

## **NORTH-SOUTH DIVIDE : KARNATAKA'S DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO**

---

**Dr.P.R.Panchamukhi**

---

With the passage of 73rd and 74th Amendments to the Indian Constitution and passage and implementation of the Panchayat Acts in different states of the country, a focused policy attention is paid to the decentralized planning and developmental process. In this background the backwardness and deprivation of the smaller regions of bigger administrative units would receive a sharp focus. Obviously no state has balanced level of development within all its sub-regions. Even the advanced states of the country show their level of advancement only in terms of the aggregate average figures for the state as a whole, while the deprivation and backwardness of some of the sub-regions of these states continue to exist. Thus, in Maharashtra, one of the most advanced states, the overall advanced level is due to only the progress achieved by the Western Maharashtra. The Vidarbha and Marathawada regions of the state continue to remain backward. Even within Western Maharashtra there are sub-regions which are not as developed as the district of Greater Mumbai. In Andhra Pradesh, the marked differences in levels of development of Telangana, West Godavari districts, and Eastern coastal regions, have led to intense political agitations. In Gujarat, there are distinct differences in the

developmental levels of northern districts of Kutch, Banaskantha, Mehesena, etc, and Central and Southern regions of Ahmedabad, Baroda and Surat districts. In Kerala, backwardness of Malabar region as compared to Travancore, Cochin is highlighted in state level debates. Similar is the situation when we consider Karnataka. The fact that some districts of Karnataka have remained backward all through the past several decades even after independence has been the subject matter of debate among politicians and social scientists. This awareness about the intense backwardness of North Karnataka has even culminated into a demand for a separate state.

The objective of the present paper is to indicate the extent of backwardness of North Karnataka with facts and figures and to take a view about whether this backwardness can be explained in terms of merely socio-economic factors within the state (the endogenous factors) or whether it is the outcome of the factors exogenous to the socio-economic forces. A brief discussion is also presented about the likely measures to overcome the extent of backwardness of North Karnataka.

---

*Thanks are due to my colleagues Shri.V.B.Annigeri, Ms. Jayashri Kulkarni, Ms.Anita Shadambi, Ms.S.T.Kulkarni and others for their assistance in writing this paper.*

The paper is divided into four sections:

Section-I develops a conceptual framework about regional equality or regional inequality.

Section-II dwells upon various aspects of regional inequality in Karnataka particularly with a comparative perspective about the North Karnataka and southern part of Karnataka.

In Section III an attempt is made to briefly look into the likely causes for the slower pace of development in north Karnataka, in view of the facts presented in Section II.

Section IV : Briefly outlines our perspective about how to overcome the deprivation and backwardness of North Karnataka.

### **I. Regional Inequality : a Conceptual Framework:**

Theories of un-balanced growth focus on the implications from unequal sectoral growth and indicate what type of planning is needed for promoting different sectors of the economy for maximizing total economic gain. There is some literature about the inter-regional inter dependencies, exploitation of which would improve the overall regional economic welfare. It is possible to view this problem using the approaches of euqi-marginal sub-regional productivities with a purpose to maximize

regional productivity. The scarce resources of the regional economy should be so allocated as to achieve maximum regional economic welfare which in turn can be realised if the productivity of the use of the resources in different sub-regions of the region would be equalized. This we may call as a **law of sub-regional equi-marginal productivity**. This does not necessarily require equal allocation of resources in all the sub regions. However, the resources will have to be allocated on the basis of the principle of comparative advantage for a region in the use of resources.

Even though this approach stands to reason it would not be considered acceptable in to to. The administrative units of sub-regions and economic regions are not identical and the law of subregional equi-marginal resource productivity is broadly relevant for the economic regions. As a result, irritations arise within the region. This is also because some of the sectors of the sub-regions need to be developed irrespective of the availability of the resources within those sub-regions themselves. For example, the basic needs like Education, Primary Health Care, Clean Water Supply, roads, etc., cannot be overlooked in a sub-region because the other sub-regions have greater advantage in respect of their supply. From this point of view with regard to some items of resource use a principle which we may call as the "**Requirements Approach**" or "**Military**

**Principle”** has to be adopted. The educational reform of neighbour-hood schools, of a Primary Health Centre in every cluster of villages can be cited as an example of the recognition of the fact that such services have to be developed in each sub-region irrespective of the availability of endogenous resources.

The Gandhian approach of self reliant village economy would go a step further-of developing sub-regions as highly self contained units. Whether this idea is fully practicable or not, atleast bigger area units of the state have to be self contained units, properly developed from all points of view, so that the people living in these sub regional units would not feel handicapped. It is from this point of view that the Finance Commissions have been adopting the ‘gap filling approach’ at the State level. The Dandekar Committee Report for Maharashtra \* tried to apply a similar principle for equalization of regional development within different sub-regions of Maharashtra State. Even though it is reported that recently a Secretary level Committee has been appointed in Karnataka to look into the problem of regional backwardness the matter still remains to receive a serious attention.

In the above conceptual background it would be useful to consider the nature of defferential development in different sub-regions of Karnataka State.

## **II. Backwardness of North Karnataka:**

The State of Karnataka can be divided into three regions demarcated broadly according to the levels of development, viz., Bombay Karnataka, Hyderabad Karnataka and Southern Karnataka. This division is useful from the point of the present study. Bombay Karnataka consists of the districts of Belgaum, Bijapur, Dharwad and Uttara Kannada. Hyderabad Karnataka consists of Bellary, Bidar, Gulbarga and Raichur Districts. The remaining districts are part of South Karnataka. Generally North Karnataka is defined to include both Bombay Karnataka and Hyderabad Karnataka districts, since these districts are part of the northern part of the state. In contrast to what is generally stated in north south debates in the international context, the southern part of Karnataka is by and large, more developed as compared to the northern part. This suggests that while north south demarcation as developed and less developed respectively may be relevant in the international context it is not so relevant within the state context.

The indicators of development which have been developed by a number of researchers show that the north Karnataka exhibits high degree of under development as compared to the South Karnataka.

---

\* The Fact Finding Committee on Regional Imbalance in Maharashtra : Govt. of Maharashtra 1984,

The district wise data base for Karnataka is still not very much detailed. The district-wise statistical tables, taluka wise statistical tables and even CMIE data base refer only to selected socio-economic variables. In view of this the analysis for North Karnataka and South Karnataka has to be based upon the data for limited number of variables. Though a number of micro level studies undertaken by different researchers (M.Phil, Ph.D levels and research projects) in Universities and research institutions generate a micro-level data base for different districts and different talukas unfortunately these are not available in one place, so that they can be used for the purpose of a comparative study. Efforts need to be initiated for meaningful compilations of such different district level and sub-district level data for many socio-economic variables as derived from field surveys and empirical studies undertaken by researchers in these organizations.\*

That North Karnataka has remained less developed in the state is brought out from the following statistical information. (tables in appendix).

#### **Social Variables:**

It can be seen that in respect of the major social variables North Karnataka is much less developed as compared to South Karnataka.

**The Literacy rate in North Karnataka is less than the State average and much less than the average for South Karnataka.** The constituents of North Karnataka present a similar picture. Bombay Karnataka has a lower literacy percentage than for both Karnataka as a whole and South Karnataka.

In Hyderabad Karnataka there are many more illiterates in the population than the literates. This is evident from less than 50 percent literacy rate for this region.

**It is also worth noting that out of the total literates in the State more than 62 percent live in South Karnataka itself.** In Hyderabad-Karnataka region only about 12 percent of the total literate population of the State lives. In view of slow pace of social change in the region, the **female literacy is also very low.** Hardly 38 percent of the female population in North Karnataka is literate. It is much below the State average of 48 percent, and the South Karnataka average of more than 53 percent. As expected, in Hyderabad-Karnataka region female literacy rate is lowest. Only 27 female members out of 100 are literate in this region.

