

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES



PAKISTAN INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS
OLD SIND ASSEMBLY BUILDING
BUNDER ROAD, KARACHI
PAKISTAN

No. 49

An Analysis of the District Census Reports
of East Pakistan

By

S.W.H. Zaidi

The Research Reports of the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics are circulated to inform interested persons with regard to research progress at the Institute. These reports may be freely circulated but they are not to be quoted without the permission of the author. Work on this manuscript is still in progress; comments are invited to improve the final version.

March 1966

PAKISTAN INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS
OLD SIND ASSEMBLY BUILDING
BUNDER ROAD, KARACHI-1
(PAKISTAN)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author, presently Head of the Communication Section, National Research Institute of Family Planning, Karachi, executed this study as Visiting Research Fellow at the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics in Karachi during Summer, 1964. He expresses his gratitude to Dr Karol Krotki, then Research Adviser at the PIDF, who helped not only in arranging the fellowship but also in designing of the project. Thanks are also due to Dr Warren Robinson, successor to Dr Krotki, who goaded and guided in the writing of the manuscript particularly section III and IV of the article which also contributed to the delay in its circulation. The study could not be completed without the pains-taking efforts of Mr.A. Razzak and A.D.Bhatti, Research Assistants of the PIDF, who tabulated and analysed part V and part IV of the DCRs respectively, and Mr. Wali Mohammad Rahi of Sweden Pakistan Family Welfare Project who did the laborious work of excellent typing of the manuscript a number of times. However, summarisation, compilation, analytic frame-work and the opinions expressed in this article are sole responsibility of the author, for the flaws of which he assumes entire responsibility.

THE ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRICT CENSUS REPORTS OF
EAST PAKISTAN

I. INTRODUCTION

Pakistan conducted her 2nd Population and Housing Census in 1960-61. The plan of the publication of census reports included not only Bulletins on specific features and main Volumes of regions, but also Reports which are supposed to be a comprehensive presentation of facts about districts. There are 17 Reports on East Pakistan, each relating to one district.

The Demographic Section of the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics arranged to have reviews written on different bulletins and volumes. A number of them have already appeared in various issues of the Pakistan Development Review (1,2,3,5,6,7 and 36). This article is another in the series. But it is different from the others in so far as it encompasses all the 17 volumes, while other articles were based on the Tables published in one (or two) release(s) from the 1961 census on some specific demographic, economic and social aspect. It seems, therefore, beyond the scope of this review to attempt an intensive critique of any single volume. Instead it presents some general statements about the purpose, summary and review of major findings, and a critical appreciation of the Reports.

This article is presented in two parts; one given in section II is critique of the general descriptive statement about the districts, the part which does not contain the statistics collected during the enumeration; the other, presented in section III, attempts to describe and analyse the census figures. In this section comparative study of the district and some generalizations and hypotheses are stated.

In the end, important conclusions and remarks are described in Section IV.

THE ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRICT CENSUS REPORTS OF
EAST PAKISTAN

I. INTRODUCTION

Pakistan conducted her 2nd Population and Housing Census in 1960-61. The plan of the publication of census reports included not only Bulletins on specific features and main Volumes of regions, but also Reports which are supposed to be a comprehensive presentation of facts about districts. There are 17 Reports on East Pakistan, each relating to one district.

The Demographic Section of the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics arranged to have reviews written on different bulletins and volumes. A number of them have already appeared in various issues of the Pakistan Development Review (1,2,3,5,6,7 and 36). This article is another in the series. But it is different from the others in so far as it encompasses all the 17 volumes, while other articles were based on the Tables published in one (or two) release(s) from the 1961 census on some specific demographic, economic and social aspect. It seems, therefore, beyond the scope of this review to attempt an intensive critique of any single volume. Instead it presents some general statements about the purpose, summary and review of major findings, and a critical appreciation of the Reports.

This article is presented in two parts; one given in section II is critique of the general descriptive statement about the districts, the part which does not contain the statistics collected during the enumeration; the other, presented in section III, attempts to describe and analyse the census figures. In this section comparative study of the district and some generalizations and hypotheses are stated.

In the end, important conclusions and remarks are described in Section IV.

II. DESCRIPTIVE CONTENT OF D.C.R.

The publication of a general report about each district

in one volume is a novel feature of the programme of publications of the 1961 census. The first Pakistan Census (1951) was confined in this respect to the presentation of village lists of each district giving meagre details about the population of each village (11).

Genesis:

The idea of publishing a separate report for each district, the basic unit of administration, originated in 1960 with R.D. Howe, the then Census Commissioner, who while admitting the ambitious nature of the project felt the tremendous value of the end-product. His scheme was to include vital statistics, cottage industries, and a larger number of maps, in addition to most of the details given in the present volumes.

In the meanwhile, S.M. Akram, Member Board of Revenue, West Pakistan, got interested in the work and suggested that the District Census Reports should be enlarged and converted into handy and businesslike District Gazetteers. But the Census organization was cognizant of its resource limitations for achieving this objective. It might be pointed out here that during the British Rule in the sub-continent, a gazetteer for each administrative district was published as a guide book for the civil administration. The main purpose was to present to the civil officers, a vivid picture of the area which might be of help to them in understanding of and in dealing with the people.

Although abandoning the idea of the Gazetteer, A. Rashid, who took over as census commissioner from Howe, pursued to its completion the publication of the present volumes. He was convinced about the "tremendous value of presenting the district in all its aspects in a handy volume, for the use of planners, administrators and the general public."

The emphasis, therefore, seems to have shifted from a Gazetteer for the executives, to a source book for planners. The value of demographic data for development planning cannot

be exaggerated. The District Census Reports showing Thana-wise statistics of various characteristics of population; age, sex, marital status, rural-urban, religions, places of birth, language, literacy, education and labour force. Housing statistics, relate to the number, size and composition of the household, the type and the tenure of the houses. In quite a few tables the figures of 1951 are also given.

The attempt is commendable particularly when one is apprized of the limitation in respect of personnel and resources at the disposal of the Census authorities. All the seventeen Districts Census Reports were published in a short span of time even before the main Census volumes started being released. The compilation must have been a stupendous task considering the numerous sources from which the informations were sought. It is unfortunate that the dates of the publication are not shown in the volumes. It could have been of value to mention the date of publication.

General Description

The seventeen volumes reviewed here are massive documents though differing in the number of pages. The largest one containing 1,000 pages relates to Mymensingh District (29), the largest district of the country with an area of 6,361 square miles and 8,069 villages. The smallest volumes, having 336 pages, is that of Chittagong Hill Tracts District (21) which extends over an area of 5,039 square miles with 407 villages. Obviously there seems to be a correspondence between the number of villages and the size of the publication, mainly because part V gives statistics for individual villages.

All the volumes have the same Foreword written by Abdur Rashid, Census Commissioner of Pakistan, and similar, though not exactly the identical, Introduction about the individual volume written by H.H. Noamani, Deputy Census Commissioner, East Pakistan. This portion includes acknowledgment to a large number of persons. Similarly, one finds appendices and ancillary pages identical in all the volumes.

One wonders whether it would not have been more appropriate and economical to publish these details in one small pamphlet to accompany a set of 17 volumes.

Comparability of Various Reports:

All the several reports were planned, most of the portions were compiled and all were edited at the Provincial Census Directorate. Hence there is a great amount of similarity in them.

The table of contents is almost the same for all of them. There are, of course, a few items included in some and omitted in others. The tables in Part II, III and IV are quite similar with the exception that there is frequently a change in arrangement. In a few ones, the urban and the rural tables are numbered separately. There are a few more tables for large cities and some tables like forests, irrigation, temperature and rainfall etc. of Part II are not presented in some; otherwise the tabular content of each Report is the same. But these minor divergences have resulted in the different numbers for the same type of tables in various volumes, a matter of a little inconvenience for reference and research.

East Pakistan districts as is generally known, are striking in their physical, economic and cultural affinity rather than divergence. Hence a lot of descriptions are remarkably similar.

One is, therefore, surprised to find a statement of personality and cultural differences among the districts. A detailed description of religious observances, socio-cultural habits, in some and not in others, keep the reader guessing whether they are the special features of the district concerned or it is the interest and selective perception of the individual writer. It is in this context that the editors owe an explanation to the research workers.

