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ROLE OF ELITES IN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

This empirical study was undertaken based on the tentative hypotheses formulated. Field work has been carried out applying purposive stratified sampling method. Schedules were served to the respondents chosen with a purpose. Their responses were elicited on various issues connected to the current study. Apart from this, stress is also laid on the informal discussions held.

Today in Karnataka, if there is any problem that needs utmost attention of the state, it is the question of Regional Disparity in respect of northern Karnataka region (consisting of two major parts, i.e., Bombay Karnataka and Hyderabad Karnataka). Irrespective of the political affiliation whatsoever, this problem seems to have larger acceptance in the state. This is so because, the region identified in northern Karnataka constitutes 52 per cent of the total geographical area in size and 42 per cent of the total population of the state. Within this is the Bombay Karnataka region, which constitutes 28 per cent in size and having a 56 per cent of the total population of North Karnataka. This enormity of the problem itself has attracted the
attention of the state in a big way. Although, Hyderabad Karnataka region forms another important area of North Karnataka, which is also a victim of this disparity. Keeping this in mind, which has a direct bearing on the population and the productivity of the state, the study was chalked out. This study today serves to withstand the criticism that the academia in this region has not contributed to strengthening the growing debate on this issue. While undertaking this study after careful analysis of the subject, a pilot survey was also conducted to measure its significance for a Doctoral work. The results of pilot survey were subjected to statistical analysis and after an in-depth discussion, considering the relevance of this subject. A common schedule was prepared with a purpose to generate the data within North Karnataka involving the cities of northern Karnataka region.

Along with other significant variables, the questions concerning the awareness of the group in focus about the problem, followed by specific questions formed the pattern of the schedules served. Diagrammatic representation of the choice and number of respondents is as given in Appendix. For the purpose of the study, the respondents were categorised depending on their chosen profession. They include Academic Elite (Ac.E), Administrative Elite (Ad.E), Business Elite (BE), Literary Elite
Data collected in this way is represented through two kinds of graphs, viz., pie chart (which represents the total percentage of respondents opinion) and the column graphs (represent the break up of the various groups within the total respondents).

After such a choice, the respondents were served the schedule, primarily it was attempted to assert their responses regarding their familiarity about the state. Majority of (98 per cent) the total 271 respondents clearly hinted of their familiarity with the state (See Graph 1). This means 266 respondents out of 271 were familiar with the state. Only 5 out of 271 respondents i.e., about 2 per cent were not familiar with the state as accepted by them. The word familiar in this question encompassed the knowledge of the respondents regarding the issues of topography, history, breadth and length of the state, cultural heterogeneity and the geophysical information about the state. This was anticipated because citizens of a state where the respondents have domicile status should at least have minimum information about their place of dwelling. The idea behind such an exercise was to make sure that the opinions of these elites has some weightage for the study in focus. Consolidated statistical data presented in Graph 1 indicates clearly that these respondents have had enough
Q.11. Are you familiar with your state?
Yes - 98%. No - 2%
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knowledge about the state. Informal discussions helped in ascertaining this.

However, what is intriguing is the response of 2 per cent of elites, who expressed their opinion as being unfamiliar about the state. The effects of their unfamiliarity on the subject, this only helps us to identify the weak response amongst elites. (See Graph 1A). As can be seen further in Graph 2, among the academic elites all the 7.01 per cent of them are familiar with the state so also, the 1 per cent of administrative elites interviewed. Among others groups All the 8.12 per cent of business elites, 12.92 per cent of the general elites, 6.27 per cent of literary elites, are aware of the state. Among the political and religious elites, nearly 60.89 per cent and 1 per cent respectively are aware. But most astonishingly the political elites, once again have expressed as not being familiar with the state as mentioned above. As explained earlier, this question was conceived to give us a clear picture about the understanding of the respondents about the state. A rejoinder to know the extent of their familiarity was put forth for those 98 per cent of the respondents who had replied positively to the earlier question. Of these, nearly 90 per cent of the respondents agreed to the fact they were familiar with the state to 'some extent'. (See Graph 2). This meant that they were aware of
the statistical information and physical details about the state. However, it was found that they were ignorant about the other details, such as the total population of the state, the number of districts in the state, major contentious issues before the government and such other details. Another 10 per cent of them replied as having 'greater knowledge' about the state (See Graph 3), of them 90 per cent once again it was the political elites who mentioned that they were very familiar with the state. This group consisted of nearly 54.98 per cent of political elites, 11.81 per cent general elites, 7.38 per cent business elites, 5.90 per cent literary elite, 2 per cent administrative elites and religious elites respectively, 6 per cent academic elites (a break up of these responses can be seen in Graph 2A). Since these were only preliminary questions having a bearing on many serious issues that were to be taken at a later stage, in-depth analysis has not been made here.

Moving away from these general questions to the specific questions, on north-south dilemma, simple questions were asked about their familiarity. 96 per cent of the respondents replied positively. While about 4 per cent said negatively (See Graph 3). Nearly 60 per cent of political elites, 13 per cent of general elites, 7.75 per cent of business elites, 7 per cent of academic
Q.11a. If yes, to what extent?
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Q.11a. If yes, to what extent?

- Some extent
- Great extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ac.E</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>54.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad.E</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.E</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.E</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.E</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.E</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
elites, 6.25 per cent of literary elites and 2 per cent of religious elites formed 96 per cent of respondents in this regard. About 3 per cent of political elites, 1 per cent of business elites are in another group, who expressed negative reply to this question. (See Graph 3A.) When attempted to know the extent of knowledge of these respondents 90 per cent of them consisting of 55 per cent of political elites, 12 per cent of general elites, 7 per cent of business elites, 6 per cent of literary elites, 6 per cent of academic elites, 1 per cent of religious elites, 1 per cent of administrative elites have consented to the fact that they were familiar with the north-south dilemma to 'some extent'. While about 9 per cent of the respondents have said that they had a grater knowledge of this north-south dilemma of this 9 per cent majority of respondents were once again the political elites accounting for 7 per cent. (See Graph 4, 4A).

In addition to this, an attempt was made to know about the major political issues in the state, keeping in view, the issue connected to the study. In the course of the study, it is observed that amongst other things in India, politics seems to be taking major share to the extent of discussions that take place within the society and that the people are more active in politics. This seems to be a continuing trend. Even in Karnataka, as can be seen from
Q.12. Are you familiar with North South dilemma in Karnataka? Yes - 96%. No - 4%.
Q.13a. To what extent? To some extent - 90.77% To great extent - 7.38% Not at all - 1.85%
the above response (See Graph 5), this is a reality. Only 2 per cent of political elites have responded 'No' to this question. Since this is a very meagre percentage, no significance can be attached to this although the respondents are from political elite group itself. Further, it is to be noticed that this percentage of respondents belongs to political executive category at the decentralised level. Having understood that nearly 98 per cent of respondents are aware of the politics (See Graph 5), break of this is 60.52 per cent of political elites, 7 per cent literary elites, 12.92 per cent general elites, 8.12 per cent business elites, 1.48 per cent administrative elites and 7 per cent of academic elites. (See Graph 5A.) Once again from general to specific, the focus in the schedule shifted from the broader areas to the specific question of the issues of regionalism, the respondents then were asked to prioritise their answers, since four major issues, viz. 1. Dissidence and leadership clash, 2. River water issue, 3. Regional Disparity problem, 4. Border disputes were spelt out in the schedule. Apart from these category of responses, No problems, All the above, None of the above, Do not know, No answer, etc., options were also given.

The major political issues that were listed in the schedule included, Dissidence and leadership clash, which has today
Q.13. Are you aware of the politics of your state?
Yes - 98%  No - 2%
become a common scene, irrespective of political parties. River water issue, which is consistently bothering state of (Chennai) Tamil Nadu since 1947. Border dispute between Maharashtra and Karnataka, which keeps surfacing now and then and finally question of Regional Disparity itself which is in existence for quite a long time but surfaced once again in recent years in 1990s. Of these, choices nearly 90 per cent respondents have chosen 'Regional Disparity' as the main political issue in Karnataka state (See Graph 6). While a substantial percentage of respondents have chosen a combination of other problems with Regional Disparity in the matrix. This has happened because the option of prioritising was given and invariably in all most all options opted disparity has figured in the responses. River water issues have taken the second position, while border dispute and the dissidence and leadership clash issues have taken 3rd and 4th position respectively.

Khanna⁶ while observing the various factors as responsible for Regional Disparity also has identified inter-state disputes over territory, boundary river water sharing etc. Thus our options in the schedule is a clear case for identifying the problem of Regional Disparity, especially in a state which is otherwise known for its calmness. Since this question had a combination of
Q.14. What do you think are the main political issues in Karnataka today?
1. Dissidence and leadership clash - 2%.
2. River water issue - 5%.
3. Regional disparity problem - 90%.
4. Boarder dispute problem - 3%.
5. There are no problems -
6. All the above -
7. None of the above
8. Do not know
9. No answer
options, a reinforcing question to ascertain which of these four problems dominate over the other, the respondents were asked to choose amongst the four major issues in order of preference. Although, this is a kind of redundant exercise, this was technically thought of to identify the exact causes for Regional Disparity in case of North Karnataka.

In response to this, 90 per cent of the respondents have identified Regional Disparity problem as major political issue, quite possibly since respondents have been drawn from within the Northern Karnataka, more so from Bombay Karnataka region, and that at the time of undertaking this study, the issues of Regional Disparity was dominating the political scenario in the state. Most of the respondents seem to have preferred Regional Disparity problem, as a major political issue. In the course of the informal discussions, it was apparent that the respondents did not have a clear vision of the content of Regional Disparity. However, it was felt that, the respondents were influenced by the much publicised issues brought out by media vis-a-vis the question of Regional Disparity.

Of the 90 per cent of respondents, there were 54 per cent of political elites, 13 per cent of general elites, 7 per cent of business elites, and academic elites respectively and 6 per cent of
literary elites constituted this group, of respondents, accompanied by 1 per cent of religious elites and 1 per cent of administrative elites, agreed to the fact that Regional Disparity is a major problem and an important political issue in Northern Karnataka (See Graph 6A). About 5 per cent of the respondents believed that river water issue as the major problem, while another 3 per cent of the respondents mentioned border dispute as the major political issue. 2 per cent of the respondents have identified the dissidence and leadership clash. River water issue, Regional Disparity problem as the major political issues. (See Graph 6). These indicate that, Regional Disparity problem in the mid 90's i.e., 1994 onwards has been dominating the political issue while sidelining the issues of river water dispute and border dispute. At the time of this work, a series of secondary sources also saw the day light highlighting the major issues involved in Regional Disparity. The same has been taken into cognizance while completing this work. However, it is clear that, none of these problems have cropped up overnight. In other words, most of these have haunted Karnataka during the years before 1995 also.

Dissidence and leadership clash in a state dominated by different caste groups clearly indicates the fact that there has
Q.14. What do you think are the main political issues in Karnataka today?