It is worthnoting that **maximum number of literate female members lives in South Karnataka.** Nearly 72 percent of total female literate population of the State lives in this region. In North Karnataka

---

\* CMDR has developed such a micro-level data bank - MLDB - from its micro level studies.

however, this number is only 28 percent. The extent of backwardness of Hyderabad-Karnataka region is reflected by the very small number of literate female population (only 6 percent) living there.

Even in respect of male literacy the position is not very different though the male literacy rate for North Karnataka is slightly higher than that for South Karnataka and also for the State as a whole. For Hyderabad-Karnataka however the position continues to be one of concern.

**Though literacy rate among the male members is high in North Karnataka, again large number of male literates live in South Karnataka rather than in North Karnataka. Their number for Hyderabad-Karnataka region is even less than 10 percent! This shows that there is an ‘exodus’ and/or concentration of literate population-both male and female-from North Karnataka particularly Hyderabad-Karnataka region to the South Karnataka region.**

Urban literacy and rural literacy rates also present the same disappointing picture. Urban literacy for North Karnataka is much below that for South Karnataka and also the State as a whole. Only silver lining in the clouds for Hyderabad-Karnataka region is that the urban literacy percentage for this region is fairly high though still lower than that in other regions of the state.

Once again, the number of literates

in urban areas of North Karnataka is much lower than that in South Karnataka. There is thus a qualitative difference in the inhabiting population of different regions, assuming that larger literate population is likely to release positive externalities for the entire population. This also shows that the literate population prefers to be located in South Karnataka rather than in North Karnataka for obvious reasons. The Hyderabad-Karnataka region obviously is not the preferred place for living of the literate population of the State. Rural literacy rate also presents a similar picture of backwardness of North Karnataka as compared to South Karnataka and the extreme backwardness of Hyderabad-Karnataka region in this respect. The literate population of the rural areas of the State do not prefer to live in the villages of North Karnataka and they seem to prefer the villages of South Karnataka.

**Literacy is considered as a major agent for socio-economic transformation of the region. The fact that regions of North Karnataka experience backwardness in respect of literacy has thus significant implications for future socio-economic development of the region. This indeed is a cause for concern which, if not remedied early, would lead to continued backwardness of the region.**

In respect of education also, the North-South divide in the state is visible. According to a study \* three out of four

\* Moonis Raza et.al: School Education in India National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi 1990.

districts of Hyderabad Karnataka are identified as districts with low school education levels. Other North Karnataka districts are lower in the rank of Districts with moderate educational levels. Though detailed results of Sixth All India Educational Survey (NCERT) are still not available, the preliminary results (1995) clearly bring out the backwardness of North Karnataka districts as compared to South Karnataka districts in respect of school educational facilities, access, and outcome. CMDR's Micro Level Data Bank (MLDB) brings out similar results from different field surveys conducted at different time points.

In respect of health care facilities and health status also North Karnataka remains less developed than South Karnataka. Primary Health Centre is a major source of health and medical care in rural areas since private clinics and private practitioners normally prefer urban locations. It is found that the backlog or gap (required member of PHCs as per Government of India norm and the actual availability) in PHC facilities is larger in the case of North Karnataka region.

The micro level studies also show that morbidity (CMDR-Micro Level Data Bank) levels for North Karnataka are much higher than for South Karnataka. While about 4 to 5 persons out of every 100 are sick in North Karnataka districts, less than 2 persons are sick in South Karnataka region.

Feeling of deprivation is likely to be more pronounced by neighbourhood comparisons. Such '**neighbour deprivation**' is felt by the border districts of North Karnataka region. Thus, there is actual '**opportunity backwardness**' and '**neighbourhood deprivation**' in the North Karnataka, which would obviously lead to discontent and resultant adverse effects. Since the geographical distance of South Karnataka. region is not very significant from North Karnataka region, 'neighbour-hood deprivation' is felt in all parts of the latter.

#### **Divide in respect of Economic Variables:**

The North South divide in Karnataka is quite pronounced in respect of economic variables also. North Karnataka is a predominantly agricultural economy as compared to South Karnataka. The agricultural productivity of the North Karnataka however, cannot be considered to be less than that of the South Karnataka. In fact, as is brought out from the per-capita value of major crops and per-capita foodgrains production, the values of these in North Karnataka are much above those for South Karnataka. Interestingly, the per capita value of foodgrains production for Hyderabad-Karnataka is quite high, being maximum in the entire State. What is the matter for concern is that the policy variables to transform agriculture into a faster growing sector have not been equitable between the North and the South Karnataka. For

example, the per-capita bank credit to agriculture for North Karnataka is Rs.340/- whereas that for South Karnataka is Rs.420/-. For Hyderabad-Karnataka region which has the potential of showing higher agricultural productivity the per-capita bank credit to agriculture is the lowest.

Despite higher productivity potential of North Karnataka, maximum bank credit to agriculture is given in South Karnataka (62%) and minimum to Hyderabad Karnataka region. This suggest that the policies are not specifically directed towards promoting the activities of North Karnataka which have higher productivity potentials.

South Karnataka is industrially more developed than North Karnataka. The least developed of the entire state is obviously Hyderabad-Karnataka. Here also policy variables have behaved inequitably. For example, per-capita bank credit to industries in North Karnataka is nearly 1/5th of that in South Karnataka. Hyderabad-Karnataka again suffers on this count also. Maximum (87 %) credit facilities are provided to the industries of South Karnataka, whereas, industries in North Karnataka, have a share of about only 13 percent in the total bank credit made available for industrial development in the state. It is true that the banking practices require the provision of collaterals and other securities for advancement of bank credit. However, the nationalised banks, which are expected to

play developmental role in the region, need to be used as significant policy instruments and bank credit as a policy variable promoting development of different sectors of sub-regional economy. It is in this sense that the North Karnataka's feeling of being let down by public sector agencies, also seems to be well justified.

When there is an all round development in a region (both agricultural and industrial) then there is a likelihood of larger resource generation and resource mobilization. The per-capita bank deposit for South Karnataka is therefore much higher than for North Karnataka.

Small scale industries are supposed to be the major instruments for economic improvement of the poor. Even with regard to the small scale industries the North Karnataka is not treated justly. The per-capita bank credit to small scale industries in North Karnataka is nearly 25 percent of that given to small scale industries in South Karnataka. Only 16 percent of the total bank credit to small scale industries in the State is located in North Karnataka. In Hyderabad-Karnataka the provision of bank credit to the small scale industries is as low as 7 percent of the total credit for such industries in the State.

This shows that the instrumental variables at the disposal of the banking sector are not equitably used for promoting either agriculture, small scale industry or other industries.

That the working population in North Karnataka is mainly concentrated on the agricultural and allied activities and house-hold industries is obvious from the data. The manufacturing industrial sector of South Karnataka has the largest number of manpower of the State for obvious reasons.

### **Intra-Regional disparities within North and South Karnataka:**

For understanding the intra-regional disparities the following norms may be useful.

- a. If the maximum of a particular socio-economic variable is higher for an advanced region than for a less advanced region, it would indicate acute backwardness of the less advanced region.
- b. If the minimum for a given socio-economic variable is higher for the advanced region than for the less advanced region then it would indicate the more acute backwardness of less advanced region with regard to that variable.
- c. If the range (the difference between the maximum and the minimum) is similar for the less advanced region and the advanced region, then this would indicate the stagnancy of the less advanced region with regard to a given socio-economic variable.

