

**Vasant P. Pethe &
Sanjeevane Mulay**

Urbanisation Trends in Maharashtra 1951-71*

THE city is not new to the Indian civilisation. However, the growth of modern towns, cities and the metropolis in the wake of industrialisation is of recent origin. A modern Indian city has all the joys and certainly all the woes of a Western city. Economic planning has given some thought to population transfers from the agricultural to non-agricultural occupations for modernisation of the economy. However, adequate attention has not been given to smooth and planned process of urbanisation which is, by and large, a concomitant of economic development.

The present study, accordingly, focusses attention on the nature and pattern of urbanisation with special reference to the State of Maharashtra during the last two to three crucial decades. The basic data for this exercise are drawn from the Indian Census Reports. Our emphasis is on the period from 1951 through 1971 in which national economic planning has provided powerful dynamic elements in the country's economy.

*A version of this study was presented to the Seminar on First Results of the 1971 Census, Delhi, held under the auspices of the Indian Association for the Study of Population and the Institute of Economic Growth, November 1971.

Maharashtra vis-a-vis India : Some Broad Features

Let us begin with a comparative picture of Maharashtra within the country as a whole as presented by the data in Table 1. In 1971, Maharashtra had a population of 50 million persons forming 9.2 per cent of India's total population. Its urban population constituted 14.4 per cent of the country's total urban population. The urban proportion for Maharashtra was 31 per cent as against the corresponding proportion of 20 per cent for the country as a whole¹.

The population of Maharashtra has been increasing at a faster rate than India's population throughout the last three decades. The urban population of Maharashtra also increased at a comparatively faster rate particularly during 1941-51, and 1961-71. Maharashtra had 289 towns in 1971 which formed 9.9 per cent of the total number of towns in India. The number of towns in Maharashtra increased at an average decadal rate of about 9 per cent between 1951 and 1971.

With regard to other demographic characteristics, Maharashtra presents an advanced stage of development, compared to the average picture for the country as a whole.² For example, in 1971, the percentage of literates, percentage of workers in total population and percentage of agricultural workers to total workers in Maharashtra were 39, 37 and 64 compared to all-India averages of 29, 34 and 69 respectively.

Urbanisation in Maharashtra : A Temporal View

For a preview of the trends of urbanisation through the past seven decades, we may refer to the summary data presented in Table 2. We may use the following three measures of urbanisation for our analysis :

1. Office of the Registrar General, Government of India,

1968, Table 2, p. 148.

According to this committee, the projected urban population of Maharashtra is as follows :

1961	11,163,000
1971	16,084,000
1981	22,040,000

2. Planning Commission, Government of India, Identification of backward areas (Pandey Committee Report), 1969, Statement I-B, Ranking of States in terms of various indicators of Industrial backwardness, pp. 18-19.

TABLE 1—SOME BROAD COMPARATIVE DATA ON MAHARASHTRA VIS-A-VIS INDIA

1. Total population (in '000)	50,335	39,554	32,003	546,996	439,235	361,088
2. Decennial growth rate (%)	+ 27.3	+ 23.6	+ 19.3	+24.6	+21.6	+ 13.3
3. Urban population	15,703	11,163	9,201 8,339(a)	108,680	78,937	62,444 58,058(fl)
4. % Urban	31.2	28.2	28.8 26.1 (a)	19.9	20.0	17.3
5. Growth rate : urban population (%)	+40.7	+ 21.3 33.9(a)	62.4	+37.8	+26.4 36.8(a)	—
6. No. of towns	289	266	383 243(a)	292!	2700	3060 2203 (a)
7. % Increase in No. of towns	+ 8.6	-30.6 9.5(a)	+44.0	8.2	-11.8 +22.6(a)	—
8. Density (per sq. km.)	164	129	104	182	138	118
9. Sex ratio	933	936	941	932	941	946
10. % Literates	39.1	30.0	21.0	29.3	24.0	16.6
11. % Workers	37.2	47.9	45.2(6)	33.5	42.9	64.4(6)

12 % Cultivators and agricultural · labourers	64.1	69.9	—	68.6	69.5	63.2
--	------	------	---	------	------	------

SOURCE : Indian Census Reports.

