

THE ROLE OF URBANIZATION IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT:
BRIDGING THE RURAL-URBAN DIVIDE

A.I.D. PROGRAM EVALUATION DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 27

by

John P. Mason, Senior Social Science Analyst
(Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, A.I.D.)

U.S. Agency for International Development

JULY 1989

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are those of the author and should not be attributed to the Agency for International Development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

For any Tables, Figure Boxes, or Graphs, as well as Table of Contents that may be omitted from this document may be found on Microfiche.

FOREWORD

Urbanization continues to remain an issue of some urgency within the U.S. Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) and the donor community. A.I.D. concern was most recently highlighted in the report *Development and the National Interest: U.S. Economic Assistance Into the 21st century* (A.I.D. 1989). Yet the urbanization process is complex and has not been very well understood. The process continues unabated and at a very rapid pace in most developing countries. It is also occurring differently from the way towns and cities have evolved in the West. In the developing countries, urbanization is not inevitably linked to overall national economic growth and development.

A.I.D., other donors, and developing country governments need a better grasp on how town and city formation contributes to national growth. At the policy level, knowing the direct impact of economic and social policies on a country's human settlements is critical to national planning. Understanding urbanization's role in national growth is also essential in developing effective Country Development Strategy Statements. On the program and project level, designing interventions in rural production, for example, requires knowing the pivotal part played by rural-urban linkages, especially market town development.

The Center for Development Information and Evaluation's (CDIE) interest in urbanization as an issue derives from the Center's role in helping to define and clarify issues of concern to A.I.D. This paper provides a development orientation to urbanization that enables the reader to conceptualize how urban centers can be effectively drawn on for purposes of overall national, including rural, development. By focusing on A.I.D.'s experience in harnessing urbanization as a development force, the paper contributes to the ongoing dialogue on urbanization and the potential of A.I.D. to make a difference in directing this force.

CDIE welcomes comments from its readers to help enrich our understanding of ways to harness the urbanization process in developing countries—one of the challenging tasks facing development assistance programs.

Janet Ballantyne
Associate Assistant Administrator
Center for Development Information
and Evaluation
Bureau for Program and Policy
Coordination
Agency for International Development
July 1989

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author benefited greatly from the overall guidance, advice, and support of W. Haven North in preparation of this paper. He received very useful comments from CDIE colleagues Paula Goddard, Annette Binnendijk, Gerald Britan, Kerry Byrnes, Siew Tuan Chew, Gary Hansen, Krishna Kumar, Cressida McKean, Joe Lieberman, and Pat Vondal. Those from outside CDIE who provided helpful commentary on the paper are Avron Bendavid-Val, Eric Chetwynd, Michael Cohen, Bill Miner, Bruce Odell, Jennifer Santer, Al Van Huyck, and Jan Van der Veen. The author gratefully acknowledges the interest and support of these and all other colleagues who commented on various drafts.

SUMMARY

A primary purpose of this report is to stimulate within the U.S. Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) a discussion on urbanization in developing countries and the importance urbanization can play in shaping national economic growth and development. Directed to project and program designers and Mission strategists, the report contends that there has been a rural-urban "divide" in the Agency and in developing country governments. The divide is viewed in the context of a growing antiurban bias and in the perception that urbanization is somehow "bad. n Although urbanization is not occurring along the same lines in the developing countries as it has in Western countries, it can, and in some cases does, contribute effectively to overall national economic growth and development.

This report argues that urbanization in developing countries falls along a continuum between extreme types. Type 1 occurs when overall national economic growth and development are present. Type 2 occurs when there is inadequate overall growth, even underdevelopment.

In a review of regional trends, much of Sub-Saharan African urbanization falls under Type 2, namely, rapid urbanization and urban growth with limited national development. The Near East is skewed toward increased concentration of urban peoples in the largest cities, but generally in the context of moderate development across the region. Asia shows a mixture of Types 1 and 2, a case of "mixed" urbanization. There, Type 1 applies mainly to the middle-income, newly industrializing countries, while Type 2 applies mostly to low-income countries experiencing low agricultural production, low employment and income, and high rates of rural migration to megacities. For Latin America, a mixture of Types 1 and 2 also occurs, mainly in the form of "overurbanization" and slowed development.

Factors of national importance in urbanization include socioeconomic conditions and policies that have a direct impact on a country's human settlements; for example, national policy that directly affects income and employment has indirect effects on those settlements. Another major factor that affects urbanization is migration by rural households to urban areas in response to economic incentives. In developing countries, households respond to such incentives in choosing places to work. Equally important is the character of rural-urban linkages. In places where urbanization is of Type 1, rural-urban linkages actively contribute to a dynamic marketing system; but for Type 2, such linkages do not create opportunities for

increased employment and income generation. Since key dimensions of the rural-urban linkage have not been presented systematically elsewhere, this report defines them: economic- technological, spatial, infrastructure and services, financial- administrative, and key organizational players. The economic- technological forces are deemed to have the greatest influence on rural-urban exchange, but the other conditioning factors are critical to how sustainable that exchange can become. An A.I.D.-funded study (Clark University 1988)-of Kutus Town, Kenya-is described to illustrate the content of rural-urban linkages.

A.I.D. experience in developing rural-urban linkages shows a 15-year history of consciously aiming to capture and channel energies that reinforce both rural and urban development. Developed mainly by the Office of Rural and Institutional Development, the approaches include the areas of resource management, regional development, urban functions in rural development, market town and secondary city development, and settlement and resource systems analysis. The A.I.D. Office of Housing and Urban Programs has also contributed to this effort through assistance in dealing with the increasing complexities of urbanization, mainly through national housing finance strategies, land use planning strategies, local mobilization of financial resources, and improved municipal management.

A suggested approach to rural-urban linkage development-called ARULINKED or "Are You Linked"--is developed in the report. ARULINKED is intended to assist developing country governments to improve their policies, planning, and programs to develop rural-urban linkages toward the goal of national growth and development. Building on A.I.D.'s work in rural-urban linkage, the proposed approach aims to provide a means of distinguishing between conventional wisdom and new thinking on such matters as migration patterns, backward linkages to rural communities, off-farm employment, the urban poor, and megacities. ARULINKED is also used to generate a list of illustrative questions to guide project and program developers and designers as well as Mission strategists toward a new view of urbanization. Potentially useful as a checklist in formulating Country Development Strategy Statements and developing program and project designs, the questions are posed in terms of macro-level and sector-level analysis and planning issues.

GLOSSARY

A.I.D.	-	U.S. Agency for International Development
ARULINKED	-	Approach to Rural-Urban Linkage Development
CDIE	-	Center for Development Information and Evaluation
GDP	-	Gross Domestic Product
MEREC	-	Managing Energy - and Resource-Efficient Cities
SARSA	-	Settlement and Resource System Analysis, a cooperative agreement with Clark University and the Institute for Development Anthropology
SCD	-	Secondary City Development
UFRD	-	Urban Functions in Rural Development
USAID	-	A.I.D. Country Mission

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Impact on A.I.D. Thinking of a Rural-Based Strategy

Development agency work in rural and urban development has become reminiscent of a divorce. The symptom is a growing "rural-urban divide" in donor agency bureaucracies. While the opposition of rural and urban is, of course, artificial, the boundaries of the two areas nevertheless have become fixed and entrenched in most donor agencies. As a rural-based strategy became the focus of most development activity, interest in urbanization faded. The result was an impoverished understanding of the role of urbanization in development, in which this process came to be viewed more and more distantly as some undefined, unmanageable "problem." Urban issues were perceived as having little to do with rural development issues. The result was a large gap in our knowledge and understanding of rural-urban linkage, a gap that for the most part has been perpetuated to the present.

Clearly there are exceptions to this "rural-urban divide" (Booth et al. 1984) in the U.S. Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) as well as other development agencies. This report builds on A.I.D.'s and, to a limited extent, other agencies' efforts to build on understandings about both rural and urban development. It is from such experience and knowledge that we come to understand how rural and urban forces of growth reinforce one another.

1.2 Origin and Purpose of the Paper

Interest in the rural-urban dynamic is partly a reaction to the tendency in some camps to narrowly characterize urbanization in the developing countries as a "problem" (Lipton 1977). It is also motivated by frustration with single-focused, rural strategies that are often treated as if they embodied the sole solution to national development. Today urbanization is being increasingly defined as integral to the national development process and as intimately bound to rural development (London 1987).

The purpose of this paper is multiple. First, it aims to stimulate in the Agency a discussion about urbanization. It proposes that urbanization is as much a natural part of the overall national development process as is rural development—that urban growth is not necessarily "bad," as it is so often depicted by many in the development community. A second purpose

is to present current knowledge on urbanization in developing countries in order to highlight the integral link of that process to rural development. Third, the paper briefly reviews A.I.D. approaches that have consciously aimed to develop the natural linkages between urban and rural environments. The intent of that review is to study whether and how those approaches have addressed national growth and development needs and to show that rural-urban linkages hold a promise for national social and economic growth in general. Finally, the paper proposes a framework for an approach to rural-urban linkage development. A major purpose of this approach is to get project planners to think about the relationship between rural and urban development in more concrete, spatial terms than they are used to doing. In so doing, they will be better able to design projects that increase the flow of goods, money, and services between farms and towns, thereby enhancing the prospects for both rural and urban development.

The Center for Development Information and Evaluation's (CDIE) interest in this topic stems from its role in helping to define and clarify issues of Agencywide concern. The urbanization issue has been drawing increasing attention inside A.I.D. (1988), in other international agencies (Beier et al. 1976; UNCHS 1987), and in the U.S. Congress. CDIE believes that it is timely to consider A.I.D.'s experience in harnessing the urbanization process for purposes of overall national development. This paper is expected to contribute to an ongoing dialogue on urbanization and the Agency's role in that process.

1.3 Rural-Urban Linkage and Urbanization Defined

A key concept in this paper is the rural-urban linkage, which is defined as the movement and exchange of people, goods, money, services, and ideas back and forth between rural areas and urban (including small town) centers. More narrowly, it is the flow of agricultural inputs, services, products, and money between farms and towns through the medium of the market.

While rural-urban exchange is rooted in the agriculture sector, it is assumed, following Mellor (1986), that the exchange is of a type that spreads growth and jobs outside of that one sector, creating more and more linkages. In Mellor's view, specific elements of the rural-urban linkage provide the basis for a successful agriculture- and employment-based strategy. These elements are provided by communications and transport infrastructure and by regional urban centers with high employment potential. Such regional urban centers are often small towns, which, if they are functioning effectively, generate demand for farm products, offer job possibilities for farm and town populations alike, and function as centers for agricultural supply (Rondinelli 1987).

