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1. Introduction
The apartheid era in South Africa left a legacy characterised by social, economic and spatial inequalities. The repercussions of the apartheid laws such as the Group Areas Act of 1953, the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act of 1953, the Bantu Authorities Act of 1953, etc. are the contributing factors to such inequalities. Whilst these laws were reversed in 1994 (20 years ago) when the Government of National Unity took office, the manifestations of apartheid are still visible today in South Africa. Major strides have been taken towards closing the gap between the previously advantaged and the previously disadvantaged; however, the journey towards this is going to be a long one. This paper aims to discuss inequality in South Africa, in the main it describes the manifestation of the phenomena over time and space. Using a variety of techniques it analyses how South Africa addresses this with varying degrees of success. The impact of apartheid plays itself out spatially, economically and socially.

2. Background
In recent studies on poverty in South Africa that were released by Statistics South Africa the results indicate that educational attainment and unemployment play major roles in determining the state of poverty amongst individuals or households. The study further indicates that there are, however, specific groups of the population that are more adversely affected by these than others. African-headed households, female-headed households, households in non-urban areas were found to be worse off compared to their counterparts, (Stats SA, 2014). Perhaps in seeking a better understanding of this pattern, a question that should be asked is “what do these groups have in common, and what has affected them in a similar way to get these results?”

Prior to 1994, South African human settlements were characterised by spatial inequalities based on racial groups. This, according to Du Plessis & Landman (2002: 2) resulted in “the exclusion of large sections of the population from the economic, social and environmental benefits of vibrant, integrated, sustainable urban development.” This exclusion resulted in poorer people settling on the urban edges that were further from urban opportunities. Napier, M (1981) (in Du Plessis & Landman 2002: 3) depicted all racial groups, except whites, located in areas removed from the CBD where they are either separated by buffer zones or main roads from ‘white areas’ (Figure 1). This spatial segregation describes the layout of most cities in South Africa during the apartheid era. Napier’s picture is that of an apartheid city. It highlights
what happens within a city. However, this paper looks at a much broader layout than that of a city. It looks at the layout of the country (South Africa) and the consequences of such layout.

**Figure 1: The South African Apartheid City**

![South African Apartheid City Diagram](source)

Evidence from literature

There is general consensus the world over that spatial inequalities, unbalanced economic growth, differences in levels of education and diverse ethnic groups (in the Case of South Africa this will mean population groups) are the major drivers of high levels of inequality in a country, especially in developing and Sub-Saharan countries.

According to Cornia and Court (2001) the drivers of inequality in developing countries are land concentration, increasing urban bias, increasing influence of the mineral sector on GDP and changes in access to education. They argue that in developing countries the poor are mostly concentrated in rural areas where their livelihood is mostly dependent on agriculture. However, due to land ownership inequality the levels of income inequality are very high. This inequality contributes to income being highly concentrated in urban areas by “depressing minimum urban wage”. They argue that the population that mostly resides in urban areas are more likely to high levels of education and thus are better placed to take advantage of new economic opportunities.

They state that when a countries’ average education level of the population is low then those few highly educated individuals are more likely to earn high salaries.
Furthermore, they maintain that countries with natural resources tend to have a higher income and asset inequality than other types of economies. “This is often due to the capital-intensive nature of the production processes and the concentration of ownership in this sector. It is also due to the greater facility with which the elites are able to appropriate the mineral rent”, (Cornia and Court 2001).

Ali (2007) maintains that the unevenness in economic growth is the reason why there has been an increase in inequality in Asia. Ali (2007) lists three dimensions responsible for the unevenness of growth in Asia. “First growth has been uneven across sub-national locations (i.e. across provinces, regions or states). Second growth has been uneven across rural and urban sectors. Finally, growth has been uneven across households such that incomes at the top of the distribution have grown faster than those in the middle and/or the bottom. In particular the growth of incomes has tended to be the highest for the best educated.

