Rethinking Rural Policy & Practice: The Rural/Urban Dialectic, in a Disruptive Milieu

Presented to The New River Valley Planning District Commission Annual Dinner Radford University Radford, VA March 12, 2014

> Charles W. Fluharty President & CEO Rural Policy Research Institute



Five Considerations

- I. Recalibrating the rural/urban dialogue and paradigm
- II. Who wins: the World Bank or the OECD?
- III. Rural imperatives, given this regional evidence
- IV. Challenging the hegemony of the urban metaphor, in a disruptive milieu
- V. Final thoughts!



I. Recalibrating the rural/urban dialogue and paradigm



Rural and Urban Definitions

- No definition is perfect at capturing rural and urban population dynamics
 - Official Census Bureau definition of urban includes places from 2,500 to several million
 - OMB Core Based Statistical Areas include some very rural counties in metro areas, because of commuting patters
- No categorical definition can properly capture the continuum.



Urban and Rural Areas

- The U.S. Census Bureau defines urban areas:
 - Core blocks and block groups with population density of 1,000 people per square mile.
 - Surrounding blocks with overall density of 500 ppmi²
 - Range in size from 2,500 people to over 18 million people.
 - **Rural** is everything that is not urban.
- Based on the 2010 Decennial Census:
 - 59 million people live in rural areas (19%)
 - 249 million people live in urban areas (81%)



Is all urban the same, though?



New York-Newark Population 18 million Bellevue, IA Population 2,543



Core Based Statistical Areas

- Defined by the Office of Management and Budget.
- Designed to be **functional regions** around urban centers.
- Classification is based on counties.
- Three classifications of counties:
 - Metropolitan
 - Nonmetropolitan counties are divided into two types:
 - Micropolitan
 - Noncore





Usually, metropolitan is equated with urban and nonmetropolitan is equated with rural.

So, if metropolitan is urban, then...



This is urban:



Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA Metro Area Population 12.8 million

And so is this:

Armstrong County, Texas Population 1,901

Part of the Amarillo Texas Metropolitan Area





And if nonmetropolitan is rural, then...



This is rural:



Loving County, Texas Population 82



And so is this:



Paducah, Kentucky Population 48,791



Most Counties are Urban and Rural!





Coconino County, Arizona Population 134,421 Flagstaff Metro Area



Most metropolitan areas contain rural territory and rural people.

In fact...

Over half of all rural people live in metropolitan counties!



Population Dynamics, 2010

Percent of U.S. Population by CBSA and Rural/Urban Status, 2010						
	Urbanized Area	Urban Cluster	Rural	Total		
Metropolitan	99.9%	36.7%	53.8%	85.0%		
Micropolitan	0.1%	47.2%	22.0%	8.8%		
Noncore	0.0%	16.1%	24.2%	6.2%		
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
53.8 % of the ruro						
Sources: U.S. Censu						



Changes in Population Dynamics

U.S.	Metro Central 2013	Micro Central 2013	Outlying or Noncore 2013	
Metro Central 2009	658	4	10	58 counties became relatively
Micro Central 2009	34	511	44	less urban
Outlying or Noncore 2009	37	34	1811	

105 counties became relatively more urban



II. Who wins: the World Bank or the OECD?





The New Rural Paradigm		Old Paradigm	New Paradigm
Guarantee an adequate attention to rural issues And empower local communities and governments	Objectives	Equalization. Focus on farm income	Competitiveness of rural areas
	Key target sector	Sector based	Holistic approach to include various sectors of rural economies
	Main tools	Subsidies	Investments
	Key actors	National governments, farmers	Multilevel-governance



Rural is not synonymous with agriculture Rural is not synonymous with economic decline

43738

world development report

RESHAPING ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY

THE WORLD BANK

Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized







GROWTH POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS PEGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS PEGIONS PEGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS PEGIONS CATCHING PEGIONS PEGIONS PEGIONS PEGIONS PEGIONS PEGIONS PEGION INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES ORDINATIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS POLICIES CROWTH CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS POLICIES CROWTH POLICIES CROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES CROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS POLICIES CROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES I CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES OF A CONTRACT OF A CON POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS PEO GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP BEGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP BEGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP BEGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP BEGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLIC GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCH GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GRO POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP COMPANY OF DECIDING CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS CATCHING-UP COMPANY OF DECIDING OF DECIDING CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS CATCHING-UP COMPANY OF DECIDING OF DECIDING CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS CATCHING-UP COMPANY OF DECIDING OF DECIDING CATCHING-UP COMPANY OF DECIDING OF GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES ORIGINAL ATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GR TUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING IN GROWTH PO INSTITUTIONS FULICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CA S REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES (REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES (REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES (REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES (REGIONS CATCHING INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES (REGIONS CATCHING INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES (REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH CHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES OR OWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS POLICIES OR OWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS POLICIES OR OWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES OR OWTH POLICIES OR OWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES OR OWTH POLICIES

Promoting Growth

in All Regions

GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTIT

POLICIES INSTITUTION CATCHING-UP REGION

NSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHIN

GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS CATCHING POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTION GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS (NETTRUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS (NETTRUTIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS (NETTRUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS (NETTRUTIONS (NETTRUTIONS REGIONS (NETTRUTIONS REGIONS (NETTRUTIONS (N POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTI CAICHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CAICHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CAT INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING POLICIES INST INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES

REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP

III. Rural imperatives, given this regional evidence



The Critical Question:

"What policy framework will best integrate rural and urban initiatives and programs, to advantage both ag and non-ag rural constituencies, their communities and regions, and enhance their children's potential to thrive there in the 21st century?"