1. Dissidence and leadership clas -2%
2. River water issue 5%
3. Regional disparity problem 90%
4. Border dispute 3%
5. There are no problems
6. All the above
7. None of the above
8. Do not know
9. No answer
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been clash amongst dominant caste-class groups in the state right from the period of Reorganisation of States. As the state politics in India has been particularly the hotbed of political casteism, as referred by Fadia giving the politics of the state, the colour of the caste. The same thing is vividly explained by Andre Betiley in his observation that, I quote:

"....... caste enters much more directly in the composition of political elites at the state level ....""

there by making it clear that political casteism is not a new phenomenon in Indian states. At the time of Independence, the state of Karnataka like many others in Indian Union, came under the dominant rule of congress and the dominant communities of the southern region. Although initially caste-class groups like Vokkaligas dominates state politics and that most of them were drawn from enlightened Southern Karnataka, this domination could not continue after Reorganisation of the State. The fight for the establishment of the capital of the state with Bangalore chosen as the capital also helped the people of Southern Karnataka, especially the dominant caste class Vokkaligas to hang over to power citadels. This of course, is still a criticism whenever the issue of North Karnataka comes up. Not going further in detail,
in post-reorganisation, much against the advice within the group of Vokkaligas, the reunification of Karnataka merging Northern Karnataka (Bombay Karnataka and Hyderabad Karnataka) with Southern Madras province, erstwhile old Mysore and part 'C' state of Coorg, etc brought about major political changes in the state. The caste class Vokkaligas leadership lost its leadership to caste-class Lingayats of northern Karnataka including Bombay Karnataka and Hyderabad Karnataka because of sheer number which is vital to democratic politics apart from this because of large land holdings, which also gives them the economic power to caste Lingayat, groups, this change in the political leadership came up in the state. In mid 70's due to dissidence within congress more so because of luke warm politics between the two dominant caste groups of Karnataka namely, Lingayats and Vokkaligas the central High Command of Congress under the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, brought in the minority politics in the state, giving third dimension to Karnataka politics. Following this, was the return of the era of Brahmin politics and return to the politics of old Mysore state with dominant Vokkaligas.

In the middle of 80's when congress lost its domination and became brittle organisation, the old socialist groups consolidating
their power with various other minor castes dominated the politics of the state under the leadership of Janata Dal. This permutation and combination often giving scope to continued dissidence and leadership clashes among leaders for leadership. Today, in a coalition era, the dissidence and leadership clash has become the order of the day. Similarly, the history of river water issues. With the two major river water issues viz., Krishna and Cauvery in Karnataka currently bothering the state leadership. The Cauvery river water issue has a history beginning from the period of Tipu Sultan while contention has been in matters of sharing river water between the three states of Kerala, Tamilnadu and Karnataka. The issue of Upper Krishna Project is gaining more importance these days as it concerns non-utilisation of river water source. Both these issues in content are more political in texture and nature and remains as a low key issue during the periods, when there is compatible coalition government in the state surfacing as an issue either of electoral politics or as an inter-state dispute.

Border dispute, on the other hand is the direct result of Linguistic Reorganisation of the state done as early as in 1956. Two important regions in this dispute were Kasargod and Belgaum. Kasargod was an issue between the state of Karnataka
and Kerala, while Belgaum was between Maharashtra and Karnataka. Despite the fact that, there were more Kannadigas in Kasargod, a lot of them speaking Kannada, this was merged with Kerala, during the leadership of Sri Ramakrishna Hegde, who was the Chief Minister of the state in 1983. To gain political mileage and credibility, it is said that he settled this issue in favour of Kerala, thus leaving the interest of Karnataka in jeopardy and problem of Kannadigas left unheard. As a result, this is still in a volcanic state not giving clear hints as to when this may erupt, because currently, no political party seem to be taking sides of Kannadigas in this region. Who feel let down, by the decisions of the state. On the other hand in case of Belgaum, the state is in the midst of controversy involving the state of Maharashtra apart from a political party viz., Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti (MES) taking up the cause of Marathi speaking minority population in the region. This city has residents, who are industrialists in neighbouring state, with narrow roads and under developed extensions. As a result, amongst commoners too, there is a rigidity in their movement within and outside the state. However, politically, despite several attempts to bury this problem, based on Mahajan Report, ruling at every other electoral scenario, politics seems to raise hue and cry about this border dispute, especially involving the state of Maharashtra.
Finally, the question of Regional Disparity itself. As one can notice, whether in case of river water issue or border dispute, North Karnataka seems to be the looser always. Right from the days of Reorganisation, there has always been a lukewarm attitude between the southern and northern part of Karnataka. Strangely enough, there is clearly a division of two major communities between these two regions. Vokkaligas dominating in the erstwhile princely state of Mysore and lingayats dominating the Bombay and Hyderabad Karnataka region. Both these groups own agricultural lands as the means of production and are feudal in characteristic. Since it was Northern Karnataka that led proactive movement for unification with southern part of the state, which has been dominated by enlightened kings and the Dewans, disparity has been noticed within the unified territories of Northern Karnataka, parameters like education, cultural finalities, welfare management, empowerment and so and so forth have led to this disparity (between) in the regions of North Karnataka, which had had prominently a different set of history. Northern Karnataka being exposed to more aggression with more multicultural groups such as Brahamins, Marathas etc., the impact of these seems to be having a bearing on their language and cultural identity. This dramatic influence has dislodged their uniform identity as against the continued tradition of benevolent
kingship in Southern Karnataka region. With this subtle and difficult existence of these two regions of the state with only common linkage viz., the language (mother tongue) Kannada. It is but important that the state should consider this issue as a priority. Apart from this, there seems to be more number of differences than similarities between the North Karnataka and South Karnataka.

Change in the political leadership and dominant share in addition to the existing developments in Southern Karnataka region has always left the North Karnataka aspiring for more. In bargaining on these issues, factors like leadership, modernisation, mobilisation, cultural diversification, sub caste and cultural interest have left North Karnataka with little powers to influence the state and to gain more. Continued negligence of the state, failure of the people to demand their needs and requirements, the weak political leadership despite having the key position in the state as Chief Ministers, of the state\(^\text{13}\) does not seem to have helped the North Karnataka in overcoming the accrued disparity.

This being the history of political issues in Karnataka in relation to Regional Disparity with specific reference to North Karnataka, the elite respondents in the current study were asked whether they think, this problem needs immediate solution?
(See Graph 7). As a response to this, about 96 per cent of respondents agreed that this needs immediate solution. While about 4 per cent of the respondents replied negatively. Of this 96 per cent of the respondents who were in favour of immediate solution to that problem, 59 per cent of political elites, 13 per cent of general elites, 7 per cent of academic elites, 8 per cent of business elites, 6 per cent of literary elites, 1 per cent of religious elites participated while, unlike in earlier questions in this case, the respondents who replied negative are rather scattered and belong to various groups, this consisted of 1 per cent of academic elites, 2 per cent of political elites, 1 per cent of business elites (See Graph 7a). Therefore, it is not only political elites in this case who are of the opinion that, this problem does not need immediate solution but has other elites too, who believe in this direction.

Similarly, for another question about the main political issues, and the attempts of the state in this direction the respondents believed in majority that this problem needs immediate solution and they opined that, the state has not made no attempt to sort out this problem. 96 per cent of the respondents believed that no attempt is made by the state in this direction, on the other hand, 4 per cent of the respondents
Q.16. Do you think these problems need immediate solution? Yes - 96% No - 4%
believed that there is an attempt made by the state (See Graph 8). This is rather a perplexing answer. However, it is important to note that, of those 96 per cent of respondents who accept that the state has made no attempt. Also observed that the state does not consider these issues especially the Regional Disparity as an important issue, include 60.15 per cent of political elites, 1.11 per cent administrative elites, 8.12 per cent business elites, 12.55 per cent of general elites, 5.90 per cent of literary elites and 1.48 per cent religions elites (See Graph 8A).

While answering to a specific rejoinder to the earlier question, the respondents observed that the state does not consider these issues especially, the Regional Disparity as an important issue. While people residing in this region consider it as a very important issue. It is a glaring contradiction between the action of the state and the needs of the people that can be noticed at this stage. Though, the state is supposed to be a representative of the people it does not seem to consider Regional Disparity as an issue, as per the varied responses of the elites (See Graph 9) 43 per cent of respondents have opted for the response that speaks of state which does not consider the Regional Disparity problem as a very important issue it consists of 23 per cent political elites, 7 per cent academic elites, 2.95 per cent of
Q.16/1. Attempts made in this direction.
No - 96%. Yes - 4%.
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Q.16/1 Attempts made in this direction. Yes - 4% No - 96%
business elites, 5 per cent literary elites, 1 per cent administrative elites (See Graph 9A).

40 per cent of the respondents who feel that there are no pressure groups in this region to articulate their interest. They consisted 21.4 per cent political elites, 4 per cent academic elites, 2 per cent business elites, 6.64 per cent general elites, 4 per cent literary elites, 2 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 9B). since this issue of Regional Disparity is a issue connected to the people of North Karnataka in particular, they are expected to build pressure upon the state and articulate people's needs through these pressure tactics. As pressure groups are of course a part of any democratic set up of governments inevitably and they must be recognised. There is no longer any contradiction between the existence of the pressure groups and the working of a democracy. If a democracy is to survive, especially in a society so diversified as in India, it can only survive by striking a balance between pluralism and unity. In order to achieve, this collective bargaining in the process of governance becomes inevitable and at that point pressure groups play a very important role. Pressure groups are organised groups within a society having a common cause. They invariably attempt to influence government's policy whenever, they notice that the governments perpetually ignore a
Q.16.b. If no, is it because:
1. State does not consider it as a very important issue - 43%
2. There is no demand from the people to sort out these problems - 8%
3. Politicians, political parties, bureaucrats do not have perception about the problem - 5.35%.
4. There are no pressure groups in this region to articulate their interest - 40%.
5. All the above - 4%.
cause considered by the society as primarily important. Since this tactics is most common around the democracies of the world and that their success rate is also quite high, it is possible that even in North Karnataka. Regional Disparity can be fought against if and only when people at large in the region along with political parties and other instruments of democracy can play, work on pressure tactics. In doing so, it is but inevitable that the issue must be given a clear exposure. Socialising the facts to broadening the societal base for the cause, thus, a clear perception of the problem in even terms should be spelt across the varied sections of the society. Otherwise it is likely that the cause may not acquire the required legitimacy to put it before the state for seeking solutions. Thus, the other reasons identified by the respondents for this no action status by the state, includes the fact that, the politicians, political parties and the bureaucrats do not seem to have a clear perception about this problem. About 5 per cent of respondents including 2.95 per cent political elites, 1.29 per cent literary elites, 0.74 per cent general elites and 0.37 per cent business elites. While 8 per cent respondents believe that there is no demand from the people to sort out these problems consists of 6 per cent political elites and 2.24 per cent literary elites as they see fragmented demands in solving these problems. Finally 4 per cent of elite respondents including 2 per
cent political elites and 1 each per cent of business and general elites have opted for all the above potions. (See Graph 9A and 9B).

In all these cases and also in the question connected to need for considering these as the main political issues, respondents seem to be hinting at the fact that state invariably takes no cognizance of the people's demand and that in this particular case, it seems more apparent than ever. Thus a clear picture seems to be emerging as to the causes of Regional Disparity, which includes (a) no initiative among various social groups within the society and (b) no response from the state to the occasional demands of North Karnataka. However, the 4 per cent of the respondents who believed that the state had made certain attempts also have had no impact felt that the state's attempts have not helped to overcome the Regional Disparity. Thus, the response for these sub-questions also throws light on the fact that the problem of Regional Disparity in North Karnataka is not a recent problem but has a history that is most peculiar to North Karnataka.

In order to validate this observation, another question was asked as to what might have contributed to the rise of the problem. Issues such as the problem as having historical reason.
Q.16 b. State does not consider - 43%. No demand from people - 8.24%. Do not have perceptions - 5.35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ac.E</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad.E</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.16 b. No pressure group - 40%. All the above - 4%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ac.E</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad.E</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options:
- Does not
- No demand
- No perception

Options:
- No pressure
- All the above
The problem as a recent political development, as an Artificially
Boosted political ploy, as a result of continued negligence of the
region by state and as a result of too much dependence of the
population on the state and such other options were given as
choices to respond. 42 per cent of respondents think, most of
these problems are because of recent political development
include 31 per cent political elites, 4 per cent general elites, 2
per cent literary elites, 3 per cent business elites, 0.74 per cent
academic elite and 0.37 per cent religious elites.

