

Document N° 125

Working Group: Development with Territorial Cohesion

# **Rural-Urban Linkages: South Africa Case Study**

Doreen Atkinson

October, 2014

This document is a product of a Rimisp initiative funded by The Ford Foundation. We authorize the non-for-profit partial or full reproduction and dissemination of this document, subject to the source being properly acknowledged.

**Citation:**

Atkinson D., 2014. Rural-Urban Linkages: South Africa Case Study. Working Paper Series N° 125. Working Group: Development with Territorial Cohesion. Territorial Cohesion for Development Program. Rimisp, Santiago, Chile.

**Author:**

Doreen Atkinson, Karoo Development Foundation, University of the Free State, Republic of South Africa.

Rimisp in Latin America ([www.rimisp.org](http://www.rimisp.org))

Chile: Huelén 10, Piso 6, Providencia, Santiago, Región Metropolitana  
| Tel. +(56-2)2 236 45 57 / Fax +(56-2) 2236 45 58

Ecuador: Av. Shyris N32-218 y Av. Eloy Alfaro, Edificio Parque Central, Oficina 610, Quito | Tel.+(593 2) 3823916 / 3823882

México: Yosemite 13 Colonia Nápoles Delegación Benito Juárez, México, Distrito Federal | Tel/Fax +(52) 55 5096 6592

## INDEX

<b>A. DEFINITIONS</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1. “Rural” and “urban” .....	5
1.1 A complex range of spatial settings.....	5
1.2 Changing official definitions .....	7
2. “Farming areas” .....	7
3. “Farm workers” and “farm dwellers” .....	8
4. “Households” .....	9
5. “Unemployment” .....	10
6. “Business” .....	11
<b>B. DEMOGRAPHICS</b> .....	<b>11</b>
1. Levels of urbanization.....	11
2. Provincial diversity .....	12
3. The cities and secondary towns.....	14
4. Peri-urban and “dense rural settlements” .....	16
5. Small towns.....	18
6. Farm workers .....	18
7. Post-productivism .....	26
<b>C. FOOD SYSTEMS</b> .....	<b>26</b>
1. Food production .....	26
2. Food markets .....	27
3. Food processing.....	28
4. Pro-poor agriculture .....	29
5. Tourism and agriculture.....	30
<b>D. LABOUR MARKETS</b> .....	<b>31</b>
1. Unemployment .....	31
2. Employment, unemployment and spatial patterns .....	33
<b>E. THE INFORMAL SECTOR</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>F. WITHIN-COUNTRY MIGRATION</b> .....	<b>38</b>
1. Who migrates, and why? .....	38
2. Enduring rural-urban kinship links and survival strategies.....	43
3. Illness and migration .....	44
4. Remittances and financial flows.....	45
<b>G. KEY GOVERNMENT POLICIES</b> .....	<b>47</b>
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>50</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>51</b>
Additional resources.....	55
List of cities and towns by population (1996 population figures) .....	56

## List of Tables

Table 1. Classification of municipalities into categories .....	6
Table 2. The geographical distribution of the South African population by settlement type and enumeration area type, 2011. ....	12
Table 3. Provincial profiles of towns .....	13
Table 4. Small towns in the Free State (Marais 2004).....	18
Table 5. Employment status of farm dwellers by sector, 2011. ....	19
Table 6. Agricultural production in different provinces and labour use .....	21
Table 7. Agricultural employment in different sectors in South Africa .....	27
Table 8. A comparison of wool production for emerging wool farmers and commercial wool farming in South Africa, 2004.....	30

# Rural-Urban Linkages: South Africa Case Study

## A. DEFINITIONS

Many comparative analyses of South African demographics, settlement patterns, and population flows are bedevilled by complex and varying definitions. Great care should be taken when drawing ostensible conclusions.

### 1. “Rural” and “urban”

#### 1.1 A complex range of spatial settings

The lack of standardization regarding what constitutes the concept of “urban” has hampered comparative research by African urbanization scholars (Collinson et al 2007:77). The following categories were used by Collinson et al (2007), using data from the 2001 national census:

South Africa has a very varied range of settlement types, which include the following (based on Collinson et al 2006; Cross 2000):

- Metropolitan formal, including large black and coloured townships joined to metropolitan areas
- Other urban formal: The non-metropolitan urban areas, such as secondary and tertiary towns, as well as many black and coloured townships
- Urban informal (“informal settlements”), which are often on the peri-urban fringe.
- Former homeland areas: This category is highly simplified since it contains a rural-urban continuum, including formal “dormitory townships” or “dense rural settlements” (but without any economically functional core), small towns, agricultural villages, and small farms
- Commercial agriculture: This category contains the rural industry settlement type, often, but not exclusively based on white-owned farms and black or coloured farmworkers.

Some of these categories straddle the “urban” and “rural” categories. Formal small towns are sometimes referred to as “urban”, and sometimes as “rural towns”. Rural dense settlements are, in some senses, urban (referring to population density), but in other senses, rural (they lack an urban economic core, and are often strongly linked with the surrounding villages and farms. The terms “urban” and “rural” therefore have different meanings: Urban areas can range on a continuum from formal to informal, and rural areas vary widely between according to population density, levels of modern agriculture, and types of social governance.

The B1 to B4 classification system has been developed by the Palmer Development Group. The definition below can be found in Chapter 12 of the National Treasury’s Local Government Budget and Expenditure Review (2011). Although this is not an official

definition, it is used very widely for analysis purposes and helps to make a case for the differentiated approach to municipalities:

**Table 1. Classification of municipalities into categories**

Table 12.1 Classification of municipalities into categories for analysis		
Class	Characteristics	Number
<b>Metros</b>	Category A municipalities	6
<b>Secondary cities (B1)</b>	All local municipalities referred to as secondary cities	21
<b>Large towns (B2)</b>	All local municipalities with an urban core. There is huge variation in population sizes amongst these municipalities and they do have large urban dwelling population.	29
<b>Small towns (B3)</b>	They are characterised by no large town as a core urban settlement. Typically, these municipalities have a relatively small population, a significant proportion of which is urban and based in one or more small towns. Rural areas in this category are characterised by the presence of commercial farms, as these local economies are largely agriculturally based. The existence of such important rural areas and agriculture sector explains its inclusion in the analysis of rural municipalities.	111
<b>Mostly rural (B4)</b>	These are characterised by the presence of at most one or two small towns in their areas, communal land tenure and villages or scattered groups of dwellings and typically located in former homelands	70
<b>Districts (C1)</b>	District municipalities that are not water services providers.	25
<b>Districts (C2)</b>	District municipalities that are water service providers	21

Source: Palmer Development Group (PDG)

*Explanatory note:* In the table above, the District Municipalities which *are* water services providers are typically located in “deep rural” or “traditional” areas, consisting of traditional villages and communal land ownership (these were the erstwhile “homelands”). In the past, these areas did not have conventional municipalities, and their current Local Municipalities are still extremely weak. Therefore the DMs took on the role of Water Services Providers.

Conversely, the DMs which *are not* water services providers are typically located in more western-type areas, consisting of large towns, small towns and commercial farmland (the erstwhile “white South Africa”). In these areas, the towns have had many decades (often over a century) of municipal governance, so the current Local Municipalities are fairly competent to manage water services provision. Therefore the DMs do not have to execute this function.

## 1.2 Changing official definitions

The South African census definitions of these terms changed significantly between 1996 and 2001. Until 1996, “urban” areas were defined as “areas with local authorities”, regardless of their spatial features.

Since 2001, the definition has been based on spatial form and land use.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, smallholdings, mining towns and residential peri-urban areas were henceforth classified as “urban” (StatsSA 2001: 1-10).<sup>2</sup> In traditional areas, villages were still regarded as rural, but the bigger towns were reclassified as “urban”. Consequently, a proportion of the population were, by definitional fiat, reclassified as urban. This could lead to inaccuracies if 1996 and 2001 figures are compared, without taking these changes into account. The real change between rural and urban population between 1996 and 2001, for example, was 2.4% for these five years, and not 3.8% if the two censuses are compared without cognisance of the definitional change.

A further complication is the changing boundaries of magisterial districts (which were the original unit of analysis in the censuses, and have now been replaced by municipal boundaries). In addition, municipal boundaries changed dramatically in 2000, when over 800 municipalities were consolidated in just over 300 municipalities. It is therefore problematic to attempt comparisons between regions over time, particularly before and after 2000.

Another dilemma is that virtually all South African data is collected according to municipal boundaries. But the constitutional classification of municipalities does not distinguish between municipalities in urban and rural areas. It is also important to note that many large urban or metro municipalities, such as eThekweni (Durban) and Tshwane (Pretoria), contain areas that are functionally rural (National Treasury 2011:192). Outside of the nine metropolitan municipalities, the only distinction made is between local (category B) and district (category C) municipalities. In terms of this definition, all South Africa’s land surface (with the exception of the metros) falls within Local Municipalities (LMs); and several LMs combine to make up a District Municipality (DMs). Rural areas straddle almost all these LMs and DMs. Typically, each LM has one or two relatively strong towns (although they may be fairly small, and they may vary widely in size), while each DM has one or two relatively major urban hubs.

## 2. “Farming areas”

The 2011 Census (Stats SA, 2013b) categorized people living in South Africa by Geography Type, i.e., whether they reside in an Urban Area, a Traditional or Tribal Area, or a Farm area (See table below).

This categorization reflects a distinct dichotomy of rural areas in South Africa: “Some researchers have described the dichotomy as commercial vs. subsistence or as large-

---

<sup>1</sup> This was not only due to the inadequate definition based on local authority status, but also because all South African areas (rural and urban) now fall within municipal jurisdictions.

<sup>2</sup> , pp. 1-10.

scale vs. small-scale, however, both of these typologies are, at best, generalizations. For example, Greenberg (2013), points out that if farmers are classified as being small- or large-scale according to a definition proposed by Kirsten (2011), then 56.5% of farmers classified as being 'commercial farmers' in the 2007 Census of agriculture would be classified as being small-scale. Likewise, Armour's (2013) and AgriSETA's (2010) respective typologies of South African farmers both include categories of commercial farming in Traditional or Tribal areas" (Ferrer 2013: 2). Some level of commercial farming takes place in both contexts, albeit to different degrees and at different scale.

The land in the traditional areas is actually owned by the state (not the traditional leaders) but governed under traditional tenure arrangements in which households typically do have exclusive use-rights to arable land. Households' arable allotments are typically small (often less than one hectare per household) and often fragmented.

### **3. "Farm workers" and "farm dwellers"**

Traditionally, South African commercial farms were occupied by (white) owners or managers, and numerous households of black or coloured families. These families offered the labour of one or more of their members – including men, who worked in the fields or with livestock, and women, who worked in the home of the farm owner or manager. Many other family members, including the elderly, schoolgoing children, small children, and unemployed people also lived there, occasionally providing their labour, often on a seasonal basis.

This created the distinction between "farm workers" and "farm dwellers". All South African rural legislation has a differential impact on these two categories. For farm workers, legislation may impact either their jobs or their place of residence; for farm dwellers, legislation may impact on whether they continue to live on the farms or move to the towns. In particular, the Extension of Security of Tenure Act has had the effect on farmers of reducing jobs on farms (because they fear that workers may obtain possible land residential rights on the farms), and to encourage – or force – farm dwellers to move off-farm. This has been one of the most counterproductive pieces of legislation in post-apartheid South Africa, since it has had diametrically the opposite effect to what was intended – to secure farm workers' residential rights on farms.

Ferrer (2013:14) notes that it is challenging to reconcile statistics from various sources, including the Quarter Labour Force Survey (QLFS), StatsSA and other sources:

- The QLFS is conducted at a point in time that may not coincide with peak employment in the industry. Some sources tend to report peak employment levels during the year.
- Employment statistics in the sector are sometimes measured differently. For example, the QLFS reports employment as the number of people employed, whereas some sources report employment as the number of "full-time equivalent" employees.
- Employment statistics in the sector are often defined differently. For example, (a) the QLFS (Stats SA, 2013c) includes employment in forestry and fisheries as being part of agricultural employment, Census of Agriculture (Stats SA, 2013a)

does not; (b) domestic workers on farms are not included in employment in agriculture in the QLFS, yet they are in industry employment statistics published by the South African Sugar Association (SASA, 2013); and (c) some agricultural employment statistics include employment in primary processing of farm produce, whereas others do not.

#### **4. “Households”**

Definitions of “households” can also be complex. The “household” is a very slippery concept, comprised of various power relations, and decisions are not necessarily collective or representative (Cross et al 1998: 636). Households are highly fluid in composition, and often merge into wider social networks. A crucial issue is the “residency requirement” in the definition of a household: How frequently must a person live in a house in order to count as a member of the household? The formal definition used in the South African census is: “The criterion for inclusion was that a person had slept in the household on the night of census enumeration.” In contrast, the AHDSS (Agincourt Health and Demographic Surveillance System (AHDSS) situated in Mpumalanga Province) defines a household as ‘a group of people living on the same property who eat from the same pot of food’. “Temporary migrants” are defined as those who have lived in the household for 6-12 months of the year to date, and who are still viewed by the household as current members; they are counted as members even if they are not present on the day of the census. Permanent migrants (those whose move out of the household is reported as ‘final’ by household members) are not counted as part of the household (Madhavan et al 2009: 39).

The counting of migrants raises problems of data collection and analysis, because they are often part of two households – one in the place of origin, and one in the place of destination, thus resulting in double-counting. In some surveys, they may be captured in the place of origin, and in other surveys, in the place of destination, resulting in misleading results. There is also a problem of reporting errors: what can one expect members of the household of origin to know about migrant household members? Would a respondent who sees a migrant household member only for a few days a year, for example, be able to provide reliable information on how much income the migrant earns? (Posel 2003a: 363).

The definition of a ‘household’ may include a subjective element, which may vary from one household to another. It seems that the recording of migrant workers at the households to which they have migrated leads to an estimation of labour migration that is less than that derived by counting labour migrants at the households from which migration has occurred.

One explanation for this is that there may be differences in the identification of membership in the household of origin, by those who have remained behind and by those who have out-migrated. For example, parents may view their children who have left the household as continuing to have membership in that household, while the children, living in another household, do not (Posel and Casale 2003).

Furthermore, different censuses have emphasised different aspects of migrancy. Whereas the 1996 census asked about labour migrants *per se*, the 2001 census simply asked about people who have moved residence. There is no way of establishing which individuals are migrant workers who retain membership in another household and which individuals have moved permanently (Posel 2003a: 365). Such questions were indeed inserted in later surveys.

The issue of migrancy statistics is part of a broader problem. South Africa has numerous datasets and national surveys. However, “The incomparability and shallow nature of South African datasets in terms of migration has been lamented by many researchers attempting to document and analyse the phenomenon. Many studies have focused on smaller regions within the country rather than on a national level. The demarcation of new provinces and the vastly different characteristics of nine provinces render the generalisation of local studies to the national level an inane exercise” (Moses and Yu 2009: 2).

## 5. “Unemployment”

South African statistics have been bedevilled by a major definitional shift. In 1996, a new definition was adopted: The *unemployed* are those people within the economically active

population who:

- (a) did not work during the seven days prior to the interview;
- (b) want to work and are available to start work within a week of the interview; and
- (c) have taken active steps to look for work or to start some form of self-employment in the four weeks prior to the interview.

The addition of criterion (c) has made all the difference, as it no longer counts “discouraged workseekers” as unemployed; it only counts active work-seekers. Due to this definitional fiat, the unemployment rate appeared to have dropped, in 1997, from 37.6% (the expanded definition) to 22.9% (the official unemployment definition).