- d. If disparity as indicated by co-efficient of variation is higher than the disparity exhibited by the 'range' (which indicates the difference between only the extreme values) then this should be a cause for greater concern, as the coefficient of variation considers all the values of the variable.

If on the basis of these norms we examine the behaviour of different socio-economic variables in different sub-regions of Karnataka the following observations can be made.

**Invariably the maximum for the social variable in the case of North Karnataka is lower than the maximum for South Karnataka. So also the minimum of the respective variable.** The range however does not behave uniformly for the North and South Karnataka. **The co-efficient of variation is uniformly higher for North Karnataka than for South Karnataka, so far as the literacy variables are concerned.** Interestingly, the rural literacy level for South Karnataka shows that the population is less heterogeneous in rural areas of South Karnataka.

North Karnataka is rich in respect of forest cover. However there are wide intra regional differences in North Karnataka with respect to this variable. As against this the South Karnataka, has less intra-regional heterogeneity with respect to forest cover.

There is high intra-regional disparity with respect to net sown area in North Karnataka as reflected by both the range and coefficient of variation. The maximum value for net sown area is higher in North Karnataka than in South Karnataka. Since urbanization is in general less in North Karnataka as a whole, the extent of intra-regional disparity with respect to this variable is also less.

Average size of operational holding in North Karnataka is generally higher than for South Karnataka. The extent of disparity in this, as reflected by coefficient of variation, is also indicating that holdings are not so much fragmented in North Karnataka as in South Karnataka. The percentage of gross irrigated area to gross cropped area is not the same in all the sub regions of both the regions of the State. However, the extent of disparity is higher in sub-regions of South Karnataka than North Karnataka. Fertilizer consumption, however, shows extreme disparities in North Karnataka as compared to South Karnataka. The maximum value of fertilizer consumption for North Karnataka is higher than the maximum value for South Karnataka, whereas the minimum value is lower for North Karnataka than for South Karnataka. This indicates that though the extent of disparity in fertilizer consumption is less in South Karnataka the consumption levels are high. Reverse is true in the case of North Karnataka.

Thus, with regard to the major

policy and developmental variable such as bank credit to agriculture, industries and small scale industries, fertilizer consumption etc., the intra-regional disparities are more in North Karnataka than in South Karnataka. The maximum is generally higher for South Karnataka than for North Karnataka in respect of the crucial variables. As against this minimum is lower for North Karnataka than South Karnataka except in the case of per-capita bank credit to industries. **Thus, disparities are large and levels are low with regard to crucial economic policy and developmental variables, so far as North Karnataka is concerned. This is like adding insult to injury !** It is interesting that despite this differential treatment of credit, supply variable of agriculture in these regions are not too much different. Thus disparity in foodgrains production is more or less similar for the North Karnataka and South Karnataka. The maximum and minimum of per-capita foodgrains production are also similar in the two regions. **These numbers show that at a particular point of time North Karnataka shows itself to be less developed and less equitably treated.**

#### **The Divide in a Dynamic Setting:**

Certain interesting results emerge with regard to the North South divide in Karnataka in a dynamic setting. We have only data for few selected variables for two points of time around 1983 and around 1993. We find (please refer to the statistical

table in the Appendix) that in South Karnataka urbanization has proceeded at a much faster rate. It is surprising to note that there is a slightly reverse urbanization trend so far as North Karnataka is concerned. Does this imply that there is a reverse flow of population from urban areas to rural areas in North Karnataka? The growth rate for net irrigated area in North Karnataka is much higher than for South Karnataka. This is the only redeeming feature. However, the compound growth rate of district income and compound growth rate of per-capita income for North Karnataka is less than that for South Karnataka. The Hyderabad-Karnataka region has experienced still lower growth rate during the decade. The population growth rate however is higher for the North rather than South Karnataka.

### III Why this Divide?

A simple univariate explanation of North Karnataka's relative backwardness would not be convincing at all. Backwardness has to be understood in its historical roots. Social, economic and political processes causing backwardness need to be considered in any study of economic development of the region.

The above paragraphs show that both in the static setting as well as dynamic setting North Karnataka presents a highly disturbing picture, suggesting that there is an urgent need to take special initiative to develop the less developed regions of the

Karnataka State. However, it appears that so far, the government policy has not taken such a positive initiative adequately. For example, though per capita Zilla Parishad sector outlay for North Karnataka was marginally higher than that for South Karnataka, during recent years this did not maintain any logical linkage with economic level of the two regions. This can be seen from below.

### Per Capita Public setor outlay with growth of per-capita Income.

Year	South	Growth	North	Growth
	Karnataka	Rate of	Karnataka	Rate of
	Outlay	per capita	Outlay	per capita
	(in crores)	Income	(in crores)	Income
1987-88	78.50		84.60	
1988-89	82.10	3.50	94.50	2.5
1991-92	145.20		156.10	
1987-92	515.80		568.80	

The growth rate distance is about 150 percent whereas the resource input distance is about 110 in the two regions indicating inadequacy of resource input efforts in North Karnataka.

It is not enough if allocations of resources are equalised in North Karnataka with those for South Karnataka. Equal treatment would lead to equality only when equals are involved. When there are unequals, what would be required is not equal treatment but unequal treatment. The principle of vertical equity referring to the equalization of the unequals demands that special efforts should be made for the

development of the region. In reality it is the success which succeeds. The advanced regions have continued to progress. However in order that less advanced regions also show progress a concerted action both from policy makers and also the people of the region, is needed. Complaining is the easiest form of response to any difficult situation. However, if complaining is followed by concerted self effort then the response would be considered more constructive and meaningful.

State investments do not seem to have been adequate for the development of North Karnataka.

State resource efforts might trigger off the developmental process if other preconditions are fulfilled. Individual initiative, achievement motivation, hard work, continuous pursuit, etc, are the human endowments which act as other crucial preconditions. Whether these are amply available or not in North Karnataka may be a point for debate. Human capital generating factors like education, health, etc., are not adequately provided in the North Karnataka region, as stated above. (Section II) Natural resources available in the region need to be properly utilised. The economic infrastructure - electricity, road, transportation, are not as well developed in North Karnataka, as in South Karnataka. Since, economic infrastructural development and social infrastructural development are interdependent, initiatives recognising such

interdependencies are not consciously and adequately taken in the North Karnataka either by the government or by the private sector.

Thus, North Karnataka's backwardness is due to endogenous and exogenous factors, some of which can be maneuvered and some of which not. We have to superimpose any initiative over the historical facts of neglect during the Bombay Presidency period and Nizam period. This suggests the need for a bigger push of all types in the region.

#### IV. Where to go from here ?

What are the prospects of development of North Karnataka ? North Karnataka is not the Run of Kutch, non-developable at all ! With suitable action plan, this part of Karnataka can certainly develop comparable to any part of the state.

We suggest below an action plan for the purpose of development of North Karnataka.

- a. The District Planning Boards created in each district, as a result of the recent constitutional amendments should clearly identify the areas of backwardness of the respective sub regions of North Karnataka and present concrete plans consisting of the project, programmes as well as resources requirements. Such an initiative for development from below would **endogenize the planning**

**process and developmental process.** Endogenized developmental process would be more likely to be successful than exogenously imposed process.

- b. Special attention should be paid to the development of socio-economic infrastructure in different sub-regions of the districts of North Karnataka. There are still habitations and villages in North Karnataka which are not reached by the health care facilities, water supply educational facilities and not even access road, leave alone electrification. In the background of focus on the aggregates the requirements of such remote and inaccessible areas are invariably overlooked.
- c. Primary Health Care activities and education should be considered as the priority sectors of development if the backward regions of North Karnataka should pick up momentum of long term development. Since education and health have a large non-plan component, emphasis on economy in non-plan expenditures has obviously caused a great damage to these two sectors. Since only those people have an access to these facilities who would be in a position to demand in loud voice additional facilities. In this loud noise the low voice of the have-nots would remain unheard. It is therefore, necessary to focus special attention on education and health care facilities of the less developed

sub-regions of North Karnataka in particular.

