INTRODUCTION

The requested topic for this presentation is to address "global capital relocations." The presentation is operationalized as a review piece, a think piece, and a normative piece, the purpose of which is to: (1) discuss some of the issues associated with capitals and capital relocations from around the world; (2) cite relevant cases of national capitals globally; and (3) suggest some implications for Korea. The intended principal audience is the practitioner in the policy environment, especially those who will be engaging the future public policy environment of Korea. Examples of such practitioners include: elected officials at all levels of government; national development strategists; regional and urban planners; private-sector investors and corporate planners; nonprofit and non-governmental organizational strategists; small-business persons; organized-labor leaders; and residents and citizens in general, among other actors whose opinions, influences and roles will impact the contemporary national capital relocation debate and decision for the Republic of Korea.

The methodology employed is to point the audience to the selected detailed cases and references that are provided here to enable them to follow up and to apply or operationalize the implied development concepts, guiding principles or actions to serve their own interests and those of the Korean nation. The intended motivation is to stimulate members of the audience to assume the responsibility to engage thoughtfully and creatively, the full range of future development needs of, and options for Korea, its regions and localities. Further, the intent here is to stimulate members of the audience noted above to construct and debate alternative development scenarios. For example, the relocation of a national capital or some of the functions of the capital is a means to an end: but what is the end being sought? In the South Korean media, it is said that "balanced national development" is the principal goal for moving the capital. Further, if the end indeed is balanced national development, then are
there other means available that might more effectively meet this end? This question is addressed elsewhere in the paper. Given the space and time limitations of this presentation, there is no attempt to be exhaustive and comprehensive in the treatment of this complex subject. Finally, the approach taken here is normative or prescriptive in the sense that "should" and "ought" are used, both to stimulate debate among Korean opinion setters and in the interest of best practice of "intelligent planning."

**ISSUES OF CAPITALS AND CAPITAL RELOCATIONS**

The policy, urban, and planning literature on capitals, including the relocation of capitals and the functions of capitals is voluminous. This literature includes historical discourses and treatments of recent capital city analysis and capital city planning (Hall 1997: and Sonne 2003). The urban literature on modern capitals has been led by such distinguished scholars as Jean Gottmann and Peter Hall. There are a number of pioneering volumes, special issues of periodicals and reports that have focused on the topic of capital cities. Some representative examples have been compiled by: Eldredge 1975: Tyrwhitt and Gottmann March/April 1983: Taylor, Lengelle and Andrew 1993: Dube’and Gordon April–May–June 2000: and Boyd and Fauntroy March 29, 2002. Several of the references at the end of this paper note in brackets the individual capital cities that are included in these books, periodicals, and reports. When delving into these informational resources, it is important to be focused and precise as to one's purpose and the issues related to those purposes. For the purposes of this presentation, the following topics have been selected: initially for discussion and consideration in planning for the relocation of capitals and new capitals: what is a capital?; what are the types of capital cities?; and critical success factors for a capital.

**What is a Capital?**

A capital, or capital city is a seat of government, that is, a center of authority, or a city from which authority is exercised. The location of government may be permanent, provisional or seasonal. In some monarchies, the capital is wherever the king's or queen's court is located.

The principal functions of the capital are administrative or executive, legislative and judicial. These individual functions may be separated locally. Usually, the location of the capital is stated in law. A country or territory may have more than one official capital at any point in time.

The form of national government often has had a strong influence on the nature and relocation of the national capital city. Unitary states, such as France and South Korea, often have the economically most important city in the country host the national capital functions. These are primate city countries. Alternatively, federated states often have relocated their national capitals away from the country's economically dominant cities, e.g., the United States and Australia. Issues of rivalry, i.e., regional and cultural/ethnic, centrality and neutrality of location, typically play a role in the capital relocation decision. These decisions quite often have revealed examples of political compromise in the public interest and on behalf of the nation's harmony. There also are states where the governance role of the country's regions is strong relative to the national or central government. Switzerland and Canada are such states. They are confederated states. See Boyd and Fauntroy March 29, 2002 for a comparative analysis of governmental structure among a selection of national capitals.

Answers to the above question of what is a capital?, do not come easily and clearly. Persons who have reflected on this question often come to the same conclusion. More study of and research into
capitals is needed. The subject of capitals is nuanced and dense. John Meisel has written, "both values [i.e., for public enterprise in Canada and private enterprise in the United States] and capital cities are immensely subtle and complicated things, the full nature of which requires extensive study (Meisel 1993: 5). Beth Moore Milroy has commented that the answer to the question, what is a capital? "is far from simple. An entire research program could be shaped out of the questions and discussion of this first session," i.e., of the book Capital Cities: International Perspectives (Milroy 1993: 91).

What are the Types of Capital Cities?

Sir Peter Hall has identified seven types of capital cities (April-May-June 2000). Quoting from him:

"Multi-Function Capitals. Combining all or most of the highest national-level functions (London, Paris, Madrid, Stockholm, Moscow, Tokyo).

Global Capitals. A special case of [multi-function capitals], representing cities that also perform super-national roles in politics, commercial life, or both (London, Tokyo).

Political Capitals. Created as seats of government, and often lacking other functions which remain in older, commercial cities (The Hague, Bonn, Washington, Ottawa, Canberra, Brasilia).

Former Capitals. Often the converse of [political capitals] representing cities that have lost their role as the seat of government but that retain other historic functions (Berlin, Leningrad, Philadelphia, Rio de Janeiro).

Ex-Imperial Capitals. A special case of [former capitals] representing former imperial cities which have lost their empires though they may function as national capitals, and may also perform important commercial and cultural roles for the former imperial territories (London, Madrid, Lisbon, Vienna).

Provincial Capitals. A special case in federal nations, overlapping with [political capitals]: cities which once functioned as de facto capitals, sometimes on a shared basis, but have now lost that role, retaining however functions for their surrounding territories (Milan, Turin, Stuttgart, Munich, Montreal, Toronto, Sydney, Melbourne). New York is a very special case here, almost sui generis, of a global provincial capital.

Super-Capitals. Functioning as centers for international organizations: these may or may not be national capitals (Brussels, Strasbourg, Geneva, Rome, New York) (Hall April-May-June 2000: 8).

There is an eighth type of capital city today: it is the intelligent capital. Using Jean Gottmann's concept of the "historical hinge,"i.e., a city-region location linking the present to the past (Gottmann March/April 1983: 89). There are the national capitals that were relocated before the digital age and there is at least one case, e.g., Putrajaya, Malaysia, that was relocated since the pervasiveness of the application of information and communications technologies (ICTs) to community and economic development. The relocation and development of a national capital is "intelligent" therefore, when ICTs are an explicit part of the development strategy, and when best practices from development and planning theory, from benchmarking cases elsewhere and from appropriate applications of the latest technologies are utilized successfully both to develop a new capital and to continue the development of the sending city-region, i.e., the earlier preceding capital. Under these guiding principles of the intelligent capital, both places, i.e., the sending place and the receiving place, need to be developed as communities that are cognizant of, and
responsive to the functional, social justice and locational realities of today and the near-term future. This includes the admonition that a national capital relocation that intends to result in an intelligent capital should help or at least does no harm for the nation's development and for the people and part of the society that is impacted directly by the new capital intervention (Corey December 19, 2003: 103).

Critical Success Factors for a Capital

Drawing principally on Andrew and Taylor's 2000 article, the following aspects have been identified as individual factors in common in the study of capitals, especially in understanding the politics and political dynamics of capital city policies and development, i.e., dynamics that go beyond the economic and physical/design factors that typically characterize so much of the policy, urban, and planning literature on capital cities.

Political. Andrew and Taylor have observed that part of the special nature of national capital cities is the relationship of the city to the rest of the country. For example, Schatz has demonstrated that the relocation of the capital city can be instrumental in nation building and state building (Schatz February 2003). Capital cities also were noted to host people and enterprises, thereby having an intra-urban role and set of relationships. Another set of internal relationships, of course, is housing the national governmental functions and their physical facilities and precincts. Professor Gottmann identified yet a third set of political-economic relationships: he called them "hinge"relationships between the city and the external global international world (Gottmann 1961). A capital city-region such as Seoul plays this third, i.e., the global hinge role.

Administrative. Capital cities have large bureaucracies. Within a national governmental context, national capitals house the support activities for the three principal functions of the central government, i.e., the legislative, the judicial, and the executive functions. Several Asian counties have created "administrative capitals," i.e., Malaysia and Sri Lanka. States that have decentralized national governance structures tend to have higher proportions of the bureaucracy outside the capital city. The more centralized the country's administrative structure, the bigger the impact on the old capital city when the administrative functions are relocated.

Cultural. Because of the relationship between the symbolic functions of a national capital city and culture in support of national symbolism, capital cities often host and attract some of the country's most highly regarded cultural institutions. Cultural institutions are attractive particularly to knowledge workers. High proportions of government workers are knowledge workers. These relationships tend to be reinforcing and reciprocal, and consequently add qualitative value to a nation's capital attractiveness and its development.