Another difficulty is comparing census data with the “official” labour market statistics in the country (the Quarterly Labour Force Survey (QLFS)). The reference period for employment in Census 2011 was fixed (the 7 days before Census night of 9/10 October). In contrast, the QLFS used a moving reference period (the week prior to the date of the interview) over a three-month period. The QLFS therefore included persons who were employed during the course of every month in the October-December quarter while in principle; the census only included those employed in the first week of October. For these reasons, nationally, the unemployment rate in Census 2011 was 5.9 percentage points higher than in the QLFS\_Q4: 2011 based on the official definition and 4.6 percentage points higher based on the expanded definition (StatsSA 2011: 55).

Different survey methods also yield significantly different results. In the measurement of employment and unemployment, the two main methods are the Censuses (recently,

2006, 2001 and 2011), and the Quarterly Labour Force Survey. Their results differ significantly (which is not surprising, given their different methodologies).

## **6. “Business”**

Businesses can be divided into the following categories (based on CDE 2004: 16).

1. Survivalist enterprises are: pre-entrepreneurial, low income, usually no paid employees, directed mainly at keeping alive, unregistered, non-tax paying, and hence informal in status
2. Micro-enterprises: operating below the VAT registration limit, often unregistered for other purposes as well, fewer than five employees
3. Very small enterprises: fewer than 10 paid employees, but registered for tax and other purposes and hence formal in status
4. Small enterprise: Fewer than 50 employees, and formally registered
5. Medium enterprises: Up to 100 employees, or 200 in mining, manufacturing and construction.
6. Large enterprises: More than 100 employees, or 200 in the case of mining, manufacturing and construction.

## **B. DEMOGRAPHICS**

### **1. Levels of urbanization**

Between the two censuses (1996 and 2001), the rural population declined from 44.9% of the population to 42.5% (StatsSA 2001). South Africa is slightly more urbanised than the international average: 60% of the population is now urbanised, and this is projected to grow to 70% by 2030 (National Planning Commission 2011: 84).

The rapid influx of migrants into cities may in part be a response to the ending of decades of restrictive apartheid legislation which artificially held down the level of urbanization and enforced a high level of circular migration.

The following table provides an overview of South African population distribution. Note that “urban areas” includes metros, large towns and small towns. The very large proportion of people still living in traditional rural areas is notable, and this creates great developmental challenges in a rapidly modernising economy. What must become of these areas, which are currently still trapped in communal land ownership systems, and therefore do not enable the development of capitalist agriculture, is still a matter of political debate. The current ANC government is closely allied to traditional leaders, especially since President Zuma has a strongly traditionalist mind-set. But there is strong opposition from more modern civil society groupings to reinforcing chiefs’ powers and rights. The Communal Land Rights Bill, which would entrench chiefs’ powers, has been so hotly contested that it has been shelved for the time being.

**Table 2. The geographical distribution of the South African population by settlement type and enumeration area type, 2011.**

Enumeration area type	Geography type			Total
	Urban area	Tribal or Traditional area	Farm	
Formal residential	28,346,689	511,426	26,970	28,885,085
Informal residential	2,920,093	24,309	47,071	2,991,473
Traditional residential	-	15,868,764	344,753	16,213,517
Farms	-	-	2,078,723	2,078,723
Parks and recreation	10,022	764	25,213	35,999
Collective living quarters	551,163	24,754	33,990	609,907
Industrial	136,980	3,887	17,111	157,978
Small holdings	284,237	10,052	157,523	451,812
Vacant	26,956	32,632	-	59,588
Commercial	283,192	2,035	1,250	286,477
<b>Total</b>	<b>32,559,331</b>	<b>16,478,624</b>	<b>2,732,605</b>	<b>51,770,560</b>

Source: Census 2011 (Stats SA, 2013b)

## 2. Provincial diversity

The provinces are also experiencing diverging paths in terms of their rural and urban profile. Between 1996-2001, three of the nine provinces (KwaZulu-Natal, Free State and the Northern Cape) showed a substantial shift from rural to urban populations, of between 4-7 percentage points; three provinces showed a significant increase (around two percentage points); and three showed a very slight increase in urban predominance.

The 2011 Census showed that people tend to move into the highly urbanised Gauteng Province from other provinces and outside the country. Only 56.0% of people counted in Gauteng during Census 2011 were born there (StatsSA 2011). The two most urbanised provinces (Gauteng and Western Cape) showed the most net in-migration; two highly rural provinces (North-West and Mpumalanga) showed significant in-migration; and five provinces showed net out-migration. These provinces have large rural hinterlands, although two (Free State and KwaZulu-Natal), also have substantial towns and cities. This complex picture shows an overarching trend towards urban provinces, but a strong

subsidiary trend away from weaker urban areas, and a surprising trend of migration back to rural provinces (StatSA 2011a: 26).

In the following table (compiled by Doreen Atkinson from 1996 census figures, the population figures of various cities and towns are indicated. After 2000, census data was collected according to the revised and consolidated municipal boundaries, which are very different from a town-based profile. The municipalities often consist of several towns, and the rural or semi-rural areas in between.

In some cases, it is sometimes difficult to decide where the actual borders of these towns are, because of dense peri-urban settlements. The figures are sometimes rather arbitrary, and depended on the pre-2000 municipal demarcation.

Given that the data is almost 20 years old, it does not give an accurate contemporary picture. However, the spatial profiles of the provinces and their urban hierarchies remain broadly similar. **See Appendix 3** for a full list of South African cities and towns by population categories (1996 figures).

**Table 3. Provincial profiles of towns**

Province	Description	Towns Below 25 000	Towns 25- 50 000	Towns 50- 75 000	Towns 75- 100 000	Towns 100- 600 000+
Eastern Cape	Two metros, several strong towns, some commercial farmland, and vast traditional rural areas with small villages	67	14	2	3	5
Free State	One strong city, several strong towns, largescale commercial farmland, and numerous small towns	48	15	3	5	6
Gauteng	Three large metros and a few large towns, many of them forming conurbations	-	2	-	1	18
KwaZulu-Natal	One metro, several strong towns, some commercial farmland, and large traditional rural areas with small	40	8	5	1	10

	villages					
Mpumalanga	Several strong towns, many small towns, some commercial farmland, and large traditional rural hinterland with small villages	23	7	5	5	12
Northern Cape	Two strong towns and numerous small towns in an arid and sparsely-populated hinterland	56	4	2	-	1
Limpopo	A few strong towns, some small towns, some commercial farmland, and a vast traditional rural area with many villages	4	2	2	1	5
North-West	A few strong towns, several small towns, some commercial farmland, and a large traditional hinterland with small villages	13	6	2	1	9
Western Cape	One metro, many strong towns, many small towns and commercial agricultural hinterland	79	6	7	1	10

*Source: compiled by Doreen Atkinson from 1996 census figures*

### **3. The cities and secondary towns**

The nine largest cities are growing, but not at the same rate. Between 1996 and 2001, not all cities grew at the same or even at a similar rate, with three categories becoming clear. There were three fast growth cities (Ekurhuleni on the East Rand, Johannesburg Metro, and Tshwane Metro centred on Pretoria). There were two stable growth cities (Cape Town Metro and eThekweni/Durban). Then there were four slow-growth cities (Mangaung/Bloemfontein, Msunduzi/Pietermaritzburg, Nelson Mandela/Port Elizabeth, and Buffalo City/East London) (Singh 2005: 8).

Four “super-growth” secondary towns are outstripping the main cities, in terms of their growth rate. These are uMhlatuze (Richards Bay), Pholokwane (Pietersburg), Mogale City (Krugersdorp on the West Rand), and Rustenburg (Singh 2005: 10). So while the large cities may be stabilizing, some of the smaller cities are in a high-growth phase. Cross et al (2000: 9) supported this observation: New settlements with rapid immigration over the last five years are appearing most often in secondary cities and small towns.

An important question is what drives the economy of the more vibrant secondary cities. Important insights are offered by the 2014 report on intermediate cities compiled by the South African Cities Network (Marais et al, 2014). The report usefully distinguishes between *secondary cities*, which refers to cities that are below the metropolitan areas in the urban hierarchy; and *intermediate cities*, which describes the functional role of larger, non-metro urban areas, as they “mediate” between metros and smaller urban areas or rural areas (Marais 2014:vii).

Intermediate cities contain a significant percentage (40%) of the South African population and, although metropolitan municipalities are growing the fastest, intermediate cities are also expanding their share of the South African population. Thus, intermediate (and smaller) cities help provide a more balanced settlement environment, taking some pressure off the larger urban agglomerations (Marais et al 2014: 30).

#### **Population of secondary cities**

Marais et al (2014) studied six secondary cities (George, Klerksdorp/Matlosana, Richard’s Bay/ uMhlatuze, Witbank/ Emalahleni, Vanderbijlpark/ Vereeniging/ Emfuleni, and Pietersburg/ Polokwane).

Their populations ranged between 194 000 and 722 000, with an average size of 455 000. In contrast, the smallest metro has 748 000 people, while the largest metro has 4.4 million people.

The average Gross Value Added (GVA) for 2011, for these six secondary cities, was R13 billion, while the average GVA for the metros was R203 billion.

Marais et al (2014) argue that secondary cities tend to be dependent on one key sector, which makes them more vulnerable to economic shifts than are the metros. Furthermore, the economic growth rate of the metros have been consistently higher than that of the secondary cities studied (an average of 3.9% per annum in the metros, compared to an average of 1.8% per annum, in the period 1996-2011). The secondary cities are also hampered by much less effective municipal government than is the case in the metros, with the result that business growth is undermined.

The secondary cities have an important advantage of location: “Key components of location include transportation and communication networks linking to the rural hinterland and larger urban areas. Ideally, intermediate cities should be close enough to large urban centres to benefit from developments in the metropolitan area but far enough away to avoid full integration with these larger cities” (Marais et al 2014: 28).

Several of these cities have international linkages (although usually only within one sector), and also host multinational companies – mainly in mining and transport (the harbour in Richard’s Bay). Three of the cities provide important commercial agricultural services. One of the cities (George) is a strong tourism destination, Witbank has a strong coal and energy sector, and Vereeniging/Vanderbijlpark developed around the steel industry.

The secondary cities appear to have a worse poverty profile than the metros: “Poverty levels in intermediate cities [around 23%] are significantly higher than in metropolitan areas [around 15%]...The informal sector is proportionally larger in intermediate cities [24%] than in metropolitan areas [16%]. The higher levels of poverty and a larger informal economy suggest that intermediate cities are in a more precarious position than metropolitan areas, but their smaller, fairly dense settlements might also allow for significant scale-related advantages in addressing poverty” (Marais et al 2014: 39).

The report argues that the secondary cities have significant economic potential: “These cities provide social and economic services and infrastructure to impoverished regions, and so rural development policies need to consider the role of intermediate cities. They can also play an

important role in poverty reduction strategies, given the higher percentage of poor people living in intermediate cities (compared to metropolitan areas)” (Marais et al 2014: 45). Public works programmes, for example, could be rolled out more extensively in secondary cities.

#### **4. Peri-urban and “dense rural settlements”**

An unusual aspect of South African history is the creation of dense rural settlements. Under Apartheid, many black people were forcefully relocated from “white” urban and rural areas, and sent to live in the black bantustans. In some cases, new dormitory towns were created to house these people. These towns were often located near the border of the bantustans, where they would effectively qualify for bantustan “citizenship” (and thereby be deprived of South African citizenship), but be near enough to white-owned industrial and commercial areas, to supply their labour. The only way of sustaining this system of keeping the black population as far away as possible but utilizing their labour services was by means of a heavily subsidized transport system (Singh 2005: 16).

Cross et al (2000:16-20) identifies several types of “non-urban dense settlements:”

- Metro peri-urban dense settlements: Because of proximity to the metro centres and their infrastructure grids, infrastructural delivery is fairly well developed in many of these areas, although there is a constant backlog due to fresh immigration. Examples are Winterveld and Hammanskraal near Pretoria (part of Tshwane Metro), Bester’s Camp near Durban (<http://informalcity.co.za/book/export/html/59>), and Khayelitsha, east of Cape Town.

- Rural peri-urbanization around rural towns and smaller cities represents the second important rural/urban interface for the rural population. This settlement class includes all rural settlements with density higher than 400 /km<sup>2</sup>, which are located from two to 10 or 20 kilometers from a rural town. Many of these settlements are on disputed territory, often state or municipal land, and are often under pressure for possible removal or resettlement. Infrastructural delivery to these settlements varies in how far it has advanced, while funding for delivery from the municipality or province is often an issue holding back completion. For the rural centres that are vibrant and growing, these dense peri-urban settlements can offer better economic and infrastructural opportunities than the metros, which are now supporting large disadvantaged populations with very high rates of unemployment. However, many or most rural centres have stagnant or declining economies, and are pushed to the limit by the delivery needs of an increasing population of the poor on their fringes. Examples are Botshabelo near the town of Thaba Nchu in the Free State (about 40 km from Bloemfontein) and Zwelitsha near King William's Town in the Eastern Cape ([www.zwelitsha.co.za](http://www.zwelitsha.co.za)).

Referring to the two categories above, Cross et al (2000) identified 4922 dense rural settlements. The number of people involved, is staggering: "The total urban informal dense population of South Africa appears to be less than three million people, while the rural dense sector accounts for as many as ten million" (Cross et al 2000:8).

Free-standing rural densification accounts for by far the largest share of dense rural settlement, and is not linked closely to any level of urban centre. Some of this dense settlement relates to local-level locational advantage, but much of it seems to have no spatial rationale other than apartheid's historical preference for displacing black settlement to remote areas away from the urban core (Cross et al 2000: 20). History remains an important determinant of urbanization trends and patterns.

After apartheid, these quasi-urban areas still remain important (and often growing) residential zones. After apartheid, the provision of many government services has increased in these areas – these include housing, schools, clinics and infrastructure. This has encouraged people to remain in these areas, although their working-age household members may well migrate to the cities to obtain jobs. "The locational advantage of these settlements continues to be seen in the continuous densification of the population on the edges of townships, where the cost of living is relatively cheaper and transport and services are still accessible" (Singh 2005: 16).

These areas often lack job opportunities within their towns, as they do not attract business investment – being situated far from markets and sophisticated banking or telecommunications services. They retain their primary functions of dormitory services and "reproduction of labour power", where children are raised and educated. Cross et al (2000:4) pose the critical policy question: "Whether or not this rural population and that of the urban dense areas can be drawn into mainstream economic life?".

These areas are also an important staging post for rural people migrating to more vibrant economic areas.

These residential patterns in these areas have social and cultural consequences. People from the same rural communities often settle in the same peri-urban neighbourhoods, whether these are formal residential areas or informal squatter camps. Such peri-urban areas can become ethnic exclusionary zones.

### 5. Small towns

Small and medium-sized towns have experienced a minor demographic revolution. As noted above, this is due to rapid in-migration of farm workers (due to economic and labour dynamics in the commercial farming sector). But it is also due to widespread migration of people away from the erstwhile homelands, towards small towns (Cross et al, 1998).

**Table 4. Small towns in the Free State (Marais 2004)**

	Cities	Regional towns	Middle-order towns	Small towns
1991	1 028 841	124 042	257 515	245 168
2001	1 097 182	158 617	355 661	435 607
% change per annum 1991 – 2001	0,9 %	3,1 %	3,5 %	8,9 %

The migration of people away from the erstwhile homelands (e.g. Transkei and Ciskei) to the erstwhile “white South African towns” is an interesting phenomenon. It is likely that such people still have land available in the rural areas. However, their need for social services (access to social grants, and better quality schools and health care), as well as their desire for a formal sector job, encourages them to leave the rural areas (possibly keeping some family members there as a fall-back). In the eastern Karoo, there appears to have been a major growth in the black population.