- d. When the resource pool is limited and the requirements of one of the regions need to be fulfilled it implies that the allocations to the other region need to be sacrificed for the sake of the development of the sister region. If this spirit of cross-subsidization and developmental support (not based upon compassion but based upon the economic grounds) of planned sub-regional development for the purpose of higher regional development is adopted then the North Karnataka would not have a grouse or grumble of being the neglected child of Karnataka.
- 5. The entire study highlights the importance of developing sub-regional indicators of social development. It also highlights the need for monitoring changes in these indicators as well. If an institution outside the framework of the official policy making machinery is invested with this responsibility of monitoring changes in the development of the indicators for the sub-regions of North Karnataka, then it would amount to creating a suitable think-tank and watch dog for the developmental initiatives for the region. The study thus highlights the importance of institutionalizing the process of developmental planning and evaluation of developmental process with the involvement of the non-governmental stakeholders.

**Selected Studies referring to Economic Development of North Karnataka, and Regional Disparities.**

1. Narendar Pani - Political Economy of Karnataka 1950-95 : An Overview. Journal of Social and Economic Development. Vol.I No.1 1998.
2. Vinod Vyasulu and B.P. Vani - Development and Deprivation in Karnataka : A District wise study. EPW. Nov-15, 1997.
3. Vinod Vyasulu :P Management of Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Karnataka. EPW. Oct 14-21, 1995.
4. CMIE - Profiles of Districts. Nov-1993.
5. CMDR - Resource Costs of Morbidity and Undernutrition 1997.
6. Rajiv Gandhi Foundation for Rural Water Supply : Basic Field study for Districts of North Karnataka. CMDR - 1994.
7. S.M.Vidwans : Regional Disparities : A New Approach Occasional Paper-1. Indian School of Political Economy, Pune-1996.
8. Government of Maharashtra : Fact Finding Committee on Regional Imbalances. (Chairman, V.M.Dandekar) 1984.

**KARNATAKA**  
**Basic Statistics - Districtwise**

**State - Karnataka**  
**Workers involved in Different Sectors**  
Per 10000 Population

No	Districts	Population (thousands)	Main Workers (thousands)	Main Workers per 10000 pop	Workers in Mfg Industries (non-households)% (as % of main workers)	Total Mfg Industrial Workers (thousands)	Mfg Industrial Workers per 10000 pop
1	Bellary	2	3	4 (3/2)*10000	5	6 (3*5)/100	7 (6/2)*10000
1	Belgaum	3583.61	1340.80	3741.479	6.56(15)	87.956	245.440
2	Bijapur	2927.99	1110.29	3791.987	4.64(10)	51.517	175.947
3	Dharmawad	3503.15	1349.94	3853.503	6.59(16)	88.961	253.946
4	U. Kannada	1220.26	428.96	3512.858	5.79(13)	24.819	203.391
	Tot (A)=	11235.01	Tot (J)=		Tot (J')= 253.253		
		4229.69	M=3764.741	U=5.98%			
	Bombay - Karnataka				D=225.414		
5	Bellary	1890.09	809.99	4285.457	4.13(8)	33.453	176.982
6	Bidar	1255.80	466.61	3715.639	3.01(4)	14.045	111.841
7	Gulbarga	2582.17	1039.92	4027.310	3.20(5)	33.277	128.872
8	Raichur	2309.89	971.00	4203.663	1.78(1)	17.284	74.826
	Hyderabad - Karnataka	8037.95	Tot (K)=	N=4089.998	Tot (K')= 98.059		E=121.995
		3287.52	V=2.98%				
	North - Karnataka		Tot (J+K)=				
	Total (A+B)=	19272.96	7517.21	O=3900.392	W=4.67%	Tot (J+K')= 351.31	F=182.281
	South - Karnataka						
9	Bangalore	4839.16	1635.99	3380.731	30.80(20)	492.106	1016.924
10	Bangalore (R )	1673.19	623.04	3723.666	8.04(18)	50.092	299.380
11	Chikmagalore	1017.28	412.28	4052.768	2.91(2)	11.997	117.932
12	Chitradurga	2180.44	843.86	3870.136	6.00(14)	50.632	232.210
13	D.Kannada	2694.26	1112.45	4128.963	28.13(19)	312.932	1161.477
14	Hassan	1569.68	589.53	3755.734	2.96(3)	17.450	111.169
15	Kodagu	488.45	220.25	4509.162	3.38(7)	7.445	152.421
16	Kolar	2216.89	881.51	3976.336	5.49(12)	48.395	218.301
17	Mandy	1644.37	635.59	3865.249	3.36(6)	21.356	129.873
18	Mysore	3165.02	1183.22	3738.428	7.47(17)	88.387	279.262
19	Shimoga	1909.66	720.98	3775.436	5.24(11)	37.779	197.831
20	Tumkur	2305.87	916.20	3973.338	4.24(9)	38.847	168.470
	Total (C)=	25704.27	Tot (L)=		Tot (L')= 1177.418		
	South - Karnataka	9774.90	P=3802.831	X=12.05%			G=458.063
	Total (A+B+C)=	44977.23	Tot (J+K+L)=		Tot (J'+K'+L')=		
	Karnatak	17292.11	Q=3844.636	(J+K+L')=8.84%	1528.728		H=339.889

$$\begin{aligned}
 U &= [Tot(J')/Tot(J)]*100 & (J+K+L') &= [Tot(J'+K'+L')/Tot(J+K+L)] \\
 V &= [Tot(K')/Tot(K)]*100 & D &= [Tot(J')/Tot(A)]*10000 \\
 W &= [Tot(J'+K')/Tot(J+K)]*100 & E &= [Tot(K')/Tot(B)]*10000 \\
 X &= [Tot(L')/Tot(L)]*100 & F &= [Tot(K')/Tot(A+B)]*10000 \\
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 G &= [Tot(L')/Tot(C)]*10000 \\
 H &= [Tot(J'+K')/Tot(A+B+C)]*10000 \\
 M &= [Tot(K')/Tot(A+B+C)]*10000 \\
 O &= [Tot(J')/Tot(A+B+C)]*10000 \\
 P &= [Tot(L')/Tot(C)]*10000 \\
 Q &= [Tot(J+K+L')/Tot(A+B+C)]*10000
 \end{aligned}$$