In Sub-Saharan Africa, Okojie and Shimeles (2006) found a positive correlation between levels of income inequality, size of land and a country’s degree of openness. They argue that there is a negative correlation between population density and income inequality. “Countries with low population density (relatively land-abundant countries) as well as high trade-GDP ratio are characterised by high inequality owing to political economy factors. They also argue that in Africa, inequality is high in countries with high levels of ethnic diversity and it becomes even higher if the country is undemocratic and poor.

In South Africa, Bhorat et al (2009) using the IES of 1995, 2000 and 2005 found wage inequality to be the main contributor of increasing income inequality in South Africa. They maintain that it is primarily income differences between race groups, rather than those within, that drives South Africa’s growing inequality levels.

They argue that migration is the ultimate reason why there’s been an increase in income inequality in urban areas in the form of “both rural-urban migration and cross-border migration, i.e. from weak economies to relatively stronger economies. Migrants are forced to move to the urban areas due to the lack of employment and income generating opportunities. They point out that wage income contributes most to income inequality mainly because its share to total income is significant. Thus from this they conclude that the labour market plays a major role in inequality because highly skilled workers are rewarded with high salaries while the unskilled workers either are not well paid or are unemployed.
3. Methodology
This paper draws from the results of a number of surveys conducted by Stats SA, i.e. Income and Expenditure Survey (IES) 2005/06 and IES 2010/11, Living Conditions Survey (LCS) 2008/09, Census 2001 and Census 2011.

Stats SA collects detailed household consumption expenditure data once every five years through conducting IESs. This paper is based on the results of the IESs conducted in 2005/06 and 2010/11. In between the IES 2005/06 and IES 2010/11, Stats SA conducted the LCS in 2008/09, which also collected detailed household consumption expenditure data. The sample size for all these surveys was approximately 30 000 households based on a stratified systematic sampling.

The data collection method used for the IESs and the LCS was a combination of diary and recall methods. This entails a combination of face-to-face interviews as well as self-administering of diaries by respondents. This required respondents to complete daily acquisitions and expenditures on food and other items in weekly diaries for a period of four weeks.

For all the three datasets the questionnaires and diaries were scanned and saved in SQL files which were then transferred to a Statistics Analysis System (SAS) server within Stats SA. The analysis of this paper is conducted using SAS, and SuperCross.

Census 2001 and Census 2011 were the second and the third censuses to be conducted in South Africa since the post-democratic elections in 1994. The first all-inclusive census was conducted in 1996. These censuses were all conducted as a de facto census, which means that people were counted where they were found or stayed on Census night (which was the midnight of the 9th/10th October), or, if they were not at the dwelling on Census night and were not enumerated elsewhere, where they returned to the next day. Data collection took place from 9 to 31 October of the respective years, with a Post-enumeration Survey (PES) happening in November to assess the undercount. For 2001, over 83 000 enumerators and over 17 000 supervisors and fieldwork coordinators were employed to collect information from about 80 000 enumeration areas (EAs). In 2011, a fieldwork force of 120 000 enumerators and about 31 000 supervisors and fieldwork coordinators was required to do the count in over 103 000 EAs.
4. Analysis

This section is divided into three sub-sections. The first sub-section describes the geographic distribution of households across the country and the profile based on access to services and poverty levels by type of settlement, thereby highlighting social inequalities based on settlement type. The second sub-section explores income inequality in the country and makes comparisons between groups by settlement type. The third sub-section attempts to highlight progress so far in terms of closing the gaps between previously advantaged and previously disadvantaged groups.

4.1 Distribution and profile of households by type of settlements

The results of Census 2011 indicate that the population of South Africa is concentrated in urban areas (67.7%), whilst only 27.1% is found in traditional areas and 5.3% in farm areas. Table 1 indicates that traditional areas are distinctly populated by black Africans and headed by females. The concentration of female headed households in traditional areas may be due to out-migration of spouses from traditional areas to urban areas in search of work and work opportunities. This is therefore an indication of scarce work opportunities in traditional areas. Farm areas consist of a mixed population of farm owners; who are generally white, and farm workers, who are generally black African. This mix may explain the distribution of the population groups found in farm areas.

