and Nicholas Phelps (Chapter 8) identify the relative position of Korea amid the recent emerging urban development leadership in East Asia. By comparing the three urban development models of Korea, China, and Singapore, they shed light on how each model may reflect the national development path as well as the national interest.

In Part III, we explore individual policies and institutions, focusing on how these policies and institutions were established and practiced in Korea

and what these experiences might mean for international cooperation. Yu-Min Joo (Chapter 9), by examining how the so-called “city export” discourse was formulated and developed in Korea, sheds light on the rarely told dimension of the Korean model, that is, the public value of urban development for international cooperation. Seong-Kyu Ha (Chapter 10) reviews the housing and urban redevelopment policies of Korea from the “housing right” perspective. He claims that the overall quality of housing in Korea has improved considerably since the 1980s but that, at the same time, urban redevelopment projects have further marginalized vulnerable groups, thereby eventually generating the polarization of housing conditions in Korea. Seowhan Lim (Chapter 11) explores the land development scheme in Korea, which has played a pivotal role in facilitating rapid urban transformations. Detailing the structure and features of Korea’s land development scheme, he stresses the background conditions that enabled it to be designed and implemented in a society under authoritarian rule and speculative land demand. Se Hoon Park (Chapter 12) sheds light on public research institutions as an integral part of Korea’s national developmental system. He examines why and how policy research institutes in Korea have played such a pivotal role in public policy development with special focus on three elements: the knowledge production market, government-institute relations and the urban development regime. Last but not least, Jieun Kim (Chapter 13) deals with public development corporations as an engine of development and as part of Korea’s urban development model. She illustrates how public development corporations became pillars of the urban development model, how their roles are changing as Korea’s economic growth and urbanization slow down and what implications they offer to the Global South.

In conclusion, this book was planned according to the simple assumption that not all countries in the Global South have the potential to follow the same developmental path that Korea took in the 1960s and 1970s. Korea’s development experience, no matter how remarkable it is, is just one example, specific in time and place. One may certainly draw lessons from it. However, at the same time, the experience of Korea must be critically reflected upon and the lessons drawn from it modified by other countries facing different developmental contexts. These modifications require a more nuanced understanding of the relevant policies than we have seen in current ODA practices. In this regard, we hope that this book opens discussion about, rather than offers hasty answers to, our question of how the Korean urban development experience should be reinterpreted and what it can contribute to rapidly urbanizing countries to allow them to be more inclusive, resilient, and sustainable.

Notes

- 1 See the presentations in the forum organized by KOTRA and the Seoul Metropolitan Government on July 4, 2019 in Seoul (Han, 2019; Noh, 2019). This forum was designed to discuss future policy directions for supporting the so-called “city export”

- with participation from the Seoul Metropolitan Government, LH Corporation, private engineering companies, and related experts.
- 2 Similar limitations can be witnessed among “developmental statist” theorists, who have highlighted the importance of state power and state autonomy in explaining the economic development of Korea (see Amsden, 1989; Woo-Cumings, 1999). Such explanations are not sufficient to tell the story of the Korean state because they focus too much on the efficiency of governance and the centralized operation of government functions, thus incurring the shortfalls of “methodological nationalism” and “methodological statism” (Doucette and Park, 2018).
 - 1 Korea is used interchangeably with South Korea.
 - 2 Until the 1980s, the number of countries signing bilateral investment treaties indicating openness to global investment averaged less than ten per year. The number skyrocketed in the 1980s to reach nearly 200 per year by the 1997 Asia Finance Crisis (Elkins, Guzman and Beth, 2006).
 - 3 According to the Third National Land Development Plan 1992–2001, in 1988 the Capital Region had an economic and social opportunity index of 141 compared to 67 for the rest of the nation (100 = weighted average).
 - 4 The 1988 Olympics—a huge neo-developmental project—infamously displaced more than 700,000 people. The Hadid Dongdaemun Design Plaza, which contributed to Seoul’s rising public debt under the neoliberal government in the first decade of this century, cost more than US\$ half billion to construct.
 - 5 Worthy of note in this regard is a study of 158 countries that finds corruption to be lower in decentralized government systems, the reason being the greater ability of citizens to have voice and accountability over public matters (Ivanyina and Shah, 2011).
 - 6 Neoclassical economists theorize that spatial polarization will eventually equilibrate over time (Hirschman, 1975). Other theorists argue that it will not automatically reverse itself; nor, due to heavy biases in public spending on primate cities and lack of knowledge about opportunities elsewhere, is it economic efficient (Myrdal, 1957; Friedmann, 1973; Smith, 1990; Jones and Douglass, 2008).
 - 7 In addition, “authoritarian capitalism” persists in countries with very high levels of per capita GDP (Carney, 2018).
 - 1 Kim (2014) discusses the evolution of Korea’s regional policy from the two combined processes of economic development and democratic governance.
 - 2 Wang-Bae Kim (2003b) pointed out that regional policies under the influence of political regionalism undermine national integration, rational judgement and a rational political culture.
 - 3 The special issue of *Korea Journal* (volume 43, no. 2, 2003) discusses regionalism in Korea.
 - 4 The fact that Chungnam recorded a positive gain in national population share indicates the effect of a new administrative city development begun in the 2000s.
 - 5 This is clearly exceptional compared to other countries. Given the higher labor productivity in the CR, the average GRDP per capita in the CR suggests that population increase in the CR has erased labor productivity advantage in the CR. However, when per capita income tax instead of per capita GRDP is used, Seoul is much higher than other regions (Kim, W.B. 2003a).
 - 6 The OECD Regions and Cities at a Glance 2018 report maps out regional disparities in GDP per capita in terms of OECD countries. Korea belongs to the middle group, having less regional disparities than Great Britain, the USA, Germany, France, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and so on.

12 Notes

- 7 It should be noted that Daejeon's high share of R&D personnel is also the result of the establishment of the Daedeok Science Park, the development of which began in the early 1970s and was completed in the early 1990s.
- 8 This is a well-known convergence hypothesis proposed by Williamson (1965). However, this convergence process is affected by country contexts including a political system, that is, whether a country has a unitary or federated system (Henderson, 1988).
- 9 The five zones are the relocation promotion zone, the limited redevelopment zone, the development reservation zone, the development promotion zone and the nature preservation zone.
- 10 See the KRIHS publication PKPP 2013–2014 by Lee (2013) for the details of the policy.
- 11 These three zones are the growth management zone, the nature preservation zone and the development control zone.
- 12 There have also been conflicts between the central government, on the one hand, and local authorities and the private sector, on the other, with respect to the restrictive measures, thus creating a governance problem for the CR (Kim, 1999).
- 13 It began as an idea to relocate the Korean capital but moving the capital from Seoul was ruled unconstitutional in 2004.
- 14 Later the city was named Sejong Special City.
- 15 As of late 2018, ten innovation cities have been completed and 115 public institutions have been relocated. As of June 2018, the population in these innovation cities grew to 182,000 and the number of enterprises that moved in reached 639. However, the majority (67.4%) of the 639 enterprises moved into the innovation districts within large metropolises such as Busan, Daegu and Gwangju-Jeonnam, while only 6.7% moved to Jeonbuk, Gyeongbuk, Chungbuk and Jeju. Out of 639 enterprises, 177 relocated from the SCR and 326 moved from within the same province. Only five of them have more than 300 employees, while the majority of them (552) are small-size enterprises with less than 30 employees (Joint Government Ministries, August 27, 2018).
- 16 Details on the progress and limitations of the enterprise cities are discussed in Kim and Shin (2013).
- 17 The regional industry promotion program began to be implemented in the late 1990s. At first, specialized industries for four metropolitan cities and provinces (footwear for Busan, textiles for Daegu, optical industries for Gwangju, and machinery for Gyeongnam) were promoted. Then the program expanded to 4 + 9 provinces. The name and emphasis have changed over time. Over this period, the scale of regions covered mostly cities, counties and provinces. From 2008 to 2012, the macro-economic regions were expanded (Regional Development Committee, 2017: 2). In essence, the central government attempted to develop region-specific industries that had at least some existing regional industrial bases and growth potential. In later periods, new industries suitable for each region were added. The most recent details of the program are summarized in the press release by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce and the Ministry of SMEs and Startups (December 27, 2018).
- 18 The five major macro-economic regions were CR (Seoul, Incheon, Gyeonggi), SCR (Busan, Ulsan, and Gyeongnam), Chungcheong Region (Chungcheongbuk and Chungcheongnam), Honam Region (Gwangju, Jeonnam and Jeonbuk) and Daegyeong Region (Daegu and Gyeongbuk). The two provinces of Gangwon and Jeju were separated due to their isolated location, even though their size is small compared to the five main regions.

- 19 In order to supplement the macro-economic regions, the daily living sphere development plan was drawn to provide minimum public services to all the residents in the country (Jang, 2009). However, in the next administration (the Park Geun-hye government, 2013–2017), the scale of the regions was changed back to a smaller scale to meet the demands of people for quality of life. The concept of regional happy living zones was introduced instead of macro-economic regions. The current government has returned to the main administrative division between metropolitan cities and provinces, scrapping the ideas of macroeconomic regions and smaller-scale daily living zones.
- 20 The KRIHS report written by Ahn and others (2017) pointed out the lack of roadmap in Korea's regional policy, that is, how and to what extent regional disparities should be reduced in a given period of time. Instead, the policy focused on industrial promotion in the non-CR and assistance to lagging regions.
- 21 An alternative has been suggested to provide a national minimum level of living standards or life capacities across the regions instead of reducing the absolute gap between regions (Koo, Kim, and Yoon, 2012).
 - 1 Methodological nationalism treats the scale of the nation-state as the exclusive unit of analysis for explaining social phenomena, thereby neglecting the importance of multi-scalar politics that are inclusive of local scales as well as transnational scales. Daniel Chernilo (2006: 129) further states that “[m]ethodological nationalism presupposes that the nation-state is the natural and necessary form of society in modernity and that the nation-state becomes the *organising principle* around which the whole project of modernity cohered”.
 - 2 The “clearance and redevelopment” scheme under the 1973 Temporary Act consisted of two different approaches. The first approach was often referred to as “self-help clearance and redevelopment” and was applied between 1973 and 1975 (Kim et al. 1996: 87). Land was to be redefined into larger housing lots (usually at least 165 square meters) so that shared ownership among several households would make it easier to build “corporative housing” of higher density. The dwelling owners were required to finance all the costs incurred for the purchase of public lands they illegally occupied, for temporary accommodation until re-housing, and for the reconstruction of houses after clearance. The second approach that presented important implications for practices in the 1980s was known as “consigned redevelopment”. Owner-occupiers were to establish a steering committee and bring in a private builder in charge of removing dwellings and producing new apartment flats or multi-household units. The municipal government was to supervise the process as well as nominate builders of good reputation. Twenty to 30 households were to come together so as to define approximately 1,000 square meters of housing lot, thereby constructing dwellings with higher density (Kim et al. 1996: 96).
 - 3 According to the Master Plan for Housing Redevelopment in Seoul, finalized in 1998, the examination of more than 100 redevelopment project sites showed that about two-fifths of land turned out to be in public ownership and that the majority of houses in redevelopment sites were, in fact, illegal (Seoul Municipal Government 1998: 20–21).
 - 4 The Urban Planning Act has been absorbed into the Act on Planning and Use of National Territory since January 1, 2003.
 - 5 Redevelopment projects are led by redevelopment associations made up of property owners as members. New flats produced as part of redevelopment consist of (a) flats allocated to members of the redevelopment association, who purchase these flats at

- construction cost; (b) flats for sale in the new housing market for profits; and (c) public housing units as required by local governments.
- 6 Urban Redevelopment Project statistics are available at <http://stat.molit.go.kr/> (last accessed April 30, 2020).
 - 7 Apartments were perceived as a symbol of the modern lifestyle and received the attention of the state from the 1960s (see Sonn and Shin 2020: 872–873).
 - 8 For the historic data on housing stocks, see the Seoul Research Data Service website on housing. Available at: <http://data.si.re.kr/node/343> (last accessed April 30, 2020).
 - 9 In Seoul, in accordance with the Urban Redevelopment Act and the Municipal Ordinance on Urban Redevelopment, a certain proportion of urban planning tax income (5 percent until 1982 and 10 percent thereafter) was earmarked for a special municipal account for urban redevelopment. The fund accumulated in this way was called the “redevelopment project fund”, which was used by the government to purchase public rental units provided in the redevelopment neighborhoods (Kim et al. 1995). The sales revenue of public land in redevelopment districts was also earmarked for the purchase of these rental units.
 - 10 One of the policy examples is the latest London Plan in the UK, which has a dedicated chapter on social infrastructure. Here, social infrastructure is understood as covering “a range of services and facilities that meet local and strategic needs and contribute towards a good quality of life. It includes health provision, education, community, play, youth, early years, recreation, sports, faith, criminal justice and emergency facilities”, and plays “an important role in developing strong and inclusive communities” (Mayor of London, 2019: 240).
 - 1 This chapter draws on earlier research, which the authors conducted and published over the past years (Kim and Križnik, 2018; Križnik, Cho and Kim, 2019). Their research was largely based on a case-oriented qualitative research approach, where primary data were collected through site visits, participant observation and in-depth interviews with residents, members of community organizations, experts and public officials. Primary data were complemented and contextualized with an analysis of relevant policies, research reports, journal articles and other secondary resources, related to community engagement and urban development in Seoul.
 - 2 Park (1998: 277) reported that in Korea, the government expenditure for public housing was less than 1 percent of the national budget in 1986, while Singapore, known for successful public housing, spent about 14 percent of its national budget for housing in the same year.
 - 3 In Korea, urban redevelopment aims to improve deprived residential areas by demolishing existing neighborhoods and building new residential complexes. In contrast, urban regeneration refers to gradual and comprehensive improvement rather than demolition of deprived residential areas (Križnik, 2018).
 - 4 *Maenul* refers not only to a particular geographic area, but also to social and economic relations, practices, histories and shared meanings embedded in a locality. In regard to community movements, *maenul* can also carry transformative connotations and cannot be translated simply as a village, town or neighborhood (Kim and Križnik, 2018). For these reasons, the authors prefer the Korean word *maenul* to its English translation.
 - 5 Haengdang-dong refers to the administrative district of Haengdang 2-dong in Seongdong-gu, Seoul. Apart from Haengdang 2-dong, the JRP also affected Geumho 1-dong, Haengdang 1-dong, and Wangsimni 2-dong (former Hawangsimni-dong).
 - 6 The state introduced neighborhood meetings in 1976 to “bring together at least one member of every household in the country on the twenty-fifth of every month,

solidifying national unity within grassroots gatherings” (Read, 2012: 154). Initial state control has relaxed over the time and the bansanghoe meetings became increasingly irregular and voluntary by the early 2000s.

