

Present Status and Future Tasks of the Integrated Rural Development Programs in Korea

In Keun Wang*

<Contents>

- I. Nature of Rural Development and Integrated Rural Development
- II. Three Major Institutions' Integrated Rural Development Programs
- III. Selected Tasks of Integrated Rural Development Programs in the 1980s
- IV. Epilogue

I. Nature of Rural Development and Integrated Rural Development

Throughout most underdeveloped regions of the world, the compelling challenge today is to conquer rural poverty, and bring to their overwhelmingly rural populations the benefits of modern technologies and services to realize quality of life (QOL). To put this another way, both growth and equity are considered necessary for agricultural development or rural development, or for agricultural and rural development.^{(1) (2)} In this connection, however, problems and needs of rural development, for example, found in the so-called "latecomer developing

* The Author is Professor of Agricultural Economics, Seoul National University. This paper is partially based on a much larger one presented as a key-note paper at the International Seminar on the Role of Agricultural Cooperatives in Integrated Rural Development organized jointly by the Food and Fertilizer Technology Center (FFTC/ASPAC) and the National Agricultural Cooperative Federation (NACF-KOREA), July 2-7, 1984, Seoul, Korea.

- (1) "Growth and Equity in Agricultural Development" was the theme of the 18th International Conference of Agricultural Economists held in Jakarta, August 24-September 2, 1982. However, to take an example, U.S. experts concerned searched to establish rural development priorities well back in 1972, centering on "the economic, welfare and equity problems of rural communities..." (North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, *Rural Development Research Priorities*, The Iowa State University Press, 1973).
- (2) "Agricultural Development" has been considered as a sub-concept of "Rural Development" which is also a sub-concept of overall, total or national development. Though rural development is our concern at this point, it may be permissible to use rural development interchangeably with the terms of agricultural development and agricultural and rural development in this paper.

countries” (LCDCs), should not be the same for the so-called “firstcomer developing countries” (FCDCs). But agricultural development, rural development or agricultural and rural development as a pre-condition for industrialization and national development should be realized in developing countries at the early stage of growth,⁽³⁾ in particular, in LCDCs.

With rural development in mind, Mabogunje⁽⁴⁾ specified four dimensions of development: (a) development as economic growth, (b) development as modernization, (c) development as distributive justice, and (d) development as socio-economic transformation. Rural development has been considered as going through several stages. For example, Arnon⁽⁵⁾ identified three stages: (a) provision of the preconditions for development, (b) developing market-oriented agriculture, and (c) building up industrialized agriculture. Technically speaking, planning, and implementation, that is, administration or management of rural development are crucially important. Rural development planning has been categorized in several ways: (a) macro-planning at the national level versus micro-planning at local and individual village and farm level, (b) improvement approach versus transformation approach, and (c) centrally-planned top-down approach versus bottom-up planning approach. In this regard, however, these analytically dichotomized planning approaches should be tackled in practice from an integrative perspective, with emphasis, whenever and wherever needed. The strategic importance of rural development administration has been emphasized by many experts.⁽⁶⁾

(3) See, for example, the following: In Keun Wang, “Agricultural Technology Research and Development in Developing Countries”, *Seoul National University Economic Review*, Vol. XV, No. 1, pp.1-35 (1981), and Joseph Klatzmann, “Agriculture and Industry in Developing Countries”, in Raanan Weitz, ed., *Rural Development in A Changing World*, MIT Press, 1971, pp.113-123.

(4) Akin L. Mabogunje, *The Development Process—A Spatial Perspective*, Huchunson University Library, 1980, pp.35-50.

(5) I. Arnon, *Modernization of Agriculture in Developing Countries—Resources, Potentials and Problems*, John Wiley & Sons, 1981, pp.508-510.

(6) See, for example, the following: Richard W. Gable and J. Fred Springer, *Administering Agricultural Development in Asia*, Westview Press, 1976, and A.T. Mosher, *Serving Agriculture as An Administrator*, The Agricultural Development Council, 1975.

Weitz⁽⁷⁾, in a summary proposition-type statement, declared that rural development has recently become a subject of major concern in the search for a general theory of economic growth and human development, and the principles of rural development are now being investigated with a new interest, especially by those seeking a strategy capable of expediting the process of development in the underdeveloped countries. World Bank⁽⁸⁾ stated officially to the extent that rural development is a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people—the rural poor, which involves extending the benefits of development to the poorest among those who seek a livelihood in the rural areas. And closely reflecting this World Bank definition of rural development, Lele⁽⁹⁾, in her study of African rural development report, offered a definition of rural development as improving standards of the masses of the low-income population residing in rural areas and making the process of their development self-sustaining. Meanwhile, Jedlicka⁽¹⁰⁾ pointed out five categories of problems related to the nature of rural development: (a) historical and political constraints on rural development, (b) political linkage with change agencies and rural clients, (c) financial marketing and administrative infrastructure, (d) research and development (R&D) for rural areas, and (e) technology transfer strategies.

In a study of rural development approaches in Asia, Inayatullah and others⁽¹¹⁾ analyzed on five subject-matter categories: (a) indicators of rural development, (b) contents of rural development policies, (c) structure of administration and

(7) Raanan Weitz, "Toward a New Approach: Introduction and Conclusion", in Weitz, ed., *op. cit.* pp. 1-22.

(8) World Bank, *Rural Development*, Sector Policy Paper, 1975, p. 1.

(9) Uma Lele, *The Design of Rural Development—Lessons from Africa*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975, p. 20.

(10) Allen D. Jedlicka, *Organization for Rural Development—Risk Taking and Appropriate Technology*, Praeger Publishers, 1977, pp. 1-28.