Another 42 per cent of respondents including 19 per cent
political elites, 9 per cent general elites, 5 per cent academic
elites, 3 per cent business elites, 3 per cent literary elites, 1.11
per cent each administrative and religious elites have said this
problem as having historical roots. (See Graph 10, 10A).

12 per cent of respondents containing 9 per cent political
elites, 1.81 per cent business elites, 0.74 per cent literary elites
and 0.37 per cent academic elites have felt that this was because
of the continued negligence of the state. While remaining 4 per
cent of elite respondents have identified too much dependence of
people on the state. They include 2.69 per cent literary elites, 0.37
per cent each business and political elites (See Graph 10 B). As a
Q.17. Do you think mos of these problems are because of: 1. Historical reasons, 2. Recent political development, 3. Artificially created ploy, 4. Continued negligence of state, 5. Too much dependence on state by people.
Q.17. Do you think most of these problems are because of historical reasons - 41.38%. Recent political development - 41.17%.

---
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- **Q.17.** Continued negligence of the state - 11.92%. Dependence of people on the state - 3.43%.

---
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- **Q.17.** Continued negligence of the state - 11.92%. Dependence of people on the state - 3.43%.
matter of fact no one has identified the reason, viz., Artificially/Boosted political ploy.

This clearly indicates that while ruling out the fact that Regional Disparity is not a political ploy artificially created, which, of course, is a very important observation that this research study is able to contribute as against the popular conception.

Every political party either power or political party either in power or in opposition has attempted to raise this issue to gain popular attention and also to find a political base. However, while being in power they seem to ignore this issue. This continued existence of the problem on the agenda of opposition, therefore, is a matter of grave concern because there is every possibility that this issue will become a non-issue in the time to come. For example, under the Congress government, the party in power despite being in power for a longer period had not made any attempt at resolving this issue. However, in recent years, the same party seems to be making several attempts to resolve this issue. This seems to be the case with most of the other parties too. In the year 1983, when Ramkrishna Hegde became the first non-Congress party Chief Minister, he constituted a Committee
under the Chairmanship of late Sri Kadapatti to study and suggest the solutions to this problem of Regional Disparity. Subsequently, the Committee submitted its report. But, yet the recommendations of the Committee are still to see the light of the day. When this north-south dichotomy reached its zenith in 1997, Sri J.H.Patel constituted yet another Committee under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka to study this problem. With the change of government in the state, the present Congress party Chief Minister, Sri S.M.Krishna, also formed another Expert Committee under the Chairmanship of Alagh, former Member of National Planning Commission, New Delhi. Thus, every time a new Chief Minister took over the reins of power, there seems to be attempts to cosmetically impress the north Kannadigas regarding Regional Disparity. Many legislators on their own have also attempted to find the problems of North Karnataka by producing statistical data. Sri H.K.Patil, former Opposition Leader in the Legislative Council, Government of Karnataka, went to the extent of publishing a book.14

Whatever may be the attempts made by different political parties, the most important factor to be taken into cognizance is that, idea of Regional Disparity with special reference to North
Karnataka in the state of Karnataka is there to stay unless resolved. Now, this clearly establishes the fact that the problem of Regional Disparity is a deep-rooted and a real problem. In the current fashion, of politics, the political executives do not seem to take keen interest in working with universities or research institutions to get feed back for designing the policy they desire. Under such circumstances, identifying a problem to its natural cause would be difficult to make an analysis of these unless one is familiar with the Regional Disparity problem in respect of North Karnataka and also intercepts the reasons for respondents' reply. It is true that the Regional Disparity in North Karnataka is the result of the historical facts and that there is enough evidence to prove it. But, then it is difficult to come to terms if one identifies this problem as being a recent phenomenon. However, one apparent reason for this, of course, encompasses the attempts to appropriate this issue by the political parties, while the party that was in power and the elites of this region by endorsing this view seem to protect their self for their inaction all these years. Apart from this, a brief analysis of these reply clearly reveals that there have been a number of issues with special reference to northern Karnataka and also Regional Disparity which are quite historical and recent once which are consolidated under one banner of Regional Disparity. For past one-decade additional problems due
to historical factors has surfaced which have called for a divided approach to the problem of development in the region. Hyderabad Karnataka and Bombay Karnataka having different needs attempts made at unified efforts to sort out these problems on one platform of northern Karnataka have at times bounced back. Reasons such as different political priorities, ego clashes of leadership, perspective planning and priorities by elites, political party interests and democratic compulsions are some of the reasons which have called for a two pronged approach to this problem.

Despite the fact that the demands of Hyderabad Karnataka and Bombay Karnataka region have similarities, their priorities no doubt are quite different depending upon land, people and their requirements. In this regard, it is important to note the experiences of Bihar, as presented by L. D. Jha\textsuperscript{15} while writing about Regional Imbalance : Case of North Bihar, observes that different regions call for different priorities and while illustrating this, he draws concrete and empirical evidences for substantiating his statement. This being the central issue, the problem of Regional Disparity acquires a new face and therefore, calls for acceptance that the problem is both historical and a recent one. Other studies such as Hemalatha Rao\textsuperscript{16} (1984), P.C.Sarker\textsuperscript{17} (1999).
G. Thimmaiah, Abdul Aziz and Sudhirkrishna (1996) do speak about the fact that Regional Disparity problem has a historical tracings.

As 12 per cent of respondents believe that this problem is a result of continued negligence of the state. This is in relation to question 17, thus strengthens the view that there is a considerable amount of negligence by the state in matters relating to North Karnataka. These data are explicit enough to speak about the gravity of the problem about the attitude of the state towards an equally important part of the state of Karnataka. There are two major possibilities for this attitude of the state to this problem of Regional Disparity. Primarily it is a question of centre-periphery problem and secondly it could be the question of capital syndrome. In case of centre periphery theory, which of course, is a more popular among the federal studies, has been employed in this case also to explain the likely factors that may have come in the way both in terms of the pace of development of this area and also the continued negligence of this area by the state, whereas in the federal studies it is observed that if an area is far away from the ‘power’ centre, the ripples of power is unlikely to sustain to reach out the peripheral parts simply because the force of power gets diluted accompanied by losing span of control.
resulting in loss of the felt existence of the state. With the growing complexities of administering large states like that of Karnataka which at times is of the size, length and breadth of nations in Europe, it is extremely difficult for organisations like Indian states to spread its tentacles of power and effect development with same effectiveness that it can do within the capital region. Given to the different aspirations and demands of the distant places, this reciprocation may not have the same effects as anticipated. It is here that the effective leadership comes into picture. In fact, often the states tend to depend heavily on the representatives of the people to feed the state the necessary input in the regions, which are far away. However, under the circumstances as one faced in North Karnataka, when there is no such feed back to the state by elites belonging to various groups with stress on political elites from the state’s capital and also to watch the administrative units on behalf of the state. The state tends to assume that everything in these regions is in goody-goody status. The state on the other hand treats the bureaucratic feed back as an administrative problem and will opt for administrative solutions, which may be too procedural and circumscribing resulting in no noticeable developments within a period.
As a result of this, over a period of time the problems gets accrued calling for dire package of development, which in spite of the necessities may not really help to find long term solutions. Thus, often, the problem of periphery remains a constant problem raising the feelings of disparity, which may be common not only to one region in particular, but to several other regions within the state, thus prejudicing the other developed region for no mistake of the development region. Second aspect of this is the capital development syndrome, which is a very popular one in the developing societies, right from state to the decentralised units where the share of power in higher percentage is taken by those who are in inner circles of power and this syndrome is seen in any power centre right from state capital and downwards. In number of cases, the capital tends to develop faster while the distant places from the capital will experience step motherly treatment. Myrdal\textsuperscript{20} (1958) using this concept of cumulative causation to explain why growth gets concentrated in the regions where it is initiated. Supported the view of Perrox that economic growth typically begins in some region rather than in all regions. Discussing about the backwash effects, Myrdal also discusses about the fast growing regions that attract resources, as against the developed regions which continue to remain backward.
With, this being the reality, North Karnataka also has experienced disparity, as a result of this backwash effect. This is one side of the story. There are other stories as well, for this problem of Regional Disparity to grow into multiple proportions. It is possible that not any one of the causes may be completely held as responsible for such a problem, because, in a democratic process, the question of governance is often treated to be the problem of ruling elites. While the ‘ruled’ takes passive roles expecting things to happen all by it. Thus, this continued dependence on the state by the large group of citizens invariably results in apathy of the ruled too in matters of governance, leading to these pathological situations. Maturity of democracy alone, therefore, can inform the citizens of the needs and importance of active participation, of people in the decision-making.

In order to assess the role of elite participation in a democratic process and to fix responsibility, a question was designed as, whom do you consider as responsible for all these problems? Despite several options like people’s representatives, people’s apathy, lack of futuristic perception among the politicians/political parties/bureaucrats continued negligence on the part of the state excess dependence of the people on the state,
etc. (See Graph 11). 47. per cent, including 31 per cent political elites, 2 per cent literary elites, 6 per cent general elites, 3 per cent business elites, 1 per cent administrative elites, 4 per cent academic elites squarely charged the people’s representatives, as being responsible for all these problems most of them agreed that it is people’s representatives who have failed in their job at any level and who are to be blamed for these problems (See Graph 11 A). Job of people’s representative as defined clearly is to aggregate the interest of the people by interacting and articulating the same at an appropriate body for taking right decisions by political executives. People’s representative must stimulate creative thinking. He must act like linkage between the state and the people. It is he who must prioritize the requirements in the area. Since, we carry on representative democracy, the people’s representatives must work for the betterment of the society at large, which can bring about changes in the living conditions of the people in the true sense. Continuing this matrix in his argument, Garner identifies three positions for these representatives to act upon according to him. Firstly, the representative is regarded as a deputy, a delegate or an agent of the particular constituency, which elects him. Charged primarily with procuring legislation for the advancement of the local interests of his constituency, obtaining appropriations
Q.18. Whom do you consider as a responsible for all these problems?

1. People's representatives - 47%
2. People's apathy - 30%
3. Lack of futuristic perception among politicians/parties/bureaucrats - 4%.
4. Continued negligence on the part of the state - 13%.
5. Excess dependence of the people on the state - 5%.
6. All the above - 1%
7. None of the above -
8. Do not know
9. No answer
GRAPH - 11A

Q.18. Whom do you consider as a responsible for these problems?
People's representatives - 47.11%. People's apathy - 29.85%. Lack of futuristic perception - 4.73%
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Q.18. Continued negligence of the part of the state - 13.24%. Dependence of people on the state - 4.67%. All the above - 0.74
of money for the construction of public works, therein and of securing other favours, which lie within the power so the legislature or government to bestow.

Secondly, a representative may be regarded as the representative of the entire state, elected to consult with other representatives and charge primarily with the care and advancement of the general interests and only secondarily with the promotion of the particular interests of the immediate constituency.

Thirdly, he may be regarded as the mouthpiece or the spokesman of the political party, which is in majority in the constituency from which he is elected and as such, he is bound by the will of his party, whatever may be his own personal views.

John Walke,22 on the other hand, has suggested a typology, which the role of a representative can be analysed, according to him. The trustee depute role; according to which a deputy can see himself as a delegate of his constituents and be willing to accept instructions or can act as he thinks necessary without seeking their advice or consultations.

The other reason as enumerated by respondents included 'people's apathy' as responsible for the Regional Disparity in
North Karnataka. Nearly 30 per cent of the respondents including 17 per cent political elites, 5 per cent literary elites, 4 per cent business elites, 2 per cent general elites and 1.85 per cent academic elites (See Graph 11 A).

4.73 per cent respondents including 3 per cent political elites, 1 per cent general elites, 0.74 per cent business elites have considered lack of futurists perception among the politicians/political parties/bureaucrats, as responsible for Regional Disparity in northern Karnataka (See Graph 11 A).