**Deficiency Index of Primary Health Care Institutions**

Name of the Districts	Existing PHCs	Reqd. No of PHCs	Defi. for PHCs	Defi. Of PHCs as % of Reqd. No of PHCs	Rural Population	Covered Population	Remaining Population	Remaining Pop as % of Rural Pop
1	2	3	4	( 4/3 * 100 )	5	6(2*30000)	7(5-6)	8(7/5) * 100
<u>North - Karnataka</u>								
1 Belgaum	25	99	74	74.75	2741820	750000	1991820	72.65
2 Bijapur	28	80	52	65.00	2239240	840000	1399240	62.49
3 Dharwad	35	98	63	64.29	2279260	1050000	1229260	53.93
4 Uttar Kannada	18	36	18	50.00	925740	540000	385740	41.67
5 Bellary	17	50	33	66.00	1325690	510000	815690	61.53
6 Bidar	11	33	22	66.67	1010100	330000	680100	67.33
	134	396	262	66.16	10521850	4020000	6501850	61.79
Maximum	35	99	74					
Minimum	11	33	18					
Range	24							
Coeff. of Var	35.41							
<u>South - Karnataka</u>								
7 Bangalore ( R )	19	53	34	64.15	1369910	570000	799910	58.39
8 Chikmagalore	16	30	14	46.67	845420	480000	365420	43.22
9 Chitradurga	18	59	41	69.49	1591770	540000	1051770	66.08
10 Hassan	16	45	29	64.44	1296960	480000	816960	62.99
11 Kodagu	6	15	9	60.00	410510	180000	230510	56.15
12 Kolar	20	64	44	68.75	1699910	600000	1099910	64.70
13 Mandya	16	47	31	65.96	1377570	480000	897570	65.16
14 Mysore	29	87	58	66.67	2224720	870000	1354720	60.89
15 Shimoga	18	55	37	67.27	1403420	540000	863420	61.52
16 Tumkur	23	66	43	65.15	1923660	690000	1233660	64.13
	181	521	340	65.26	14143850	5430000	8713850	61.61
Maximum	29	234	219					
Minimum	6	15	9					
Range	23							
Coeff. of Var	30.06							
Karnataka	315	917	602	65.65	24665700	9450000	15215700	61.69
Maximum	35	234	219					
Minimum	6	15	9					
Range	29							
Coeff. of Var	34.67							

**Zilla Parishad Sector Outlay by District : 1987-89 and 1991-92**

<b>Name of the Districts</b>	<b>1987- 88</b>	<b>1988 - 89</b>	<b>1989 - 90</b>	<b>1990 - 91</b>	<b>1991- 92</b>	<b>1987- 92</b>	<b>Rs. Crores</b>
<b>North - Karnataka</b>							
1 Belgaum	26.98	29.76	32.25	37.89	46.76	173.64	
2 Bijapur	25.36	27.26	29.93	38.46	45.47	166.48	
3 Dharwad	28.34	29.76	33.41	38.82	46.08	176.41	
4 Uttara Kannada	13.76	15.36	16.68	17.95	23.66	87.41	
5 Gulbarga	23.21	26.68	30.17	38.63	46.66	165.35	
6 Bellary	15.25	16.97	19.32	23.64	28.70	103.88	
7 Bidar	11.73	13.90	15.66	19.70	24.28	85.27	
8 Raicur	18.54	22.48	25.06	32.42	39.20	137.70	
<b>South - Karnataka</b>							
9 Bangalore	8.95	8.65	9.56	12.71	16.33	56.20	
10 Bangalore Rural	17.18	16.94	20.45	24.44	29.71	108.72	
11 Chitradurga	18.81	19.53	22.66	30.41	37.73	129.14	
12 Kolar	21.54	21.95	25.87	31.10	40.86	141.32	
13 Shimoga	16.38	18.60	22.06	25.77	31.63	114.44	
14 Tumkur	20.77	22.08	25.91	32.93	41.10	142.79	
15 Tumkur	26.78	28.24	31.30	38.14	48.43	172.89	
16 Mysore	12.58	13.09	15.11	19.22	24.04	84.04	
17 Dakshina Kannada	20.45	21.93	24.04	28.45	35.19	130.06	
18 Hassan	15.52	16.88	19.33	23.21	29.36	104.30	
19 Kodagu	7.43	7.81	9.05	10.23	13.02	47.54	
20 Mandya	15.28	15.18	17.00	21.07	25.86	94.39	

Source : Economic Survey 1991-92, Government of Karnataka

**Per Capita Zilla Parishad Sector Outlay  
by District: 1987-89 and 1991-92**

( Unit in Rs )

Name of the Districts	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1987-92
<u>North - Karnataka</u>						
1 Belgaum	75.29	83.04	89.99	105.73	130.48	96.91
2 Bijapur	86.61	93.10	102.22	131.35	155.29	113.72
3 Dharwad	80.90	84.95	95.37	110.81	131.54	100.72
4 Uttara Kannada	112.76	125.87	136.69	147.10	193.89	143.26
5 Gulbarga	89.89	103.32	116.84	149.60	180.70	128.07
6 Bellary	80.68	89.78	102.22	125.07	151.84	109.92
7 Bidar	93.41	110.69	124.70	156.87	193.34	135.80
8 Raicur	80.26	97.32	108.49	140.35	169.71	119.23
<b>Average</b>	<b>699.80</b>	<b>788.09</b>	<b>876.53</b>	<b>1066.90</b>	<b>1306.80</b>	<b>947.62</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>84.66</b>	<b>94.52</b>	<b>105.06</b>	<b>128.42</b>	<b>156.08</b>	<b>568.75</b>
<u>South - Karnataka</u>						
9 Bangalore	18.49	17.88	19.76	26.26	33.75	23.23
10 Bangalore Rural	102.68	101.24	122.22	146.07	177.57	129.96
11 Chitradurga	86.27	89.57	103.92	139.47	173.04	118.45
12 Kolar	97.16	99.01	116.70	140.29	184.31	127.49
13 Shimoga	85.77	97.40	115.52	134.95	165.63	119.85
14 Tumkur	90.07	95.76	112.37	142.81	178.24	123.85
15 Tumkur	84.61	89.23	98.89	120.50	153.02	109.25
16 Mysore	123.66	128.68	148.53	188.94	236.32	165.22
17 Dakshina Kannada	75.90	81.40	89.23	105.59	130.61	96.55
18 Hassan	98.87	107.54	123.15	147.86	187.04	132.89
19 Kodagu	152.11	159.89	185.28	209.44	266.56	194.66
20 Mandya	92.92	92.31	103.38	128.13	157.26	114.80
<b>Average</b>	<b>1108.54</b>	<b>1159.90</b>	<b>1338.94</b>	<b>1630.31</b>	<b>2043.34</b>	<b>1456.21</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>78.46</b>	<b>82.04</b>	<b>94.28</b>	<b>115.81</b>	<b>145.21</b>	<b>515.80</b>
<b>Karnataka</b>	<b>1808.34</b>	<b>1947.99</b>	<b>2215.47</b>	<b>2697.21</b>	<b>3350.15</b>	<b>2403.83</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>81.12</b>	<b>87.39</b>	<b>98.90</b>	<b>121.21</b>	<b>149.87</b>	<b>538.49</b>

Source : Economic Survey 1991-92, Government of Karnataka

## North - South Divide in Karnataka

No	Districts	Male Literacy (%)	Male Population (thousands)		Tot Male Pop above 7 Years (thousands)	Tot Male Pop above 7 Years (thousands)		Male Literates (thousands)
1	2	3		4(2*3)/100	5(3-4)		6(2*4)/100	
1	Belgaum	66.65	1834010		1222367.67	611642.34		814708.05
2	Bijapur	69.69	1491020		1039091.84	451928.16		724143.10
3	Dharwad	71.37	1802420		1286387.15	516032.85		918094.51
4	U. Kannada	76.39	6207000		4741527.30	1465472.70		3622052.7
			11334450	A =	8289373.30	3045076.04	D' =	6078998.37
	Bombay - Karnatak						D" =	73..33%
							A1=	36.94%
5	Bellary	58.71	961990		564784.33	397205.67		331584.88
6	Bidar	58.97	643190		379289.14	263900.86		223666.81
7	Gulbarga	52.08	1316090		685419.67	630670.33		356966.57
8	Raichur	49.53	1166960		577995.29	588964.71		286281.07
			4088230	B =	2207488.43	1880741.57	E' =	1198499.32
	Hyderabad - Karnatak						E" =	54.29%
							A2=	7.28%
	North - Karnatak		15422680		Tot(A+B)=			Tot (F')
					10496862.39	4925817.61		7277497.69
							F'' =	69.33%
	South - Karnatak							A3=44.22%
9	Bangalore	82.94	2542950		2109122.73	433827.27		1749306.39
10	Bangalore (R)	61.51	860230		529127.47	331102.527		325466.31
11	Chikmagalore	70.56	514530		363052.37	151477.63		256169.75
12	Chitradurga	66.88	1121650		750159.52	371490.48		501706.69
13	D. Kannada	84.40	1306260		1102483.44	203776.56		930496.02
14	Hassan	68.87	785140		540725.92	244414.08		372397.94
15	Kodagu	75.35	246870		186016.55	60853.46		140163.47
16	Kolar	62.69	1128320		707343.81	420976.19		443433.83
17	Mandy	59.18	8376000		4956916.80	3419083.20		2933503.36
18	Mysore	56.23	1620620		911274.58	709345.37		512409.72
19	Shimoga	71.24	974160		693991.58	280168.42		494399.60
20	Tumkur	66.49	1177230		782740.23	394489.77		520443.98
			20653960	C =	13632955.04	7021004.961	G' =	9179897.07
	South - Karnatak						G" =	67.33%
							A4=	55.78%
	Karnatak		36076640	Total (A+B+C)=		11946822.57	Tot (D+E+G)=	
					24129817.43			16457394.75
							(100%)	
							G''' =	68.20%