(11) Inayatullah, "A Proposed Conceptual Framework for Study of Approaches to Rural Development in Asia," in Inayatullah, et al., *Approaches to Rural Development in Asia—The Comparative Perspective*, Vol. 1, presented at a seminar on "Approaches to Rural Development in Asia" organized by the Asian Center for Development Administration, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, from 26 May to 3 June, 1975, pp. 25-36.

mobilization, (d) the rural community and its effect on implementation of policy, and (e) other intermediate variables. Six-point indicators of rural development, coming from the definition of rural development as “a process which leads to a rise in the capacity of rural people to control their environment, accompanied by wider distribution of benefits resulting from such a control”, are: (a) changes in rural productivity, (b) changes in the extent of employment, underemployment, unemployment, etc., (c) changes in distribution of income and wealth, (d) changes in the power structure, (e) changes in the degree of mobility in the local class structure, and (f) changes in the values, beliefs and attitudes favourable to the control of larger environments. Hansen and others⁽¹²⁾ studied rural development in Indonesia in which they focused on eight topics: (a) policy dimensions, (b) the green revolution, (c) employment and income distribution, (d) village dynamics, (e) rural institutions, (f) migration, (g) the household economy, and (h) resource management. And finally, Ban and others⁽¹³⁾, in an analysis of Korean rural development, dealt with such major topics as: (a) agriculture’s role in Korean economic development, (b) the growth of agricultural output and productivity, (c) the sources of agricultural growth, (d) regional agricultural production and income, (e) government investment policy and plans, (f) agricultural credit policy, (g) farm price policy, (h) local government and rural development, (i) land reform, and (j) off-farm migration.

Recently many rural development experts use the concept and term of “Integrated Rural Development” (IRD) rather than those of “Rural Development”. Much has been written in recent years on the integrated rural development. Nevertheless, the IRD concept does not have a uniform meaning yet. It should be probably most meaningful to turn to Pakistan for a basic understanding of the IRD in that she has been credited with incepting the rural development

(12) Gary E. Hansen, ed., *Agricultural and Rural Development in Indonesia*, Westview Press, 1981.

(13) Sung Hwan Ban, *et. al.*, *Rural Development*, Studies in the Modernization of the Republic of Korea: 1945~1975, Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1980.

program in 1972. According to an authoritative international seminar report,⁽¹⁴⁾ Pakistan has had several national programs for rural development, the experience of which was not good. However, unsatisfactory as they proved to be, they did indicate pitfalls to be avoided in designing the Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP). The most significant of these were: (a) a loose and uncoordinated institutional framework on bureaucratic lines, (b) lack of understanding and collaboration within and among the nation-building departments and the department of rural development, (c) a tendency to undertake single-purpose isolated programme, (d) leadership imposed from above; non-participation particularly of poorer and more backward rural people, (e) lack of ability to evolve grassroot rural leadership, (f) inadequate formulation of self-help and self-reliance methods and procedures, (g) lack of supervision, follow-up, research and evaluation, and (h) inability to achieve a multiplier effect coupled with extraordinarily high costs.

These unhappy outcomes helped to specify some aspects of the design for Integrated Rural Development in Pakistan. They are: (a) an emphasis on coordination and institution-building; at central and provincial government levels, full understanding and collaboration among all concerned departments, (b) development of fully coordinated and programmed work at all levels with particular emphasis on the local level, (c) full participation of all rural people with particular emphasis on tenants, smaller farmers, landless labourers and the unemployed, and strenuous efforts to evolve competent local leaders, (d) dedication on encouragement of self-help and self-reliance, and (e) organizational arrangements with combined adequate supervision, follow-up, research, and evaluation to cover a large people at minimum costs. As a matter of fact, practically all rural development objectives are contained in the Pakistan Integrated Rural Development. But what is new and innovative in the Pakistan's definition of the IRD or the IRDP are: (a) the integration and combination of

(14) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, *Report on the International Seminar on Integrated Rural Development, Lahore, Pakistan, 3-10 November 1973*, 1975, pp.10-11, 51-53.

several services in a united programme, (b) the empirical determination of an identified, manageable operational unit—“50 to 60 villages in a production area”, (c) the emphasis on “small and medium-sized farmers”, (d) recognition of the need for “sound physical organizational and institutional diversification” and (e) emphasis on the need to combine “intensification, diversification and commercialization of agriculture through a social cooperative system under a total approach”.

Probably it would be very pertinently meaningful to pay a serious attention to what Kühnen⁽¹⁵⁾ calls the integrated rural development, which should enable to grasp the general understanding of the IRD as having evolved from the concept of Pakistan's inceptive IRD. In his final analysis of the disappointment over the results of past rural development efforts in many countries, he declared that the reason for the very unsatisfactory results seemed to lie in the basic approach which could be characterized as an attempt to promote development by applying economic principles derived from experiences in developed countries. It was not fully realized that the conditions in developing countries were greatly different as regards, for instance, factors like: (a) the rate of population increase, (b) the degree of international communication, (c) the educational level, (d) the availability of new technologies, and (e) the value system of the population, to mention only a few examples. As a result of the reassessment of rural development strategies, the concept of the IRD has been widely accepted and practised.

