Green Belt in the Republic of Korea

Fukagawa, Hiroshi

https://doi.org/10.15017/4494316

出版情報：經濟學研究. 63 (1), pp.29-41, 1996-07-10. 九州大学経済学会
バージョン：
権利関係：

Green Belt in the Republic of Korea

Hiroshi Fukagawa

The Republic of Korea is famous for its rapid economic growth. Korea has developed tremendously in a short period due to the export oriented industrialization based on an external free trade policy, but the government has imposed severe restrictions on the domestic development. The typical case is the green belt, which I will discuss in this discourse.

The main feature of Korean Green Belt is that it includes a vast farm land in flat suburban areas. Compared to forest, farm land is usually easier to transform into urban uses, industrial, commercial, and residential use. Urbanization is always accompanied by this kind of land transformation. However, in the case of the green belt, such farm land transformation is prohibited in principle. The farm land must be kept as a green-zone for protection of the area's environment. In Korea, urbanization occurred so rapidly that the population became concentrated in the big cities, causing vast urban sprawl to overrun the suburbs. The green belt area, however has been kept undeveloped by the authorities. As suburban areas were urbanized, the landscape changed dramatically except for the green belt. Only the green belt area is the same as it used to be. This shows that the green belt is an effective means of development regulation. Without green belt regulations, the majority of the suburban farm land might be transformed into other urban uses. For certain, the green belt has contributed to the protection of the environment in the suburban area of Korea. But now, the green belt is faced with problems, caused by an economic structural change. Critical opinions of the green belt in Korea now exist. These viewpoints are diverse, but one of the main problems seems to be the land price differential. This is a recent problem. Behind it, there is an economic structural change. In other words, the farm land has been transformed from a means of production to a capitalized value. It seems to me that the people are faced with the problem of asset differential caused by the rise in land prices. As a result, they become critical of the green belt.

I am grateful to Gregory Noble, Andrew Barshay, and Julia Beebe for useful comments on an earlier draft of this study.

1. Conception of the green belt and its regulation

Many people know about the green belt of Britain and other countries, but few people know about the Korean Green Belt. It is true that the Korean government has made economic development a priority for a long time. But on the other hand, they have imposed rigid restrictions on the development.

Generally, a green belt is the name of a suburban green-zone intended to protect the environment. In Korea, it is also called "the development control area," or "kaebal chehan kuyoku." In this discourse, I will use the name of green belt, because it is a common name throughout the world.

According to the Korean urban planning law,

> "The Secretary of Construction has the right to decide a green belt area as a part of urban planning, when it is necessary to protect natural conditions in the urban area, or to regulate the urban development for state security."[1)]

Following this law, the green belt was thus placed around urban areas, in the ring shaped. The central cities are located at inside the ring. The largest ring is surrounds the city of Seoul. This is metropolitan area. As for the contents of these rings, you may imagine a dense forest area because of the name green belt. However, the Korean Green Belt is different. It includes farm land and residential areas in addition to forest and open fields. This green belt system directly affects the daily life of the people in the area. Among the regulations, the most important one is control of land transformation. Because no one can develop an area without transforming the land.

As urbanization spreads, much farm land in the central part of cities was transformed for other uses. Such transformed areas were not green belts but rather "Green Zone."[2)] It is a somewhat difficult to distinguish a green belt from a "Green Zone." Some people misunderstand the green belt, and they confuse it with the "Green Zone." The "Green Zone" is located in central urban area, in other words in the green belt ring. The "Green Zone" is part of an urban planning zone, which also includes industrial, commercial, and residential zones. Comparing the "Green Zone" with the green belt, both areas include farm land, but the land transformation of the "Green Zone" is far easier than that of the green belt. In the "Green Zone," much farm land has been transformed into another use so far, but in the green belt area, such a transformation has been prohibited as a rule.[3)]

According to the urban planning law, building construction, land transformation, land dividing, and other urban planning projects which violate the green belt regulation are prohibited. Anyone

who violates the regulation, will be imprisoned with hard labour for up to 1 year, or fined 1 million won, equivalent to about US$1, 300.[4]