Informational. Information in support of decision making is at the core of all the functions of national government and the private-sector producer services that support government. Therefore, by definition, a capital city is an informational city. In the current era of the global knowledge economy and network society, an important informational node such as a capital city has a comparative advantage. The Washington, D.C. metropolitan region exemplifies these informational dynamics. If these functions should be removed from the capital, the consequences should be assessed and planned accordingly.

Symbolic. This aspect of the national capital city is one of the most distinctive features of capitals. Symbolism enables national leaders and institutions to reinforce and advance the country's core values and images. These factors are perceived by visitors and residents alike as central to the experience of engaging the capital city.
The above critical success factors cover a great deal of the scope of the issues that need to be considered when studying and planning the new capital city. However, this listing is not exhaustive and comprehensive especially for the complex and uncertain world of today and of the near-term future. Several critical factors that come immediately to mind are: leadership (including personality); champion (including personality); the form of the governmental organization of the state, i.e., a unitary state in contrast to a federal state; the role of information and communications technologies (ICTs); the relationships of the capital city to the global knowledge economy and network society time and timing location and spatial organization; applicable theory, e.g., relational planning theory; planning practice and scheduling, operating and managing the planned capital.

In addition, to the individual factors noted above, there are transcendent factors that cut across the above criteria for success in planning for the development of a capital. For example, for a national capital to be successful, it must function both as a national seat of government for the country and it must function as a prosperous and livable city in its own right. Further, a nation's capital city must interface with the rest of the world; its global relationships are more critical today than ever before in history. John H. Taylor (September 4–7, 2002) has elaborated on the political cultures of the "city" and "capital" functions of capital cities. These national and local functions, plus the international and global linkages are three factors of success that apply to most of the above individual criteria and should be incorporated into strategies and plans for relocated and new national capitals. On the international and global function, Gottmann's "hinge function" is relevant here (Gottmann and Harper 1990: 11; and Gottmann 1961: 103). He has observed, "A capital city is necessarily a hinge in the relations between its country and the outside world" (Gottmann March/April 1983: 89). The hinge function concept is a precursor to today's global-city and world-city phenomenon (Sassen 1991; Sassen 1994; and Sassen 1996).

From the perspective of capital city strategic planning practice and implementation, these tools and mechanisms should be considered: benchmarking and best practices from comparative planning cases (cf., Williams and Stimson 2001; and Hall 1980) should be derived and used in monitoring and evaluating the results of the capital city plan as implemented (Gordon Winter 2002).

As a manifestation and recognition of the imperative of planning new cities today within the context of the global knowledge economy and network society, the functioning of which is facilitated by ICTs, new additional factors of plan monitoring and evaluation are required. For example, drawing on the crucial factors used by Rosenberg (2002) in his study of Silicon Valley science park characteristics around the world, Ramasamy, Chakrabarty and Cheah (August 2002) conducted an evaluation of Malaysia's Multimedia Super Corridor (MSC). They applied "tangible" and "intangible" factors to the MSC, which includes the new administrative capital of Malaysia, i.e., Putrajaya. The assessment factors listed next include the tangible factors that are institutional and the intangible factors that are entrepreneurial:

Institutional (tangible) Factors
- Universities
- Diversified and Talented Human Resource Pool
- Supporting Services Infrastructure
- Role of Government
- Corporate and Government Research Institutes
- The Venture Capital Community
- Small Business Incubators
- Infrastructure (cf., Phillips 2003)
- Quality of Life

Entrepreneurial (intangible) Factors

See the discussion of Malaysia and Putrajaya elsewhere in this presentation. Compare this technology evaluation approach to Phillips
2003 evaluation design.

CASES OF SELECTED NATIONAL CAPITALS

Relocation of National Capitals and Multiple National Capitals

There are at least 70 cities that once were national capitals. These include capitals that have moved, or been renamed, or their host country no longer exists (Wikipedia June 15, 2004). At least fifteen of these have relevance to the relocation of national capital functions of the Republic of Korea. The country, the earlier former capital, and the names and founding years of the city to which the new capital has been located are listed here in this selection of the more relevant relocated national capital cities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Old Capital</th>
<th>New Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Canberra (1927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>Brasilia (1960)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Quebec City</td>
<td>Ottawa-Hull (1865)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>London (9th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>Berlin (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (British)</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>New Delhi (1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (Kingdom)</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Rome (1871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Kyoto</td>
<td>Tokyo (1868)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Wellington (1865)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Christiana (1299)</td>
<td>Oslo (1824)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Karachi</td>
<td>Islamabad (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Petrograd</td>
<td>Moscow (1918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Ankara (1923)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the national capital relocation conversations in the recent South Korean context have revolved around the notion of moving a partial set of capital functions, i.e., an "administrative capital," there will be several other administrative or other cases of "partial capitals" added to the discussion below. Both of these cases are from Asia. They are Sri Lanka's Sri Jayawardeneepura Kotte and Malaysia's Putrajaya.

Geography.About.Com (2004) has identified at least twelve countries with multiple capitals as well as countries that have moved their capital. With their respective functions noted, they are:

- Bolivia: La Paz (administrative), Sucre (legislative and judiciary)
- Cote d'Ivoire: Abidjan, Yamoussoukro
- Germany: Bonn, Berlin
- Israel: Jerusalem, Tel Aviv-Jaffa (embassies)
- Kazakhstan: Alma-Ata, Astana
- Malaysia: Kuala Lumpur, Putrajaya (administrative and PM)
- Netherlands: Amsterdam (de jure), The Hague (de facto and monarchy)
- Nigeria: Lagos (some administrative), Abuja (some administrative)
- South Africa: Pretoria (administrative), Cape Town (legislative), Bloemfontein (judiciary)
- Sri Lanka: Colombo (administrative and judiciary), Sri Jayawardeneepura (legislative)
- Swaziland: Mbabane (administrative), Lobamba (royal and legislative)
- Tanzania: Dar es Salaam (de facto), Dodoma (de jure and legislative)

In 2003, as a contribution to the Republic of Korea national capital relocation debate, Harry Richardson provided a selection of brief reviews of capitals (Richardson, October 24, 2003). His selections included: Washington, D.C.; Ottawa: the state capitals of the United States; Brasilia; Abuja; Yamoussoukoro (Ivory Coast); Jerusalem; Berlin; Islamabad; Dodoma (Tanzania); Canberra; Putrajaya; and he referenced "failed Plans" for the intended relocation of the capitals of
Peru and Argentina. Given that these selections by Professor Richardson already are available to Korean readers, some of the cases that he introduced will not be treated here. The comments and issues provided here in the rest of this section seek to be pointed so as to inform directly, policy planning and plan implementation thinking, reflection, and best practice in today’s Korean context. There is no special order in the sequence of cases discussed.

The Neighborhood Effect of New Capitals

When reflecting on the history and patterns of relocating capitals, it may be worth noting that there seems to be a kind of a contagious "neighborhood effect" during some periods of modern relocations of national capitals and other capitals by region. For example in southern South America, though it took some time for Brazil ultimately to realize the full move of the capital functions from Rio de Janeiro to Brasilia, next-door neighbor Argentina put forth a proposal to move the capital from Buenos Aires to Viedma/Carmen de Patagones (Gilbert August 1989). In 1983, Argentine President Raul Alfonsín caused to be put into law this transfer of the capital. In the end, the Argentine capital relocation did not come to fruition. In Chile, the national congress relocated to Valparaíso from the capital city Santiago. Throughout Latin America, national capitals have been the object of interest and attention. This has been the case, in part, because capital cities are seen by the leaders in these countries to "symbolize modernity thus, shaping the capital city's built environment remains an important issue area. Construction of these projects also provides opportunities for rewarding supporters, building political machines, and acquiring personal wealth" (Myers April 17–19, 1997: 10). Also, refer to Hall (April–May–June 2000: 10) for a listing of Latin American new-capital cities.

In Northeast Asia, from ancient times onwards, China has moved its capital to various locations. Japan too has relocated its national capital from the Nara period to the nineteenth century, and discussed further capital relocations through to the present day with the active promotion of Gifu Prefecture as a candidate site for the relocation of such capital functions as "the Lower House, the Upper House, the Central Government Offices, Supreme Court" (Sweet Valley n.d.). It has been estimated that Japan's plan to relocate the nation's capital could cost approximately U.S.$200 billion (Ko June 21, 2004: 2). Recently, in Taiwan there has been some partisan political party debate about moving the nation's capital from Taipei in the north of the island to Kaohsiung in the south (Ko June 21, 2004). Korea too has had a history of various capital locations and sporadic capital relocation discussions have taken place throughout the last generation (Kim and Hwang July/August 1979; and Meier July/August 1979).

South Asia has had a number of noteworthy capital relocations. These have included: India: Pakistan and Sri Lanka. They are noteworthy especially for issues associated with colonialism, the stimulation of national pride and tradition, and for the physical and urban design of these new capitals.

In modern sub-Saharan Africa, the Cote d'Ivoire (1983), the Nigerian (1991) and the Tanzanian capital relocations have occurred. Also, see Hall (April–May–June 2000: 10; and Schatz February 2003). The history of the Tanzanian case is not an atypical story of the relocation of national capitals. The government of Tanzania announced in 1974 the decision to transfer the capital to interior Dodoma from coastal Dar es Salaam by the 1990s. The legislative body was relocated immediately and permanently. Lack of financial resources however has delayed the schedule for the full transfer of government until 2005.