The list of departments mentioned under administration (Chapter I, Part I) does not show any fixed criteria. While

32 departments have been named in a district like Dinajpur, there is mention of only few departments in Chittagong Hill Tracts. In some districts only Provincial (Communication and Building Departments) roads are described, other districts mention also those maintained by the District Councils. Seldom is there a mention of roads maintained by the Union Councils, although they play quite a significant role in the life of the villages. Description of the climatic conditions seem to have different frames of reference for the different writers. The historical description of the district also has dissimilar treatment. In some local events have occupied prominence while in others it does not appear to be the narration of local history. Statements about the demand for an Independent Muslim State seems to be a little exaggerated in some districts. It is good to have mentioned the adjustment of district boundaries in the areas concerned. There is an obvious lack of a uniform standard in the selection of important towns. While a number of small market places have been described, important towns like Brahmanbaria in Comilla, Parbatipur in Dinajpur and Ishurdi in Pabna are omitted. The basis of mentioning Dharmasagar (a tank in Comilla town) and Sunderbans (an area in Khulna) as towns is not understandable.

Each volume is divided into five parts. Part I (General Description) consists of four chapters with descriptive statements, the first on historical geographical and economic aspects and departmental programmes. The second a description of human aspects. Chapter III mentions a few important places and Chapter IV is a detailed description of the district headquarter town. Part II contains 14 to 16 general tables on economic aspects of the district. These tables show the figures and statistics supplied by the government departments.

Part - III consists of thana wise and sub-division wise tables, nine in number (there are 20 tables in case of 5 districts) compiled from the 1960 Housing Census.

Part - IV has the largest number of tables, 41 to 49

in number, giving thanawise statistics obtained in population census.

Part - V is a list of villages of the district showing population and literary figures of the villages along with the locations of certain institutions and facilities.

The information contained in the volumes are supposedly illustrated with the help of 8 to 18 pages of photographs. The photographers should have been so selected as to portray the salient and characteristic features of the district concerned. Most of them are related to the life of the people. (Dacca volume (23) has strikingly interesting caption). But there seems hardly a justification for a preponderance of snaps relating to buildings, tombs and historical monuments: six out of a total of 13 photographs in Comilla (22), 12 out of 23 in Rajshahi (32), 6 out of 10 in Bogra (19) 9 out of 20 in Pabna (31) and 8 out of 21 in Khulna (27). There place lies not in a census publication, but in the souvenir distributed to the tourists. One cannot believe that there is such a great dearth of diversity as to necessitate the inclusion of two or three photographs of the same buildings and persons as in Sylhet (34), Pabna (31), Kushtia (28) and Noakhali (30).

The inclusion of pictures of persons belonging to different tribes in the Chittagong Hill Tracts (21), Mymensingh (29) and Dinajpur (24) Reports are certainly commendable. But the presentation of so many pictures of women particularly in festive dresses in Noakhali (30) and Faridpur (25) is not a true representation of the rural life in East Pakistan.

A large proportion of the pictures relate to the towns and cities while it is the rural life that should be illustrated.

Seeing the pictures of a variety of boats in the volume on Bakerganj (28) is undoubtedly an indication of the significance of riverine life of the district, but there would be very few readers who might be interested in this

detail or they might refer to D.C.R. for such information.

There is no plate relating to the growth of date-palm in Jessore (26), while it is mentioned as a most important product of the district. There are, on the other hand, three photos concerning cottage industries in Rangpur (33) which were not at all described in the text.

There is only one photo of primitive way of irrigation printed in the Rangpur (33) Report, but irrigation is not at all mentioned in the text of this report.

There seems to be a lack of the scenes depicting rural life and activity in most of the D.C.Rs.

When taken all the 17 DCRs of East Pakistan as a whole, the representative characters of the photographs might be visualized, but the individual volumes do not portray the picture. It appears that the pictures were selected upon the consideration of convenience and striking features, rather than an illustration of the district.

Maps:

Each volume has two maps (Dacca Volume has a city map as well) one topographic and the other economic. In the former subdivisional boundaries are prominently marked, different colours have been assigned to subdivisions, and thana boundaries are shown with thin lines. This is a useful and essential accompaniment to the descriptions. However, the maps are not without flaws. In quite a few there are misprints e.g., Comilla, Jessore and Faridpur. Errors of spelling and omissions of names occur in a few maps. There should be a uniform standard either to name district, province or country beyond international boundaries. This has not been kept in mind in case of India. In Khulna, 24-Pargana, in Dinajpur, Purnea, and in Rajshahi, Murshedabad districts of Bharat are named while in others the name of the Indian Province is shown in the map. In case of district boundaries in some maps sub-divisions are mentioned but not in others. The relief described in the texts are not always shown in the map. In Khulna broad gauge railway lines have been drawn with meter gauge symbol.

The economic map shows the intensity of the cultivation of crops by printing the name of the crop in different types in each sub-division. Yet it is surprising that the type of letters in many cases are not in accordance with the statistics given, e.g., Chittagong Hill Tracts, Khushtia, Faridpur and Pabna to mention only a few. The symbols relating to industry give no indication of the number or size of the industrial units nor do they seem to portray the industrial importance of the district as gauged by the number of persons employed. If the 17 maps are placed side by side, it is only the most penetrating eye that can mark the difference among them and it is quite probably that the differences may be due to errors in drawing.

Presentation:

The district census reports of East Pakistan were printed at different presses of Dacca. Still the uniformity in the standard has been maintained. The paper used is of very high quality, variety of types have been used to emphasise the significance of the figures and for the convenience of the reader. Spacing between the rows is strikingly useful. Boldness of the letters, headings and sub-headings has been used to advantage. Tables are very clear and self-explanatory.

It goes to the credit of the Pakistan Census Officer that the publications have maintained a high quality of presentation and the uniformity in the various volumes has been substantially achieved. But the press in East Pakistan does not seem to have attained a high standard of efficiency. Printing errors are certainly expected and may be excused. But it can be regretfully noted that in corrigenda, given after each part in all the volumes, minor and insignificant errors of punctuations, grammar and spellings, as in Rajshahi one, which are of little importance for an intelligent reader, have been mentioned, while serious errors have been overlooked. Printing errors abound in some of the volumes particularly Jessore, Dinajpur, Bogra and Rajshahi and some of the descriptive

pages have at least ten mistakes. A paragraph of 8 lines has six errors. Even the maps are not free from errors.

Sources of Data Presented:

The most striking and novel feature of these Reports is the presentation in one volume all sorts of relevant materials available about the district concerned. The source and method of collection of data are not the same for all the items.

Part I - General Description, which called for the greatest amount of labour, research and coordination is essentially a compilation rather than fully original writing. Many sections of the first chapter (Geography, History and Administration) are largely adaptations from the relevant District Gazetteers, particularly the sections on physical features, geography, geology, climate, flora and fauna and history. They have presumably been modified and seem to be brought upto date. A comparison with the source books only would reveal the contribution of the writers. The sections relating to the activities of the various government departments are mostly original writings based on informations supplied by the departments concerned. The Section on Basic Democracies is a new one. Chapter II of Part One giving a description of the people and their environment is, in most cases, the contribution of the Deputy Commissioners concerned. They might have relied on the District Gazetteers. But in view of the transition occurring in the country, they are probably rewritten. It has not been mentioned who was responsible for the selection of important places in chapter three. The Chapter on District Headquarter towns has been written by the Census Officer. Part I also includes photographs which were provided by the Deputy Commissioners and maps which were drawn by the census organization. Part One was compiled by the Zonal Deputy/Joint Director of Census and edited by the Provincial Director of Census. This part in all the Reports is, therefore, not of equal quality. The one for Dacca has additional contributions from specialists from the university and other professional institutions and is particularly scholarly in nature. The one

from Chittagong Hill Tracts has a detailed description of the various tribes. The varying degree of interest and competence of the authors has resulted in the difference in the quality of writing.

The table and statements constituting Part II, were obtained from the departments concerned and are largely statistical accompaniment of the description given in Chapter one, Part one. In some tables the figures are given for different years between 1947 and 1960. There are years for which the figures are missing. The reference period too is not identical in all the Reports. This might present serious problems in making comparisons. It could not probably be obviated in view of the heterogeneous character of the source even though they were compiled at the Provincial Directorate.

Part III containing the Housing Census Tables was compiled at the Provincial Hand Sorting Centre. The informations were obtained from the schedules of Housing Census 1960.

Part IV containing Population Tables were compiled at the Provincial Directorate of Census. The Data in this case were collected on the basis of 1961 Population Censuses enumeration. There is a great deal of uniformity in the Housing and Population Tables of all the District Census Reports.

Part V - Village Statistics was compiled by the Zonal Deputy/Joint Census Director concerned. The statistics on population, literacy and housing are the census figures. Other informations shown in symbols against each locality were collected from Union Councils and Union Committees. This involved the cooperation of persons not possessing technical competence. Hence there are limitations in this part.