The restrictions are as follows : The authorities approve applications of land transformation or development only in the following cases ;

- The facilities are related to agriculture, forestry, or fisheries, examples being grassland development, land cultivation, and land reclamation.
- House extensions or renovations within 115m² of one's home.
- Collective facilities in the village, examples being a village road, an agricultural road, an agricultural storage.
- Public facilities in the village, examples being a school, a village office.[5]

From these cases, we know the fundamental rules of restriction, and what potential plans would be prohibited. According to the above restriction, agricultural facilities can be developed, but commercial or industrial facilities can not. House extensions and renovations are permitted, but a new house or building is not permitted. All of the prohibitive cases are related to population growth. A new commerce or an industry could expand employment opportunities, and a new house could signify a migration. Both of these instances could cause population growth. Population growth might destroy the natural environment. So in this area, the authorities restrain industrial development that might cause population growth.

But, without industrial development, the area might stagnate economically or economic disparity among the villages might increase, and perhaps causing the people of the area to complain about the government policy. So, as a counter-measure, the authorities freely permitted agricultural and collective facilities.[6] They plan to develop the agriculture as the main industry in the area to make up for the loss of other industries. But the counter-measure does not seem to be sufficient for improving the conditions of the people.

Some people complain that the authorities' control is too strict.[7] The development regulation is truly strict. It is enforced through the following controls.

The Secretary of Construction makes a building register, takes an aerial photograph of the area every year, and checks for new violations. Boundary markers are every 100m, and an observation post every 10km, and allowing them to keep a daily watch for violations in the green belt. When violations occur frequently, the prosecution would conduct an investigation into the affair.[8]

In spite of the strict controls, violations occur frequently. According to the Hangyore Shinmun, a radical newspaper in Korea, on August 11th, 1990,

> "Last year (therefore 1989), 3,614 violations were exposed, and many public officials were dismissed from their jobs for neglect of control. In this year (1990), on August 9th, the

Secretary of Construction exposed 219 violations, and dismissed 96 officials from their jobs for neglect of their duties."[9]

So it seems to me that the Korean Green Belt has a strict control system, and the government has imposed rigid restrictions on domestic development.

2. History of the green belt and its present conditions

The green belt was framed in the 1960's. During that decade, the industrial structure changed, the population and the industry were rapidly concentrating in urban areas, and the urban areas began to expand into the surrounding regions. In 1964, the government began to review other countries' policy, including that of the British and Japanese one. In 1971, the Korean government instituted and enforced the green belt system as one of the urban planning laws. At the same time, the capital Seoul and its environs was named the first green belt. Since then, other provincial city areas were established as green belts.[10]

The total area of green belts as of 1993 is 5,343.3km^2, which includes Seoul, 5 big cities, 28 provincial cities, and 36 counties. The area is equivalent to 5.5% of the whole country. As for land utilization, the forest and fields comprise 3,272.4km^2, which is equivalent to 61.2% of the green belt (see Table 1). Farm land is 1,308.6km^2, which is equivalent to 24.4% of the green belt. Residential land is 113.3km^2, which is equivalent to 2.1% of the green belt. As for farm land, the total farm land for the nation is about 21,000km^2.[11] Thus, the farm land of the green belt, 1308.6km^2, is just 6.2% of the total farm land. However it does include valuable farm land in urban areas.

The green belt includes 3,447 villages, and the population size is about 964,000. The number of households is about 228,000. The number of buildings is about 520,000.[12] The green belt is concentrated in the suburban area, since it is designed to restrict urban development. Regionally, the metropolitan area (Seoul, Inchoen, Kyonghi) is 1,523.9km^2, which equals 28.5% of whole the green belt. The 5 biggest green belt areas which includes the metropolitan area, Pusan, Taegu, Taejon, and Kwangju, is 3,657.8km^2. It is 68.5% of the green belt area. And the population size of the metropolitan area is about 468,000, which is 48.5% of the green belt population (see Table 2). The population of the 5 biggest green belt is about 780,000, which is 80.9% of the green belt population. Comparing the population of 1993 with that of the date of green belt establishment, the population of the whole green belt has increased 2.22 times on the average, and that of the metropolitan areas is 3.49 times what it was in the 1970s'.