- 7 After 2010, LMPP proceeded as a Seoul Human Town and Residential Environment Management Project, which, however, changed little in terms of its aims, planning approach or implementation (Yu, 2018).
- 1 A policy research institute is often called a “think tank”, so these two terms are used interchangeably in this chapter.
- 2 I use the term “regime” to mean “an informal yet relatively stable group with access to institutional resources that enable it to have a sustained role in making governing decisions”, in accordance with Clarence Stone’s work (Stone, 1993).
- 3 I acquired much of the information in this session from an interview with Dr. Won Young Kwon (February 8, 2019).
- 4 Interview with Dr. Won Young Kwon on February 8, 2019.
- 5 It is said that the NRC benchmarked the Research Council system in the UK. The UK operates the seven Research Councils as governing bodies for public research institutes under the Department for Business Innovation and Skills. The UK system has been known for the Haldane principle under which the government provides financial support but does not intervene in the management of research institutes (Kim, 2012). When the NRC was introduced, there were three official reasons offered by the government for the governance change: to provide independence in management and research, to evaluate the PRIs more efficiently and to promote collaborative research among PRIs (*Maeil Economy Daily*, December 9, 1998).
- 6 These are the project-based contracts in which the MOLIT requests research projects to KRIHS, separate from the central government’s annual financial support for general management. Currently, around 30 percent of research projects are those commissioned by the central government to KRIHS.
- 7 At first, the MAC Construction Project started in 2003 under a different title, the “New Capital Construction Project”, with a view to relocate the capital from Seoul to the new city. After the project was judged as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 2004, the government modified the plan, and resumed it in the current form of the MAC. Here, I omitted the details to avoid unnecessary confusion.
- 1 The OECD defines state-owned enterprises as enterprises in which the state has significant control through full, majority or significant minority ownership. In this chapter, the state includes both central and local government.
- 2 Based on the individual financial statements.
- 3 50 Year History of K-Water (2017).
- 4 The total project cost was KRW 32.1 billion, of which 63 percent was funded by the central government and 37 percent was covered by the war reparations from Japan to Korea.
- 5 It is supposed to be enough to cover the electricity demand of 330,000 people (50 Year History of K-Water, 2017: 34).
- 6 The amount of loan from the Housing and Commercial Bank varies by sources. 50 Year History of K-Water (2017) says KRW 105 million; a Maekyung newspaper article (January 28, 1969) says KRW 560 million.
- 7 Seobinggo, Apgujeong and Banpo are most expensive residential areas to this day.
- 8 At the time, KHC was required to build public housing for middle-income households (Grade 1 Public Housing), and local governments for low-income households (Grade 2 Public Housing).

16 References

- 9 Dongdaemun Apartment (1965), Jeongdong Apartment (1965) and Hilltop Apartment (1967) to name a few.
- 10 “Ju-Seok Roe’s Seoul Story: Apartment, Part (1)”, Seoul Newspaper (March 10, 2014).
- 11 KEPCO and K-Water have been able to enter PPP projects which require equity investment and track records of operation and management in relevant projects. They join forces with construction companies or equipment manufacturers to win competitive bids for mega-infrastructure projects such as power plants, electric grids, hydro dams, and so on.

References

- Amsden, A. H. (1989). *Asia’s Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chua, B. H. (2011). “Singapore as Model: Planning Innovations, Knowledge Experts,” in R. Ananya and A. Ong (eds.), *Worlding Cities: Asian Experiments and the Art of Being Global*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 27–54.
- Chun, H.-M., E. N. Munyi, and H. Lee (2010). “South Korea as an Emerging Donor: Challenges and Changes on its Entering OECD/DAC,” *Journal of International Development* 22(6), pp. 788–802.
- Doucette, J. and A. R. Müller (2016). “Exporting the *Saemaul* Spirit: South Korea’s Knowledge-Sharing Program and the ‘Rendering Technical’ of Korean Development,” *Geoforum* 75, pp. 29–39.
- Doucette, J. and B.-G. Park, eds. (2018). *Developmentalist Cities? Interrogating Urban Developmentalism in East Asia*. Leiden: Brill.
- Han, M. H. (2019). “Achievement and Task for the Korean Urban Model,” in the forum for *Achievement and Task for the Korean Urban Model* on July 4, 2019 in Seoul (in Korean).
- Howe, B. (2015). “Development Effectiveness: Charting South Korea’s Role and Contribution,” in I. Bradford, S. Snyder, C. I. Bradford, T. Dalton, B. Howe, J. K. O’Donnell and A. O’Neil (eds.), *Middle-Power Korea: Contributions to the Global Agenda*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, pp. 21–43.
- Igbafen, M. L. (2014). “South Korea’s Development Experience as an Aid Recipient: Lessons for Sub-Saharan Africa,” in E. M. Kim and P. H. Kim (eds.), *The South Korean Development Experience: Beyond Aid*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 111–135.
- Jeong, H. (2017). “Globalizing a Rural Past: The Conjunction of International Development Aid and South Korea’s Dictatorial Legacy,” *Geoforum* 86, pp. 160–168.
- Kim, E. M. and P. H. Kim, eds. (2014a). *The South Korean Development Experience: Beyond Aid*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kim, E. M. and P. H. Kim (2014b). “From Development to Development Cooperation: Foreign Aid, Country Ownership, and the Developmental State in South Korea,” in E. M. Kim and P. H. Kim (eds.), *The South Korean Development Experience: Beyond Aid*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kim, K.-T. (2009). “Six Dead as Police Crash with Protesters in Seoul.” *Independent*, January 20, 2009. Available at: (www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/six-dead-as-police-clash-with-protesters-in-seoul-1451650.html) [Accessed August 28, 2020].
- Kim, S. (2019). “The Misadventure of Korea Aid: Developmental Soft Power and the Troubling Motives of an Emerging Donor,” *Third World Quarterly* 40(11), pp. 2052–2070.

- Kim, S. and H. Kang (2015). "Young and Dynamic? The Curious Case of Korea's National Level Post-2015 Process," *Journal of International Development* 27, pp. 776–800.
- The Korean Government (2012). *Implementation Strategy for Korean ODA Model*. www.korea.kr/archive/expDocView.do?docId=32621 [Accessed August 28, 2020] (in Korean).
- Martin, B. and B. Geglia (2019). "Korean Tigers in Honduras: Urban Economic Zones as Spatial Ideology in International Policy Transfer Networks," *Political Geography* 74. doi: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.102041
- Mawdsley, E., S. M. Kim and D. Marcondes (2017). "Political Leadership and 'Non-traditional' Development Cooperation," *Third World Quarterly* 38(10), pp. 2171–2186.
- Meil Daily* (2009). "Korean Style of New City as a Popular Product in Global Market." August 10 (in Korean).
- Munhwaha Daily* (2007). "Rush to the Export of the Korean Style New City." January 30 (in Korean).
- Noh, E. H. (2019). "Cases of Public–Private Cooperative Overseas Business of Seoul's Policy Model," in the forum for *Achievement and Task for the Korean Urban Model* on July 4, 2019 in Seoul (in Korean).
- OECD (2018). *OECD Development Co-operation Peer Reviews: Korea 2018*. Paris: OECD.
- Park, S. H., B. J. Lee, Y. An, H. You, E. Lee, K. S. Kwon, Y. S. Kim (2019). *Policy Directions of International Development Cooperation in the Urban Sector for Implementing SDGs*. Sejong: Korean Research Institute for Human Settlement (in Korean).
- Parnell, S. (2016). "Defining a Global Urban Development Agenda." *World Development* 78, February 2016, pp. 529–540.
- Potter, C. (2019). "Just Like Korea in the 1970s? Policy Transfer and the Fiction of Familiarity," *International Development and Cooperation Review* 11(4), pp. 21–36. doi:10.32580/idcr.2019.11.4.21.
- Shin, H. B. (2018). "Urban Movements and the Genealogy of Urban Rights Discourses: The Case of Urban Protesters against Redevelopment and Displacement in Seoul, South Korea," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108(2), pp. 356–369.
- Shin, H. B. and S.-H. Kim (2016). "The Developmental State, Speculative Urbanisation and the Politics of Displacement in Gentrifying Seoul," *Urban Studies* 53(3), pp. 540–559.
- Shin, H. B., Y. Zhao and S. Y. Koh (2020). "Whither Progressive Urban Futures? Critical Reflections on the Politics of Temporality in Asia," *CITY*. doi: 10.1080/13604813.2020.1739925
- UN Habitat (2016). "New Urban Agenda: Quito Declaration on Sustainable Cities and Human Settlements for All" (<http://habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda/>) [Accessed August 28, 2020].
- Woo-Cumings, M., ed. (1999). *The Developmental State*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Yi, I. and T. Mkandawire (2014). *Learning from the South Korean Developmental Success: Effective Developmental Cooperation and Synergistic Institutions and Policies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Amsden, A. H. (1992). *Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barber, N. W. and R. Ekins (2016). "Situating Subsidiarity," *The American Journal of Jurisprudence* 61(1), pp. 5–12.
- Carney, R. (2018). *Authoritarian Capitalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

18 References

- Cha, B. (1998). "Four Customs-Free Zones to Be Set Up," *Chosun Ilbo*, December 22.
- Chandler, M. (2010). "South Korea: Paradox of Rural Education," *Global Post*. Available at: www.pri.org/stories/2010-12-23/south-korea-paradox-rural-education. [Accessed February 20, 2020].
- Chang, D. and Y. Bae (2012). *The Birth of Social Election in South Korea*. Berlin: Fesmedia Asia for Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Cho, M. (2019). "A Progressive City in the Making—The Seoul Experience," in M. Douglass, R. Garbaye and K. Ho (eds.), *The Rise of Progressive Cities East and West*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 47–64.
- Cho, Y. (2014). "Appraising the Quality of Democracy as a Developmental Phenomenon: How South Koreans Appraise the Quality of Their Democracy," *Social Indicators Research* 116(3), pp. 699–712.
- Choi, C., H. Lee and E. Kim (2019). "Critical Junctures and Path Dependence in Urban Planning and Housing Policy: A Review of Greenbelts and New Towns in Korea's Seoul Metropolitan Area," *Land Use Policy* 80, pp. 195–204.
- Choi, M. and Y. Kim (2018). "Planning Paradigm Shift in the Era of Transition from Urban Development to Management: The Case of Korea," in A. Frank and C. Silver (eds.), *Urban Planning Education*. Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 161–174.
- Chung, J. (2019). "The Neo-Developmental Cultural Industries Policy of Korea: Rationales and Implications of an Eclectic Policy," *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 25(1), pp. 63–74.
- Dahlgren, P. (2009). *Media and Political Engagement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Douglass, M. (1994). "The 'Developmental State' and the Newly Industrialized Economies of Asia," *Environment and Planning A* 26(4), pp. 543–566.
- Douglass, M. (2014). "The Saemaul Undong in Historical Perspective and in the Contemporary World," in I. Yi and T. Mkandawire (eds.), *Learning from the South Korean Developmental Success*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 136–171.
- Douglass, M. (2019). "The Rise of Progressive Cities for Human and Planetary Flourishing—A Global Perspective on Asia's Urban Transition," in M. Douglass, R. Garbaye and K. C. Ho (eds.), *The Rise of Progressive Cities East and West*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 23–46.
- Elkins, Z., A. T. Guzman and S. Beth (2006). *Competing for Capital: The Diffusion of Bilateral Investment Treaties 1960–2000*. Berkeley, CA: ALACDE Annual Papers 29. University of California at Berkeley.
- Evans, P. (1989). "Predatory, Developmental and Other Apparatuses: A Comparative Political Economy Perspective on the Third World State," *Sociological Forum* 4(4), pp. 561–587.
- Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Freedom House. (2019). *Freedom in the World 2019*. Available at: <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2019/democracy-in-retreat>. [Accessed July 20, 2019].
- Friedmann, J. (1973). *Urbanization, Planning and National Development*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Froebel, F., H. Jürgen and K. Otto (1980). *The New International Division of Labor*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Ha, S. (2007). *Regions, Local Autonomy, and Democracy*. Seoul: Humanitas.
- Ha, Y. and M. Kang (2011). "Creating a Capable Bureaucracy with Loyalists: The Internal Dynamics of the South Korean Developmental State, 1948–1979," *Comparative Political Studies* 44(1), pp. 78–108.