A qualification to the rural-urban linkage definition, one that will be discussed more fully later in the report, is that not all connections between rural and urban environments are beneficial to all populations affected by those connections. One example is certain types of rural-urban linkages that serve elites, often urban elites, in economically exploiting small agricultural producers. Another is linkages that commercialize agriculture and, as some social scientists contend, put the survival of the poor who reside in low-resource agricultural regions at greater risk than they already face, by subjecting them to the whim of market forces (Rondinelli 1987).

While the major impetus for rural-urban movement or exchange is viewed as economic-including jobs, production, income, marketing, and consumption-it is heavily shaped by the social factor, that is, by how people involved in the exchange are organized. Type of community, extension of kinship system, household organization, division of labor by age and gender, and solidarity and degree of sharing among social groups are some of the social features of linkage. Also critical to linkage is the clearly physical aspect or infrastructure, including roads, marketplaces, and communication systems. Political-administrative arrangements and health and education services also provide an important glue for linkage. Ultimately it is in these kinds of conditions surrounding economic exchange, the so-called "conditioning environment" (Bendavid-Val et al. 1988), not in the mechanics of trade or commerce itself, that development interventions will be made. The urbanization process is, of course, very much a part of this conditioning environment and must be analyzed and planned for in developing rural-urban linkages.

The vantage point from which rural-urban linkages are viewed in this paper is urbanization, which is defined as the process by which a country's population changes from a predominantly rural to an urban way of life. Urbanization is measured by an increase in the proportion of a nation's population living in towns and cities. Urbanization thus differs from urban growth, which is simply the rate of increase in size of an urban population (Davis 1972; Singlemann 1984).

This paper views the rural-urban issue from the urban side mainly because urbanization is a critical though, within A.I.D., poorly understood part of national growth and development, and it therefore requires greater attention. By the same token, because the Agency's strategy is rural based, the rural side is of course much better understood than the urban. This is evidenced in numerous reviews of rural and integrated rural development efforts (e.g., Binnendijk 1988; Chambers 1983; Honadle and VanSant 1985; Kumar 1987; Moris 1981).

A final clarification is the term "urban" itself. Virtually every country uses different definitions to classify its population into urban and rural components. In computing statistics, the United Nations expects national definitions to distinguish urban areas from rural areas (UNCHS 1987). For example, many African nations define as urban those localities with 2,000 or more population. Ethiopia uses 2,000 as its lower limit, while Nigeria defines as urban towns with 20,000 or more inhabitants whose occupations are not mainly agrarian. In Latin America, Peru defines as urban populated centers with 100 or more occupied dwellings. In Asia, India defines as urban a town that possesses specific municipal administrative bodies, while Japan uses 50,000 inhabitants as its minimal definition. Some nations stipulate a minimal number of persons per hectare or square kilometer, and others use such criteria as secondary schools, government and private offices, or mills and factories.

The point of all this is twofold: first, comparisons of data on urban populations between countries and regions must be treated with care, and second, when the term "urban" is used here, it may refer to any settlement from the smallest rural town to the largest megacity. Where it is relevant to the discussion, an attempt is made to differentiate among these definitions.

2. CHANGING IMAGES OF URBANIZATION

Urbanization in the developing world today is qualitatively different from urbanization as it occurred in the West. This is particularly so in low- or no-growth countries, where rapid urbanization is occurring at much lower per capita income levels than for Western countries in comparable periods (Hamer 1985; Mohan 1976). In some developing countries, urban growth is happening at almost alarming rates of speed-alarming in the sense that the most rapid urban growth often occurs in some of the poorest countries with the lowest resources and least capacity to generate productive work and income in urban areas.

2.1 Urbanization and "Progress"

The development profession's view of urbanization has changed significantly over the years. Up to the mid-1960s, urbanization was tied to modernization, a process that was assumed to include the elimination of a society's "traditional" or "backward" elements (Gusfield 1967). Social or political difficulties accompanying rapid urbanization were viewed as merely transitional—a byproduct of becoming modern (Bienen

1984). During that time, it was the developing countries' urban-based public policies that shaped decisions about use of national resources. As a result of those policies, surpluses from agriculture and livestock were often transferred to urban investment; food prices were subsidized; and distribution of public services, facilities, and infrastructure decidedly favored urban areas. General effects were an overemphasis on the modern, formal sector and an increasing gap between rural and urban income levels.

As the focus of developing country urbanization shifted, however, the "progress" model became unworkable. Many of the criteria of modernization were relatively absent from the developing country urbanization process, including such benchmarks as a productive agriculture sector, industrialization, formal employment, and balanced rural-urban development (Abu-Lughod and Hay 1979). The differences in the evolution of Western and developing country cities, and especially the extraordinary growth rates among the urban poor, began to gain increasing attention.

2.2 A Growing Antiurban Bias

Later ideas about modernization tended to depict migration and urbanization as undesirable. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, development task group pronouncements (Pearson 1969; Prebisch 1970) distinctly downplayed the role of urbanization in national development. The result was that urban centers were characterized not as a focus of development but as a place where rural surplus labor ends up, unemployment occurs, and social tensions abound. The new urban poor were seen as a drain on developing nations and as belonging primarily back on the farm (Goldstein 1983). Poor urban migrants were also depicted as a drain on the city because, with their involvement in unskilled, unproductive work, they ultimately ended up in "slums of despair" or "cultures of poverty." Thus emerged the stereotype of the urban poor as a people ensnared in a tradition of poverty, incapable of contributing to urban life and therefore marginal to the modernization process (Perlman 1987).

Paralleling the inability of international assistance agencies to pinpoint the most effective place for their interventions in urban development was the tendency of national governments to cast their urbanization problems too narrowly (Terzo 1971). Problems were defined as sector issues—for example, housing or community services—or as resource needs, such as infrastructure or subsidized shelter projects. Developing country proposals presented to donor agencies for funding of urban sector activities were therefore very narrowly defined and focused on specific urban problems.

Recently, the urban poor are no longer being described as a fleeting appearance on the road to becoming modern. Rather, they are seen as a fixed part of the urban landscape, thereby coming under scrutiny in light of their role in carrying much of the burden of urban economies as well as their potential to foster revolutionary action (Bienen 1984). And even the image of the urban poor as a revolutionary force has shifted, so that currently many development specialists consider them to be no more or less rational than urban elites, adapting as best they can under worsening socioeconomic conditions, and as serving an indispensable economic function in underdeveloped economies (De Soto 1987; Nelson 1979).

However, the antiurban bias that arose in academic and international assistance agency circles in the 1960s and 1970s is still with us (Lipton 1977; Cohen 1979; Booth et al. 1984). The strong urban bias seemed in need of redressing, and the 1973 New Directions legislation and the resultant A.I.D. rural-based strategy were attempts to correct the situation. Even the new policies were not entirely successful, however, as they had the seemingly unintended effect of deemphasizing the rural-urban dynamic—which is now beginning to be recognized as very important for overall national growth and development.

3. TWO TYPES OF URBANIZATION: A REVIEW OF REGIONAL TRENDS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO RURAL-URBAN LINKAGE

The literature reviewed for this report revealed no clear distinctions about types of urbanization as they relate to development. Therefore it was deemed useful to develop definitions of two distinct types of urbanization, which differ according to how each is associated with national economic growth and development. Representing extremes of the urbanization process, most of which occurs on a continuum lying between the two types, these definitions are intended to help clarify the issue of how best to harness that process for national development purposes.

Type 1 is urbanization with development. It occurs when national economic growth and development are present, including a national policy that integrates economic and spatial planning, a productive agricultural sector, growth of secondary cities and market towns, and manageable levels of rural-urban migration. Type 1 urbanization takes place in developing countries experiencing an increase in the proportion of urban to rural population at the same time as there are increases in agricultural production and incomes and in urban employment, productivity, and incomes. Type 1 favors a dynamic agricultural sector, which in turn leads to prosperous secondary cities and market towns.

Type 2 is urbanization with limited development. It occurs where overall national economic growth and development are inadequate to meet the needs of a growing population. Other features of this type of urbanization include the lack of a national policy that integrates economic and spatial planning, underproduction in agriculture, overmigration, growth of megacities, and the relative absence of intermediate cities and towns. In contrast to Type 1, Type 2 urbanization occurs in countries in which there is an increase in proportion of urban to rural population, but also an absence of adequate agricultural production increases, job and income growth, and viable secondary cities and market towns. Furthermore, in countries experiencing Type 2 urbanization, cities become increasingly populated by the poor who are unable to improve either their employment possibilities or their incomes.

3.1 Worldwide Urban Population Trends

In countries in which Type 2 urbanization occurs, the constraints have often been historically determined. In physical terms, the spatial arrangements in the developing countries were formed to fulfill the trade, commercial, and political requirements of the colonial powers (McNulty 1987). Thus, regional and national economies were bypassed, creating a distorted pattern of urban settlements and an imbalance in the distribution of rural and urban settlements.

Policies in developing countries have reinforced rural-urban imbalances, as present population and urbanization data show. When projected to the future, these data suggest significant trends for both developing country urban growth and urbanization. The United Nations Population Division (1986) has made the following projections on the basis of its biannual country analyses of urban and rural populations:

- Urban population increases will occur most rapidly in the developing countries in the next several decades.
- Developing countries' urban populations are expected to be fully 50 percent of their populations in the next generation or so.
- Developing countries' urbanization levels will begin to approach those of the developed countries by about the year 2020.

These trends might convey a favorable picture if the industrial world pattern were serving as the model. When measured against the world's poorest countries and regions, however, they are a cause for alarm. In countries such as India, Bangladesh,

Ethiopia, Sudan, Zaire, or Kenya, for example, growth in the number of megacities tends to draw resources from rural areas without much return benefit to rural producers. Furthermore, the major portion of urban growth in most developing countries is due to natural increases in the birthrate rather than to rural-urban migration. This means that continued rural-urban migration will only worsen a situation in which the larger cities have enough to cope with given their own, already high, natural population growth rates. One recent sign of optimism is that as economic realities change in poorer countries, more and more migrants are heading to the intermediate cities, cities that provide a means of building or maintaining the rural-urban balance (UNCHS 1987).