In the towns with a static or shrinking formal sector, this in-migration leads to a growing number of unemployed people. A proportion of these individuals and families may attempt some kind of informal economic activity.

### 6. Farm workers

The dynamics regarding farm workers are extremely complex in South Africa. During most of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, farm workers were “trapped” on farms, by means of apartheid influx control regulations which prevented them from moving to the towns and cities, where economic prospects were better. The advent of democracy in 1994 changed the legal environment, and farm workers could now freely move to wherever they wished.

The table below provides an overview of this sector. Many farm dwellers work in formal agriculture (about half a million), in informal agriculture (about 210 000 – presumably in small-holdings), and in private households (presumably domestic work for farmers’ households). The large number of respondents in “fuzzy categories” (“do not know”, “not applicable”) suggests a great deal of disguised unemployment or mixed livelihoods in rural areas.

**Table 5. Employment status of farm dwellers by sector, 2011.**

Type of sector	Official employment status					Total
	Employed	Un-employed	Discouraged work-seeker	Other not economically active	Not applicable	
In the formal sector	506,364	-	-	-	12,956	519,320
In the informal sector	213,528	-	-	-	4,589	218,117
Private household	139,659	-	-	-	4,359	144,018
Do not know	23,360	-	-	-	613	23,974
Not applicable	-	100,117	51,196	413,014	608,966	1,173,294
Total	882,912	100,117	51,196	413,014	631,484	2,078,723

Source: Census 2011 (Stats SA, 2013).

Employment on commercial farms has declined over the long-term (Aliber et al 2007; Liebenberg 2012; cited in Ferrer 2013). From 1971 to 2002, the number of employees in the sector declined from 1.516 million to 0.941 million (a decline of 37.9%). According to Liebenberg (2012) employment in the sector declined from 1.25 million in 1990 to 0.83 million in 2010. Statistical variations are possible because of seasonal changes in labour patterns, as well as different enumeration methods. Absolute numbers of both permanent and seasonal/casual workers declined, but permanent employment decreased more significantly compared to seasonal/casual employment (Aliber, et al., 2007). Aliber et al. (2007) argue that this pattern of job shedding in commercial agriculture fits the stereotype of developed countries, but also points out that employment has declined as the “perceived” real costs of labour (which includes “historic costs”, as well as transaction costs and perceived risks caused by labour legislation) have increased. Furthermore, the increased provision of social grants may have increased reservation wages in agriculture because rural households have become less dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods.

Many farm workers have moved to the towns and cities during the last 20 years. In the towns, social services (such as housing, schools and clinics) are better, and where social life is freer and more creative (Sithole 2005: 32). Many managed to secure employment in the towns, while others live in the urban “township houses” or squatter areas, and subsist on a combination of social grants and small-scale farming on nearby commonage land. Correspondingly, many government social services on the farms (such as farm schools and clinics) have declined or disappeared, prompting a further exodus from the farms.

Many farmers have proactively reduced their labour force, in the face of new labour legislation and minimum wage laws (Stanwix 2013), as well as a much more competitive international agricultural market, and much reduced tariff protection of the agricultural sector. Those workers who remained often earned above the minimum wage level (Theron and Visser 2012: 23).

Nevertheless, many farm workers actually *want* to stay on farms, because they prefer the rural environment, or because they are on good terms with their employers, or because they dread the crime and grime of the towns and cities. Many of these farm workers have been forcefully evicted, because of the labour and economic environment mentioned earlier. To assist these farm workers to remain on the land (often against the preferences of the farmers), new legislation was introduced (*The Extension of Security of Tenure Act*, or ESTA, of 1997) which attempted to *protect* farm workers’ residential rights on farms. In many cases, farmers managed to circumvent these rights, either by following the legal process in ESTA, or simply by ignoring ESTA and not being prosecuted. So ironically, whereas many farm workers under apartheid were keen to leave the farms, but were prevented from leaving, many are now keen to stay, but are forced out, as farmers shed labour.

Many farmers now require a much smaller but much more skilled labour force (Barrientos and Visser 2012). They have difficulties attracting such workers, at least partly because the ANC government has, unintentionally, undermined the training of workers – by the closure of the colleges which existed before 1990, and by the creation of an unwieldy and unproductively bureaucratic training system. In this context, many middle-level and senior-level agricultural employees are now graduates of Departments of Agriculture at universities; many are middle-class white and black people, and they return to the farming sector (particularly in agri-business and corporate operations) as professionals. Compared to the rural population, the numbers of these people are not large, but they make a major impact in the professionalisation of agriculture.

There remains a need for unskilled, often temporary, workers. This has led to rapid immigration – either circular or permanent – of black workers, from the rural areas, to small agricultural towns. This tends to happen in areas with highly intensive horticultural crops, where farms are small and located near to the towns, and it is easy to transport workforces to and from the residential villages. The Western Cape’s agricultural sector is a typical case, but other regions are the wine-growing area near Upington (Northern Cape), the horticultural area in the Eastern Free State (near the towns of Ficksburg and Fouriesburg), and intensive vegetable-growing areas in Mpumalanga.

**Table 6. Agricultural production in different provinces and labour use**

Enterprise	Extent (ha)	Primary production regions	Labour use
Maize	2 700 000ha	Free State: 42% North West: 21% Mpumalanga: 20%	Generally low (about 1 worker per 100 hectares)
Sunflower seed	300 000ha	Free State: 42% North West: 33%	
Soya beans	470 000ha	Mpumalanga: 42% Free State: 37% KwaZulu-Natal: 7%	
Dry beans	40 000ha	Free State: 36.9% Mpumalanga: 17.8% Limpopo: 13.1%	
Wheat	500 000ha	Western Cape: 53% Free State: 25%	
Barley	90 000ha	Mostly in the Southern Cape.	
Canola		Western Cape: 93%	
Cotton	10 000ha	Mpumalanga, Limpopo, Northern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and North West	25 mandays per hectare (dryland) and 45 mandays per hectare (irrigated)
Ground nuts	45 000ha	Free State: 44% North West: 25% Northern Cape: 14%	
Sugarcane	380 000ha	Kwazulu-Natal: 80% Mpumalanga: 20%	About 77 000 on farm employees, but because a large proportion of farmworkers are seasonal employees, employment is

			about 55 000 Full-time equivalents.
Other field crops including tobacco, spice crops, fiber crops such as sisal, and beverage crops such as hops			
Fresh and canned fruit (including table grapes) and Dried fruit	74 499ha	Western Cape: 74% Northern Cape: 15% Eastern Cape: 8%	99 778 people are employed in deciduous fruit production.  Grapes (table and dried), apples and pears account for over 81 000 farm workers.
Grapes for wine production	100 568ha	Predominantly the Western Province and northern parts of the Northern Cape.	24 136 permanent employees and 6 034 seasonal employees.
Avocados	15 000ha	Mostly produced in the Limpopo Province, Mpumalanga and KwaZulu-Natal.	Approximately 1.3 employees per hectare (BFAP, 2012), or more than 62 000 employees in total (my estimate)
Pineapples	12 000ha		
Bananas	12 000ha		
Mangoes	7 000ha		
Litchis	1 700ha		
Also papayas, granadillas, guavas and macadamias			
Citrus: Oranges, grapefruit, lemons and	60 000ha	Produced mostly in Limpopo, the Eastern Cape, the Western Cape, Mpumalanga and KwaZulu-Natal.	10 200 permanent jobs plus 70 875 temporary jobs during the harvesting season

naartjies.			(6 months).
Vegetables (excluding potatoes)	30 000ha	Vegetables are produced country wide.	>1.3 employees per hectare  Tomatoes account for over 33 000 farm workers
Potatoes	Between 50 000 and 55 000ha (NAMC, 2007b)	Free State: 30% Limpopo: 18% Western Cape: 19% Mpumalanga: 10%	Approximately 6 000 permanent employees and 25 000 seasonal employees.
Forestry	1.204 million ha	KwaZulu-Natal, Mpumalanga, Limpopo, Eastern Cape, Western Cape.	95 000 employees
Cattle (beef)		Eastern Cape: 23% KwaZulu-Natal: 20%  Free State: 16.6%	
Cattle (dairy): Milk production is the 6th largest agricultural industry in SA. The number of milk producers has declined sharply due to consolidation of dairy farms to achieve economies of size.		Western Cape: 25.4% Free State: 22.4% North West: 14.4% KwaZulu-Natal: 12% Eastern Cape: 11.7%	
Sheep (mutton and lamb)		Eastern Cape: 29.1% Northern Cape: 24.6% Free State: 20% Western Cape: 11.6%	

Sheep (wool)		Eastern Cape: 13.9 million kg per annum Free State: 9 million kg per annum Western Cape: 8 million kg per annum Northern Cape: 5.3 million kg per annum	
Goats		Eastern Cape: 38% Limpopo: 20%	
Pork		Limpopo: 23% North West: 20%	
Poultry (broilers and eggs)		Western Cape: 27% North West: 15.8% Gauteng: 15.7% KwaZulu-Natal: 15% Mpumalanga: 14.1%	Employment of 74000 people in 2005, of which 73% are employed in the broiler industry (NAMC, 2007c)
Ostriches		90% in the Oudtshoorn, Swellendam, Mossel Bay region of the Western Cape.	
Mohair		Eastern Cape	
<b>Game farming</b> is the fastest-growing branch of agriculture in South Africa. Very significant.		Limpopo, Northern Cape, Eastern Cape, Western Cape.	
<b>Aquaculture and fishing:</b> Several initiatives to promote inland aquaculture.		Western Cape, Eastern Cape, Limpopo, Mpumalanga and Northern KwaZulu-Natal	

(Source: Ferrer 2013).

Migration to towns takes place in contexts where large seasonal labour forces are needed. The influx of workers places pressure on employers and local municipalities to provide housing and social services. In the last few years, these workers have experienced greater militancy, and several large strikes, which ironically have had the effect of encouraging farmers to mechanise their operations – and thereby reduce their labour force. Many of those workers who had migrated to the agricultural towns to obtain seasonal work, and now have a precarious foothold in these towns, are now unemployed, but are reluctant to return home to their “deep rural” – where the chances of employment are even less. So they are now becoming bottled up on the outskirts of the rural towns.

Increasingly, many farmers actually prefer their own workers to live off-farm (in nearby towns), and not on-farm (in farmer-provided housing). Not only does this save costs on housing, but it also deflects any future claims by farm workers to have residential rights on the farm (in terms of ESTA, described above). So a new pattern of daily commuting has developed, whereby farm workers are transported by bus or by private farm transport, to their place of work, and back, in the evening (Atkinson 2007). This is a crucial trend, as it means that many more people are effectively urbanised. The spouses and children of farm workers now live in urban areas and enjoy urban amenities (or suffer urban problems). This is a systemic de-linking of “place of work” and “place of residence”, which would have been almost unthinkable three decades ago. In general, such town-farm commuting would take place over distances of 30 km or less.

There is a growing phenomenon of “split families”, whereby parents and very young children live on-farm, while older children, siblings, spouses and grandparents stay in towns or villages elsewhere (Hall et al 2013: 64). This creates a new rural-urban dynamic, as on-farm workers have to liaise with their close relatives living in nearby towns, and are pressured to find affordable transport. As more permanent workers live off-farm, transport is becoming a more critical service. Most farming communities are located far away from towns, with no public transport system in place. Many farmers provide free transport to town on pay days and for social and sport events (Theron and Visser 2012: 10). The most common and cheapest ways for farm workers is to walk or to get a lift. This is very time-consuming and sometimes unsafe, especially for women. Transport by private taxi operators is partly available. However, it is very expensive and mostly only used for specific purposes, such as attending a clinic.

The rural-urban consequences of this rapid 20-year transition have been far-reaching. Many people have moved from farms to towns (either voluntarily or because they were evicted), and therefore are effectively urbanised; many farm workers lost their jobs, and now have worse poverty; many farm workers have moved out of agriculture altogether, into more robust sectors, such as retail and transport; and the ranks of seasonal workers – the most vulnerable of the sector – have grown, often drawing on in-migrants from “deep rural” areas, or from neighbouring countries, with large-scale new migration patterns. This has also brought physical changes to the farms (which are largely de-populated) and the towns (with large new peri-urban formal and informal housing areas), with attendant problems of water, sanitation and electricity provision.

## **7. Post-productivism**

Rural change has been rapid in many parts of the country. The theoretical term “post-productivism” (Halfacree 2006) refers to the changing nature of the rural economy, to include tourism, lifestyle activities, art, craft, boutique towns, sport, recreation and nature conservation. Niche agricultural products (such as organic farming) are also part of this structural rural change. The key driver of post-productivism is that urbanites move to the country on a permanent basis (to invest and obtain an improved quality of life), or on a temporary basis (e.g. tourism). This creates a range of new employment and entrepreneurial opportunities.

The trend towards post-productivism will be varied in nature and extent throughout South Africa. Towns with attractive climate, setting, architecture, heritage and eco-tourism possibilities are typically the first to be “colonized” by new urban settlers (Ingle 2010; Ingle 2013). Tourism is becoming a major income-earner in some rural areas, offering new jobs for some ex-farm workers (Moseley 2008: 296). In more extensive farming areas, conversion to game farming responded to investor and tourist interest and involved major farm mergers (Hall et al 2013: 58).

There are also concerns that the new in-migrants may have negative effects, such as driving up land and housing prices. Such purchases do have the effect of “crowding out” local people from housing and land markets – at least initially. However, there are also compensatory trends. Since agricultural land is a productive asset, expensive land typically suggests well-capitalised investors, who can provide the infrastructure and inputs required of modern farming. The provision of such inputs and services sets in motion further multiplier rounds in the vicinity.

### **C. FOOD SYSTEMS**

#### **1. Food production**

There has been a long debate in South Africa about the merits of large-scale agriculture (providing food at scale, especially for the cities, i.e. food security for the nation) versus the merits of small-scale farming (providing food security for households, absorbing more labour, and building a rural economy (see Atkinson 2006, Palmer and Sender 2006). Government agricultural policy tends to be focused almost exclusively on supporting the existing black small-holder farmers, with the result that systemic changes to the land tenure system in the ex-homelands has not been contemplated. This, effectively, maintains the bifurcated agricultural system.

Furthermore, different types of agricultural industries have vastly different profiles regarding current employment, full-time and part-time employment, residence on farms, future employment prospects, and future demands for skilled/unskilled labour. The South African agricultural sector is diverse and highly developed, but also very exposed to natural and economic fluctuations - which creates multiple stressors and dynamics.

**Table 7. Agricultural employment in different sectors in South Africa**

Industry	Total number of workers
Growing of crops	415,567
Farming of animals	160,112
Growing of crops combined with farming of animals(mixed farming)	74,824
Agricultural and animal husbandry services, except veterinary activities	6,869
Game hunting, trapping and game propagation, including related services	101
Forestry and related services	47,712
Logging and related services	6,147
Ocean and coastal fishing	5,558
Fish hatcheries and fish farms	2,135
Total	719,024

Generally, those agricultural sectors which encourage workers to live on the farms (such as extensive livestock production and game farms) would reduce rural-urban migration, and may even induce urban-rural migration, as workers and families take up residence on farms. However, intensive agriculture such as horticulture (particularly in the Western Cape) on relatively small farms, encourage residence in nearby towns.