- Heo, U. and S. Hahm (2014). "Political Culture and Democratic Consolidation in South Korea," *Asian Survey* 54(5), pp. 918–940.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1975). "Interregional and International Transmission of Economic Growth," in J. Friedmann and W. Alonso (eds.), *Regional Policy, Readings in Theory and Application*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 139–157.
- Hwang, S. (2005). "Korea: U-city Project – Next IT Agenda," *The Korea Herald*. December 13, 2005.
- Im, H. (1987). "The Rise of Bureaucratic Authoritarianism in South Korea," *World Politics*, 9(2), pp. 231–257.
- Ivanyina, M. and A. Shah (2011). "Decentralization and Corruption: New Cross-Country Evidence," *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 29, pp. 344–362.
- Jones, G. and M. Douglass, eds. (2008). *The Rise of Mega-Urban Regions in Pacific Asia—Urban Dynamics in a Global Era*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Joo, Y. (2019). "Progressive Solutions to Urban Woes: Arts and Culture as Tools for Urban Revitalization in Busan, South Korea," in M. Douglass, R. Garbaya, and K. C. Ho (eds.), *The Rise of Progressive Cities East and West*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 217–231.
- Jung, M. (2017). "Precarious Seoul: Urban Inequality and Belonging of Young Adults in South Korea," *Positions* 25(4), pp. 745–767.
- KDI (Korea Development Institute) (2015). "Evaluation of Special Economic Zone Policy and Suggestions for Vitalization of Free Economic Zone," *KDI Focus*. February 26, 2015.
- KFEZ (Korean Free Economic Zones) (2019). "Where Business Blossoms." Available at: <http://fez.go.kr/global/en/intro/greeting.do>. [Accessed July 16, 2016].
- Khanna, P. (2016). "Megacities, Not Nations, are the World's Dominant, Enduring Social Structures," *Quartz*. Available at: <https://qz.com/666153/megacities-not-nations-are-the-worlds-most-dominant-enduring-social-structures-adapted-from-connectography/>. [Accessed October 20, 2016].
- Kim, C. (2016). "After Building Boom, South Korea Girds for Housing Glut," *Reuters*. March 16, 2016.
- Kim, J. (2016). "Korea Worst in Income Inequality in Asia-Pacific," *The Korean Times*. Available at: www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/biz/2016/03/488_200524.html#. [Accessed July 16, 2016].
- Kim, J. and S. Choe (1996). *Seoul: The Making of a Metropolis*. London: John Wiley.
- Kim, K. and M. Park (2016). *Housing Policy in the Republic of Korea*. Manila: Asian Development Bank Institute Working Paper, 570.
- Kim, P. (2017). "Guns Over Rice: The Impact of US Military Aid on South Korean Economic Reconstruction," *International Development and Cooperation Review* 9(1), pp. 33–50.
- Kim, S. (2017). "From Protest to Collaboration: The Evolution of the Community Movements amid Sociopolitical Transformation in South Korea," *Urban Studies* 54(16), pp. 3806–3825.
- Kim, T. (2008). "Mayor Eyes Second Miracle on Han River," *Korea Times*. Available at: www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/special/2008/07/229_12815. [Accessed July 16, 2016].
- Kim, T. and J. Lim (2016). *Regional Policy in the Republic of Korea: Principles and Experiences*. Santiago: Rimisp Working Paper, 189.
- Kim, Y. (1995). "Spatial Changes and Regional Development," in G. Lee and H. Kim (eds.), *Cities and Nation; Planning Issues and Policies of Korea*. Seoul: KRIHS, pp. 53–78.

- Kim, Y. (2000). "Spatial Development Policy—Spatial Development," Proceedings from the OECD Korea Workshop on Spatial Policies and Issues, Seoul, March 8–9, 73–95.
- Korea Times (2010). "Gwangyang Free Economic Zone Emerges as Mega Hub." www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/biz/2010/11/123_76769.html. [Accessed May 10, 2019].
- Korea Times (2019). "Korea's Population Likely to Peak in 2028." Available at: www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/nation/2019/03/703_266208.html#. [Accessed July 15, 2019].
- KRIHS (Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements) (1994). "Consolidated Cites," *Space and Environment* November, p. 4.
- Lee, H., M. Lee, and D. Park (2012). *Growth Policy and Inequality in Developing Asia: Lessons from Korea*. Manila: Asia Development Bank, ERIA Discussion Paper Series, ERIA-DP-2012-12.
- Lee, K. and D. Shin (2015). *Concentrated Growth and Spatial Disparities in Korea*. ERSA 55th Congress, Lisbon, 26 August.
- Lee, S., H. You and H. Kwon (2015). "Korea's Pursuit for Sustainable Cities through New Town Development: Implications for LAC," IDB (Inter-American Development Bank, Discussion Paper IDB-DP-390.
- Lee, S., J. Han, T. Yoon and Y. Tan (2008). "Towards Ubiquitous City: Concept, Planning, and Experiences in the Republic of Korea," in T. Yigitcanlar, K. Velibeyoglu and S. Baum (eds.), *Knowledge-Based Urban Development: Planning and Applications in the Information Era*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, pp. 148–169.
- LHI (Land & Housing Institute) (2014). *National Report for Habitat III*. Seoul: Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport.
- Minns, J. (2001). "The Labour Movement in South Korea," *Labour History* 81, pp. 175–195.
- MOLIT (Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport) (2015). *New Town Policy of Korea*. Seoul: MOLIT.
- Myrdal, G. (1957). *Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions*. London: Methuen.
- Myrdal, G. (1970). "The 'Soft State' in Undeveloped Countries," in P. Streeten (ed.), *Unfashionable Economics: Essays in Honour of Lord Balogh*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, pp. 227–243.
- OECD (2019). "OECD Better Life Index – Korea." Available at: www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/countries/korea/. [Accessed February 20, 2020].
- Park, B., C. Richard and S. Asato, eds. (2012). *Locating Neoliberalism in East Asia: Neoliberalizing Spaces in Developmental States*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Park, B., W. Lee, C. Hwang, J. M. Choi, J. N. Choi and C. Gregory, eds. (2016). *The National Atlas of Korea, Volume III: Human Geography*. Seoul: Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, and Transport; and National Geographic Information Institute (NGII), Republic of Korea.
- Park, S. (2018). *Urban Challenges and Planning Responses in South Korea*. The Second Spatial Planning Platform Meeting. July 31–August 1. Fukuoka, Japan.
- Reese, L. and R. A. Rosenfeld (2008). "Introduction: Comparative Civic Culture," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 30(4), pp. 355–374.
- Rice, T. W. and M. Arnett, (2001). "Civic Culture and Socioeconomic Development in the United States: A View from the States, 1880s–1990s," *The Social Science Journal* 38(1), pp. 39–51.
- Seth, M. (2019). *South Korea's Economic Development, 1948–1996*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia, Asian History. Available at: <https://oxfordre.com/asianhistory/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190277727.001.0001/acrefore-9780190277727-e-271>. [Accessed August 18, 2020].

- Smith, N. (1990). *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. Georgia: University of Georgia Press.
- Sonn, J. and D. Lee (2015). "Heterogeneity as the Source of the State's Resilience: The Case of Spatial Planning Under State-led Neoliberalization in South Korea," *International Journal of Urban Sciences* 19(3), pp. 364–378.
- Tacoli, C., ed. (2006). *Rural-Urban Linkages*. London: Earthscan.
- Valmero, A. (2015). "The Long-Term Impact of a Month Without Cars," *CityLab*. Available at: www.citylab.com/commute/2015/10/the-long-term-impact-of-a-month-without-cars/412408/. [Accessed May 3, 2019].
- Yap, O. F. (2011). "A Strategic Model of Economic Performance and Democratization in South Korea and Taiwan," *British Journal of Political Science* 42(1), pp. 213–239.
- Ahn, H., A. Hong-gi, S. Kim, M.-Y. Lee, S.-J. Ha, S. H. Hong and D. Kim (2017). *Toward Balanced Regional Development in the Low-growth Era: Issues and Policy Implications*. Sejong: KRIHS (in Korean).
- Barca, F., P. McCann and A. Rodriguez-Pose (2012). "The Case for Regional Development Intervention: Place-based Versus Place-neutral Approaches," *Journal of Regional Science* 52(1), pp. 134–152.
- Cha, J. (2017). "Evaluation of Balanced Development Policies in Former Governments: From Park Chung-hee Government to Park Geun-hye Government," *Social Science Studies* 25(2), pp. 130–174 (in Korean).
- Choe, S. (2014). "A Preliminary History of Regional Policies in Korea: 1960–1980 (I)," *The Korea Journal of Regional Policy* 1(2), pp. 1–16 (in Korean).
- Choe, S. (2015). "A Preliminary History of Regional Policies in Korea: 1980–2000 (II)," *The Korea Journal of Regional Policy* 2(2), pp. 109–127 (in Korean).
- Choe, S. (2016). "A Preliminary History of Regional Policies in Korea: 2001–2016 (III)," *The Korea Journal of Regional Policy* 3(2), pp. 217–239 (in Korean).
- Choe, S. and W. Kim (2001). "Globalization and Urbanization in the Republic of Korea," in S. Yusuf, S. Evenett and W. Wu (eds.), *Facets of Globalization, World Bank Discussion Paper*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 415.
- Choi, H. (2017). *Balanced Development and Decentralization Policy in South Korea*. Case Studies on Public Policy in Korea for Knowledge Sharing. Sejong: KDI.
- Henderson, J. V. (1988). *Urban Development: Theory, Fact and Illusion*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jang, J. (2009). "Regional Development Policy in Korea: Past, Present, and Future," *Journal of the Economic Geographical Society of Korea* 12(4), pp. 576–596.
- Jang, J. (2011). "Regional Development Policy in Korea—Past, Present and Future," *Journal of the Economic Geographical Society of Korea* 12(4), pp. 576–596.
- Jang, J. (2014). "Rationale of Regional Policy and Paradigm," *The Korea Journal of Regional Policy* 1(1), pp. 1–15 (in Korean).
- Joh, J., Y. Kim and Y. Koh (2010). "Territorial Development Policy," in I. Sakong and Y. Koh (eds.), *The Korean Economy: Six Decades of Growth and Development*. Sejong: KDI, pp. 177–226.
- Joint Ministries of Government (August 28, 2018). *Enterprises Establishment in the Innovation Cities and Venture Promotion Measures* (in Korean).
- Kim, D. and Y. Koh (2010). "Korea's Industrial Development," in I. Sakong and Y. Koh (eds.), *The Korean Economy: Six Decades of Growth and Development*. Sejong: KDI, pp. 83–122.
- Kim, J., W. Jeong, J. Song and K. Nahm (2017). *Policy Directions for Revitalizing Innovation City in the 2nd Stage*. Sejong: KRIHS (in Korean).

22 References

- Kim, K. (2010). "Reconsidering the Goal and Strategy of Regional Development Policy in Korea," *KDI Journal of Economic Policy* 32(1), pp. 69–96.
- Kim, S. (2014). "Regional Policy and National Development in Korea," *The Korea Journal of Policy Studies* 29(1): 101–122.
- Kim, S. and Y. Jin (2006). "A Study on Decentralized Regional Development System: A Political Economic Analysis," *The Korea Spatial Planning Review* 49, pp. 55–76 (in Korean).
- Kim, W. B. (1998). "Regional Development Policies in the Republic of Korea," *Regional Development Dialogue* 19(2), pp. 122–134.
- Kim, W. B. (1999). "National Competitiveness and Governance of Seoul, Korea," in F. John (ed.), *Urban and Regional Governance in the Asia Pacific*. Vancouver: Institute of Asian Research, the University of British Columbia, pp. 33–50.
- Kim, W. B. (2001). "Repositioning of City-regions: Korea After the Crisis," in A. J. Scott (ed.), *Global City-regions Trends, Theory and Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 263–281.
- Kim, W. B. (2003a). "The Evolution of Regional Disparities in Korea," *Korea Journal* 43(2), pp. 55–80.
- Kim, W. B. (2003b). "Regionalism: Its Origins and Substance with Competition and Exclusion," *Korea Journal* 43(2), pp. 5–31.
- Kim, W. B. (2012). *Korea's Industrialization and Urbanization: Processes and Policies*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Kim, W. B. and H. Shin (2013). "Economic Crisis and Regional Resilience in Korea," *The Korea Spatial Planning Review* 79, pp. 3–21 (in Korean).
- Kim, Y. and S. Lee (2010). "Analysis of Inter-regional Growth Differentials and Policy Implications," *e-KIET*, 481 (2010–13) (in Korean).
- Koo, G., S. Kim and J. Yoon (2012). "Regional Disparity and Regional Policy: Capability of Life Approach," *Korean Public Administration Review* 46(3), pp. 173–192 (in Korean).
- Kwon, Y. (April 14, 2017). *Progress of Innovation Cities and Future Tasks*. Sejong: Joint Workshop on Regional Growth Hub Strategy Utilizing Innovation Cities (in Korean).
- Lee, W. (2005). "Assessment of Balanced National Development Policy and Future Tasks," *Planning and Policy* 290, pp. 59–67 (in Korean).
- Lee, W. (2013). *Growth Management of the Capital Region. A Primer on Korean Planning and Policy. PKPP 2013–14*. Sejong: KRIHS.
- Lee, W., J. Yang, T. Park and J. Kim (2018). *A Study on the Strategies for Decentralization of Balanced National Development Policies*. Sejong: KRIHS (in Korean).
- Lim, H. (2012). "Paradigm Shift in Korea's Regional Development," Korea Regional Development Association Spring Symposium DanKook University Jookjeon Campus, June 2 (in Korean).
- Ministry of Industry and Ministry of Small and Medium Enterprises (December 27, 2018). Press Release: "Run Together for Revitalizing Community Economy" (in Korean).
- Ministry of Land and Transportation (October 25, 2018). *Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Innovation Cities (Proposal)* (in Korean).
- MLIT and KRIHS (Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transportation and Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements, 2013). 2012 Modularization of Korea's Development Experience National Territorial and Regional Development Policy: Focusing on Comprehensive National Territorial Plan.
- Moon, J., J. H. Moon, E. G. Jang, J. H. Park and M. J. Kang (2013). *National Territorial and Regional Development Policy: Focusing on Comprehensive National Territorial Plan*. In: *2012 Modularization of Korea's Development Experience*. Ministry of Land,