3.2 Regional Urbanization Trends

The world's major regions are characterized by clear differences in rates, levels, and types of urbanization. These differences are summarized in the following generalizations, which-it must be stressed-do not necessarily hold for all countries in each region:

- In Africa, countries will experience a high, 4-5 percent rate of urbanization in coming decades, but generally in the absence of adequate overall national development, especially with regard to jobs and urban infrastructure.
- In the Near East, countries will undergo urbanization skewed toward a growing concentration of urban people in the largest cities.
- In Asia there will increasingly be differences in type of urbanization from one country to the next: low-income countries will experience very high levels of urbanization, while middle-income countries will undergo less rapid, more balanced urbanization.
- Latin America will have an extraordinarily high level of urbanization but without the kind of economic growth characteristic of the West.

A general review of regional variations follows. For each region, one example is given to illustrate the type of urbanization and the potential for rural-urban linkage development.

3.2.1 Africa: Rapid Urbanization and Urban Growth With Limited National Development

Dramatic population growth and high rates of urbanization in the 1970s and 1980s are causing critical changes in Africa's demographic picture. Sub-Saharan Africa is the world's least urbanized region, with less than one-third of its population living in urban centers. At the same time, among the world's developing regions, it has the highest rates of urban growth and urbanization. The average rate of urbanization during the 1970s was 4.6 percent, and that figure is not expected to diminish to less than 3 percent until after the first quarter of the next century (UNCHS 1987). Thus, by the year 2020 over half of the African population will be living in towns and cities. The presence of explosively expanding metropolises in Africa is accompanied by an economic base inadequate to provide either jobs or urban services (Adepoju 1986). In short, in varying degrees, Type 2 urbanization characterizes most Sub-Saharan African developing countries.

The high rates of rural-urban migration compound the already serious urban problems in Africa. The result of these demographic trends combined is that large numbers of poor, young urban adults are now starting families. This situation will place even greater demands on a system already overburdened by the demand for jobs, shelter, and urban and human services. As it is, many low-income residents in African urban centers have been successful in creating employment by taking advantage of previously untapped markets in the cities' informal sectors. These same residents have also found informal solutions to shelter, credit, and other services that they require to survive in the city.

As Figure 1 indicates, Southern and Northern Africa are the most urbanized; in the Eastern and Western regions, only one-fifth to one-quarter of the population lives an urban life. Annual average growth rates of urban populations during the next few decades will be highest for the Eastern and Southern regions. While natural growth is expected to be the major factor in the growth of cities in Northern and Southern Africa, in the Western and Eastern regions the key element will be rural-urban migration. This point is important because of the bearing that migration has on rural-urban linkages (discussed later in the report) and in light of the fact that East and West Africa possess some of the world's most rapidly growing cities.

Unfortunately for the well-being of Sub-Saharan Africans, the rapid growth of their towns and cities is associated with the absence of many of the benefits of accelerated urbanization in the West. For example, most cities in Sub-Saharan Africa cannot boast high levels of economic development nor high

standards of health, life expectancy, or education. Nevertheless, Africans continue to be drawn to cities because they hope for better job opportunities and education and improved health care (anna and Hanna 1981). However, benefiting from these urban amenities has been greatly constrained by the inability of most Sub-Saharan African cities to provide much more than bare survival.

Figure 1

Can be found on Microfitch

Much of African consists of low-resource agriculture-proceeding nations, and its urbanization trends tend to fit Type 2--urbanization with low development. To recall, that type accompanies low agricultural production, overmigration to cities, and the growth of megacities in the relative absence of intermediate city and town development.

Using Mellor's (1986) model for an agriculture- and employment-based strategy, it could be said that in many African countries the engine of agricultural production is simply not sufficiently powered to increase growth. African governments have typically followed economic policies that discriminated against the agricultural sector, including maintenance of low

food prices. The consequent low agricultural production cannot create sufficient numbers of jobs, nor is economic growth otherwise adequate to increase incomes or purchasing power. At the same time, the poor conditions of life in rural areas contribute significantly to migration to cities. In Africa, migration typically leapfrogs intermediate towns and cities, and the migrants land mostly in the ever-growing megacities. There, they increasingly confront some of the same conditions of low productivity, joblessness, and poor incomes that they encountered in rural areas, now compounded by overcrowding, pollution, and other urban problems.

Important for this discussion is the fact that in Africa, one of the critical ingredients is missing from the development equation. There is a distinct lack of town and city centers with the transport-communications infrastructure or the political-administrative structure necessary to stimulate, facilitate, and normalize economic exchange with rural areas. In this context, "political-administrative structure" includes the policy environment, especially the need to "get your prices right" and thus to induce increased agricultural production.

The absence of the appropriate conditioning environment in many African nations' agricultural zones contributes to the circularity of the problem: low production, poor market demand, low consumption, little income, and so on. Furthermore, in most of Africa, effective linkages are either absent or inadequate to support economic growth with development. The case of Tanzania, described in Box 1, illustrates many of these problems.

3.2.2 Near East: Rapid Growth of Megacities

In the Near East, urbanization has resulted in a growing concentration of urban people in the largest cities (El-Shakhs 1982). See Figures 1 and 2, which include data, respectively, for the Near East subregions of Northern Africa and Southern Asia. The extent of this concentration is evident from the fact that, except in Algeria and Saudi Arabia, from 20 to 66 percent of urban persons lived in the largest city of their Near Eastern country in 1980. Today more than 50 percent of urban Egyptians and over 40 percent of Turkey's urbanites live in their country's two largest cities. The region's largest cities have been growing much more rapidly than the smaller cities and towns, and this trend is expected to continue up to the year 2000.

The missing Box 1. The Case of Tanzania and the Colonial Legacy
Available on Microfiche

Natural growth will be responsible for much of the future urbanization of the Near East Region. This fact suggests that urban growth as a result of rural-urban migration is slowing somewhat in both Northern Africa and Southern Asia. The result of slowed migration to the region's megacities further suggests the possibility of a reasonably well-balanced settlements pattern throughout most of the countries of the region in the next century (Type 1). Even in those countries top-heavy with megacities, such as Egypt and Turkey, the prospect for a more balanced pattern is not unreasonable.

The situation in Cairo, described in Box 2, is typical of many Near East megacities.

3.2.3 Asia: A Case of "Mixed" Urbanization

As early as 800 A.D., China had the world's first city whose population reached 1 million; so it could be said that Asia has a long experience of urbanization. Because Asia includes almost 60 percent of the world's 5 billion people, it is not surprising that cities there are growing (UNCHS 1987). Many of Asia's megacities, such as Calcutta, Manila, Dhaka, Jakarta, Bombay, and Karachi, are characterized by a mixture of skyscrapers and slums, in some cases an equal mix. Although these cities have been unable to provide the quality of life to which the rural migrants aspired, demographers' forecasts that even larger megalopolises would be scattered over Asia have not been realized.

One reason that some Asian supercities have been basically manageable is that urban and demographic planners have learned much about dealing with urban problems. For example, knowledge of the role of rural-urban migration to Asian cities following World War II, especially in Southeast and Southern Asia, has permitted planners to more accurately forecast urban service and infrastructure needs (Hackenberg 1980). Furthermore, an understanding of the proportionately larger part played by natural population growth than by migration in causing growth of Asian cities in the middle and late 1950s has also been important to planners in estimating urban expansion. (Box 3 describes the results of urbanization in China.)

Asia's urban population growth is averaging about 3 percent per year, with little expectation that the rate will change before the year 2000. Nevertheless, towns and cities in Asia will double their population to a total of 1.2 billion by the year 2000. Subregional differences in urbanization trends are shown in Figure 2.

The missing Box 2. The Case of Cairo--A Problem of Space
Available on Microfiche

The missing Box 3. The Case of Urbanization and Settlements
Policy in China
Available on Microfiche

A useful distinction about Asian cities can be made in terms of country income category. In the large, low-income countries, such as China, Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan, high overall population growth has resulted in rapid rural, and even more rapid urban, growth. While urbanization levels will continue to be low, urban growth rates per se will be relatively high. Bangladesh is a case in point: only 12 percent of the country's 100 million people lived in cities and towns in 1985, but the urban growth rate has been in the range of 6 percent (UNCHS 1987). This rate translates to an increase from 9 million urbanites in 1980 to 27 million in the year 2000, a sizable leap given the poor economic profile of the country.

Figure 2. Urbanization Trends in Asia by Sub-region
Available on microfiche

Urbanization of both Types 1 and 2 occurs in Asia. Not by coincidence, the low-income countries are mostly characterized by Type 2, urbanization accompanied by low agricultural production, employment, and income; an absence of vitality in small- and mid-size urban centers; and overmigration of rural inhabitants to megacities. Countries such as Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan, parts of China, and, to a lesser extent, Indonesia have for the most part experienced high population growth,

resulting in very large increases in both urban and rural populations (UNCHS 1987). They remain mostly rural, though their urban populations are growing more quickly than rural areas.

Type 1 urbanization applies to the middle-income and newly industrializing Asian countries, though with some important distinctions. The distinctions revolve around the importance of agriculture in the overall national strategy, since in the case of countries such as Singapore and Hong Kong, the national development strategy is driven by the growth of an export-oriented industry in which agriculture plays a minimal part. That strategy has contributed to an increasingly rapid rate of urbanization. In the countries where an agriculture- and employment-based strategy prevails, as in Mellor's (1986) model, Type 1 urbanization occurs. Typical for most of the middle-income Asian countries, including Taiwan, Thailand and Malaysia, are growth in agricultural production, jobs, and income; manageable rural-urban migration; and the evolution of large cities. Urban development in those countries usually includes the formation of mid-size towns and cities. In the final analysis, differences in the degree of urbanization in these countries are related to each nation's individual economic growth strategy, rural policy, and infrastructure investment policy (UNCHS 1987).

3.2.4 Latin America: A Question of "Overurbanization" and Slowed Development

In Latin America, the Spanish colonial urban settlement plan set the tone for the present unfolding of towns and cities. In Spanish Latin America, the town was a response not to the need for urban services by rural settlers but, rather, to the desire of the Spanish Crown to occupy, exploit, and administer its new territory (Gwynne 1986). That system, which later evolved into something like city-states, eventually served as the basis for the formation of the states of present-day Spanish Latin America.

In every country in Latin America today, the growth rate for towns and cities is three to four times that for rural areas. In the years from 1950 to 1980, the average urban growth rate for Latin America was over 4 percent, except in Argentina, Cuba, and Uruguay, where rates were less than 3 percent. Continuing high fertility rates and a significantly declining mortality contribute to the region's overall rapid population growth and especially to its very high urban growth (Jordan 1986).