- NOTES : 1. adjusted = data of 1951 census were adjusted according to 1961 definition of urban. There was some difference in definition of town in 1951 and 1961. To make the data comparable, 1951 data were adjusted by applying the 1961 definition.
Workers in 1951 = earners + earning dependents.
2. 1951 Census : No. of towns in India 3060. Declassified in 1961 = 803; Merged = 54. Total declassified = 857, New Towns in 61 : 497. Towns in 1961 = 2700.
3. No. of towns in Maharashtra in 1961 = (266) = No. of towns in 1951(383)-Declassified (128)-Merged(12) + New Towns (23).

Scale of urbanisation

Degree of urbanisation $\left(\frac{P^u}{P^t}\right)$; and

(c) Pace of urbanisation $\{P_n^u = P_0^u (1 + r)^n\}$

where, P^u = urban population; P^t = total population; P_n^u = urban population at time $t = n$; P_0^u = urban population at time $t = 0$.

It is usual to indicate scale of urbanization by the size of urban population and to assess the degree of urbanisation by relating the urban population in a region to its total population.³ The pace of urbanisation can be gauged by noting the rate of change in urban population over a specified period of time. In studying pace, decadal growth rates rather than compound growth rates are used here.

TABLE 2-URBANISATION AND GROWTH OF TOWNS IN MAHARASHTRA FROM 1901 THROUGH 1971

			%	%		%
1901	10	3217202	16.59		219	
1911	10.74	3248989	15.13	0.99	232	5.94
1921	-2.91	3857326	18.50	18.72	238	2.52
1931	14.91	4456730	18.60	15.54	258	8.40
1941	11.99	5665111	21.11	27.11	266	3.10
1951	19.27	9201013	28.75	62.42	383	43.98
		8338708(o)	26.06(a)		243 (a)	
1961	23.60	11162561	28.22	21.32	266	-30.55
				33.86(a)		9.48(a)
1971	27.16	15703403	31.20	40.68	289	8.64

NOTE: (o) adjusted. SOURCE: Indian Census Reports.

The scale of urbanization in Maharashtra is comparatively of a high order. The size of urban population of the State increased by over 400 per cent from about 3 million in 1901 to more than 15 million in 1971. As regards the

3. Gibbs Jack, P.,

D. Van Nostrand Company, 1961, pp. 402, 408-

degree of urbanisation, Maharashtra is the most urbanised of all the states within the Union. Whether or not, in absolute terms, the level is adequate, in the light of the state's level of industrialisation and economic development, is another issue.

The pace of urbanisation has been firmly maintained in the past and there are sure indications of its continuance in time to come. The pace of urbanisation was especially remarkable in 1941-1951, when the urban population increased by as much as 62 per cent. This upsurge, like the one of 1911-21, can be traced to the World War. These wars, stimulated industrialisation in the country and thereby led to migration of rural population to towns and cities. Between the last two decades, growth in urban population has been greater during 1961-71 (41 per cent) than during 1951-61 (34 per cent : adjusted figure).

This growth is also reflected in the increase in the number of towns, which moved up from 219 towns in 1901 to 289 in 1971.* The increase in the number of towns was notable in 1931 and 1941-51. The changes in the definition of urban in the 1961 Census led to major elimination of towns. In the following decade of 1961-71 there was an increase in the number, of around 9 per cent.

Spatial Distribution of Urban Population in Maharashtra

Let us now look at the principal administrative divisions of the State. There are 4 such divisions into which the districts are grouped as follows :

Bombay	7	Greater Bombay, Thana, Kolaba, Ratnagiri, Nasik, Dhulia, Jalgaon.
Poona	6	Ahmednagar, Poona, Sa'ara, Sangli, Sholapur, Kolhapur.
Aurangabad	5	Aurangabad, Parbhani, Bhir, Nanded, Osmanabad.
Nagpur	8	Buldhana, Akola, Amraoti, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara, Chandrapur.