Apart from these two major reasons, around 13 per cent of elite respondents mentioned the continued negligence on the part of the state. They included 5 per cent political elites, 4.24 per cent academic elites, 3 per cent business elites, and 1 per cent general elites (See Graph 11B). Another 4.67 per cent of respondents consisting 2 per cent political elites, 1.56 per cent academic elites, 1.11 per cent general elites have considered excess dependence of the people on the state as responsible for these problems. (See Graph 11B).

Holding political executives or the state as responsible, while the people within the region are also responsible is somewhat difficult to digest. This dependent population in North
Karnataka is rather too dependent on the state for their own development and hence the problem. With this the problem of Regional Disparity in Northern Karnataka is becoming more acute. What the people in this area have to learn is that this problem of Regional Disparity is not a problem to be sorted out merely by the state alone, but it needs people's positive involvement with the efforts made by the state also. It is very clear that this problem has a number of issues intertwined with this and needs to be seen as a complex one. With this being the proportion of the problem a positive question was put forth to learn from the respondents. Do they think that this problem can be overcome. Nearly 98 per cent of the respondents have replied positively, wherein 2 per cent of the respondents have spoken with a negative tone. (See Graph 12). Of those, who preferred positive response for this include 61.25 per cent political elites, 12.92 per cent general elites, 8.12 per cent business elites, 7.01 per cent academic elites, 6.27 per cent literary elites, 2 per cent religious elites and 1 per cent administrative elites. (See Graph 12A). Further, for those who responded to this question were asked another question as to know through what means this problem could be overcome. Nearly five options were given such as i) By states' intervention, ii) By effective people's participation, iii) By active mobilisation of political parties, iv) By active
Q.19. Do you think these problems can be overcome? Yes - 98%. No - 2%.
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Q.19. Do you think these problems can be overcome? Yes - 98%. No - 2%

Percentage

Ac.E 7.01
Ad.E 1.11
BE 0.37
GE 8.12
LE 12.92
PE 6.27
RE 1.48

Category
involvement of politicians/political parties/Bureaucrats, and v) By people’s group/NGO’s. Apart from all the above, None of the above, Do not know, No answer, of course, were a part of the question (See Graph 13).

63 per cent of respondents consisting of 33 per cent political elites, 7 per cent literary elites, 8 per cent academic elites, 4 per cent business elites, 10 per cent general elites, 0.37 per cent administrative elite and 0.74 per cent religious elites. The response was once again in favour of people’s effective participation as means to overcome the problem of Regional Disparity. (See Graph 13A). Active participation of people is a pre-requisite for successful working of a democracy. It is a fact that so long as the people burden the state depending excessively on them, democracy loses its meaning. Therefore, people must learn to become more vigilant and politically conscious. They must actively involve themselves in the process of policy making.

As against this 29 per cent respondents including 13 per cent political elites, 5 per cent literary elites, 4 per cent general elites, 5 per cent business elites, 1.48 per cent academic elites and 0.37 per cent administrative elites had opted for the need for state’s intervention to sort out Regional Disparity in North Karnataka. (See Graph 13A). Altogether 92 per cent of the
Q. 19a. If Yes, how? By state's intervention - 29%. By effective people's participation - 63%. By active involvement of politicians/parties/bureaucrates - 6%. By people's group/NGOs - 2%.
Q. 19a. If Yes, how? By state's intervention - 29%. By effective people's participation - 63%.
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Q. 19a. By active involvement - 6.55%. By people's group/NGO - 2.48%
respondents share the view that state’s intervention and people’s effective participation could sort out these problems. The remaining 5 per cent respondents including 2.55 per cent general elite, 3 per cent literary elites opted the option. By active involvement of politicians/political parties/bureaucrats wherein the remaining 3 per cent of elites belonging to 1 per cent each to business, political and general elite category identified people’s group/NGOs as the remedies to overcome this glaring Regional Disparity problem. (See Graph 13B)

Now, with the state being targeted as an institution causing Regional Disparity, the question as to whether the politics of the state is being in the right direction, as to solve the problem was put forth before the respondents to elicit their response. The democratic process in its attempt at solving problem in the state invariably chooses two sets of path. (a) By sorting the problems through institutional mechanism, policy making and implementation, which fall under the purview of the larger constitutional framework, wherein the effective mechanisms of administration would be utilised ably to sort out any disparity that may exist in this state. Following these mechanisms greater share in the allotment of budget may help in sorting out the problem. As recommended by L.D. Jha,23 while writing on
regional imbalance – North Bihar case. On the other hand, the other method of sorting out this problem is (b) method of political intervention, wherein representatives could effectively bargain with the state and where politics would be as defined by Karl W. Duetsch put it, the question of who gets what, where, when and how. Further, we should also be aware of the fact that, people respond to events not only in terms of what happens but in terms of what they think is happening. They respond according to their perceptions of each situation.

It is also likely that under other circumstances, they may respond in part to the memories and images, which they have in their mind. Therefore, elites responses for this question may not necessarily give us any hope, that the state has solutions to the problem. Therefore, as if, it is a logical sequence, 93 per cent of respondents, however, have opined that politics of the state is not in the right direction to solve this and only a 7 per cent of respondents believed that politics is in right direction. (See Graph 14). 93 per cent of respondents comprises 57.2 per cent political elites, 12.55 per cent general elites, 7 per cent academic elites, 7.75 per cent business elites, 5.54 per cent literary elites, 1.48 per cent each administrative and religious elites. (See Graph 14A).
Q. 20. Do you think the politics of the state is in the right direction to solve these problems? Yes - 7%. No - 93%.
However, for a rejoinder, the 7 per cent respondents could not give any substantial reply as to based on what reasons they say that politics is in right direction, this leaves in an unclear position about what is the right direction, in which the politics of the state is moving vis-a-vis Regional Disparity in North Karnataka.

As opposed to this view, the 93 per cent of respondents who agree to the view that politics is not in the correct direction, identified, of the five responses, such as ineffective leadership party in power does not have clear perception of the problem, state has inadequate representation of the regions, policy outcome is biased, politicians/political parties/bureaucrats are apathetic, etc., and the respondents chose in quite a good percentage, (33 per cent) the reply that the 'policy outcome in respect of North Karnataka is biased. (See Graph 15). This 33 per cent respondents included, 18.45 per cent political elite, 4 per cent each academic and general elites, 3 per cent business elite, 2.85 per cent literary elites, 0.37 per cent administrative elites. (See Graph 15A). This strengthens our argument that the North Karnataka is a victim of the Centre-periphery syndrome in the state. The state of Karnataka like among other states of India, following in line with the Five Year Plans had, in the initial years
Q. 20b. If No, it is because leadership is ineffective-30%. Party in power does not have clarity of problem-6%. Policy outcome is biased-33%. Politicians/parties/bureaucrates are apathetic-31%.
Q.20b. If No, it is because policy outcome is biased - 32.93%. Politicians/party/bureaucrates are apathetic - 30.82%.
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Q.20b. If No, it is because leadership is ineffective - 29.58%. Party has no perception - 6.28%.
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laid thrust upon mainly on solving the pressing basic priorities. The question of Regional Development since then did not receive emphasis. As priorities of the nation changed, the federal states responded to the centralised policy thrusts, rather than preferring their priorities. As a result the choice of alternative policies for the states was thought of much later. At this point, the states entered into a phase of resolving inter-state regional differences. Although, inter-state issues called for central government intervention, intra-regional differences were left to be tackled by the respective state governments. At this time in the state of North Karnataka, one can notice the absence of a regional perspective development plans to guide decision making in the state, although some committees were appointed to study the problem. The policy of earmarking sites for industrial areas, providing the necessary infrastructure and then hoping to stimulate private investment as per these studies also seem to have worked no magic.

As a matter of fact, there is a feeling in North Karnataka that the attempts of the state to develop this area based on reports is rather as a ritual than with a purpose or commitment behind. Lack of conscious efforts, therefore, has left this problem haunting the state. Various Finance Commissions appointed did
not tackle this problem. As a result, without a policy alternative, the problem of disparity glaringly grew even under the plan period causing visible disparity in terms of investment, growth and development. Case of Zilla Parishad plan outlay for example is one such issue that has rocked the state. (See Table 4.1). Similar disparity is explained in the various tables shown in Appendix.

**TABLE – 4.1**

Zilla Parishad Plan Outlay

(Rs. in lakhs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>1996-97</th>
<th>1998-99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangalore South</td>
<td>67,750</td>
<td>79,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgaum North</td>
<td>54,010</td>
<td>59,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus there is a vast variation is found in all most all sectors, which are, of course, parameters to assess the Regional Disparity.

P.C.Sarker,²⁵ (1999) expressing his concern regarding this, offers another explanation to this problem. He traces the bias in favour of a region to the policy making in economic planning, which are mainly sectoral in nature with no serious effort at formulating an integrated plan for the state as a whole, taking into consideration the priorities of the component parts of the state. Accordingly if the planning is taken up the author opines that it would build on the
inter-sectoral linkages in each region resulting in solving the problem of regional imbalances. However, our data indicate that the problem of Regional Disparity in North Karnataka is due to various other reasons too.

31 per cent of the respondents believe that politicians/political parties/bureaucrats are apathetic. They included 2 per cent academic elites, 0.37 per cent administrative elites, 5 per cent business elites, 6 per cent general elites, 3 per cent literary elites, 13.65 per cent political elites and 0.74 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 15 A). While 30 per cent of the respondents, i.e., 3 per cent academic elites, 0.37 per cent administrative elites, 5 per cent business elites, 4 per cent general elites, 2.21 per cent literary elites and 15 per cent political elites believed that the leadership is ineffective. (See Graph 15B). Altogether 61 per cent of respondents believed politicians/political parties/bureaucrats along with ineffective leadership as the cause for the misdirected policy in the state.

Similarly, about 6 per cent of the respondents believe that party in power does not have a clear perception of the problem. This group included 1.11 per cent academic and general elites respectively, 1.48 per cent literary elites and 2.58 per cent political elites. (See Graph 15B).
An analysis of this leaves us speculating as to why nearly 18 per cent of the political executives themselves feel that the policy outcome for North Karnataka is biased. While 14 per cent political elite respondents see themselves supporting the idea that the bureaucrats' apathy as responsible for the wrong policy perceptions in state politics and also see their own leadership as ineffective. After a focussed survey about the main problems of the state/political issues and then tapping it down to cause and effect, a question of re-examining the political issues was taken up with a question that attempts to define the problem of Regional Disparity. The question was posed with a loose end to understand whether the nature of this problem has anything to do with necessary solutions expected. Therefore, options like Regional Disparity problem with special reference to northern Karnataka is a problem (a) worth considering by the state, (b) is only a political issue, (c) is blown out of proportions by vested interest groups and (d) is a 'case' specific and needs more attention were posed. The responses have been that most of them, i.e., 41 per cent of respondents included 5 per cent academic elites, 1.11 per cent administrative elites, 2.58 per cent business elites, 10 per cent general elites, 4.32 per cent literary elites, 18.82 per cent political elites and 0.74 per cent religious elites considered Regional Disparity as a problem worth considering by the state. (See Graph 16, 16A). While 35 per cent of the elite respondents, i.e., 1.48 per cent academic elites, 0.37 per cent
Q.22. In your opinion regional disparity problem w.r.t. to North Karnataka is
worth considering problem by the state - 41%. Only a political issue - 20%.
Blown out by vested interest groups - 4%.
A case specific needs attention - 35%
22. In your opinion regional disparity problem w.r.t. to North Karnataka specifically is - A problem worth considering by the state - 41% is only a political issue - 19.73%.
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22. In your opinion regional disparity problem w.r.t. to North Karnataka specifically is - blown out of proportions by vested interest groups - 3.69%. Is a case specific and needs more attention - 34.85%.
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- 26.2%
- 2.58%
- 2.58%
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- 0.74%
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administrative elites, 3.11 per cent business elites, 2.58 per cent general elites, 0.74 per cent literary elites, 26.20 per cent political elites and 0.37 per cent religious elites consider Regional Disparity problem. Is a 'case' specific and needs more attention. (See Graph 16, 16B). Another 19.73 per cent of elite respondents including 0.74 per cent academic elites, 1.85 per cent administrative elites, 2 per cent business elites, 1.11 per cent general and literary elites respectively, 12.55 per cent political elites, 0.37 per cent religious elites felt that it was only a political issue, 3 per cent of elite respondents felt that it was an issue blown out of proportions by vested interest groups. (See Graph 16A).