There are certain common characteristics of the population growth areas. Most of the population growth is composed of tenants, who live in rented houses or rooms. According to statistics

Table 1 Land Utilization, 1993

Region	Forest : A	Farm : B	Resid : C	Other : D	Total : E	Compo. of E	A	B	C	D	Total
	(km^2)	(km^2)	(km^2)	(km^2)	(km^2)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Metropol.	886.9	381.6	47.4	208.0	1,523.9	28.5	58.1	25.0	3.1	13.6	100.0
Pusan	335.8	158.0	11.9	74.0	579.6	10.9	57.9	27.2	2.0	12.7	100.0
Taegu	384.7	99.0	6.3	57.8	547.8	10.3	70.2	18.0	1.1	10.5	100.0
Kwangju	300.7	190.5	11.5	66.7	569.4	10.7	52.8	33.4	2.0	11.7	100.0
Taejon	296.3	78.9	10.0	52.0	437.1	8.2	67.7	18.0	2.2	11.8	100.0
Chunchon	196.5	48.9	2.6	22.9	270.9	5.1	72.5	18.0	0.9	8.4	100.0
Chongju	82.4	67.1	3.6	28.9	181.9	3.4	45.2	36.8	1.9	15.8	100.0
Chonju	118.6	77.2	4.5	27.9	228.1	4.3	51.9	33.8	1.9	12.2	100.0
Yosu	67.8	17.2	0.6	7.0	92.7	1.7	73.2	18.5	0.6	7.5	100.0
Urusan	210.3	43.3	3.3	30.2	287.1	5.4	73.2	15.0	1.1	10.5	100.0
Masan	235.9	46.6	7.1	26.4	316.0	5.9	74.6	14.7	2.2	8.3	100.0
Chinju	114.0	51.5	2.5	28.1	196.0	3.7	58.1	26.2	1.2	14.3	100.0
Chungmu	18.0	8.0	0.4	2.2	28.6	0.5	63.1	28.0	1.2	7.5	100.0
Cheju	24.6	41.0	1.5	17.0	84.2	1.6	29.2	48.7	1.7	20.2	100.0
Total	3,272.4	1,308.6	113.3	649.0	5,343.3	100.0	61.2	24.4	2.1	12.1	100.0

Source : The Ministry of Construction, *Construction Statistics* 1993.

Note : 1) Forest=Forest & field. Farm=Farm land. Resid.=Residential area. Compo.=Composition. 1 km^2=0.386sq.mi.

2) The area name Pusan does not mean Pusan City. Pusan area green belt includes pusan and two counties. Taegu area green belt includes Taegu and four counties.

of the Ministry of Construction, the number of tenants is 404,700, which is equivalent to 76.3% of the increased population, the increased population being 530,500 after established year.[13)]

According to a research report on a green belt village in the Kyonghi region in 1994, 90.8% of the new residents were tenants, and only 9.2% were homeowners.[14)] As for the occupations of this population, 32.1% were office workers, 28.6% were farmers, 12.6% were students, 19.7% had other occupations, and 7.0% held no occupation. This data indicates that the main industry is agriculture in this village, and thus most of the office workers commute from the village to downtown.