Table 1: Percentage distribution of households by characteristics of household head and type of settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group and sex of household head</th>
<th>Urban area</th>
<th>Traditional area</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian or Asian</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proportion                                | 67.7       | 27.1             | 5.3  | 100.0 |
Whilst the results indicate that the majority (67.7%) of the population in South Africa lives in urban areas and only 27.1% and 5.3% live in traditional and farm areas respectively; the ramifications of the Group Areas Act of 1953 which was based on principles of spatial segregation according to race are evident in Figure 2. Figure 2 indicates very small percentages of Indian/Asian, coloured and white households in non-urban areas; while about nine out of ten households from these population groups are found in urban areas. On the contrary, only about six out of ten black African headed households are found in urban areas.

As it has already been established above that non-urban areas (i.e. traditional areas and farms) are predominantly black African and headed by females; according to Census 2011 male headed households have the highest proportion in urban areas whilst female headed households have the highest proportion in traditional areas.
Figure 3: Proportion of households in South Africa by type of settlement and sex of household head

Placing this discussion into context, Figure 3 highlights the differences in terms of service delivery between urban areas and non-urban areas. According to the results of the 2011 Census, the majority of households in urban areas have access to most basic services such as clean piped water, electricity, flushed toilets, as well as refuse removal by local authority. The Census reports that more than 80% of households in urban areas of South Africa access these basic services. On the other hand, only a small minority (5.4%) of households in traditional areas have access to a flushed toilet inside their dwellings or on site, only 9.5% have their refuse removed by the local authority and 38% have access to piped water in dwellings or on site. The majority of households in traditional areas however, have some access to electricity, almost 80% of households in traditional areas use electricity for lighting. (One can of course argue or point out that this kind of access is not necessarily useful or of great impact to the improvement of living conditions).

However, households in farm areas are better off compared to those in traditional areas regarding access to basic services.
Figure 4: Proportion of households in South Africa by access to selected basic services and type of settlement

Figure 5 below indicates a map of multidimensional poverty headcount according to South African wards. The poverty index used is based on four dimensions with a number of indicators describing each dimension. The four dimensions include health, education, living standards, as well as economic activity. The darker shade of green indicates low levels of poverty and the lighter shade of green indicates high levels of poverty. The dark bold border lines indicate the former homelands. These were areas set aside for black African inhabitants of South Africa as part of the apartheid policy. They were ten of them in South Africa and were predominantly rural, namely, Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda, Ciskei, Gazankulu, KaNgwane, KwaNdebele, KwaZulu, Lebowa, and Qwaqwa. In Figure 5, most of the light green areas (high levels of poverty) are found among households living in the former homelands, for example, Transkei, Ciskei and KwaZulu. Whilst Figure 5 indicates lighter shades of green in most of the former homelands, the results do not indicate the worse kind of poverty levels that will be depicted by darker shades of orange as presented in the legend of the map. This paper later compares (in section 4.3) how the situation was ten years earlier to what it is now.

Figure 5: Multidimensional poverty headcount by wards in South Africa in 2011
4.2 Income inequality
Section 4.1 above describes social inequalities by geographic location of households. The next section explores income inequalities between, and within various population groups. The section begins by exploring the average household income by population group and sex of household head as well as average household income by type of settlement. It further filters down to individual incomes for one particular group of society, women, to demonstrate spatial and racial inequalities.

Table 2 indicates that in 2011, the average household income in South Africa was approximately R120 000, about R151 186 for male headed households and R70 830 for female headed households. Whilst the difference between household incomes of female headed households and male headed household is high, it should be noted that female headed households tend to be single headed with only one person bringing in income to the household. On the other hand, male headed households may have dual income from both husband and wife or spouse.