Consistency of the Data:

The District Census Reports have attempted to present facts and figures, secured from different sources. There are some which appear in different sources. There are some which appear at different places in the same volumes. This writer

pages have at least ten mistakes. A paragraph of 8 lines has six errors. Even the maps are not free from errors.

Sources of Data Presented:

The most striking and novel feature of these Reports is the presentation in one volume all sorts of relevant materials available about the district concerned. The source and method of collection of data are not the same for all the items.

Part I - General Description, which called for the greatest amount of labour, research and coordination is essentially a compilation rather than fully original writing. Many sections of the first chapter (Geography, History and Administration) are largely adaptations from the relevant District Gazetteers, particularly the sections on physical features, geography, geology, climate, flora and fauna and history. They have presumably been modified and seem to be brought upto date. A comparison with the source books only would reveal the contribution of the writers. The sections relating to the activities of the various government departments are mostly original writings based on informations supplied by the departments concerned. The Section on Basic Democracies is a new one. Chapter II of Part One giving a description of the people and their environment is, in most cases, the contribution of the Deputy Commissioners concerned. They might have relied on the District Gazetteers. But in view of the transition occurring in the country, they are probably rewritten. It has not been mentioned who was responsible for the selection of important places in chapter three. The Chapter on District Headquarter towns has been written by the Census Officer. Part I also includes photographs which were provided by the Deputy Commissioners and maps which were drawn by the census organization. Part One was compiled by the Zonal Deputy/Joint Director of Census and edited by the Provincial Director of Census. This part in all the Reports is, therefore, not of equal quality. The one for Dacca has additional contributions from specialists from the university and other professional institutions and is particularly scholarly in nature. The one

has attempted to make certain random comparisons. A number of discrepancies were noted some of which may be mentioned here.

The administrative units have been shown under "at a glance", "Administration", "Basic Democracies" and "Village Statistics". One would expect some correspondence in the figures given in the same volume at difference places. Unfortunately such is not the position. The number of subdivisions, and the number of Thanas shown in "at a glance" do not correspond to the numbers mentioned in Chapter 2, Part I (Administration and Basic Democracies) in Chittagong, Noakhali and Khulna. In some columns, the page "at a glance" shows the number of unions while in others it is Union Councils. The Summary village statistics mention Unions with a note that the number includes union and town committees. But most of the figures of unions do not tally in several district reports. In Jessore the number of villages included in "at a glance" are not equal to the number in village statistics.

Another category of data where inconsistencies are numerous relates to the total population in 1951. In the table showing the figure, the population of non-Pakistani has been presumably excluded in Rural-Urban distribution as indicated in the footnote to the relevant table. Yet in atleast 11 districts the figures in the two tables are not the same.

Roads given in the tables are only those maintained by the C & B Department. Those of local bodies have been mentioned in general description in only some of the D.C.Rs. Even then the road mileage shown in the different sections does not agree in Noakhali, Khulna, Jessore and Kushtia.

Numbers of schools and colleges mentioned in "at a glance" does not tally the figures in Tables and Description in Chapter 2 of Part I of the Reports of Dinajpur, Chittagong, Comilla, Rajshahi.

Figures about agricultural labour force in "at a

glance" and in Table IV-41 of Pabna do not agree. Similar is the case about non-agricultural labour force in Chittagong Hill Tracts (2).

Total areas of the district mentioned in description and in "at a glance" are not equal in case of Chittagong, Noakhali, Faridpur and Rajshahi.

In Noakhali malaria has been mentioned as first common disease. But under 'Health' it is said to be hardly any problem in the district. In Khulna the text describes tank irrigation as the most important source, but the table shows largest acreage under other sources.

There are tables which show the numbers of educational institutions, electric supply companies, post and telegraph offices, which are shown in symbols against each locality in the village statistics. These informations could be of quite significance had they been complete. The numbers of localities having primary schools, post offices, telegraph offices, Dispensaries, Hospitals and Electricity bear no relation with the numbers shown in other tables of Part II. The incompleteness of village statistics can be imagined from the fact that it shows only one locality with electricity in 5 districts and no such locality in the remaining 12 districts; no locality with telegraph has been shown in 3 districts and no hospital has been shown in one district.

Consistency with other sources:

Reliability of the facts and figures in a report are estimated by making comparisons with other sources. A number of tables presented in the DCRs have previously appeared in other census Bulletins. A comparison was made between the figures in these Reports and the Bulletins. It is regrettable to find several figures not agreeing in the two publications.

Table I, in Bulletin No. 5 (15) and Table IV-37 (in many reports) showed the number of working persons 10 and over. The figures did not at all corroborate at least for the Mymensingh and Rajshahi Districts, while there were smaller

discrepancies in case of Chittagong, Dacca, Dinajpur, Khulna and Sylhet.

The literacy and Education figures published in Bulletin No.4, (14) did not agree with those shown in the Reports:

There did not appear any correspondence between the latest figures given in Table 3 Part II of these reports and those given in Tables 13 of the Agricultural Census Report 1960 (8). Total cropped area for the whole province was about 257 lakhs in the former as compared to about 279 lakhs in the latter. It was higher for some districts and lower for the others. Similar was the case about number of working persons. (Table 48 in the 1960 Agricultural Census Report of East Pakistan and Table IV-41 of the Reports).

Comprehensiveness:

The Census organisation in Pakistan has released six bulletins, each pertaining to specific fields. The first and the second (12) gave figures about total population and rural-urban, the third bulletin (11) provided data about age, sex and marital status, the fourth (13) about literacy and education, the fifth (15) about Economic characteristics, the sixth about cottage industries (16)

Being a compendium of information about the district, the District Census Reports have attempted to present all the information about the individual district in one volume. A comparison of the individual bulletins and the DCRs shows that the tables printed in the latter are clearer and more detailed than those presented in the former. This reflects the desire on the part of census organisation to make improvements and provide as much information to the readers as are available from time to time.

The DCRs have, as noted, attempted to present information available from non-Census sources as well. But in quite a few cases, important figures are lacking. In the table showing agricultural product, one comes across a year when the

acreage of some important crops like jute is missing, (e.g., 1957-58 Dinajpur). The compilers have not shown whether or not they were available. The two assumptions made a material difference in the analysis and interpretation of the data. Similar is the case in the tables showing Cooperative Societies, Irrigation, Forests etc. The latest figures in the different districts also do not belong to the same year. The omission of certain tables in part II of many DCRs is understandable and can be attributed to the non-significance of certain informations.

The tables on large and small scale industries are least satisfactory. There is no definition or criteria indicated in the table to explain the classification (2). The assignment of a separate category of industries under Government and Local Bodies seem to be of little relevance. "In at a glance" the number of units has been shown, while in the tables in Part II, only the average number of labour daily employed is mentioned.

The Office of the Census released Statistics of Cottage Industries as Census Bulletins No.6 which gives districtwise figures. But it is inexplicable to exclude the information from the DCRs. The information contained in the Bulletin (16) is certainly of higher relevance than several other details about the district given in the DCRs.

In addition to informations available elsewhere, the DCRs have a special feature of presenting statistics on population by sex, numbers of literate, houses and households in each of the villages in the districts. Besides specific symbols are printed against each locality denoting the presence of educational institution, post and telegraph offices, dispensaries and hospitals, dak bungalows or circuit house, union council or committee, police station or outpost, railway station or steamer ghat, tubewell, electricity and historical sites. These are undoubtedly useful for a score of purposes. But as hinted earlier, there is reason to believe that they

are far from complete. These details are based on data supplied by the Union Councils through local administration. The publications makes no claim about the up-to-date nature or comprehensiveness of these details. But no leads are mentioned about the kinds of error involved. The symbols are not indicators of numbers of such institutions in each village. In case of towns the symbols in such cases are marked against the union committee or wards, while in others they are shown against the entire urban locality concerned.

Value of the District Census Reports:

The most pertinent question in the review is to examine the purpose envisaged in planning the District Census Reports and to assess the extent to which it seems to have achieved the objectives. As noted they seem intended mainly for practical purposes - planning and administration.

An analysis of the figures can show the trends in respects of size, and quality of the population. These data can be of valuable assistance in planning for housing, education, agriculture, cooperatives, irrigation, communications, land reforms, health and welfare of physically disabled at grassroots level.

The villagewise figures given in Part V can give an indispensable lead to the needs of underdeveloped villages in respect of, among other things, educational facilities for the children as well as for the adults, tubewells, the main source of supply of drinking water, post offices, electricity, housing, hospitals and dispensaries. The mention of railway and steamer stations could be of use for the planners had they been supplemented with road transport stations.

The general tables presented in Part II could serve as useful references had they been complete and upto-date, and if they could be available for smaller units. The informations can also serve, if considered complete, as a bench-mark for evaluation of evaluation of future development plans and employment policies.