As for the whole green belt area, in 1993, the population of homeowners was about 560,000, many of whom were farmers. The homeowner population was 58.0% of the whole green belt population, greater than the percentage of tenants who comprised 42.0%. By contrast, the

Table 2 Population 1993

Region	Population : A	Homeowner : B	First Pop. : C	Compo. of A	B÷A×100	A÷C
	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(%)	(%)	
Metropol.	467.6	190.2	133.7	48.5	40.6	3.49
Pusan	147.9	81.8	73.8	15.3	55.3	2.00
Taegu	49.4	35.2	29.5	5.1	71.2	1.67
Kwangju	74.9	68.8	59.4	7.8	91.8	1.26
Taejon	40.1	33.7	26.1	4.2	84.0	1.53
Chunchon	18.6	15.7	11.3	1.9	84.4	1.64
Chongju	29.4	25.5	20.2	3.1	86.7	1.45
Chonju	35.0	31.5	24.1	3.6	90.0	1.45
Yosu	5.3	4.5	3.4	0.6	84.9	1.55
Urusan	25.6	16.4	14.9	2.1	79.6	1.38
Masan	31.9	22.2	13.7	3.3	69.5	2.32
Chinju	22.5	20.7	16.3	2.3	92.0	1.38
Chungmu	5.0	4.2	3.3	0.5	84.0	1.51
Cheju	16.4	9.5	4.5	1.7	57.9	3.64
Total	964.5	559.8	434.0	100.0	58.0	2.22

Source : The Ministry of Construction, *Construction Statistics* 1993.
Note : First Pop.=Population when the green-belt was placed in the area.

metropolitan area where the population growth was so rapid, had 40.6% homeowners and 59.4% tenants. As for the other provincial cities, as a rule, the population growth was more rapid, the percentage of homeowners was smaller, and that of the tenants was greater. The typical case is Pusan, Masan, and Cheju area where the number of tenants increased. It seems to me this is a result of the new building restriction policy.

The green belt problem is a serious regional matter. For example, (see table 3) in case of Pusan, the green belt is concentrated in Kangso district, which accounts for 55.4% of the whole Pusan green belt. In the Kangso district, farm land accounts for 63.9% of the area.

According to my research, the population of the Pusan is about 3,500,000. It is a big harbour city, but the city is surrounded by many mountains, and so the flat land is limited.[15] Recently, the population grew rapidly, and many houses were constructed close together. Many people built new houses outside of the green belt, and commute 2 hours to downtown. But the roads have been badly maintained so far. So Pusan has a housing and traffic problem.[16] On the other

Table 3 Green-belt in Pusan

District	Forest : A	Farm : B	Resid : C	Other : D	Total	A	B	C	D	Total
	(km^2)	(km^2)	(km^2)	(km^2)	(km^2)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Tongne	0.30	0.01	0	0.02	0.33	90.9	3.0	0.0	6.0	100.0
Puku	16.07	0.19	0.94	0.80	18.00	89.2	1.0	5.2	4.4	100.0
Haeundae	23.49	2.23	1.18	1.73	28.63	82.0	7.7	4.1	6.0	100.0
Kumjong	31.76	4.23	1.42	1.83	39.24	80.9	10.7	3.6	4.6	100.0
Kangso	16.64	68.35	3.73	18.19	106.19	15.5	63.9	3.4	17.0	100.0
Total	88.26	75.01	7.27	22.57	193.11	45.7	38.8	3.7	11.6	100.0

Source : Pusan City, *Master Plan of Pusan City* 1992, p. 116.

hand, the adjoining farm land in the green belt is a vast flat area, and it is often not fully cultivated. It seems that farmers do not take care of their land. What is happening to the green belt area?

Urbanization greatly impacted land development. Most homeowners began living in the green belt area prior to its establishment. Many of them are farmers, who own some land inside the green belt. They are directly subject to the green belt regulation. But recently, as the green belt area is urbanized, the regulation becomes a heavy burden for them. As a result, they are now dissatisfied with the green belt regulation. They feel that their assets were damaged by the regulation, and they called for deregulation by the government.[17] In 1993, When I stayed in Seoul for my research, I saw demonstrations, one of which was held in front of the Ministry of Construction. I collected some leaflets. Here is a translation of the leaflets :

" • Residents of green belt become victims of the regulations. In a democratic nation, all people should be treated equally.