$$D'' = [Tot(D') / Tot(A)] * 100$$
$$E'' = [Tot(E') / Tot(B)] * 100$$
$$G''' = [Tot(D'+E'+G') / Tot(A + B + C)] * 100$$
$$F''' = [Tot(F') / Tot(A+B)] * 100$$
$$G'' = [Tot(G') / Tot(C)] * 100$$
$$A1 = (D' / (D'+E'+G')) * 100$$
$$A2 = (E' / (D'+E'+G')) * 100$$
$$A3 = (F' / (D'+E'+G')) * 100$$
$$A4 = (G' / (D'+E'+G')) * 100$$

**North - South Divide in Karnataka**

No	Districts	Female Literacy ( % )	Female Population (thousands)		Tot Female Pop above 7 Years (thousands)	Tot Female Pop above 7 Years (thousands)		Female Literates (thousands)
		1	2		3	4(2*3)/100		6(2*4)/100
1	Belgaum	38.69	1749600		676920.24	1072679.76		261900.44
2	Bijapur	40.06	1436970		575650.182	861319.818		230605.4629
3	Dharwad	45.20	1700730		768729.96	932000.04		347465.9419
4	U. Kannada	56.77	599560		340370.212	259189.79		193228.1694
			5486860	A =	2361670.59	3125189.41	H' =	1033200.02
	Bombay - Karnatak						H'' =	43.75%
							B1 =	22.10%
5	Bellary	31.97	928100		296713.57	631386.43		94859.33
6	Bidar	30.53	612610		187029.833	425580.17		57100.21
7	Gulbarga	24.49	1266080		310062.992	956017.01		75934.43
8	Raichur	22.15	1142930		253159.00	889771.01		56074.72
			3949720	B =	1046965.39	2902754.61	I' =	283968.68
	Hyderabad - Karnatak						I'' =	27.12%
							B2 =	6.07%
					Tot (A+B)		J' =	1317168.70
	North - Karnatak				3408635.98		J'' =	38.64%
			9436580			6027944.02	B3 =	28.17%
	South - Karnatak							
9	Bangalore	68.81	2296210		1580022.10	716187.90		1087213.21
10	Bangalore (R)	38.15	812960		310144.24	502815.76		118320.0276
11	Chikmangalore	51.31	502760		257966.156	244793.84		132362.4346
12	Chitradurga	43.36	1058800		459095.68	599704.32		199063.8868
13	D. Kannada	67.96	1388010		943291.60	444718.40		641060.97
14	Hassan	44.90	784540		352258.46	432281.54		158164.0485
15	Kodagu	61.22	241590		147901.40	93688.60		90545.24
16	Kolar	37.75	1088570		410935.175	677634.83		155128.0286
17	Mandy	36.70	806780		296088.26	510691.74		108664.3914
18	Mysore	37.95	1544390		586096.005	958294.00		222423.43
19	Shimoga	51.42	935160		480859.272	454300.73		247257.8377
20	Tumkur	41.93	1128590		473217.787	655372.21		198420.2181
			12588360	C =	6297876.13	6290483.87	K' =	3358623.72
	South - Karnatak						K'' =	53.33%
							B4 =	71.83%
					Total (A+B+C)		Tot ( K '' ) =	
	Karnatak				9706512.11		4675792.41	
			22024940			12318427.89	( 100 % )	
							K''' =	48.17%

$$H'' = [Tot(H') / Tot(A)] * 100$$

$$I''' = [Tot(I') / Tot(B)] * 100$$

$$J''' = [Tot(J') / Tot(A+B)] * 100$$

$$K''' = [Tot(K') / Tot(C)] * 100$$

$$K''' = [Tot(K'') / Tot(A+B+C)] * 100$$

$$B1 = ( H' / K'') * 100$$

$$B2 = ( I' / K'') * 100$$

$$B3 = ( J' / K'') * 100$$

$$B4 = ( K' / K'') * 100$$

## North - South Divide in Karnataka

No	Districts	Urban Literacy (%)	Urban Population (thousands)		Tot Urban Pop above 7 years (thousands)	Tot Urban Pop above 7 years (thousands)		Urban Literates (thousands)
					4(2*3)/100	5(3-4)		
	1	2	3					6(2*4)/100
1	Belgaum	73.59	841790		619473.26	222316.74		455870.37
2	Bijapur	68.42	688750		471242.75	217507.25		322424.59
3	Dharwad	70.20	1223890		859170.89	364719.22		603137.89
4	U. Kannada	81.10	29520		23940.72	5579.28		19415.92
			2783950	A =	1973827.51	810122.49	L' =	1400848.47
	Bombay - Karnatak						L'' =	70.97%
							C1 =	17.97%
5	Bellary	60.93	564400		343888.92	220511.08		209531.52
6	Bidar	68.02	245700		167125.14	78574.86		113678.52
7	Gulbarga	64.36	609800		392467.28	217332.72		252591.94
8	Raichur	56.38	480120		270691.66	209428.34		152615.96
			1900020	B =	1174173.00	725847.00	M' =	728417.94
	Hyderabad - Karnatak						M'' =	62.04%
							C2 =	9.34%
	North - Karnatak				Total (A+B)=		N' =	2129266.41
					3148000.51		N'' =	67.64%
			4683970			1535969.49	C3 =	27.31%
	South - Karnatak							
9	Bangalore	79.53	4169250		3315804.53	853445.48		2637059.34
10	Bangalore '( R )	67.39	303290		204387.13	98902.87		137736.4876
11	Chikmangalore	78.59	171860		135064.77	36795.23		106147.4059
12	Chitradurga	73.52	588680		432797.54	155882.46		318192.75
13	D. Kannada	84.51	762590		644464.81	118125.19		544637.21
14	Hassan	77.76	272720		212067.07	60652.93		164903.3552
15	Kodagu	83.27	77940		64900.64	13039.36		54042.76
16	Kolar	74.09	516980		383030.48	133949.52		283787.28
17	Mandy	68.46	266800		182651.28	84148.72		125043.0663
18	Mysore	73.50	940290		691113.15	249176.85		507968.17
19	Shimoga	78.01	935510		729791.35	205718.65		569310.23
20	Tumukur	75.61	382160		288951.18	93208.82		218475.9842
			9388070	C =	7285023.92	2103046.08	O' =	5667304.04
	South - Karnatak						O''' =	77.79%
							C4 =	72.69%
					Total (A+B+C) =		O" =	7796570.45
	Karnatak				10433021.43			(100%)
			14072040			3639015.57	P''' =	74.73%