- Infrastructure and Transport & Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements. Sejong: KDI.
- OECD (2007). *OECD Economic Surveys KOREA*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2009). *How Regions Grow*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2012). *Industrial Policy and Territorial Development: Lessons from Korea*. Development Centre Studies. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2018). *OECD Regions and Cities at a Glance*. Paris: OECD.
- Oh, S. and S. Sohn (2017). “The Fourth Industrial Revolution and the Smart Regional Development Strategy,” *KISTEP InI 21*, pp. 35–47. (in Korean).
- Oh, Y., Y.-S. Oh, W.-G. Kim, I.-C. Kim and H.-k. Min (2009). *Strategies for Industrial Upgrading to Expand the Growth Potential After the Global Economic Crisis*. Sejong: Korea Institute of Industrial Economics and Trade (in Korean).
- Regional Development Committee (February 2017). *Promotion of Regional Industries and Analysis of Employment Creation* (in Korean).
- Ryu, S. (2018). “50 Years of Industrial Park Development: Results and Tasks,” *KRIHS Policy Brief* No. 686 (in Korean).
- Sakong, I. and Y. Koh (eds) (2010). *The Korean Economy: Six Decades of Growth and Development*. The Committee for the Sixty-Year History of the Korean Economy. Korea Development Institute.
- Sonn, H. (2003). “Regional Cleavage in Korean Politics and Elections,” *Korea Journal* 43(2), pp. 32–54.
- Williamson, J. B. (1965). “Regional Inequality and the Process of National Development: A Description of the Patterns,” *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 13, pp. 3–45.
- World Bank (2009). *World Development Report. Reshaping Economic Geography*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Asian Coalition for Housing Rights (1989a). *Battle for Housing Rights in Korea: Report of the South Korea Project of the Asian Coalition for Housing Rights*. Bangkok: Asia Coalition for Housing Rights [and] Third World Network.
- Asian Coalition for Housing Rights (1989b). Evictions in Seoul, South Korea. *Environment and Urbanization* 1(1), pp. 89–94.
- The Bank of Korea (2004). *National Accounts 2004*. Seoul: The Bank of Korea.
- Castells, M. (1992). “Four Asian Tigers with a Dragon Head: A Comparative Analysis of the State, Economy and Society in the Asian Pacific Rim,” in R. P. Appelbaum and J. W. Henderson (eds.), *States and Development in the Asian Pacific Rim*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 33–70.
- Castells, M., Goh, L. and R. Y.-W. Kwok, (1990). *The Shek Kip Mei Syndrome: Economic Development and Public Housing in Hong Kong and Singapore*. London: Pion.
- Chernilo, D. (2006). “Methodological Nationalism and its Critique,” in G. Delanty, and K. Kumar (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Nations and Nationalism*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 129–140.
- Choi, B.-D. (2010). “Gyeongbu Highway: Political Economic Geography of Mobility and Demarcation,” *Journal of the Economic Geographical Society of Korea* 13(3), pp. 312–334.
- Choi, Y.-J. (2014). “The Historical Background of the Development of Changwon Industrial Complex: A Geopolitical Economy Approach,” *Journal of the Korean Geographical Society* 49(2), pp. 178–199.

24 References

- Chua, B. H. (2011). "Singapore as Model: Planning Innovations, Knowledge Experts," in A. Roy and A. Ong (eds.), *Worlding Cities: Asian Experiments and the Art of Being Global*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 29–54
- Clark, E. (1988). "The Rent Gap and Transformation of the Built Environment: Case Studies in Malmö 1860–1985," *Geografiska Annaler* 70B (2), pp. 241–254.
- Dong'a Ilbo (1980). Plan for the Construction of 5 Million Dwellings. October 3.
- Doucette, J. and B-G. Park, eds (2019). *Developmental Cities? Interrogating Urban Developmentalism in East Asia*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Economic Planning Board of Korea (1982). *1980 Population and Housing Census Report: Vol. I: Complete Enumeration, 12-1: Whole Country*. Seoul: National Bureau of Statistics, Economics Planning Board of Korea.
- Fainstein, S. S. (2011). *The Just City*. New York: Cornell University Press
- Gelezéau, V. (2007). *The Republic of Apartments: Views of a French Geographer on South Korean Apartment Complexes*. Seoul: Humanitas (In Korean).
- Glassman, J. and Y-J. Choi (2014). "The Chaebol and the U.S. Military-Industrial Complex: Cold War Geopolitical Economy and South Korean Industrialization," *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 46(5), pp. 1160–1180.
- Ha, S.-K. (2001). "Substandard Settlements and Joint Redevelopment Projects in Seoul," *Habitat International* 25, pp. 385–397.
- Ha, S.-K. (1987). "Korea," in S.-K. Ha (ed.), *Housing Policy and Practice in Asia*. London: Croom Helm, pp. 80–116.
- Harvey, D. (1978). "The Urban Process Under Capitalism: A Framework for Analysis," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 2(1–4), pp. 101–131.
- Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London: Verso.
- Helbrecht, I. and F. Weber-Newth (2018). "Recovering the Politics of Planning: Developer Contributions and the Contemporary Housing Question," *CITY* 22(1), pp. 116–129.
- Holliday, I. (2000). "Productivist Welfare Capitalism: Social Policy in East Asia," *Political Studies* 48(4), pp. 706–723.
- Jang, S.-H. (1998). "Development of Slum Clearance Policies in Seoul," in S.-H. Kim, H.-G. Jeon, J.-H. Jang, S.-K. Ha and S.-H. Jang (eds.), *Eviction from the Perspective of Evictees: The History of Evictees' Movement in Seoul* (In Korean: Cheolgeomin yi bon cheolgo). Seoul: Korea Centre for City and Environment Research, pp. 21–83.
- Jeong, J.-H. (1984). "The Possibility of Taking A Third World Perspective for Research on Korean Society" (in Korean: Hanguk Sahoe Yeongu-e iss-co-seo Je 3 segyejeog Jeobgeun-ui Ganeungseong), *Sungshim Yeodae Nonmunjib* 16, pp. 126–132.
- Jin, M.-Y. and S.-H. Kim (2017). *Searching for the Desirable Housing Policy: The Trend of Global Housing Markets and the Future of Korea* (in Korean: Ggum'eui Jutaeog Jeongchaeg'eul Chajaseo). Seoul: O'Woleui Bom.
- Jung, S.-y. (2019). "LH Corp. Exports Smart City Technology to Middle East," *Business Korea*, January 28. Available at: www.businesskorea.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=28699. [Accessed May 4, 2020].
- Kim, H.-C., H. C. Kim, S. J. Jeon, J. G. Seon (1995). *A Study on the Development and Management of Financial Resources for Urban Renewal Projects*. Seoul: Housing Research Institute, Korea National Housing Corporation.
- Kim, K. J., K.-J. Kim, I.-J. Lee and S.-H. Jeong (1996). *Substandard Housing Redevelopment in Seoul: 1973–1996* (in Korean: Seoul-si Jutaeog Gaelyang Jegaebal Yeonhyeog Yeongu). SDI Research Series Completion Report 96-R-08. Seoul, Seoul Development Institute.

- Kim S.-H. (2010). "Issues of Squatters and Eviction in Seoul," *City, Culture and Society* 1(3), pp. 135–143.
- Kim, W.-J. (1996). *Economic Growth, Low Income and Housing in South Korea*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Kim, Y.-S. (2018). "Korean-style Apartment Complexes Go Global," *The Korea Herald*, December 27. Available at: www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20181227000537. [Accessed May 3, 2020].
- Kohn, M. (2016). *The Death and Life of the Urban Commonwealth*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Korea Center for City and Environment Research (eds.) (1998) *Eviction in the Eyes of Evictees: The History of Evictees' Movement in Seoul*. Seoul: Korea Center for City and Environment Research.
- Korea Housing Institute (2001). *Improvement of Housing Policy and Industry of 2000s: Reconstruction and Redevelopment* (in Korean: 2000 Nyeondae Jutae-g Sangjeom mit Jeongchaeg Banghyang: Jaegonchug Jaegabal-eul Jungsim-euilo). Seoul: Korea Housing Institute.
- Korea Land and Housing Corporation (2016). *2016 Yearbook of Land and Housing Statistics*. Jinju: Korea Land and Housing Corporation.
- Korea National Housing Corporation (2001). *Housing Statistical Yearbook*. Sungnam: Housing and Urban Research Institute, Korea National Housing Corporation.
- Korea National Housing Corporation (2004). *Housing Statistical Yearbook*. Sungnam: Housing & Urban Research Institute, Korea National Housing Corporation.
- Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements (1981). *Housing Handbook*. Seoul: Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements.
- La Grange, A. and H. N. Jung (2004). "The Commodification of Land and Housing: The Case of South Korea," *Housing Studies* 19(4), pp. 557–580.
- Latham, A. and J. Layton (2019). "Social Infrastructure and the Public Life of Cities: Studying Urban Sociality and Public Spaces," *Geography Compass*. doi: 10.1111/gec3.12444
- Lee, J.-Y. (2000). "The Practice of Urban Renewal in Seoul, Korea: Mode, Governance, and Sustainability," Presented at the 2nd International Critical Geography Conference, August 9–13, Taegu, Korea.
- Lee, M. H. (2015). "LH to Export Location Knowhow for New City Development to Africa," *Korea Bizwire*, February 24. Available at: <http://koreabizwire.com/lh-to-export-location-knowhow-for-new-city-development-to-africa/30687>. [Accessed May 3, 2020].
- Lee, N. (2007) *The Making of Minjung: Democracy and the Politics of Representation in South Korea*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lee, Y.-O. and K.-D. Bae (1998). "A Study of Housing Renewal Problems, Measures and New Directions" (in Korean: Seoul-si eui Jegaebal Munje wa Haebeob Gochal), *The Journal of Urban Sciences*. The University of Seoul Dosi Gwahag Nonchong 24, pp. 263–87.
- Lees, L., H. B. Shin and E. López-Morales(2016). *Planetary Gentrification*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lett, D. P. (1998). *In Pursuit of Status: The Making of South Korea's New Urban Middle Class*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Marcuse, P. (2009). "From Critical Urban Theory to the Right to the City," *City* 13, pp. 185–197.

- Marcuse, P. (1985). "Gentrification, Abandonment and Displacement: Connections, Causes and Policy Responses in New York City," *Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law* 28, pp. 195–240.
- Mayor of London (2019). *The London Plan: Intend to Publish (clean version)*. London: Greater London Authority. Available at: www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/intend_to_publish_-_clean.pdf. [Accessed May 11, 2020].
- Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Energy of Korea (2001). *Trends in Foreign Direct Investment* (in Korean: Oe-gug-in Tuja Donghyang). Gwacheon: Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Energy of Korea.
- Ministry of Construction and Transportation of Korea (2002). *Housing White Paper* (in Korean: Jutaeg Baegseo). Gwacheon: Ministry of Construction and Transportation of Korea.
- Ministry of Construction and Transportation of Korea (2000). *Operational Manual for Housing Redevelopment* (in Korean: Jutaeg Jaegaebal Ubmu Pyeonlam). Gwacheon: Ministry of Construction and Transportation of Korea.
- Mobrand, E. (2008). "Struggles Over Unlicensed Housing in Seoul, 1960–80," *Urban Studies* 45(2), pp. 367–389.
- National Statistical Office of Korea (2002). *Major Statistics of Korean Economy* (in Korean: 2002 Sangbangi Hangug Juyo Gyeongje Jipyo). Daejeon: Korea National Statistical Office.
- National Statistical Office of Korea (1994). *Major Statistics of Korean Economy* (in Korean: Hangug Juyo Gyeongje Jipyo). Daejeon: Korea National Statistical Office.
- Park, B.-G. (1998). "Do Tigers Sleep at Night? The State's Role in Housing Policy in South Korea and Singapore," *Geography* 74(3), pp. 272–288.
- Park, B.-G. and J. B. Jang (2016). "Gangnam-ization and Korean Urban Ideology," *Journal of the Korean Association of Regional Geographers* 22(2), pp. 287–306.
- Percival, T. and P. Waley (2012). "Articulating Intra-Asian Urbanism: The Production of Satellite Cities in Phnom Penh," *Urban Studies* 49(13), pp. 2873–2888.
- Planning and Coordination for the Cabinet Office (1972). *Administration White Paper* (in Korean: Haengejong Baegseo). Seoul: Government of the Republic of Korea.
- Planning and Coordination for the Cabinet Office (1967). *Administration White Paper* (in Korean: Haengejong Baegseo). Seoul: Government of the Republic of Korea.
- Power, A. (1993). *Hovels to Highrise: State Housing in Europe*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Roy, A. (2016). "When is Asia?" *The Professional Geographer* 68(2), pp. 313–321.
- Roy, A. and A. Ong, eds (2011). *Worlding Cities: Asian Experiments and the Art of Being Global*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Seoul Municipal Government (1998). *Master Plan for the Housing Redevelopment in Seoul* (in Korean: Seoul Teugbyolsi Jutaeg Jaegaebal Gibon Gyehoeg). Seoul: Seoul Metropolitan Government.
- Seoul Municipal Government (1974). *Municipal Administrative Outline* (in Korean: Sijeong Gaeyo). Seoul: Seoul Metropolitan Government.
- Seoul Municipal Government (1973). *Municipal Administrative Outline* (in Korean: Sijeong Gaeyo). Seoul: Seoul Metropolitan Government.
- Seoul Municipal Government (1970). *Municipal Administrative Outline* (in Korean: Sijeong Gaeyo). Seoul: Seoul Metropolitan Government.
- Shin, H. B. (2019). "Asian urbanism," in A. M. Orum (ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Urban and Regional Studies*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. doi: 10.1002/9781118568446.curs0010