Specifically, according to Kühnen, it is not possible to understand the concept of the IRD without familiarizing oneself with some basic assumptions on which the IRD concept has been built, which are: (a) rural development is part of the overall socio-economic development, (b) development is a system of inter-related social change, (c) agriculture has a multitude of functions in the development process, and (d) agricultural development is one aspect of rural

(15) Frithjof Kühnen, “The Concept of Integrated Rural Development”, *Korean Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 19, 1977, pp.137-146.

development. Based on these assumptions, aspects of implementation of the IRD policy are specified: (a) IRD being a goal as well as a methodological approach, the interdependent relation of all economic, social, political and technical factors has to be taken into account by applying a systems analysis approach, (b) differentiation should be realized in time and place, first, by dealing with the creation of minimum requirements for development, such as activities for increasing production and improving social conditions, and putting a minimum of infrastructure at work, and then the general expansion of the activities can be made following, (c) area development or regional development plans must be integrated with the national and overall development framework, and (d) the success of the IRDPs depends on the degree to which a population can be motivated which, again, depends on how much their interests, their felt-needs are taken into consideration and to what extent they are involved in the planning and implementation process or decision-making process... problems and needs for decentralization and participation.

Based on the information from the already-quoted international seminar on Pakistan's IRD,⁽¹⁶⁾ it may be possible to generally identify for reference major areas or aspects of the IRD to which one has to pay serious attention. They are: (a) problems of organizational, administrative and institutional structures (responsibility for policy plans and execution, production structure, tenure structure, structure of agricultural services, existing farmer association organization and its viability, and future potentials of rural cooperatives), (b) the program planning process (geographical area aspects of program planning, participation aspects of rural people and their organizations, government and political aspects, financial constraints and priorities, and employment considerations), (c) research, studies, strategies, and evaluation (who has research responsibility?, evaluation, statistics, etc.), (d) training requirements and arrangements for meeting them (kinds and numbers of staff requiring pre-service, induction, and in-service training, training facilities required to train farmers

(16) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, *op. cit.*

and their families, members and officers of farmers associations/cooperatives, the capacity to meet the training requirements), (e) private and public social services structure (literacy, youth, women, health and nutrition, population planning and social development), and (f) physical infrastructure.

Before concluding a refreshment-type examination of the IRD concept as an evolutionary follow-up to the conventional rural development with special reference to the Parkistan's case, several additional points need to be mentioned. First, it should be pointed out that the so-called integrated approach has become increasingly practised in other planned social change programs, too, to take only one case, for population (family planning), food and nutrition.⁽¹⁷⁾ And second, regional development, area development or regional rural development programs can be integrated into rural development programs at regional level to be called as "regional integrated rural development programs" (RIRDPs). Furthermore, there could be "local integrated rural development programs" (LIRDPs).⁽¹⁸⁾ As a matter of fact, it may be true that in most cases actual planning and implementation of the rural development are made either at local level or at regional level as in the case of almost all directed development and change programs. In this connection, it would be meaningful to note that the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific of the United Nations (ESCAP-UN)⁽¹⁹⁾ has published guidelines for the rural center planning in 1979 as part of the IRD approach. Planning and decentralization lie at the heart of the process of the rural center planning concept in translating the IRD approach into the practical sphere.⁽²⁰⁾

(17) See, for example, the following: Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific of the United Nations, *An Integrated Approach to Population, Food and Nutrition Policies and Programmes for National Development*, Report of a Regional Seminar held in Bangkok from 24 to 31 July 1979, Asian Population Studies Series No. 45.

(18) See, for example, the following: Raanan Weitz, "Regional Planning for Rural Development in Developing Countries," in Weitz, ed., *op. cit.*, pp.86-102, and Marilyn Campbell, ed., *Integrated Approach to Local Rural Development*, Report of an Interdisciplinary Seminar, Makati, Philippines, 31 March-3 April 1975.

(19) Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific of the United Nations, *Guidelines for Rural Center Planning*, 1979.

(20) The Korea Rural Economics Institute (KREI) has conducted a feasibility study on two occasions in line with the rural center planning guidelines of ESCAP-UN.

II. Three Major Institutions' Integrated Rural Development Programs

1. Present Status

The period of 1960s saw the First 5-Year Economic Development Plan, an overall development plan, formulated and implemented for the first time in Korea, followed up by several successive plans. The Fifth 5-Year Economic and Social Development Plan is being implemented since 1982, which, as its title shows, could be differentiated from the previous 5-year plans in that social development is overtly and manifestly accentuated in the plan for the first time in Korea. If and when confining roughly to the 1970s from the 1960s, namely, for two decades in which government-led externally-directed industrialization has been strenuously pushed, and if and when trying to generalize government policies and major programs for agriculture as reflected in the "Agricultural Basic Law" and the 5-year development plans, it may be possible to note the fact that several policy dimensions have been made broadened not only to the staple food production-oriented agricultural and rural development. To cite a few more illustrations, there have been: (a) various measures for income boost, (b) improvement of rural environmental conditions (electrification, communication, health, sanitation, etc.), (c) strengthening cooperative organizations, and (d) securing and training of the future farmers.

Generally observing, however, actual planning and implementation of policies and programs for agricultural and rural development during the two-decade period could not justly fall into the category of "rural development" or "integrated rural development" as defined strictly in the above. This, of course, does in no way imply that there have not been any programs of rural development or integrated rural development and the like, which will be later examined on. It has been found, on the other hand, that even academicians did not pay their serious attention to rural development or integrated rural development during the period. Among the 911 academic papers in agricultural

economics, rural sociology, and agricultural and extension education, only six papers dealt with anything on integrated rural development and only 12 papers were found on regional development problems.⁽²¹⁾

It would be pertinently meaningful in the following to take an approach to briefly describe and examine several major institutions' programs which may be more or less considered to be related to those of rural development in an integrated approach in Korea. Selected as the major institutions in this regard are: (a) agricultural extension work by the Office of Rural Development (ORD), (b) Saemaul Undong, or "New Community Movement", and (c) agricultural cooperatives by the National Agricultural Cooperative Federation (NACF).

