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Introduction

Urban development has been pursued with expectation that any change can bring about the better situation by getting rid of, or mitigating the problems caused by the past trend. However, nothing can be free from criticism against any side effects beyond expectation at the beginning in the process of changing or being changed. Three different kinds of problems are related with the change managed by urban development the first and present problem brought about by the past trend, the second and future problem estimated and the third and also future desire or expectation.

Most criticisms on side effects, usually negative in urban development projects, point out that those projects tend to deal with the first problem, and fail to draw the second and third problem will indicate the level of our satisfaction in urban development projects. In addition, the change can be disassembled into two main components the first is the directionality connecting the present situation and the future, and the second is the speed implying how fast to get out of the present situation. The directionality can be referred to the quality of the change, while the speed to the quantity of the change. To choose where to put the destination or where to go, will be far more important than to decide how fast to get out of the present situation when planning urban development projects. So far, many experiences have shown that most urban at first, had given rise to harmful effects to human settlements. The basis of development is knowledge. For the most part, we have not questioned knowledge or its producers because the assumption was that the creation of knowledge was for the greatest good. However, the methods for determining good or bad knowledge may not be adequate. What appears to be good knowledge today may not be good or adaptive knowledge 20 to 50 years from now The case of Freon gas verifies this. Simon already implied that sustainable knowledge could not be secured from the beginning, depending on bounded rationality. It`s the evidence that human beings have the limitations to get sustainable knowledge. In addition, the bright side of urban development projects has been exaggerated, while the problems caused against expectations have been underestimated or overlooked. And culture makes almost all the difference. Problems in urban management are related with leads to the assumption that different paradigm for unban management planning. Here, urban management this context, this paper aims at investigating the possibility of Asian Paradigm for urban management planning by chaining Asian value or culture to land use behavior.

1. Why Asian Paradigm in the age of globalization?

 Globalization can be supposed to standardize land use pattern all over the world, and unify paradigm for urban management planning. Indeed, globalization cannot be denied or manipulated from any part of the world. Some authors have identified globalization with such features of economic linkage as boundary free trade or cooperation between countries. Apart from the case of internationalization process, every country, in the age of globalization, may not need to negotiate with counterparts over the heterogeneous measure of value. Global competition, in the end, will not admit any exceptions or any preferential treatment even for the poorest countries. In this context, globalization has been generally perceived as a set of policy goals to cope with the rapidly changing world, as well as set of external environments affecting the future situation. But there must be some differences among countries in their capabilities to meet globalization according to their stage of economic growth. It`s obvious that globalization has not only positive effects, but also negative effects on the spatial structure and ways of life within a country and between countries. Globalization has multifaceted features beyond drawing its general view. It`s the reason why globalization cannot be defined within one field or must not be monopolized by the particular academic society. It`s a main stream for all, which will remold the future world into new one. Globalization and internationalization are often used interchangeably, because both involve the geographical spread of economic activities across national boundaries. And Dicken viewed globalization as a more advanced and complex from of internationalization which was precipitated by the onset and diffusion of industrialization from the eighteenth century onwards in Europe. But globalization has more fundamental dimension over a mere advanced internationalization process that can be conceived between two countries. Globalization stretches over all the fields of human society including cultural, social, and political contexts, as well as economic measure, whereas internationalization deals with economic problems, mainly. Globalization tends to ignore or surpass boundaries among countries, on the contrary internationalization sounds to be confined within boundary between two countries over negotiations about the rate of exchanging.