4. Strictly speaking, figures are not comparable because the definitions of a town differ for the years 1901 and 1951 and for 1961-71. If figures regarding the number of towns for census years 1901 to 1951 are deflated according to the ratio of adjusted number to actual number of towns for 1951, the number of towns in 1901 works out to be 138. The estimated figures as per 1951 criterion for the different census years would be as follows :

No. of towns 138 147 151 164 169 243 266 289

Table 3 gives the distribution of the total urban population of the State as between these divisions for the period 1951 through 1971. It will be observed that the Bombay Division accounts for more than a half of the total urban population in the State. This can surely be attributed to the presence of Greater Bombay in the division. If we exclude Greater Bombay, the rest of this division claims only 17 per cent of the State's urban population. Greater Bombay occupies the most dominant position in the urban map of Maharashtra. Almost two-fifth of urban population of Maharashtra is concentrated in this giant city of Bombay. Bombay city is indeed one of the biggest cities of the world. If Greater Bombay is excluded, Poona Division occupies the first position among the divisions followed by Nagpur and the Bombay division excluding Greater Bombay.

TABLE 3-SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF URBAN POPULATION OF MAHARASHTRA AS BETWEEN ITS DIVISIONS : 1951-71

1,A	Greater Bombay	32.51	14.23	37.20	38.01
1.B	Bombay Division with Greater Bombay	50.12	51.68	53.70	54.66
1.C	Bombay Division without Greater Bombay	17.61	37.45	16.50	16.65
2.	Poona	24.39	21.36	20.66	20.05
3.	Aurangabad	7.66	8.03	7.11	7.55
4.	Nagpur	17.83	18.93	18.53	17.74
	Total Urban	9201013	8338708	11162561	15703403
	Maharashtra	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

NOTES : adjusted. SOURCE : Indian Census Reports.

The Aurangabad Division accounts for a relatively very low percentage of the total urban population of Maharashtra. It had been under feudal and medieval kind of rule until its absorption into the Indian Union in 1949. Under the former rule, the economic interests of the present Marathwada region were glaringly neglected. There was little industrial and economic development of the region. Moreover, the division, unlike other divisions, does not have any city or town which could become a catalyst for further

urbanisation. The relative positions of the divisions as indicated by their shares in the State's total urban population have remained more or less stable during the last two decades.

Degree and Pace of Urbanisation

From Table 4, it will be seen that Greater Bombay is wholly an urban area. Poona and Nagpur divisions are relatively more urbanised, each containing about one-fourth of its population in cities and towns, closely followed by the Bombay division (without Greater Bombay). The Bombay division (without Greater Bombay) contains some of the very poorly urbanised districts. Within this division, the Konkan area is the least urbanised.

TABLE 4-PERCENTAGE OF URBAN TO TOTAL POPULATION IN DIFFERENT DIVISIONS OF MAHARASHTRA : 1951-71

1.A.	Greater Bombay	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
1.B.	Bombay Division with Greater Bombay	42.46	39.68	43.87	
1.C.	Bombay Division without Greater Bombay	20.56	15.34	19.37	19.11
2.	Poona	26.88	21.33	22.26	24.33
3.	Aurangabad	13.79	13.10	12.61	14.75
4.	Nagpur	21.35	20.55	22.40	23.90
	Maharashtra	28.75	26.06	28.22	31.20

NOTE : adjusted. SOURCE : Indian Census Reports.

With regard to the pace of urbanisation. Table 5 gives decadal growth rates of urban population for different divisions of the State. During the last decade, the Aurangabad division was getting urbanised at a very rapid rate compared to other divisions. The urban population of Aurangabad division increased by over 49 per cent in 1961-71, as against the corresponding figure of 19 per cent for 1951-61. The growth rates in Poona and Nagpur divisions for the last two decades have been more or less steady, that is, between 30 and 35 per cent. Greater Bombay continues to grow at a very fast rate; the rest of the Bombay Division is also growing rapidly.

TABLE 5—DECADAL GROWTH RATES IN URBAN POPULATION IN
DIFFERENT DIVISIONS OF MAHARASHTRA : 1951-71

1.	Greater Bombay	38.66	32.99	43.75
2.	Bombay with Greater Bombay	29.98	39.11	43.18
3.	Bombay without Greater Bombay	13.91	55.20	41.89
4.	Poona	2.73	29.42	36.54
5.	Aurangabad	12.69	18.64	49.27
6.	Nagpur	26.11	31.01	34.76
7.	Maharashtra	21.32	26.95	40.6S

*Adjusted as per 1961 definition of town.
SOURCE : Indian Census Reports.