In Latin America, the proportion of the population that lives in urban areas is, on average, much higher than that of the other developing regions. In the mid-1970s, it had reached an average of almost 70 percent, the same as Europe's. By the year 2000, that percentage is projected to reach 77 percent. At present, just over half the urban increase is due to natural increase. The remainder is due to rural-urban migration and reclassification of rural areas as a result of urban absorption of rural localities or of redefinition on the basis of numerical size (Jordan 1986).

The proportions of people living in cities in Latin America vary from about 55 percent for the Caribbean countries to about 84 percent for the Temperate South American subregion. For the latter, including Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay, it is worth noting that only the most highly urbanized parts of the developed world such as North America and Western Europe have higher percentages of urban dwellers. City-to-city in contrast to rural-urban movement is becoming an increasingly significant factor in the already urbanized population of the Temperate subregion. Urbanization trends by subregion are shown in Figure 3.

Latin America's primate cities, like those of other developing regions, have become magnets for industrialization, which has in turn attracted rural migrants. Also, there are too few industrial or service jobs for too many migrants and a substantial small-scale, informal economy—a situation that is not unique to Latin America.

Urbanization in Latin America is characterized by both Type 1 and Type 2. The picture there is mixed, despite a very high overall rate of urbanization. Some nations—for example, Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina—are moving toward having a high proportion of population concentrated in urban centers along with national economic development—Type 1. In others—Colombia and Peru, for example—the population is moving in that same direction, but in a situation of limited national development—Type 2. Ecuador's urbanization policy, described in Box 4, is an example of an effort to direct urbanization into the most productive channels.

3.2.5 World Urbanization Trends and Level of National Development

Of the major regions, Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia give the most reason for concern. These two poorest subregions in the world could one day possess as much as 50 percent of the global population, and of that amount, fully half would be living in cities. While Africa, Asia, and Latin America show

The missing Box 4. The Case of Market Town and Intermediate City
Development in Ecuador
Available on Microfiche

significant differences in rates, levels, and types of urbanization, they do share certain characteristics. For one, in low-income developing countries, the proportion of rural to urban population is much greater than for middle- or high-income countries. For another, megacities are present in all regions. For supercities generally, the question of whether they are desirable or technically feasible looms large on the horizon; it will not be long before the world has several major metropolitan areas of 25-30 million people, many of whom will be poor and not productively employed.

The missing Figure 3. Urbanization Trends in Latin-America by Sub-region
Available on Microfiche

This section brings together some of the major factors involved in the processes of urbanization and national development described above for the regions. Its purpose is to set the stage for a discussion of rural-urban linkages in development.

4.1 The Link of Urbanization, Migration, and Development

National development is based on the connection of three important factors: migration, urbanization, and development (Timberlake and Kentor 1983). An imbalance in these factors can throw that entire process, including the rural-urban balance, out of kilter. Such a linkage can be witnessed most emphatically in countries where an "urban explosion" is essentially transforming a nation from an agrarian to an industrial service economy (Rogers and Williamson 1982). In such cases the net flow of migrants from rural to urban areas can be quite closely correlated to the level and rate of economic growth (U.N. 1980). As Ledent (1982) wrote, urbanization is a function of a population transfer from rural to urban areas in response to "spatial imbalances between labor supply and demand during the course of modernization (industrialization)" (p. 537). Certain other studies, however, link migration to urban poverty rather than to national development (UNCHS 1987).

4.2 Theories of Migration: Contrasting Views

In developing countries, households respond to economic incentives in choosing places to work. What is still being debated is how households decide to migrate and where to go, and why they continue to migrate to the city in the face of growing urban unemployment.

Economists Harris and Todaro (1970, Gugler 1982) wrote that potential migrants do in fact take into account not only rural-urban income differences but also the probability of obtaining urban employment. Their explanation, known as the Harris-Todaro model, proposed that migrants even try to guess what the expected differences in rural-urban income will be and to hedge their bets accordingly. Thus, according to this model, rural-urban migration continues theoretically until the relative chances for a potential job diminish to a point approximating zero.

Research on where rural migrants end up in the urban economy suggests they may either become a drag on the economy or, at the opposite extreme, provide a stimulating force (UNCHS 1987). On the one hand, migrants are seen to contribute to underdevelopment, straining the resources of the city to provide jobs, shelter, infrastructure, and urban services. Because migrants come to cities where poverty already exists, conventional wisdom has generally assumed that they only aggravate urban problems because of their increased numbers and absence of skills. On the other hand, recent research has indicated that rural migrants often make a positive contribution to the socio-

economic life of the city (Goldscheider 1983). That research points to young, highly self-selected, and ambitious representatives of the rural poor whose migration to a smaller, then larger, city results in competition by which the urban-born are being nudged higher up the socioeconomic scale. This perspective views the city in the developing world as a modernizing force, making cosmopolitans out of rural migrants.

4.3 National Policy and Human Settlements Development

National economic and social policies have a direct impact on a nation's human settlements. National policy that directly affects income and employment, for example, has additional effects, in turn, on the settlements. In addition, as the Habitat report (UNCHS 1987) on human settlements suggests, "Policies on imports, on the value of the currency, on the growth of industrial and agricultural output, and on the distribution of investments between sectors all affect, sometimes in unintended ways, the development of human settlements" (p. 93).

As this economic policy-human settlements link is becoming better understood, some countries are making efforts at the policy level to integrate economic goals with human settlements planning. Such an integration may result in a better spatial distribution of people and economic growth, aimed at reducing regional and local inequality. On the other hand, it may result in a set of policies that mobilize resources to deal with high population growth rates and urbanization that might otherwise cause severe employment, housing, and urban services problems. Further implications of a policy approach that links economic and spatial planning are addressed in Section 7.1.

5. CRITICAL DIMENSIONS OF RURAL-URBAN LINKAGE

The nature of rural-urban linkages is above all situational, depending on where and under what conditions the linkages occur. Linkages are different from one another, for example, depending on whether they occur in low-resource and subsistence agricultural regions, commercializing agricultural regions, or urban regions. Where urbanization is of Type 1 (with development), rural-urban linkages actively contribute to a dynamic marketing system, while for Type 2 (limited development), they do not generate opportunities for increased employment and income generation.

The situational character of rural-urban linkages is especially evident at the level of small and intermediate urban centers in rural areas. Given that every such center has its own peculiar mix of resources, skills, and development potentials (Bendavid-Val et al. 1988), its ties with the surrounding area, including regional and national economies, are bound to be more or less unique. This is the case even where two towns in the same region have a similar population size. Thus, local or situational factors must clearly be factored into the design of development interventions that aim to promote a greater dynamic in the rural-urban linkage.

5.1 Key Dimensions

Since the rural-urban linkage seems not to have been systematically defined elsewhere, it was decided for the purpose of this report to develop an inventory of what appear to be the most important dimensions. These dimensions, summarized in Box 5, are (1) economic-technological, (2) spatial, (3) infrastructure and services, (4) financial-administrative, and (5) key organizational players. While economic forces are deemed to have the greatest influence on rural-urban exchange, the other "conditioning" factors are critical to how viable and sustainable that exchange can become.

As Box 5 shows, the economic-technological dimension includes rural and urban demand, production, and employment/income. It consists of backward and forward flows between predominantly rural agriculture and mostly urban industry, including production, exchange, and consumption of each other's products. Rural and urban demand and production are seen as generating exchanges that drive economic growth and development. Rural nonfarm employment and income generation are important ingredients of the economic-technological aspect of rural-urban linkage.

Under the spatial dimension, towns and small secondary cities are highlighted for their place as links in the food marketing chain between rural and urban markets and as centers of innovation and diffusion, especially technological and financial. Infrastructure and services include all the means of keeping things and ideas moving (market, transport, roads, water and sanitation systems, communications systems), and people fed, healthy, and educated so they can go about their business and be productive. These different, physically based systems play a critical part in keeping the rural-urban flow dynamic.

The missing Box 5. Key Dimensions in the Rural-Urban Linkage
Available on Microfiche

The financial-administrative dimension consists of financial institutions for savings, investment, and credit for rural production in the broad sense. In addition to financial resources for agricultural production, this dimension includes services, marketing, manufacturing, and commerce for off-farm and nonfarm production. This dimension is divided along public and private lines in that some of the critical services and infrastructure in rural areas (such as irrigation, roads, and central marketplaces) are financed by public sources, while private sources finance the private sector for the functions associated with the food marketing chain.

The last dimension consists of the key organizational players. They are the persons who in their specific roles keep the linkages linked. They produce the surplus crops, broker the sale, lend the money, process the food, market the produce, drive the trucks, earn an income, buy the product, spend their cash. These key players also highlight some of the points where development interventions can be made in order to enhance the growth of rural-urban exchange. Interventions in the exchange are more fully discussed in Section 6.

5.2 An Illustration of Rural-Urban Linkage: Kutus Town, Kenya

An A.I.D. study (Clark University 1988, Executive Summary) may be used to illustrate the kind of rural-urban linkage that might occur in conjunction with Type 1 urbanization-urbanization with development. The example presented derives from research on the household-based rural-urban exchange in and around Kutus Town, Kenya. It was carried out by A.I.D.'s Office of Rural and Institutional Development, Bureau for Science and Technology, through the Settlement and Resource Systems Analysis (SARSA) Cooperative Agreement. The Kutus area study took place in the context of the Republic of Kenya's approach to long-term economic development, which specifically seeks a rural-urban balance. That approach builds on small town and secondary city development in rural areas of expanding agriculture but also includes a focus on the growth of off-farm employment for farm households. It is intended to result in an investment program, mainly in agriculture and in infrastructure that supports rural-urban economic growth, including roads, water, power, communications, and markets. The SARSA activity consisted of haseline research that would inform such an investment program.

5.2.1 Economic and Spatial Setting

Kutus Town, with a population of about 4,800, lies in the highlands, about 1-1/2 hours by paved road northeast of Nairobi. Kutus is a rural market center situated where several paved

roads come together from farmlands, villages, and cities in a zonal region of about 40,000 people. The major agricultural product of the surrounding area is coffee, and it is followed in importance by maize, beans, tomatoes, and potatoes. Industrial activities include sawmilling, cart manufacturing, furniture making, hide and skin preparation, leatherworking, rice milling, and tobacco processing. Commerce consists of general retailing, bookselling, hardware sales, bicycle retailing, agricultural bulking and trading, cement retailing, soft drink wholesaling, and sales of household goods and food, and it is carried on in shops of varying size, stalls, and open markets. Restaurants, hotels, hairstyling, manual small-load hauling, transportation, metal goods repair, vehicle repair, and many more constitute the active services sector. District offices in a nearby town support urban and agricultural development, including markets and trade, agriculture and veterinary medicine, works and roads, and community development. The Kutus area also has several state-supported supply and production cooperatives, including credit institutions, for coffee and maize production.