Further analysis indicates that black African headed households have the lowest average household income compared to households headed by other population groups. Average household income for black African headed households is almost less than half of coloured headed households, almost 3,6 times less than that of the Indian/Asian headed households and almost 5,6 times less than that of white headed households.
The results further indicate, in Table 2, that households in traditional areas have the least (R45 088) average household income compared to households in other types of settlements.

**Table 2: Average household income by characteristic of household head**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of household head</th>
<th>Income in Rand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119 542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70 830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>151 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population group</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>69 632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>139 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>252 724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>387 011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of settlement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional areas</td>
<td>45 088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban informal</td>
<td>46 482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural formal</td>
<td>117 003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban formal</td>
<td>166 916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Isolating females to further highlight the stark inequalities that exists based on population group and on type of settlement as the apartheid laws dictated, indicates that when isolating incomes of individuals from household income the following pattern emerges, see Figure 6 and Figure 7 below;

- Females earn R33 385 per annum on average.
- Black African females are worse off compared to females of other population groups. Black African females earn approximately R21 600 whilst white females earn about R112 242 per annum on average.
- Similarly, females living in non-urban areas are far worse off than females living in urban areas. The percentage difference between the two is approximately 69.6%.

**Figure 6: Average individual income for females by population group**
Figure 7: Average individual income for females by type of settlement

Figure 8 and Figure 9 indicate the levels of inequality using the Gini coefficient. The Gini coefficient, which is the commonly used measure of inequality, is a number between zero and one; where zero indicates total equality and one indicates total inequality. Therefore a Gini coefficient that is close to one indicates high levels of inequality whilst a Gini coefficient close to zero indicates low levels of inequality. Figure 8 and Figure 9 indicate Gini coefficients based on household per capita expenditure.

As shown in Figure 8, levels of inequality remain high in South Africa, 0.67 in 2006, 0.65 in 2009 and 0.65 in 2011. However, there is an interesting pattern observed in the Gini coefficients for different population groups. Figure 8 indicates that there is less variation in household expenditures among the white population. The Gini coefficient for this group has
consistently been less than 0.45 between 2006 and 2011. On the other hand, a steady decline in the levels of inequality among Indian/Asian and coloured populations is observed. In 2006, there was less variation in household expenditure among black Africans as opposed to coloured population. This changed by 2009 where higher levels of inequality were found among the black Africans as opposed to coloureds. By 2011, black Africans had the highest level of inequality compared to other population groups.

**Figure 8: Gini coefficients of different population groups**

![Gini coefficients of different population groups](image-url)

In terms of inequality by settlement type, Figure 8 shows that the level of inequality found among people living in urban areas is higher than that of people living in non-urban areas. This may be explained by various income groups found in urban areas, i.e. white population living in affluent areas and black African population living in townships. There is more homogeneity in non-urban areas regarding income with the exception of farms areas where a mixture of farm owners and farm workers are found.
4.3 Progress so far

The results discussed in sub-section 4.3 indicate targeted development towards the previously disadvantaged groups in terms of type of settlement, population group and sex.

As it has been mentioned that by 1994 most of the apartheid laws had been repealed. This implies integration of population groups in areas where they live as well as in terms of schools their children are allowed to attend. The results of Census 2011 indicate a still spatially segregated country almost 20 years after the abolition of apartheid laws. The concerning factor with this spatial segregation is the different levels of development in different types of settlement.