For a more detailed view Appendix Tables 1 and 2 give urban proportions decadal and rates of growth rates respectively for different districts of the State. According to the 1971 census data, the Nagpur, Poona and Thana districts are, relatively speaking, highly urbanised districts of the State. In the case of the Thana district this may be due to the proximity of Greater Bombay.

Placed at the lower levels in the ladder of urbanisation, are the districts of Kolaba from western Maharashtra, Ahmednagar and Satara from the Poona

(1) Relatively highly urbanised (more than 30 per cent)	Greater Bombay, Thana, Poona, Nagpur
(2) Medium urbanisation	Nasik
Level I	Sholapur
20 to 30 per cent	Akola
	Wardha
(3) Medium urbanisation :	Dhulia
Level II	Aurangabad
15 to 20 per cent	Nanded
(4) Low urbanisation	Kolaba
Less than 15 per cent	Ahmednagar
	Bhir
	Yeotmal
	Chandrapur
	Sangli
	Parbhani
	Buldhana
	Ratnagiri
	Satara
	Osmanabad
	Bhandara

division, Bhir and Osmanabad from the Marathwada region and Yeotmal, Bhandara and Chandrapur from the Vidarbha region. The statement given on p. 386, will give a rough idea about the levels of urbanisation as between the various districts of Maharashtra.

It may be noted that the districts on lower levels of urbanisation are getting urbanised at a faster rate. The growth rates of urban population during 1961-71 is as high as 75 per cent in Chandrapur district, and 52 per cent each in the districts of Aurangabad, Bhir and Osmanabad. The pace of urbanisation is quite slow for the districts of Ratnagiri, Jalgaon, Sholapur and Buldhana and Wardha. According to the pace of urbanisation in 1961-71, the districts are grouped as follows :

(1) Rapid urbanisation (growth rate more than 50 per cent)	Thana, Aurangabad, Bhir, Osmanabad, Chandrapur
(2) Medium pace : level I (40 to 60 per cent)	Greater Bombay, Kolaba, Nasik, Poona, Satara, Sangli, Kolhapur, Parbhani, Nanded, Yeotmal
(3) Medium pace : Level II (30 to 40 per cent)	Dhulia, Ahmednagar, Akola, Amraoti, Nagpur, Bhandara
(4) Slow pace (less than 30 per cent)	Ratnagiri, Jalgaon, Sholapur, Buldhana, Wardha

The districts showing a fairly high pace of urbanisation both in 1951-61 and in 1961-71, are : Greater Bombay, Thana, Chandrapur, Nasik and Sangli. The urban growth rates in 1951-61 were quite high in the districts of Greater Bombay, Thana, Ratnagiri, Nasik, Sangli, Bhandara and Chandrapur and quite low in the districts of Jalgaon, Parbhani, Bhir, Nanded and Osmanabad. The Marathwada region increased its pace of urbanisation in 1961-71.

Differential Growth of Big and Small Towns

An important trend in urbanisation observed in Maharashtra, as elsewhere, is that the bigger towns tend to grow faster than the smaller. In Maharashtra, the "big towns" increased in population by 41 per cent in 1961-71, whereas the "medium towns" and "small towns" increased only by 29 per cent and 28 per cent respectively.

TABLE 6-DIFFERENTIAL GROWTH RATES OF TOWNS OF 1961 DURING
1961-71 IN MAHARASHTRA

1. Big towns (Population 50,000 and above)	27	7,780,695	10,977,352	41.08
2. Medium towns (Population 10,000 to 50,000)	135	2,676,806	3,456,806	29.14
3. Small towns (Population less than 10,000)	99	716,972	915,797	27.73
Total	261	11,174,473	15,349,955	37.37

This growth pattern of the big vis-a-vis the small towns seems to support the theory of social classes that the big tend to become bigger. Big industry and monopolies tend to locate their activity in big towns, and as such, big towns represent more or less the locational counterpart of growth of social classes.