## 2. Food markets

For the last twenty years, the rise of supermarkets in South Africa has now reached the rural and urban poor as new customer segments. This is at least partly the legacy of apartheid, where black entrepreneurs were systematically discouraged and undermined by means of racial legislation. In this context, large supermarkets (which are now even larger, and are called “hypermarkets”) took up much of the retail sector.

The last decade has seen a significant increase in the number of retail centres being developed in 'emerging economy' areas - townships and rural areas - in South Africa. In Soweto, for example, at least six shopping centres have opened their doors since 2005. Even in the townships of smaller South African cities, shopping centre developments have sprung up, changing the face of commercial transactions for many residing in these

areas. 160 retail centres have been developed nationally in township and rural areas of South Africa between 1962 and 2009 (Landmark 2011).<sup>3</sup>

Traditional and informal distribution ways are so far the most important sales opportunities for millions of small farmers, which are mostly not capable to fulfil the requirements of the supermarket chains. Supermarkets are putting traditional and informal food vendors in a very unequal market. Supermarkets can guarantee low prices and good quality stock, which is difficult to compete against. Some researchers suggest supermarket model suggests it is inherently hostile towards smaller producers. The South African food retail market structure resembles that of industrialised countries rather than developing countries. Therefore, we should expect that the position of South African small farmers vis-à-vis supermarkets is similar to that of small farmers in industrialised countries, who are increasingly excluded from these value chains (Van den Heiden and Vink 2013).

### **3. Food processing**

At the same time, the processing sector is highly concentrated, putting commercial farmers at a disadvantage. In South Africa, as in much of the world, the agricultural and food industry worldwide, now takes the form of supply chains of vertically related oligopolies have emerged either through ownership, strategic alliances, or contractual relationships (Cutts and Kirsten 2006: 324). The maize to maize meal supply chain, for example, is made up of four main stakeholders: the farmers, the silo or storage industry, the milling industry, and the retail sector. As is the case with most farming sectors, the maize sector in South Africa is not concentrated. It has approximately 9000 farmers planting 3.4 million hectares of maize. The storage and milling industries show a certain degree of concentration, which arose naturally from many years of a single channel controlled marketing system. Even though the number of informal millers has increased rapidly since deregulation, the situation in the milling industry is not very different from that of the storage industry: 73% of the market share is held by four companies (Cutts and Kirsten 2006).

Nevertheless, these processing plants are often located in secondary towns, providing a much-needed boost to local economies. Although the supply chains show a significant degree of concentration of ownership, they also encourage spatial de-concentration.

#### **Rural deconcentration of processing facilities**

In the case of Bothaville (population 46,030 in 2011) in the Free State, for example, large granaries collect the maize crop; this has led to the creation of a major regional annual agricultural show, with excellent facilities; which in turn are leased out to other organisations for the purposes of conducting exhibitions and conferences.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.urbanlandmark.org.za/research/x51.php>

Some processing plants lend themselves to a larger degree of spatial deconcentration. Many towns have small but relatively professional abattoirs, which provide substantial employment in areas where unemployment is rife. However, such modern facilities tend to be located within the commercial farming areas (the historically “white rural areas”), and are much more sparse in the deep rural traditional areas, where there is little capital to establish and run such ventures.

#### **4. Pro-poor agriculture**

A great deal has been written in South Africa about the decline of the agricultural extension services since 1994. This is due to a range of reasons, including the loss of experienced staff, the appointment of young and inexperienced staff, poor management at provincial levels, and a growing political bifurcation between the South African state and commercial agriculture. In effect, commercial farmers receive no support from the state, either in terms of research, technical support, markets or tariffs. The ostensible aim of Government Departments of Agriculture has been to reach out to disadvantaged black farmers, to enable them to improve the quality and quantity of their products, and break into new markets. However, the highly inadequate skills of extension officers has often (but not always) negated this goal.

In this vacuum, producer organisations have become critically important development organisations. Their function is to support commercial farmers, by providing R&D, marketing networks, and policy lobbying. Significantly, the branch offices of these producer organisations are often located in regional towns, thereby boosting the local economies.

These producer organisations now believe that it is in their own interest, as a sector, to reach out to “emergent” or small-scale black farmers, and to build their productive potential.

A major success story has been the South African Woolgrowers Association, which launched a programme of support in the early 2000s. This programme reaches into “deep rural” areas, where skilled staff assist emergent farmers to improve the quality of their sheep, wool and shearing processes. The programme has built numerous rural shearing sheds in local villages, which have become development hubs for local sheep farmers.

Table 8 below shows the far-reaching impact on emergent wool farmers, in the context of a coherent small farmer support programme. Similar success stories can be found in other sectors, such as sugar (in KwaZulu-Natal) and maize (in the central South African provinces, managed by the National Maize Producers Organisation). In such cases, the producers’ organisations - consisting of commercial farmers and their significant financial resources - spearhead the promotion of “emergent” black farmers.

**Table 8. A comparison of wool production for emerging wool farmers and commercial wool farming in South Africa, 2004**

Criteria	Emerging wool farmers: Market through trader	Emerging wool farmers: Market through formal auction (wool development programme)	Commercial wool farmers
Number of farmers	63000	8340	8000
Total wool production	2.3 million kg	2.03 million kg	44.3 million kg
Number of shearing sheds	0	278	Approx. 8000
Farmers per shearing shed	No shearing shed	30	1
Number of sheep	1.9 million	1 million	12.7 million
Sheep per farmer	30	120	300 – 20000
Kg of wool per sheep	1.2kg/sheep	2.03kg/sheep	3.5kg/sheep
Price per kg	R2/kg	R10/kg	R20/kg???
% share of wool production in South Africa	4.7%	4.2%	91.1%

*Source: Marais, Lenka and Venter 2005: 5.*

## **5. Tourism and agriculture**

In the light of the “post-productivist turn” in some rural areas, a growing linkage is that between tourism and agriculture. Rural tourism enterprises are typically owned by white individuals or largely white-owned corporates, and it is very difficult for black entrepreneurs to break into this sophisticated market. Consequently, the potential beneficial impacts of tourism on black communities tend to be in other tourism sectors: craft manufacture and sales, food sales, performing arts, and tour guiding. There is a degree of economic multipliers in practice (often varying greatly from one setting to another), but such “pro-poor” impacts often tend to be in the realm of wishful thinking.

One of the most features of modern rural South Africa is rural tourism, and in particular, safari lodges and game farms. It is often argued that such facilities could support local food production and local farmers, in new tourism-agriculture linkages. Many of these lodges market themselves as being responsive to community needs. But cuisine is an increasingly important aspect of tourism, and ingredients have to be of a high and reliable quality. By far the most of these lodges use urban-based intermediary

purchasers, for the sake of convenience, quality and reliability (Rogerson 2012). The majority of South African lodges source the bulk of their fresh produce from established urban-based distributors or suppliers.

Further barriers to local linkages relate to lack of local farming skills and access to agricultural investment capital.

## **D. LABOUR MARKETS**

### **1. Unemployment**

The most critical, and most discussed problem in South Africa, is unemployment. In 1999, for example, the South African unemployment rate was 23,3% according to the strict (official) definition and 36,2% according to the expanded definition (which includes discouraged jobseekers (those people who said they were unemployed but had not taken active steps to find work in the four weeks prior to the interview, perhaps because they did not feel they had any chance of obtaining work, or because the costs of travelling from home to an area where work might be available were prohibitive, or because of an absence of transport from home to an area where work might be available<sup>4</sup>).

In 1999, the narrow definition of unemployment was now around 23.3% of the workforce, and the older definition at 36.2%. In the March 2004 labour force survey, the results of which were released at the end of September, 27.8 percent of the economically active population was unemployed. On the expanded definition, this rose to 41.2 percent. The two definitions clearly have a very different statistical result.

In addition, as noted above, the Quarterly Labour Force Survey (QLS) and the Censuses also yield different results. In 2011, the QLFS found the unemployment rate (on the narrow definition) to be 23.9%, while the census found it to be 29.8% (on the same definition). So all statistics regarding employment should be treated with great caution.

Many discouraged job seekers will be found in rural areas distant from the major cities and towns, and reflect a deeply entrenched rural-urban divide. However, one should not conclude that rural areas do not have livelihoods: Many livelihoods in the “deep rural areas” are informal, such as livestock-keeping or small-scale vegetable growing, or trading, or transport services, and may not reflect in the employment statistics at all. Also, many services in the rural areas are cheap or free, such as housing, water or household fuel collection (for cooking purposes). There is therefore not a clear relationship between employment and livelihoods.

One factor is commonly agreed on: The rate of unemployment is rising inexorably, due to a phenomenon of “jobless growth”. Numerous commentators and analysts have provided very understandable reasons for this phenomenon<sup>5</sup>. These reasons include:

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.statssa.gov.za/news\\_archive/14oct2004\\_1.asp](http://www.statssa.gov.za/news_archive/14oct2004_1.asp)

<sup>5</sup> For example, see <http://twentythirdfloor.co.za/2010/12/01/causes-of-unemployment-in-south-africa/>

(a) Generally poor education levels thus a mismatch of too much unskilled labour and insufficient skilled labour; (b) the growth in tertiary sectors of the economy at the expense of primary (particularly agriculture and mining) sectors at a rate far faster than the country can be retrained; (c) the rapid decline in the primary sectors reduces the job opportunities for unskilled people; (d) the breakdown of the apprenticeship system which enhanced skills (and not adequately replaced with officially accredited skills training); (e) minimum wages that are higher than levels of productivity, (d) the strong political power of organised labour, (e) overly protective Labour Laws (for employees) making it less attractive to hire new staff; (f) people living far away from work opportunities, e.g. in peri-urban or rural areas, with high costs of travel; (g) the long-term impacts of unemployment which reduce people's workplace skills, culture and employability; (h) a very open economy, with very little tariff protection, making industries highly vulnerable to foreign competition.

An additional factor is that unemployment is particularly high amongst the youth – many of whom have high school diplomas. This is due to their lack of experience, their poor levels of high school education, their inability to understand the workplace, and possibly, a poor attitude to work. For young people with a matriculation certificate, low-grade work is highly unattractive. Most young people aim to go to university or colleges, which are simply not able to accept such large numbers of students. Furthermore, the completion rate at South African colleges is generally poor, due to poor study habits learnt and very poor high schools.

The unemployment problem is therefore complex and chronic: “South Africa has one of the highest rates of unemployment in the world. Job creation is a national priority, yet labor-intensive options are derided by the trade union movement as an unacceptable throwback to the “cheap labor” policies of apartheid, and effectively ruled out by the government in its recent National Development Plan (NDP). Instead, minimum-wage setting in South Africa continues to contribute to job destruction (as evidenced most recently in the clothing industry). Policy-makers hope that support for high-productivity firms and rapid economic growth will make up for job losses and solve the unemployment problem. Unfortunately, South Africa's economic performance has been comparatively disappointing and constrained by negative investor sentiment, especially with regard to the labor market ... Unemployment is likely to remain a significant feature of the South African economic landscape” (Nattrass 2014).

Some of the proposed solutions to dealing with the scourge of unemployment include: The solutions proposed include the relaxation of labor laws, which hinder entry into the labor market, especially for young people; the introduction of special economic zones; the adoption of an open migration regime for skilled migrants; and the establishment of low-fee private schools and private tertiary education providers (Bernstein 2014).

## 2. Employment, unemployment and spatial patterns

There is, conceptually, a strong link between employment and spatial patterns. In South Africa, however, this link has been poorly understood, and at a theoretical level, highly contested. Since 1994, there have been four rough phases of policy thinking: Firstly, from 1994 to about 2002, a “human rights” approach prevailed, whereby poor people – wherever they live – are entitled to certain services, including water, sanitation, electricity, housing, education and health. Extensive government infrastructure was rolled out in cities, towns, and rural areas (particularly “deep rural” areas). There was no clear government position on the desirability of urbanisation, nor were government policies been based on clear spatial assumptions or arguments. The overriding impression is that Government seemed to assume that the abolition of influx control would result in the gradual, but inevitable, permanent settlement of rural people in towns and cities. There was virtually no spatial thinking, and one of the first analysts calling for a reconsideration of spatial issues, was Dr Catherine Cross of the Human Sciences Research Council (Cross 2001).

Furthermore, from 1999 onwards, the nine provinces were required to write their own provincial development plans. The focus on provincial boundaries (as well as municipal boundaries) has long bedeviled a coherent understanding of spatial patterns. This pattern of “spatial silos” continues today.

The second phase started with the era of President Thabo Mbeki, in 2002. During his Presidency, the National Spatial Development Plan (NSDP) became the overriding spatial guideline of national planning. The NSDP purported to guide investment to areas of greatest economic potential. In this quest, it tended to have a strong pro-urban bias, whereby the metros and secondary cities were counted as having the greatest economic potential. On the face of it, this argument seems obvious, but the NSDP failed to recognise the economic potential of commercial and traditional agricultural areas – if appropriate policies were drafted to support rural development. At the same time, there was some concern, in the dominant political party, with rural poverty. The Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Strategy (ISRDS) was drafted in 2001. But it had two singular weaknesses: Firstly, it had a “nodal approach”, focusing on specific and politically-selected spatial nodes, without a general understanding of rural development systems; secondly, these nodes were selected according to the extent and depth of poverty, instead of according to their economic potential. Almost all the nodes were located in “deep rural” areas, which profoundly lacked commercial systems, private land ownership, development capital or adequate infrastructure. As such, the nodes were almost set up to fail. Unfortunately, the nodal approach still finds its way into government plans, such as the recent Rural Tourism Strategy drafted by the National Department of Tourism.

Because the nodal strategy was so weak, it gave added impetus to the NSDP, which emphasised urban development. Large government funds were directed to these nodes, but their impact was generally weak or non-existent; although it probably did secure the loyalties of local chiefs and political brokers. Thabo Mbeki introduced the terms “first economy” and “second economy” (distinguishing between the modern

capitalist economy and the informal poverty-stricken economy), but in his tenure of office, government policy made little headway in addressing this fundamental economic chasm.

The third phase started with the fall of Thabo Mbeki and the rise of Jacob Zuma's Presidency. Zuma always had a much stronger sympathy for rural areas, and the NSDP has quietly lapsed into the background. Zuma introduced a new National Planning Commission, based within the Presidency itself. This Commission, consisting of numerous well-qualified and highly reputable researchers and thinkers, have produced the National Development Plan (NDP), which is now regarded as the "bible of development" in South Africa. This lofty title, however, conceals two weaknesses: Firstly, that many sectoral government departments have hardly grappled with the contents of the NDP, and continue to pursue their own goals and targets; and secondly, that political opponents on the left of government (such as the trade unions) are highly sceptical of the pragmatic approach of the NDP – which, in their view, does not go far enough to challenge the role of the private sector.

Chapter 9 of the National Development Plan argues for "an integrated and inclusive rural economy" (National Planning Commission 2011: 195). Also, the Plan argues for the strategic importance of rural areas, as providers of food, water, minerals, energy, biodiversity, cultural experiences, labour and land (NPC 2011: 239). The Plan notes that rural poverty has declined (70% of the poor in 1993 to 57% of the poor in 2008), but acknowledges that this progress has been primarily due to the large number of government social grants (for the elderly, for children, and for the disabled). The NDP is reinforced by a strong new government management approach, called the "Outcomes Approach", which is driven by the Presidency and enforced by the sectoral government departments. Outcome 7 aims to achieve "Vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities with food security for all".<sup>6</sup>

Outcome 7's lead sectoral agency is the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) – a Department which has, of late, been responsible for one of the most severe ideological disagreements in recent years, by proposing to expropriate half of each commercial farm (for a government-determined sum of money), and that this land be made available to farm workers resident on that farm. For many reasons, this proposal has been publicly derided as outrageous, expensive and unworkable, and that it would greatly destabilize the commercial agricultural sector and produce very little in the way of empowerment of farm workers.