(1). Agricultural Extension Work.

The local-level or grass-root extension organizations have been charged with several categories of activities, it is true. Unfortunately, however, appropriately satisfactory integrated approaches have not seemed to be materialized. Analogous to the so-called "Research Applied to National Needs" (RANN), extension program needs for a given year are determined at the ORD, taking into consideration pertinent needs and factors with special emphasis on the production of staple food crops, which could be termed as "Extension Applied to National Needs" (EANN). The grass-root extension organizations are multi-purpose ones but with not much degree of integrated approaches employed, it should be true. A full-fledged county-level agricultural extension advisory committee system to see the bottom-up program planning in coordination with the related agencies and organizations had been tried for a very brief period of time in vain.⁽²²⁾ At both provincial and local levels, the Provincial Office of Rural Development

(21) Information has been figured out based on *Academic Summary Journal*, Volume 16, *Agricultural Science Series (II) (1910-1979)*, National Academy of Science, Republic of Korea, 1980.

(22) In Keun Wang, "The Role of County Advisory Committees in Program Planning in the Cooperative Extension Service with Implications for the Agricultural Extension Work in the Republic of Korea, Unpublished M.S. Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1960 (especially pp. 139-147).

(PORD), and the City/County Rural Guidance Office (CCRGO) are outside arms of the provincial and county governments, respectively, which are, at the same time, under the administrative control of the ORD and the PORD, respectively, primarily on technical matters and personnel management. This dual structure in terms of the organization and operation may bring out some dysfunctional consequences. At all levels, the ORD system has established with the agricultural educational system of various levels the so-called "Agricultural Institutional Cooperation Linkage Program" (AICLP).

The extension program of managing the "demonstrative intensive income-boosting village development" should be considered as a kind of remnant-type follow-up program to the formerly-functioned rural community development, now incorporated into the ORD extension work. A resident multi-purpose extension agent works in a pilot village with special reference to increasing incomes. This program, however, has not apparently received a priority emphasis in the ORD extension programs, but Chung and Dong⁽²³⁾ described it as an integrated rural development program. Agricultural extension work has very important multiple developmental programs or activities. But they have been heavily centered around agricultural development under so many external or exogenous factors and conditions, for the control of which the ORD has apparently no capacity or power.⁽²⁴⁾ Agricultural extension work is primarily for the development of agriculture which is the very core of any rural development or integrated rural development programs. It has been a partner in cooperation and coordination with closely related agricultural and rural development agencies and organizations. The ORD's agricultural extension work might not be thought of as "Integrated Agricultural Development" nor "Integrated Rural Development" in the very strict meaning of the sense,⁽²⁵⁾ though it has multiple programs to

(23) Yong-Bok Chung and Youl-Mo Dong, *Agricultural Extension Services in Korea*, Office of Rural Development, 1982, pp. 91-97.

(24) In Keun Wang, "Influencing Factors and Development Measures for Rural Socio-Economic Development—The Case of Agricultural Extension Work", in In Keun Wang, *Korean Rural Development Studies*, Bak-Yung-Sa, 1982, pp. 410-443.

(25) For a different concept of an "integrated agricultural development" and an "integrated rural

be desirably planned and implemented in an integrated approach.

(2). Saemaul Undong or "New Community Movement".

According to Kim,⁽²⁶⁾ he saw Saemaul Undong as an integrated rural development program in a Korean way, emphatically pointing to the positive contribution of it to the spiritual and ideological reform, among other things, coining the term of "social reform" to designate it. In the meantime, Kwon and Kim⁽²⁷⁾ clearly identified Saemaul Undong as the community development whose line of thought may be certainly same with that taken by Chung and Choi.⁽²⁸⁾ Whang,⁽²⁹⁾ in his almost all research publications and papers on Saemaul Undong, explicitly implied that Saemaul Undong is the Korean-version rural development and integrated rural development program. Wang⁽³⁰⁾ has also taken the position that Saemaul Undong is an integrated rural development program of Korea. As a matter of fact, in the international community, it has been generally taken as a Korean-version of the IRDP.

Certainly, Saemaul Undong is a national development movement with an integrated approach. To be more specific, it has been incepted essentially as an integrated rural development program at local level or individual rural villages as units of operation or implementation. Saemaul Undong, today, however, is in transition after its successful initiation in 1971: (a) it has been expanded to cover urban areas to have "Urban Saemaul Undong" and others, (b)

development", see A.T. Mosher, *Projects of Integrated Rural Development*, The Agricultural Development Council, 1972.

(26) Il Chul Kim, "Population Growth and Development of Rural Society," in Hae Young Lee and Tae Hwan Kwon, eds., *Korean Society III: Population and Development*, Population and Development Research Institute, Seoul National University, 1978, pp.727-751 (736-738).

(27) Tai Joon Kwon and Kwang Woong Kim, *Community Development in Korea*, Bup-Moon-Sa, 1981, pp.173-300.

(28) Ji Woong Chung and Sang Ho Choi, *Community Development*, Sun Il Publishers, 1983.

(29) See, for example, the following: *Management of Rural Change in Korea: The Saemaul Undong*, The Institute of Social Science, Seoul National University Press, 1981.