As a tentative probe into this phenomenon, we may refer to the two components of population growth in towns, viz., (a) natural increase, i.e., excess of births over deaths, net-immigration i.e., excess of in-migration over out-migration. Such decomposition cannot be carried out adequately for want of data. However, one may hazard a few statements based on general observation rather than on firm data. About the first factor, the data are much too inadequate for any generalisation. Regarding the second, there are good reasons to believe that there is lot of movement of population from the smaller to bigger towns.⁵ This is a case of intra-urban migration. The bigger towns have better infra-structure facilities for the location of industry, trade and other economic activities leading to the creation of more and more and better employment opportunities attracting the labour force. Further, indi-

5. They would also seem to meet the assertion sometimes made regarding the mode of internal migration, namely, that it proceeds step-wise, 'from farm to village from village to town, from town to city from city to metropolis'. Weber A. F.

Cornell University Press, p. 267. See pp. 213-18-20-24-25-28-29-67-72-74, 388, 397 and 408. Also see Browning H. L., 'Migrant Selectivity and Growth of Large Cities in the Developing Societies' in _____ edited by Study Committee of the Office of Foreign Secretary, National Academy of Sciences, John's Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1971, pp. 280-281.

viduals and even whole families may move from smaller towns to bigger towns because of better facilities of education, job training, recreation etc. In Maharashtra, cities like Bombay, Poona, Nagpur, Aurangabad, etc., have grown very fast during the recent years. This growth cannot wholly be explained in terms of natural increase. Flow of migration from rural areas to bigger towns has evidently been stronger than to smaller towns. Even for the rural population, big urban centres are found to be more attractive places to go to, from the point of view of educational or employment opportunities. The city of Bombay provides a good example in this regard, for as we know, much of the labour force in Bombay comes from the rural areas of the Konkan hinterland.⁶ Thus, taken together rural-urban and intra-urban migrations are behind the relatively higher rates of growth in populations of big urban units.

Some Basic Policy Issues

The disparate growth of big and small towns, especially during recent times, can be traced to facts of economic growth since independence and of national economic planning. It is now fairly well established that the process of economic growth during the last two decades, has been accompanied by the phenomenon of concentration and monopolization of industry, trade and other spheres of productive and distributive activity. The big industry and business monopolies find it convenient and economical from the point of view of productivity and costs to locate industry, trade and other form of business activity in bigger towns and cities. In the process some very big cities may get 'overgrown', invoking dis-economies of scale in the broad socio-economic sense. When this happens, it would be desirable to pass on the role of further economic development to medium and small towns and develop them into what has been called 'growth centres'.⁷ Large and unweildy population concentrations may pose intricate sociological and economic problems like traffic congestion, crime, ill-health, pollution, etc. These problems have also to be taken into account in framing a policy of urbanisation and location of economic activity. In any case, it is time to assess the strategy of economic growth in general and

Of the total immigrants to Bombay, 78.3 per cent were from rural areas, (Bulsara . J. F., Prakashan, Bombay, 1964, p. 28). Also see, Bogue D. J. and Zachariah K. C., 'Urbanisation and migration in India' in :

Edited by Roy Turner, University of California Press, 1962, p. 35.

7. Small Industries Service Institute, Ministry of Industrial Development, Government of India, (Mimeographed).

viduals and even whole families may move from smaller towns to bigger towns because of better facilities of education, job training, recreation etc. In Maharashtra, cities like Bombay, Poona, Nagpur, Aurangabad, etc., have grown very fast during the recent years. This growth cannot wholly be explained in terms of natural increase. Flow of migration from rural areas to bigger towns has evidently been stronger than to smaller towns. Even for the rural population, big urban centres are found to be more attractive places to go to, from the point of view of educational or employment opportunities. The city of Bombay provides a good example in this regard, for as we know, much of the labour force in Bombay comes from the rural areas of the Konkan hinterland.⁶ Thus, taken together rural-urban and intra-urban migrations are behind the relatively higher rates of growth in populations of big urban units.