Responses of the elite are as shown in Graph 16, 16A and 16 B acquires more importance. Among these respondents, in the informal discussions, it was revealed that the stakes for the state were rather high, if the state did not consider this Regional Disparity problem in North Karnataka soon. The elite respondents (the break up of which is given in Graph 16, 16A, 16B) were in an action mood to plunge into a North Karnataka wide strike to pressurise the state, they expressed their will to demand for a separate state, if the state did not react.26

Hemalatha Rao in her book on Regional Disparities and Development in India, while discussing the need for solutions to the Regional Disparity, observes that it is necessary to address this
issue on priority from the point of maintaining national integration, political stability and unity. Further, she observes that if Regional Disparity is left neglected and unchecked, these disparities are capable of assuming serious dimensions and threatening the very existence of a nation hinting at the demands for sessionist attitude of those who agitate. In fact, there are several instances, where the observations of Hemalatha Rao is substantiated.

About 35 per cent of respondents as mentioned earlier see the Regional Disparity problem in respect of North Karnataka is a specific case, which needs priority of the state to resolve it. They were of the opinion that apart from its historical perspective, day by day this problem is getting aggravated, because of newer demands are being added on (citing the examples of Zonal Railway Office, High Court Bench).

About 20 per cent of the respondents believed that Regional Disparity is only a politically motivated ploy pushed in by various political parties now and then to embarrass the party in power. This response, if weighed against the question No. 17, shows a complete drift in the opinion of the respondents which possibly may have crept in as the respondents have been continuously discussing about the details of Regional Disparity, also because, there has been a lot of up rise in the recent period in North Karnataka regarding this. There are in all likelihood that the influences of these movements
on the respondents. It is true that there can be no movement in a developing society without the intervention of the political parties in the absence of a civil society, but the fact that a movement like Regional Disparity in North Karnataka is not a political ploy, cannot be completely accepted, while certainly it is a question of percentage of the participation of political parties in the movements. This shift has to be noticed because of the reasons mentioned above.

After identifying the problem, specifically an attempt was made to cross-examine the respondents in relation to the question of Regional Disparity and backwardness especially in northern Karnataka, hence another question with an open end was posed with options mentioned below. (a) North Karnataka is backward, (b) Not really, but has problems with the state and society, (c) Has been neglected by the (south dominated) state, (d) North Karnataka is truly suffering from disparity and this needs solution. For this question, 68 per cent of elites including 40.22 per cent political elites, 5.80 per cent academic elites, 0.74 per cent administrative elites, 5.69 per cent business elites, 9.23 per cent general elites, 5.69 per cent literary elites and 1.11 per cent religious elites believe that North Karnataka is backward (See Graph 17, 17A). To substantiate the opinions elicited regarding backwardness, well defined parameters to assess the backwardness, such as the per capita income and other tables are placed in Appendix.
Q.23. Do you agree North Karnataka is backward - 68%. Not really but has problem with state and society - 2%. Has been neglected by south dominated state - 1%. North Karnataka is truly suffering from disparity and this needs solution - 29%.
Q.23. Do you agree North Karnataka is backward -68.48%.
Not really but has problem with state and society - 2.59%.
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Q.23. Do you agree North Karnataka is backward -68.48%.
Not really but has problem with state and society - 2.59%.
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Q.23. Do you agree? Has been neglected by the south dominated state - 1.48%. North Karnataka is truly suffering from disparity and needs solution - 28.78%.
These tables are self-explanatory and speak for themselves. Further the 29 per cent of elites who believed that northern Karnataka is truly suffering from disparity and needs a solution, has consisted 16.24 per cent political elites, 2.11 per cent literary elites, 2.96 general elites, 6.11 per cent business elites, 0.37 per cent academic elites. (See Graph 17B).

Another 1 per cent of elites identified the reason as this part is neglected by south dominated state and remaining 2 per cent identified not really but has problem with state and society. (See Graph 17A).

Similarly, for another direct question, as an elite do you agree that Karnataka is experiencing Regional Disparity? The response to this question accounted for 98 per cent with 7.01 per cent academic elites, 1.48 per cent administrative elites, 7.38 per cent business elites, 12.92 general elites, 6.27 per cent literary elites, 61.99 per cent political elites and 1.48 per cent religious elites, agreed to the fact that Karnataka is experiencing Regional Disparity, while 2 per cent respondents believe that it is not so. (See Graph 18, 18A).
Q.24. As an elite do you agree that Karnataka is experiencing regional disparity? Yes - 98%. No - 2%.
Further, when the respondents were asked to identify the reasons they think as most important for the disparity. They identified as follows:

24 per cent of respondents identified leaders apathy. They included 4.06 per cent academic elites, 1.11 per cent administrative elites, 7.38 per cent business elites, 9.23 per cent general elites, and 2.22 per cent political elites. (See Graph 19, 19A).

41 per cent respondents identified government's negligence, which included 23 per cent political elites, 1.11 per cent academic elites, 0.37 per cent administrative elites, 4.47 per cent business elites, 7.01 per cent general elites, 4.80 per cent literary elites. (See Graph 19, 19A).

13.28 per cent respondents including 6.27 per cent business elites, 2.58 per cent general elites, and 4.43 per cent literary elites identified people's apathy as the reason for Regional Disparity. (See Graph 19, 19A).

5.17 per cent respondents, i.e., 3.69 per cent business elites, 1.48 per cent literary elites identified the geographic reasons.
A.24a. If yes, please identify the reasons you think are most important. Leaders apathy - 24%. Govt's negligence - 41%. People’s apathy - 13%. Geogr. reasons - 5%, Cultural difference - 2%. Historical - 7%. Lack of political will - 3%. Poor - 5%.
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Q.24a. If yes, please identify the reasons you think are most important.
Leaders apathy - 24%. Government's negligence - 41%.
People's apathy - 13%. Geographical reasons - 5%.
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Q.24a. If yes, please identify the reasons you think are most important, cultural difference - 2%. Historical reasons - 7%.
Lack of political will - 3%. Poor infrastructure - 5%.
7.38 per cent respondents consisting 4.80 per cent general elites and 2.58 per cent political elites identified historical reason.

2 per cent elite respondents identified cultural difference as the reason for Regional Disparity, wherein 5.16 per cent respondents identified poor infrastructure and the remaining as the reasons for Regional Disparity. (See Graph 19B).

In order to ascertain the political mood connected with Regional Disparity in Karnataka, a reexamination of the issue was taken up with a question. Whether Regional Disparity is a major political issue in Karnataka today? For this re-enforcing question, nearly 97 per cent have agree that it is a major political issue. (See Graph 20). This included 7.01 per cent academic elites, 1.48 per cent administrative elites, 7.38 per cent business elites, 12.92 per cent general elites, 5.90 per cent literary elites, 60.89 per cent political elites and 1.48 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 20). While 87 per cent of the respondents had agreed to this view. (See Graph 6). This clearly supports our argument that Regional Disparity with special reference to northern Karnataka is a major political issue in the state of Karnataka. An analysis of this reveals that 97 per cent respondents are in favour of this response.
Q. 25. Do you agree with a view that regional disparity is a major political issue in Karnataka today?

Yes - 97%. No - 3%.

Q. 25. Do you agree with a view that regional disparity is a major political issue in Karnataka today? Yes - 97%. No - 3%.
For those respondents, who agreed that Regional Disparity is a major political issue, a further question was asked whether this issue has had any specific characteristic with mixed options. Such as a) it is an issue across the political parties, b) it is an issue specific to a government, c) it is a problem before the state, d) it is the result of intentional neglect by the state, e) it is because southern people have dominated the state and f) all the above.

The response for this is as follows. 55 per cent of respondents agreed that it is an issue across the political parties. (See Graph 21). The break up of this per cent is as follows. 5.06 per cent academic elites, 1.11 per cent administrative elites, 1.06 per cent business elites, 10.23 per cent general elites, 4.43 per cent literary elites, 25.83 per cent political elites and 0.74 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 21A). As a matter of fact, this is rather true, although no political party can claim that it has given birth to this issue, while they actively participate in it and appropriate certain of the demands like establishment of High Court Bench, North West Railway Zonal Office, laying railway line between Hubli and Ankola, completion of Upper Krishna project, Almatti dam issue, etc. Hence, every chosen elite
Q. 25a. If Yes, issue across political parties - 65%. Issue specific to Government - 2%. Problem before the state - 33%. Result of intentional neglect by state - 8%. Southerners domination - 1%. All the above - 3%.
Q.25a. If Yes, it is an issue across political parties - 54.67%. Issue specific to a Government - 1.48%. Problem before the state - 33.04%
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- Across: 5.06%
- Specific: 7.27%
- BE: 10.23%
- GE: 4.43%
- LE: 0.74%
- PE: 0.74%
- RE: 0.74%

**Category**

---

Q.25a. If Yes, result of intentional neglect by the state - 5.91%. Because southerners domination - 1.85%. All the above - 2.58%

**GRAPH - 21B**

- Intentional: 1.11%
- Southern: 0.37%
- All: 1.48%

**Category**
respondent seems to believe that it is an issue across political parties.

Nearly 33 per cent elites believed that it is a problem before the state. They comprised of 1.11 per cent academic elites and administrative elites respectively, 1.48 per cent general elites, 2.77 per cent literary elites, 25 per cent political elites and 0.74 religious elites. (See Graph 21A). This kind of a response seem to be giving way to the feeling that people in this region do not wish to consider their role in developing this region. They think that state is the only agency, which can sort out this problem and that it is the responsibility of the state alone. Thus, one gets a feeling that people of this region would like to remain far away from participating with state. As a result of this, they have also failed to pressurise the governments to sort out this glaring problem while contributing their might. This also hints at too much dependence of the people in the region upon the state. While 5.91 per cent respondents believe that it is a result of intentional neglect by the state and 2.58 per cent respondents believed that all the options given above as responsible for the Regional Disparity as the major political issue in Karnataka today.

A reconfirmation of the fact about Regional Disparity and North Karnataka, with a question on, Do you agree that the
Regional Disparity is a problem specific to North Karnataka? The chosen respondents gave overwhelming of 98 per cent answer saying yes. This 98 per cent included 7.01 per cent academic elites, 1.48 per cent administrative elites, 7.38 per cent business elites, 12.92 per cent general elites, 5.90 per cent literary elites, 62.73 per cent political elites and 1.48 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 22, 22A). While 2 per cent gave their reply as 'No'. For those who agreed that there was disparity, three options were given to locate this disparity, such as a) The entire North Karnataka including Bombay and Hyderabad Karnataka, b) The entire Hyderabad Karnataka only, c) The entire Bombay Karnataka only to locate this disparity and were asked to choose. Nearly 86 per cent of the respondents agreed that entire North Karnataka (including Bombay+Hyderabad Karnataka is facing this problem. (See Graph 23). Break up of 86 per cent runs like this 7.01 per cent academic elites, 1.48 per cent administrative elites, 7.75 per cent business elites, 12.55 per cent general elites, 6.27 per cent literary elites, 49.45 per cent political elites and 1.48 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 23A). While 14 per cent believed that the Regional Disparity is being experienced only in Bombay Karnataka.
Q. 26. Do you agree that the regional disparity is a problem specific to North Karnataka? Yes - 98%. No - 2%.

