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Chapter-VII

CONCLUSIONS

Sociologists generally agree with the common sense observation that major social changes are taking place more rapidly now than at any earlier period of history. Some of the important social changes that are taking place in the modern world have created and are creating massive shift in social structure throughout the world. Urbanization is one of such important changes. According to Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, urbanisation is characterised by movement of people from small communities concerned chiefly or solely with agriculture to other communities generally larger, whose activities are primarily centered in government, trade, manufacture or allied interests. Thus urbanisation may be characterised by self-evident factors like:

1. Mobility of Population from agricultural to non-agricultural areas,

2. Variety of occupations other than agriculture and continued mobility in these occupations,
3. A particular mode of habitation and non-agricultural (such as industrial, commercial etc.) patterns of economy.

Thus we may call urbanisation the process of transforming rural into urban area. Here a very pertinent question arises: what is urban? It means one will have to follow the 'city' as a concept. Like many other sociological categories the city is an abstraction. But its constituting elements -- population, structures, means of transportations and other instalations et cetera, are concrete entities of varying natures. Wirth has, therefore, identified it in terms of size, density and heterogeneity. So urban then means city. But we in sociology prefer to call it urban. The ideas obviously give to a dichotomy in terms of rural and urban. Sorokin and Zimmerman have assembled eight characteristics to explain this dichotomy: These are: (1) Occupation, (2) environment, (3) size of community, (4) density of population, (5) heterogeneity or homogeneity of population, (6) social differentiations and stratification, (7) mobility and (8) system of interaction.

Thus urbanisation simply indicates becoming urban, i.e., non-rural. Here one point needs some clarification.
Sometimes in terms of above mentioned criteria, certain places may not be explicitly classified into rural or urban category. Some Indian sociologists like Professor Mukerjee termed it RURBAN. However, we are not at this point, going to discuss this idea at length.

In the popular usages the term urbanisation refers to a process whereby a traditionally rural bound community wholly or partially moves to adopt a different pattern of life where activities are primarily centred in government, trade and manufacture. The process is intimately related with the concepts like industrialisation, westernisation and modernisation. These all are indices of change in different aspects of society. Apparently so close, these concepts vary characteristically in meaning and contents. From Robert Redfield's point of view the small, isolated, non-literate and homogenous communities with a strong sense of group solidarity become large, exposed, literate and heterogenous societies with a sense of functional unity. At this juncture a distinction between 'Urbanisation' and 'Urbanism' is required to be explained. Urbanism represents a particular way or style of life contrast with that of rural, agriculturally dominated communities, while urbanisation is a process of
becoming urban. Following Louis Wirth, urbanism is now generally regarded as 'a way of life' of urban areas. He outlines a limited number of identifying characteristics — heterogeneity of city, high degree of dependence of urbanites upon others, segmental character of social relations and the sophistication and rationality of urban man.

The present study titled 'Trends of Urbanisation in Uttar Pradesh, 1961-71', is a humble attempt to explore the emerging trends in the urban growth of Uttar Pradesh. The study is primarily based on secondary data particularly Census data. Other sources of data such as National Sample Survey, and Techno-economic Survey, etc. have also been utilised. For operational purposes the 1971 census definition of 'Urban' has been accepted for the allocation of urban areas in the State. Variables such as family size, sex ratio, literacy and migration have been considered. Working hypotheses incorporating these elements have been formulated. Comparative method has been adopted for the analysis of data. Analysis begins from the discussion of the concept of 'degree of urbanisation.' It is defined as the ratio of urban population to the total population of the geographical territory under consideration. It is
expressed in terms of the following formula:

\[ U = \frac{p_c}{p_t} \]

Where \( U \) means Urbanisation,

\( p_c \) means population of cities,

and \( p_t \) means total population.

A debate has also been initiated to deal with the relationship between degree of urbanisation and density of population. It was found that there hardly exists any definite relationship between the two. Analysis reveals that over all urbanisation in India is 19.91 per cent, and in Uttar Pradesh it is only 14.02 per cent as per 1971 data. Maharashtra (31.20%), Tamil Nadu (30.28%), and Gujarat (28.13%) are the most urbanised states in the country. Uttar Pradesh moved from 12.85 per cent in 1961 to 14.02 per cent in 1971 and thus trailed in the middle so far as its position in comparison with other states is concerned. As discussed in chapter III in 1961, 49.97 per cent of total urban population (9,479,895) was living in Class I cities which rose to 52.89 per cent in 1971 (Total urban population 12,388,596). In 1961, most of the internal population growth and migration has been
accommodated by crowding more and more people into the existing urban limits and not through the expansion of cities into suburbs and fringe areas. This indicates that upto 1961 urban sprawl was not an important feature in Uttar Pradesh. John Brush's study of 'The Morphology of Indian Cities' confirms this result. But 1971 data provide a different picture. Now the growing urban population has started exerting pressure on the urban periphery to penetrate into neighbouring suburbs and villages. Former may be termed as Vertical and the latter as Horizontal urbanisation. Town development authorities while planning for urban development are to be more careful for providing necessary amenities in terms of living area, parks and schools, playground and hospitals, water and electricity and above all protection and security to the people. Thus residential colonies are planned even out of existing limits of the city. Many industrial units and manufacturing concerns have also been shifted out of the core city. Thus extending the urban area and reducing the density of population.

Data also provide certain very fascinating results. Urban population of the state increased at rate that exceeded the total growth rate of population in the state.
Number of class I cities (population of 1 lac and above) rose from 18 in 1961 to 21 in 1971. The development of major cities indicates that increasing urbanisation is closely associated with 'Rail' and not the 'Road'. In other words urbanisation and industrialisation have a positive relationship. Meaning thereby that urbanisation is basically taking place as an economic change. In case of old religious places in the state one thing has very clearly come up on the basis of data analysis. Almost all the famous religious places (Ayodhya, Mathura, Vindhya-chal, Hardwar and Banaras) except Varanasi are left behind the average urbanisation rate of the state. Even Varanasi as one of the KAVAL towns shows comparatively meager urban growth.