- Shin, H. B. (2018). "Urban Movements and the Genealogy of Urban Rights Discourses: The Case of Urban Protesters Against Redevelopment and Displacement in Seoul, South Korea," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108(2), pp. 356–369.
- Shin, H. B. (2011). "Vertical Accumulation and Accelerated Urbanism: The East Asian Experience," in M. Gandy (ed.), *Urban Constellations*. Berlin: Jovis, pp. 48–53.
- Shin, H. B. (2009). "Property-based Redevelopment and Gentrification: The Case of Seoul, South Korea," *Geoforum* 40(5), pp. 906–917.
- Shin, H. B. (2008). "Living on the Edge: Financing Post-displacement Housing in Urban Redevelopment Projects in Seoul," *Environment and Urbanization* 20(2), pp. 411–426.
- Shin, H. B. and S.-H. Kim (2016). "The Developmental State, Speculative Urbanisation and the Politics of Displacement in Gentrifying Seoul," *Urban Studies* 53(3), pp. 540–559.
- Smith, N. (1996). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, N. (1979). "Toward a Theory of Gentrification: A Back to the City Movement by Capital Not People," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45, pp. 538–548.
- Song, J.-S. (2009). *South Koreans in the Debt Crisis: The Creation of a Neoliberal Welfare Society*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Son, J.-M. (2000). "The Construction of 5 Million Housing Units and the Development of Mokdong New Town," *Planning and Policy* 230, pp. 106–125.
- Son, N.-G. (2008) *The Era of Class Society of Real Estate*, Seoul: Humanitas.
- Sonn, J. and H. B. Shin (2020). "Contextualizing Accumulation by Dispossession: The State and High-rise Apartment Clusters in Gangnam, Seoul," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 110(3), pp. 864–881.
- Statistics Korea (2019). Press Release of 2018 Population and Housing Census: Registered Census Method Results. Available at: http://kostat.go.kr/portal/korea/kor_nw/1/1/index.board?bmode=read&aSeq=377115. [Accessed April 30, 2020].
- van Noorloos, F. and M. Leung (2017). "Circulating Asian Urbanisms: An Analysis of Policy and Media," in E. Woertz (ed.), *Reconfiguration of the Global South: Africa, Latin America and the "Asian Century"*. New York: Routledge, pp. 125–142.
- Watson, V. (2014). "African Urban Fantasies: Dreams or Nightmares?" *Environment and Urbanization* 26(1), pp. 215–231.
- Woo-Cumings, M., ed. (1999). *The Developmental State*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Yang, M. (2018). *From Miracle to Mirage: The Making and Unmaking of the Korean Middle Class, 1960–2015*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Yoon, I.-S. (1994). *Housing in a Newly Industrialised Economy: The Case of South Korea*. Aldershot: Avebury, p. 1717.
- Ahn, H., S. Wi and C. B. Yu (2016). *Neighbourhood Community*. Seoul: The Seoul Institute (in Korean).
- Castells, M. (1983). *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Castells, M. (1992). "Four Asian Tigers with a Dragon Head: A Comparative Analysis of the State, Economy, and Society in the Asian Pacific Rim," in R. P. Appelbaum and J. Henderson (eds.), *States and Development in the Asia Pacific Rim*. London: Sage, pp. 33–70.
- Chang, Y., W. Nam and C. Lee (2018). *Coping with Housing Demand: Experience of Seoul*. Seoul: The Seoul Institute.
- Cho, I. S. and B. Križnik (2017). *Community-based Urban Development, Evolving Urban Paradigms in Singapore and Seoul*. Singapore: Springer Nature.

- Cho, M. R. (1998). "Progressive Community Movements in Korea: The Case of the Hangdang Redevelopment Area in Seoul," *International Journal of Urban Sciences* 2(1), pp. 92–109.
- CLC and SI (2017). *Planning for Communities, Lessons from Seoul and Singapore*. Singapore: CLC.
- Cohen, A. P. (1985). *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Ellis Horwood and Tavistock Publications.
- Day, G. (2006). *Community and Everyday Life*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Douglass, M., O. Ard-Am and I. K. Kim (2001). "Urban Poverty and the Environment: Social Capital and State-Community Synergy in Seoul and Bangkok," in P. Evans (ed.), *Livable Cities? The Politics of Urban Livelihood and Sustainability*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 31–66.
- Harvey, D. (2001). *Spaces of Capital. Towards a Critical Geography*. New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel Cities. From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London: Verso.
- Hawang 2–1 District Tenants Rights Committee (1995). *Together in Harmony towards the Community*. Seoul: Hawang 2–1 District Tenants Rights Committee (in Korean).
- Hodkinson, S. (2012). "The New Urban Enclosures," *City* 16(5), pp. 500–518.
- Jang, G. T. (2012). "Making of Liveable Seowon Maetul," *Review of Architecture and Building Science* 56(6), pp. 46–50.
- Jeong, K. H. (2012). "Development of the Korean Urban Community Movement and the Meanings of Collaborative Model," *Korean Studies Quarterly* 35(2), pp. 7–34 (in Korean).
- Jeong, S. (1999). *Basic Guidelines for the Implementation of Neighbourhood Unit Urban Plan: A Case Study of Residents' Participatory Community Building*. Seoul: SDI (in Korean).
- Joo, Y. M. (2019). *Megacity Seoul: Urbanization and the Development of Modern South Korea*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Katsiaticas, G. N. (2012). *Asia's Unknown Uprisings. Volume 1, South Korean Social Movements in the 20th Century*. Oakland: PM Press.
- Kim, J. H. (2017a). "Unrealised Dream, Moving Again towards Community. In: Publishing Committee for the History of Urban Poor Areas," in *Searching for the Origin of Neighbourhood Community Movements*. Seoul: Hanul, pp. 107–159 (in Korean).
- Kim, K. J. and I. S. Yoon (2003). "Urban Renewal and Change of the 20th Century Seoul," in K. J. Kim (ed.), *Seoul, Twentieth Century: Growth & Change of the Last 100 Years*. Seoul: Seoul Development Institute, pp. 543–596.
- Kim, S. (2017b). "From Protest to Collaboration: The Evolution of the Community Movements Amid Sociopolitical Transformation in South Korea," *Urban Studies* 54(16), pp. 3806–3825.
- Kim, S. H. (2018a). "High Density Dilemmas: Apartment Development vs. Urban Management Plan in Seoul," *Seoul Studies* 19(4), pp. 1–20.
- Kim, S. H. (2018b). "A Theory of Planned Behaviour Approach to Neighbourhood Community Engagement in Samdeok Town, Seoul," *Master Thesis*, Seoul: Seoul National University (in Korean).
- Kim, S. and B. Križnik (2018). "Civic Urbanism and the State: Transition of the State Involvement in Community Building in Seoul, South Korea", in GASS/PRCDNET/SFI 2018 (ed.), *Emerging Civic Urbanisms/Designing for Social Impact*. Singapore: National University of Singapore, pp. 228–252.
- Kim, S. H. (2010). "Issues of Squatters and Eviction in Seoul: From the Perspectives of the Dual Roles of the State," *City Culture and Society* 1(3), pp. 135–143.

- Kim, S. K. and C. E. Lee (2015). *Maecul Built Together, Life Enjoyed Together*. Seoul: Korea National Open University Press (in Korean).
- Križnik, B. (2009). *Local Responses to Global Challenges: Cultural Context of Urban Change in Barcelona and Seoul*. Ljubljana: FDV Press (in Slovene).
- Križnik, B. (2018). "Transformation of Deprived Urban Areas and Social Sustainability: A Comparative Study of Urban Regeneration and Urban Redevelopment in Barcelona and Seoul," *Urbani Izziv* 29(1), pp. 30–41.
- Križnik, B., I. S. Cho and S. Kim (2019). "Deciding Together: Citizen Participation in Planning the Neighbourhood Improvement in Seoul and Singapore," *Asia Review* 8(2), pp. 65–102.
- Lash, S. (1994). "Reflexivity and Its Doubles: Structures, Aesthetics and Community," in U. Beck, A. Giddens and S. Lash (eds.), *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 110–173.
- Ledwith, M. (2011). *Community Development, a Critical Approach*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (2003). *Urban Revolution*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Manzi, T., K. Lucas, T. L. Jones and J. Allen (2010). *Social Sustainability in Urban Areas: Communities, Connectivity, and the Urban Fabric*. London: Earthscan.
- Massey, D. (1994). *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Park, B. G. (1998). "Where Do Tigers Sleep at Night? The State's Role in Housing Policy in South Korea and Singapore," *Economic Geography* 74(3), pp. 272–288.
- Park, W. S. (2014). "In Seoul, the Citizens Are the Mayor," *Public Administration Review* 74(4), pp. 442–443.
- Read, B. L. (2012). *Roots of the State: Neighborhood Organization and Social Networks in Beijing and Taipei*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Robson, T. (2000). *The State and Community Action*. London: Pluto.
- Sassen, S. (2017). "The City: A Collective Good?" *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 23(2), pp. 119–126.
- SDI (1994, 2000). *Thematic Maps of Seoul*. Seoul: SDI (in Korean).
- Shin, H. B. (2018). "Urban Movements and the Genealogy of Urban Rights Discourses: The Case of Urban Protesters against Redevelopment and Displacement in Seoul, South Korea," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108(2), pp. 356–369.
- Shin, H. B. and S. H. Kim (2016). "The Developmental State, Speculative Urbanisation and the Politics of Displacement in Gentrifying Seoul," *Urban Studies* 53(3), pp. 540–559.
- Short, J. R. and Y.-H. Kim (1998) "Urban Crises/Urban Representations: Selling the City in Difficult Times," in T. Hall and P. Hubbard (eds.), *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 55–75.
- SMG (2010a). *Seven Years of New Town Development*. Seoul: SMG (in Korean).
- SMG (2010b). *Seoul Human Town, Type-1 District Unit Plan for Seowon Maecul*. Seoul: SMG (in Korean).
- SMG (2011). *Liveable Maecul-making: Guidelines for Participatory Urban Design with Residents*. Seoul: SMG (in Korean).
- SMG (2015). *White Paper on Neighborhood Communities of Seoul: Seoul, Life and People*. Seoul: SMG.
- SMG (1998, 2000, 2018). *Seoul Statistical Yearbook 1998, 2000, 2018*. Seoul: SMG.
- Smith, N. (2002). "New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy," *Antipode* 34, pp. 427–450.
- Somerville, P. (2016). *Understanding Community: Politics, Policy and Practice, 2nd edition*. Bristol: Policy Press.

- Wolfram, M. (2019). "Assessing Transformative Capacity for Sustainable Urban Regeneration: A Comparative Study of Three South Korean Cities," *Ambio* 48(5), pp. 478–493.
- Yu, N. K. (2018). "From Seoul Human Town to Urban Regeneration: The Case of Seowon Village," in SMG (ed.), *Seoul Urban Regeneration Policy Brief*. Seoul: Seoul Urban Regeneration Support Center, pp. 22–26 (in Korean).
- Agnew, J. and S. Corbridge (1995). *Mastering Space: Hegemony, Territory and International Political Economy*. New York: Routledge.
- AMRC (2014). *A Week that Shook Cambodia. The Hope, Anger and Despair of Cambodian Workers after the General Strike and Violent Crackdown (December 2013–January 2014)*. Hong Kong: AMRC.
- Azmeh, S. and K. Nadvi (2014). "Asian Firms and the Restructuring of Global Value Chains," *International Business Review* 23(4), pp. 708–717.
- Bhagwati, J. N. and A. O. Krueger (1973). "Exchange Control, Liberalization, and Economic Development," *The American Economic Review* 63(2), pp. 419–427.
- Brenner, N. (2017). *Critique of Urbanization: Selected Essays* 156, Gütersloh, Bauverlag, Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Cartier, C. (2018). "Zone Analog: The State–Market Problematic and Territorial Economies in China," *Critical Sociology* 44(3), pp. 455–470.
- Chernilo, D. (2006). "Methodological Nationalism and its Critique," in G. Delanty and K. Kumar (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Nations and Nationalism*. London: Sage, p. 129.
- Choi, Y. (2010). "Korea Exporting Knowhow on Dam Construction," Korea Times. Available at: www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/biz/2016/01/291_66552.html [Accessed February 20, 2020].
- Choi, J. C. and W. B. Kim (1991). "The Influence of Foreign Investment on Local Economic Development: Iri Free Trade Zone of Korea," *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science* 19(1/2), pp. 139–153.
- Doucette, J. (2020). "Anxieties of an Emerging Donor: The Korean Development Experience and the Politics of International Development Cooperation," *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 38(4), pp. 656–673.
- Doucette, J. and B. G. Park (2018). "Urban Developmentalism in East Asia: Geopolitical Economies, Spaces of Exception, and Networks of Expertise," *Critical Sociology* 44(3), pp. 395–403.
- Doucette, J. and A. R. Müller (2016). "Exporting the Saemaul Spirit: South Korea's Knowledge Sharing Program and the 'Rendering Technical' of Korean Development," *Geoforum* 75, October 2016, pp. 29–39. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.06.018> [Accessed February 20, 2020].
- Doucette, J. and S. O. Lee (2015). "Experimental Territoriality: Assembling the Kaesong Industrial Complex in North Korea," *Political Geography* 47, pp. 53–63.
- Evans, P. B. (1995). *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Glassman, J. and Y. J. Choi (2014). "The Chaebol and the US Military-Industrial Complex: Cold War Geopolitical Economy and South Korean Industrialization," *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 46(5), pp. 1160–1180. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1068/a130025p> [Accessed February 20, 2020].
- Glassman, J. (2018). *Drums of War, Drums of Development: The Formation of a Pacific Ruling Class and Industrial Transformation in East and Southeast Asia, 1945–1980*. Leiden: Brill.