In 2014, the Government's approach to spatial planning has reached a hiatus. On paper, the National Development Plan makes numerous excellent proposals. It is at the level of policy design and implementation where several government sectors appear to come unstuck. In the meantime, unemployment remains high, economic growth rates are low and declining further, the exchange rate is weakening leading to import-driven inflation, key productive sectors are shrinking (mining, manufacturing and agriculture), wage rates are being pushed up by ongoing and militant trade union activity, and national debt is escalating. The prospect of "stagflation" looms, and a "Greece-type scenario" is

---

<sup>6</sup> [www.poa.gov.za](http://www.poa.gov.za).

becoming a very real prospect. A very real underlying reason for this economic drift is that no leadership emanates from the President himself, being embroiled in several scandals, and leading a political party which has very few ideological principles or leaders left. An underlying difficulty is that the trade union lobby is very strong (despite rather limited membership numbers), and it is a key part of the ANC alliance; this lobby is poised to jump ship and establish its own workerist party, and the middle-ground ANC leaders cannot afford to alienate the unions any further. Contemporary South Africa resembles a ship without a captain or a rudder.

In this ideological vacuum, spatial trends continue in a haphazard way. These are caused by a variety of government policies, often with unintended consequences (Atkinson and Marais 2006): Some departments (such as water affairs) allocate resources regardless of where people live – whether rural, urban or peri-urban; some departments have explicit spatial criteria (such as health and education); some programmes depend on local municipalities having sufficient competence and will to apply for capital funding; in some areas, spatial investment corridors have been created; and the location of government offices has become almost the most frequent determinant of local investment. As the public sector grows (or bloats), the offices and salaries of government officials have become almost the only steady growth sector in the economy; between 2008 (the high point of South African employment figures) and 2013, private sector employment declined by 4.5% while public sector employment grew by 11.1%<sup>7</sup>. This trend, of course, has potentially dangerous consequences.

#### **E. THE INFORMAL SECTOR**

South African small and larger towns differ vastly in their economic vibrancy and resilience. As such, they offer very different prospects for the informal sector. The following are some superficial generalisations regarding the state of the economy in non-metro urban areas. The more the informal sector can prosper, the more it is likely to attract migrants – either from deep rural areas, or from the commercial farms, or even “return migrants” back from the metros. Various trends can be noted:

1. In many small towns, the survivalist and informal businesses (“spaza shops”) are owned by black and coloured people, but increasingly also by white people (the phenomenon of “white spazas”), who do not register their business formally. Many of these entrepreneurs are in the agricultural sector, mainly on municipal land (commonage), and an increasing number are found in the legal or illegal alcohol trade. Some of the informal businesses are in the taxi sector, operating longer-distance routes to nearby larger towns or cities.
2. The local retail market is limited, and often dominated by one or a few established (often white-owned) enterprises. Shoppers in many small towns use public or private transport to shop in larger towns, causing a leakage of purchasing power. This is very damaging to the small towns.

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.moneyweb.co.za/moneyweb-south-africa/employment-trends-a-hard-look-at-the-numbers>. Government employment data does not specify “public” or “private” employment; it uses sectoral categories, which can be rather misleading. However, most government functions fall within the category of “social and personal services”.

3. A growing number of “Asian” immigrants are entering the spaza sector. They tend to provide good service (long opening hours, fairly good supply of products), but they undercut the local black and coloured traders, who are being driven out of the sector.
4. Many poor people who borrow from loan sharks spend this funding on consumption, and not investment. This contributes to local poverty. Many middle-class and working-class people are deeply in debt.
5. A key distinction is between those towns situated within commercial farming areas, and those within traditional “deep rural” areas. In the case of the former, a growing bifurcation between “town” and “country” has occurred, as hard-pressed, globalizing farmers increasingly bypass small towns and instead use the more sophisticated facilities in larger towns and cities. Also, few commercial farms sell their products in the small towns – the main marketing channels are now located in bigger centres.
6. Small business support services, such as SEDAs, are located far from most towns. In the Eastern Cape, for example, the main office in Cacadu district is located in Port Elizabeth, and one outlying office is now planned for Graaff-Reinet – leaving numerous towns without business support. Travel costs to larger centres are prohibitive for many informal entrepreneurs, and they therefore cannot access business support. Many government SMME support programmes do not penetrate to rural areas.
7. Many key support providers (e.g. tax consultants, lawyers and even banks) are situated far away. For those companies trying to become formally registered, and operating within the law, access to such services becomes a major hurdle.
8. Training is difficult to access. The Department of Labour (DoL) has stringent criteria about who can access training. It insists that aspirant trainees must *already* have a job. This disqualifies the many unemployed people who could benefit from training. Also, the DoL insists that a group of at least 20 people must be available to do a training course – which is often difficult in small towns, where the market could hardly keep a few people gainfully employed in any specific trade.
9. Municipal procurement can be an important strategy for SMME support (Nel and Goldman 2006: 39). But in many municipalities, municipal out-sourcing tends to be constrained by the vested interest of organised labour (SAMWU), which resists attempts to contract temporary labour to undertake menial tasks (such as litter removal). Also, many municipalities have sweetheart relationships with certain service providers, creating major hurdles for aspirant contractors.
10. Private capital is generally small in scale, and cannot undertake corporate social responsibility (CSR), which reduces the amount of money and technical support available for new start-up enterprises.
11. The industrial base in small towns is typically limited, so that workers tend to have few opportunities for training and acquiring technical skills. People have limited experience in working in large organisations, and therefore lack an effective business network (CDE 2004: 55).

12. Few small towns have Chambers of Commerce. This makes it very difficult for municipalities to engage systematically with the local business sector. In addition, many black and coloured councillors have shown a steady disregard for local business interests, which further alienates government and business.

But the private sector in small and medium-sized towns does enjoy certain advantages:

1. Generally low crime against property
2. A well-functioning postal system (although this is currently being weakened severely by public sector strikes)
3. Improved levels of telecommunications, both landline and cellular
4. Many towns have fairly good inherited infrastructure (water, sanitation and electricity), although deteriorating maintenance is causing some of it to crumble
5. Poor people in small towns tend to have strong networks and social capital, which can facilitate borrowing and practical support.
6. Transport costs within the towns are generally lower, and people often move about on foot or by bicycle, which lowers transport costs (however, trade with other centres raise transport costs)
7. Property is still relatively cheap, whether to purchase or rent, and many towns have vacant erven or buildings.
8. Peri-urban agriculture is often possible, on municipal commonage land.

As far as commonage farming is concerned, there is a rapid growth in black and coloured “informal” or “emergent” farmers, operating on municipal land in peri-urban areas. Commonage farmers are very diverse, and some show signs of becoming viable small farmers, and even emerging commercial farmers. The following categories of commonage farmers have been identified (Atkinson and Buscher 2006: 450):

- *Survivalists*: Households with few alternative sources of income (perhaps other than social grants or pensions), and who are likely to continue using livestock to fulfill basic food security needs.
- *Micro-farmers*: They have other livelihoods, and want to keep only a certain limited number of livestock, as an income supplement, or as a hobby, or for cultural purposes.
- *Emergent small-scale farmers*: They show signs of commercialization: for example, they may have bank accounts, they would like access to loans, they may want to farm on their own (i.e. not in a group), and they would like to farm on a larger scale, to make some profit. These farmers may be good candidates for ownership of small-holdings, where they could either undertake small-scale agriculture, or combine this with other income-generating activities.
- *Proto-capitalist farmers*: People who may have other livelihoods, but would like to go into commercial farming on a full-time or large-scale basis. For them, livestock and capital accumulation is important. Acquiring property may also be important. These farmers would be ideal candidates for a “step-up” land reform strategy, i.e. opting out of commonage use and finding their own farm.

There is therefore a wide range of scale, formality, professionalism, and capital investment in the growing black and coloured peri-urban farming sector.

## **F. WITHIN-COUNTRY MIGRATION**

Migration is a very prevalent part of the South African historical experience, and continues to be so today. South Africa's spatial development system is still profoundly underpinned by the Apartheid system of deep rural areas (almost only Black people), commercial farming areas (largely white ownership and black or coloured workers), spatially divided towns and cities, and peri-urban shack settlements. In this system, migration has been a key part of the labour system since the 1890s, as black people in rural areas attempt to break into the urban economy. Many of them have succeeded, and have joined the ranks of the professional and middle classes; many black people still attempt to escape rural poverty by migration; and many black people still keep their rural homes as a safety net or a retirement ideal. At the same time, the white middle class is now almost completely urbanised, and even white commercial farmers have strong links with the cities. New migration patterns lead from small to medium-sized towns, and to cities; but there are also other, more hidden, flows, between rural areas, and even from urban back to rural areas. There is no one-way street.

A crucial issue is that the demise of Apartheid freed up the spatial system for human choices. But at the same time, South Africa truly entered an era of globalisation, where economic systems change rapidly, and businesses and sectors rise and fall with dizzying speed. South Africa is also now a country without any effective economic policy – or, to be exact, with a range of different and often contradictory policies – ranging from monetarist conservatism to fiscal Keynesianism. For rural migrants, making sense of where to go must be a difficult task, and it is possible that many of them fall back on tried-and-trusted migration paths developed over decades by their own kin and communities. This, in turn, means that many rural cultural patterns are brought into the urban areas, and consolidated in the urban or peri-urban shacklands, leading to great cultural diversity in the cities.

### **1. Who migrates, and why?**

An underlying question is: Why do people migrate? The obvious answer refers to the search for employment opportunities. But there are scholars who maintain that job prospects are so poor that people are now migrating with other goals in mind – mainly to get access to better government services. Also, new migration patterns are opening up possibilities of empowerment for social categories that were particularly constrained in the past – notably, women, who may wish to escape patriarchal systems in the rural areas. And people may well migrate because it becomes “the done thing to do” – that almost all young and talented rural people want to try their hand at moving to the cities. The overwhelmingly large numbers of people moving from the Transkei and Ciskei (“deep rural” areas) to Cape Town may reflect this trend. So motives may vary from utter desperation to rational job-seeking, from personal empowerment to upward social status, from material concerns about government services to a strong desire for education and training. The picture defies simple generalisations.

Some analysts emphasise the issue of material desperation: “The rural labour market participant is likely to be the most vulnerable in urban labour market settings. The fact that rural individuals still migrate, even though their employment (or rather unemployment) probabilities are similar in urban and rural environments, points to the extreme desperation among rural job-seekers” (Moses and Yu 2009: 20).

Other authors make the same point. In 2000, Prof Lawrie Schlemmer and Tamzin Lovell observed that “Jobs are now so scarce that they have apparently ceased to be a factor in strategic movement” (2000:5). Hence they titled their paper as: “*Millions of people with nowhere to go*”. They argued that “... the mass South African population, in its movement, may no longer be *opportunity-driven* as the assumptions made would imply, but may rather be *survival oriented*, with different implications for its distribution in the future” (2000:4). Cross et al (2000:4) made the same point: “With critical levels of unemployment prevailing in the cities, the rural areas in South Africa are becoming more sealed off as the urban job market becomes more closed to rural-born workers”.

In particular, the argument goes, the high level of unemployment affects young rural people: rural young people have difficulty breaking into urban job markets. “The decline of migrant labour ... puts younger rural people in a situation where they are trapped in isolated rural areas and unfamiliar with the developed economy of the metro sector. What results is an apparent increase in moves to smaller rural centres and to spontaneous rural concentrations of population around facilities with urban access” (Cross 2000: 8). This argument emphasises the fact that cities are difficult to enter, and therefore there is a pattern of displaced urbanisation, whereby rural people move to smaller towns.

But that is not entirely true either. Some research points to the fact that young people do aim for the cities, and do manage to break into these new environments. In the mid-1990s, young adults (26 to 35 years old) and youths (16 to 25 years old) were more likely to migrate from the Transkei to the Western Cape, than younger and older people (Moses and Yu 2009: 24). Also, in the highly urbanised Gauteng Province, “In-migrants are typically single, career-oriented individuals relative to their local-born counterparts or are less likely to bring their children with them to the area of destination”, based on 2001 statistics (Moses and Yu 2009: 23, citing Oosthuizen and Naidoo, 2003: 11). Clearly, some rural young people do have the personal and financial resources to make such radical shifts, even in a tough economic climate. Also, the proportion of people away for work reasons falls considerably from 1993 to 2008 (from 77% to 59% of the sample). This may suggest that previous migrants have now settled near their workplaces. A larger proportion of adults are reported as absent for *education reasons* (from 10% to 13%) (Posel 2009: 3). Since 1993, labour migrants also appear to have more education, with an increase in the proportion of labour migrants reported as holding at least a matric education (Posel 2009: 8).

A comparison of several data sources suggests that the category of current main place ‘metropolitan formal’ is a highly frequent destination category (Collinson et al 2006: 14).

These observations strengthen the typical argument that migration follows jobs (and by implication, that many people have not given up hope of finding an urban job). The

National Planning Commission subscribes to this view: “Differential migration patterns largely reflect national patterns of job creation and job loss. Between 2001 and 2007, for example, Gauteng had a net gain of about 3 million people and the Western Cape just over 1 million. The Eastern Cape had a net loss of about 1.4 million and Limpopo 1.2 million” (National Planning Commission 2011: 84).

But a very different argument is that people move because they need access to government infrastructure – particularly land, water, and sanitation – where they can erect their shacks (Cross et al 2000:9). If this is a major reason for moving, then the cities are not such attractive places, due to high competition for land and high land prices (which reduce the roll-out of government housing programmes). Smaller cities and towns are then more attractive – despite the fact that there may be fewer jobs there. Such trends may well reflect a different kind of migrant – those who want to remain closer to their rural homesteads, and want to maintain stronger rural-urban ties, which is a valuable form of social capital: Migration into small town or rural city peri-urban zones is likely to take place over relatively small distances and within magisterial districts, over local routes well known to migrating families as they visit their nearest town to make purchases or access services (Cross et al 2000: 20).

Such migration from rural areas to small towns may also suggest a sequential migration pattern. Migration streams should not to be thought of in terms of single, once off moves, but rather as involving more than one move in the form of *step-wise migration* (Singh 2005:12). While a migrant may aim to move to a metro, he/she may do so by initially moving to other rural areas, smaller neighbouring towns, and eventually peri-urban settlements before making it into the metro itself. Regional survey data indicate an increase in mobility to smaller towns, semi-urban areas, other rural areas and to peri-urban sites (Cross et al, 1998, Bekker, 2002, Collinson and Wittenberg, 2001), often along transport routes (Collinson et al (2003)).

The N4 road is a major east-west route between Johannesburg and the port city of Maputo in Mozambique, and passes through a number of smaller industrial and mining towns. Destinations along this road are particularly important for employed and unemployed men and women, often staying with relatives.

In fact, one of the strongest South African government development programmes, since 1994, has been the development and upgrading of highways, which make many rural towns much easier to access. This has been accompanied by a vast expansion of the bus and long-haul taxi industries, which reduce the costs and hassle of long-distance travel.