The Framework for Regional Rural Innovation



Critical Internal Considerations

- Wealth Creation and Intergenerational Wealth Retention
- Youth Engagement and Retention
- Social Inclusion and Social Equity



Eight Forms of Rural Wealth





What is Demanded?

- 1. Asset-based development
- 2. Regional frameworks
- Regional Innovation Policies Which Align Rural and Urban Interests
- 4. Support for New Intermediaries



- 5. Attention to Working Landscapes
- Bridging Innovation and Entrepreneurship
 Support Systems, Across the Rural/Urban
 Chasm
- Addressing Spatial Mismatch in Key Sectoral Alignments
- Innovative and Linked Investment
 Approaches Which Enhance Jurisdictional and Cross-Sectoral Collaboration

IV. Challenging the hegemony of the urban metaphor, in a disruptive milieu





The New York Times

National Edition

Mostly cloudy north. Part mostly sunny south. Highs i upper 20s to middle 40s. Cle partly cloudy tonight. Lows n in the 20s. Weather map, Pag

CUTS GIVE OBAM

Printed in Columbia, Mo.

VOL. CLXII No. 56,072

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 2013



Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel spoke with American troops on Sunday at a military training center in Kabul, Afghanistan.

Small States Find Outsize Clout Growing in Senate

By ADAM LIPTAK

RUTLAND, Vt. - In the four years after the financial crisis struck, a great wave of federal stimulus money washed over Rutland County. It helped pay for bridges, roads, preschool programs, a community health center, buses and fire trucks, water mains and tanks, even a project to make sure fish could still swim down the river while a bridge was being

Just down Route 4, at the New York border, the landscape abruptly turns from spiffy to scruffy. Washington County, N.Y., which is home to about 60,000 people just as Rutland is - saw only a quarter as nuch money

DEMOCRACY TESTED Unequal Representation

© 2013 The New York Times

"We didn't receive a lot," said Peter Aust, the president of the local chamber of

commerce on the New York side. "We never saw any of the positive impact of the stimulus funds. Vermont's 625,000 residents have two United States senators, and so do New York's 19 million. That means that a Ver-

monter has 30 times the voting power in the Senate of a New Yorker just over the state line - the biggest inequality between two adjacent states. The nation's largest gap, between Wyoming and California, is more than double that.

The difference in the fortunes of Rutland and Washington Counties reflects the growing disparity in their citizens' voting power, and it is not an anomaly. The Constitution has always given residents of states with small populations a lift, but the size and importance of the gap has grown markedly in recent decades, in ways the framers probably never anticipated. It affects the political dynamic of issues as varied as gun control, immigration and campaign finance.

In response, lawmakers, lawyers and watchdog groups have begun pushing for change. A lawsuit to curb the small-state advantage in the Senate's rules is moving through the courts. The Senate has already made modest changes to rules con-Continued on Page A12

By ALISSA J. RUBIN and THOM SHANKER

KABUL, Afghanistan - President Hamid Karzai leveled particularly harsh accusations against the United States on Sunday, suggesting that the Americans and the Taliban had a common goal in destabilizing his country. The comments cast a shadow on the first visit by Chuck Hagel as defense secre-

The Afghan president's discontent with his American allies has been a recurring theme over the past 10 years. Still, his condemnation now, at a critical moment for talks under way on the shape and scope of any American military presence here past 2014, has aised new questions about the two countries' abilities to bridge their intensifying differences.

In recent days, Mr. Karzai has been the most critical about some of the policies that American officials have described as most important to their mission here, including the widespread use of Special Operations forces and a continuing say in how battlefield detainees are vetted and released. He has seized on both as violations of Afghan sovereignty, banning American commandos from Wardak Province and bristling at key terms in a negotiated agreement on Bagram Prison.