• The government deceived us by saying the green belt is natural forest or field, but truly, it includes non-green areas.

• The green belt takes away our enterprising spirit, and as a result, we feel frustration for the restriction of private ownership. We desire to reform the green belt system to include only forests and open fields."[18]

3. Evaluation of the green belt

It may be true that the green belt has contributed to the protection of the environment in the suburban area. According to Ho Jae Yong, who is the former president of the Institute of the

Table 4 Land transformation 1980-90

Uses	Area size : A	Composition	Number : B	A/B
	(1,000m²)	(%)		(1,000m²)
Public work site	21,041	37.9	528	39.8
Military facility	9,623	17.4	228	42.2
Green-zone development	2,625	4.7	56	46.8
Village collective work	1,133	2.0	304	3.7
Sub-total (public sector)	34,442	62.0	1,116	30.9
Agriculture and forestry	11,343	20.5	910	12.4
Gravel-pit	8,926	16.1	77	115.9
Mining	410	0.8	25	16.4
Other	336	0.6	34	8.6
Sub-total (private sector)	21,015	38.0	1,051	20.0
Total	55,436	100.0	2,167	25.5

Source : Calculated from data presented in Ho Jae Yong, *A Land Policy*, p. 208.
Note : Gravel pit (Gravel digging or aggregate collecting for construction use)

National Land Development,

> "The benefit is protection of the suburban environment. When urban development depends on the private sector alone, as is true in Korea, very few green zone would naturally remain. Without the green belt, the big cities such as Seoul or Pusan, would have expanded widely, and could have not kept the green like now."[19]

And according to a public hearing report by the Ministry of Construction in 1993, some people estimate affirmatively the point that the green belt has kept some suburban areas from developing, and has contributed to the improvement of the urban environment.[20]

As mentioned above, there is a consensus among some experts that the green belt has contributed to the protection of environment, but there is not entirely an agreement on the recent problems.

There are two viewpoints criticising the green belt. One is the unfairness between the public and private sectors, regarding approval from the authorities. The second is the economic problem that is the land price differential inside and outside of the green belt area. My view is close to the later.

As for the former viewpoint, the authorities do not forbid all development. They approve certain kinds of development, which are as follows (see table 4). Seeing the approval records on the land transformation between 1980 and 1990, the number of transformations into public work

lots is 528, which is 37.9% of the gross area, and the number of transformation into farming lots is 910, which is 20.5% of the gross area. Including military facilities, green development, and village collective work among the public sector, the percentage would be 62.0%. The private sector is 37.4%, which includes agriculture and forestry, gravel pit, and mining. Public sector area is bigger than that of private sector.

According to the public hearing report by the Ministry of Construction,

> "When the residents apply for land transformation, they have to get a licence from the Secretary of Construction or the provincial governor. But truly, it takes them long time to get the licence."[21]

Then, above mentioned Ho Jae Yong said that

> "Public land transformation is easier than private land transformation. This is one reason why residents always complain of green belt. On the one hand, the authorities take a severe attitude toward private works, but on the other hand, they take a flexible attitude to public works."[22]

This exemplifies the unfairness of the approval rates between public and private works. And it is said to be one of the problems of the green belt. But, I do not agree with this argument due to the following three reasons.

First, most of the public works are school or other public buildings, and the priority on the public sector is originally based on the green belt fundamental policy. So it seems to me that such priority is not a defect of the green belt.

Second, it is true that the public sector area is bigger than that of the private sector, but the ratio of land per work site in the private sector is sometimes bigger than that of public sector (see table 4). For example, the average of gravel pit is larger than that of any public works. The area of gravel pit is 8,926m^2, which is equivalent to just 16.1% of the total, but the area per one work is as much as 115.9m^2. Thus, I think it suggests the unfairness among the private sector works.

Third, as mentioned before, the opposition to the green belt has recently become very serious, but the priority on public works is not so recent. So there seems to be some other reason for the recent problem.