GRAPH - 22
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Q. 26. Do you agree that the regional disparity is a problem specific to North Karnataka? Yes - 98%. No - 2%.
Q. 26a. If Yes, is this being experienced in - the entire North Karnataka including Bombay + Hyderabad Karnataka - 85.98%.
Entire Bombay Karnataka only - 14.02%.
At this juncture, it pertinent to expose the fact that a large number of respondents, i.e., 86 per cent elites served with the schedule were not conscious of the regions that come under North Karnataka. They were also not clear about the difference between Bombay Karnataka and Hyderabad Karnataka.

For another question, reinforcing the details about what in their opinion constitutes the Regional Disparity. Responses for this, in fact, gave a clear picture about how complex is the problem of Regional Disparity. It includes – as 30 per cent elites opined that variation in development or injustice in development means Regional Disparity. (See Graph 24). A break up included 2.21 per cent academic elites, 1.11 per cent administrative elites, 2.21 per cent business elites, 2.96 per cent general elites, 2.58 per cent literary elites, 18.45 per cent political elites, and 0.74 per cent religious elites constituted this group of 30 per cent. They opined that there is a lot of variation in terms of development and they also opined that lot of injustice is made to this area by the rulers of the state.

35 per cent of elite respondents including 26.57 per cent political elites, 0.37 per cent each academic and administrative elites, 3.69 per cent business elites, 2.58 per cent general elites, 1.48 per cent literary elites, meant backwardness as Regional
Q. 27. Definition of regional disparity - Injustice - 30%. Imbalanced growth - 5%. Politics in development - 3%. Improper development - 17%. Backwardness - 35%. Poor infrastructure - 4%. Away from capital - 3%. South domination - 3%.
Disparity. (See Graph 24B). As they estimate the comparative developments in the two parts of Karnataka viz., north and south Karnataka. As a result they find this North Karnataka region as backward.

Another 17 per cent elite respondents including 2.21 per cent academic elites, 0.74 per cent administrative elites, 0.37 per cent business elites, 4.80 per cent general elites, 8 per cent political and 0.37 per cent literary elites, who said improper development as a meaning to Regional Disparity. The remaining respondents ranging between 2 per cent to 5 per cent gave varied meanings while they were asked to define Regional Disparity in their own words of convenience such as imbalanced growth, politics in development, poor infrastructure, far away from capital, southerners domination, etc., were given as meaning to Regional Disparity. (See Graphs 24, 24A, 24B).

After ascertaining from them their understanding about the Regional Disparity, the respondents were asked to identify the consequence for Regional Disparity with special reference to North Karnataka. The options included a) Consequence common to peripheral areas, b) Consequence of people’s resistance to change, c) Consequence of cultural fortification, d) Consequence of the failure of socio-economic and political elites, e) Consequence of
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Q.27. Definition of regional disparity w.r.t. to North Karnataka - Injustice in development - 30.36%. Imbalanced growth/progress - 5%. Politics in development - 2.68%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Injustice</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Politics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ac.E</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad.E</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q.27. Definition of regional disparity w.r.t. to North Karnataka - Improper development - 17%. Backwardness - 35.6%. Poor infrastructure - 4.6%. Far away from capital - 3%. Southerners domination - 3%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Improper</th>
<th>Backward</th>
<th>Poor infra</th>
<th>Far away</th>
<th>Dominate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ac.E</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad.E</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
historically specific reasons, f) Consequence of deliberate act on the part of state/government/political leadership, g) Consequence of capital-peripheral syndrome and h) Consequence of southerners dominating the state. For this, 30 per cent elite respondents including, 7.64 per cent academic elites, 4.06 per cent business elites, 3.69 per cent general elites, 1.11 per cent literary elites, 14 per cent political elites expressed their view that Regional Disparity with special reference to North Karnataka is the consequence of the failure of socio-economic and political elites. (See Graph 25, 25A).

12.82 per cent elites identified the consequence common to peripheral areas, they included 4.06 per cent academic elites, 0.37 each administrative and business elites, 1.11 per cent general elites, 4 per cent literary elites and 2.85 per cent political elites. (See Graph 25B). Wherein 7.32 per cent elites identified consequence of people's resistance to change, 3 per cent elites say that Regional Disparity is the sequence of cultural fortification. About 22 per cent respondents consisting 1.48 per cent academic elites, 0.37 per cent each administrative and religious elites, 6.69 per cent business elites, 3.21 per cent general elites, 4.85 per cent literary elites, 4.80 per cent political elites. See it as a consequence of capital peripheral syndrome.
Q.28 Regional disparity wrt to north Karnataka is
1. Consequence common to peripheral areas -13%
2. Consequence of people resistance to change -7%
3. Consequence of cultural fortification -3%
4. Consequence of the failure of socio-economic and political elites -30%
5. Consequence of historically specific reasons -17%
6. Consequence of deliberate act on the part of state /Govt./leadership -4%
7. Consequence of capital peripheral syndrome -22%
8. Consequence of southerners domination -3%
9. All the above -0%
Q. 28. Regional disparity w.s.r. to North Karnataka is consequence common to peripheral areas - 12.82%. Cons of people’s resistance to change - 7.32%. Cons of cultural fortification - 3%. CON of failure of socio-economic and political elites - 30.5%
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Q. 28. Regional disparity w.s.r. to North Karnataka is consequence of historical reasons - 17.84%. Deliberate act on the part of the state/Govt./Leadership - 3.7%. Of capital - peripheral syndrome - 21.77%. South domination - 3.8%
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(See Graph 25B). Similar view are held by K. Puttaswamaiah in his book *Economic Development of Karnataka: A Treatise in Continuity and Change*, that development occurs unequally across the territory of a state and there may be a general tendency for the centre to grow at the cost of periphery. This leads to polarisation, which means the places, which are nearer to the capital grow at a faster rate, whereas the places which are away from it suffer heavily. As this is already discussed in earlier pages while analysing the Graph 15.

Around 18 per cent respondents comprising 5 per cent academic elites, 2.58 per cent administrative elites, 3.9 per cent business elites, 1.11 per cent literary elites, 5.25 per cent political elites saw Regional Disparity as the consequence of historically specific reasons (See Graph 25B).

Of the remaining 6 per cent, 3 per cent each have identified the consequences such as deliberate act on the part of the state/government/political parties/leadership and southerners dominating the state respectively. (See Graph 25B).

Here, it is to be noted that around 30 per cent elite respondents have identified the Regional Disparity as the consequence of the failure of socio-economic and political elites.
Hence, it is inevitable to know about the elites performance in a democratic set up who are treated as the prime movers of the society.

The term 'elite' refers to the people, who have some distinct qualities by which they are differentiated from the general masses. The elite owes its peculiar position of privilege to the recognition and esteem accorded to it by the society. The special qualities or attainments of these people are recognised by society and are honoured and respected. Thus, the holders of high positions in any given society may be said to have constituted the elite. The position of elite depends on recognition, either formal or informal, by majority of the members of the society. In democratic societies the elites are recruited from a broad base, but elitism has been considered as anti-democratic by some as it is opposed to the concept of equality. But there are others who argue that the elites can also play an unavoidable role in democracies by occupying predominant positions in the ruling as well as opposition, in the bureaucracy and other professions. They become the opinion-leaders and greatly influence the decision-making process. Hence, the majority of ruled looks to the elite for proper guidance and leadership, as masses lack
common purpose and do not have an acknowledged system of communicating information or co-ordination policy.\textsuperscript{29}

Elites as spokesmen or representatives of the people contribute to the democratic functioning of the political system. In the consensus model of democracy the policy decisions are to be taken by discussions. Though every citizen has a legitimate right to participate in public policy making, in practice very few people are capable of understanding the implications of policy decisions and take interest in the matters affecting public policy making those who participate in public policy making are elites. The masses rarely take interest in public policy making. Elites are supposed to contribute to the public policy making. In democratic societies elites are expected to represent the people's aspirations. Elites must function as a link between the people and government. Hierarchically elites are classified as top elites, mid elites and grass-root level elites. Top elites are those who are associated with their governing the society or the most excellent people in their respective field, and possess either policy making powers or are able to influence the policy makers. On the other hand, though mid and grass-root level elites do not have formal policy making powers but they do attempt to influence the policy
makers through mobilisation of public opinion and interacting with the top brass of policy making.

From the viewpoint of interest articulation and interest aggregation the elites, as mediators must play a very vital role in bringing about changes. The role of elites is to help in formulating the public issues and must provide prescriptive guidance to the governing elites.

Like-wise people of North Karnataka also expect the elites to perform their duties in tune with the public needs and aspirations. It is heartening to note that the elites of this region do not interact with each other thereby maintain a sort of distance. This clearly speaks of the feudalistic nature of elites. In order to achieve development in a democratic set up, elites of various fields must join their hands together. This is quite absent in this region as the respondents hold the socio-economic and political elites consolidated efforts to reduce the intensity of the Regional Disparity problem, which proves the tentative hypothesis formulated in this thesis.

Further a re-emphasising question was designed with various options. Such as, Regional Disparity as discussed today covers, a) Socio-economic backwardness of the region, b) Poor
communication, Rail/Road/Air/Sea transport conditions, c) Poor health/hygiene facilities, d) Per capita income/GNP, e) Poor infrastructural support, f) All the above. The respondents were left to choose options. Nearly 62 per cent elite respondents including 7.01 per cent academic elites, 0.74 per cent administrative elites, 7.75 per cent business elites, 12.55 per cent general elites, 5.90 per cent literary elites, 26.57 per cent political elites, 1.48 per cent religious elites chose all the above aspects, which covers the Regional Disparity and are parameters to assess the Regional Disparity adopted by various scholars (See Graph 26).

Whereas 18 per cent of the elites belonging to 5 per cent academic elites, 3 per cent business elites, 6 per cent general elites and 4 per cent political elites believed that it is poor infrastructure that has caused Regional Disparity. (See Graph 26A). Similar views are expressed by Jha, while writing on Regional Imbalance: Case of North Bihar. He is of the opinion that one of the most prominent factors for economic development consists in existence of infrastructural facilities. In a private enterprise economy, where most of the economic activities have to be conducted by private individuals, existence of infrastructure facilities will spur them to initiate
Q.29. Regional Disparity as discussed today covers:
1. Socio-economic backwardness of this region - 5%.
2. Poor communication condition - 6%.
3. Poor health facilities - 3%.
4. Low per capita income - 6%.
5. Poor infrastructure - 18%.
7. All the above - 62%.
Q.29. Regional Disparity as discussed today covers. All the above - 62%. Poor infra. - 18%.
activities for setting up business houses. The remaining elite respondents ranging between 3 to 6 per cent gave varied replies such as socio-economic backwardness of this region. Poor communication, Rail/Road/Air/See transport conditions and poor health/hygiene facilities as the issue covered under Regional Disparity.

Subsequently, after learning from the respondents, the various dimensions of Regional Disparity, it is noticed from the time of undertaking research on Regional Disparity as discussed in the print and electronic media, or among politicians or by various elite groups in North Karnataka, which are active for a short period, which would go for hibernation seem to be not addressing the question of Regional Disparity at a depth that was expected by them. As a result, perceptional variation was seen. In order to notice the variation and to identify, what seem to be the problem of Regional Disparity at perception level, eleven options such as a) Literary rate is low, b) Poor communication facilities, c) Poor transport conditions [Railway/Road/Airways/Sea], d) Per capita income is low/GNP, e) Inadequate water supply, f) Bad conditions of approach roads, g) Improper rural electrification, i) Poor civic amenities, j) Environmental consciousness, k) Continued negligence on the part of the state to
develop tourism in the region, and All the above were given to choose. 7.01 per cent academic elites, 0.74 per cent administrative elites, 7.75 per cent business elites, 9.23 per cent general elites, 5.90 per cent literary elites, 20.66 per cent political elites, 1.48 per cent religious elites, in all constituted 53 per cent and chosen the above said options. Altogether contributed to the problem of Regional Disparity at the perceptual level.