Brazil: A Case of Sustained Followership. Brasilia, i.e., the relocated Capital of Brazil, is especially pertinent for the Republic of Korea. There are many similarities, and there are some important differences.
A notable difference is Brazil is a federal state; the Republic of Korea is a unitary state. The idea of relocating Brazil's capital had been in the public's consciousness for hundreds of years. An early proviso for a new capital city located away from the coast in the country's interior had been mandated in national law. In the mid-1950s, Brazil's President Juscelino Kubitschek got behind the notion of relocating the country's capital from crowded coastal Rio de Janeiro to the present-day location on the then undeveloped central plateau.

From this moment onward, the new city became virtually a compulsion with the President who placed behind the project all his political skill and personal enthusiasm. Some felt the project was undertaken with undue haste, but speed was necessary in the circumstances. Once Kubitschek had determined to build Brasilia, the task had to be accomplished within his single five-year term of office. By law, he could not succeed himself, and he knew that Brazilian politicians are loath to continue any project begun by a previous administration. In order for Brasilia to endure, therefore, it would have to be sufficiently complete before Kubitschek left office so that the project could not with reason be abandoned (Eldredge 1975: 475).

Some of the mechanics of Brasilia's planning and implementation are noteworthy. These include: the simple and straightforward competition for the urban design of the planned new capital; and the nature of the government corporation charged with constructing Brasilia.

The construction of Brasilia is considered Kubitschek's most notable achievement of his presidency. The initiative to relocate Brazil's national capital enjoyed the confluence of several hundred years of popular and constitutional support and the increasing realization that the crowded old capital of Rio de Janeiro was inadequate to meet the needs of the future and for the first time in Brazil's history, the country's technical capacity was up to the task of developing a new capital.

In the long run however, the most important factor in keeping Brasilia alive may have been the popular support the project eventually received. With what now seems shrewd political insight, Kubitschek seems to have sensed that the Brazilian people were ready for adventure, and that popular imagination would respond to such a grand gesture more readily than to pedestrian and 'practical' enterprises. By 1960, Kubitschek was able to proclaim confidently, 'The Capital is moving, and anybody who tries to stop it will be lynched by the people' (Eldredge 1975: 476).

In order to guarantee that enough of Brasilia, i.e., the monumental pilot area, would be built quickly enough to ensure the perpetuation of the new capital city, President Kubitschek commissioned architects, including the renowned Oscar Niemeyer, to begin work on several of the intended buildings even before the national competition for the city's plan was completed. The result of this initial swift implementation process was to realize the construction of the monumental pilot area of Brasilia. Slightly more than three years after the selection of the winning master plan from the national competition, the formal inauguration of Brasilia occurred in 1960. Lucio Costa's plan prevailed through the competition.

Within a brief period of time, he had to give Brasilia physical reality, and only the indisputable presence of a sufficient investment of asphalt, concrete and steel on site could guarantee the continuation of the project. Had Kubitschek sought to begin with a series of lengthy and very likely social and economic studies, it is more than likely that the city would never have come into existence (Eldredge, 1975: 477).

One of the most important lessons from the Brazil experience for the
current capital relocation debate in South Korea is the inherent uncertainty associated with the varying policies, priorities and commitments of different succeeding presidents and their different political parties over the long time period that it takes to realize a new capital city. The strong personal identification of Brasilia with President Kubitschek did not adhere to the three presidents who succeeded him during the decade of the 1960s. However, by 1970, the population of the Federal District of Brasilia had exceeded one-half million people, about half of these resided in the original pilot monumental area and about half lived in the separate outlying satellite communities of lower income people. The relocation of Brazil’s national capital tapped into and generated a large reservoir of national pride. Despite this, “some felt the project was undertaken with undue haste” (Eldredge 1975: 475).

Sri Lanka: A Case of a Partial, Suburban and Historic Capital Relocation. In 1982, Sri Lanka, the country formerly known as Ceylon moved its House of Parliament from Colombo to Sri Jayewardenepeera Kotte. This new location is in historic Kotte in suburban metropolitan Colombo eleven kilometers from the center of Colombo. Kotte was an early national capital several times in history. It was the capital most recently in the fifteenth century. Sri Lanka is a republic. It is a unitary state with Colombo serving as the country’s dominant urban agglomeration. Except for the legislative functions of parliament, Colombo continues to host the other capital functions along with the highest level command and control decision making functions in the private and non-governmental sectors. Sri Lanka is noteworthy here because its policies of counterurbanization had operated to mute over concentration of population in Colombo. Successions of national governments had maintained relatively high levels of social, health-care and educational services, and relatively good roads and public transportation and connectivity throughout much of the rural countryside. This, combined with a policy of deconcentrating industries, operated to stunt inclinations for migration into Colombo city. However, as large-scale development investments, e.g., the Mahaweli Development Program, were made in the 1970s and 1980s, the regionally dominant Tamil ethnic communities in the most northern and eastern areas of the island perceived that they were not sharing in national development benefits equitably in comparison to the country’s majority ethnic group, the Sinhalese (Corey 1996). This perceived and actual disparity has resulted in an armed separatist movement by Tamil groups that has persisted for more than 20 years. The key lessons from the Sri Lanka case are that equity and social justice need to be addressed, and counterurbanization and deconcentration policies and programs sometimes can be effective in reducing overconcentration in a country’s largest economically dominant urban area.

Malaysia and Putrajaya: A Case of Global Knowledge Economy Leadership in Intelligent Development. Another case of the relocation of just some capital functions with relevance for Korea is the administrative capital of Malaysia, Putrajaya. Malaysia is a multi-racial and multi-cultural country that has attained one of the better economic development levels in the Islamic world. Malaysia recently relocated the administrative functions of its federal government from Kuala Lumpur (KL) to Putrajaya. An intelligent city, Putrajaya was unveiled as the country’s administrative capital in 1999. Malaysia’s new administrative capital of Putrajaya is embedded in the Multimedia Super Corridor (MSC), a 15 by 50 kilometer high-technology corridor that is anchored by KL in the north and the Kuala Lumpur International Airport (KLIA) in the south (Ariff and Goh 1998; Mohamad 1998; and Corey August 2000). The new Administrative Capital of Putrajaya is 25 kilometers south of KL and with new highway and rail connections, it functions consequently as a suburban location especially for the relocated national civil service. Putrajaya was sited not on a true greenfield site, but rather in and among commercial plantations. The MSC and the relocation of the administrative capital to Putrajaya were the result of the active
leadership and championing of former Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad. He left office in 2003. The MSC also includes another intelligent city, Cyberjaya. This city is intended as a commercial technopole, i.e., a research and development based growth center that engages in the creation of new technology. Both corporations from overseas and the spawning of new Malaysian firms were envisioned to locate in, and take full advantage of the technology-based environment of innovation that is being developed in the Multimedia Super Corridor (Bunnell 2004: 96). This conception is one of both government and private sector actors collaborating on common interest in value-added economic development based on contemporary information and communications technologies-supported production.

However, this case in the production of intelligent space has not been without practices of exclusion and concerns for increasing disparities, including social and spatial exclusions. The MSC growth pole has been seen by some as running “against regional development trends ostensibly oriented to a more ‘balanced national’ distribution” (Bunnell 2004: 117). Malaysia’s approach to “intelligent development” has come up lacking in the full attainment of social justice principles. For example, in implementing the MSC:

The cheapest land identified and targeted for (re)development was frequently that over which [pre-existing] residents had limited land rights and/or legal claims to compensation. As such, the greatest social costs of transformation were borne by already socio-spatially marginal individuals and groups. New private sector-produced urban spaces were oriented to and intended literally to accommodate numerically and spatially expanding middle classes. The in situ residents here I consider, in particular, plantation workers and indigenous Orang Asli groups were financially excluded from privatized urban developments. Pre-“intelligent” territories and their inhabitants had no place in authoritative imaginings of utopian futures multimedia (Bunnell 2004: 117-118).

During the early years of the MSC implementation, the priority and the bulk of the national high-tech development investment of Malaysia went to the Corridor area. It was only later that action was taken to ensure that regions outside the MSC were included among the national high-tech investment allocations. Director General Dato’ Wan Mohamed Mukhtar Bin Mohd Noor of Peninsular Malaysia’s Department of Town and Country Planning envisaged that, beyond the MSC, “Malaysia will have a network of cyber cities that is linked to the global information highway and other cyber cities of the world” (Noor, October 22-24, 2001: 7). The National Physical Plan for Peninsular Malaysia to 2020 is intended to promote more balanced regional and sustainable growth. A principal means of achieving this development is “in the form of dispersed concentration of networked nodes.” That is, as the knowledge economy of the MSC matures, “development will be encouraged to disperse to regional centers with greatest growth potentials to catalyze the commercialization of their hinterlands” (Noor, October 22-24, 2001: 8).