A result was a last-minute refusal by American officials on Saturday to hand the Afghan government full control of the prison. After the cancellation of a joint news conference on Sunday -American officials said security concerns were the cause, even as Afghan officials dismissed that claim - Mr. Hagel and Mr. Karzai met for private discussions Continued on Page A8



Bases, Health Prog and Nuclear Arm **Face Scrutiny**

By DAVID E. SANGER and THOM SHANKER

WASHINGTON - At a when \$46 billion in mand budget cuts are causing an at the Pentagon, administr officials see one potential be there may be an opening to for deep reductions in prop long in President Obama's s and long resisted by Congre

On the list are not only closings but also an addition duction in deployed nu weapons and stockpiles and structuring of the military ical insurance program that more than America spends

sidered is yet another s back in next-generation planes, starting with the Fmost expensive weapons gram in United States histo None of those programs go away. But inside the Pen even some senior officer saying that the reduction done smartly, could easily e those mandated by sequ tion, as the cuts are calle leave room for the areas

the administration believes money will be required. These include building d developing offensive and

sive cyberweapons and for on Special Operations forces Publicly, at least, Mr. C has not backed any of those even though he has deplor "dumb" approach of simpl ting every program in th itary equally.

Mr. Obama will visit C Hill on Tuesday in anoth tempt to persuade lawmak reach a long-term deficittion deal and replace the criminate cuts with more ed ones. [Page A14.] Still, Pentagon officials

Continued on Page Al4

Algorithms C.

As North Korea Blusters, South Breaks Taboo With Nuclear Talk

By MARTIN FACKLER and CHOE SANG-HUN

SEOUL, South Korea - As opinion polls show that twotheir country prospered, South thirds of South Koreans support rugged off the the idea nosed by







"All great truths begin as blasphemies."

--George Bernard Shaw



LEAVING THE LAND

China's Great Uprooting: Moving 250 Million Into Cities

Articles in this series look at how China's government-driven effort to push the population to towns and cities is reshaping a nation that for millenniums has been defined by its rural life.







V. Final thoughts







Charles W. Fluharty

cfluharty@rupri.org

President and CEO Rural Policy Research Institute 214 Middlebush Hall University of Missouri Columbia, MO 65211 (573) 882-0316 <u>http://www.rupri.org/</u>

Addendum: OECD Graphs





GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS PEGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INST INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES CROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING POLICIES CROWTH POLICIES CROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING POLICIES CATCHING POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES OF A CONTRACT OF A CON POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS PEO GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP BEGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP BEGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP BEGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP BEGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLIC GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIE GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES ORIGINAL ATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GR ITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING PROVIDE GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS FOLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS FOLICIES GROWTH CAT B REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES (POLICIES OPOLICIES (POLICIES) (POLICIES (POLICIES) (POLIC HING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES

GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTIT

REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP

POLICIES INSTITUTION

CATCHING-UP REGION GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS POLICIES (ROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS CATCHING-UP REGIONS POLICIES (ROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS CATCHING-UP REGIONS POLICIES (ROWTH POLICIES (RO NSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHIN GROW TH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROW TH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROW OF GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES CROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES CROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES CROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTION CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CAT INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP GROWTH POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS CATCHING-UP REGIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS CATCHING-UP REGIONS POLICIES GROWTH CATCHING-UP REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS REGIONS INSTITUTIONS POLICIES INSTITUTIONS

Promoting Growth in All Regions



No marked convergence or divergence profiles by type of region

9% 8% South-West 7% Annual average growth rates 1995-2007 Dublin 6% islavsk Miasto Warszawa 5% 4% InnerLondon - West 3% Hauts-de-Seine 2% Paris Oslo 1% Brussels 0% -1% Berlin Bolu -2% -3% Adana -4% 0 10,000 20,000 30,000 40.000 50,000 60,000 70,000 80,000 90,000 100,000 Initial per capita GDP in PPP Predominantly Rural Predominantly Urban

Predominantly urban and rural regions, 1995-2007







...but not necessarily faster growth

Only 45% of metro--regions grow faster than the national average.

Metro-regions appear to have entered in a process of convergence.



...signs of inefficiencies appear in significant number of metro-regions...

Contributions to aggregate growth depend on few hub regions...



Contributions to growth by OECD TL2 Region, 1995–2007

Regions in declining order of growth contribution

Source: OECD Regional Database (Territorial Level 2 regions).

...the fat tail is equally important -- if not more -- to aggregate growth...

Contributions to growth OECD TL3 regions



Lagging regions contribute to national growth

	lagging	leading
Australia	29%	71%
Austria	53%	47%
Canada	26%	74%
Czech Republic	62%	38%
Finland	35%	65%
France	68%	32%
Germany	27%	73%
Greece	-16%	116%
Hungary	34%	66%
Italy	26%	74%
Japan	27%	73%
Korea	23%	77%
Mexico	44%	56%
Netherlands	49%	51%
Norway	61%	39%
Poland	44%	56%
Portugal	54%	46%
Slovak Republic	67%	33%
Spain	48%	52%
Sweden	58%	42%
Turkey	47%	53%
United Kingdom	57%	43%
United States	51%	49%
average unweighted	43%	57%
average weighted	44%	56%

Lagging Regions Contribution to Aggregate Growth

Overall, they contributed to **44%** of aggregate OECD growth in 1995-2007.

In eight OECD countries lagging regions contributed more to national growth than leading regions.