According to Von Thunen (in Jordaan, Drost & Makgata, 2004) land found in close proximity to the central business district (CBD) is in greater demand compared to other areas because of low transport costs. This demand results in higher rent on residences close to the CBD. On the other hand, in the outer belt the demand for land is low because of high transport costs, and therefore rent in these areas is low and the corresponding value of extensive production is also low. Von Thunen's theory implies that the high-income earners live closer to the CBD and the low-income earners live further away from the CBD. This is supported by the model of trade-off between space and access/transport costs where households have to choose between bigger spaces found further away from the CBD and access to amenities and cheaper transport costs related to areas closer to the CBD. Jordaan, Drost & Makgata (2004) argue that space as a pull factor is much stronger than access or transport costs, therefore
higher income earners will be found in areas far from the CBD where they can enjoy bigger spaces, and low-income earners will be found closer to the CBD where they enjoy easy access to amenities.

The residential location theories discussed above indicate that households prefer to live in areas close to the CBD where there is close proximity to urban amenities and economic opportunities and where transport costs are low. However, because of pull factors such as space and low rent in areas further out of the CBD, households are compelled to trade one for the other. Baker (2008), for example, maintains that the location of the urban poor vary from city to city. In some cities, the poor are concentrated in areas closer to the city centre where they can save on transport and be closer to work opportunities; in other cities they are located in areas far from the city centre where land is more affordable. The point that this paper seeks to make is that whilst the spatial segregation laws have been abolished, the choice of residential area still depends on availability of income.

Whilst cities and the poor grapple with this trade-off between space, rent and transport, Patridge & Rickmal (2008) found that poverty rates increase as distance from amenities and economic opportunities increases. They also found that remote areas may experience reduction in poverty from place-based economic development policies. This finding is similar to that of the Center for the Study of Social Policy (2011) where it is argued that effects of household poverty on individual educational achievement, economic prospects, health and other measures of well-being of household are intensified by the fact that households are living in distressed neighbourhoods. Furthermore, they maintain that living in distressed neighbourhoods isolates households from the resources they need to reach their full potential. However, Kumarage (2007), in a study conducted in Colombo Metropolitan District, Sri Lanka, found that people who are able to commute outside their communities are likely to get better incomes. Studies conducted in various countries confirm the relationship between location and economic well-being, i.e. economic well-being decreases with distance from amenities. So, whilst the Group Areas Act was abolished, its residual dictated where people end up staying and ultimately dictates the economic well-being of individuals based on where they stay.

The government of South Africa has since introduced various programmes and policies aimed at reducing inequality in South Africa. These include Employment Equity Programmes, EPWP, Job Fund, Rural Development Programmes which includes building of infrastructure, shopping
malls, better schools, better health facilities, provision of basic services, etc. The graphs and maps presented below indicate progress that South Africa has made to get the country where it is today.

Whilst levels of inequality have remained high in South Africa, lots of efforts have been made towards poverty reduction. This section shows a picture of South Africa prior to the current state in terms of poverty levels. Whilst in section 4.1 it was indicated that the former homelands, which are predominantly rural, have higher levels of poverty compared to the rest of South Africa, Figure 10 indicates that in 2001 the situation in the former homelands was worse than what it is today. Again using graduated colouring from green to orange, the darker shades of green indicates low levels of poverty whilst the darker shades of orange indicate high levels of poverty. Figure 10 indicates more orange in the former homelands in 2001 whilst Figure 11 indicates a greener map countrywide meaning that the orange colours have graduated towards green (graduated out of poverty) in 2011.
Figure 10: Multidimensional poverty headcount by wards in South Africa in 2001
Figure 11: Multidimensional poverty headcount by wards in South Africa in 2011

Overall, in terms of money metric poverty, there was a decline in the number of people living below national food poverty line (R321 in 2011 prices) from 12.6 million people to 10.2 million people between 2006 and 2011, (Figure 12). Whilst this decline tells a good story, it is the trends that are observed when looking at poverty levels by population group, sex as well as type of settlement that tell a story of targeted poverty alleviation programmes.
The results show that the line representing female headed households in Figure 13 takes dominance over that of male headed households, indicating higher levels of poverty among female headed households compared to households headed by their male counterparts. The results also show that poverty levels declined for both male headed households and female headed households, however, the downward gradient is sharper for female headed household than that of male headed households. This indicates specific efforts against feminisation of poverty. These could be due to policies about women empowerment and gender equity.
Figure 13: Poverty headcount by sex of household head