(30) See, for example, the following: "'Participation' as a Fundamental Concept of Rural Development and Saemaul Undong," *Seoul National University College of Agriculture Bulletin*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp.51-64 (1979); "Selected Elements of Strategy for the Integrated Rural Development and Saemaul Undong", *Seoul National University Economic Review*, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, pp.297-325 (1979).

the very strong government-led top-down management approach is being phased out as taken over by the Saemaul Undong Headquarters (SUH), a non-governmental national organization, and (c) it has been increasingly broadening its function and responsibility to have finally reached a point at which it may be identified with *the agent* of the national and total development of Korea. It should be absolutely true that Saemaul Undong with a central focus on integrated rural development or local integrated rural development has, directly and indirectly, contributed so much to the development of Korea, positively and dramatically, needless to mention.⁽³¹⁾

Confining to what is called “Rural Saemaul Undong” (RSU) today, program categories cover such areas as: (a) improvement of living environments, (b) expansion of production infrastructure, (c) inducement to development will and motivation, and (d) income increase.⁽³²⁾ In this connection, however, the following must be pointed out: (a) Saemaul Undong is a combined or joint scheme of the government and public rural development projects supported by public funds and other resources and peoples’ participatory mobilization for action, (b) it might be very difficult, and sometimes, misleading, to try to reasonably isolate proper and indigenous accomplishments of Saemaul Undong, primarily because of dangers of overlapped or duplicated evaluation in that it has been fashionable to put “Saemaul” to almost all the titles of the projects or actions in this country, (c) it used to be planned and implemented by a central government ministry in cooperation and coordination with other related ministries by means of highly centralized, top-down and authoritarian ways with an integrated approach, under the historically-fostered climate of very rigid and bureaucratic social, political, administrative and economic situational backgrounds, (d) the integrated approach employed in the Saemaul

(31) There have been made available so many reports and papers on Saemaul Undong with special reference to its achievements. In this connection, however, the annual editions of *Saemaul Undong* by the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Korean government should be most comprehensive.

(32) Ministry of Home Affairs, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-89.

Undong may have been limited in several respects, two illustrative reasons of which may be: one would be that it has been advocating too grand and holistic an idea to be actually planned and implemented; a second would be that in actuality the integrated approach of Saemaul Undong might have been only possible through the heavy involvement of government agencies, and (e) Saemaul Undong as an integrated rural development program has been limited to individual rural villages, that is, it has been just “micro or local integrated rural development program”, so that it has not been possible to plan and implement a little more cosmopolite or regional development programs, in an integrated way, of course.

(3). Agricultural Cooperatives.

Rural development strategists have given their principal and often exclusive attention to the cooperatives as a self-contained institutional entity.⁽³³⁾ Many failures have occurred that the cooperatives' intended beneficiaries have become discouraged, it is true.⁽³⁴⁾ But many advocates of agrarian reform and rural development have continued to support cooperative institutions as the most important to solve problems of rural society.⁽³⁵⁾ As a matter of fact, the Comilla Project of East Pakistan, now of Bangladesh, Tanzania's Ujama Project, and Pakistan's Integrated Rural Development Programme, to cite a few examples, have been designed under a grand cooperative concept, directly and indirectly.

There are several producers' cooperative systems in Korea which have nation-wide organizational network and activities in agriculture as interpreted

(33) See, for example, the following: Advisory Committee on Overseas Cooperative Development, *Farmer Cooperatives in Developing Countries*, 1971; Edgar Owen and Robert Shaw, *Development Reconsidered: Bringing the Gap Between Government and People*, D.C. Heath and Company, 1972.

(34) See, for example, the following materials: *Organization of Peasants in Asia*, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 1974; Inayatullah, ed., *Cooperatives and Planned Change in Asian Rural Communities: Case Studies and Diaries*, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, 1970; In Keun Wang, “Impeding Factors and Development Measures for the Agricultural Cooperatives in Selected Asian Countries,” *Seoul National University College of Agriculture Bulletin*, Vol. 2, 1977, pp. 257-280.

(35) See, for example, the following: Henrik F. Infield, *Utopia and Experiment—Essays in the Sociology of Cooperation*, Praeger, 1955 (especially p. 27).

as broadly as possible. In this connection, however, the National Agricultural Cooperative Federation (NACF) is the most important and representative of all in any standard. Notwithstanding some serious developmental problems it is faced with,⁽³⁶⁾ the NACF is the most important cooperative organization and certainly one of the most important institutions for agricultural and rural development, and it has been so well established, having been undergoing trial-and-error adaptation experiences because of usual problems of transfer and adoption of an alien socio-cultural complex. Conventionally, the agricultural cooperatives' activities have been covering such major areas as: (a) guidance, (b) provision of supplies, (c) sales, (d) utilization and processing, (e) credit, and (f) mutual security and insurance. In this connection, however, probably one of the most marked development over the years in these activities would be found in the category of "guidance" function.⁽³⁷⁾ The guidance function may be classified into four sub-areas as of 1983: (a) professional or job training and education for the operation and management of the cooperative organization, (b) regional agricultural development and technical guidance for farmer members concerned, (c) normative training and education of officers and farmer members, and (d) provision of information, publication and promotion of rural cultural welfare.⁽³⁸⁾

As implicitly and explicitly suggested and described, all the functions or activities of the agricultural cooperatives have been contributing to the agricultural and rural development. In particular, the so-called "guidance" function has been having a markedly evolutionary development to directly promoting rural development with special reference to the expanded planning and implementation

(36) National Agricultural Cooperative Federation, *Twenty-Year History of Agricultural Cooperatives*, 1983, pp.16-22.