Malaysia’s existing mega projects and extensive technology investments that have been achieved and are planned have made possible some changed development priorities for different regions and additional sectors. Malaysia’s new prime minister, Abdullah Ahmad Badawi, for example, now can envisage emphasizing smaller, rural development investments with more explicit priority for the education and agriculture sectors (Jayasankaran, November 6, 2003). Both Sri Jayewardenepura Kotte in Sri Lanka and Putrajaya in Malaysia may be instructive for Korea’s capital city relocation planning, because these cases of new capital cities are ones involving just some of a capital’s functions, and because both cases are in relatively close proximity, i.e., within the suburban fringe, to the metropolitan area of the former capital city-region location. The relocation of Malaysia’s administrative capital within the strategic
context of the nation's Vision 2020 development agenda was the direct outcome of the leadership and advocacy of the country's chief executive, the former prime minister Mahathir Mohamad: this championing had both the explicit and tacit support of the majority of Malaysians. Putrajaya and the MSC benefited greatly by the long-term tenure of Mahathir Mohamad as prime minister: he led the country for 22 years. His advocacy ensured the realization of this national Corridor project and the relocation of the administrative capital, even through the disruption of the Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s. Research of the development processes and site visits to both of these Asian cases would be most informative for the policy makers and planners of South Korea's national capital relocation initiative.

For a full analysis and discussion of these new and other related intelligent development issues, see the recently published book by Tim Bunnell. It is entitled, *Malaysia, Modernity and the Multimedia Super Corridor: A Critical Geography of Intelligent Landscapes* (Bunnell 2004). Also, refer to Ramasamy, Chakrabarty, and Cheah August 2002 for an evaluation of the MSC and its need to strengthen the institutional and entrepreneurial factors of success especially focused on skills, attitude and aptitude of the workforce.

Germany and Ireland: Cases of Divided Nations and Their Capitals. As one looks to the future, there are several two-territory capital city planning cases that make for particularly creative and potentially relevant situations for the consideration of all-peninsula Korean strategists and planners. The divided nations of Germany and Ireland should be studied as cases that may provide somewhat analogous issues when planning for the Korean nation's possible ultimate reunification is conducted in the years ahead.

The German case is well documented (Campbell April 2000; and Wise April-May-June 2000). The relocation of the capital from Bonn back to Berlin as the capital of a unified federal Germany, and all the issues associated with this unique case may have parallels for a possible reunification of the two Korea's in future. Peter Hall has noted:

"The German government has faced huge costs in relocating the capital to Berlin while paying for the modernization of the East German economy. Other countries, with no such major political change in prospect, are even less likely to take the plunge [i.e., of relocating its national capital] (Hall April-May-June 2000: 11).

Because of the somewhat analogous issues, the German capital relocation case merits focused attention and research by Korean policy makers and planners respectively.

The Ireland case is less well documented for the purposes of this context. Its relevance may be in its possible source of learnings for the possible time when the Korean peninsula is to be re-unified. Since the Belfast Agreement (also known as the Good Friday Agreement) fordevelope government was reached in April 1998, important movement has taken place toward improving the relationships between Northern Ireland (a province of the United Kingdom) and the Republic of Ireland. One of the important elements of the improved cross-border climate is the policy and planning work that has begun on the Dublin-Belfast Corridor 2025.

This effort must be viewed within the context of the European Union's European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP). The ESDP, adopted in May 1999 by the EU, is a non-binding statutory agreement by the member states on common objectives and concepts for the spatial and regional development of Europe. The resulting policy options have three major goals in common: (1) a polycentric urban system (HealeyMay 2001); (2) equal access to infrastructure and knowledge; and (3) sustainable development, prudent management and protection of natural and cultural heritage. The Republic of Ireland
has formulated the National Spatial Strategy (Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government 2002), and Northern Ireland has produced the Regional Development Strategy (Department for Regional Development 2001). Combined, these two strategies represent an all-island opportunity for collaboration and joint development. Within the policy and planning context of the ESDP, and the two spatial development strategies, planners from both sides of the border have begun working together to operationalize a coherent cross-border spatial development strategy for the Dublin–Belfast Corridor linking the capitals of the Republic and the Province (Healey September 11, 2003; and Healey March 2004).

The Irish case may inform the Korean case on at least two counts. One, it is essential to address the broader policy and spatial context when considering a territory's capital city's networks and linkages, both internal and external. In the case of the two Irelands, both function with dominant urban agglomerations or primate cities within their respective units of government. Two, looking to relate two territories that have been operating under separate sovereign development behavior requires analysis and planning attention to understand the commonalities and the differences and to plan differentially and in targeted staged ways that take into operational account the linkages, the disparities and the complementarities. Consequently, any all-island strategizing requires sensitive attention to these relationships. Places and the flows among their spaces produce different geographies; as a result different theories and different development strategies need to be applied appropriately.

The parallel lessons for Korea and planning for the context and the time when the two Koreas are re-united will require an all-peninsula approach that seeks similar commonalities, disparities, complementarities and differentiated sensitive theoretical and policy applications. Simply, an approach that makes sense in the South, may not in the North. Alternatively, as in Ireland, it may be important to forge development networks and linkages in common, such as a Seoul–Pyongyang Corridor that traverses the border not radically different from the Dublin–Belfast Corridor that traverses that border.

Canberra: The Planned Capital City and its Instruments of Plan Implementation. The location of Canberra is a product of compromise because of the rivalry between Sydney and Melbourne. It is the capital of a federated state. It took much of the 20th century for Canberra to realize a fully developed city. See Gordon Winter 2002. For Canberra's pertinence to the issue of relocating South Korea's national capital, its many plan–implementation instruments of making the city work are noteworthy. These may be helpful to Koreans, both in planning for a new capital and in the implementation of a new capital strategy. For purposes of learning from, and possible tailoring, planners of a new capital city for Korea should investigate Canberra's: National Capital Authority (NCA); the corporate plan of the NCA; the business plan of the NCA; NCA's communications strategy; "Australians' Perceptions of their National Capital" (CRC for Sustainable Tourism June 2002); program for "Culture, Commemoration and National Capital Awareness:"The Canberra Spatial Plan: a program for National Capital Security; and among other national capital plan–implementation instruments and public–education documents, Annual Reports. These are all instruments that are contemporary operational tools that can facilitate the realization of the capital city's vision, both as planned and as an evolving living organism of a city once implementation has gotten underway. The 2002 study of "Australians' Perceptions of their National Capital" revealed interesting findings. It found that younger visitors (18–34 years) to Canberra were most likely to believe that the capital city is portrayed positively in the media and least likely to believe that Canberra was dominated by politics; they were most likely to have visited Canberra in the last five years. On the other hand, older visitors, 35–54 and 55–75 years old, were most likely to have visited the capital more than five years ago or have never visited it; these groups further were more likely to have negative views of Canberra as
a city and see it as dominated by politics (CRC for Sustainable Tourism June 2002). It is a reasonable inference that the lengthy time that it took to get Canberra to be nearly fully developed from the time of its founding in 1927 has produced a generation gap. Older people have spent much or most of their lives with the national capital under slow development, while young Australians have grown up during a time when Canberra was coming to near full realization. This generational factor is one that should be carefully considered by the policy makers and planners of a new national capital for South Korea. It suggests that a reservoir of deep and sustained commitment by the national citizenry is an important dynamic in having the support required to complete such a time-consuming and expensive project as relocating a national capital.

In this present era of concern for security, it is important for a new capital to have detailed plans and procedures for public access and safety. Canberra has available a set of protocols and assessment criteria for approving public demonstrations. See National Capital Authority 2002.

Washington, D.C.: Government, Inc City-Region. After several hundred years of development and evolution, this planned national capital city case offers an example of a fully developed and thriving relocated capital. It is the capital of a federated national state. Similar to Canberra, it too came about because of compromise. It was located along the Potomac River, adjacent to the existing town of Georgetown. Thomas Jefferson supported Alexander Hamilton's "banking and federal bond plans in exchange for the choice of a Southern locale for the capital" (Word&IQ n.d.). The states of Maryland and Virginia granted the land initially to the federal government for the national capital. In terms of governance today, the citizens of the District of Columbia are not equally represented in Congress with the same rights as the citizens of the fifty states. District citizens however, may vote in U.S. Presidential elections. While financially dependent on the federal government, the municipality operates under a form of self government. Washington, D.C.'s governmental structure has been analyzed and compared to ten other national capitals (Boyd and Fauntroy March 29, 2002).