5.2.2 Employment and Income Conditions

Household employment and income data show that there is considerable unpaid labor both on the farm and in Kutus itself. Many of the paid workers in the rural part of the study area are wage workers in farming. In Kutus itself, commerce makes up the majority of self-employment and supplies the highest earnings per person. More people work in the services sector than in industrial and commercial activities, and they receive higher earnings per person than do those in the industrial and commercial activities sector.

Farming as a form of self-employment supplements nonfarm household incomes based on work in Kutus. Even farm households tend to obtain more of their cash earnings from nonfarming work than they do from farming. Nevertheless, farming is a centerpiece of the economy in that it contributes significantly to the overall cash income situation, plays an important part for farm and nonfarm residents in spreading their risk, contributes significantly to the marketing and commercial activities of the town, and supports households that spend money on consumer goods in Kutus.

5.2.3 Program Implications: Infrastructure and Finance-Administration

The Kutus exchange system has several key ingredients. One is income multiplication in production and consumption in Kutus Town and its hinterland. A second is the spatial distribution

of gross revenues from the production and marketing of the main commodities between the Kutus area and areas external to it and between Kutus Town and farm households. A third is the distribution of consumption expenditure between farm and town households.

In the process of market exchange, Kutus Town and its rural hinterland retain four-fifths of the value of final coffee, maize, and tomato production. Feeding into profits and labor wages or secondary activities in marketing and production, this revenue generates income for, among others, farm households- which spend over 40 percent of income on consumption items purchased in Kutus Town. A significant portion of spending in Kutus accrues in turn to area farm households that market produce or have members working in Kutus. Farm households are actually seen to "drive" the economy of Kutus, resulting in income multiplier effects for both farm and town residents. This illustrates the essence of rural-urban exchange.

The SARSA study suggests a number of implications for strengthening the existing rural-urban linkage in the Kutus area, although, at this preliminary stage, it does not yet make recommendations for program considerations. Physical capital for market infrastructure, including roads, facilities, and utilities servicing marketplaces, is a priority area named for consideration. Other physical capital is needed for small workshop space, a coffee input supply depot, a wholesale produce bulking depot, improved society-to-coffee-factory roads, improved farm-to-market roads, and irrigation technology for tomatoes. Institutional capital to be considered is cooperative tomato marketing, a Kutus labor exchange, and a revolving loan fund for small businesses. In the policy and procedures area, the study suggests interventions that would have a major impact on such elements as producer prices, productivity, and income multiplier effects.

5.2.4 More Expansive Rural-Urban Linkages

What is important for the present discussion is that the SARSA research clearly foresees the rural-urban linkage as going beyond small towns to larger urban centers. True, the role of small towns in giving farmers access to agricultural supplies, serving as market centers for rural produce, and raising farm household incomes is basic in the primary stages of rural-urban linkage formation. However, since all of the demand for urban goods and services cannot be met in small towns, greater spending must occur outside the region-hence the need to expand rural-urban linkages. At this stage of SARSA's research the focus is quite correctly on local- and district-level exchange,

which must be fully grasped before a wider scope can be studied. For the present purpose of illustrating the basis of rural-urban linkages, however, the Kutus Town example serves well.

6. A BRIEF REVIEW OF A.I.D. EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING RURAL-URBAN LINKAGES

Over the last 15 years or so, A.I.D. has experimented with several related approaches to developing existing patterns of exchange between urban and rural environments. These approaches consciously aim to capture and channel the energies that reinforce both rural and urban development. In certain cases, A.I.D. has been able to assist developing countries in forging linkages between rural and urban communities.

6.1 Resource Management Approach

Management of natural resources is a good starting point in looking at A.I.D. approaches, since it is in the particular use of and organization around the physical environment that gives cities, towns, and villages their defining character. It is also in the degradation of natural resources that the ecological balance between urban and rural conditions is perhaps most readily observable (Brown and Jacobson 1987; Sachs 1986). One response by A.I.D. Bureau for Science and Technology's Office of Rural and Institutional Development to increased pressures on scarce resources, high energy costs, and rapid urban population growth is the MEREC-Managing Energy- and Resource-Efficient Cities-approach (Bendavid-Val 1987b; Sood and Rogers 1983).

The MEREC planning process is designed for secondary or smaller cities with much of their growth and expansion ahead of them. MEREC can be applied to a variety of ecological problems or conditions in such a way that cities can develop and expand through use of resource-conserving and economical approaches. In one demonstration city, Tacloban, the Philippines, project elements included land use planning, a water distribution system, solid waste management, a slaughterhouse bio-gas plant and oxidation ponds, electricity efficiency, urban farming, a traffic plan, and training and public awareness activities. Besides having the effect of creating new job and income opportunities, MEREC contributes to improving the quality of life of a city's residents by adapting its institutional capacity to creatively manage a new set of human-environmental conditions.

While rural-urban linkages do not feature prominently in the MEREC approach, implicit in it is the role of small intermediate cities in absorbing surplus rural labor that might otherwise migrate to larger cities or megacities. If MEREC were applied in concert with an approach such as the evolving SARSA methodology, combining environmental resource and market economy management, a double objective could be achieved. Whether such a combination is advisable on logistical/implementation grounds is a point that must await future scrutiny and judgment.

6.2 Regional Development Approach

The predominantly rural-based strategy that A.I.D. developed in the early 1970s led to the use of a sort of "hybrid" terminology for discussing rural-urban linkages. The Office of Rural and Institutional Development used such terms as "regional analysis and development," "urban functions in rural development, n nrural market towns," and "secondary city development" to define the economic role of cities or towns in increasing agricultural productivity and rural incomes (Rondinelli 1980, 1985; Rhoda 1982). Use of those terms has continued to the present.

Specifically, regional development and analysis concentrates on cities and metropolitan areas, including their size, place, and economic functions, within more encompassing regional or subregional contexts. Its concerns range from geographically based studies of poverty to household-level income surveys. While A.I.D.'s effort in building on the rural-urban dynamic has rarely gone by the name of "regional development," the Missions and regional bureaus have implemented a significant number of projects that are essentially of that type. This effort reflects a gradual shift in the Agency's regional activities, especially in the Asia/Near East and Africa regions, to urban development issues, but not issues of megacities and metropolitan areas with all their perceived problems. Rather, the shift has been to urban centers that serve important economic functions for rural areas, functions that are not so readily apparent in the case of megacities. Regional development specifically directs attention to the economic functions of those secondary cities and rural market towns that are capable of sustaining and being sustained by rural, agriculturally productive regions (Bendavid-Val 1987a; Rondinelli 1987). The regional approach underscores development of multisectoral linkages, city-city or city-town (interurban) connections, and interregional ties. It requires a more complex planning organization than project designers are accustomed to, including multidisciplinary research on numerous multisectoral needs and spatial conditions.

In Sub-Saharan Africa A.I.D. has gradually turned to a regional orientation, in which the priorities have been to address problems of declining food production and very rapid population growth (Clark University 1988). Interventions there include agricultural production and urban income-generating projects. The regional development approach has permitted A.I.D. Missions in Africa to channel some resources toward urban-regional conditions while remaining within the framework of rural development and expertise. Because organizational planning complexities and limited financial resources prevent application of this approach across the board to a developing country's national development needs, Missions have used it mainly for production and income-generation projects.

The regional development approach continues to be applied to this day, though modified and newly clothed. Today it is not as broadly based as the original approach, in that it focuses on subregions, district-level areas, or even subdistricts such as the Kutus Town area described above. SARSA, which served as the basis for the Kutus Town work and is briefly detailed in Section 6.4, is in fact a repackaged version of the regional development approach. In its new form this approach is heavily research intensive because it starts with the household, though it is pitched at a level at which not only is intervention feasible, but results or impact are quite readily observable after an interval of a few years or so.

6.3 Urban Functions in Rural Development and Market Town/ Secondary City Development

One effort to decentralize investment and authority along spatial lines in order to promote growth outside of large cities and metropolitan areas was the Urban Functions in Rural Development project (UFRD), sponsored by the Bureau for Science and Technology's Office of Rural and Institutional Development (Rondinelli 1980). UFRD built on the concept of rural-urban interdependency and especially the important role of market towns in rural development. UFRD defined cities as service providers to rural areas, and rural areas as providers of agricultural products for marketing in towns and cities. Applied in several demonstration projects in the Philippines, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, and Cameroon, UFRD provided an analysis of the degree of linkage of rural areas to regional centers. While heightening local planners' awareness of the importance of spatial factors, UFRD did not result in planning and investment decisions in A.I.D.-assisted projects partly because these factors were seen by development experts as too "top down" (Karaska and Belsky 1987). Recently the focus of UFRD has been narrowed to two critical aspects of the rural-urban dynamic:

(1) market towns and their place in marketing specific agricultural products and (2) secondary cities as producers of goods and services for rural communities, sources of employment, and stimuli for agricultural production.

Most developing countries have too few small towns and intermediate cities (Rondinelli 1984). Where such urban centers do exist, they rarely have sufficient public services or job opportunities to absorb rural migrants and, therefore, they cannot readily contribute to regional economic growth. One result is that migrants from labor-surplus rural areas are forced into already oversaturated megacities, while rural regions lose many of the better educated and more productive people. In this context market towns play the important role of stimulating rural economies through the increased commercialization of agriculture (Rondinelli and Ruddle 1977). The Office of Rural and Institutional Development has supported studies of the place of market towns in a rural-urban strategy that underscore the role of these towns as a stimulus for agricultural production and income growth (Bromley 1984; Carroll et al. 1984; Gibb 1984; Hackenberg and Hackenberg 1984).

The Office of Rural and Institutional Development has supported a study (Rondinelli 1987) of the rural-urban dynamic that focuses on marketing as the most important linkage between rural areas, towns, and cities. More specifically, marketing linkages are defined as being critical in agriculture, employment, and enterprise development. From this perspective, A.I.D.'s best investment is seen as lying in improvement of rural-urban marketing systems in areas undergoing a transition from subsistence to commercial agriculture through developing basic market-support infrastructure. Examples of such infrastructure include on-farm and commercial storage facilities, basic transportation facilities, and farm-to-market and inter-market roads that give farmers greater access to market towns and small cities. The critical issue in developing marketing linkages is not whether, but how, government should use its resources in promoting growth and diversification of agricultural economies. The study recommends that where the private sector is unable to provide services and infrastructure or where poor households would have little access to the market, public resources should be used.