Some Basic Policy Issues

The disparate growth of big and small towns, especially during recent times, can be traced to facts of economic growth since independence and of national economic planning. It is now fairly well established that the process of economic growth during the last two decades, has been accompanied by the phenomenon of concentration and monopolization of industry, trade and other spheres of productive and distributive activity. The big industry and business monopolies find it convenient and economical from the point of view of productivity and costs to locate industry, trade and other form of business activity in bigger towns and cities. In the process some very big cities may get 'overgrown', invoking dis-economies of scale in the broad socio-economic sense. When this happens, it would be desirable to pass on the role of further economic development to medium and small towns and develop them into what has been called 'growth centres.'⁷ Large and unwieldy population concentrations may pose intricate sociological and economic problems like traffic congestion, crime, ill-health, pollution, etc. These problems have also to be taken into account in framing a policy of urbanisation and location of economic activity. In any case, it is time to assess the strategy of economic growth in general and

Of the total immigrants to Bombay, 78.3 per cent were from rural areas, (Bulsara J. F., Prakashan, Bombay, 1964, p. 28). Also see, Bogue D. J. and Zachariah K. C., 'Urbanisation and migration in India' in : Edited by Roy Turner, University of California Press, 1962, p. 35.

7. Small Industries Service Institute, Ministry of Industrial Development, Government of India, (Mimeographed).

that of the location of economic activity in particular, in the context of the nature and pattern of urbanisation.

With regard to the future trend, we examined the data on urban and industrial growth for 1961-71 in order to ascertain the extent to which the industrial development led to urban growth. In this exercise, industrial development was taken as the independent variable and was represented by the percentage growth in non-agricultural workers during the period 1961-71. This percentage was adjusted for the difference in labour force participation rates for 1961 and 1971. Urban growth, the dependent variable, was represented by the percentage growth in urban population. The correlation between urban and industrial growth was as high as 0.71. A linear regression of urban growth on industrial growth was fitted. The result was :

$$37.30 + 0.0634 T \quad \text{where } U = \text{urban growth and } T = \text{industrial growth.}$$

The regression is used to predict the extent of urbanisation that can be expected from a given growth-rate in the labour force in non-agricultural occupations. Assuming that following the trend of 1961-71, the percentage of non-agricultural workers would rise to 42 per cent in 1981, growth rate in urban population would be 40 per cent and so the percentage of urban to total population on assumed regression will be of the order of 35. (For calculating the growth rate in labour force in non-agricultural occupations, figures projected by Expert Committee were used). The high degree of urbanisation that would prevail in 1981 underlines the urgency of framing a suitable policy on urbanisation and growth of cities and towns in Maharashtra.

Acknowledgements

Statistical coefficient etc. were worked out by Smt. Sanjeevane Mulay and data were compiled by Smt. S. Nikam.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1-PERCENT AGE OF URBAN POPULATION TO TOTAL POPULATION IN 26 DISTRICTS OF MAHARASHTRA : 1951, 1961 AND 1971

1.	Greater Bombay	99.08	99.08	100.00	100.00
2.	Thana	29.51	24.81	30.21	36.24
3.	Kolaba	10.56	9.23	10.08	12.10
4.	Ratnagiri	8.00	5.62	8.09	8.42
5.	Nasik	25.87	22.42	25.60	28.65
6.	Dhulia	18.44	15.64	15.97	17.32
7.	Jalgaon	31.77	22.89	22.50	23.65
8.	Ahmednagar	15.23	10.63	10.55	11.03
9.	Poona	42.78	36.09	38.10	41.85
10.	Satara	13.62	10.89	11.08	13.21
11.	Sangli	28.74	14.14	15.64	18.67
12.	Sholapur	31.24	28.55	27.95	27.37
13.	Kolhapur	21.21	16.53	19.28	21.53
14.	Aurangabad	14.13	14.13	14.14	16.82
15.	Parbhani	15.27	15.27	13.82	16.08
16.	Bhir	10.47	10.05	9.85	11.63
17.	Nanded	15.65	15.08	14.44	16.33
18.	Osmanabad	13.14	10.92	10.58	12.52
19.	Buldhana	16.50	16.50	16.56	17.59
20.	Akola	22.11	21.56	22.10	23.55
21.	Amravati	27.44	25.51	26.14	27.49
22.	Yeotmal	11.99	11.99	12.61	13.65
23.	Wardha	23.35	22.66	23.65	24.54
24.	Nagpur	46.79	47.53	52.22	54.37
25.	Bhandara	8.58	8.11	10.71	11.41
26.	Chandrapur	9.16	6.39	7.73	10.21
	Maharashtra	28.75	26.06	28.22	31.20