From the perspective of particular lessons for Korea, it is noted that Washington, D.C. anchors a highly productive and prosperous economic region, i.e., the Baltimore-Washington Corridor that includes Northern Virginia. This region is part of the southern segment of Megalopolis (Gottmann 1961). This segment has one of the country's largest and densest concentration of scientists and engineers and white collar knowledge workers in information and communications technologies, and the biosciences, in government, for-profit corporations, not-for-profit or non-governmental organizations, and universities. These knowledge-based jobs, in part are stimulated by the consulting, professional services, and in general, the producer industries associated with doing business with the federal government. These include firms of attorneys, accountants, advertising, public relations, marketing, trade associations, lobbyists, think tanks, and in general, a range of occupations of knowledge workers who are employed by "Beltway Bandits," i.e., firms that compete for and execute government contracts. As a result, over a 32-year period, from 1969 to 2001, the District of Columbia had per capita income growth that was 31.2 per cent above the national average; 31.5 per cent of the D.C. workforce is in knowledge-based jobs, while less than one per cent of the workers are in manufacturing (Michigan Technology News August 12, 2004: 3). Many capitals are government cities: their principal government products include such outcomes as: regulations; monetary and central bank decisions; weather forecasts; information, such as from the census; and research, as from laboratories and science institutes. Washington, D.C. and its southern Megalopolis region is a significant "government city and region," but its economy also has developed into a diverse one, driven by a wide range of relatively high-paid workers in
producer service sectors as just noted. Additionally, over the last generation, the Washington metropolitan area has evolved into an international-level cultural center with associated tourists from elsewhere and enhanced quality of life amenities for the residents of the city-region. It should be noted that the U.S. government long has practiced a form of deconcentration. Federal buildings and complexes are constructed and leased outside the District of Columbia (as well as inside the city). Among other beneficiaries, this policy has produced benefits for the private sector, including property developers and real estate firms, and in the outlying destination localities. This policy has served to disperse development widely throughout the region. Traffic congestion for example, has increased dramatically beyond the Beltway and along north–south corridors away from the city. In addition to implementing this kind of a deconcentration policy, the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) operates a program of telework centers in surrounding communities of the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. Further, the cumulative effect of these deconcentrated developments have functioned to spawn significant private-sector property and construction investments, especially general office space and back office commercial enterprises, beyond the District of Columbia and beyond the Beltway and its edge cities (Fuchs, C., S. Mastran and J. Meaney 1991). An additional function of the GSA is to ensure quality in the selection of the most highly regarded private sector architects, engineers, designers and construction professionals. The result has been internationally recognized design and construction programs for their excellence. The GSA also plays the role of steward for historic federal properties. As part of its Fine Arts Program, the GSA commissions top artists to create quality artwork for federal buildings. In the end, the federal government's impact on the Washington, D.C.–Baltimore–Northern Virginia region is significant.

National government and its capital functions, even in large metropolitan capitals, have a major impact on the region's economy. For example, the Washington, D.C. National Capital Region has had the following economic impacts:

- The region had 20 million visitors in 2001, which generated more than US$4 billion in regional economic activity. Part of the touristic attraction are the more than 230 memorials and museums in D.C. and surrounding environs.
- In 2002, there were 169 diplomatic missions and 28 officially recognized international organizations in the region.
- The federal government is the largest employer in the region; in 2000, 15 per cent of the region's total workforce were federal employees, this was approximately 370,000 workers, many of these were knowledge workers.
- Federal procurement contracts in the region amounted to 21 per cent of the gross regional product in 2000; this was valued at US$28.4 billion.
- The federal government owned 155 million square feet and leased 55 million square feet in 2003. Of this total space, 43 per cent was in the District; 30 per cent in Maryland; and 27 per cent in Virginia.
- The federal government has jurisdiction of 13 per cent of the region's 2,412 square miles. Of the government's 321 square miles, 19.3 per cent is in parkland and open space. This is a much greater proportion of park area than most large cities in the United States (National Association to Restore Pride in America's Capital January 5, 2004; and National Capital Planning Commission March 2004). The National Mall in the heart of Monumental Washington is noteworthy particularly because it provides the country with a "national space" that accommodates the expression of collective will. Some of these expressions include protest, celebration, and national mourning, among other demonstrations. Such space is critical for the sustenance of national pride and solidarity, and therefore must be a component of a new-capital plan.
Has a baseline economic impact study been done for the Seoul Metropolitan Region? Because of the symbolic nature of Washington, D.C., Americans hold this city in special regard. It is a monumental city, which has been laid out and built up according to principles of good urban design and planning. Public art, civic architecture, and landscape design have framed the plan implementation for over several hundred years now. This long-standing planning tradition has produced a city that has a national image and appearance. Consequently, Washington is perceived as a special place by the American people. The planning legacy from this national capital city planning has set and raised planning and design expectations and standards in the United States for the populace in general and professional planners in particular. (Gutheim 1977; and National Capital Planning Commission March 2004).

Given the strong influence of the federal government on the National Capital Region outside of the District and beyond the Beltway, it should be noted that there are suburbanization dynamics that hold lessons for planners of other capital cities. In the United States, including the Washington, D.C.–Baltimore–Northern Virginia corridor region, a new metropolitan form has been identified: it has been labeled "edgeless cities" (Lang 2003). The growth and spatial structure of suburban office development in many American city-regions have revealed two types of forms: edge cities that are large-scale bounded relatively dense forms of suburban office and other development; and edgeless cities which are relatively low density forms of office and other non-mixed use development that is relatively less accessible by public transit. If this phenomenon of various forms of more distant urban sprawl (Hayden 2004) is generic to the largest city-regions, then what might be the implications for the Seoul Metropolitan Region, especially for areas beyond Gyeonggi Province and possibly in association with a planned alternative of relocating capital functions in closer, rather than more distant locations?

Ottawa. Ottawa, the capital of Canada is located at the language, ethnic and cultural seam of Canada, i.e., on the boundary between the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Situated on the Ottawa River, Ottawa was named Canada's capital by Queen Victoria in 1857. This locational choice was a compromise. The Queen's selection settled a capital relocation dispute between Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto, Kingston and Quebec City (the preceding capital location). Ottawa–Hull's distances to the country's two largest cities are: 402 kilometers to Toronto and 203 kilometers to Montreal. The Ottawa–Hull area had pre-existing settlements, so it was not a greenfield site. Indeed, during their history, they were said to be "dreary industrial towns" (Gordon Winter 2002: 191).

Soon after the Queen's capital location decision, work began on the new parliament buildings. In part, because of this early start of the physical capital, by 1999, the National Capital Commission was able to mark one hundred years of planning and implementing the plans of the capital region of Canada. See Gordon Winter 2002. The National Capital Region consists of Aylmer, Gatineau and Hull in Quebec, and Ottawa–Carleton in Ontario. The National Capital Region is recognized as reflecting the founding cultures of the nation. Canada today is a confederated state with parliamentary democracy. During the long period of one-hundred years, the weakness of provincial planning legislation and the opposition of local governments retarded the early implementation of a highly regarded comprehensive national capital plan. Consequently, the federal government decided that it had to act on its own: it formed the National Capital Commission (NCC) in 1959, and granted it powers to expropriate land, build infrastructure and create parks. After more than a hundred years of development, the resulting Ottawa–Hull capital city area now has been recognized generally as a success. Four factors have been assessed as key to the success of the capital city: (1) vision; (2) political leadership; (3) long-range planning; and (4) capacity for evolution (Lapointe and Dube' April-May-June 2000: 18). As NCC's managerial capacity
increased and matured, it was delegated "responsibility for maintaining the grounds of all federal buildings in the National Capital Region, project management of infrastructure, and land use planning approval for federal properties" (Gordon Winter 2002: 190). In order to build on its record of continuous planning and plan implementation accomplishment, the National Capital Commission (NCC) has developed a Corporate Plan 2001–2002 to 2005–2006 (National Capital Commission n.d.). Because of a recent governance study that assessed the NCC’s relationships with federal partners, local municipal governments and the public, the Commission prioritized "relationships" as its central concern to advance its mission of continuing to build the national capital. Attending to relationships was seen as critical to enhancing understanding of and support for its mission of "creating pride and unity through Canada's Capital Region."

To plan the capital region, the NCC has identified these capital planning principles: symbolism; beauty; greenery; stewardship; orientation, i.e., facilitating visitors finding the services and information that they need to fully appreciate the capital; safety; comfort and accessibility; and transportation and communication. The Commission also has developed regional planning principles to address the needs of local residents: livability; partnerships for planning to enhance coordination among the various levels of planners; efficiency so as to produce good and timely results from government investments in the capital; natural resource conservation: "heart," so as to ensure a dynamic core area of the capital region; and transportation and communication (Planning the Capital Region n.d.).

The National Capital Commission is rich in case material of various approaches that are used during the plan implementation stages of fully developing a national capital. In addition to the just-cited Corporate Plan, the NCC Web site may be explored for such practicalities as: budget figures; reporting relationships, i.e., to Parliament; its status as an organization that functions at arm's length from the central government, i.e., as a Crown Corporation; its functioning as a business with a public policy purpose; real asset management; communications, marketing and external relations; land management; and corporate audit, research and evaluation functions. Finally, in order to monitor progress on the capital city's development, and to ensure NCC's accountability to the public, a not-for-profit citizens organization has formed called NCC Watch (See NCC Watch, n.d.).

Ottawa planners now are building planning visions for the next 100 years. They would plan for four elements: (1) preserving heritage resources; (2) urban design and economic development; (3) protecting the environment; and (4) transportation planning (Dowd, et.al. April–May–June 2000).