Secondary cities combine economic, social, and physical traits of both rural and urban contexts, an important fact for A.I.D. strategy consideration. Commerce and trade, manufacturing, and provision of urban services are common features in such cities, although scale is of course much smaller than in megacities. That a significant portion of their population works in agriculture or agriculture-related activities is a factor they have in common with rural communities. The Office of Housing and Urban Programs and the Office of Rural and Institutional

Development have supported studies of secondary city development (SCD) (e.g., Rondinelli 1983a, 1983b, 1983c; Van Huyck et al. 1985) that demonstrate the importance of certain understandings about the SCD process. First, SCD will not cure the poverty and "overurbanization" of the more problematic megacities. Second, social and economic objectives rather than, for example, preconceptions about "hierarchies of urban places" should drive SCD. Third, basic infrastructure is a precondition for SCD. Finally, implementation of SCD should be decentralized and involve local stakeholders.

The UFRD and SCD approaches represent A.I.D.'s continuing effort to maintain the integral role of the urbanization process in national development. They are in effect refinements and recastings of the earlier regional development approach. Their results were initially generalized plans for regional rural-urban development, plans that proved difficult to use for investment purposes. Subsequently these approaches were narrowed to focus on the role of marketing linkages and especially the market town in promoting economic growth and development. The offspring of UFRD and SCD is the even more focused and therefore more specific SARSA approach.

6.4 Settlement and Resource Systems Analysis

The Settlement and Resource Systems Analysis (SARSA) approach (A.I.D. 1988; Clark University 1988) is outlined here only briefly because its basic framework was presented earlier in the illustrative example of the Kutus Town area (Section 5). SARSA, sponsored by the Office of Rural and Institutional Development, aims to provide understanding of land settlement issues, natural resources management, and the rural-urban dynamic. It is also used to advise USAID Missions, some of which may be prepared in the near future to support development projects based on SARSA's regional economic findings, analyses, and recommendations. Following the lead of the Government of Kenya, A.I.D. is supporting a strategy of local investments that build on development prospects of small towns and secondary cities tied to areas of expanding agriculture. Specifically, the strategy focuses on applying scarce resources to develop infrastructure in rural centers selected as the best prospect for agricultural production and related activities such as processing, manufacturing, and services. A.I.D.'s purpose is to support analysis for use in shaping interventions in the selected region, develop baseline data for future evaluation purposes, and assist in developing guidelines for the Kenyan rural-urban balance policy. It is expected that this evolving approach can be applied elsewhere in Kenya.

SARSA represents an evolution from a somewhat macro-oriented approach rooted in a regional development tradition. Through time the rural-urban development orientation has been narrowed and refined, resulting in the highly specific, household-based research methodology embodied in SARSA. A highly promising approach for A.I.D.-assisted rural-urban development, SARSA is still at the stage of basic research, though moving ever closer to becoming a framework for an investment strategy. The apparent drawback to SARSA is its heavy reliance on intensive, household-level research that generates data of a highly situation-specific nature. As an experimental method it has much to commend it, although to standardize it for use as an investment strategy might prove difficult given the variable character of local, subregional socioeconomic conditions within, and especially between, countries. One possibility is that the general principles SARSA has derived from its research on rural-urban exchange could be operationalized in a rapid reconnaissance format in order to speed up their application to project development. This problem will be discussed further in Section 8.2.

6.5 The City as "Engine of Growth"

The idea that the urban center, in this case the city-in contrast to the rural market town-is the engine of national economic growth, while certainly not a new idea, has recently gained some currency through a report supported by A.I.D. Bureau for Private Enterprise's Office of Housing and Urban Programs (Bendick 1984). According to that report, urban centers offer greater economic efficiencies because their population concentration is so much greater than that of rural areas. The report further defines for secondary cities and market towns a specific role in raising rural incomes. In contrast to approaches described earlier, however, the focus of this approach is not on the reciprocity of rural and urban factors but rather on the arena of competition between different types of urban centers. The type of urban development envisioned according to this approach would take place in smaller cities and market towns lying in areas of expanding agriculture-which in effect takes us full circle to the regional development, market town/SCD, and SARSA approaches depicted earlier.

One qualification to the "city-as-engine" school of national growth is some industries' reluctance to locate outside of metropolitan regions, despite public initiatives for industrial decentralization programs. This school maintains that the provision of industrial infrastructure in itself is the wrong incentive, so long as firms do not see the advantages in terms

of production and market efficiencies. Therefore, the selection of cities for SCD would have to be based on strict measures of economic efficiency and comparative advantage.

There is now prominent in A.I.D. an alternative school of thought to the "city-as-engine" school: that what is needed to get dynamic growth started (based on agriculture/comparative advantage) is policy reform. Such reform, which focuses mainly on freeing markets and prices in favor of agriculture and economic efficiencies, is juxtaposed, by way of example, with infrastructure projects. Tending to favor that thinking is the evolving strategy of the Office of Housing and Urban Programs, by which assistance is directed at helping developing countries to deal with the growing complexities of urbanization. Included in that strategy is assistance in developing national housing finance strategies, land use planning policies, local mobilization of finance, and improved municipal management (Clark University 1988). In addition, such Office of Housing and Urban Programs activities as studies of issues and opportunities in African urbanization (Abt Associates 1988) reflect a concern with some of the larger questions surrounding national urban development.

7. ARE YOU LINKED? A SUGGESTED APPROACH TO RURAL-URBAN LINKAGE DEVELOPMENT (ARULINKED)

The discussion of a continuum between two extreme types of urbanization that may occur in developing countries, presented at the beginning of this paper, points to the need for a strategy to influence and thereby benefit from the urbanization process. The A.I.D. approaches to rural-urban development sketched earlier, in addition to demonstrating a gradually evolving wisdom about linkage and exchange, underscore the necessity for a comprehensive strategy that harnesses the mutually reinforcing energies of rural and urban development. Since there is no such strategy, this section will present a preliminary outline of an approach to a rural-urban linkage development program.

Called an "Approach to Rural-Urban Linkage Development" or ARULINKED (Are You Linked?), the suggested outline in its broadest sense takes account of the distribution of natural resources in specific human habitats, and of the different types of communities that use and exchange those resources, and includes the key factors developed in Section 5.1 above and diagrammed earlier in Box 5. ARULINKED is considered to be developmental in character, directed at more sustained use and distribution of resources by the entire spectrum of A.I.D.-assisted communities.

One of ARULINKED's major purposes is to assist developing country governments to improve their policies, planning, and programs to develop the rural-urban linkage towards the goal of national growth and development. Another is to stimulate those governments, A.I.D., and other international agencies and organizations to rethink their national rural and urban strategies not as two separate arenas or sectors but as a single entity. To do so would lead quite naturally to formulating one coherent strategy. That strategy would recombine "rural~ and "urban" in such a way as to give shape to a fresh conception of national economic growth and development.

ARULINKED is intended to provide a means of distinguishing between conventional wisdom and new thinking on such matters as migration patterns, backward linkages to rural communities, off-farm employment, and the urban poor. It attempts to reflect accurately the real-life conditions in both rural and urban communities. It also serves to counter a recent pessimistic view of the prospects for balanced rural-urban development. Discouraging world economic trends and the ensuing development crisis of the 1970s and 1980s have been responsible in part for this pessimism. The ARULINKED view in no way intends to soft-pedal the imperative of assistance to those most disadvantaged by the recessionary trends. To the contrary, the approach envisioned here is one that sees so-called "problems of developing country urbanization"-including increased migration, the growth of urban informal sectors, even supercity growth-more pragmatically as symptoms of, and in some cases even solutions to, much larger problems of national economic policy, growth, and development.

ARULINKED does not pretend to represent a wholly new approach. Rather, it synthesizes and builds on the rural-urban approaches already tried, mainly by A.I.D., to a certain extent by U.N. Habitat, and to a lesser degree by the World Bank. Building blocks for the suggested approach are the A.I.D. programs described above-resource management, regional development, and housing and urban programs; the U.N. human settlements development approach (UNCHS 1987); and World Bank urban sector activity (Linn 1982; Renaud 1981). Table 1 outlines the A.I.D. approaches discussed earlier and ARULINKED, to facilitate comparisons.

7.1 Economic Planning and Development Aspects of ARULINKED

Development of rural-urban linkages is heavily influenced by national social and economic policy, especially through policy impacts on spatial aspects of income and employment generation. As Section 4.1 described, there is today a growing recognition of the intimate relationship between socioeconomic

The missing Table 1. Approaches to Development From the Vantage Point of Urbanization at National, Regional, and Municipal Levels Available on Microfiche

factors and the spatial dimensions of rural-urban linkages. Coincident with that trend is an increasing receptivity in some quarters to an integration of socioeconomic/sector planning with spatial factors. This is especially so in countries with explicit policies on regional development. Countries using a spatially and economically linked approach include both market-oriented economies and some of the centrally planned type. The spatially based approach should not be confused with older "top-down" planning practices in which political and economic decisions are imposed with little reference to market forces. In that respect, ARULINKED can be applied by both market-oriented and central planning countries.

One example of how the combined socioeconomic/sectoral/spatial approach may be applied is a U.N.-supported investment plan for Indonesia, a country that is now undergoing rapid urbanization. That plan directs investments to a hierarchy of major cities that are linked by the national transport network (UNCHS 1987). Similar spatially oriented approaches aimed at a hierarchy of urban and rural settlements are being undertaken in several other countries, and they include assistance in promoting strategies for development of small and intermediate cities. These approaches aim to attract to such cities rural-urban migrants who might otherwise gravitate to the larger cities. They do so by ensuring productive agriculture, income, and employment generation in urban centers in rural areas, and by creating multiplier effects of overall increased productivity.

The principal elements of ARULINKED are summarized in Box 6. The scheme does not pretend to be either comprehensive or detailed enough to permit immediate movement to the project drawing board. It could, however, serve as a framework for eventual project design purposes.