$$L'' = [Tot(L')/Tot(A)] * 100$$

$$N'' = [Tot(N')/Tot(A+B)] * 100$$

$$M'' = [Tot(M')/Tot(B)] * 100$$

$$O''' = [Tot(O')/Tot(C)] * 100$$

$$P'''' = [Tot(O'') / Tot(A+B+C)] * 100$$

$$C1 = (L'/O'') * 100$$

$$C2 = (M'/O'') * 100$$

$$C3 = (N'/O'') * 100$$

$$C4 = (O'/O'') * 100$$

## North - South Divide in Karnataka

No	Districts	Rural Literacy (%)	Rural Population (thousands)	Tot Rural Pop above 7 years (thousands)		Rural Literates (thousands)
				4(2*3)/100	5(3-4)	
1	Belgaum	46.47	2741820	1274123.75	1467696.25	592085.31
2	Bijapur	50.91	2239240	1139997.08	1099242.92	580372.52
3	Dharwad	52.31	2279260	1192280.91	1086979.09	623682.14
4	U. Kannada	62.10	925740	574884.54	350855.46	357003.30
			8186060	A = 4181286.28	4004773.72	P = 2153143.27
	Bombay - Karnatak					P''' = 51.50%
						D1 = 30.53%
5	Bellary	38.71	1325690	513174.60	812515.40	198649.89
6	Bidar	39.43	1010100	398282.43	611817.57	157042.76
7	Gulbarga	30.36	1972370	598811.53	1373558.47	181799.18
8	Raichur	30.42	1829770	556616.03	1273153.97	169322.60
			6137930	B = 2066884.60	4071045.41	Q = 706814.43
	Hyderabad - Karnatak					Q''' = 34.20%
						D2 = 9.98%
	North - Karnatak			Total ( A +B )		R' = 2859957.69
				6248170.88		R''' = 45.77%
			14323990		8075819.12	D3 = 40.37%
	South - Karnatak					
9	Bangalore	56.68	669910	379704.99	290205.01	215216.79
10	Bangalore ( C )	46.37	1369910	635227.27	734682.73	294554.88
11	Chikmangalore	57.46	845420	485778.33	359641.67	279128.23
12	Chitradurga	48.69	1591770	775032.81	816737.19	377363.48
13	D. Kannada	72.37	1931670	1397949.58	533720.42	1011696.11
14	Hassan	52.40	1296960	679607.04	617352.96	356114.09
15	Kodagu	65.50	410510	268884.05	141625.95	176119.05
16	Kolar	43.16	1699910	733681.16	966228.84	316656.79
17	Mandy	44.19	1377570	608748.18	768821.82	269005.82
18	Mysore	36.00	2224720	800899.20	1423820.80	288323.71
19	Shimoga	55.48	506240	280861.95	225378.05	155822.21
20	Tumukur	50.23	1923160	966003.27	957156.73	485223.44
			15847750	C = 8012377.83	7835372.17	S' = 4225224.6
	South - Karnatak					S''' = 52.73%
						D4 = 59.63%
				Total (A+B+C)		S" = 7085182.29
	Karnatak		30171740	10473395.48	15911191.29	(100%)
						T = 67.65%

$$P''' = [ \text{Tot} ( P' ) / \text{Tot}(A) ] * 100$$

$$Q''' = [ \text{Tot} ( Q' ) / \text{Tot}( B ) ] * 100$$

$$T = [ \text{Tot} ( S'' ) / \text{Tot} ( A+B+C ) ] * 100$$

$$R''' = [ \text{Tot} ( R' ) / \text{Tot}(A+B) ] * 100$$

$$S''' = [ \text{Tot} ( S' ) / \text{Tot} ( C ) ] * 100$$

$$D1 = ( P / S'') * 100$$

$$D2 = ( Q / S'') * 100$$

$$D3 = ( R' / S'') * 100$$

$$D4 = ( S'' / S'') * 100$$

Karnataka  
Basic Statistics - Districtwise









**STATE : KARNATAK**  
**(ACCORDING TO 1991 CENSUS)**

	Districts	Urbani-sation (%)	Total Population	Urban Population	Workers as % of Tot Pop (%)	Workers
No.	1	2	3	4(2*3)/100	5	6(3*5)/100
1	Belgaum	23.49	3583610	841790	42.35	1517730
2	Bijapur	23.52	2927990	688750	41.64	1219150
3	Dharwad	34.94	3503150	1223890	42.14	1476060
4	U. Kannada	24.14	1220260	294520	38.78	473160
			Tot(A)=11235010	D=3048590		I=4686100
	Bombay - Karnatak	D' '=27.13%		A1=21.25%	I' '=41.71%	B1=24.81%
5	Bellary	29.86	1890090	564400	45.13	853030
6	Bidar	19.57	1255800	245700	39.87	500640
7	Gulbarga	23.62	2582170	609800	43.07	1112190
8	Raichur	20.79	2309890	480120	44.43	1026280
			Tot(B)=8037950	E=1900020		J=3492140
	Hyderabad - Karnatak	E' '=23.64%		A2=13.24%	J' '=43.45%	B2=18.49%
				F=4948610		K=8178240
	North-Karnatak	F' '=25.68%	Tot(A+B)=19272960	A3=34.49%	K' '=42.43%	B3=43.30%
	South - Karnatak					
9	Bangalore	86.16	4839160	4169250	34.27	1658300
10	Bangalore(R)	18.13	1673190	303290	43.00	719560
11	Chikmangalore	16.89	1017280	171860	44.97	457460
12	Chitradurga	27.00	2180440	588680	43.04	938480
13	D.Kannada	28.30	2694260	762590	43.16	1162910
14	Hassan	17.37	1569680	272720	44.25	694640
15	Kodagu	15.96	488450	516980	47.12	230140
16	Kolar	23.32	2216890	516980	43.42	962580
17	Mandy	16.23	1644370	266800	44.50	731760
18	Mysore	29.71	3165020	940290	40.20	7272280
19	Shimoga	26.51	1909660	506240	40.89	780850
20	Tumkur	16.57	2305870	382160	47.69	1099590
			Tot( C )=25704270	G=9397840		L=10708550
	South - Karnatak	G' '=36.56%		AA=65.51%	L' '=41.66%	B4=56.70%
			Total(A+B+C)=			
			44977230	H=14346450		M=18886790
	Karnatak	H' '=31.90%		(100%)	M'=41.99%	(100%)

D" = Tot (D) / Tot (A)      I " = Tot (I) / Tot (A)      A1=(D/H)\*1      B1=(BM)\*100  
 E " = Tot (E) / Tot (B)      J"=Tot (J) / Tot (B)      A2=(E/H)\*1      B2=(JM)\*100  
 F " = Tot (F) / Tot (A+      K"=Tot (K) / Tot (A+B)      A3=(F/H)\*      B3=(K/M)\*100  
 G " = Tot (G) / Tot (C      L"=TOt(L) / Tot (C)      A4=(G/H)\*1      B4=(L/M)\*100  
 H " = Tot (H) / Tot (A+

M"=Tot (m) / Tot (A+B+C)