Japan: Experience in Growing a Science City. To the extent that South Korea's capital relocation of government entities will involve the movement of science-producing organizations. There may be usefulness in assessing the pros and cons, and questions of the Japanese experience in planning and implementing Tsukuba Science City and other related projects in Japan, e.g., the technopolis initiatives. For example, what were the reasons for the long period of time that was taken for the science city's development? In this era of the global knowledge economy, which is driven in important respects by the creation of value-added science and technology intellectual property, such concerns as should they be localized and regionalized will be important factors in planning for national development in Korea. The Tsukuba Science City planning and implementation experience is rich in development and community building lessons for other places whose leaders and planners are considering similar projects. The case has all the pros (e.g., getting away from the congestion of Tokyo and the pleasant new upgraded environment in which to live and work, etc.) and cons (e.g., long time to build, sterile environment, etc.) of new town planning, plus its success is dependent directly on the communication among, and productivity of the
Confederation have constructed a global niche of special "international capitals" that operate to bring value-added prosperity and cross-border networking on top of its traditional economic advantages in watches, chocolate, international banking, and so on.

Europe: Culture Capitals and Super Capitals of Europe. Europe is a source for innovative ideas on and for "capitals". The European Union (EU) initiated the "European City of Culture" program, the purpose of which was to bring European citizens closer together. The program has evolved and advanced to the point in 1999, when it was re-named European Capital of Culture. The EU operates a competition and then has a jury select a city each year. The selected city is awarded a grant and is designated a "Capital of Culture" for a year's time. Recent examples have included: Cork, Ireland; Patras, Greece; Luxembourg; and Liverpool, United Kingdom. When competing for the capital of culture title, cities have expended great effort to improve the city's physical facilities and programs in culture. Such upgrading, whether selected in competition or not, have operated to enhance cultural life in specific cities and through visitors, across Europe. While the EU operates this program across its continent, it also represents an interesting model for application at the scale of a country. Such a program could be instrumental in bringing attention to and support for local culture, national history and the significance of the capital concept that can be nurtured further.

Additionally, in this era of globalization and increasing interdependence among countries, new pan-national governance forms have emerged. The European Union (EU) again is noteworthy. Typically, Brussels in Belgium is popularly thought of as the "capital" of the EU. However, the EU has its principal governance functions allocated to three "capital cities." The Secretariat of the European Parliament and the European Court of Justice, i.e., the court of the European Union, are located in Luxembourg. The seat of the European Parliament is in Strasbourg, France; the plenary sessions of
the European Parliament meet there. In addition, Strasbourg is the seat of the non-EU Council of Europe and the European Court of Human Rights. Brussels is the seat for the EU's European Commission and the Council of the European Union. Parliamentary committees of the European Union also meet in Brussels. Additionally, Brussels is the political seat of the non-EU North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

These examples are relevant here because they demonstrate transnational and cross-border governance approaches. They also are pertinent because they illustrate operation of the dispersion of individual or partial "capital"functions and cases of actual spatially deconcentrated governance structures. The question of the effectiveness of such a structure remains to be assessed and determined.

London: A Global-City Capital

London is a national capital. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is a constitutional monarchy. It is a place of historical and imperial roots, and it is a place that has an internal geography that is rich and diverse (Ackroyd 2000). However, from the perspective of the presentation here, there is a much more compelling reason to understand the dynamics of London today. London today is a global-city that also happens to be a national capital; it is a global capital. It is a national capital of a unitary state that recently has devolved more governance autonomy to some of its provinces. "The global city is not just a place, it is a process" (Taylor April 15, 2004: 1). In the spirit of Castells' space of flows concept, London has been analyzed recently within the context of the global knowledge economy and network society (Taylor April 15, 2004).

Manuel Castells has written, "a network is a set of interconnected nodes."..."Networks are open structures, able to expand without limits, integrating new nodes as long as they are able to communicate within the network... (Castells 1996: 470)." "The new economy is organized around global networks of capital, management and information, whose access to technological know-how is at the roots of productivity and competitiveness."... The network society, in its various institutional expressions, is, for the time being, a capitalist society. ... But this brand of capitalism is profoundly different from its historical predecessors. It has two fundamental distinctive features: it is global, and it is structured to a large extent, around a network of financial flows (Castells 1996: 471)."At a deeper level, the material foundations of society, space and time are being transformed, organized around the space of flows and timeless time. (Castells 1996: 476)."

London may be a useful case for a relatively few other city-regions as their planners plan for the complete transformation that is required to attain global-city status (Seoul Development Institute December 2003). Three recent books have provided insights into London's functioning as a strategic actor in the context of globalization (Buck, et. al. 2002: Ellis, Hirmis and Spilsbury 2002; and Hamnett 2003). Collectively, they are extremely useful object lessons for would-be world city policies formulation and planning ideas. They provide analysis of the internal relations as well as the external networking relations that distinguish world-cities from other city-regions. That is, world-cities interact significantly with other distant world-cities, in addition to interacting with nearer non-world cities. Peter Hall has observed that in addition to the cost and the disruption, governments will be cautious to move the capital from major global cities. They now increasingly compete with each other to attract top-level global activities, transnational capital and elite populations.

Because of this fact, national governments are less likely to countenance a move that could compromise their leading city and,
by implication, their country (Hall April-May-June 2000: 11).

In this context, a fundamental question is to what extent does the national capital functions contribute to the economic status of Seoul’s city-region as a would-be global city? Put another way, if the national capital functions of a global city were removed, then what would be the impact on the global city or on a city-region aspiring to become a global city? Planning research to answer these questions seems critical if the capital functions are to be relocated away from the current capital city-region of Seoul (Cf., Jun November 15, 2003). It must be noted further that it is not good enough to study and plan for generic “capital functions.” To be effective, such research today must get inside these dynamics; it must parse out the different geographies that are involved. Refer to the e-business spectrum discussion below in the subsection on “New and Different Geographies.” We know now that the more routine informational activities of government are more susceptible to successful distant relocation than are the high-level idiosyncratic decision functions that are associated with specialized command-and-control activities by both top government and corporate leaders. These latter activities require the option of regular face-to-face contact; this requires spatial and locational proximity.

Other Capitals. Kazakhstan, relocated its national capital city from Alma aty to Astana in 1997. This case of national capital relocation is idiosyncratic. Schatz (February 2003) has depicted the move of this capital as more analogous to the reasons for relocating capitals in post-colonial Africa than to the development issues faced by the newly-created countries of the post-Soviet era. The interests of Kazakhstan President Nursultan Nazarbayev to change the Soviet-era patronage structure, to marginalize members of the bureaucracy of the old capital, to re-structure the economy because of new opportunities presented by extractive industries, to re-orient the capital away from China and toward Russia, all combined to contribute to the president’s vision to address Kazakhstan’s construction of independent statehood and to build a national identity from the country’s ethnic diversity. The move to Astana was a key tool and central part of this multifaceted approach to state and nation building.

As capitals of unitary states, Paris and Rome also might be informative for Korean policy makers and planners. France has long been concerned with the dominance of Paris and has applied different approaches to the issue (Evenson 1979). An assessment of their effectiveness may provide useful lessons for Korea. With Rome located between the developed north of Italy and less developed southern Italy, there may be some parallels for Seoul and for the Korean peninsula by deriving lessons from Italy in general and overcrowd traffic congested Rome in particular (Malusardi November 1989).

**IMPLICATIONS FOR KOREA**

Given the lack of national consensus, the huge long-term stakes involved and the mixed history of relocating national capitals and implementing new capitals elsewhere, it would make sense for the leaders and people of South Korea to think twice before proceeding now with the actual implementation of such a project. A six-month period of further reflection and informed debate would seem to be in order. If after such a pause there is compelling reason to proceed, then at least the nation’s major concerns and visions would have been aired and thoughtfully considered.

**Lessons Derived from the Capital City Planning and Implementation Cases from Ottawa and Canberra**

The deep literature on capital cities and capital city planning defies exhaustive analysis here. The cases selected however seem
reasonably representative of the principal issues that must be considered when contemplating the relocation of the national capital of the Republic of Korea. From this vast literature, an excellent evaluative article was identified. It is valuable especially for planners and for plan implementers who might be engaging in the relocation of a national capital and the associated capital city planning and plan implementation. The 2002 article, by Professor David L. A. Gordon is comparative. It is entitled, "Ottawa–Hull and Canberra: Implementation of Capital City Plans." His analysis spans a 75-year period for Ottawa and a parallel 67-year period for Canberra. Five elements for successful plan implementation were used to assess and evaluate the city planning and plan implementation processes of the two capital cities. The elements used were: (1) political support; (2) financial support; (3) planning skills; (4) administrative expertise; and (5) champion. This section here on deriving implications for Korea may begin best by means of a brief review of Professor Gordon’s findings of joint lessons from Ottawa and Canberra.

**Politics and Champions.** Australia was unable to "lock in" the winning choice in the early (1911–1930) capital plan competition soon enough to get capital construction started and enough of the complex in place to ensure that the capital would be built on schedule. In Ottawa and Brasilia, they were able to get the initial construction in place soon enough to lock in the commitment needed to complete the new city over time. Consequently,

Canberra was subject to almost a half-century of debilitating attacks by civil servants, federal politicians and the press who did not wish to leave the comfort of Sydney and Melbourne, and state politicians who regarded spending upon the federal capital as a waste (Gordon Winter 2002: 201).