There may be a correlation between the *purpose* of migration (search for jobs vs search for a better lifestyle or services) and the *nature* of migration (temporary or permanent). Collinson et al (2007:80) argued that the reasons for *permanent* migration include marriage and divorce, and taking families out of rural villages in order to benefit from better access to services. The challenge of work seeking and employment follows a pattern of *temporary* migration, and that many of these employment-seeking migrants may well wish to return to the rural areas if the job prospects improve there. Clearly, a

move to seek immovable assets such as land and infrastructure suggests a more permanent migration purpose.

People move to areas of high population concentration that are closer to the rural home for four main reasons, and this has led to the expansion of Apartheid-created “dense rural settlements”. Firstly, the cost of migration as well as the cost of living in smaller towns or peri-urban areas is lower than that of living in the cities, and there is better access to government-supplied welfare, services and national transport. Secondly, such a move allows some level access to natural resources (Singh 2005: 13; Cross, 2000, Posel, 2003). Thirdly, there are opportunities in informal trading. And fourthly, such “this “small-step” migration may make it easier for migrants to retain links to home areas, providing insurance in the event of unemployment or illness (Singh 2005: 14; Casale and Posel, 2002a: 8). As opportunities open up further afield, people may move again and again, often to larger areas, as their financial resources, social networks and skills are built up.

Rural-rural migration also takes place. For example, migration to rural areas of Mpumalanga’s farms and game farms, is an important destination for people in the nearby traditional rural villages (Sing 2005: 13; Collinson et al, 2003). Such migration is stimulated by the difficulties of finding jobs in cities, and the new jobs opening up because of rural tourism.

There is also the phenomenon of urban-rural migration (sometimes called “reverse urbanisation”): “Secondary urban areas are more in equilibrium with rural villages with stable flows in both directions. This pattern is repeated between metropolitan areas and rural areas, only at a lower rate” (Collinson et al 2007: 80). As noted earlier, this is happening amongst the middle-class, as well-heeled people move to small towns or farms, often creating rural post-productivist lifestyles or incomes. It also takes place amongst poorer people, who fall back onto rural communities in times of difficulty.

There is much speculation in academic circles regarding the current extent of circular migration in South Africa. While some authors such as Cross et al (1998) and Bekker (2002) believe that circular migration is in decline, others such as Collinson et al (2001) and Ndegwa et al, (2004) believe that it is still highly prevalent (Singh 2005: 2). Posel (2003) blames the lack of sound national level data for such conjectures, because research on migration from Africa has eclipsed research on intra-South African movements. The coverage of labour migration in national survey instruments in South Africa declined during the 1990s, and then ceased in 2000 (Posel, 2003:1). In fact, it may well be the case that different localities in South Africa are experiencing different trajectories, with some remaining strongly oscillatory, while others are largely uni-directional (Singh 2005: 11).

Migration patterns are so entrenched in South Africa’s various cultural groups (black, coloured and white) that the phenomenon of “second homes” is widespread – for the middle classes as well as the poor. Many families have split spatial identities, due to patterns of work, school and retirement.

Amongst poor black people in Durban metro, in 1998, the main *advantages* of multiple-home ownership, as seen by multiple-home households, are the opportunity to escape violence either in the city or in the countryside (41%) and having a place to go on leave (19%). The main *disadvantage* is the expense (39%) but 34% of multiple-home households did not think that there were any disadvantages to it. Most multiple-home households (57%) preferred the urban home, mainly because of better access to services and facilities (61%) and better job opportunities (4%); however, they did not like the poor quality of informal houses in urban areas (19%) or the high cost of formal urban houses (11%). Only 32% preferred the rural home, mainly because of the opportunity to practise agriculture (43%) and a perceived better lifestyle (19%); however, poor services and facilities (43%) and poor job opportunities (38%) were seen as negative aspects (Smit 1998: 84-5).

The overall picture regarding migration is extremely complex. Although a strong rural-urban pattern exists, other patterns are still strong, and may even increase. The crucial causal factor is the weakness of the formal economy; if there were more jobs in the urban areas, it is highly likely that more rural people would migrate. In effect, South Africa's poor economic performance is maintaining very complex spatial patterns. "Although there are no longer any restrictions on urbanization, circular migration and migrant labour continue to exist due to the economic and cultural factors discussed above. Studies of households in South Africa have found complex social patterns with constant movement of people between rural areas, informal settlements, hostels and residential townships, as extended families attempt to make the best of life in severely constrained circumstances" (Smit 1998: 80).

One causal factor is the resilience of the formal sector in South Africa – in cities, towns and villages. The private business sector has historically been dominated by whites (due to apartheid legislation), but there are increasing black and coloured enterprises – although they tend to be small. (Of course, many super-wealthy black people – the so-called "black diamonds" – have achieved access to large corporations as part of Black Economic Empowerment). At the same time, the black and coloured middle classes are growing, often due to public sector employment, and this has historically depended on a robust taxation system and fiscus. The significance of the formal sector is that it provides "handles" for the informal sector to get a foothold in the economy, in several ways: (1) formal employment provides work experience; (2) formal investment creates a local economic surplus and multipliers, on which informal businesses can draw; and (3) one can then look for creative ways in which partnerships, networks and markets can be promoted, to link the first and second economy. This, in turn, stimulates migration patterns, as informal livelihoods are created in the cities, towns and villages.

Arguably, the presence of the middle class in an area is almost the most significant attractor of migrants. "The various survival opportunities created by the middle class are possibly perceived to be of enormous value. These attractions could be as diverse as the prospects of odd jobs, handouts, more interesting refuse dumps, and of course crime. It is not a particularly pleasing relationship but it is confirmed for long-term population growth trends" (Schlemmer and Lovell 2000).

The long-term trends remain unclear – a combination of inherited apartheid spatial planning, globalisation, and current policies. While migration patterns continue strongly, other evidence suggests a slight *decline* in migration in South Africa (Posel 2009, citing data from the National Income Dynamics Study). From 1993 to 2008, there was a significant fall in the percentage of households who report non-resident household members<sup>8</sup>, from approximately 24% of households in 1993 to 18 % in 2008. African households are still more likely than other households to report absent household members; and African households in rural areas are the most likely to contain non-resident members. But these figures are also declining. In 1993 and 2008, 39% and 30% respectively of African households in rural areas reported at least one adult as a non-resident member of the household. Does this suggest that South African society is – at last – normalizing, with people living in rural or urban areas according to their real preferences?

## 2. Enduring rural-urban kinship links and survival strategies

One of the key questions is whether migrants gradually let go of their rural roots, or whether these roots remain important to them. The evidence is very mixed, and is not clearly correlated to income or status. Many poor people keep their rural roots, as a safety net, and many more well-off black people keep a link with their rural villages, in anticipation of retirement. With reference to the Durban metropolitan area, Smit (1998:82) found three levels of rural-urban connections, which are very likely reflected throughout South Africa:

- Strong rural links: Where the head of household comes from a rural area, still owns a rural home, visits there once a month, sends money back home and/or has children still living there. In the Durban sample, this section constituted 48% of the interviewees.
- Weak rural links: Where the head of household comes from a rural area and visits there during the holidays. This section constituted 32% of the interviewees.
- No rural links: The household has severed their rural links, usually because of political violence but sometimes because of family quarrels. This group constituted 19% of the interviewees.

The nature of migration patterns also encourages rural-urban linkages to be maintained. Informal support through contact persons who already live in town and know how to gain access to housing and employment is the only assistance arriving migrants can rely on. Migration flows are hence sustained by these networks and concentrate on specific destination areas (chain migration) in which local supportive networks evolve often

---

<sup>8</sup> “Non-resident household members” are defined as: They do not usually reside at least four nights of the week in the household; or they are absent from the household for at least a month a year to work or to look for work, or because they are in prison or in school; or they are away from the household for more than three months of the year for other reasons.

based on the idea of common origin – a phenomenon well known and studied all over the world (Steinbrink 2010: 43).

This makes rural-urban linkages very complex, not only as regards migration, but also the flows of money, ideas, cultural identity and livelihoods. “Internal migration [should be seen ] as an integral part of livelihood organisation embedded in a larger, informal, rural-urban nexus ... many poor people organise their livelihoods across vast distances between rural and urban areas. This can be conceptualised as a “*translocal livelihood*”, i. e. a livelihood system of households whose members do not all reside at the same place at the same time” (Steinbrink 2010:39).

Such translocal livelihoods enable *task-sharing* across rural and urban settings: “Households ... often live both in townships and rural areas in varying intervals. The rural and urban household locations in turn are characterised by specific functions: Urban household locations allow access to the labour market and to monetary income. Moreover, they facilitate access to conventional medicine and secondary education; they mean gaining a foothold for arriving migrants. In contrast, rural household locations are where children are brought up and receive primary education. Here, the elderly or sick household members are also cared for. Agricultural-subsistence production contributes to the household’s food security. In times of lasting unemployment, the migrants return to their rural homesteads to reduce their costs of living. The *imizi* are of ritual importance (weddings, circumcisions, funerals) and moreover they facilitate access to traditional and spiritual healing techniques. During periods of crisis or conflict, *both the rural and urban residences can be a refuge* for the family members” (Steinbrink 2010:42). Significantly, therefore, complex rural-urban linkages enable the spread of risk.

### **3. Illness and migration**

A major factor in South African social profiles, is the prevalence of HIV infections and full-blown AIDS illnesses. HIV/AIDS and Tuberculosis (TB) are the two main illnesses impacting on poor households. Both of these topics are vast, involving social mores, economic options, household behaviour, and public services. In this brief overview, only the migration dimensions are highlighted.

South Africa is recorded to have the largest number of persons living with HIV/AIDS in the world (Rehle and Shisana, 2003; Singh 2005: 28). The Red Cross has declared the epidemic of HIV/AIDS in southern Africa ‘an unprecedented disaster that conventional intervention can no longer contain’ (World Disasters Report, 2004, cited in Singh 2005: 28). In 2004, South Africa had a 21.5% prevalence rate for HIV infections (Singh 2005: 28), although there are of course various issues related to sampling. An important 2003 survey anticipated 4.96 million deaths to take place by 2010 (Rehle and Shisana 2003). According to the *State of South Africa’s Population Report: Population, Poverty and Vulnerability* (2000:61), “The HIV/AIDS pandemic is the single most important phenomenon that will shape future demographic and development trends in South Africa”.

HIV/AIDS is a “disease of mobility”, and high levels of circular migration can lead to multiple sexual partners at both ends of the migration cycle (Collinson 2007: 82). In particular, people who live a quasi-urban life in the peri-urban informal areas, are highly vulnerable to HIV infection (Singh 2005: 32). Many of these people have multiple sexual partners, as they maintain households in rural and urban squatter areas. Other sexually transmitted diseases have always followed such patterns of circular or oscillatory migration from mineworkers to rural areas. Migrant women may also engage in transactional sex as a survival strategy (Singh 2005: 35).

HIV and TB lead to a macabre form of reverse migration: After falling ill in the cities, many people return to the rural areas, where they are looked after by their families. This can place an increased burden on rural households (Singh 2005: 32). Migration is a strategy used by household members before and after a death, particularly the death of a household head or a household member earning a significant livelihood. It could involve the in-migration of a productive household member from elsewhere, to help support the family, or the out-migration of dependents to more productive family members living elsewhere. The phenomenon of “returning home to die” has been repeatedly observed in South Africa (Singh 2005: 39). Falling ill often encourages people to return home: The debilitating effect of AIDS also results in the inability to work, and hence to pay for urban expenses. Peri-urban shack areas may have inadequate access to water and sanitation that make the management of AIDS-induced symptoms, such as diarrhoea, difficult to manage for the affected person. In the rural areas, it is often the older people who take care of their adult children with AIDS. Furthermore, the tradition of being buried in the ancestral home remains strong. “Rural familial ties may be seen as sites of stability and refuge” (Singh 2005: 40).

On the other hand, HIV and TB infection could also lead to out-migration from rural areas, because HIV medication is more readily available in the nearby towns (Singh 2005: 38). Access to HIV medication, effective follow-up, and paediatric care are all poorer in deep rural areas (Fatti et al 2010).

#### **4. Remittances and financial flows**

From the censuses and various standard surveys, it is difficult to ascertain the income earned by migrants. Furthermore, what is important from the perspective of the economic wellbeing of the rural household is not the migrant’s wage, but that portion of the wage that is shared with the rural household through remittance transfers (Posel 2003a: 367).

The sending of remittances has always been an important aspect of rural-urban migration in South Africa: “The strategy entails one household member migrating alone, setting up cheap accommodation and working to pay off loans made to pay for migration. The selection and investment of the family in one or more household members’ migration costs compels the migrant to make regular remittances to support those left behind ... Migrants’ remittances, sometimes the only link between the sending household and the migrant, support poorer and less able household and family members. Generally remittances are used for consumption, but in many cases are used

for investment or paying for education or improving agricultural productivity” (Moses and Yu 2009: 30; Kok et al, 2006: 31).

In 1998, a study conducted in the Durban metropolitan area (Smit 1998: 82) found two distinct type of urban residents, who still had linkages with rural homes:

- Owner-only households are multiple-home units where the head “owns” another home but does not contribute money towards its upkeep<sup>9</sup>. These households have only a tenuous link to the rural home which they maintain because they are among the most economically vulnerable households in low-income urban settlements. The rural homestead is thus a safety net and a measure of last resort should the household find itself unable to survive in the urban environment.
- Owner/contributor households are multiple-home units where the household head both “owns” and contributes financially towards the upkeep of another home. The urban-based members of these households keep in regular contact with their rural homesteads and there are probably flows of population between the two, with children being raised in the rural home and coming eventually to town in search of employment while their parents may be retiring to the rural homestead after they have reached the end of their employment careers. Urban based household heads who contribute to the upkeep of a second home usually do so because their children are living there. Half of all multiple-home households regularly visit the rural home once a month, mainly to visit and contribute to the children’s upkeep. Although these households identify themselves as urban, they also clearly believe that the rural link is important, not merely as a safety net in times of crisis but also as a necessity for a more fulfilling life.

But the system of remittances is changing. Remittance transfers received by rural Black households increased from 1993 to 1999, but by 2002 this proportion had decreased substantially, suggesting that economic ties with sending households had become weaker over time (Moses and Yu 2009: 30, citing Posel and Casale 2003: 345).

Remittances may also be decreasing, because of the improved coverage and increased values of social pensions and child grants in the rural areas (Singh 2005: 11), and perhaps remittances are no longer so desperately needed. New formal investment choices such as insurance policies and savings accounts may crowd out direct investments in rural alternatives, such as cultivation. This may mean a smaller funding stream from the urban to the rural areas, which may have dire consequences for rural households (Moses and Yu 2009: 30; Barber 1996: 293).

Recent data also suggests a decline in the proportion of all households receiving income transfers in 2008. In 1993, approximately 23% of all households reported positive income transfers from “absent members of the household or from any other person”. In 2008, this had fallen to 15% (Posel 2009: 9). The average real value of transfers has also

---

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that “owning” a home is not seen as depending on whether or not one owns the land it is on.

declined since 2000. Yet rural areas remain an important place for retirement, and many urban people continue to contribute funds to maintain their rural homesteads (Moses and Yu 2009: 31; Posel and Casale (2003); Todes (1999) and James (2001)). Once again, these data suggest a kind of social normalization in a society which had been perverted by official policies for centuries. Perhaps people are now choosing where to stay, according to their own preferences, with individuals within the same family making their own decisions, and maintaining linkages as it suits them.