12 per cent elite respondents including 3 per cent general elites, 6 per cent political elites, 3 per cent business elites blame the state for not developing tourism in this region.

9 per cent elite respondents, i.e., 2 per cent academic elites, 3 per cent business elites and 4 per cent general elites opined that poor civic amenities are noticed because of the Regional Disparity problem.

7 per cent each elite respondents have noticed, low literary rate, bad condition of approach roads. The remaining elite respondents varied between 2 to 4 per cent gave other replies. (See Graph 27).

Now, all these indicators are in fact true parameters for measuring regional backwardness, which in turn leads to
Q.30. At the perception level regional disparity problem is because of all the above - 63%. Tourism - 12%. Poor civic amenities - 9%

Q.30. At the perception RDP is low literacy - 7%. Poor communication - 2%. Transport - 4%. Per capita - 12%. Water supply - 2%. Bad Road - 7%. Drainage - 4%. Civic amenities - 7%. All the above - 63%. Electrification - 2%.
Regional Disparity, when considered on the comparative scale. Hemalatha Rao (ISEC) has also used the similar parameters while working on her book, *Regional Disparity and Development in India*.

Adding on to this reasoning, few more issues, which concern the environmental aspects and also the culturally different coastal specific questions were posed, i.e., what factors do they think have contributed to Regional Disparity in North Karnataka. The options were a) Stress on national security as in case of Karwar Nuclear Plant, b) Intentional discouragement of development of this region for tourism and beach development as in case of Dharwad and Karwar respectively, c) Intentional protection of western ghat region for their flora and fauna, d) Reason of security for projects like Sea Bird, e) Failure of state to exploit the potential for tourist spots in this region.

As a result, 35.79 per cent respondents including 0.37 per cent academic elites, 3.32 per cent business elites, 5.90 per cent general elites, 24.72 per cent political elites opined that factor like reasons for security for projects like Sea Bird have contributed to the Regional Disparity. (See Graph 28, 28A).

Other 18.05 per cent elites including 0.74 per cent academic elites, 1.48 per cent administrative elites, 0.37 per cent business elites, 2.55 per cent general elites, 5.90 per cent literary elites, 7
Q.31. Of the following what factors have contributed to regional disparity?

1. Stress on national security - 18%
2. Discouragement to develop tourism - 15%
3. Protection of western ghat - 7%
4. Security for Sea Bird - 36%
5. Failure of state - 23%
Q.31. Of the following what factors have contributed to regional disparity?

220 per cent political elites, have chosen the reason of stress on National Security as in case of Karwar's nuclear plant. (See Graph 28).

23.62 per cent elite respondents consisting of 1.85 per cent academic elites, 7.01 per cent business elites, 2.21 per cent general elites, 5.54 per cent literary elites, 7.01 per cent political elites, blame the state for not exploiting the potential tourist spots in this region. The same opinion is held by another 16 per cent elite respondents as they blame the state for the discouragement of development of this region for tourism and beach development as in case of Dharwad and Karwar respectively. (See Graph 28B).

Wherein 7.38 per cent elites identified the protection of western ghat region for the flora and fauna. (See Graph 28). As a matter of fact, the much publicised national projects such as Kaiga and Sea Bird have not brought prosperous packages to the residents of this area. As it is the coastal belt, it is acquired heavily by both these projects in the name of national interest and national security. Lot of restrictions has been imposed on the coastal belt residents.
Fishing, which was the main occupation of coastal people, has been affected heavily by these projects, as the authorities have put maximum limitations for entering into the sea for fishing. Secondly, the government has imposed maximum restrictions under Forest laws as this belt is enriched with thick forest, very little amount of land is available for cultivation. Due to environmental factors, no big industries are set up in this area. Thus the people's initiative is suppressed by the government's legislation. On the other hand, the government is not keen to develop tourism in this region, as some of the respondents belonging to business class expressed their grave concern for sustaining in this area, as the government has restricted the entrepreneurs to build permanent structures within 5 k.ms and hence, they are hesitant to set up beach resorts, etc.

Another very important factor that was revealed during the course of informal discussions is that, the people of coastal Karwar show more inclination towards the neighbouring state of Goa as they find similar cultural identities and have a high emotional attachment, which still persists.

With the recent rumours of nuclear gas leakage people of Karwar are under fear with no chance to develop their age old profession of fishing, goldsmith work, etc. People have largely
migrated to the various places of the country as to earn their livelihood. Most of them have even fled to gulf countries to try their luck off the shore.

After knowing the above opinions another question was asked to the elite respondents, i.e., Do they agree with a view that historically North Karnataka has always experienced a step motherly treatment? 98 per cent of the respondents gave positive reply while 2 per cent respondents have given negative reply. (See Graph 29). 98 per cent break up is as follows - 99.74 per cent academic elites, 1.48 per cent administrative elites, 7.38 per cent business elites, 12.92 per cent general elites, 6.27 per cent literary elites, 62 per cent political elites and 1.48 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 29A).

Further, to know the reasons for the step motherly treatment, the options were given viz., a) It was because of the neglect of the area by Bombay province, b) It was because of its location towards the border state, c) People of this area are culturally diversified and divided, d) It is because of the natural terrain (western ghat), e) People have been exposed to mixed historical consequences and not of benevolent ruling, f) The region has failed to consolidate the gains of reorganisation, g) The
Q. 32. Do you agree with the view that historically North Karnataka has always experienced a step motherly treatment?
Yes - 98%. No - 2%.
leadership in socio-economic/political areas have vested interest,
h) All the above.

37 per cent respondents agreed to the view that historically North Karnataka has always experienced a step motherly treatment, because of its location towards the border of the state (See Graph 30). This 37.55 per cent included, 4.02 per cent academic elites, 4.69 per cent business elites, 8.01 per cent general elites, 4.72 per cent literary elites, 14.39 per cent political elites and 1.48 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 30 A).

As a matter of fact, earlier when this North Karnataka region was under the rule of Bombay province, it was controlled and administered from Bombay as it was the capital by then. Further after the Reorganisation of States in 1956, this area was ruled from the garden city Bangalore. In both pre and post Reorganisation, this area was located once as the southern most far away from capital city Bangalore. Hence, the development could not travel uniformly throughout the length and breadth of Karnataka state. Thus, location acted as a contributory factor for the Regional Disparity problem.
Q.32a. If Yes, because of neglect by Bombay province - 28%.
Location - 37.55%. Mixed historical consequence - 22.14%.
All the above - 12.32%.
Q. 32a. If Yes, it was because of neglect by Bombay province - 28%.
It was because of location towards border of the state - 37.55%.

Q.32a. Exposed to mixed historical consequence and not of benevolent kingship - 22.14% All the above - 12.31%
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28 per cent respondents identified the neglect of the area by Bombay province. They included 5.58 per cent academic elites, 0.37 per cent each administrative and religious elites, 4.58 per cent business elites, 3.11 per cent general elites, 4.32 per cent literary elites, 10.23 per cent political elites. (See Graph 30A).

22.14 per cent respondents agreed that people have been exposed to mixed historical consequence and not of benevolent kingship. They included: 6.02 per cent academic elites, 0.74 per cent administrative elites, 4.39 per cent business elites, 3.69 per cent general elites, 0.37 per cent literary elites and 2.21 per cent political elites. (See Graph 30B). It is to be noted here that North Karnataka region was under so many dynasties, such as Muslim, Maratha, Hindus, etc, who were land hungry people and were busy in fighting the battles, apart from this there were several local feudatories. They never prioritised the progress of the people. The areas did not gain more importance later even Britishers were also not able to bring about changes in this area. Due to mixed historical experiences people were not exposed to benevolent kingship as it happened in southern Karnataka. Hence, a sort of step motherly attitude was grown towards this area even historically too.
12 per cent respondents opted 'All the above' option as their reply, for the step motherly treatment experience to North Karnataka. (See Graph 30 B).

After a series of reinforcing questions to identify the Regional Disparity and causes for the same, an attempt was made to notice, the elites responses to the direct questions framed like

As an elite, do you agree with a view that there is a solution to this problem? The reply was sought in terms of 'Yes' or 'No.' 99 per cent elite respondents believed that there is a solution to this problem. 99 per cent elites included 7 per cent academic elites, 1.48 per cent each administrative and religious elites, 8.12 per cent business elites, 12.92 per cent general elites, 6 per cent literary elites, 62 per cent political elites. (See Graph 31 A).

However, the 99 per cent elite respondents who replied positively gave varied solutions to this glaring problem of Regional Disparity. About 50 per cent respondents including 4 per cent academic elites, 0.74 each administrative and religious elites, 3 per cent business elites, 4 per cent general elites, 5 per cent literary elites, 32.84 per cent political elites. (See Graph 32A) emphasised on people's participation.
Q. 33. As an elite do you agree with a view that there is solution to this problem? Yes - 99%. No - 1%.
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Q. 33. As an elite do you agree that there is solution to this problem?
Yes - 98%. No. 1%
21 per cent respondents specified that the problem of Regional Disparity can be solved by the efforts of government by evolving a comprehensive action plan. They included 1.11 per cent academic elites, 3.76 per cent business elites, 1.48 per cent general elites, 1.11 per cent literary elites, 13.65 per cent political elites. (See Graph 32). They want the government should create an action plan to develop this region. Then only the development is possible they added.

Whereas 23 per cent respondents specified for the united efforts of people and elites in general. They included, 1.11 per cent academic elites and literary elites respectively, 6 per cent general elites, 7 per cent business elites, 8 per cent political elites. (See Graph 32A). As it is observed, there is totally lack of unity among the various groups of elites as they do not come together to fight for a cause of greater importance. Whenever the calls for agitation or for a meeting were made, it is only a few self declared leaders attend them while most of the elected representatives of the people remain at distance from the meeting venue. Even quite surprisingly the representatives never came forward to discuss this issue on the floor of the state assembly due to inter and intra-party affiliations. Hence, unless a good
Q.33a. Solution to the problem people's participation - 50%.
Government's comprehensive plan - 21%. United efforts of elites - 23%. By setting nwq board - 4%. Infrastructure - 2%.
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Q.33a. Solutions to the problem by people's participation - 50%.
By Government's comprehensive action plan - 22%.
amount of united efforts are made this problem can never be solved they expressed.

While 2 to 4 per cent of elites interviewed look for a separate North Karnataka Development Board and for more infrastructural base for the development of North Karnataka. After moving from general questions to specific question, the respondents were asked, Do they see a role for elites in this specific context? All the respondents, i.e., 100 per cent opined that they have a role to play. (See Graph 33). Connected to this, another sub-question was asked as to what role they can play. 52 per cent elite respondents think that elites must mediate between the state and people. (See Graph 33). It includes 5 per cent academic elites, 1.48 per cent administrative elites, 8.12 per cent business elites, 12.92 per cent general elites, 4.32 per cent literary elites, 20 per cent political elites, 0.37 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 34A).