From these points, I think that the priority on public sector is just one of the reasons of the opposition, and it is not the crucial problem of the green belt. What is the crucial problem ? I think that it is an economic problem and the structural change behind it.

Table 5 Farm land Price 1984=100

Year	Hills : A	Semi-Plain : B	Plain : C	Suburban : D	A	B	C	D
	Won per pyong	Won per pyong	Won per pyong	Won per pyong				
1984	5,857	6,485	7,520	13,064	100	100	100	100
1985	6,743	6,657	8,067	15,202	115	103	107	116
1986	7,394	6,920	8,586	15,960	126	107	114	122
1987	7,446	7,391	9,563	18,091	127	114	127	139
1988	9,430	10,543	12,048	16,347	161	163	160	125
1989	11,126	14,473	16,020	25,789	189	223	213	197
1990	14,677	18,266	21,111	42,321	250	282	281	324
1991	19,769	22,371	22,872	56,040	337	345	304	429
1992	19,322	24,441	24,299	65,252	329	377	323	500
1993	18,325	23,606	21,869	74,682	312	364	291	572

Source : The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries, *Report on the Farm Household Economy Survey*, 1984-1993.

Note : 1) 1 won=US$0.0013 (Present exchange rate). 1 pyong=3.306m².
1 m²=1.196sq.yd. 1 pyong=3.954sq.yd.
Suburban farm land price in 1993=74,682won per pyong (US$24.55 per sq.yd.)

2) Hills=More than 75% of the area is composed of hills. Semi-plain=About 50% of the area is plain and hills. Plain=More than 75% of the area is plain. Suburban=City or region which surrounds a large city (Another standard is used only in Suburban).

4. The rise of the farm land price

The previously mentioned Ho Jae Yong also said that the land price in the green belt declined relatively.[23] It was a loss to the land owners in the area. According to the public hearing report, the land price problem was serious for the farmers.[24] The agricultural profit tended to decline relatively, and farm land prices tended to rise outside of the green belt. So, the land-owners in the green belt felt the economic loss. Table 5 explains this in detail.

First, the suburban area land price is very high and rising rapidly. Seeing the land price trend by the region between 1984 and 1993, we find that the suburban area land price has risen more rapidly than the other areas between 1990 and 1993. The index numbers start from 100 in 1984, and they are on the same upward trend until 1989 in the four regions, but after 1990, only the suburban area index begins to rise rapidly. Its highest level is in 1993, the most recent year for which data is available.

Second, the condition of the agriculture was not so good in this period. Both population and

Table 6 Relative Land Price Rates

Year	Market Price : A	Net Profit	Capitalized : B	A/B
	(Won per pyong)	(Won per pyong)	(Won per pyong)	
1984	6,778	374	3,736	1.81
1985	7,318	391	3,913	1.87
1986	7,873	430	4,304	1.82
1987	8,320	405	4,049	2.05
1988	—	531	5,314	—
1989	15,022	477	4,768	3.15
1990	20,211	487	4,872	4.14
1991	24,494	454	4,542	5.39
1992	26,434	530	5,297	4.99

Source : The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries, *Report on the Farm Household Economy Survey*, 1984-1993.

Note : Market Price : A=Market land price. Net profit (Land net profit)=Gross profit -total cost-capital interest. Capitalized : B (Capitalized land price)=Net profit ÷ interest rate (Loan rate of the agricultural cooperative)

household number declined.[25] And, it was difficult for farm lands owner to manage their lands. Since the market land price is rising so rapidly, and the profit from the farm management is so low, most of the farmers felt that the green belt was a hindrance, and they desired to abolish or deregulate the green belt.

Table 6 indicates a relative land price rates, which is a land price differential between the market price and the capitalized price.[26] Since the market price rose and the capitalized price declined relatively, the differential extended widely, the relative land price rates grew from 1.81 in 1984, to 4.99 in 1992. This means that the farmers' economic conditions worsened. They were caught between a rising market price and a declining profit.