Evidence from Mpumalanga Province suggests that the longer a person is a migrant, the higher his/her remittances are likely to be. A person who has been a migrant for 5-10 years is 60% more likely to remit than one who has been a migrant for less than two years; a migrant of 11-20 years is 3 times more likely to remit; and a migrant of over 20 years is four times more likely to remit This is probably a phenomenon associated with the desire to retire at the traditional home in the rural area (Collinson et al 2003; Singh 2005: 14).

### **G. KEY GOVERNMENT POLICIES**

As outlined earlier, various rural development policies in South Africa have been attempted, but have generally shown poor results. The cities have shown a much greater degree of developmental momentum, driven by ambitious and fairly effective metropolitan governments. Consequently, there has been an inexorable trend: The effective de-development of rural areas (at least by means of government programmes), and the consequent relative strengthening of the cities and towns vis-à-vis the farms and the deep rural communities. The drift of poor people, as well as those with professional and middle-class aspirations, to the towns and cities has been unrelenting.

Government policies have tended to be designed in sectoral isolation (the so-called “sectoral silos”), often with little regard to their spatial or cross-sectoral impacts. In some cases, such policies have had a distinct detrimental impact on the people they were intended to help. Two such cases are the land redistribution programme (aimed at bringing landless black people into the rural economy by providing farmland)<sup>10</sup> and the Extension of Security of Tenure Act (designed to assist farm workers to retain their residence rights on commercial farms).<sup>11</sup> Both these programmes have involved a great deal of government resources and effort, but have floundered in the face of rural development realities, including the trend towards capital-intensive agriculture. The story of rural development policy, in South Africa, may well be one of poorly designed, poorly understood and poorly implemented policies, in which “rural development” has largely remained a political platitude. The most effective rural programmes have been those launched by the private sector, such as the agricultural producer organisations.

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.ruraldevelopment.gov.za/services/land-redistribution-and-development#.VDfsW-lxnIU>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.pmg.org.za/report/20110316-meeting-stakeholders-rural-development-land-reform-focusing-evidence->

There are five recent factors which may have far-reaching impacts in future.

The first is the ongoing government capital expenditure and works programmes which take place in rural areas as well as urban areas. These are the Municipal Infrastructure Grant (aimed primarily at water, sanitation and roads), the Expanded Public Works Programme (a job creation system aimed at producing hard infrastructure), and the Community Works Programme (a job creation system which assists communities to address local social and economic challenges, such as waste removal or bush clearing). These are very large fiscal transfers, and help to make it more attractive to rural people to remain where they are – especially if they can combine it with social grants (for pensioners, parents and disabled), and thereby cobble together a basic livelihood.

The second factor is the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act (“SPLUMA” of 2013), which – for the first time – enables and encourages provincial governments to collaborate with one another.<sup>12</sup> The Act provides for the declaration of “development regions”, which could cross provincial boundaries. This is in stark contrast to the strong thrust of provincially-based planning (Provincial Growth and Development Strategies), which prevented any coherent spatial understanding or interventions.

A third factor is the new mining revolution in South Africa, for coal, uranium, manganese and shale gas. In some rural areas, such as the Kalahari, new mining areas have sprung up with scant regard for any planning processes. Mining licences are allocated by a national government department, the Department of Mineral Resources<sup>13</sup>, with scant regard for other sectoral departments (such as water or environmental affairs), or provincial and municipal planning processes. In this sector, much foreign and South African money circulates, and there is often a suspicion that the allocation of licences is encouraged by irregular financial practices. In some cases, municipalities are not even aware of which mines are operating within their own jurisdictions. Some of the new licences have been exposed to much more scrutiny (as is the case with Karoo shale gas mining, where public opposition has been robust<sup>14</sup>); in other geographic areas or sectors, events sometimes resemble a cowboy movie of wheeling and dealing. These mines have huge implications for job-seekers, investors, infrastructure providers, financial flows, rural-urban linkages, and the perennial question of the sustainability of mining settlements. There is simply no coherent understanding or effort to grapple with the spatial consequences of mining developments.

A fourth factor is the rapid roll-out of privately owned alternative energy projects in rural areas. These are typically wind or solar projects. They are well capitalised, well implemented, and are required by law to have significant community projects within 50 km of their operations.<sup>15</sup> Many of these projects are in remote and arid areas, with high levels of poverty. They now appear to be providing employment to many local people

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.ruraldevelopment.gov.za/services/345-splum>; <http://www.pmg.org.za/node/33646>

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.dmr.gov.za/>.

<sup>14</sup> [www.treasurethekaroo.co.za](http://www.treasurethekaroo.co.za).

<sup>15</sup> For example, <http://www.engineeringnews.co.za/print-version/big-scale-up-plans-for-grid-connected-karoo-microsolar-plant-2010-05-28>

(although skills may be lacking), and bringing in new workseekers as well as middle-class investors. There is, as yet, no study of their multiplier impacts. This may well be one of the real game-changers in rural development, as it is technologically advanced, it is environmentally sustainable, it provides a much-needed product with huge demand, and it has built-in requirements for skills promotion. It is also not land-hungry, and can co-exist with agricultural operations in the same vicinity.

All these factors will not only impact on the nature and density of rural-urban linkages (demographic, financial, transport, etc), but are likely to change the spatial profile of South Africa itself. Previously disadvantaged regions may now gain prominence, which could take some of the demographic pressure off the cities and towns.

A fifth factor is the continuing dependence on social grants (through the public fiscus) to stave off severe poverty and destitution.<sup>16</sup> Social grants are now part of the metabolism of South African society. Effectively, the South African state redistributes massive funds to vulnerable people (the aged, parents, the disabled, and foster children). This provides a much-needed safety net for households which often do not have one person in proper employment. For a developing country, this is an impressive performance. However, given South Africa's mediocre economic performance and growing public debt, there are growing concerns that the social grant system may not be financially sustainable. At present, the system is a major shift of resources from urban to rural areas, via the tax and fiscal systems. If social grants were to be reduced – or phased out – the consequences are likely to be extremely severe, for rural and urban households. The impact on rural-urban linkages may well be that such networks would be re-activated, in a last-ditch attempt at material survival.

---

<sup>16</sup> [www.sassa.gov.za](http://www.sassa.gov.za); <http://www.southafrica.info/about/social/grants-060709.htm#.VDfzz-lxnIU>; <http://www.nwf.org.za/papers-documents/145-whats-wrong-with-the-social-grants-system-in-south-africa>

## CONCLUSION

In brief, the South African story since 1994 (“20 years of democracy”) appears to be one of rural decline, urban growth, and a long-term decline in economic prospects. There are exceptions to all these trends, but there is currently a sense in South Africa that we are nearing an economic cliff. The private sector is simply not strong enough to sustain the tax burden; government services are often of poor quality; the government sector is becoming bloated and unaffordable; and a rigid labour market prevents new jobs and training opportunities. It is an economy which limps from one quasi-recession to another. In the past, infrastructural programmes were available to stimulate demand and create employment, but it is not clear how long this will still be feasible.

It is possible that South Africa may be coming to the end of its post-apartheid honeymoon phase. The economy is losing steam. Many households have found a precarious foothold in the towns and cities, where there are indeed better opportunities – if only for education and health services. However, South Africa’s economy is not primarily a productive one; it is based on government services and retail, and almost all households are highly indebted. This is not a robust society. Many people draw salaries off government, and are poorly equipped to enter the private sector if there were cut-backs in public expenditure. Furthermore, a great deal of public money is lost through corruption and irregular dealings. Arguably, unemployment and government corruption are now the two most pressing public issues.

This bleak scenario suggests that, if South Africa were to meet its day of reckoning (à la Greece), every single aspect of our lives will be profoundly scrambled. The system of rural-urban linkages, which has evolved for twenty years, will be fundamentally altered. In this context, rural areas may well play the role they always did – as a safety net for urban people. This may seem to be an inordinately pessimistic point of view, but there are many signs that the South African economy is faltering, and the fiscus is under severe strain. At the same time, patterns of bureaucratic bloat, corruption and poorly targeted expenditure are rife. South Africa has survived for decades on the tax revenue of the mining and manufacturing sectors, which are now both in decline. Many commentators are warning that the writing is on the wall.

## REFERENCES

### Definitions

Collinson, MA, Tollman, SM and Kahn, K (2007), Migration, settlement change and health in post-apartheid South Africa: Triangulating health and demographic surveillance with national census data, *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 35(Suppl 69): 77–84.

Cross, C, Harwin, SJ, Schwabe, C, Morris, N and Kekana, A (n.d., estimated date 2000), Rural and Urban Densification in South Africa: A preliminary review of policy implications for migration and infrastructure, University of Natal, Durban.

National Treasury (2011), *Local Government Budget and Expenditure Review (2011)*, [http://www.treasury.gov.za/publications/igfr/2011/lg/02.%202011%20LGBER%20-%20Final%20-%2013%20Sept%202011%20\(renumbered\).pdf](http://www.treasury.gov.za/publications/igfr/2011/lg/02.%202011%20LGBER%20-%20Final%20-%2013%20Sept%202011%20(renumbered).pdf)

StatsSA (2001), *Investigation into appropriate definitions of urban and rural areas for South Africa: Discussion Document*, Report no. 03-02-20.

### Household dynamics

Cross, C, Mngadi T., and Themba, M. 1998. 'Constructing migration: infrastructure, poverty and development in KwaZulu-Natal.' *Development Southern Africa* 15(4).

Madhavan, S, Schatz, E and Clark, B (2009), Effect of HIV/AIDS-related mortality on household dependency ratios in rural South Africa, 2000-2005, *Population Studies*, Vol. 63, No. 1, 2009, pp. 37-51.

Moses, E and Yu, D (2009), *Migration from the Northern Cape*, South African Labour and Development Research Unit (SALDRU), Cape Town.

Posel, D and Casale, D (2003). What has been happening to internal labour migration in South Africa, 1993-1998? *The South African Journal of Economics*, vol. 71:3.

Posel, D (2003). The collection of national household survey data in South Africa (1993–2001): rendering labour migration invisible *Development Southern Africa Vol. 20, No.*

### Demographics

Aliber, M, Baiphethi M, and Jacobs, P (2007), *Agricultural Employment Scenarios*. <http://www.hsrc.ac.za/en/research-data/view/3408>

Atkinson, D (2007), *Going for Broke: The Fate of Farm Workers in Arid South Africa*, HSRC Press, Pretoria.

Cross, C, Harwin, SJ, Schwabe, C, Morris, N and Kekana, A (n.d., estimated date 2000), Rural and Urban Densification in South Africa: A preliminary review of policy implications for migration and infrastructure, University of Natal, Durban.

Hall, R, Wisborg, P, Shirinda, S and Zamchiya, P (2013), Farm Workers and Farm Dwellers in Limpopo Province, South Africa, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 47–70.

Ingle, M (2010), “A ‘Creative Class’ in South Africa’s Arid Karoo Region”, *Urban Forum* 21(4):405-423.

Ingle, M (2013), “Counterurbanisation and the Emergence of a Post-productivist Economy in South Africa’s Arid Karoo Region, 1994-2010”, *New Contree* 66:55-69.

Liebenberg, F. (2012). South African agricultural production, productivity and research performance in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Pretoria. <http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-05062013-162707/unrestricted/00front.pdf>

Marais, L et al (2014), *Outside the Core: Towards an Understanding of Intermediate Cities in South Africa*, South African Cities Network, Pretoria.

Stats SA (2013b). Census 2011. <http://interactive.statssa.gov.za/Superweb>.

Theron, JP and Visser, M (2012), Prospects of Decent work in Agriculture, Working Paper, Labour and Enterprise Policy Research Group (LEP), University of Cape Town.

### Food systems

Armour J. (2013). Private sector and commercial farmer involvement in smallholder integration. In Greenberg (Editor), *Smallholders and agro-food value chains in South Africa: Emerging practices, emerging challenges*, Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Atkinson, D (2006). Is there a case for smallholder agriculture? *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*. 24 (3): 277-383.

Atkinson, D and Buscher, B (2006) , “Municipal commonage and implications for land reform: A profile of commonage users in Philippolis, Free State, South Africa”, *Agrekon*, vol. 45, no. 4, December.

Cutts, M and Kirsten, J (2006), Asymmetric price transmission and market concentration: An investigation into four South African agro-food industries, *South African Journal of Economics* Vol. 74:2.

Ferrer, S (2013). *Report 6: Demographics of farms, farm workers and farm dwellers in South Africa*, unpublished report for an ILO study on farm workers.

Greenberg S. (2013). Introduction: Smallholders and value chain integration in South Africa. In Greenberg (Editor), *Smallholders and agro-food value chains in South Africa: Emerging practices, emerging challenges*, Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Palmer, K and Sender, J (2006), Prospects for On-Farm Self-Employment and Poverty Reduction: An Analysis of the South African Income and Expenditure Survey 2000, *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 24, vol. 3.

Rogerson, CM (2012), Tourism–agriculture linkages in rural South Africa: evidence from the accommodation sector, Vol. 20, No. 3, April 2012, 477–495

Stats SA (2013a). Census 2011: Agricultural Households: Key Highlights, Report No. 03-11-01 (2011). Statistics South Africa, Pretoria.

Stats SA (2013b). Census 2011. <http://interactive.statssa.gov.za/Superweb>.

Troskie, D.P. (2013), Provinces and agricultural development: challenge or opportunity? *Agrekon* 52:1.

Urban Landmark (2011). *Taking Stock: The development of urban retail centres in emergency economy areas*. <http://www.urbanlandmark.org.za/research/x51.php>

Van den Heiden, T and Vink, N (2013), Good for whom? Supermarkets and small farmers in South Africa – a critical review of current approaches to increasing access to modern markets. *Agrekon* 52:1.

#### Informal markets

Centre for Development and Enterprise (CDE) (2004), *Key to Growth: Supporting South Africa's Emerging Entrepreneurs*, Research Report no. 12, Johannesburg.

Centre for Development and Enterprise (CDE) (2006), *Accelerating shared growth: Making Markets Work for the Poor in South Africa*, Report commissioned by ComMark Trust, Johannesburg.

<http://books.google.co.za/books?hl=en&lr=&id=v2jsIFo183cC&oi=fnd&pg=PA302&dq=informal+sector+skinner&ots=2EtV7obEX1&sig=dZF8DTAFSy0BwwsTVFuEKmVWJvI#v=onepage&q=informal%20sector%20skinner&f=false>

#### Labour markets

Atkinson, D and Marais, L (2006), Urbanisation and the future urban agenda in South Africa" (with Lochner Marais), in *Democracy and Delivery: Urban policy in South Africa*, edited by Richard Tomlinson and Udesch Pillay, pp. 22-49. HSRC Press.

Bernstein, A (2014). South Africa's key challenges: Tough choices and new directions. *Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science*. Mar2014, Vol. 652 Issue 1, p20-47.

National Planning Commission (2011). National Development Plan: Vision for 2030. Office of the Presidency. [www.presidency.gov.za](http://www.presidency.gov.za).

Nattrass, N (2014), Meeting the challenge of unemployment. *Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science*. Mar2014, Vol. 652 Issue 1, p87-105.

### Within-country migration

Collinson, M. and Wittenberg, M. 2001 "Labour Force Dynamics in a Rural Part of South Africa: The Agincourt sub-district of the Northern Province, 1992-2000." Paper presented to the DPRU/FES Conference, "Labour Markets and Poverty in South Africa". Johannesburg. (Cited in Singh 2005: 2).