SOURCE : Indian Census Reports. For 1971 data, Census of India 1971, Paper I of 1971-supplement, Provisional Totals.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1-PERCENT AGE OF URBAN POPULATION TO TOTAL POPULATION IN 26 DISTRICTS OF MAHARASHTRA : 1951, 1961 AND 1971

1.	Greater Bombay	99.08	99.08	100.00	100.00
2.	Thana	29.51	24.81	30.21	36.24
3.	Kolaba	10.56	9.23	10.08	12.10
4.	Ratnagiri	8.00	5.62	8.09	8.42
5.	Nasik	25.87	22.42	25.60	28.65
6.	Dhulia	18.44	15.64	15.97	17.32
7.	Jalgaon	31.77	22.89	22.50	23.65
8.	Ahmednagar	15.23	10.63	10.55	11.03
9.	Poona	42.78	36.09	38.10	41.85
10.	Satara	13.62	10.89	11.08	13.21
11.	Sangli	28.74	14.14	15.64	18.67
12.	Sholapur	31.24	28.55	27.95	27.37
13.	Kolhapur	21.21	16.53	19.28	21.53
14.	Aurangabad	14.13	14.13	14.14	16.82
15.	Parbhani	15.27	15.27	13.82	16.08
16.	Bhir	10.47	10.05	9.85	11.63
17.	Nanded	15.65	15.08	14.44	16.33
18.	Osmanabad	13.14	10.92	10.58	12.52
19.	Buldhana	16.50	16.50	16.56	17.59
20.	Akola	22.11	21.56	22.10	23.55
21.	Amravati	27.44	25.51	26.14	27.49
22.	Yeotmal	11.99	11.99	12.61	13.65
23.	Wardha	23.35	22.66	23.65	24.54
24.	Nagpur	46.79	47.53	52.22	54.37
25.	Bhandara	8.58	8.11	10.71	11.41
26.	Chandrapur	9.16	6.39	7.73	10.21
	Maharashtra	28.75	26.06	28.22	31.20

SOURCE : Indian Census Reports. For 1971 data, Census of India 1971, Paper I of 1971-supplement, Provisional Totals.

TABLE 2-DECADAL GROWTH RATES IN TOTAL AND URBAN POPULATIONS IN THE
26 DISTRICTS OF MAHARASHTRA : 1951 AND 1961-71

			1961-71		
1. Greater Bombay	38.66	39.95	39.95	43.75	43.75
2. Thana	28.86	31.92	51.17	37.88	65.37
3. Kolaba	16.48	11.09	23.60	19.11	43.05
4. Ratnagiri	6.73	7.89	38.04	8.64	13.04
5. Nasik	29.75	28.39	47.65	27.58	42.75
6. Dhulia	27.44	10.43	30.20	22.94	33.28
7. Jalgaon	19.96	-15.02	17.87	20.27	26.44
8. Ahmednagar	25.88	-12.81	24.91	27.62	33.47
9. Poona	26.44	12.60	28.30	28.60	41.24
10. Satara	21.50	-1.19	23.59	20.29	43.45
11. Sangli	23.26	-32.93	36.28	24.83	49.05
12. Sholapur	23.57	10.56	20.97	21.04	18.55
13. Kolhapur	22.05	10.93	42.26	28.08	43.05
14. Aurangabad	29.93	30.07	30.07	27.78	51.93
15. Parbhani	19.33	8.02	8.02	24.66	45.08
16. Bhir	21.24	14.04	18.84	28.33	51.41
17. Nanded	22.20	12.70	16.97	29.42	46.39
18. Osmanabad	22.12	-1.74	18.23	28.09	51.58
19. Buldhana	21.78	22.17	22.17	19.01	26.45
20. Akola	25.06	25.02	28.16	26.16	34.45
21. Amravati	19.55	13.87	22.48	25.26	31.75
22. Yeotmal	17.86	23.98	23.98	29.34	40.02
23. Wardha	17.70	19.20	22.84	22.73	27.34
24. Nagpur	22.54	36.36	34.24	28.68	33.99
25. Bhandara	18.35	48.17	48.16	24.29	32.50
26. Chandrapur	17.58	-0.77	39.31	32.09	74.50
Maharashtra	23.60	21.32	26.06	27.26	40.68

SOURCE : Indian Census Reports.