7.2 Potential Constraints of ARULINKED

There are practical constraints that go beyond the conceptual level when it comes to integrating socioeconomic/sector planning with spatial planning. First is the technical matter of having available data and expertise for evaluating key national economic policies for their impact on the physical distribution of people and communities. Second is translating those same policies into spatially based planning actions. While evaluation of economic policy on a sector-by-sector basis is standard practice, it is not as often done on a spatial basis. Even more elusive in this process are the policy decisions that direct the distribution of investments across the national map and the inherent political risks to leaders of explicitly stating those decisions (UNCHS 1987). At least partly for these reasons, therefore, there is in national

The missing Box 6. Principal Conceptual Elements of ARULINKED
Available on Microfiche

development no overwhelming evidence of a direct application of economic policy to decisions about an overall investment plan that takes account of a country's entire human settlements pattern.

Yet another factor that could hinder a successful marriage between national economic and spatial planning may be characterized as both professional and bureaucratic. Economic planners are usually predominant in the scheme of national planning, and they are able to influence decisions about investment and growth without much concern for how these will affect the distribution patterns of resources and communities. Spatial planners are usually subordinate in the decision-making process and, furthermore, are not always knowledgeable about conditions conducive to economically sustaining various population distributions. Such professional/bureaucratic conditions are often compounded, as has been mentioned, by an absence of data on socioeconomic and demographic conditions essential for accurate and effective socioeconomic/spatial planning.

7.3 Suggestions for Overcoming Constraints

The constraints mentioned above are by no means impossible to overcome. Changes may be envisioned that would permit a breakthrough in thinking about development, rural-urban linkage development, and socioeconomic/spatial planning. First, such changes would have to occur in the realm of the conceptual, bringing about a different view of causation in development. Second, the technical or methodological focus would have to be adapted: spatially oriented socioeconomic data would have to be collected and planners trained to analyze and use such data. Third, professional/bureaucratic modes of work would have to be altered, so that economic planning would proceed in concert with spatial planning. Fourth, and equally important, developing country authorities would have to be prepared to risk promulgating policies to influence the distribution of investments on a geographic versus purely sectoral basis. The difficulty or severity of these changes does not appear so extreme as to preclude the possibility of donors negotiating such changes with developing country governments. Of course, donors, too, must perceive the benefit and wisdom of the changes.

8. ISSUES FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Some of the major issues raised in this paper concern the general role of urbanization in fostering national socioeconomic growth and development. Others concern more specific elements of the urbanization process, such as its part in promoting or

inhibiting rural-urban linkages and, in turn, those linkages' place in wealth generation. Yet other issues pertain to A.I.D.'s need to develop an approach to urbanization that will best permit it to leverage the movement of various segments of national wealth. Illustrations of the different types of issues are provided below.

8.1 General Conceptual Issues

In correcting a perceived urban bias, donor agencies have in recent decades adopted a rural-based development strategy. That strategy resulted in neglect of urbanization's contribution to development and in a mental association of that process mainly with "problems." What new paradigm will come into being that will reduce today's "rural bias?" Furthermore, what stimulus will trigger a renewed interest in the role of urbanization in national development? What strategies are appropriate for low-income countries, where migration plays the dominant role in urbanization, and for middle- and high-income countries, where natural birthrate increase is the dominant player?

These questions might suggest that the present report has posed more questions than answers, that urbanization is an impossibly broad, complex subject, and that much more analysis of the issues lies ahead for A.I.D. before it is able to deal effectively with the subject. While there is some truth to that statement, this report contends that steps have been taken toward responding to the questions. Additionally, it proposes the beginnings of an approach that may prove useful to Missions and program and project designers in thinking about the forces of urbanization as a factor in planning policy strategies and investments in rural-urban development.

8.2 Strategic Issues

There are several alternative ways to deal with a developing country's urbanization trends. Any strategic-level consideration must take into account the type of urbanization—that is, where it is along the continuum between Type 1 and Type 2. If Type 2, urbanization with limited development, prevails, then more emphasis should be placed on addressing such policy-level issues as rural or urban bias, overmigration, megacities, and a general rural-urban imbalance. These are the broader kinds of issues ARULINKED is intended to address.

If Type 1, urbanization with development, is prevalent, then an approach that emphasizes issues specific to urban development, such as municipal management, finance mobilization,

and land use policy, would seem appropriate. That approach, presently used by the A.I.D. Office of Housing and Urban Programs, directly addresses the issue of the cost of urbanization (A.I.D. 1984). Although experts have known all along that that cost is enormous, it was W. Arthur Lewis (cited in Linn 1982) who perhaps stated the problem most plainly and forcefully: "Urbanization is decisive because it is so expensive." Reflecting both the concern with cost and the kinds of needs occurring in Type 1 urbanization, A.I.D.'s role in the urban sector has been to assist in providing cost-effective methods for planning, budgeting, operating, and maintaining cities.

As was noted at the outset of this report, the differences between Type 1 and Type 2 approaches was purposely overdrawn for purposes of emphasis. In fact, because there may be a mix of the two types of urbanization within a single developing country (although one usually prevails), a specific country might well require a blend of the approaches sketched above. Such a determination should derive from the USAID Mission's procedure of arriving at an appropriate Country Development Strategy Statement.

8.3 Tactical Issues

The issue of the representativeness and standardizability of data collected under SARSA, touched on in Section 6.4, must be discussed more fully. That issue concerns the implications for A.I.D. resources—namely time, personnel and expertise, and money—of the detailed, household level of research called for by SARSA's methodology. Although the methodology is defined as experimental at this stage, the fact is that it builds directly on theories and methods that A.I.D. has used for almost 15 years. The findings, though to a certain extent new, are not revolutionary, given our understandings of rural-urban development generally. What the SARSA methodology does potentially do for A.I.D. program development, however, is provide a much higher level of specificity about rural-urban exchange and balance than earlier approaches. And in that respect it is an effective planning tool for A.I.D.

Because the SARSA approach has such a high potential value to the overall A.I.D. strategy, its steps must be prioritized so that it may be used to more effectively harness already scarce A.I.D. resources. Briefly, the following priorities are recommended for establishing which steps of the SARSA methodology should be applied and under what circumstances.

- Where existing information or conventional wisdom exists or an observed pattern is obvious concerning the agricultural potential and key commodity systems

involved in a rural-urban exchange system, a rapid assessment should be considered in lieu of applying the full-blown methodology.

- Where conventional wisdom about linkages and exchange between towns and hinterland or about expanded forward and backward linkages does not hold true (or where anomalies are present), a more limited version of the full-blown methodology should be carried out.
- Where socioeconomic conditions are highly situational (or unique), the same limited version as mentioned above should be carried out and a typology of situational factors constructed and applied to similar situations.

Streamlining the SARSA methodology may not be appropriate in all contexts, however, especially given the situational character of a specific region or subregion's economy, society, and ecology. In any case, second-guessing SARSA is not the intention of this report. Nevertheless, as rural-urban linkage patterns under a number of variable conditions become clear and these patterns' cross-regional and cross-national validity becomes established, then use of those data in shaping various A.I.D. investment strategies would be highly appropriate.

8.4 Future Needs in A.I.D.

While modest advances are presently being made in rural-urban linkage development through limited programs carried out in individual Missions, more experimentation of a selected kind is recommended. The shape and direction of the effort are, as described in this report, presently provided under the rubric of SARSA. SARSA is already being undertaken in selected Missions in Africa, the region also in greatest need of both rural and urban development assistance. What is underscored here is that the rural-urban linkage should be isolated for project/program development and design purposes in the Agency in a clear-cut and forceful manner.

In the spirit of this conviction, a list of illustrative questions is posed to potential users of ARULINKED to aid in applying that approach (see Box 7). ARULINKED is in this sense treated as if it were itself a question, to be used in assisting project and program developers and designers as well as Mission strategists in guiding them away from the conventional wisdom about urbanization. Potentially useful as a checklist in formulating country strategy and designing programs and projects, the questions are posed in terms of macro-level and sector-level analysis and planning issues.

The illustrative questions listed in Box 7 are intended to give ARULINKED firmer shape as a tool for rethinking how best to integrate rural and urban factors in the planning and design of national development programs.

9. CONCLUSION

A.I.D. has a limited but growing experience in the area of rural-urban linkage development. What it requires for further advancement in this area is a better understanding of the urbanization process. The importance of developing country urbanization is clearly becoming recognized. As the two types of urbanization defined in this paper show, urbanization may in some cases become a critical stimulus for national development, while in others it is a symptom of underdevelopment. In either case, more knowledge is essential for creating more effective development strategies or for improving existing strategies to foster Type 1 urbanization.

In concluding, the purpose of this paper is to refocus the development community's attention on some very basic factors that give shape to the national development process, namely urbanization and rural-urban linkages. An equally important intention of the paper is to stimulate an Agencywide discussion about bridging the "rural-urban divide" that looms large both in A.I.D. and in the developing countries.

The missing Box 7, and Table A-1 thru A-3 are Available on
Microfiche

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adepoju, Aderanti. 1986. "Managing Cities in Sub-Saharan Africa." POPULI, Journal of the U.N. Fund for Population Activities 13 (no. 1):32-38.
- Abt Associates, Inc. 1988. "Urbanization in African Development: Issues and Opportunities." Washington, D.C.: Office of Housing and Urban Programs, Bureau for Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development.
- Abu-Lughod, Janet, and Richard Hay, Jr., eds. 1979. Third World Urbanization. New York: Methuen.
- Agency for International Development. 1984. Urban Development Policy. A.I.D. Policy Paper. Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Agency for International Development. 1985. "Secondary Towns: An Overview of Five Case Studies." Washington, D.C.: Office of Housing and Urban Programs, Bureau for Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development.
- Agency for International Development. 1988. "Urbanization in the Developing Countries and Its Implications for Foreign Assistance." Interim Report Prepared for the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Agency for International Development. 1989. Development and the National Interest: U.S. Economic Assistance Into the 21st Century. A report by the Administrator. Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Beier, George, Anthony Churchill, Michael Cohen, and Bertrand Renaud. 1976. "The Task Ahead for the Cities of the Developing World." World Development 4 (no. 5):363-409. (World Bank Reprint series).
- Bendavid-Val, Avrom. 1987a. "Means, Motivators, and Markets in Rural Regional Development." In Patterns of Change in Developing Rural Regions, edited by Raphael Bar-El, Avrom Bendavid-Val, and Gerry Karaska. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Bendavid-Val, Avrom. 1987b. More With Less: Managing Energy and Resources Efficient Cities (MEREC). Washington, D.C.: Bureau for Science and Technology, Agency for International Development.