But a planner is seriously handicapped by the unreliability and non-comparability of some of the data. The incompleteness of the data and the inconsistency of figures are unpardonable from his point of view.

A planner should not confine himself to one source of data when other avenues are open. He feels confident if there is corroboration among various sources. Besides internal inconsistency of data in the DCRs, as pointed out, he is bewildered by the wide divergence in the data reported in the Report of the Agricultural Census 1960 (8), and the information on production and agricultural labour force given in the DCRs. Similarly the figures on industry collected by the Directorate of Industries do not agree with the statistics in the Reports (2). Similar is the case with the literacy figures of the census and those released by the Central Bureau of Education (9). The problem is rendered more difficult by the fact that the definitions in various publications are not comparable.

The paragraphs on Land Reforms and Basic Democracies are mentioned in almost all the Reports. About Basic Democracies it has been mentioned that:

"as a result of introduction of the system, great change has taken place in the outlook of the people toward the administration and the country. They have come to realise their responsibilities for development and welfare of the country, and the spirit of patriotism is taking firm root in their mind."

Another category of users whom the DCRs are intended for is that of administrators. Part I seems to be particularly designed for them and hence a heavy leaning on District Gazetteers. It is admitted that most of the revisions and

modifications have been incorporated by the administrators who had an intimate knowledge of the area. One may contend that the administrators are in possession of more detailed, comprehensive and upto-date information. There is a greater reason to believe so since the establishment of Thana, District and Divisional Councils in the scheme of Basic Democracies. It is in these institutions where the officials representing various departments and the public representative from all areas pool their knowledge and experiences in formulating policies and schemes. The administration must be in possession of better maps than those printed in the DCRs. The mention of location of certain institutions like Police Stations, union council office, dak bungalows, railway and steamer stations, schools, post offices, with the village statistics in Part V might be of help to the administrators. But the incomplete nature of these informations mitigate their value. It seems that the presentation of so many informations in one volume, may stir up an enthusiasm in the administrators to collect and keep in a compiled form such data for their ready use rather than to refer to relevant sources as and when the need arises.

The other category of users prominently mentioned is that of general public, a term comprehensive enough to include any and all types of citizens. This cannot be the lay public constituting at least 90% of the population, who are not conversant with English Language. It can also be of little significance to those who lack the technical competence of understanding the meanings of maps, symbols and figures, particularly those presented in tabular forms. This leaves a small population of intellegentsia and enlightened citizens interested in the facts about the areas.

A perceptive glance at the District Census Reports does reveal a category not mentioned but who might avail of the volumes as a handy companion. This can be that of tourists and travellers. The selection of the photographs seems to have

Page 107

this class in mind. A lot of descriptions seems to be geared to their needs. Chapter II (Part I) could be of value to a stranger only. The description of religion, customs and ceremonies, cultural habits, superstitions, dress and dwellings are more familiar and more accurately known to any citizen of Pakistan than attempted in these volumes. The reference of the cultural traits in this connection is of particular relevance. There are hasty generalizations about peoples of different districts. People of Noakhali have been described as 'highly enterprising and adventurous'; those of Bakerganj' passionate, daring, sentimental, God-fearing, conservative and fatalistic'; those of Jessore 'lethargic, simple, kind-hearted, artistic and contented'; of Khulna 'honest, Hard-working, God fearing and simple'; of Kushtia 'hospitable, kind-hearted and sympathetic'; of Faridpur 'sluggish and easy going'; of Dinajpur 'fatalistic and lacking initiative'; of Rangpur 'credulous, an easy prey to quacks, headman and touts'; of Pabna having a natural urge for poetic and artistic things, hardy, courageous, modest, enterprising yet home-loving. There are only some districts notably Noakhali, Jessore, Khulna, Rangpur, Bogra and Pabna where Purdah is said to be prevalent in middle class. Similarly there are districts like Bakerganj and Rajshahi where influence of Pirs and Mullas is mentioned while in some, Dacca for example, it is denied to have any importance. Polygamy is not uncommon in Noakhali and Bakerganj.

It is hard to picture in this period of cultural transition, social interaction and mass communication that such general statements can have much value.

The description of ceremonies like marriage and Aqiqa in some Reports can hardly generate interest in general readers.

The chapters on the Important Places and the Headquarters town seem to be of significance to the tourists and temporary visitors and of little use to any other groups. The mention of localities with railway station, steamer ghats,

airports, post and telegraph offices, dak bungalows and rest houses, monuments and excavations, seat of police station, police outpost, can help only the above class.

III CENSUS FIGURES

In this section, as stated earlier, a summary of parts of the statistical reports of the districts is given. The figures are based on the enumeration conducted during Housing Census 1960 and Population Census 1961. Some comparisons, generalisations and hypotheses are also stated.

Housing:

Part III of the District Census Reports constitutes the tables prepared on the basis of Housing Census 1960. In this operation in Urban areas total count of houses and structures was conducted, while for Rural areas the estimates were prepared on the basis of 10% sample of total count 14.

Tables give the number of houses and structures of various types for all areas, as well as for urban areas, and the averages are calculated on the basis of population count at that period. In urban areas of East Pakistan, the average number of persons per household ranged from 4.77 in Chittagong Hill Tracts to 6.57 in Sylhet (Table 1). The size of the households did not seem to bear clear relationship with the size of the urban localities. Dacca the most urban district had 5.62 persons per household, Chittagong 5.29, Khulna 5.35 and Rajshahi 6.02. This may be due to the fact that the workers in industrial towns generally leave their families in the rural area, thereby reducing the size of the households. In rural areas the variation is smaller. The average size of the households of 4.82 was the smallest in Bakerganj, and the largest was 5.66 for Chittagong Hill Tracts. Generally the size in all the districts was around 5.50. It appears that there was some inverse relationship between the size of the household in urban and the rural area. The Districts with

large household had comparatively smaller households in rural areas.

There seems to be a greater variation between the districts in respect of average number of persons per house in urban area. The smallest number, 4.65, was again for Chittagong Hill Tracts and the largest, 6.19, for Jessore, while Sylhet ranked second with 6.14 persons. The districts with large urban localities do not rank very high here as well. Dacca had 5.37, Chittagong 4.99, Khulna 5.52 and Rajshahi 5.80. For rural areas the largest number was 5.67 persons per house in Pabna, and the smallest was 5.03 in Bogra, in the same administrative division. The inverse relationship in the sizes between urban and rural areas was not obvious in this respect.

The average size of the family was from 4 to 5 in all the districts in East Pakistan, from 4.12 in Bogra to 4.74 in Pabna. In urban areas it ranged between 2.74 in Chittagong Hill Tracts and 4.81 in Rajshahi. The urban areas of Chittagong, Dacca, and Khulna are among the districts with smaller number of persons per family. East Pakistan with large size of the families and smaller size of the houses has very few rooms available for each household. The average number of rooms per household was 1.06 for Kushtia and 2.19 for Rangpur.

The housing figures do not warrant any generalization about the nature of variations. The districts of East Pakistan are marked with homogeneity in housing, Rajshahi division appears to present some remarkable differences among the districts.

The District Census Reports also show the number of houses according to type of structure. Nine categories were thus formed. All the districts of Dacca Division had the largest number of house belonging to type IV (wall of kutcha bricks, G.I. sheets etc. with roof of tiles, G.I. sheets and wood) while all the districts of Chittagong Division had the

largest number of type V structures (walls of wood, bamboo and thatch) probably due to the availability of these materials from the nearby hilly areas. Rajshahi district was the only one which had the largest number of houses belonging type VI (kutchha brick walls and roof with bamboo and thatch). In the Khulna and Rajshahi divisions some districts had a larger number of type IV structures and others had a larger number of type V. The largest category of house structure was unclassified in Barisal, Khulna and Pabna, may be due to riverine nature of these districts.

Total Population:

Part IV of the District Census Reports is comprised of various tables prepared from the enumeration slips of 1961 Census Population tables as shown in 1951 Census figures in many cases for sake of comparison.