Strong high-level champions were essential to getting both capitals built and completed. Canada’s prime minister, William Lyon Mackenzie King, personally shepherded Ottawa proposals for 30 years. A new capital city champion with this kind of longevity is extremely rare. More characteristic is for the champion of the new-capital city to leave office well before the project’s completion and without having achieved a political consensus across party lines to ensure that the effort will be sustained over different administrations. Even after death, the groundwork that was laid in both Canada and Australia by Mackenzie King and prime minister Robert Menzies respectively was sufficient to bridge regime changes and to see the successful realization of the two capital cities.

**Financial Management.** From his analysis of the long capital city planning histories of Canberra and Ottawa, Professor Gordon concluded:

It takes a great deal of time and money to develop a new town. A national capital has additional costs to construct the key government buildings, monuments and public spaces to a standard that inspires national pride. The infrastructure, which has no political benefits, has to be built first. The lengthy construction period needed for infrastructure and major public buildings like a Parliament House require stable financing over periods exceeding the typical four–Year political mandate (Gordon Winter 2002: 205).

Political consensus has to be built early in the capital city planning process. This consensus and stream of funding has to be strong and deep enough to transcend many years, different prime ministers, regime changes, party politics, and the weariness of the public.

**Planning and Urban Design Expertise.** Lack of professional planning capacity was a factor that long delayed the realization of Canberra and Ottawa. Outstanding outside designers were brought in early and as needed, but an in-house design capacity, combined with design administrators and managers were needed to complement the
early work of the external planners and designers. This enabled each group of professionals to emphasize their specialized skills. From the Australian experience, good design and quality planning were proven quite important over the long term.

**Administrative Skills.** In the implementation of the plan, organizational capacity and autonomy have been demonstrated to be crucial. Using staff from other agencies was not a successful approach. The value of demonstrating results and outcomes that are recognized by the public was proven important. The role of memorials, monuments and symbols that stimulate national pride are essential to sustaining the public’s interest in the developing new capital. These results are supported best by effective public education and public relations. Independent capital development agencies staffed by high-quality personnel not subject to civil service restrictions were identified by Professor Gordon are part of successful plan implementation.

**Future Directions.** Professors Gordon’s findings also found that capital implementation agencies as just described are needed in the early stages of plan execution, however later, after the city’s basic infrastructure resulting from land use and transportation planning has been established, then these agencies can be scaled back. By re-focusing their missions in the later stages of plan implementation, the new focus can be on developing the monumental and ceremonial cores of the capitals.

**Additional Lessons from Elsewhere**

The next part of this section derives additional lessons, from the other capital relocation cases and literature, i.e., beyond those lessons from Ottawa-Hull and Canberra just summarized above. These implications are listed in no particular order.

Knowledge Exploration to Enhance Capital City Planning: Toward a Learning Community. Korean urban and regional planners long have involved foreign experts in the research and formulation of future planning strategies and policies’ planning. In the case of relocating some or all of its national capital functions away from Seoul, it is recommended that this tradition be maintained. A component of such knowledge exploration should include more focused research from home, and study visits abroad to a selection of other countries that have engaged in the relocation of the national capital or some of the functions of such cities, e.g., the executive or administrative functions of the central government. Countries also should be visited that have produced some success and have failed in such capital relocation related issues as balanced national development (e.g., Europe’s experience to date with the European Spatial Development Perspective) and congestion of large city-regions (e.g., London, Rome, and Singapore). The study team should be composed of opinion leaders from South Korea’s policy and planning communities. The team should be cross-generational and representative of the principal segments of the political party spectrum in the Republic.

Such study visits should include a range and diversity of cases of national capital city planning (Putrajaya) and other examples of related new-town planning and implementation cases, e.g., Tsukuba Science City. The cases should be variable with respect to such characteristics as: historical origins; political economy; form of national government; and culture, among other attributes.

This approach has the potential also to develop a base of common experience among the Korean policy makers and planners who are selected to engage in such direct knowledge exploration. Such experience can be invaluable after returning to Korea to engage in the hard work of political consensus building and imagining an innovative and creative development vision for Korea and its regions. Study visits also should be complemented by additional on-going knowledge
exploration research conducted from Korea.

Process Really Matters. Doing the capital relocation right is a huge national opportunity. Thereby, enhanced faith in government might be an important legacy to build on in future. The opportunity costs must be considered. If the country were to relocate the national capital, then what other strategic initiative(s) will not be pursued? The unintended consequences must be thought through. If the capital is moved, and based on the lessons from elsewhere, what likely candidate unplanned events might be lost? For example, when there might be a re-unified Korean peninsula, might a new capital option to facilitate all-peninsula unification be diminished or lost because of already having made such a huge relatively recent investment?

Consensus and Sustained Support Really Matter. The means here are leadership, vision, championship and followship. From the capital relocation cases elsewhere, it was clear that these ingredients were required, but not necessarily sufficient for success. In the case of Brazil, several hundred years of widespread popular yearning for a break from a colonial past and the vision to expand the development of the country into the undeveloped interior combined with an old overcrowded capital city, were powerful forces of momentum for a speedy relocation of the initial pilot core physical infrastructure for the national capital. Even this case suffered long lapses of national action as leaders and regimes came and went. In the cases of Ottawa and Canberra, at certain phases in long and badly-flawed capital city development processes, the leadership and national consensus were sufficient to retrieve nearly dormant aspirations for a new capital and turn the tide of inaction ultimately to complete the capital vision.

Compromise. Historically, political compromise has been routine and central to the process of selecting locations for the movement of national capitals. Such compromises frequently involved splitting the difference on location. The cases of Washington, D.C., Ottawa and Canberra are the prototypical examples of locational compromise. Argentina demonstrated another kind of compromise, and that was deciding not to proceed with a planned national capital relocation. Politicians and leaders change their minds and policies routinely. To change one's mind for a project as expensive and time consuming as relocating a national capital should not be taken as a sign of indecision, but rather one of wisdom and discretion.

A legacy of Consensus and Good Planning. Should it ultimately be decided not to relocate the Republic's capital at this time, then an alternative position is to invest the political capital necessary to build a strong and lasting national consensus for more even and equitable balanced national development premised on increased local and regional autonomy and fully anticipatory of a re-unified Korean peninsula. Such a legacy and vision would follow the principles of intelligent development defined above and would include the possibility of a new capital for an all-peninsula Korean country that taps into the contemporary dynamism, global competitiveness and a five millennial history of the nation. One may discern flashes and pieces of such consensus/leadership and good planning/implementation in such cases as: Ottawa Putrajaya: Washington, D.C., and Canberra.

Nearby Versus Distant Capital and Capital Functions Relocations. Many capital relocations have involved distant moves, such as the cases of Brasilia, Canberra, Ottawa, and Washington, D.C. The other pattern of relocated capitals or some capital functions are those whose relocation destination(s) is relatively close to the previous location of the nation's capital; these examples include New Delhi (Volwahsen 2002), Sri Jayawardenapura Kotte, Putrajaya, The Hague, and Washington, D.C. The nearby location(s) for the new capital or some of the functions of the capital has the advantage of: (1) deflecting some development from the old capital's congested core; and (2) being able to draw development benefits from the older earlier capital city.
During the initial development period of the new capital, the old capital and its strong urban agglomeration dynamics can provide some economic support to the new capital city. It is unclear what direct benefits accrue or might accrue to the old capital once the new capital has matured into a city in its own right. This is the case whether the relocated capital or its functions are near or far. The distance factor may be ameliorated only somewhat by electronic communications and high-speed rail and expressway links between the new capital and the economically-socially-culturally-amenities-dominant old capital. For high-level private and public decision making and strategic social capital exchanges, routine face-to-face proximity is critical. For a would-be global city, this needs careful attention.

New and Different Geographies. What has been termed the e-business spectrum (Corey December 19, 2003: 71) included below, depicts the principal economic functions of today’s global knowledge economy and network society at regional and local scales. It was conceived with the inherent bias that the production functions are the economic drivers with the other functions following as dependent variables. Each of these functions has its own locational and spatial organizational pattern. These general geographical patterns are conceptualized as concentrated or clustered patterns and dispersed or distributed patterns. These general geographical patterns are symbolized below as (C) for concentrated or clustered patterns and (D) for dispersed or distributed patterns.

Production Functions:
- Science & Technology-driven Research & Development (C)
- Commercialization of Products & Services (C)
- Business & Producer Services (C) & Products (D)
- Public & Government Producer Services & Products (C&D)
  - e.g., regulatory functions, fiscal & monetary decisions, information (i.e., weather forecasts), taxation, etc.

Consumption (e-commerce) Functions:
- Online Procurement: B2B & B2G (D)
- Online Retailing: B2C & G2C (D)
- Value-Added Complementarities between Electronic & Physical Sales, i.e., "clicks & bricks" (C&D)

Amenity Factors:
- Social, Cultural and Institutional Activities (C & D)
- Natural Environmental Attributes (C)
- Educational & Human Capacity Building & Quality of Both (C&D)

When planning for the location and relocation of economic functions these locational and spatial differentiations should be accommodated.

Most importantly from the perspective of Seoul City, Gyeonggi and the Seoul Metropolitan Region which functions get impacted by a decision to relocate the capital or some of the administrative functions of the capital, are critical. Many of the production functions associated with value-added ideas, strategic command and control functions and highest level joint decision making and coordination that bridge the private sector and the national government sector need to be in proximity. Without careful attention to such specialized functional and spatial/locational dynamics, the global city/world-city development of the Seoul urban agglomeration could be muted, and in the process negatively impact the nation’s economy. These dynamics must be researched in depth and strategized accordingly.