Similarly to female headed households, Figure 14 indicates that the line representing black African headed households takes dominance over lines representing households headed by other population groups, indicating high levels of poverty among this group compared to its counterparts. The downwards gradient for households headed by black Africans is sharper than that of households headed by other population groups. Again, this may be an indication of targeted efforts of poverty reduction programmes towards previously disadvantaged groups as well as the contribution of social wage towards poverty alleviation. One such policy which is aimed at reducing poverty and inequality resulting from the injustices of the apartheid era includes the Employment Equity Act No. 55 of 1998.
Figure 15 shows the same trend and pattern with Figure 13 and Figure 14. Households in non-urban areas have higher levels of poverty compared to households in urban areas. However, the decline of poverty is sharper for households in rural areas compared to the decline for households in urban areas. This could be explained by rural development projects implemented towards poverty reduction in non-urban areas.
5. Summary of the findings

The aim of this paper was to demonstrate the contribution of spatial segregation resulting from the apartheid era to levels of inequality in South Africa. The paper highlighted through evidence from literature that there is a relationship between proximity to urban amenities and well-being of households. Economic well-being decreases with distance from urban amenities. Literature also indicated that households found in remote areas may experience poverty reduction from place-based economic development policies.

When looking at the geographic distribution of households in South Africa, the results indicated that the population of the country is concentrated in urban areas, with 67.7% of the households found in urban areas whilst only 27.1% are found in traditional areas and only 5.3% are found in the farm areas. When presenting this distribution by population group, traditional areas indicated a distinct characteristic. Whilst other types of settlement indicated a somewhat racial mixture, the traditional areas are predominantly black African (almost 100% black African). Another notable characteristic found is that the majority of households in traditional areas are headed by females.

In terms of social inequality, more than 80% of the households in urban areas have access to basic services such as running water inside their dwellings or on site, flushed toilet inside the dwellings or on site, electricity, etc. whilst a minority of households in traditional areas have
access to these facilities. The plight of households in farm areas was found to be better compared to households in traditional areas.

The pockets of poverty calculated using an index created based on four dimensions, i.e., health, education, living standards and economic activity are mostly found in the former homelands. The former homelands are predominantly traditional in nature.

In terms of income inequality, the results indicated that black African headed households are worse-off compared to households headed by other population groups. Furthermore female headed households are worse-off compared to male headed households. Comparing average incomes for females across population groups and across types of settlement indicated that white females earn about 5 times more than their black African counterparts. Similarly, females in urban areas earn more than 3 times than the women in traditional areas earn.

The paper further looked at the impact of the contribution of targeted efforts towards poverty and inequality reduction in the country. The results indicated that even though poverty levels decreased between 2006 and 2011 for all groups of the population but the reduction of poverty is more significant amongst the previously disadvantaged groups such as black Africans, females as well as for households found in rural areas. The paper then associates this significant increase with economic growth policies and programmes such as Women Empowerment and Gender Equity, Employment Equity and Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP), Compulsory education and introduction of no-fee schools, Rural Development Programmes, etc.

6. Conclusion

To conclude therefore, the spatial segregation resulting from the apartheid era has an impact on the high levels of inequality in the country. Whilst there have been placed-based economic development policies, these assisted in reducing poverty in the country. There is evidence that these economic development policies are targeted to the previously disadvantaged as their impact is seen when studying the rate of decrease in poverty levels amongst these groups. The levels of inequality, on the other hand, have remained very high in South Africa, especially among the black African population. Whilst the levels of inequality are low among households in rural areas, this does not necessarily tell a positive story as the levels of income in these areas are equally low.
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