The total population of each district increased during the decade. By virtue of its size Mymensingh district which ranked highest with a population of 5,798 thousand in 1951 (10) retains the same position with a population of 7,019 thousand. Chittagong Hill Tracts District was at the bottom as in 1951 with 288 thousand people in 1951 and 385 thousand in 1961. Most of the districts almost retain their position. Noakhali which, with 2,276 thousand people in 1951, ranked 9th was relegated to 11th position in 1961 when the enumerated population was 2,383 thousand. With the overall increase of population in all the districts the density has increased. Table 2 shows density of population in 1951 and 1961 and the variation during the decade. The highest density of 1,768 persons per square mile was in Dacca followed by 1,693 in Comilla. The position was reverse in 1951 when the density of population was 1461 in Comilla followed by 1,413 in Dacca. This is probably the result of greater urbanisation of Dacca. The exceptionally low density of 56 of Chittagong Hill Tracts in 1951 rose to 76. The next was Khulna where the density in 1961 was 526 as compared to 446 in 1951. In absolute numbers the growth in the density

of population during the decade has been largest, 355 persons per square mile, in Dacca followed by 238 in Rangpur and 232 in Comilla. Other districts where the density rose by more than 200 persons per square mile were Jessore (217) and Kushtia (207) where the density in 1951 was not very high and could therefore be the result of migration. The districts where the rise in density was lower than 100 were Chittagong Hill Tracts (20), Khulna (80), Noakhali (88) and Sylhet (90).

Sex Ratio:

In the census of Pakistan the sex ratio was calculated in unconventional manner (6). Instead of giving masculinity ratio (males per 100 females), the femininity ratio (females per 1,000 males) has been given. For the whole of East Pakistan the sex ratio has shown a tendency to balance out from 911 females for 1000 males in 1951 to 930 females in 1961. The first Pakistan census showed an unusual low proportion of women leading to a consensus, among the statisticians and demographers of sex-selective under-enumeration (4). Special efforts were made in 1961 census to minimize this error. This was still far more unbalanced than in other countries of the world (35, 37). The possibility of improvement in female life expectancy cannot be ruled out. Table 3 gives the sex ratio by district, according to 1961 census. Yet two districts of East Pakistan registered a further imbalance in 1961 census. The number of females for 1,000 males in Khulna fell from 913 in 1951 to 907 in 1961, while the total population registered an increase of 18.0%. The situation is much more astonishing in Chittagong Hill Tracts District where the ratio fell from 872 to 815, while the population grew by 34%, the highest after Rangpur which showed an increase of 39.1%. Incidentally these two districts are the ones which had the preponderance of non-Muslim population and have a fairly large forested area. Chittagong Hill tracts possessed the highest masculinity ratio in both the Pakistan censuses. Within the districts there is a large variation in this respect. Only two thanas, Lama

and Naikhongchhare in the Bandraban subdivision have shown improvement of the sex ratio. All the others have larger percentage of males in 1961. It may partly be due to a larger female mortality or migration. But the most obvious reason seems to be the urbanisation of the area with the setting up of Karnaphuli Paper Mills at Chandraghona and Karnaphuli Hydroelectric Project at Kaptai. The sex ratio of Chandraghona Thana decreased from 928 in 1951 to 606 in 1961, and that of Rangamati Thana from 838 to 785. In Kulna, also, the sex ratio has improved in all the thanas except in Daulatpur, Renpel and Sarankhola. The biggest drop was in Daulatpur, where the number of females per 1,000 males decreased from 931 in 1951 to 636 in 1961. Daulatpur it may be pointed, is the industrial suburb of Khulna. The migration of industrial labour, therefore, largely accounts for the fall of sex ratio in the two districts of East Pakistan.

Among the remaining 15 districts, the highest masculinity ratio of 973 was recorded in Noakhali. It has also shown the greatest improvement since 1951 when there were 909 females for 1000 males. This might quite reasonably be due to the migratory character of Noakhali males, who can be predominantly found in labour force all over the country. With the accelerated development activities in the province and job openings for East Pakistanis in the other wing, this can be the most probable explanation. Other districts, where more than 950 women were recorded per 1,000 male population size, were Faridpur (955), Comilla (954), Bogra (953) and Rajshahi (953). These are the districts which are considered less industrialized districts.

Age specific Sex Ratio:

In all the districts of East Pakistan the number of females was smaller than that of males, for all ages taken together. But the story is not identical at different ages. Only in case of Chittagong Hill Tracts, the male population

was larger for all age-groups. For Dacca and Chittagong, the two largest and most industrialised districts, the male population exceeded female population in all five-year groups from age 5 onwards. This tendency was found in Kushtia and Khulna, from the age of 20 years. Dinajpur, Rangpur, Rajshahi and Jessore recorded larger male population in all groups from the age of 25. This was true for Bogra, Pabna, Bakerganj, Mymensingh and Sylhet from the age of 30. But Faridpur, Comilla and Noakhali recorded larger male population continuously only from age 35. This could probably be explained by considering the economic aspect of the districts. Dacca, Chittagong and Khulna are the most industrial and urban centres, whereas Faridpur, Comilla and Noakhali are known to be residential towns, where people leave their families while seeking their livelihood in other districts.

One of the peculiarities of the census population was that 7 out of 17 districts recorded more females than males less than one year old, and 14 districts showed larger female population. In almost all the population studied by demographers, the male population was larger at early ages (37). The same phenomenon is observed in respect of the age structures of 0 and 1-4 to women of all ages were higher than those of males population in all the districts.

But in age groups 5-9 years, all the districts recorded larger male population. The same was observed for 10-14 years except in Kushtia. The larger female population in this district probably tipped the balance in favour of males so much so that Kushtia had the preponderance of males from age 20 onwards. When the age structures are considered the female percentages were larger in all the districts except Noakhali, Pabna and Rajshahi for groups 5-9, but the male percentages were higher than female percentages for age-groups 10-14.

In the age group 15-19, the females again emerge the majority in 13 districts. In group 20-24, this was observed

in 12 districts and, in 8 districts in age-group 25-29, the district was the enumerated female population larger than the male population beyond age 30. The same is not true if stated as percentages of populations in the age-group to the populations of all ages, calculated for the two sexes separately. The males percentages were higher for age groups 15-19 in all the districts except Chittagong where the population in this age group was 7.44 for females as against 8.32 for male. The same was true for age-group 20-24. Here the percentages of population were higher for males than for females except in Chittagong and Chittagong Hill Tracts. The trend continues to the group 25-29. But the number of districts where the female percentages were lower than male percentages increased in number. Such districts were Chittagong Hill Tracts, Jessore, Khulna and Kushtia.

As regards age-group 30-34, the percentage of female populations in this age-group was lower than the percentage of male population for the province as a whole. But the same is not true for all the districts. All the districts of Khulna and Rajshahi Divisions, the districts of Dacca and Chittagong Hill Tracts showed this tendency. This age-group seems to be the critical one in this respect.

Beyond age 35, except in a few cases, the age-structure of the two sexes was such that percentages of female populations were lower than the male percentages.

These observations confirm that the life expectancy of female population of East Pakistan is lower than the males. A smaller total female population, therefore, is understandable in view of mortality conditions of women. But their preponderance at certain earlier ages can hardly be explained. One explanation could be misenumeration. This error could well be due to deliberate sex-selective mis-statement of ages by the women or their heads of the households. If the women, as is generally observed in this culture, are stated to be younger than in actuality, specially at young ages, their

distribution will be pressed downwards. If some of the females who were enumerated in age-groups 15-19, 20-24 and 25-29 were placed in upper age-groups, the ratio in their disfavour at upper age-groups would be reduced, and the low masculinity ratio from 15-29 would be improved. Similarly if those enumerated 0-5 were moved upwards the high masculinity ratio 5-14 and low ratio 0-5 would be better balanced. This could then be closer to the age-sex composition of the population found in other countries.

If one goes along finding women aged 5-14 years to balance the sex composition of that age, he is by force of his own argument prompted to inflate the male population in age-groups 0-4 and 15-29. This seems to be only balancing the account regardless of the validity of the argument. Of course, the probability of sex-selective enumeration error for the groups 5-9 and 10-14 (where the enumerator might have been tempted to suppress the age of male persons to obviate the cumbersome duty of filling the reverse side of the enumeration card containing questions about economic activities) (4,7) and the non-declaration of unmarried young girls by the heads of the household on grounds of cultural values is not ruled out. But the understatement of ages of females is a more widely known phenomenon in Pakistani culture. Error in giving the age of one female in the family is likely to be reflected in the ages of others.

If the error is attributed to the understatement of ages, the life table of females would show a different mortality schedule and life expectancy and sex-ratio at birth will be more in line with other populations. This seems the more likely possibility.

Rural-urban

Rural population as shown in Table 4 increased as one would expect, in all the districts of East Pakistan during the decade. The percent increase was 20.2 for the province as a whole. The largest percent increase was 32.1%

in Jessore followed by Kushtia (30.7) and Rangpur (30.4).