- Gore, C. (1996). "Methodological Nationalism and the Misunderstanding of East Asian Industrialisation," *The European Journal of Development Research* 8, pp. 77–122.
- Han, J. J. H. (2015). "Our Past, Your Future: Evangelical Missionaries and the Script of Prosperity," in A. Roy and Shaw, E. (eds), *Territories of Poverty: Rethinking North and South*. University of Georgia Press, Athens, pp. 176–194.
- Hankyoreh (2014). "Interactive Feature: How a Pay Raise Killed Workers: the Story of a North Face Manufacturer in Bangladesh." Available at: <http://hani.co.kr/interactive/bangla/english.html> [Accessed February 20, 2020].
- Hart, G. (2010). "D/developments After the Meltdown," *Antipode* 41(S1), pp. 117–141. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00719.x
- Horner, R. (2017). "Beyond Facilitator? State Roles in Global Value Chains and Global Production Networks," *Geography Compass* 11(2), pp. e12307.
- Hsu, J. Y., D. W. Gimm and J. Glassman (2018). "A Tale of Two Industrial Zones: A Geopolitical Economy of Differential Development in Ulsan, South Korea, and Kaohsiung, Taiwan," *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 50(2), pp. 457–473.
- Hwang, J. T. (2016). "Escaping the Territorially Trapped East Asian Developmental State Thesis," *The Professional Geographer* 68(4), pp. 554–560.
- Jessop, B. (2005). "Critical Realism and the Strategic-Relational Approach," *New Formations: A Journal of Culture, Theory and Politics* 56, pp. 40–53.
- Jo, J. H. (2010). *Kongdong Doshi [The Common City]*. Kalmuri, Seoul.
- Joo, Y. M. (2018). *Megacity Seoul: Urbanization and the Development of Modern South Korea*. New York: Routledge.
- Kaplinsky, R. and M. Morris (2016). "Thinning and Thickening: Productive Sector Policies in the Era of Global Value Chains," *The European Journal of Development Research* 28(4), pp. 625–645.
- Kim, E. M., H. J. Kim and J. E. Lee (2014). "Aid Effectiveness and Fragmentation: Changes in Global Aid Architecture and South Korea as an Emerging Donor," in E. M. Kim (eds), *The South Korean Development Experience Beyond Aid*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kim, E. and H. Kim (2014). "From Development to Development Cooperation: Foreign Aid, Country Ownership, and the Developmental State in South Korea," in E. Kim and H. Kim (eds), *The South Korean Development Experience Beyond Aid*. London: Palgrave, pp. 7–25.
- Kim, J. and J. Garland (2019). "Development Cooperation and Post-Colonial Critique: An Investigation into the South Korean Model," *Third World Quarterly* 40(7), pp. 1–19.
- Kim, S. (2019). "The Misadventure of Korea Aid: Developmental Soft Power and the Troubling Motives of an Emerging Donor," *Third World Quarterly* 40(11), pp. 1–25.
- Korea Development Institute (2016). *Special Economic Zones: What Can Developing Countries Learn from the Korean Experience?* Sejong: Knowledge Sharing Program. Ministry of Strategy and Finance.
- Kozul-Wright, R. and P. Fortunato (2015). "Sustaining Industrial Development in the South," *Development* 58(4), pp. 463–472.
- Krueger, A. O. (1987). *The Importance of Economic Policy in Development: Contrasts between Korea and Turkey*. NBER Working Paper Series No. 2195. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- KSP Policy Consultation Report (2014). "Policy Agenda for Industrial Development in Cambodia." Available at: www.ksp.go.kr/english/pageView/info-eng/95?listCount

- =10&page=2&srchText=&kspCd=048&kspCd=047&kspCd=046&kspCd=045&kspCd=049 [Accessed February 20, 2020].
- Lavers, T. (2012). "Patterns of Agrarian Transformation in Ethiopia: State-Mediated Commercialisation and the 'Land Grab'," *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39(3-4), pp. 795-822.
- Lee Y. S. (1999). "The Masan Free Export Zone: Conflict and Attrition," in A. R. Markusen, Y. S. Lee and S. DiGiovanna (eds), *Second Tier Cities: Rapid Growth Beyond the Metropolis*, 3, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 183-198.
- Markusen A. and S. Park (1999). "Changwon: A State-Sponsored Industrial District," in A. R. Markusen, Y. S. Lee and S. DiGiovanna, eds (1999). *Second Tier Cities: Rapid Growth Beyond the Metropolis*, 3, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 163-182.
- Martin, B. and B. Geglia (2019). "Korean Tigers in Honduras: Urban Economic Zones as Spatial Ideology in International Policy Transfer Networks," *Political Geography* 74.
- Mawdsley, D. E. (2012). *From Recipients to Donors: Emerging Powers and the Changing Development Landscape*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Mawdsley, E., S. M. Kim and D. Marcondes (2017). "Political Leadership and 'Non-Traditional' Development Cooperation," *Third World Quarterly* 38(10), pp. 2171-2186.
- Meulbroek, C. and M. Akhter (2019). "The Prose of Passive Revolution: Mobile Experts, Economic Planning and the Developmental State in Singapore," *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, pp. 1242-1263.
- Merk, J. (2014). "The Rise of Tier 1 Firms in the Global Garment Industry: Challenges for Labour Rights Advocates," *Oxford Development Studies* 42(2), pp. 259-277.
- Milberg, W. and W. Deborah (2013). *Outsourcing Economics: Global Value Chains in Capitalist Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport (2019). *Plan to Revitalize Overseas Smart City Expansion* [in Korean]. Available at: <https://bit.ly/2Fvacj3> [Accessed August 2020].
- Park, B. G. (2005). "Spatially Selective Liberalization and Graduated Sovereignty: Politics of Neo-Liberalism and 'Special Economic Zones' in South Korea," *Political Geography* 24(7), pp. 850-873.
- Park, B. G. and Y. J. Choi (2014). "Relations between the State and the Local in the Construction of Masan Export Processing Zone," *Journal of the Korean Geographical Society* 49(2), pp. 113-138. (In Korean).
- Rosen, E. I. (2002). *Making Sweatshops: The Globalization of the US Apparel Industry*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Salazar-Xirinachs, J. M., I. Nubler and R. Kozul-Wright (2014). *Transforming Economics: Making Industrial Policy Work for Growth, Jobs and Development*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Schober, E. (2018). "Working (Wo)Man's Suicide: Transnational Relocations of Capital-Repercussions for Labour in South Korea and the Philippines," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 24(S1), pp. 134-147.
- Schwak, J. (2018). "Dangerous Liaisons? State-Chaebol Cooperation and the Global Privatisation of Development," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, doi: 10.1080/00472336.2018.1501806
- Sial, F. and J. Doucette (2020). "Inclusive Partners? Internationalising South Korea's Chaebol through Corporate Social Responsibility-linked Development Cooperation," *Third World Quarterly*. doi 10.1080/01436597.2020.1782185

- Song, E. (2019). "Transplanting Developmentalism from East Asian States to Developing Countries through ODA; A Case Study of KDI," Presentation at EARCAG-GPE Workshop, Osaka, November 2019.
- Sonn, J. W. and H. B. Shin (2018). "Contextualizing Accumulation by Dispossession: The State and High-Rise Apartment Clusters in Gangnam, Seoul," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 110(3), pp. 864–881.
- Stallings, B. and E. M. Kim (2017). *Promoting Development: The Political Economy of East Asian Foreign Aid*. Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan.
- UNCTAD (2015). *Global Value Chains and South-South Trade: Economic Cooperation and Integration among Developing Countries*. Geneva: United Nations.
- UNRISD (2018). *Social and Solidarity Economy for the Sustainable Development Goals: Spotlight on the Social Economy in Seoul*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Watanabe, C. (2018). "Instrumental Culturalism: The Work of Comparisons Across Japan, 'the West' and Myanmar," *TRaNS: Trans-Regional and National Studies of Southeast Asia* 6(1), pp. 27–45.
- Williams, J., C. Robinson and S. Bouzarovski (2019). "China's Belt and Road Initiative and the Emerging Geographies of Global Urbanisation," *The Geographical Journal*. doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12332
- Woo, J. (1991). *Race to the Swift: State and Finance in Korean Industrialization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Yeung, H. (2016). *Strategic Coupling: East Asian Industrial Transformation in the New Global Economy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Yuan, J. D. and L. Eden (1992). "Export Processing Zones in Asia: A Comparative Study," *Asian Survey* 32(11), pp. 1026–1045.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991). *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Galézeau, V. (2012). *Republic of Apartments*. Translated by Hyecheon Gil. Seoul: Humanitas.
- Harms, E. (2016). *Luxury and Rubble: Civility and Dispossession in the New Saigon*. California: University of California Press.
- Howe, B. (2015). "Development Effectiveness: Charting South Korea's Role and Contributions in Middle-Power Korea: Contributions to the Global Agenda," *Council on Foreign Relations Press*, June.
- Jeon, N. I., S. H. Yang and H.-O. Hong (2009). *Paju: Hong. Microhistory of Housing in Korea*. Paju: Dolbegae.
- Kim, H. (2002). "An All-Out War to Receive Orders of New Town Developments in Hanoi," *The Kyunghyang Shinmun*. July 11. Available at: biz.khan.co.kr/khan_art_view.html?artid=200207111825301&code=920100 [Accessed September 3, 2020].
- Korean Institute of Architects (1994). *Modern Architecture in Korea 1876–1990*. Seoul: Gimundang.
- Labbé, D. and C. Musil (2013). "Periurban Land Redevelopment in Vietnam under Market Socialism," *Urban Studies* 51(6), pp. 1146–1161. doi:10.1177/0042098013495574.
- Latour, B. (1990). "Technology is Society Made Durable," *The Sociological Review* 38(1), pp. 103–131.
- Lee, B. (2012). *Korean Version of New Town Development*. Seoul: Ministry of Strategy and Finance (MOSF), Republic of Korea.

- Lee, J. W. (2014). "The Role and Operation of the International Urban Development Cooperation Center," *Korea Journal of Construction Engineering and Management* 15(3), pp. 10–14.
- Lee, K., Y. Kim, J. Ki and H. Shin (2011). *Building Technological Capabilities: Four Cases from Manufacturing Sectors in Korea*. Seoul: Center for Economic Catch-up, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea.
- Nicolas, F., S. Thomsen and M. Bang (2013). "Lessons from Investment Policy Reform in Korea," OECD Working Papers on International Investment, 2013/02. doi:10.1787/5k4376zqcpfl-en.
- Park, C., S. Gwon and S. Lee (2012). "Policy for the Construction and Supply of Affordable Housing in Korea," *Technical Report*. Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements. Sejong: KRIHS. doi: 11-1051000-000208-01.
- Potter, C. (2019). "Just Like Korea in the 1970s? Policy Transfer and the Fiction of Familiarity," *International Development and Cooperation Review* 11(4), pp. 21–36. doi:10.32580/idcr.2019.11.4.21.
- Potter, C. and D. Labbé (2020). "Gentrification or ...? Injustice in large-scale residential projects in Hanoi," *Urban Studies*, doi:10.1177/0042098020949035.
- Yi, I., and T. Mkandawire (2014). *Learning from the South Korean Developmental Success*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baldacchino, G. (2010). *Island Enclaves: Offshoring Strategies, Creative Governance, and Subnational Island Jurisdictions*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.
- Brautigam, D. and X. Tang (2011). "African Shenzhen: China's Special Economic Zones in Africa," *Journal of Modern African Studies* 49, pp. 27–54.
- Brautigam, D. and T. Xiaoyang (2012). "Economic Statecraft in China's New Overseas Special Economic Zones: Soft Power, Business or Resource Security?" *International Affairs* 88, pp. 799–816.
- Caprotti, F. (2014). "Critical Research on Eco-Cities? A Walk Through the Sino-Singapore Tianjin Eco-City, China," *Cities* 36, pp. 10–17.
- Chan, G. (2015). "Cabinet Papers Reveal Confusion Over 'Vague' Plan to Build Futuristic Japanese City in Australia," *The Guardian*. Available at: www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2015/jan/01/cabinet-papers-reveal-confusion-over-vague-plan-to-build-futuristic-japanese-city-in-australia. [Accessed September 10, 2020].
- Chen, K. H. (2010). *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Choi, J. and H. M. Kim (2021). "State-of-the-art of Korean Smart Cities: A Critical Review of the Sejong Smart City Plan," in H. Kim, S. Sabri and A. Kent (eds.), *Smart Cities for Technological and Social Innovation*. Oxford: Academic Press, pp. 51–72.
- Chong, A. (2009). "Singapore and the Soft Power Experience," in A. F. Cooper, and T. M. Shaw (eds.), *The Diplomacies of Small States*. Basingstoke: Springer, pp. 65–80.
- Dannenberg, P., K. Yejoo and D. Schiller (2013). "Chinese Special Economic Zones in Africa: A New Species of Globalisation?" *African East-Asian Affairs* 2, pp. 4–14.
- Han, S. S. (2005). "Global City Making in Singapore: A Real Estate Perspective," *Progress in Planning* 64, pp. 69–175.
- Jun, M. J. and J. W. Hur (2001). "Commuting Costs of 'Leap-Frog' New Town Development in Seoul," *Cities* 18, pp. 151–158.
- Jung, S. (2019). *Effort for the Export of Cities*. Urban Information Service. Seoul: Korean Planning Association (in Korean).
- Kang, D. and M. J. Park (2017). "Competitive Prospects of Graduate Program on the Integration of ICT Superiority, Higher Education, and International Aid," *Telematics and Informatics* 34, pp. 1625–1637.