Bib-2

- Bendavid-Val, Avrom, Jeanne Downing, and Gerry Karaska. 1988. "Rural-Urban Dynamics: Synthesis Report." A report prepared for A.I.D.'s Bureau for Science and Technology under the Settlement and Resource Systems Analysis Cooperative Agreement. Worcester, Massachusetts: Clark University.
- Bendick, Marc, Jr. 1984. "The Urban-Rural Dimension in National Economic Development." A report prepared for the Office of Housing and Urban Programs, Bureau for Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Bienen, Henry. 1984. "Urbanization and Third World Stability." World Development 12 (no. 7): 661-691.
- Binnendijk, Annette. 1988. A.I.D.'s Experience With Rural Development: Project-Specific Factors Affecting Performance. A.I.D. Special Study No. 60. Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Booth, David, John Harriss, and Mick Moore. 1984. "Development and the Rural-Urban Divide." The Journal of Development Studies 20 (no. 3) :1-166.
- Bromley, Ray. 1984. "Market Centers, Marketing Policies, and Agricultural Development." Regional Development Dialogue, 5 (no. 1):149-168.
- Brown, Lester, and Jodi Jacobson. 1987. "Assessing the Future of Urbanization." In The State of the World 1987: A Worldwatch Institute Report on Progress Toward a Sustainable Society. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Carroll, Thomas, Barry Lentnek, and Richard Wilkie. 1984. "Exploration of Rural-Urban Linkages and Market Centres in Highland Ecuador." Regional Development Dialogue 5 (no. 1): 22-69.
- Chambers, Robert. 1983. Rural Development: Putting the Last First. London: Longman.
- Clark University and Institute for Development Anthropology. 1988. "Rural-Urban Exchange in Kutus Town and Its Hinterland." Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Cohen, Michael A. 1979. Urban Growth and Economic Development in the Sahel. World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 315. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Bib-3

- Cour, Jean-Marie. 1988. "Urban-Rural Linkages: Macroeconomic and Regional Implications." Interim Report of African Technical Department, Africa Technical Infrastructure Regional Studies. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, November.
- Davis, Kingsley. 1972. "The Role of Urbanization in the Development Process." Reprint No. 408. Berkeley, California: International Population and Urban Research, University of California.
- De Soto, Hernando. 1987. "Constraints on People: The Origins of Underground Economies and Limits to Their Growth." Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development, October.
- El-Shakhs, Salah. 1982. "Population and Planning of Large Cities in the Middle East." POPULI, Journal of the U.N. Fund for Population Activities 13 (no. 1) :39-44.
- Gibb, Arthur, Jr. 1984. "Tertiary Urbanization: The Agricultural Market Centre as a Consumption-Related Phenomenon." Regional Development Digest 5 (no. 1) :110-148
- Goldscheider, Calvin. 1983. "The Adjustment of Migrants in Large Cities of Less Developed Countries: Some Comparative Observations." In Urban Migrants in Developing Nations: Patterns and Problems of Development , edited by C. Goldscheider. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Goldstein, Sidney. 1983. "Urbanization, Migration, and Development." In Urban Migrants in Developing Nations: Patterns and Problems of Development, edited by C. Goldscheider. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Gugler, Josef. 1982. "Overurbanization Reconsidered." Economic Development and Cultural Change 30 (no. 3) :173-189.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. 1967. "Tradition and Modernity: Misplaced Polarities in the Study of Social Change." American Journal of Sociology 72 (no. 4): 351-362.
- Gwynne, Robert N. 1986. Industrialization and Urbanization in Latin America. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hackenberg, Robert A. 1980. "New Patterns of Urbanization in Southeast Asia: An Assessment." Population and Development Review 6 (no. 3): 391-419.
- Hackenberg, Robert, and Beverly H. Hackenberg. 1984. "Developing Intermediate Cities as Agro-Industrial Processing Centres: A Project in Western Panama." Regional Development Dialogue 5 (no. 1) :74-104.

Bib-4

- Hamer, Andrew. 1985. "Urbanization Patterns in the Third World." Finance and Development. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, March.
- Hanna, William, and Judith Hanna. 1981. Urban Dynamics in Black Africa: An Interdisciplinary Approach. New York: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Harris, John, and Michael Todaro. 1970. "Migration, Unemployment, and Development: A Two-Sector Analysis." American Economic Review 60:126-142.
- Honadle, George, and Jerry VanSant. 1985. Implementation for Sustainability: Lessons From Integrated Rural Development. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.
- Ibrahim, Saad Eddin. 1987. "Cairo: A Socio-Political Profile." In The Metropolis in Transition, edited by Ervin Y. Galanty. New York: Paragon House.
- International Labour Organization. 1972. Employment, Incomes, and Equality: A Strategy for Increasing Productive Employment in Kenya. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Jordan, Ricardo. 1986. "Urban Concentration in Latin America." Populi, Journal of the U.N. Fund for Population Activities 13 (no. 1):26-31.
- Karaska, Gerald J., and Eric S. Belsky. 1987. "Rural/Urban Dynamics in Regional Planning: Examples From Underdeveloped Regions." In Patterns of Change in Developing Regions, edited by Raphael Bar-El, Avrom Bendavid-Val, and Gerry Karaska. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Kumar, Krishna. 1987. A.I.D.'s Experience With Integrated Rural Development Projects. Program Evaluation Report No. 19. Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Ledent, Jacques. 1982. "Rural-Urban Migration, Urbanization, and Economic Development." Economic Development and Cultural Change 30 (no. 3):507-538.
- Linn, Johannes F. 1982. "The Costs of Urbanization in Developing Countries." Economic Development and Cultural Change 30 (no. 3):625-648.
- Lipton, Michael. 1977. Why Poor People Stay Poor: Urban Bias and World Development. London: Temple Smith.

Bib-5

- London, Bruce. 1987. "Structural Determinants of Third World Urban Change: An Ecological and Political Economic Analysis." American Sociological Review 52: 28-43.
- McNulty, Michael L. 1987. "Urban/Urban Relations and Rural Regional Development." In Patterns of Change in Developing Rural Regions, edited by Raphael Bar-El. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Mellor, John W. 1986. "Agriculture on the Road to Industrialization." In Development Strategies Reconsidered. U.S.-Third World Policy Perspectives No. 5, Overseas Development Council. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.
- Mohan, Rakesh. 1976. Toward Modelling Poor Cities: A Review of Urban Economic and Planning Models. World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 232. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Moris, Jon. 1981. Managing Induced Rural Development. Bloomington, Indiana: International Development Institute.
- Morris, David. 1986. "The City as Nation." Development: Seeds of Change-Village Through Global Order 4: 72-76.
- Nelson, Joan. 1979. Access to Power: Politics and the Urban Poor in Developing Countries. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Pearson, Lester B. 1969. Partners in Development: Report of the Commission on International Development. New York: Praeger.
- Perlman, Janice E. 1987. "Misconceptions About the Urban Poor and the Dynamics of Housing Policy Evolution." Journal of Planning Education and Research 6: 160-207.
- Prebisch, Raul. 1970. "Change and Development: Latin America's Great Task." Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Renaud, Bertrand. 1981. National Urbanization Policy in Developing Countries. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rhoda, Richard. 1982. Urban and Regional Analysis for Development Planning. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Rogers, Andrei, and Jeffry G. Williamson. 1982. "Migration, Urbanization, and Third World Development: An Overview." Economic Development and Cultural Change 30 (no. 3): 463-482.

Bib-6

- Rondinelli, Dennis A. 1980. "Spatial Analysis for Regional Development: A Case Study in the Bicol River Basin of the Philippines." Resource Systems Theory and Methodology Series No. 2. Tokyo: United Nations University.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. 1983a. "Dynamics of Growth of Secondary Cities in Developing Countries." Geographical Review 73 (no. 1):42-57.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. 1983b. "Intermediate Cities' Role in Industrialization, Employment Generation, and Economic Development in South Korea." Prepared for A.I.D. under Cooperative Agreement on Human Settlement and Resource Systems Analysis. Worcester, Massachusetts: Clark University.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. 1983c. Secondary Cities in Developing Countries: Policies for Diffusing Innovation. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. 1984. "Regional Cities, Agricultural the Productivity, and Employment Generation: The Challenges of Urban Transition and Rural Development." Prepared for A.I.D. under the Cooperative Agreement on Human Settlement and Resource Systems Analysis. Worcester, Massachusetts: Clark University.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. 1985. Applied Methods of Regional Analysis: The Spatial Dimensions of Development Policy. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Rondinelli, Dennis. 1987. "Agriculture, Employment, and Enterprise: Rural-Urban Dynamics in A.I.D. Development Strategy." Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A., and Kenneth Ruddle. 1977. Urbanization and Rural Development: A Spatial Policy for Equitable Growth. New York: Praeger.
- Sachs, Ignacy. 1986. "Work, Food, and Energy in Urban Ecodevelopment." Development: Seeds of Change-Village Through Global Order 4:2-11.
- Singlemann, Joachim. 1984. "Migration and the Growth of Metropolitan Areas in the Third World." In Comparative Social Research, Vol. 7, edited by R.T. Tomasson. Greenwich, Connecticut: Jai Press.
- Slater, D. 1977. "Colonialism and the Spatial Structure of Underdevelopment: Outlines of an Alternative Approach, With Special References to Tanzania." In Third World Urbanization, edited by J. Abu-Lughod. New York: Methuen.

Bib-7

- Sood, Devinder, and Peter Rogers. 1983. "Waste Streams Integrated Resource Recovery Systems in Developing Countries: Step 2-Application of the State of the Art in Tacloban City, Philippines." Cambridge, Massachusetts: Meta Systems, Inc.
- Terzo, Frederick C. 1971. Urbanization in the Developing Countries: The Response of International Assistance. International Urbanization Survey. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Timberlake, Michael, and Jeffrey Kentor. 1983. "Economic Dependence, Overurbanization, and Economic Growth: A study of Less Developed Countries." Sociological Quarterly 24:489-508.
- United Nations Population Division. 1980. Patterns of Urban and Rural Population Growth. New York: United Nations Population Division.
- United Nations Population Division. 1986. Urban and Rural population projections, 1950-2025: 1984 Assessment. New York: United Nations Population Division.
- United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS/Habitat). 1987. Global Report on Human Settlements-1986. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Huyck, Alfred P., and Goldie W. Rivkin. 1985. "Overview." In Secondary Towns: Five Case Studies. Washington, D.C.: Office of Housing and Urban Programs, Bureau for Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development.