The position is not the same in respect of Urban population. In absolute numbers the most striking increase was in case of Dacca, where the Urban population registered a rise of .34 million (83.2%) from 4,11,372 in 1951 to 7,53,798 in 1961. The Urban population of Barisal and Dinajpur has shown a decrease of 13,010 and 4,592 in number or by 9.8% and 6.0% respectively. There was no urban area in Chittagong Hill Tracts in 1951 but 2 localities were designated as Urban in 1961. The percent increase in Urban population in East Pakistan was 45.1. The largest variation since 1951 was in Khulna 150.0% and Jessore 101.3% and Dacca 83.2%. This could be due to industrialization of Khulna and Dacca. Jessore is closely linked with Khulna by good communications.

Narayanganj (in Dacca district) and Khulna attained the position of Class I cities (population more than 1 lakhs), Comilla, Mymensingh and Rajshahi have risen to the status of Class II localities (population more than 50,000 and less than 1 lakhs) and Sylhet, Faridpur and Jessore have become Class III cities (population more than 25,000 but less than 50,000) in 1961. In all there were 3 Class I, 5 class II, 15 class III, 23 class IV and 21 class V urban localities. There were 10 localities which had a population of less than 5,000 but were classified as urban areas.

Place of Birth:

Place of Birth:

A rough indicator of the migration could be the statement of the respondents about the district they were born in. In this paper the figures have been calculated and provided in Table 5 for those born in the district of enumeration, born in other districts of East Pakistan and born in India. Comilla, Noakhali, Mymensingh and Bakerganj each reported more than 98% of the population having the same district of birth and enumeration. None of these districts was affected in extent by Partition and had a predominantly

Muslim population before Independence. The district at the lower end in this respect were Chittagong Hill Tracts (89.3%), Kushtia (88.5%) and Dinajpur (89.9%). The first one was the only district where more than 10% of the population was born in other districts of the province. This might be due to the migration of workers in tea garden, Karnaphuli Hydro-electric Project at Kaptai, and Karnaphuli Paper Mills at Chandraghona. These industries might not employ a large number of persons, but the fact became significant due to smallness of the population of the district. The smaller proportion in case of Kushtia and Dinajpur might be due to a comparatively larger population which migrated from India. These two districts registered the largest percent of people (7.76 and 4.52 respectively who had their place of birth in India.

The districts whose boundaries were affected by partition, particularly Kushtia, Sylhet, Dinajpur, Rajshahi and Rangpur had comparatively larger population that was born in other districts of East Pakistan (exceeding 3% in all cases). This aspect of Chittagong, Dacca, Khulna and Jessore might be accounted by the industrialisation of these areas. The only other district where more than 3% people were born in other districts of East Pakistan was Bogra, the smallest district (in area) of the province. Probably some small factories and railway centres caused this situation.

Religious Composition of Population:

Residents of all the districts of East Pakistan, excepting Chittagong Hill Tracts were predominantly Muslims, males as well as females, in 1961 as shown in Table 6 as in 1951 shown in Table 7.

The population of Kushtia had 91.10% Muslims in 1951 and 92% in 1961 the highest proportion in the province. Chittagong Hill Tracts had 6.3% Muslims in 1951 and 11.77 in 1961, the lowest proportion of Muslims in the province. The Hindu population of the district exceeded the Muslims

population in 1951, but was smaller in 1961. The largest group in this district consisted of other religions mostly Buddhists who accounted for 78.12% of total population in 1951 and 73.22 in 1961. The position of Kushtia could be due to the partition of the district of Nadia of undivided Bengal out of which this new Pakistani district was carved. Among the districts with low majority of Muslim population Khulna had 54.43% Muslims which in 1951 rose to 60.2% in 1961. Among the non-Muslim population, Chittagong Hill Tracts had Buddhist as the largest group. All other districts of Chittagong division had Hindus as the largest minority group. In Bacca, Bogra, Rajshahi and Pabna the population of Hindus and Scheduled Castes were nearly equal. The scheduled castes were the largest non-Muslim group in Faridpur, Barisal, Jessore, Khulna, Dinajpur and Rangpur. In the district of Pabna and Rajshahi the Hindu population was larger than the Scheduled Castes in 1951, but became smaller in 1961. Except in Chittagong Hill Tracts the Christians constituted less than 1% of the population in all districts both in 1951 and in 1961.

The proportion of Muslim population of all the districts increased in and the percent of Hindus population decreased in almost all the cases except slight increase in Bogra and Dinajpur, the largest decline was in the districts of Chittagong Division and the smallest in Rajshahi Division. Percent decline occurred in case of Scheduled Castes population in all the districts. The christian population, although smaller in percentage, showed an increase in almost all the districts.

But in number, the minority population did not decrease in all the districts. As regards Hindus the total population enumerated in 1961 was smaller than that in 1951 in Comilla, Noakhali, Faridpur and Mymensingh. The Scheduled Castes population decreased in all the district of Chittagong Division (except Chittagong District), Barisal; Bogra, Dinajpur, Pabna and Rangpur. This might be the indication of migration of these community from East Pakistan particularly

from Chittagong Division. Since in all the districts there were larger number of males as is observed in the population of the subcontinent there does not appear to be a sex-selective migration.

Literacy:

The definition of literacy in the 1961 census was not identical to 1951 census.* Whereas any person able to read printed words in any language (including) Arabic was counted as literate in 1951, only those who could read with comprehension were considered literate in 1961.

figures of 1961 are not comparable to 1951. The percentage of literate persons in the total population of aged 5 and over as shown in Table 8 ranged from 15.3 in Chittagong Hill Tracts to 27.2 in Khulna followed by 26.4 in Chittagong. The comparatively high percentage of literacy in Chittagong can probably be explained by the introduction of compulsory free primary education in that district before Independence. Khulna in pre-Independence period was considered to be comparatively better off districts socio-economically. It has probably left a mark. This can be visualized from the figures of students attending school, and colleges. The percentage of persons attending educational institution in 1961 to the school-going age population was not the highest. Noakhali, Chittagong and Bogra were better placed having 7.29, 6.89 and 6.95 percent respectively compared to 6.62 Khulna. The low percentage of Chittagong Hill Tracts is understandable in view of the large backward tribal population. Other districts with less than 20% literate population were Faridpur (17.8), Mymensingh (17.3), Kushtia (15.4), Pabna (17.1) and Rangpur (18.9). Division-wise, Dacca occupies the lowest position. If the city of Dacca is excluded, the position will be still worse. Khulna

* The analysis of the 1961 literacy figures was done on the basis of other criteria by Miss Jamila Akhtar and Dr. M. S. Jillani in their reports (1, 5) for comparison with 1951 statistics.

and Chittagong divisions were almost on equal footing, each having a district with the first two (Khulna and Chittagong) and the last two positions in the province (Kushtia and Chittagong Hill Tracts).

The district Census Reports present tables showing the number and percent of persons of specified age-groups who were reported to be attending schools and colleges in 1961. This is presented in Table 9. The highest percentage of population recorded as students was in age-group 10-14 years in all the districts for both the sexes. This could be explained probably not by the fact that the spread of education has dwindled, but by an analysis of the age-distribution of population. There is a general consensus in varying degree, about the inflation of figures in age-group 5-9, at the cost of 10-14 due to the demand from the enumerators to fill up the reverse side of schedules, meant for labour force informations from all persons aged 10 and over. Hence it is reasonable to suspect that it was the illiterates and uneducated who were not very accurate in age statements to have given temptation to the enumerators to record their ages below 10 years rather than over. Secondly the 5-9 group includes a large number of children who do not, but might later enter the school. May-be some who were not then five year old were reported in the group due to numerical bias.

Percentage of students of all ages attending schools or colleges to the total population was the lowest, 2.58, in Chittagong Hill Tracts and highest in Noakhali, 7.29. The districts where the students comprised more than 6% of the population were Chittagong, Khulna, Dinajpur, Rajshahi and Bogra in that order whereas the district with less than 5% students were Mymensingh, Faridpur and Kushtia. The students in the age-group 5-9 were again the highest, 14.40, in Noakhali and the lowest 4.65 in Chittagong Hill Tracts. The districts with more than 10% of the age-group 5-9 attending schools were Bogra, Dinajpur, Sylhet, Comilla, Khulna and

Chittagong in that order. For age 10-14 the percentage of students to the population of that age ranged from 26.09 in Khulna and to 8.98 in Chittagong Hill Tracts. The district with more than 20% student population in that age group were Noakhali, Bogra, Barisal, Comilla, Chittagong, Dinajpur, Jessore and Dacca. Besides Chittagong Hill Tracts, the only district with less than 15% student population was Pabna.

In regard to age-group 15-19, which should have a large proportion of college-going students, the percentage of students varied from 11.47 in Noakhali to 3.21 in Chittagong Hill Tracts. Other districts showing more than 10% of the student population in this age-group were Chittagong, Comilla and Barisal.