Criticality of Early Building. In the cases of Brasilia and Ottawa, the tactic of earliest speedy construction was used to ensure that sufficient building was on the ground to make it difficult to halt the process of completing the relocation of a national capital.
Quality. The cases from elsewhere have demonstrated a number of instances of bold and excellent plans and designs for a new capital. Some of these, through time have included: Brasilia: Canberra: Paris: St. Petersburg, Russia: and Washington, D.C. Quality also has manifested itself in the landscaping, architecture, memorials, artwork and quality of materials used. Sometimes such quality can be in stark contrast with the rest of the country or the surrounding area of the new capital, as in the case of Brasilia and Astana, Kazakhstan.

Timing. In the initiation of Brasilia at that time (late 1950s) was a fortuitous nexus of interests and forces that was facilitative of taking action for the relocation of the national capital. In the cases of Washington, D.C., Astana, Canberra and Ottawa, among others, the move of the capital occurred at a period in the evolution of the country such that state building and or nation building were underway. In the case of the Republic of Korea today, the question must be asked and answered, "why now?"

Sustainable Commitment. Brasilia, Ottawa and Washington, D.C. are good examples of new capitals that underwent forward motion and then periods of relative inaction in the implementation of the planned city. But either through the lasting consensus built by the first champion or by a later champion, there was sufficient support politically and or among the populace over longer or briefer periods of time to the complete the essence of the physical and functional capital.

The Form of the National State Matters. National capital relocations make different contributions based in part on the nature of the country's structure of state governance. Confederations, e.g., Canada and Switzerland, offer maximum autonomy for the country's provinces and local units of governance. If South Korea is to continue the pursuit of greater local autonomy, then federation might be considered as a longer term goal (Corey 1993). Federal governments have demonstrated proclivities for relocating national capitals as a means of building and strengthening national cohesion among its intra-national states, e.g., Australia and the United States. Should South Korea pursue greater local autonomy, then federation might be an intermediate transition stage before launching into a possible confederation. Unitary states often have national capitals that are economically dominant and function as primate cities. Such dominance typically attracts migrants from the state's countryside and out-country urban areas, and there often is cumulative synergistic over-development that results in population and traffic congestion and over extension of the capital's aging infrastructure.

The Role of Congestion. Does intervention for deconcentration work? Note Sri Lanka and Washington, D.C. Old, large overly congested city-regions have been the targets of deconcentration interventions for centuries. Does relocating the national capital or some of its functions from such congested capitals either reduce, slow the growth or divert congestion? This is a fundamental question that demands much more systematic attention before using over concentration as a primary motivation for moving a national capital. By no means is the evidence clear or compelling. Sri Lanka was successful for quite a period of time by keeping the countryside relatively attractive, while the colonial capital of Colombo was maintained at a level that did not stimulate in migration and core-area employment generation (Corey 1996). The Washington, D.C. metropolitan region over the years has dispersed a great deal of development away from the District and the area inside the Beltway. This has resulted slowing a bit the hyper congestion that otherwise would have totally clogged the capital.

Physical Planning and Design in Capital City Planning: The Model from the Past. In the past, the bulk of the effort that went into the planning of new and relocated capitals was in design and physical planning. Coupled with the interests of presidents, prime ministers and other national leaders for the early initiation and swift construction of
the new capital that they championed, well-known architects and planners often were commissioned at the earliest stage of the capital city planning process. This enabled early construction and widespread regard of the initial buildings because of the repute of these famous designers. Examples of some of these designers have included: Oscar Niemeyer and Lu’cio Costa for Brasilia; Le Corbusier for Chandigarh the capital of the Punjab, India; Constantinos Doxiadis for Islamabad, Pakistan (Botka July/August- November/December 1995; and Doxiadis 1968); Jacques Gre’ber for Ottawa; and among others, Walter Burley Griffin for Canberra.

Organizational and Governance Issues for Capital Cities: Planning and Implementation. In the zeal to get a new capital underway, too often short shrift is given to the post-planning phase of relocating a capital. Many of the cases from elsewhere evidenced too heavy a reliance on on-the-job-training when it came to plan implementation, governance, and management of the built capital city. Washington, D.C., Ottawa and Canberra each had to invent implementation organizations and governance structures at various stages of their respective implementation processes to accommodate to the "good plan/bad implementation" situations that have characterized many other capital moves. See Boyd and Fauntroy March 29, 2002 for additional cases of governmental structures for national capitals.

Central Government Impact: To Disperse or To Cluster? In the end, the local, regional economic, and development impacts of national governments are huge. To the extent that such government investments and spin-off developments by the private sector are concentrated in a principal city–region or in a dispersed pattern of planned growth poles, then there may be more or less impact. Critical–mass issues may be critical: in any case, they need to be thoroughly researched for applicability to the Korean case. It is imperative to do baseline economic and other impact research on Seoul’s current influence. Then forecasts of likely future impacts need to be made for the receiving area to which the administrative capital functions are to be sent, and the resulting impacts for the sending area of Seoul (Cf., Jun November 15, 2003). The latter impact analyses should be sensitive enough to be able to differentiate between the likely different impacts that can be expected for Seoul City, Gyeonggi and an expanded Seoul Metropolitan Region, including edge city and more remote edgeless city types of areas. This will necessitate applying the different geographies that are associated with today’s different economic functions.

Security, Demonstrations, Festivals and Events. The importance of the new capital having large enough and properly designed space is critical. Examples noted here have included Washington, D.C. and Canberra. Such large open spaces are used regularly in such Asian capitals such as: Pyongyang; New Delhi; Beijing and Singapore (Burton August 14/August 15, 2004).

Move the Capital to Change the Bureaucracy. Astana and Brasilia in part were motivated by presidential interest in replacing or catalyzing the government workers of the national bureaucracy. In the Kazakhstan example, changing the patronage system and recipients was the motivation (Schatz February 2003). In the Brazil example, the national government workers in Rio de Janeiro worked part-time; the president intended that the move to isolated Brasilia would result in full-time commitment and greater productivity (Eldredge 1975).

The Need for Long-Term and Planning. Given that several generations are needed to relocate and build a fully developed new capital and new town, it is essential that the strategies for the capital project prepare for well into the future. The cases that have been reviewed here suggest that 60 to 100 years is an appropriate and realistic time horizon for such planning.
The Need for Medium-Term Planning and Short-Term Scheduling. A new capital city takes a great deal of time and operational scheduling to develop. Experiences and lessons learned from Canberra, Brasilia and Islamabad indicate that, among other things, the process of creating a new capital city tends to take a long time. It has taken over 20 years to implement Islamabad's plan and a half a century was required to reach the new capital's population of 50,000 in Canberra. Because of this time scale, creating a new capital will go through different stages: preparation, planning and design, construction, relocation and operation of the municipal government. The entire planning period undoubtedly depends on a variety of input factors including finance, labor, and technology. Among other things, however, a well defined development schedule seems to be vitally important not only as a starting point, but also as a tool to reduce the uncertainties that are involved in the great length of planning period that is required for creating a new capital city (Kim and Hwang July/August 1979: 262).

Public Planning Education. One of the many means of building an effective operating consensus to see a capital relocation through to realization is to educate the current generation of Koreans about the vision and opportunities presented by the new capital. In addition, since the new capital project is such a long-term proposition, the next generation too must be engaged. In addition to informational programs and campaigns, it is imperative to invent involvement processes for the citizenry that actively seeks participation and suggestions for operational solutions to the issues deemed to be priorities for the new capital and for the Seoul city-region alike. A complementary tactic is to construct models, dynamic map-plans and exhibits for the public and for school-age children and young adults. Singapore and Washington, D.C., have a history of maintaining effective planning exhibits. Given South Korea's ubiquitous availability of high speed broadband Internet connectivity, "e-engagement"activities for interaction around the development of the new capital and the old capital await invention and creative application. The invention and maintenance of such a technology-based system of programs should include youngsters in important design and updating decision making roles.

CONCLUSION

This has been a normative discussion. It has sought to bring together prior thought by Korean policy thinkers and planners on their solutions to the issues of Korean national capital relocation, and balanced national development. The purpose in presenting and connecting these positions was to suggest that alternatives and resultant choice can, and should be part of the debate that ought to drive large-scale public and private development projects and investments. South Korean strategists and developers have proven repeatedly that they have the technical and creative capacity to execute successfully such mega efforts as the Summer Olympics, a world's fair and the World Cup. No less success and excellence should be expected in planning for and implementing the possible relocation of the national capital, and or addressing the complex issue of balanced national development both for South Korea, and later for the time of possible re-unification of the two Koreas. In the end, innovation and great effort must be expended here because a great deal is at stake. To paraphrase Dr. An-Jae Kim, as he looked to the need to strategize for a unified Korean peninsula, he wrote,

we the people living on the Korean Peninsula, should do our best to transmit a worthwhile land and settlements to our descendants through effectively unified development and conservation of only one country with unified wisdom and efforts" (Kim July 7-11, 1993: 52).
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