- Kim, H. M. (2020). "International Real Estate Investment and Urban Development: An analysis of Korean Activities in Hanoi, Vietnam," *Land Use Policy* 94, pp. 1–10, 104486 (Land Use Policy article no.).
- Kim, H. M. and M. Cocks (2018). "Urbanisation and Globalisation: An Overview of Modern Suzhou Development," in S. S. Han and W. Lin (eds.), *Healthy Future Cities*. Beijing: China Architecture Industry Press, pp. 379–395.
- Kim, H. M. and S. S. Han (2012). "Seoul," *Cities* 29, pp. 142–154.
- Kim, H. M. and A. Kent (2019). "The Emergence of International Urban Planning and Design Firms in China from an OLI Perspective," *Journal of Regional and City Planning* 30, pp. 123–139.
- Kim, H. M. and T. S. Kim (2013). "U-City Development for Economic Competitiveness in an Advanced ICT Era," in G. Boscarino, and D. Notte (eds.), *Economic Developments and Emerging Markets of the 21st Century: Global Practices, Strategies, and Challenges*. New York: Nova, 245–264.
- Kim, H. M., K. B. O'Connor and S. S. Han (2015). "The Spatial Characteristics of Global Property Investment in Seoul: A Case Study of the Office Market," *Progress in Planning* 97, pp. 1–42.
- Kim, S. H., H. S. Kim, M. W. Lee, K. J. Paek and J. W. Lee (2009). *The New Visions and Strategies for National Territorial Development Model of Korea*. An-Yang: Korea Research Institute of Human Settlements (in Korean).
- La Grang, A. and H. N. Jung (2004). "The Commodification of Land and Housing: The Case of South Korea," *Housing Studies* 19, pp. 557–580.
- Liu, W. and M. Dunford (2016). "Inclusive Globalization: Unpacking China's Belt and Road Initiative," *Area Development and Policy* 1, pp. 323–340.
- Mahutga, M. C., M. Xiulian, D. A. Smith and M. Timberlake (2010). "Economic Globalisation and the Structure of the World City System: The Case of Airline Passenger Data," *Urban Studies* 47, pp. 1925–1947.
- Miao, J. T. (2018). "Parallelism and Evolution in Transnational Policy Transfer Networks: The Case of Sino-Singapore Suzhou Industrial Park (SIP)," *Regional Studies* 52, pp. 1191–1200.
- Miao, J. T. and N. A. Phelps (2019). "The Intrapreneurial State: Singapore's Emergence in the Smart and Sustainable Urban Solutions Field," *Territory, Politics, Governance* 7, pp. 316–335.
- Myint, H. (1958). "The 'Classical Theory' of International Trade and the Underdeveloped Countries," *The Economic Journal* 68, p. 317.
- OECD (2020) Net ODA (indicator) doi: 10.1787/33346549-cn. [Accessed September 10, 2020].
- Pereira, A. A. (2003). *State Collaboration and Development Strategies in China: The Case of the China-Singapore Suzhou Industrial Park (1992–2002)*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Phelps, N. A. (2007). "Gaining from Globalization? State Extraterritoriality and Domestic Economic Impacts—The Case of Singapore," *Economic Geography* 83, pp. 371–393.
- Rodgers, D. T. (1998). *Atlantic Crossings*. Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press.
- Shin, H., S. H. Park and J. W. Sonn (2015). "The Emergence of a Multiscalar Growth Regime and Scalar Tension: The Politics of Urban Development in Songdo New City, South Korea. Environment and Planning C," *Government and Policy* 33, pp. 1618–1638.
- Shin, H. B. (2019). "Asian Urbanism," in A. M. Orum (ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Urban and Regional Studies*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 1–10
- Squires, G. and E. Heurkens (2016). "Methods and Models for International Comparative Approaches to Real Estate Development," *Land Use Policy* 50, pp. 573–581.

- Tölölyan K. (1996). "Rethinking Diaspora(s): Stateless Power in the Transnational Moment. Diaspora," *A Journal of Transnational Studies* 5, pp. 3–36.
- Watson, V. (2009). "Seeing from the South: Refocusing Urban Planning on the Globe's Central Urban Issues," *Urban Studies* 46, pp. 2259–2275.
- Wei, Y. D. (2002). "Beyond the Sunan Model: Trajectory and Underlying Factors of Development in Kunshan, China," *Environment and Planning A* 34, pp. 1725–1747.
- Wei, Y. D., W. Li and C. Wang (2007). "Restructuring Industrial Districts, Scaling Up Regional Development: A Study of the Wenzhou Model, China," *Economic Geography* 83, pp. 421–444.
- Wu, F. (2017). "State Entrepreneurialism in Urban China: A Critique of the Neoliberal City," in G. Pinson and C. M. Journel (eds.), *Debating the Neoliberal City*. Oxon and New York: Routledge, pp. 163–183
- Wu, F. and J. Zhang, (2007). "Planning the Competitive City-Region: The Emergence of Strategic Development Plan in China," *Urban Affairs Review* 42, pp. 714–740.
- Yang, D. Y. R. and H. K. Wang (2008). "Dilemmas of Local Governance under the Development Zone Fever in China: A Case Study of the Suzhou Region," *Urban Studies* 45, pp. 1037–1054.
- Yeh, A. G. O. and F. Wu (1999). "The Transformation of the Urban Planning System in China from a Centrally-Planned to Transitional Economy," *Progress in Planning* 51, pp. 165–252.
- Yeung, H. W. C. (2000). "Local Politics and Foreign Ventures in China's Transitional Economy: The Political Economy of Singaporean Investments in China," *Political Geography*, 809.
- Zhang, J. (2012). "From Hong Kong's Capitalist Fundamentals to Singapore's Authoritarian Governance: The Policy Mobility of Neo-Liberalising Shenzhen, China," *Urban Studies* 49, pp. 2853–2871.
- Amsden, A. H. (1989). *Asia's Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Choi, J. S. (2015). "Current State of Overseas New City Development and Promotion Strategy," *Real Estate Focus* 89, pp. 39–50.
- Gelézeau, V. (2007). *The Republic of Apartments: South Korean Apartment Complexes as Seen by a French Geographer*. Seoul: Humanitas.
- Graham, S. and S. Marvin (2001). *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities*. London: Routledge. .
- Hanoi real estate agency (n.d.) "Starlake City Hanoi: Villas & Apartments". [Online] Available at: <https://hanoirealestate.com.vn/apartment-building-in-tay-ho-dist/starlake-hanoi.44.html>. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- Hwang, J. S. (2011). "The Korean Wave of Apartments: It is Now an Era of New City Exports," *Donga Ilbo*, November 11. Available at: <http://news.donga.com/home/3/all/20111110/41773509/2>. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- Joo, Y. M. (2012). "New Town Developments in Korea: Then and Now," in G. Del Cerro (ed.), *Urban Megaprojects: A Worldwide View*. London: Emerald Group Publishing, pp. 3–25.
- Joo, Y. M. (2019). *Megacity Seoul: Urbanization and the Development of Modern South Korea*. Oxford and New York: Routledge.
- KHI (Korea Housing Institute). (2006). *Research on Redeemable Housing Bonds*. Seoul: Housing Industry Research Center.
- Kim, C. H. and K. H. Kim (2000). "The Political Economy of Korean Government Policies on Real Estate," *Urban Studies* 37(7), pp. 1157–1169.

- Kim, D. I. (2018). "Shrinking Cities Outside the Capital Region: Increasing Number of Both Apartment Units and Empty Houses," *Sisa-In*. June 21. Available at: <https://news.v.daum.net/v/20180621110804845>. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- Kim, E. M. (1997). *Big Business, Strong State: Collusion and Conflict in South Korean Development, 1960–1990*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kim, H. J. (2019). "[Searching for the New Korean Wave of Construction] Exporting Bundang and Ilsan New Towns to Vietnam ... Making the Best City," *Asia Economy*, January 9. Available at: www.asiae.co.kr/article/2019010810163324097. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- KOLAND (Korea Land Corporation) (1997). *Bundang New Town Development*. Seoul: KOLAND.
- KRIHS (Korea Research Institute for Human Settlement) (1993). *A Research on Residential Pattern Following New Town Developments in the Capital Region*. Seoul: KRIHS.
- Lee, B. H. (2012). *2011 Modularization of Korea's Development Experience: Korean Version of New Town Development*. Seoul: Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements.
- Lee, E. A. (2010). "MK Real Estate. 'Having been to the first export of "the Korean new city"'", in Algeria, *Boughezoul*. September 16. Available at: estate.mk.co.kr/news2011/view.php?sc=90000001&year=2010&no=505773. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- Lee, K. I. (1996). "Development Structure of Bundang New Town," in National Architecture Research Association (eds.), *18C New Town and 20C New Town*. Seoul: Balun (in Korean).
- Lee, K. J. (2009). "A Study on the Betterment Distribution of Residential Development: Focused on the 1st New Towns," *Master's Thesis*. Seoul: Konkuk University.
- Lee, S. K., H. Y. You and H. S. Kwon (2015). *Korea's Pursuit for Sustainable Cities through New Town Development: Implications for LAC*, Inter-American Development Bank: Discussion Paper. Seoul: Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements, pp. 1–44.
- Lim, S. H. (2005). *A Half Century of Housing Policy*. Seoul: Gimundang.
- MOLIT (2015). "Introduction to the First-Generation New Towns," MOLIT, July 28, 2018. Available at: www.molit.go.kr/USR/policyData/m_34681/dtl?id=523. [Accessed September 3, 2020].
- MOLIT (2017). "Introduction to the Construction of the Second-Generation Capital Region New Towns," MOLIT, July 28, 2018. Available at: www.molit.go.kr/USR/policyData/m_34681/dtl?id=524. [Accessed September 3, 2020].
- MOLIT (2018). "The Current Development Status of Innovation Cities," MOLIT, Available at: http://innocity.molit.go.kr/module/board/bbs_download.jsp?sidx=26&stypex=1&bidx=349&idx=3744. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- Moon, S. H. (2012). "Global Development Boom of the 'Korean Model of New Towns' ... Increased Demand for the Construction Companies," *Jose-Ilbo*, December 20. Available at: www.joseilbo.com/news/htmls/2012/12/20121220165353.html. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- Paling, W. (2012). "Planning a Future for Phnom Penh: Mega Projects, Aid Dependence and Disjointed Governance," *Urban Studies* 49(13), pp. 2889–2912.
- Park, S. M. (2017). "New Town That Is Three Times Larger Than Bundang in Dessert ... Putting Wings on the 'K-Smart city' export", *Dong-A Ilbo* 4, April, Available at: www.donga.com/news/article/all/20170404/83675114/1. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- Park, Y. G. (2011). "Current Trends and Policy Tasks for 'city export'", *SERI Economy Focus* 356, pp. 1–15.

- Peiser, R. and A. Chang (1999). "Is it Possible to Build Financially Successful New Towns? The Milton Keynes Experience," *Urban Studies* 36(10), pp. 1679–1703.
- Percival, T. and P. Waley (2012). "Articulating Intra-Asian Urbanism: The Production of Satellite Cities in Phnom Penh," *Urban Studies* 49(13), pp. 2873–2888.
- Robertson, H. (2018). "The Pristine Exclusivity of Cambodia's 'Imported Cities'," *Next City*. February 12. Available at: <https://nextcity.org/features/view/the-pristine-exclusivity-of-cambodias-imported-cities>. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- Shwayri, S. T. (2013). "A Model Korean Ubiquitous Eco-City? The Politics of Making Songdo," *Journal of Urban Technology* 20(1), pp. 39–55.
- STFSAP (Special Task Force for State Affairs Press) (2007) *Forty Years of Real Estate in Korea*. Seoul: Hans Media.
- Angel, S. (2000). *Housing Policy Matters: A Global Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brandt, V. S. R. (1982). "Upward Bound: A Look at Korea's Migrant Squatters," *Korea Culture* 2(4), pp. 16–27.
- Chiu, R. L. H. and S.-K. Ha, eds. (2018). *Housing Policy, Wellbeing and Social Development in Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Department for Communities and Local Government. (2010). *Communities and Local Government's Departmental Annual Report 2009, and the Performance of the Department in 2008–09*. London: House of Commons.
- Doling, J. (1997). *Comparative Housing Policy*, Houndmills: Macmillan Press.
- Economic Planning Board, *Korea Statistical Yearbook*, various years.
- Freeman, L. (2005). "Displacement or Succession? Residential Mobility in Gentrifying Neighborhoods," *Urban Affairs Review* 40(4), pp. 463–491.
- Gibson, M. S. and M. J. Langstaff (1982). *An Introduction to Urban Renewal*. London: Hutchinson.
- Ha, S.-K. (1999). "Urban Growth and Housing Development in Korea: A Critical Overview," *Korea Journal* 39(3), pp. 63–94.
- Ha, S.-K. (2001). "Substandard Settlements and Joint Redevelopment Projects in Seoul," *Habitat International* 25, pp. 385–397.
- Ha, S.-K. (2003). "The Urban Poor, Rental Accommodations, and Housing Policy in Korea," *Cities* 19(3), pp. 195–203.
- Ha, S.-K. (2004). "Housing Renewal and Neighborhood Change as a Gentrification Process in Seoul," *Cities* 21(5), pp. 381–389.
- Ha, S.-K. and K. H. Kim (2017). "In-Movers' Housing Choice and Gentrification in Seoul," *Journal of Urban and Regional Analysis* IX(2), pp. 159–172.
- Holmans, A. (1995). *Housing Demand and Need 1991–2011*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Kim, H. K. and S. K. Ha (1998). *Redevelopment of Squatter Settlements*. Seoul: Nanam (in Korean).
- Kim, K. H. and M. Park (2016). "Housing Policy in the Republic of Korea," *Asian Development Bank Institute Working Paper* (570), Manila: ADB.
- Kim, S. H. and S. C. Park (September 7, 2018). "'0.9 Shock' This Year ... Low Birth Rate Maginot Line Collapses." Available at: http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/09/03/2018090300158.html.
- Kim, Y. W. (1999). "Industrialization and Urbanization in Korea," *Korea Journal* 39(33), pp. 35–62.
- Korean Statistical Information Service (KOSIS). Available at: <http://kosis.kr/eng/search/searchList.do>, various years.