It would, therefore, appear that most of the districts of Chittagong Division had a large percentage of school-going population in upper-age groups and districts of Dacca Division generally lagged behind at all ages.

Age Distribution:

The age distribution in 1961 census population has shown astonishing differences from 1951 population both in East and West Pakistan particularly at earlier age-groups. This has led to varying interpretations and speculations by the demographers (4,7). A comparative study of the districts in respect of age composition of the population is given here in Table 10, 12, and 13 reveal the nature of the differences between the districts. Percent of population reported age zero (less than one year) ranged from 1.92 in Dinajpur district to 3.38 in Kushtia for males (Table 12), 2.14 for Dinajpur to 3.72 in Kushtia for females, (Table 13) and 2.02 in Dinajpur and 3.55 in Kushtia for both sexes (Table 10). The population 0-4 for the two districts was 15.58 in the former and 15.67 in the latter. The provincial average for 0-4 population was 17.38 as compared to 16.49 in case of Dinajpur and 18.29 in case of Kushtia. Hence it is not likely that there was an error for the adjacent group. One may only guess that

Chittagong in that order. For age 10-14 the percentage of students to the population of that age ranged from 26.09 in Khulna and to 8.98 in Chittagong Hill Tracts. The district with more than 20% student population in that age group were Noakhali, Bogra, Barisal, Comilla, Chittagong, Dinajpur, Jessore and Dacca. Besides Chittagong Hill Tracts, the only district with less than 15% student population was Pabna.

In regard to age-group 15-19, which should have a large proportion of college-going students, the percentage of students varied from 11.47 in Noakhali to 3.21 in Chittagong Hill Tracts. Other districts showing more than 10% of the student population in this age-group were Chittagong, Comilla and Barisal.

It would, therefore, appear that most of the districts of Chittagong Division had a large percentage of school-going population in upper-age groups and districts of Dacca Division generally lagged behind at all ages.

Age Distribution:

The age distribution in 1961 census population has shown astonishing differences from 1951 population both in East and West Pakistan particularly at earlier age-groups. This has led to varying interpretations and speculations by the demographers (4,7). A comparative study of the districts in respect of age composition of the population is given here in Table 10, 12, and 13 reveal the nature of the differences between the districts. Percent of population reported age zero (less than one year) ranged from 1.92 in Dinajpur district to 3.38 in Kushtia for males (Table 12), 2.14 for Dinajpur to 3.72 in Kushtia for females, (Table 13) and 2.02 in Dinajpur and 3.55 in Kushtia for both sexes (Table 10). The population 0-4 for the two districts was 15.58 in the former and 15.67 in the latter. The provincial average for 0-4 population was 17.38 as compared to 16.49 in case of Dinajpur and 18.29 in case of Kushtia. Hence it is not likely that there was an error for the adjacent group. One may only guess that

Kushtia being a new district was effected by partition and birth cohorts around 1960 were larger. In this district the population aged 15-19 was slightly below the provincial average. For all other groups below age 30 the percent of population in Kushtia was higher than the provincial average, while all age-groups above age 30, the proportion was lower than the provincial average. This shows that Kushtia had a younger population hence higher fertility.

The reverse is the case of Dinajpur, where the proportion of population below age 15 was lower than the provincial average in each age-group and was higher than the provincial average for each age-group above age 15 excepting a minor difference in case of males 55 and above. Dinajpur also appears to be district whose boundaries were effected by partition. In this case probably the migration was in the other direction.

There were two other districts besides Kushtia namely Jessore and Rajshahi where persons below one year age constituted more than 3% of the total population. These two districts are directly linked with West Bengal industrial districts by road and railways which could have resulted in the immigration of young Muslim population of India into Pakistan. The districts which had comparatively low population age zero, were Chittagong, Comilla, Noakhali, Dacca, Mymensingh, Bogra and Rangpur. Chittagong and Dacca being the largest metropolitan areas and industrial centres, could be expected to have a smaller child population, while the other districts might have been adversely affected by emigration.

The proportion of population recorded in East Pakistan, aged 5-9 was 18.49 for males and 19.03 for females. The districts having the population in this group above 20% were Noakhali (20.37) and Pabna (20.15) in case of males and only Pabna (20%) in case of females.

Table 11 gives the position of each district for different age-groups as compared to the figures for the whole

province. For the age-group less than one year and 1-4, there seems to be an error of enumeration in most of the districts. Considering the provincial average to be index number of 100, one can find that except in case of Chittagong and Dacca, which show lower than the provincial average for both the groups, and for Rajshahi and Pabna which show higher figures, all the remaining districts have registered varying higher and lower figures for the two groups.

The age-group 5-9 in the 1961 census has particularly attracted the attention of demographers. A comparison between the index numbers of the districts for 1-4 and 5-9 shows quite similarity between the two. Most of the districts which showed percentage of population below the percentage for the province at the former age group, also registered it at the latter group.

The pattern seems to change from age 10. The districts whose index number was lower than 100 generally exceed the provincial average after age 10 and vice versa. Hence Chittagong, Chittagong Hill Tracts, Sylhet, Khulna and Kushtia showed index numbers more than 100 for age groups upto age 55 in case of the former three and upto 35 in the case of the latter two. The same phenomena appeared in case of Dinajpur and Rajshahi between 15 and 35 years and in Rangpur between age 20 and 45. The reverse seems to be the case in a number of districts whose index was higher than 100 at early ages, as Comilla, Noakhali, Faridpur, Barisal, Dinajpur and Pabna. Barring a little exceptional fluctuations, the index numbers of all these districts are more than 100 for all groups beyond the age of 10 years. One can see that these districts are generally rural and comparatively less affected by boundary changes consequent upon partition of Bengal. (The same pattern continues in middle ages). The districts whose proportion of population after age ten was higher than that for the entire province continue, in general, to hold the same position while those who had lower populations maintain the same upto the age of 50. Except in the cases of a few districts where the same

trend which was visible upto age 50 continues even beyond 60, the groups are marked by fluctuations exceeding the provincial proportion at one age group and falling short at some other groups. In case of Comilla and Bogra and Pabna, it was above the provincial average, while in case of Barisal, Rajshahi and Rangpur it was below that figures.

Other districts with population above provincial average in this group were Comilla, Faridpur, Mymensingh, Bakerganj, and Rangpur (males) and Comilla, Noakhali, Dacca, Faridpur, Mymensingh, Bakerganj and Rangpur.

The districts where the population age 5-9 was lower than the province as a whole were Chittagong, Chittagong Hill Tracts, Sylhet, Dacca, Jessore, Khulna, Kushtia, Dinajpur, and Rajshahi. Most of them are the district with a low population in the earlier age-group.

In respect of 10-14, the districts where the proportion exceeded that of East Pakistan as a whole were Chittagong, Chittagong Hill Tracts, Sylhet, Dacca, Faridpur, Jessore, Kushtia, Bakerganj and those with lower ones were Mymensingh, Bogra and Rangpur.

The age statement is even less reliable beyond age 50 years. Hence it does not seem worthwhile to draw any conclusion about the age distribution at later ages.

Economic Activity of the Population:

The census of 1961 put questions about economic activities to the respondent stating their ages 10 years or more. In 1951 such questions were asked from persons aged 12 and above. This variation has not only led to non-comparability of the data but also resulted in unusual mis-statement of age. In 1951 there was an unusually large number of persons aged 10 and 11. In 1961, the same could be said about age 8 and 9. Hence any attempt to make comparison between 1951 and 1961 census population on this basis will be misleading (3).

The labour force as shown in Table 14 was classified as those who were working; looking for work; women doing

household work; dependents over age 10; and dependents under age 10. When the figures of the two sexes were combined the provincial average was 34.1% working, .2% looking for work, 21.8% women doing household work, 6.9% dependents over age 10, and 37.0% dependents under age 10. In this respect the largest percent of working population was in Chittagong Hill Tracts (55.8%) followed by Comilla (46.4%). The smallest percent was in Pabna (28.1%), and Bakerganj (28.4%). Dacca, Faridpur and Bogra were the other districts where the working population constituted less than 30% of the total population. The high percent in Chittagong Hill Tracts and Comilla Districts was due to a large proportion of women engaged in labour force, (46.8% and 38.1%) of female population respectively where the provincial average was 10.8%. The tribal women of Chittagong Hill Tracts, and the women working in tea gardens have probably raised the proportion working for the district. Chittagong Division as whole has a larger proportion of working women, whereas Khulna Division seems to be the last in this respect. The large proportion of working population in Mymensingh District could also probably be explained by tribal composition of population. The low percentage belong to those districts which are overwhelmingly rural and do not border Indian territory, which would result in selective migration.