(37) Way back in 1965 there was an international workshop on agricultural credit and cooperatives in Seoul at which one of the five session groups dealt with "Assistance for Rural Development". It is interesting to note that the topic of "community improvement" was taken up in which (a) small farms assistance and (b) rural guidance service (extension) to subsistence agriculture were specifically discussed (*Agricultural Credit and Cooperatives in the Far East*, Official Proceedings of the Fifth Far East Agricultural Credit and Cooperatives Workshop, May 10-22, 1965, Seoul, pp.145-149).

(38) National Agricultural Cooperative Federation, *Agricultural Cooperative Yearbook*, 1983, pp.119-131.

of “integrated rural development programs”. Specifically, with a view to promoting “regional or area integrated agricultural development” at eup/myun or town/township level, “intensive income generation program” (literally translated, “Saemaul Integrated Income Boosting Program”) has been planned and implemented since 1977 under the jurisdiction of the viably strengthened primary cooperative organizations. Under the terms of this program which has seemed to be made synonymous with what the NACF calls “integrated rural development program” rather than “integrated agricultural development program”,⁽³⁹⁾ the following projects have been in effect: (a) strengthening production infrastructure, (b) promoting production facilities, (c) re-aligning and strengthening marketing facilities, (d) furthering farm mechanization, and (e) introducing innovative farming systems. For the purpose of supporting the five-category project, various necessary activities have been planned and implemented, some examples of which may be the development and utilization of grass-root groups of (a) farmers, (b) farm homemakers, and (c) youth. Farm homemakers’ groups, for example, have been charged with cooperative home-making activities including the operation of day-care centers and quasi-kindergartens for pre-school children.⁽⁴⁰⁾

It is the impression that the agricultural cooperatives have been contributing toward agricultural and rural development in the most integrated way, relatively speaking, when paying special attention to such aspects as: (a) a wide range of assorted activities centering on the so-called “guidance” function, (b) being agents for planning and implementation of programs, and (c) having relatively more cosmopolite areas covered, that is, sub-regions, regions, not single

(39) As already pointed out, “integrated agricultural development” may need to be differentiated from “integrated rural development”. In this connection, the proposition is that the former has the basic and central role to play in the latter. It may also be true that the former may be a sort of sub-concept of the latter. Looking through a few publications by NACF (and those by other closely related agencies, too), there seem to be found some confusions in terminologies, surely reflected by confused conceptualizations with respect to the integrated agricultural development and the integrated rural development. An impression is that these two closely related concepts are being used interchangeably.

(40) National Agricultural Cooperative Federations, *loc. cit.*

individual farms or villages. In this connection, however, it should be pointed out again that the agricultural cooperatives' integrated programs might be considered as the "integrated agricultural development", rather than the "integrated rural development", at least for the moment. And furthermore, it may be true that the agricultural cooperatives have more diversified resources, manifestly and potentially, than other closely related agencies which could be mobilized and utilized for the promotion of integrated rural development. But, on the other hand, it should be reminded of the fact that the agricultural cooperatives need institutional cooperation and coordination with other pertinently related agencies more to realize complementarity.

2. Self-stated Achievements

Braving the dangers of having conflicts in operationalized concepts of the integrated rural development programs employed and expressed in print by the three major institutions, summarization of the achievements to be made would be done as faithfully as possible and as briefly as possible, too.

(1). Agricultural Extension Work.

Under the sub-heading of "Integrated Rural Development Program" in a heading of "Rural Society Development Program", Chung and Dong⁽⁴¹⁾ stated that "... In response to contemporary demand, the agricultural extension endeavour has been directed to the development of increased income in a pilot area designed to promote regional development by means of an integrated cooperative management approach, being implemented in collaboration with other government agencies concerned." Summaries of effects or accomplishments of the pilot area during the period of 1973 to 1978, compared to those of the non-pilot areas are: (a) changes in farmers' consciousness and attitude for more progressive and positive ones, (b) enhancement of farmers' technical competence, (c) increased farm household income, and (d) the trickle-down effects to farmers in neighboring areas on income-generating cash crops. As to the cooperating agencies concerned, they pointed out the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

(41) Chung and Dong, *op. cit.*, pp.91-97.

(for administrative function), the Office of Rural Development (for educational function), and the National Agricultural Cooperative Federation (for marketing function). In addition, they mentioned that family planning program has been incorporated into the extension work through the establishment of working relationships with the Planned Parenthood Federation of Korea.⁽⁴²⁾ As pointed out already before, what they call, the ORD's integrated rural development is directly referring to the "Income Boosting Pilot Area Program" or "Demonstrative Intensive Income-Boosting Village Development."

(2). *Saemaul Undong* or "New Community Movement"

Annual editions of the *Saemaul Undong* having been published by the Ministry of Home Affairs of the central government document annual achievements, among others, in a very detailed and specific way. But it would be more pertinent and meaningful for the present purpose to turn to a government publication⁽⁴³⁾ which has been already quoted before. Under the major chapter, "Achievements of *Saemaul Undong*", as one of the eleven, first, a general picture is presented, point by point, on the four categories with the grand theme of "reform of structure of outlook": (a) cultivation of self-reliant spirit, (b) enhancement of national self-awakening, (c) sound thinking and temperate conduct and (d) respect for public interests. On the second grand theme of "rural modernization" which should be directly and closely related to the *Saemaul Undong*'s achievements in its integrated rural development, an overall achievements in general terms are presented: (a) improvement of living environment, (b) inducement to development will and motivation, (c) expansion of production infrastructure and (d) momentum to income boosting, which have been already mentioned before.

(42) Specifically, the Planned Parenthood Federation of Korea, Korean Parasite Eradication Association and Office of Rural Development have had field experiments jointly in which family planning program, nutritional improvement program and parasite eradication program were planned and implemented in an integrated way in two counties in Kyunggi Province, as what was called "integrated family health program". The result was that family planning program proved to be highly successful.