Rank size rule is not applicable as it was hypothesized in case of urban development of the state. According to this principle the biggest city in any given territory has the double of the population of the second largest city and the three times of the third one and so on in the process of urban development of that territory. As compared with 1961, the dependency ratio in 1971 has gone low (59.48 to 49.95) and therefore, the per cent of active age increased from 62.7 in 1961 to 66.8 in 1971. In case
of sex ratio (females per one thousand males) the largest
city (Kanpur) has the lowest sex ratio. But the trend is
towards increase. (1961 - 739; 1971 - 662). Mirzapur
has the highest sex ratio, i.e., 893 and 853 in 1961 and
1971 respectively. Over all the big cities of the state
indicate a trend of increase in the sex ratio. This
indicates an increasing settlement of migrants with their
family and spouses. Now the traditional family and kinship
systems are bound to be affected in the urban conditions.
This trend in the sex ratio is again confirmed when
examined from 'density' point of view. Higher the population
density, higher is the sex ratio. Daniel Lerner has
taken literacy as one of the criteria of modernisation.\(^3\)
However, urbanisation and literacy are also closely asso­
ciated. With the increase in the degree of urbanisation in
1971, the literacy rate has also gone up from 39.02 per cent
in 1961 to 43.63 per cent in 1971 in urban Uttar Pradesh.
In case of male female literacy differential we again find
a trend. The literacy differential goes on decreasing
as one moves upward from class V towns to Class I cities.
From the point of view of individual cities in the State
it was found that the cities with relatively high Muslim
population have low level of literacy. Rampur (31.26 %),
Shahjahanpur (33.94%), Moradabad (40.44 %) and Aligarh (42.50 %) are some of the examples. This appears more valid in case of female literacy in these cities.

The economic structure of urban population of the State has also been analysed. There has been an increase of 19.8 per cent in the working population in 1971. As compared with primary and tertiary sectors, secondary sector of the economy is less developed. Only 28.49 per cent of the total workers are in secondary sector while the figure for tertiary sector is 60.95 per cent. Again the expenditure on public institutions is very meager. According to 1971 data only 3.10 per cent of the total urban females are working women. Majority of it (1.99 %) is engaged in tertiary sector. From the point of view of migration, we find a clear trend. In 1961, there had been only ten cities where the migrants constituted more than 25 % of their total population. In 1971, this figure rose to 13.

In terms of migration to individual cities, we found that the cities having big industrial establishments are attracting more migrants. Cities with local industries (Varanasi, Aligarh, Moradabad, etc.) could not attract much migrants. Ghaziabad is a city having more than 50 per cent migrants in its total population. In the eastern part of the State
Gorakhpur has maintained its attraction for rural migrants. On the basis of the analysis of data on migration, there are clear indications that Ghaziabad and Meerut in the West, Kanpur in the centre and Gorakhpur in the east have better prospects for development. But the age-wise break up of migrants gives two quite striking views. The highest proportion of migrants in 0-14 year age group is in the cities which are industrially less developed (Dehradun, Rampur, Shahjahanpur) and 15-34 year age group in industrially developed cities. It then means that child labour is not a typical phenomenon of industrially developed cities only. But it is more pronounced in other cities particularly the cities with civic background in the State.

The analysis of data on family and size of household reveals certain interesting results. The highest number of households falls in class I cities. It is also concluded that upper size class of cities have the bigger size of household. It is contrary to the general feeling that family size in big cities is smaller than that of the small towns. This conclusion however need further enquiries relating to the structure and organization of urban family. It may also be analysed from the point of view of the functions and the transfer of functions to
other institutions. It may also be seen from marriage and divorce point of view. The position of educational, medical and transport and recreational facilities in the state has also been analysed. In the overall examination of data, it was found that major concentration of these facilities is in the big cities. Educational and medical facilities available at small urban centres, are not able to cope with the increasing urbanization. Out of 334 towns of the state there are 134 towns having no rail connections. 83 are at a distance of 10 kms. or more from some nearest railway station. It indicates that the rural population tends to move towards market centres. This phenomenon of the movement of people from rural pockets to the neighbouring marketing centres must be given due consideration while formulating any programme for social reconstruction. The idea of service centres may be useful. By a policy of decentralised industrial development these emerging urban areas may be further developed. This may be helpful to some extent to check the problem of 'selected migration'.
Suggestions

1) For successful town planning, it is important to collect carefully data on the nature of urban expansion, extension of city limits, the development of new residential land, clearance of slums, and the absorption of neighbouring villages.

2) In order to really understand the role of small towns in economic development, we must have the basis data on such towns.

3) In the understanding of emerging trends of urbanisation in the state of Uttar Pradesh, it is necessary to give attention on new industrial townships, and industrial agglomerations. A traditional analysis in terms of rural/urban dichotomy may not be of much importance now.

4) It is not enough now to study internal migration. Study of 'movement' has become necessary now. To examine the impact of commutation in demographic and economic term, on city life, it is also necessary to have data on place of work.

5) Again, any undue importance to 'Push' and 'Pull' factors in migration may be avoided. Certain more important
factors like labour recruitment procedures, rural urban wage differentials, interaction between rural and urban areas due to frequent flow of persons, commodities and money, and hierarchy of functions etc. are to be studied to explain the rural-urban migration.

6) In spite of all the limitations of data on urbanisation the fact remains that these data have not been fully utilised. There is therefore a need for rigorous analysis of such data.
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