Collinson, M., Kok, P. and Ganenne, M. (2006) Migration and changing settlement patterns: Multilevel data for policy. Report 03-04-01, Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.

Collinson, MA, Wolff, B, Tollman, SM, and Kahn, K (2006b), Trends in Internal Labour Migration from Rural Limpopo Province, Male Risk Behaviour, and Implications for the Spread of HIV/AIDS in Rural South Africa, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 633-648.

Collinson, MA, Tollman, SM and Kahn, K (2007), Migration, settlement change and health in post-apartheid South Africa: Triangulating health and demographic surveillance with national census data, *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 35(Suppl 69): 77–84.

Fatti, G, Block, P, Grimwood, A and Eley, B (2010), Increased vulnerability of rural children on antiretroviral therapy attending public health facilities in South Africa: a retrospective cohort study, *Journal of the International AIDS Society*, 13:46.

Fry, L(2013), Trust of the Police in South Africa: A Research Note, *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences (IJCS)*, vol. 8 (1): 36–46.

Hall, R, Wisborg, P, Shirinda, S and Zamchiya, P (2013), Farm Workers and Farm Dwellers in Limpopo Province, South Africa, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 47–70.

Kok, P, O'Donovan M, Bouare O and Van Zyl J, 2003. *Post-Apartheid patterns of Internal Migration in South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC Publishers.

Kok, P., Gelderblom, D., Oucho, J.O. & Van Zyl, J. 2006. *Migration in South and Southern Africa: dynamics and determinants*. Cape Town: HSRC Publishers.

Moses, E and Yu, D (2009), *Migration from the Northern Cape*, South African Labour and Development Research Unit (SALDRU), Cape Town.

Posel, D. 2003. *Have Migration Patterns in post-Apartheid South Africa Changed?* Paper prepared for Conference on African Migration in Comparative Perspective, Johannesburg, South Africa, 4 – 7 June, 2003. (cited in Moses and Yu 2009: 24).

Posel, D (2003a). The collection of national household survey data in South Africa (1993–2001): rendering labour migration invisible *Development Southern Africa Vol. 20, No. 3*.

Posel, D and Casale, D (2003). What has been happening to internal labour migration in South Africa, 1993-1998? *The South African Journal of Economics*, vol. 71:3.

Posel, D (2009), *Migration: Analysis of the NIDS [National Income Dynamics Study] Wave 1 Dataset : Discussion Paper No. 1*, School of Development Studies, Durban, University of Kwa-Zulu Natal.

Rhele, T.M., and Shisana, O. 2003. 'Epidemiological and demographic HIV/AIDS projections: South Africa'. *African Journal of AIDS Research*, 2003, 2(1): 1–8.

Singh (2005). Patterns of Migration, Settlement and Dynamics of HIV/AIDS in South Africa, South African Cities Network and Forced Migration Studies Programme, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

### **Additional resources**

#### *1. Demarcation Board*

South Africa's Demarcation Board is responsible for demarcating the boundaries of municipalities (including metros, local municipalities and district municipalities). It also demarcates the wards within these municipalities. See [www.demarcation.org.za](http://www.demarcation.org.za).

#### *2. StatsSA*

South Africa's official statistical agency manages the Censuses, as well as several other periodic surveys. See [www.statssa.gov.za](http://www.statssa.gov.za).

#### *3. South African Cities Network (SACN)*

This network has seven members, including the metros. It conducts a great deal of research on urban development. See [www.sacitiesnetwork.co.za](http://www.sacitiesnetwork.co.za).

#### *4. The Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC)*

The HSRC has conducted a wide range of research on rural and urban settings. See [www.hsrc.ac.za](http://www.hsrc.ac.za).

#### *5. Centre for Development and Enterprise (CDE)*

This is a formidable think-tank based in Johannesburg ([www.cde.org.za](http://www.cde.org.za)). It commissions cutting-edge research on a wide range of topics, usually substantially in advance of government policy thinking. It also tries to influence policy-making by involving senior government staff in its debates. The Director is Ms Ann Bernstein.

### List of cities and towns by population (1996 population figures)

These tables were compiled by Doreen Atkinson in 2008, from 1996 census figures (thereafter, data is provided according to municipal boundaries, which are very different).

The municipalities often consist of several towns, and the rural or semi-rural areas in between. It is sometimes difficult to decide where the actual borders of these towns are.

Given that the data is almost 20 years old, it does not give an accurate contemporary picture. However, the spatial profiles of the provinces and their urban hierarchies remain broadly similar.

Province: Eastern Cape: Two metros, several strong towns, some commercial farmland, and vast traditional rural areas with small villages					
Towns 0-25 000		Towns 25-50 000	Towns 50-75 000	Towns 75-100	Towns 100-600+
Aberdeen	MountFletcher	AliwalNorth	Alice	Grahmstown	Uitenhage
Adelaide	Mount Frere	Burgersdorp	Butterworth	Zwelitsha	King William's Town
Alexandria	Mqanduli	Cradock		Umtata?	Queenstown
Alicedale	Ngqeleni	Despatch			East London: Main component of Buffalo City Metro
Bathurst	Nieu-Bethesda	FortBeaufort			Port Elizabeth: Main component of Nelson Mandela Metro
Bedford	Patensie	Graaff Reinet			
Bizana	Paterson	Humansdorp			
Cala	Pearston	Kirkwood			
Cathcart	Peddie	Middelburg			
Cofimvaba	Rhodes	Port Alfred			
Cookhouse	Riebeek East	Stutterheim			
Dordrecht	Seymour	Whittlesea			
Elliot	Somerset East	Barkly East?			
Elliotdale	St Francis Bay	PortStJohns			
Engcobo	Sterkspruit				
Flagstaff	Sterkstroom				

Hamburg	Steynsburg				
Hankey	Steytlerville				
Hofmeyr	Tabankulu				
Idutywa	Tarkastad				
Indwe	Tsolo				
Jamestown	Tsomo				
Jansenville	Ugie				
Jeffreys' Bay	Klipplaat				
Joubertina	Komga				
Kareedouw	Lady Frere				
Kei Mouth	Lady Gray				
Kei Road	Libode				
Keiskamhoek	Lusikisiki				
Kentani	Maclear				
Kenton- Sea	Middeldrift				
Molteno	Mount Ayliff				
Venterstad	Willowvale				
Willowmore					
<b>TOTALS:</b>					
67		14	2	3	5

**Province: Free State: One strong city, several strong towns, largescale commercial farmland, and numerous small towns**

Towns 0-25 000		Towns 25-50 000	Towns 50-75 000	Towns 75-100	Towns 100-600+
Arlington	Petrus Steyn	Allanridge	Bothaville	Bethlehem	Bloemfontein: Now the main city of the Mangaung Metro
Bethulie	Petrusburg	Bultfontein	Ficksburg	Harrismith	Botshabelo
Boshof	Philippolis	Clocolan	Thaba Nchu?	Odendaalsrus	Kroonstad

Brandfort	Reddersburg	Frankfort		Parys	Phuthadijhaba
Clarens	Rosendal	Heilbron		Virginia	Sasolburg
Cornelia	Senekal	Hennenman			Welkom?
Dealesville	Smithfield	Ladybrand			
Edenburg	Soutpan	Lindley			
Fauresmith	Springfontein	Reitz			
Gariiep Dam	Steynsrus	Theunissen			
Hertzogville	Thaba Patchoa	Villiers			
Hobhouse	Trompsburg	Vrede			
Hoopstad	Tweeling	Wesselsbron			
Jacobsdal	Vanstadensrus	Winburg			
Jagersfontein	Ventersburg	Viljoenskroon?			
Kestell	Verkeerdevlei				
Koffiefontein	Vredefort				
Koppies	Warden				
Luckhoff	Wepener				
Marquard	Zastron				
Fouriesburg	Opermansgronde				
Memel	Paul Roux				
Dewetsdorp	Deneysville				
Excelsior?	Rouxville?				
<b>TOTALS</b>					
48		15	3	5	6

**Province: Gauteng: Two large metros and a few large towns, many of them forming conurbations**

Towns 0-25 000	Towns 25-50 000	Towns 50-75 000	Towns 75-100	Towns 100-600+	
-	Bronkhospruit	-	Heidelberg	KemptonPark (the main component of the Ekurhuleni)	Alberton

				Metro)	
	Cullinan			Lethabong	Benoni
				Midrand	Boksburg
				Krugersdorp	Brakpan
				Vereeniging	Carletonville
				Pretoria (the main component of the Tshwane Metro)	Germiston
				Centurion	Johannesburg (the main component of the Johannesburg Metro)
				Randfontein	Khayalami
				Springs	Westonaria

**Province: KwaZulu-Natal: One metro, several strong towns, some commercial farmland, and large traditional rural areas with small villages**

Towns 0-25 000		Towns 25-50 000	Towns 50-75 000	Towns 75-100 000	Towns 100-600+
Ashburton	Southbroom	Dundee	Ballito	Margate?	Durban
Bergville	Mtubatuba	Empangeni	Howick		KwaDukuza
Camperdown	Ixopo	Estcourt	Richmond		Ladysmith
Cathkin Park	Louwsburg	Kokstad	Vryheid		Newcastle
Cedarville	Matatiele	Mandeni	Scottborough?		Pennington
Colenso	Melmoth	PortShepstone			Msunduzi
Impendle	Mooi River	Umkomaas			Richards Bay
Creighton	Mtunzini	Port Edward?			Ulundi
Dalton	New Hanove				Uthukela
Dannhauser	Nkwazi				Uthungulu
Eshowe	Nongoma				
Gingindlovu	Dumbe				
Glencoe	Pongola				

Greytown	St Lucia				
Harding	Underberg				
Hattingspruit	Utrecht				
Hibberdene	Wartburg				
Hilton	Weenen				
Himeville	Winterton				
<b>TOTALS:</b>					
40		8	5	1	10

**Province: Mpumalanga: Several strong towns, many small towns, some commercial farmland, and large traditional rural hinterland with small villages**

Towns 0-25 000		Towns 25-50 000	Towns 50-75 000	Towns 75-100	Towns 100-600+
Amersfoort	Greylingstad	Badplaas	Balfour	Bethal	Empuluzi
Amsterdam	Grobblersdal	Barberton	Breyten	Elukwatini	Highveld
Belfast	Grootvlei	Hendrina	Delmas	Ermelo	Kwamhlanga
Carolina	Komatipoort	Kriel	Hazyview	Leandra	Witbank
Chrissiesmer	Lothair	Lydenburg	Piet Retief	Ekgangala?	Mathanjana
Davel	Emthonjeni	Ogies			Mbibane
Dullstroom	Malelane	Volksrust			Mdutfane
Ekulindeni	Marble Hall	WhiteRiver			Middelburg
Graskop	Sivukele				Mkobola
Perdekop	Steelpoort?				Moutse
Sabie	WatervalBoven				Nelspruit
Wakkerstroom					Standerton
<b>TOTALS:</b>					
23		7	5	5	12

**Province: Northern Cape: Two strong towns and numerous small towns in an arid and sparsely-populated hinterland**

Towns 0-25 000		Towns 25-50 000	Towns 50-75 000	Towns 75-100 000	Towns 100-600+
Brandboom	Kamieskroon	De Aar	JanKempdorp		Kimberley
Brandvlei	Kathu	Postmasburg	Upington		
Britstown	Keimoes	Warrenton			
Calvinia	Kenhardt	Barkly West?			
Carnarvon	Komaggas				
Colesberg	Kuruman				
Concordia	Kamiesberg				
Danielskuil	Loeriesfontein				
Deben	Loxton				
Delportshoop	Marydale				
Douglas	Mier				
Eksteenskuil	Niekerkshoop				
Fraserburg	Nieuwoudtville				
Garies	Noupoort				
Griekwastad	Olifantshoek				
Grobbershoop	Pella				
Hanover	Petrusville				
Hartswater	Philipstown				
Hopetown	Pofadder				
Kakamas	PortNolloth				
Strydenburg	Prieska				
Sutherland	Richmond				
Vanderkloof	Richtersveld				
Vanwyksvlei	Ritchie				
Vanzylsrus	Springbok				
Victoria West	Steinkopf				
Vosburg	Windsorton				

Williston	O’Kiep				
<b>TOTALS:</b>					
56		4	2	-	1

**Province: Limpopo: A few strong towns, some small towns, some commercial farmland, and a vast traditional rural area with many villages**

Towns 0-25 000	Towns 25-50 000	Towns 50-75 000	Towns 75-100	Towns 100-600+
Ellisras	GaKgapane	Warmbaths	Tzaneen	LouisTrichardt
Naboomspruit	Messina	Hoedspruit?		Phalaborwa
Nylstroom				Polokwane
Thabazimbi				Potgietersrus
				Thohoyandou
<b>TOTALS:</b>				
4	2	2	1	5

**Province: North-West: A few strong towns, several small towns, some commercial farmland, and a large traditional hinterland with small villages**

Towns 0-25 000	Towns 25-50 000	Towns 50-75 000	Towns 75-100	Towns 100-600+
Coligny	Bloemhof	Tigane	Schweizer-Reneke	Bophirima
Atamelang	Fochville	Vryburg		Brits
Hartbespoortdam	Marikana			Klerksdorp
Koster	Ottosdal			Lichtenburg
Leeudoringstad	Christiana?			Mafikeng
Makwassie	Wolmaransstad?			Orkney
Reivilo				Potchefstroom
Sannieshof				Rustenburg
Stella				Stilfontein
Swartruggens				
Ventersdorp				
Wedela				
Zeerust				

Lehurutshe?				
<b>TOTALS</b>				
13	6	2	1	9

**Province: Western Cape: One metro, many strong towns, many small towns and commercial agricultural hinterland**

Towns 0-25 000		Towns 25-50 000	Towns 50-75 000	Towns 75-100 000	Towns 100-600+
Ashton	Hopefield	Beaufort West	Hartenbos	Worcester	Paarl
Aurora	Klawer	Grabouw	Mossel Bay		Cape Town
Nuwerus	Knoetzie	Knysna	Oudtshoorn		Helderberg
Bonnievale	Koringberg	Malmesbury	Plettenberg Bay		Oostenberg
Bot River	Ladismith	Robertson	Stellenbosch		South Peninsula
Bredasdorp	Laingsburg	Wellington	WestCoast Peninsula		Tygerberg
Brenton	LambertsBay		Kraaifontein?		George
Caledon	Langebaan				Overberg
Calitzdorp	Leeu Gamka				Bellville
Ceres	Lutzville				
Citrusdal	Mcgregor				
Clanwilliam	Montagu				
Darling	Mooreesburg				
De Doorns	Murraysburg				
De Rust	Napier				
Doring Bay	Piketberg				
Dysselsdorp	Pniel				
Ebenhaeser	Porterville				
Franschoek	PrinceAlbert				
Friemersheim	PrinceAlfred Hamlet				
Gansbaai	Rawsonville				

Genadendal	Redelinghuys				
Gouritzmond	Rheenedal				
Graafwater	Rietpoort				
GreatBrak River	Riversdale				
Greyton	Riviersonderend				
Haarlem	Saron				
Hangklip	Sedgefield				
Heidelberg	Slangrivier				
Herbertsdale	Stanford				
Hermanus	Stilbaai				
Uniondale	Struisbaai				
Vanrhynsdorp	Suurbraak				
Vanwyksdorp	Swellendam				
Velddrift	Touws River				
Villiersdorp	TulBagh				
Vredendal	Wolseley				
Wilderness	Yzerfontein				
Albertinia	Zoar				
Barrydale					
<b>TOTALS:</b>					
79		6	7	1	10