- Mills, E. and B. N. Song (1979). *Urbanization and Urban Problems*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transportation, <http://stat.molit.go.kr>, various years.
- Murphy, D. (1990). *A Decent Place to Live*. Bangkok: ACHR.
- Murphy, D. and M. Pimple (1995). *Eviction Watch Asia*. Bangkok: ACHR.
- National Statistical Office (2017). *Population and Housing Census*. Seoul: NSO.
- Oxley, M. (1991). "The Aims and Methods of Comparative Housing Research," *Scandinavian Housing & Planning Research* 8, pp. 67–77.
- Oxley, M. (2000). *Future of Social Housing: Learning from Europe*, London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Robinson, R. (1979). *Housing Economics and Public Policy*, London: Macmillan.
- Shin, H. B. (2017). "Urban Movements and the Genealogy of Urban Rights Discourses: The Case of Urban Protesters Against Redevelopment and Displacement in Seoul, South Korea," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108(2), pp. 356–369.
- Shin, H. B. and S. H. Kim (2015). "The Developmental State, Speculative Urbanisation and the Politics of Displacement in Gentrifying Seoul," *Urban Studies*. doi: 10.1177/0042098014565745
- Shucksmith, M. (2002). *House Building in Britain's Countryside*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, N. and Williams, P. (eds) (2013). *Gentrification of the City*, London: Routledge.
- Tighe, R. J. and E. J. Mueller (2013). *The Affordable Housing Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Turkington, R. and C. Watson (2015). *Renewing Europe's Housing*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- UN Habitat (1996). *An Urbanizing World: Global Report on Human Settlements*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- UN Habitat (1997). *The Habitat Agenda Goals and Principles, Commitments and the Global Plan of Action*, UN Habitat. Available at: https://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/pdfs/habitat_agenda.pdf.
- UN Habitat (2012). *Global Housing Strategy*, First Report: Regional Reviews and Global Assessment of the Global Strategy for Shelter to the Year 2000. Nairobi: UNCHS.
- UN Habitat (2015). "Urbanization and Development: Emerging Futures," *World Cities Report 2016*. Nairobi: UN Habitat.
- Yoon, I. S. (1994). *Housing in a Newly Industrialized Economy: The Case of South Korea*. London: Avebury.
- Cho, J. H. (1990). "Evolution of Residential Land Development Policies and Programs in Korea." Paper presented at International Conference on Korean Housing Policies organized by Hyundai Research Institute. November 29–30, Seoul.
- Das, D. (1992). *Korean Economic Dynamism*. London: Macmillan.
- FKI (Federation of Korean Industries) (1987). "Korea's Economic Policies (1945–1985)." Seoul: Federation of Korean Industries.
- GDPIC (Global Development Partnership Center) (ed.) (2013). "Land Development and Management Laws, Korea Research Institute for Human Settlement," *GDPIC Study Report 2013-01*.
- Hamilton, C. (1986). *Capitalist Industrialization in Korea*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Inflation.eu, Worldwide inflation data, 'Historic Inflation South Korea—CPI Inflation.' Available at: www.inflation.eu/inflation-rates/south-korea/historic-inflation/cpi-inflation-south-korea.aspx. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- KICAC (Korea Independence Commission Against Corruption) (2007). *A Plan for the Enhancement of Fairness and Clarity Enhancement in Public Land Development* (in Korean).
- Kim, K. (1980). "Structural Characteristic of Labour-Capital Relationship in Korea," in C. Lim and M. Bae (eds.), *Korean Labour Economy*. Munhahkkwa-Chisung-Sa. Seoul: Moonii Publishing (in Korean), pp. 171–206.

- Kitay, Michael G. (1985). *Land Acquisition in Developing Countries, Policies and Procedures of the Public Sector, with Surveys and Case Studies from Korea*. Boston: India, Thailand, and Ecuador, Oelgeochlagcr, Gunn & Hain, Publishers, Inc.
- KNHC (Korea National Housing Corporation) (1992). *Reformation of Institutional Systems to Promote the Improvement of Substandard Housing* (in Korean).
- KNHC (1996). *1996 Yearbook of Housing Statistics*.
- KNHC (2002). *2002 Yearbook of Housing Statistics*.
- KOSIS (Korean Statistical Information Service). “Urbanization Rate.” Available at: http://kosis.kr/statHtml/statHtml.do?orgId=101&tblId=DT_2KAA204 [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- KRIHS (Korea Research Institute for Human Settlement) (2008). *Sea Change of National Territory of South Korea, a 60-year History*, 2. Policy Implementation. Sejong: KRIHS (in Korean).
- KRIHS (2014a). *A Study on Establishing the Policy for Public Land Supply System in Post-Development Era*. Sejong: KRIHS 2014–34 (in Korean).
- KRIHS (2014b), *The Expropriation and Compensation System in Korea*, 2013 Modularization of Korea’s Development Experience. Sejong: KRIHS.
- Lee, H. (2011). “Improvement of Institutional System to Mitigate Conflicts Associated with Land Expropriation in Public Projects,” *KDI Policy Forum Series* No. 238. Korea Development Institute Available www.kdi.re.kr/research/subjects_view.jsp?pub_no=11990&pg=7&pp=10&mcd=001003002 [Accessed August 7, 2019] (in Korean).
- LH (Land and Housing Corporation). (2016). *2016 Year Book of Land & Housing Statistics*. Jinju: LH.
- LHI (Land and Housing Institute). (2019). *Urbanization and Regeneration in Korea*. Seongnam: LHI.
- Lim, S. H. (1994). “Landowners, Developers and Rising Land Cost for Housing, the Case of Seoul, 1970–1990,” Ph. D. Thesis, London: University College London.
- Mason, E. S., Kim, M. J., Perkins, D. H., Kim, K.S. and Cole, D. C. (1980). *The Economic and Social Modernization of the Republic of Korea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MOLIT (Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport) (2012), *Korea’s Development Experience Modularization – Industrial Complex Development Policy in Korea*. Seoul: KRIHS.
- MOLIT (2014b). *A New Paradigm for and System Improvement of the Restitution of Development Gains*, prepared by KRIHS (in Korean).
- MOLIT (2019a). *Current Status of Urban Planning, Statistics as of 2018*, News Release, June 24 (in Korean).
- MOLIT (2019b). Land Price Fluctuation Rate (% on year-on-year basis) 1975–2018. August 23 (in Korean).
- MOLIT Policy Data. “New Towns, Concept and Construction Status.” Available at: www.molit.go.kr/USR/policyData/m34681/dtl?id=522. (in Korean) [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- MOLIT Policy Data. “Current Status of Enterprise City Construction.” Available at: <https://bit.ly/3iFnfMO>. [Accessed November 1, 2019] (in Korean).
- MOLIT Policy Data. “Current Status of Innovative City Construction.” Available at: http://innocity.molit.go.kr/v2/submain.jsp?sidx=211&styp=1&cbmode=view&idx=4&search_key_n=&search_val_v=¤tPage=1. [Accessed November 1, 2019] (in Korean).
- MOLIT Statistics System. Designation and Supply of Residential Area. December 31, 2018. Available at: <https://bit.ly/2FsyV7B>. [Accessed November 1, 2019] (in Korean).

- NGII (National Geography Information Institute) (2017). *The National Atlas of Korea*, 3–4 Economy and Industry. Available at: <http://nationalatlas.ngii.go.kr/us/index.php>. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- OECD.Stat. (2019). “Dataset: Built-up Area and Built-up Area Change in Functional Urban Areas, Korea.” Available at: https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=BUILT_UP_FUA. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- Payne, G., A. Piskowoy and L. Kuritz (2014). “Land Tenure in Urban Environments, the United States Agency for International Development’s Division of Land Tenure and Property Rights,” *Issue Brief*. Available at: www.land-links.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/USAID_Land_Tenure_Urban_Brief_061214-1.pdf. [Accessed November 1, 2019].
- Renaud, B. (1989). “Compounding Financial Repression with Rigid Urban Regulations: Lessons of the Korean Housing Market,” *Review of Urban and Regional Development Studies* 1, pp. 3–22.
- Seoul Solution (2015). “Gangnam Development Plan” written by Kang, M.K. Available at: <https://seoulsolution.kr/ko/content/%EA%B0%95%EB%82%A8%EA%B0%9C%EB%B0%9C%EA%B3%84%ED%9A%8D>. [Accessed November 1, 2019] (in Korean).
- SI (Seoul Institute) (1999). *Guidelines for the Residential Environment Program in Seoul*. Seoul: Seoul Institute (in Korean).
- SI (2010). “Housing and Construction,” in Changing Profile of Seoul: Major Statistics and Trends, the 2010 revision. Seoul: Seoul Institute (in Korean).
- SMG (Seoul Metropolitan Government). (2017). *White Book on Land Readjustment Project in Seoul. 2* (in Korean).
- SMG (1991). *1990 Statistical Yearbook* (in Korean).
- SMG. Statistics on Built-up Area of Seoul 2003–2017. Seoul Open Data Center. Available at: <https://data.seoul.go.kr/dataList/datasetView.do?infId=569&srvType=S&serviceKind=2> [Accessed November 1, 2019] (in Korean).
- Sohn, J. (2003). *Seoul Urban Planning Story. 3*. Paju: Hanwool (in Korean).
- UN Habitat (2019). *Land Readjustment in the Republic of Korea: A Case study for Learning Lessons*. Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme.
- United Nations (2019a). *World Urbanization Prospects The 2018 Revision*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, New York. ST/ESA/SER.A/420.
- United Nations (2019b). *World Population Prospects 2019 Highlights*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, New York ST/ESA/SER.A/423.
- World Bank National Accounts Data. Available at: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD?locations=IN-KR> [Accessed August 20, 2019].
- Amsden, A. H. (1989). *Asia’s Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Igbafen, M. L. (2014). “South Korea’s Development Experience as an Aid Recipient: Lessons for Sub-Saharan Africa,” in K. E. Mee and P. H. Kim (eds.), *The South Korean Development Experience: Beyond Aid*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 111–135.
- Johnson, C. (1982). *MITI and the Japanese Miracle*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Karthik, N., M. Enrique and D. Ajoy (2010). *Think Tanks in East and Southeast Asia: Bringing Politics Back into the Picture*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Kim, B. C. (2012). “An International Comparative Study on the Operating System of the Policy Research Institutes,” *Journal of Policy Development* 12(2), pp. 37–64 (in Korean).
- Kim, D. E and K. H. Kim (2014). *Think Tanks of Korea: Contributions to Economic Development and Their Evolution*. Sejong: Knowledge Sharing Program Report, Ministry of Strategy and Finance.

- Kim, E. M. (2014). "Conclusion: Beyond Aid," in E. M. Kim, and P. H. Kim (eds.), *The South Korean Development Experience: Beyond Aid*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 172–182.
- Kim, H. K., K. W. Shin, C.-G. kang, W.-S. Moon, M.-H. Park, S. H. Park, J.-Y. Lee, B. Thole, J.-S. Lee, T.-H. Lim and J.-Y. Kim (2009). *Think Tanks of Five Countries*. Sejong: National Research Council for Economics, Humanities and Social Science (in Korean).
- Kim, T. (2014). "Learning through Localizing International Transfers: South Korea's Development Experiences," in I. Yi and T. Mkandawire (eds.), *Learning from the South Korean Developmental Success: Effective Developmental Cooperation and Synergistic Institutions and Policies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 216–234.
- KRIHS (1983). *5 Years History of Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements*. Sejong: KRIHS (in Korean).
- Lee, D. H., Z. Bae and J. Lee (1991). "Performance and Adaptive Roles of the Government-Supported Research Institute in South Korea," *World Development* 10(10), pp. 1421–1440.
- Mo, J. (2005). *Think Tanks and Good Governance: The KDI Story*. HGCY Working Paper Series No. 05-04. Seoul: Hills Governance Center, Yonsei University.
- The National Agency Administrative City Construction (2008). *White Paper on the Multi-functional Administrative City, 2003–2007*. Sejong: The National Agency Administrative City Construction.
- Rich, A. (2004). *Think Tanks, Public Policy, and the Politics of Expertise*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stone, C. (1993). "Urban Regimes and the Capacity to Govern: A Political Economy Approach," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 15, pp. 1–28.
- Stone, D. (1996). *Capturing the Political Imagination, Think Tanks and the Political Process*, London: Frank Cass.
- Um, K. C. (1993). "The Root of KRIHS, from UPI to KRIHS," *Monthly News* February 1993, pp. 5–10 (in Korean).
- Weaver, R. K. (1989). "The Changing World of Think Tanks," *Political Science and Politics* 22(3), pp. 563–578.
- Woo-Cumings, M. (1999). "Introduction: Chalmers Johnson and the Politics of Nationalism and Development," in M. Woo-Cumings (ed.), *The Developmental State*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Yoon, B.-S. L. (1992). "Reverse Brain Drain in South Korea: State-led Model," *Studies in Comparative International Development* 27(1), pp. 4–26.
- Ahn, T. H. (2008). "Issues in the Use of Public Development Corporations," *Land Development Profits and Policy Directions for Improvement: Focusing on the Korea Land and Housing Corporation, Program & Policy Evaluation Brief*. 22, National Assembly Budget Office.
- Hong, S. T. (2005). *Public Development Corporations and the Construction State*. Paju: Hanul Academy.
- K-Water. (2017). *50 Year History of K-Water*. Daejeon: K-Water.
- Kim, Y. S. (2017). "Analysis of Public Development Corporations' Encroachment of Private Functions and Direction to Improve Neutrality of Market Competition," *KERI Insight* 17(3), Korea Economic Research Institute.
- Korea Housing Corporation (1992). *The Thirty Years of Korea Housing Corporation*. Seoul: Korea Housing Corporation.
- Kwon, N. E., S. J. Kwong and J. H. Lee (2016). "Evaluation of Adequacy of Recent Construction Investment Level," *BOK Issue Note* 7, The Bank of Korea.

- Lee, M. H. (2002). "The Story Behind the Soyang Multipurpose Dam," *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering* 50(3), pp. 61–63.
- Lim, J. C. (2015). "Experiences of Government-Led Korean New Town Export and Changing Strategies," *World & Cities* 5. Seoul Institute, pp. 43–50.
- National Assembly Budget Office (2019). *Public Institutions of Korea*, National Assembly Budget Office.
- Seoul Housing & Communities Corporation (2019). *30 Year History of the Seoul Housing & Communities Corporations*. Seoul: Seoul Housing & Communities Corporation.