(43) Ministry of Home Affairs, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-102.

Furthermore, the same publication describes major successful rural Saemaul projects: (a) rural housing improvement, (b) community resettlement, (c) operation of Saemaul nurseries, and (d) Saemaul factories (rural industrialization). All the Saemaul projects, categorized into two: (a) for economic development and (b) for social development, are planned and implemented at villages in an integrated manner. In addition to the above-described two-category achievements of (a) reform of structure of outlook, and (b) rural modernization, the publication lists six more categories of achievements: (a) expediting of balanced industrial growth, (b) establishment of urbanites' ethics, (c) increase of factory productivity, (d) promotion of industry-academy cooperation, (e) practice of nature preservation, and (f) internationalization of Saemaul Undong.

(3). Agricultural Cooperatives.

Following up to what is called "Cooperative Saemaul Development Program", a village integrated development program (1974~1978), "Saemaul Income-Generation Integrated Development Program" which is now being implemented with emphasis by the NACF is a regional agricultural integrated development program at town/township level initiated in 1977. Originally, the integrated program had the genuine traits of the integrated rural development with cultural and welfare projects, which, however, were dropped out due to limited availability of financial resources. As mentioned above, primary-unit cooperatives have the jurisdiction over the regional integrated development program in close cooperation and coordination with the administrative agencies and agricultural extension organizations at all levels.

According to a scarce evaluative study of the seven successful cooperatives in action and participant farmers, some information of preliminary nature on the achievements of the program may be noted.⁽⁴⁴⁾

First, it has been found that the regional integrated program has been

(44) So Hyun Kim, "Special Features and Accomplishments of Saemaul Income-Generation Integrated Development Program," in National Agricultural Cooperative Federation, *Selected Problems of Korean Agriculture*, 1983, pp. 389-403.

significantly contributing to the increase in farm household income, though follow-up and more detailed analyses on this should be needed.

Second, the bottom-up planning and implementation approach adopted has produced three kinds of positive consequences: (a) voluntary participation in the program by client farmers increased significantly, (b) location-specific considerations have been satisfactorily taken into account and met, and (c) active fostering and developing of voluntary and associational groups and organizations by producer farmers.

Third, introduction and implementation of various related projects in a coordinated and integrated way for a particular region have tended to result in the following functional results: (a) promotion of localized specialization of regional agriculture, realizing complementary effects, (b) furthering of diversified farming and rationalization of farm management, (c) increased efficiency and effectiveness in getting projects implemented, that is, increasing social returns, economic benefits, or productivity of the projects enhanced, and (d) change-propensity of farmers has been enhanced in terms of positive and innovative aspirations and willingness to adopt new technology.

Finally, fourth, since primary cooperatives as farmers' self-help organizations have the jurisdiction over the regional integrated development program, which should be construed as being in line with the phasing-out of the very strong government-led, top-down development planning and implementation approach, the following benefits have been incurred: (a) the multi-purpose cooperatives' assorted businesses and functions proved to be effectively made linked with the regional integrated development program itself, (b) thanks to the multi-purpose cooperatives' functions, economic profitability and benefits have been increased for the participating farmers, and (c) various benefits are accrued from the unit cooperatives' central role assumed in the regional program, because of which, farmer members have become to have more favourable and positive attitudes toward, and relationships with, the primary cooperative organizations.⁽⁴⁵⁾

(45) As a matter of fact, the official kind of guideline publication made available quite recently

III. Selected Tasks of Integrated Rural Development Programs in the 1980s

An overall but brief reassessment of general rural development and integrated rural development, in particular, would be as follows: (a) basic concepts and terms of rural development and integrated rural development does not seem to be appropriately and correctly understood and used by those directly concerned. In particular, the so-called “integrated rural development” and “integrated agricultural development” have not seemed to be well distinguished, (b) an integrated approach seems to be employed more or less by many of those major institutions for agricultural and rural development, primarily in the sense of doing several programs or activities together. And potentially and normatively speaking, many institutions concerned should and could take the integrated approach in behalf of themselves and rural development of Korea as a whole, (c) in practice, apart from the initial-stage “micro” programs of the Saemaul Undong (what are now called as “Rural Saemaul Undong”), the NACF’s program at town or township level seems to be relatively the most typical or representative of all as far as major programs are concerned. But the program may be apparently an integrated agricultural development program (IADP), not an integrated rural development program (IRDP), and (d) the full-fledged integrated rural development is yet to be planned and implemented in Korea in its strict and authentic definition.

Under the circumstances when incentive programs have been planned and implemented for agricultural and rural development in an integrated approach, consequently, little information seems to be available on scientific evaluation of the programs, it may be challenging to try to establish directions and tasks for the furthering of the integrated rural development with special reference

has its title: *Agricultural Cooperatives' Regional Integrated Agriculture Development Directions*, National Agricultural Cooperative Federation, 1984.

to the 1980s. For what we call “strategies” (here, of course, strategies for integrated rural development in the 1980s) must be based on the three major categories of information with a view to deriving necessary generalizations: (a) theoretical understanding of the integrated rural development from behavioral perspectives, (b) empirical research studies on the integrated rural development, with the so-called “place-time qualifications”, needless to mention, and (c) experiences with actual programs of the integrated rural development. The generalizations thus derived would be applied to specific actual situations in which all variables and resources are combined for the maximum degree of goal attainment of a particular integrated rural development. Accordingly, the description here in this paper on the direction and task of the integrated rural development of Korea in the 1980s cannot but be presented in general terms with normative propositions rather than the field-tested action-oriented strategies.