**STATE : KARNATAK**  
**(ACCORDING TO 1991 CENSUS)**

	Districts	Geographical Area (sq kms)	Forest Area (sq kms)	Forest Area as percentage of geographical area (%)	Net sown area (sq kms)	Net sown Area as percentage of geographical area (%)
No.	1	2	3	4(3/2)*100	5	6(5/2)*100
1	Belgaum	13415	1915.48	14.28	8903.69	66.37
2	Bijapur	17069	831.03	4.87	12618.63	73.93
3	Dharwad	13738	1130.18	8.23	9477.99	68.99
4	U. Kannada	10291	8279.61	80.45	1092.35	10.61
		Tot(A)=54513	Tot(D)=12516.30		I=32092.66	
	Bombay - Karnatak			A'=22.30%		I'=58.87%
				C1=40.13%	D1=31.82%	
5	Bellary	9885	1174.16	11.88	5314.91	53.77
6	Bidar	5448	174.24	3.20	3585.20	65.81
7	Gulbarga	16224	657.79	4.05	12557.57	77.40
8	Raichur	14017	476.03	3.40	9778.96	69.76
		Tot(B)=45574	Tot(E)=2482.22		J=31236.64	
	Hyderabad - Karnatak			B'=0.55%	D2=30.97%	J'=6.85%
				C2=8.19%		
		Tot(A+B)=100087	Tot(D+E)=			
	North-Karnatak			(A+B)' =14.63%	K=63329.30	
				C3=48.32%	D3=62.79%	K'=63.27%
	South - Karnatak					
9	Bangalore	2190	-	-	-	-
10	Bangalore( R )	5815	845.70	14.54	3783.96	65.07
11	Chikmangalore	7201	1790.18	24.86	2767.59	38.43
12	Chitradurga	10852	815.32	7.51	5390.76	49.68
13	D.Kannada	8441	2257.55	26.75	2170.57	25.71
14	Hassan	6814	540.29	7.93	3392.80	49.79
15	Kodagu	4102	1346.57	32.83	1476.20	35.99
16	Kolar	8223	702.93	8.55	3533.19	42.97
17	Mandy	4961	237.04	4.78	2522.06	50.84
18	Mysore	11954	3384.69	28.31	5151.65	43.10
19	Shimoga	10553	3286.23	31.14	3160.97	29.95
20	Tumkur	10598	449.84	4.24	5042.87	47.58
		Tot(C) =91704	Tot(F)=15656.34		L=38392.62	
				C' = 17.07%		L' = 41.87%
	South - Karnatak			C4=61.68%	D4=38.06%	
		Tot(A+B+C)=	Tot(D+E+F)=		M=100865.90	
		191791	30294.86		(100%)	

A'=[Tot(D)/Tot(A)]100                  I'=[Tot(I) / Tot (A)]\*100                  C1=(Tot D/(D+E+F)\*100                  D1=(I/M)\*  
 B'=[Tot(E)/Tot(B)]\*100                  J'=[Tot(J)/Tot(B)]\*100                  c2=(Tot E/(D+E+F)\*100                  D2=(J/M)\*  
 (A+B)=Tot(D+E)/Tot(A+B)\*100                  K'[Tot(K)/Tot(A+B)]\*100                  c3=(Tot (D+E)/(D+E+F)\*100                  D3=(K/M)\*  
 C'=[Tot(F)/Tot(C)]\*100                  L'=[Tot(L)/Tot(C)]\*100                  C4=(Tot F/(D+E+F)) \*100                  D4=(L/M)\*  
 G'=[T0t(D+E+F)/Tot(A+B+C)]\*100                  M'=[Tot(M)/Tot(A+B+C)]\*100







**Table 1**  
**North - South Divide In Karnataka (Around 1991)**  
**Social Dimensions**

No	Regions	Literacy	% of Literates	Male Literacy (%)	% of Male Literates (%)	Female Literacy (%)	% of Female Literates (%)	Urban Literacy (%)	% of Urban Literates (%)	Rural Literacy (%)	% of Rural Literates (%)
1	Bombay - Karnataka	56.85	25.07	73.33	36.94	43.75	22.10	70.97	17.97	51.50	30.53
2	Hyderabad - Karnataka	46.98	12.36	54.29	7.28	27.12	6.07	62.04	9.34	34.20	9.98
3	North - Karnataka	53.17	37.42	69.33	44.22	38.64	28.17	67.64	27.31	45.77	40.37
4	South - Karnataka	60.26	62.58	67.33	55.78	53.33	71.83	77.79	72.69	52.73	59.63
5	Karnatak	57.39	100	68.20	100	48.17	100	74.73	100	67.65	100

**Table 2**  
**North - South Divide In Karnataka : Selected Economic Variables (Around 1991)**

No	Regions	Per Capita Value of Major Crops (Rs)	% of Value of Major Crops (%)	Per Capita Bank Credit to Agriculture (Rs)	% of Total Bank Credit to Agriculture (%)	Per Capita Bank Credit to Industries (Rs)	% of Total Bank Credit to Industries (%)	Per Capita Bank Deposits (Rs)	% of Total Bank Deposits (%)
1	Bombay - Karnataka	976.9	27.54	353.4	22.85	231.7	7.91	1593.9	13.95
2	Hyderabad - Karnataka	1046.5	21.10	323.0	14.94	219.1	5.35	1104.2	6.92
3	North - Karnataka	1006.0	48.65	340.7	37.79	226.5	13.26	1389.7	20.87
4	South - Karnataka	796.2	51.35	420.5	62.21	1111.2	86.74	3950.7	79.13
5	Karnatak	886.1	100	386.3	100	732.1	100	2853.3	100

**Table 2 (Contd)**  
**North - South Divide In Karnataka (Around 1991)**  
**(Economic Variables)**

Workers (As % of Main Workers)

No	Regions	Workers in Mfg Industries (non-households)	% of Total Workers Involved in Mfg Industries (%)	Agriculture & Allied Activities (%)	% of Total Workers In Agri & Allied Activities (%)	Mining & Querring (%)	% of Total Workers In Mining Querring (%)	Workers as % of Total Population (%)	% of Total Workers (%)
1	Bombay - Karnataka	5.98	16.57	70.86	26.39	0.31	11.35	41.71	24.81
2	Hyderabad - Karnataka	2.98	6.41	77.74	22.16	1.23	34.77	43.45	18.49
3	North - Karnataka	4.67	22.98	74.48	48.55	0.71	46.13	42.43	43.30
4	South - Karnataka	12.05	77.02	60.70	51.45	0.64	53.87	41.66	56.70
5	Karnatak	8.84	100	66.69	100	0.67	100	41.99	100

**Table 2 (Contd)**  
**North - South Divide In Karnataka - Economic Variables (Around 1991)**

No	Regions	Main Workers Per 10000 Pop	Mfg Industrial Workers Per 10000 Pop	Workers Involved in Agri & Allied Activities Per 10000 Pop	Workers Involved in Household Industries Per 10000 Pop	Workers Involved in Construction Per 10000 Pop	Workers Involved in Services Per 10000 Pop	Workers Involved in Mining & Querring Per 10000 Pop
1	Bombay - Karnataka	3764.74	225.41	2708.63	103.28	88.39	637.73	11.75
2	Hyderabad - Karnataka	4090.00	122.00	3119.76	64.56	57.71	615.70	50.33
3	North - Karnataka	3900.39	182.28	2905.12	87.14	75.45	628.54	27.84
4	South - Karnataka	3802.83	458.06	2308.23	60.07	114.40	837.57	24.38
5	Karnatak	3844.64	339.89	2564.00	71.67	97.71	748.00	25.86



**CMDR Monograph Series No. - 21**

**NORTH-SOUTH DIVIDE : KARNATAKA'S  
DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO**

**Dr. P. R. Panchamukhi**

**CENTRE FOR MULTI-DISCIPLINARY DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH**  
Jubilee Circle, DHARWAD-580001, Karnataka, India  
Ph : 091-0836-447639, Fax : 447627  
E-mail : [cmdr@bgl.vsnl.net.in](mailto:cmdr@bgl.vsnl.net.in)