16 per cent elite respondents see that the role of influencing, pressurising the government through guilds. They included, 3 per cent business elites, 5 per cent general elites, 6.27 per cent literary elites and 2 per cent political elites. (See Graph 34A).
Q.34. Do you see role for elites in this specific problem? Yes - 100%.
Q.34a. If yes, what role do you think they can play?
1. Mediate between the state and people - 52%.
2. Divert funds for development - 2%.
3. Work hard to get key position in the government to bargain - 2%.
4. Prepare a development plan - 5%.
5. Ask for specific solutions 3%.
6. Create reactive movement - 4%.
7. Influence government through guilds - 15%.
8. Create infrastructure - 7%.
9. Form association - 5%.
10. Improve decentralisation - 3%.
11. Invest funds - 1%.
Q.34a. If 'Yes', what roles do you think they can play? Mediate between the state and people - 52%. Influence the government through guilds - 16%.
5 per cent each, elite respondents, think that the elites can form association/pressure groups and call for the attention of the state and prepare a development plan (Area specific) and propose it to the state to take up. 7 per cent respondents think that elites must strive hard to create infrastructure and must call for more economic activity. The rest of the elite respondents who varied between 2 to 3 per cent gave diversified replies such as to divert funds for development, work hard to get key positions in the government and bargain, Ask for specific bureaucratic and political solutions, create a reactive movement and demand justice, join political parties and mobilise opinion, organise investment of funds for development, to create infrastructure and call for the attention of the state and improve decentralisation process and call for greater investment.

Though elite respondents did mention about the elite's role, but in reality no action has been initiated. Elites have never come together to sort out this problem. Hence, the feeling of injustice prevails in North Karnataka region. No action has been initiated either.

This explanation is strengthened, when we asked the respondents a question, viz., North Karnataka disparity is a) A problem resulting from the apathy of the
socio/political/economic elites in general, b) a gimmick for political mileage by political parties, c) an intentional act of socio/political/economic vested interest groups in North Karnataka, d) Is a result of North Karnataka’s weak leadership. As a result, 61 per cent elites opined that it is a problem resulting from the apathy of the socio/political/economic elites in general. They include, 2 per cent academic elites, 1 per cent each administrative and religious elites, 7 per cent business elites, 9 per cent general elites, 4 per cent literary elites, 37 per cent political elites. (See Graphy 35, 35A).

3 per cent elites see it as a gimmick for political mileage by political parties and 3 per cent noticed it as an intentional act of socio/political/economic vested interest groups in North Karnataka.

As a matter of fact, the elites of North Karnataka are apathetic to sort out this problem. No consensus is attained. The leaders are busy in their own activities neglecting this glaring problem the North Karnataka is facing.

Further, to another question, like, Regional Disparity in North Karnataka is: a) Consequence of comparative evaluation between north and south Karnataka, b) Consequence of economic
Q.35. North Karnataka disparity is - (1) Result of socio-political-economic elites apathy in general - 61%, (2) is a gimmick -3%, (3) intentional act - 3%, (4) Weak leadership of North Karnataka - 33%.
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Q.35. North Karnataka disparity is problem resulting from elites apathy in general - 61%, is a gimmick -3%, intentional act - 3%, result of weak leadership of NK - 33%.
backwardness in the region, c) Consequence of weak political leadership in the region, d) Consequence of weak social leadership in the region, e) Result of poor infrastructure and low capital inflow in the region, f) Consequence of people's reactionary attitude in the region, g) Result of long term negligence of this region by the state were the options given to choose.

As a result, 62 per cent respondents replied as the consequence of comparative valuation between north and south Karnataka. (See Graph 36). 62 per cent respondents included, 7 per cent academic elites, 1 per cent each administrative and religious elites respectively, 15 per cent business elites, 9 per cent general elites, 7 per cent literary elites, 22 per cent political elites. (See Graph 36A).

25 per cent elite respondents including 2 per cent academic elites, 7 per cent business elites, 2 per cent general elites, 14 per cent political elites. (See Graph 36A) mentioned Regional Disparity in North Karnataka as the result of poor infrastructure and low capital inflow in the region. As a matter of fact, infrastructure is a must for the overall development. Due to poor infrastructure the regions do not flourish.
Q.36. Regional disparity in North Karnataka is - (1) Consequence of comparative evaluation - 61%, (2) Eco backwardness - 7%, (3) Weak pol. Idrshlp - 24%, (4) Weak socl. Idrshlp - 1%, (5) Poor infrastructure - 1%, (6) Reactionary - 1%, (7) Negligence - 4%
Q.36. Regional disparity in North Karnataka is - (1) Consequence of economic backwardness in the region - 8%. (2) Consequence of weak social leadership - 1%. (3) Consequence of people's reactionary attitude - 1%. (4) weak political leadership - 0%.
8 per cent elites believe that Regional Disparity in North Karnataka is the consequence of economic backwardness in the region. They included 4.8 per cent general elites, 1.83 per cent political elites. (See Graph 36B). Economic activity crumbles down if there is poor infrastructure and lack of political will to develop an area in accordance with the people's aspirations. There must be good amount of investment for the development. Then only an area develops or else economic backwardness prevails. The remaining elites who varied between 4 to 1 per cent gave different replies such as, weak leadership, consequence of people's reactionary attitude and result of long term negligence of this region by the state.

The elite respondents who saw role for them in sorting out this problem of Regional Disparity in North Karnataka region in earlier questions (See Graph 33) have replied to the options, viz., in view of Regional Disparity elites have failed to: a) Understand people's requirement in the region, b) Develop infrastructure for capital flow, c) Prioritise the requirements of the region, d) Mobilise human resources, e) Stop migration, f) Take proactive/reactive stand to develop the region, g) Mirror people's aspiration before the state, h) Mirror the infrastructural needs of this region before the state, i) To rise above culture-centric society
and modernise, j) Argue for smaller districts, k) To oppose the oppressive religious, social structure to facilitate decentralisation.

Quite surprisingly, the elite respondents themselves view that elites have failed to understand people's requirements in the region. They accounted for 48 per cent and included, 6.64 per cent academic elites, 0.37 per cent administrative elites, 7 per cent business elites, 9 per cent general elites, 4 per cent literary elites, 18 per cent political elites and 2 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 37, 37A).

21 per cent elites comprising 3 per cent academic elites, 7 per cent business elites, 3 per cent general elites, 4 per cent literary elites and 2 per cent political elites felt that elites have failed to prioritise the requirements of the region. (See Graph 37A)

15 per cent elite respondents viewed that elites have failed to mirror the aspirations of people before the state, (See Graph 37, 37B), wherein 11 per cent elites said that elites have failed to develop infrastructure for capital inflow, 5 per cent elites noticed the fact that elites have failed to take proactive/reactive stand to develop the region. (See Graph 37B).
Q.37. In view of regional disparity elites have failed to understand people's requirements - 48%. To develop infrastructure - 11%. Prioritise requirements - 21%. Mirror people's aspirations - 15%. Take pro-active stand - 5%.
q.37. In view of regional disparity elites have failed to:

1. Understand people's requirements - 48%  
2. Develop Infrastructure - 11%  
3. Prioritise requirements - 21% 

---
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- Understand: 7, 8, 9, 4, 2, 2
- Infrastructure: 3, 1
- Prioritise: 2, 2

---

**GRAPH - 37B**

- Mirror: 2, 2, 3, 1, 1
- Pro-active: 4, 3, 3, 2, 2
With the above responses, one can definitely understand the point that lack of political unity, political will and mutual cooperation and co-ordination has altogether aggravated this problem of Regional Disparity.

Further to another question, viz., As an elite, what do they think of the future of this problem of Regional Disparity, the elite respondents were quite optimistic and expressed their opinion accounting to 80 per cent including 6 per cent academic elites, 1 per cent administrative elites, 6 per cent business elites, 9 per cent general elites, 4 per cent literary elites, 51 per cent political elites, 2 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 38, 38A) as problem has a solution, wherein 15 per cent respondents foresee a separate state, they included, 1 per cent business elites, 3 per cent general elites, 1 per cent literary elites, 10 per cent general elites, 1 per cent literary elites, 10 per cent political elites. (See Graph 38A). 3 per cent respondents think that this problem will contribute to change in leadership, while 2 per cent respondents think that this problem will continue to haunt the state. (See Graph 38, 38A).

Most of the respondents believe that the problem has a solution. They give various options such as, people must become more assertive, and they must come forward to put forth their
Q.38. As an elite what do you think of the future of this problem? Foresee a separate state - 16%. Problem has solution - 80%. Contribute to change in leadership - 3%. Continue to haunt - 2%.
demands in a positive way. Secondly, people's representatives and other elites in the society must come together to fight the problem, then only this problem can be solved. Unless consolidated efforts take place this problem cannot be sorted out. The representatives must co-ordinate to gain the attraction of the state through various bargaining tactics.

Further elites were asked whether they think Regional Disparity in North Karnataka is because of: a) The dominant southern Karnataka socio/political/leadership, b) Weak North Karnataka socio/economic/political leadership in the state, c) All the above. As a result 32 per cent respondents including 1 per cent academic elites, 2 per cent administrative elites, 2 per cent business elites, 8 per cent general elites, 2 per cent literary elites, and 18 per cent political elites opined that Regional Disparity in North Karnataka is because of the dominant southern Karnataka socio/economic/political leadership in the state. (See Graph 39, 39A). 28 per cent respondents remarked the weak leadership of North Karnataka and 39 per cent chose all the above option.

As it is noticed, most of the time, the tactful lobbying of southern Karnataka elites has always yielded the results in their favour. To given an example, the shifting of North West Railway
Q.39. Do you think regional disparity in North Karnataka is because of:
- Dominant southern Karnataka socioeconomic/political leadership - 33%
- Weak North Karnataka leadership - 28%
- All the above - 39%

Category
Percentage

Ac.E. 1
Ad.E. 2
BE 2
GE 4
LE 2
PE 26
RE 1
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Zonal office from Bangalore to Hubli, the very important place in North Karnataka was quashed by the judiciary on the writ filed by an political elite group of southern Karnataka. In any case, this specific case was never pleaded effectively either by political or general elites of this region who raise shrill voices for separate state.

Once proposed Information Technology Park never came to North Karnataka as Bangalore is treated as the only source of operation. Popularly known as Silicon Valley very recently, the issue of High Court bench at Hubli also saw the end as one of the noted general elite and also an political elite filed a writ petition in Supreme Court, very wisely the verdict came in his favour quashing the proposal of setting up an High Court Bench as in the neighbouring state of Maharashatra.

Thus, the weak leadership has always proved as a set back for the growth and progress of this underdeveloped region of North Karnataka.

Finally, the elites were asked to suggest measures to overcome this problem. 58 per cent respondents suggested that this problem of Regional Disparity in North Karnataka can be sorted out by the dynamic force of people's participation.
22 per cent suggested, this problem can be sorted out by government's action plan with extra budget allotment to this neglected areas of North Karnataka.

20 per cent elites suggested that there must be committed leadership to sort out this problem by bargaining tactics. (See Graph 40). The category-wise break up is as follows. 58 per cent included 7.01 per cent academic elites, 1.48 per cent each administrative and religious elites, 7.38 per cent business elites, 12.92 per cent general elites, 6.27 per cent literary elites, 20 per cent political elites. (See Graph 40A).

While 22 per cent elite respondents included 3.32 per cent academic elites, 1.48 per cent administrative elites, 2.58 per cent business elites, 3.69 per cent general elites, 2.95 per cent literary elites, 7.38 per cent political elites and 0.37 per cent religious elites. (See Graph 40A). The remaining 20 per cent elite respondents covered 1.85 per cent academic elites, 0.37 per cent administrative elites, 2.95 per cent business elites, 3.69 per cent general elites, 2 per cent literary elites and 9 per cent political elites.
Q.40. Solutions to overcome regional disparity by people's participation - 58% By Govt.'s action plan - 22% By committed leadership - 20%
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Q.40. Solution to overcome regional disparity by committed leadership - 20%. 

![Graph showing percentage distribution across different categories.](image-url)
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3. Ibid. (Since the prefixes speak of their profession, no explanation is given.

4. This factor of awareness is the primary condition to understand the depth of involvement of respondents to the problems connected with Regional Disparity and such a scale of measurement has also been employed.

5. As can be seen in earlier questions also, much of the negative responses amongst political elites have come from political leaders who represent the Local Self Governments.
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