First, there could and should never be any single institution for the integrated rural development in Korea including, of course, the Saemaul Undong. All the pertinently relevant and concerned institutions could and should be able to do *part* of the integrated rural development programs, sticking to the principle and practice of the integrated rural development.

Second, at both present and prospective stage of development of Korea, namely, that of economic development, of national development, consequently of rural development, the regional development or the area development approach is a must for actual planning and implementation of the integrated rural development. No matter how a “region” may be operationally defined, it is absolutely clear-cut that it should be more than single village or farm, but, on the other hand, not the nation as a whole. As a matter of fact, pointed out already before, regional development can be integrated into rural development at the regional level, that is, “Regional Integrated Rural Development” (RIRD). Therefore, participation of related government and public agencies as well as private organizations represented in a region, is a must, for which, spirit and practice of the team-oriented cooperation and coordination are absolutely and

essentially needed.

Third, there has to be a particular institution among the participating ones which should take a central or jurisdictional role for the regional IRD. Government ministries cannot and should not assume such a role in that the long-time-practised strong government-led program has no longer its place not only for the IRD but also for others. In this connection, it is advanced, based on the several very significant reasons and justifications, the NACF system should be most desirable for this role. Other related and participating agencies and organizations do contribute with their specialty or expertise. For example, ministries of Agriculture and Fisheries, and Home Affairs, may significantly involve themselves in the IRD by providing policy guidelines and administrative measures if needed. The Office of Rural Development (ORD) could supply for the program its highly-qualified technical expertise both research-wise and extension-wise. The Agricultural Development Corporation (ADC) may concentrate on land and water development projects within the framework of the IRD. The public health centers under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Public Health and Social Affairs, and other medical institutions could render their medical and health services including the family planning program. The Korea Rural Economics Institute (KREI) does play a very crucial role in providing vital socio-economic information and conducting, on behalf of the IRD or the NACF, evaluative studies. And educational institutions of various levels also have their part. Meanwhile, the NACF, the jurisdictional host agency, with the widest coverage of projects and activities of its own, may help to realize complementarity.

Fourth, the so-called integrated agricultural development is part or sub-concept of the integrated rural development as the regional integrated rural development is part of the integrated rural development or the national integrated rural development. Therefore, it should be necessary to make the IAD or the RIAD evolving to the IRD or the RIRD. In this connection, however, this expanded and evolutionary transition should be made progressively,

taking into consideration all the variables impinging on the program and regional conditions. Basically, we should keep in mind the fact that agriculture is central in any IRD programs, not to mention IAD programs.

Fifth, we have seen the initial stage of rural Saemaul Undong implemented almost simultaneously and almost over the whole country. From this past experience, one might be tempted to want to try to apply this exceptionally unique approach to the IRD, which, however, should never be done: it is simply impossible, especially at the present and prospective developmental stage when ultimately strong government-led approach should be phasing out in the country. Needless to say, this does not imply that no top-down planning would be needed any more: policy guidelines and other high-level measures are usually worked out at the national level, coming down to the regional and local level for discretionary applications with field conditions taken into account.

Sixth, and finally, only one illustrative case of the relatively more important requirements than others especially on the part of the host institution, the NACF, may be pointed out, which is concerned with staff training and re-training in both professional or job-related and normative aspects. In one sentence, the very *democratic discussion leadership*, among other types of leadership, should be cultivated.⁽⁴⁶⁾

IV. Epilogue

The rural development in Korea seems to be making a dramatic and full-fledged turn to the integrated rural development approach with the county or “Gun” as the unit geographical area to be covered to have genuine regional integrated rural development. The theoretical framework and considerations as well as the practical guidelines should have been provided by the Korea

(46) Actually, the democratic discussion leadership concept is consisted of three patterns: (a) leadership in inter-personal relations, (b) leadership in scientific method, and (c) leadership in cooperative thinking (F.S. Haiman, *Group Leadership and Democratic Action*, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951, especially pp.113-127).

Rural Economic Institute (KREI) along the lines of the so-called “Rural Center Planning” concept having been advocated originally by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific of the United Nations (ESCAP-UN), as mentioned already before.

Probably the first of the most striking features of the design adapted to suit local conditions for the regional integrated rural development scheme would be to put a priority emphasis on the setting-up the so-called “Agriculture-Industry Districts” within the program unit area so that seriously-needed non-farm income generation could be made for the resident farmers who generally depend on the relatively meager farm income to a great extent: approximately speaking, the average farm household derives around 70 percent of its total income from farming.

Certainly, and basically, rationally-formulated government policy supports are a must for this regional integrated rural development scheme as in the case of almost all other programs. And substantially, such government policy supports should and are in a ctuality, studied and formulated, theoretically and feasibility-wise, in the form of a draft, by the Korea Rural Economics Institute, the very think-tank of the government for socio-economic aspects of the rural development. Nevertheless, we should keep in mind the fact, as examined in the above briefly, there are essential and important requirements for the successful planning and implementation of the newly-emerging regional integrated rural development scheme, whose satisfaction, however, would not be perceived less challenging indeed.⁽⁴⁷⁾

(47) The newly-emerging scheme for the regional integrated rural development has been re-confirmed at the KREI-sponsored “Symposium on the Action-oriented Regional Integrated Rural Development Policy Alternatives”, September 14, 1984, in which, for example, Yang Boo Choi and Yong Man Lee presented a key research paper, “Strategies of Regional Integrated Rural Development Policy Alternatives.”