Third, outside the green belt, their land price could rise highly according to the market price, but inside of the green belt, it would be low because of the transformation control. The land price in the green belt is truly lower than that of the outside area. According to the public hearing report, when the authorities purchased the inside land for public use, they undervalued the land at lower price, and it effected the other inside land prices.[27] As a result, the inside people felt a frustration not only on the differential between the market price and the capitalized price, but also on the differential between the inside land price and outside land price. The later case is directly effected by the green belt control. Thus, the land price differential seems to me the central problem of the green belt. Furthermore, behind the differential, there seems to be an economic structural change in Korea.

In summary, the Korean Green Belt includes farm land, which is prohibited from land transformation. Without the green belt, much farm land might be transformed. So we can say that the green belt contributed to the protection of the environment. But now in Korea, there are opinion critical of the system. Among the problems, I think that a land price differential rates is the most important index. And behind the problem there is a recent economic structural change, which is that land has become a capitalized value. It seems to me that the people are faced with rising land prices and taking a critical attitude toward the green belt.

Recently, the Ministry of Construction put forward a new policy on the green belt, which was a deregulation policy of agriculture.[28] The new policy effected minimal change on the present situation. As far as I know, there is no plan to change the policy, so this problem remains unsettled for the present.

Note :

1) The Ministry of Construction, *The statute book of green belt*, 1994, p. 12.
2) For details on the Green Zone, see H. Fukagawa, "On the Policy of Land Utilization in the Republic of Korea," *Keizaigaku-Kenkyu* (Kyushu University). Vol. 58, No. 6 (1993), p. 47.
3) On the distinction between Green Zone and Green Belt, see Kim Hung Guan, "Deregulation and abolition of development control," *Dongnamkaebal-yongu* (Institute of Dongnam Development). No. 4 (1993), p. 29.
4) The Ministry of Construction, 1994, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
5) *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.
6) The Ministry of Construction, "*Public hearing report on the green belt*," 1993, p. 15.
7) "On the relaxation of the green belt restriction," *Chunang Ilbo*, April 21, 1993.
8) The Ministry of Construction, 1993, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
9) Ree Bong Sue, "Possibilities of green belt development," *Hangyore Shinmun*, August 11, 1990.
10) Ho Jae Yong, *A Land Policy*, 1993, Ponmunsa, pp. 199-200 ; Kim Hung Guan, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30 ; and the Ministry of Construction, 1993, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
11) On the data of the farm land, see H. Fukagawa, "Structural Change of Korean Agriculture," *Keizaigaku-Kenkyu* (Kyushu University). Vol. 58, No. 1 (1992), p. 90.
12) The Ministry of Construction, 1993, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
13) *Ibid.*, p. 21.
14) The Ministry of Construction, "Research on a green belt village," (Unpublished paper) 1994, pp. 1-2.
15) Pusan City, *Master Plan of Pusan City*, 1992, pp. 120-122.
16) This problem is addressed in more detail in Kim Hung Guan, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31.
17) The Ministry of Construction, 1993, *op. cit.*, p. 9. ; and Ho Jae Yong, *op. cit.*, p. 209.
18) All Green Belt Residents Committee, "The truth of the green belt," 1993.
19) Ho Jae Yong, *op. cit.*, p. 208.
20) The Ministry of Construction, 1993, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.
21) *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.
22) Ho Jae Yong, *op. cit.*, p. 210.
23) *Ibid.*, p. 209.
24) The Ministry of Construction, 1993, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
25) For details, see H. Fukagawa, 1992, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-90.
26) For details on the capitalized price, see H. Fukagawa, "The land tenure system in the Republic of Korea,"

Keizaigaku-Kenkyu (Kyushu University). Vol. 58, No. 3 (1993), pp. 91-92.

27) The Ministry of Construction, 1993, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

28) For details on this policy, see Yom Hyon Min, "Reform of the green belt," (Unpublished paper, Institute of National Land Development) 1994, pp. 2-4 ; and the Ministry of Construction, 1993, *op. cit.*, p. 15.