As regards the unemployed population, two districts are conspicuous although even they are less than one percent of the total population, was looking for work. They were Chittagong with .7% of the total population, and 1.2% of male population and Noakhali with .6% of total population and .9% of the female population. Chittagong situation could be largely due to its being the seaport and an industrial town, while Noakhali supplies the migratory farm and other unskilled labour. Dacca and Khulna and Kushtia each have about half of one percent of male population looking for work. The places have industrial units which might account for it.

One could easily guess that the districts where a comparatively larger proportion of female population was classified as gainfully employed, will have smaller percent of women doing household work. Such districts were Chittagong Hill Tracts and Comilla. Faridpur and Bogra are on the other end. All the districts of Khulna and Rajshahi divisions had more than 25% of the total population, and more than 50% of the female population in this category, while every district of Chittagong division had less than 20% of the total population, and less than 40% of the female population categorised as such.

In regard to dependent population aged 10 and over, the highest percentage 10.1 was recorded for Chittagong, followed by Dacca (9.8) and Sylhet (9.8). Probably industrial workers of Dacca and Chittagong, and plantation labourers of Sylhet could afford to bear such burden. In rural agricultural situation even an old man might consider him as a working member of the family. The first two had 11.6 and 10.8 percent of the males in this category, whereas Sylhet had the largest percent of women (9.3) in this group. Dinajpur, Rangpur, and Mymensingh each had less than 5% of total population, between 5 and 6 percent of male population, and about 3% female population belonging to this category.

As to the dependents under 10 years of age, the differences between the districts did not appear striking. Chittagong Hill Tracts (32.4) and Chittagong (34.2) were the only two districts with less than 35% population in this age-group. The highest 39.1% was in Pabna, which had the lowest proportion of working population. The percent of child population in other districts varied only slightly.

Amenities in Villages:

Part V of the DCR's gives information about particular villages. Besides population statistics it also showed certain facilities and institutions that exist in individual localities.

Since the population, area and number of villages in different districts vary substantially, statement of numbers only will not be illuminating. Accordingly it was considered appropriate to analyse the different facilities on the basis of number of localities served by one unit. While presenting these figures no claim is made to the correctness of the number shown. As pointed out in earlier pages there are reasons to believe that the figures are not quite correct. In this part no weight has been given to several units existing in one locality.

Table 15 shows the number of units serving per hundred villages. According to this analysis Chittagong district had the largest number primary schools and Rajshahi had the lowest. The districts having more than 40 localities with primary schools for 100 villages were Chittagong, Barisal and Khulna, while Rajshahi, Pabna, Dinajpur Mymensingh, Dacca, Sylhet, Comilla and Chittagong Hill Tracts each had less than 30 schools for 100 villages. The three districts having larger proportions of primary schools, had also higher literacy percentage according to the census. It seems that as a whole Khulna Division had the best facilities and Rajshahi has the least. In regard to middle schools Chittagong was again at the top and Sylhet at the bottom. The districts having more than 5 middle schools for 100 villages were Chittagong, Noakhali, Barisal and Rangpur and those with less than two schools were Sylhet, Faridpur, Jessore and Pabna. In case of high schools, Barisal with 12.60 high schools localities for 100 villages is ahead of all, while Rangpur is behind all (No school was shown in Chittagong Hill Tracts). Those with more than six included Comilla, Noakhali, Dacca, Faridpur, Barisal and Khulna and those with less than three were Sylhet, Kushtia, Dinajpur, Rajshahi and Rangpur. The districts with larger number of high schools were not divided in 1947, while those with lower number had their boundaries changed in partition. May be that this led to closure of some of the high schools.

In regard to postoffices, the position of Chittagong, Barisal and Khulna is good, so much so that less than 10 villages were served by one post office, whereas more than 20 villages were served by one post office in Chittagong Hill Tracts, Sylhet and all district of Rajshahi Division. Khulna Division seems to be better off in this respect. For telegraph office Chittagong and Kushtia seem to be better off and Sylhet and Dinajpur worse off.

In East Pakistan the main source of fresh water supply is handpipe locally called tubewell. The districts with more than 75 tubewells for hundred villages were Bogra and Faridpur, while Chittagong Hill Tracts (18.18), Sylhet (19.48) and Dinajpur (20.78) had smallest numbers.

There were 10 districts where more than 50% localities had a tubewell. This included all the districts of Khulna Division. Seven districts did not have a tubewell in 50% of the villages. These districts were Chittagong, Chittagong Hill Tracts, Sylhet, Dacca, Dinajpur, Rajshahi and Rangpur, the former three are hilly districts and the latter three have a large number of wells.

IV SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

1. This article is based on 17 District Census Reports (1961) of East Pakistan which are massive documents containing descriptive and statistical information right down to the village level on social, economic educational, and population characteristics. Despite their short-comings in printing, consistency and objectivity they are valuable for research, administrative and planning purposes.

2. As regards housing the average number of persons per house ranged from 4.8 to 6.6 in urban areas and 4.8 to 5.66 in rural areas. It appears that the larger the size of households in the urban area of the district, the smaller the size in rural area and vice versa. As for persons per house the number ranged from 4.7 to 6.2 in urban areas and 5.0

number ranged from 4.7 to 6.2 in urban areas and 5.0 to 5.7 in rural areas. The average size of the family was from 4 to 5.

3. Total population in every district increased during the decade. The increase in the density ranged from 355 persons per square mile to 20 persons per square miles.

4. There was a tendency for the sex ratio to balance out, that is, there was a larger increase in the number of women. The population of the urban areas was more masculine than the rural areas. There was only one district (Chittagong Hill Tracts) which had larger males population in all 5 year age-groups. Generally the masculinity ratio was lower at younger ages than at upper ages which indicates not only a lower average life expectancy for females in East Pakistan but a sex-selective under-statement of ages.

5. Rural population of all the districts increased, the maximum being 32% in Jessore. Urban population of all the districts increased (maximum 150% for Khulna) during the decade except district of Bakerganj and Dinajpur. There was a decrease by about 10 and 6 per cent respectively. Industrialization of the districts seems to be the major cause of the change.

6. The population having the same district of birth and of enumeration was very large ranging from 88.5% to more than 98%. The districts whose boundaries were disturbed by partition had comparatively larger population that were born in India or in other districts of the province. The larger industrial districts also had a population that was not born in the district.

7. All the districts of East Pakistan had predominantly Muslim population except the Chittagong Hill Tracts where the Muslim population was less than 12%. The proportion of Muslim population increased in all the districts. Caste Hindus were the largest minority group in Chittagong Division (except in the Chittagong Hill Tracts where Buddhists constituted the

majority). In some districts the Scheduled Caste population was larger than the Caste Hindu population particularly in Khulna Division. The percentage of Hindus decreased in all the districts except two districts of Rajshahi Division. The Scheduled Caste population decreased in percentage in all the districts while Christians, who constituted a small minority increased in number and proportion. In number, there was a decrease of Hindu population in 4 districts and Scheduled Caste population in 9 districts. This might be a clear indication of the migration of minority and in some cases conversion to Christianity.

8. The literacy percentage, as defined in 1961, was lowest 15.3% in Chittagong Hill Tracts and highest 27.2 in Khulna. As regards the number of persons attending schools and colleges to the population of that age, the age-group 10-14 registered the highest proportion. It shows not a very great increase in the primary education. Per cent of students was largest in Noakhali and lowest in Chittagong Hill Tracts for all ages taken together.

9. The peculiarity of the age distribution of 1961 Census Report mentioned in a number of reviews was true for all the district. There was a unusually large population in age-group 5-9 and smaller population in age-group 10-14, 15-19 and 20-24. There were minor differences between the districts, for example, Kushtia had a younger population and Dinajpur had a comparatively older population which shows some influence of migration on the composition of the population. The districts with higher in-migration had comparatively younger population than the district with out-migrant population. The districts which are comparatively more rural and were less affected by boundary changes during Independence had population at upper ages higher than the provincial average.

10. The proportion of presently employed population was highest in Chittagong Division due to the reason that a larger

population of women were reported working. The districts where the proportion of women engaged in the labour force was small, had an overall working population even less than 30%. The largest proportion of working population was slightly more than 55% in Chittagong Hill Tracts which had a large tribal population and some big industries. Reported unemployment was low, but comparatively larger in urban localities.

11. There were three districts where more than 2/5 of the localities had a primary school as against 8 districts which had 7 out of 10 localities without a primary school. There were 5 districts with a middle school in 5 out of 100 localities and 4 with 50% of the villages without one. There were 6 districts which had more than 6 localities out of 100 where there was a high school and there were 6 which had less than 3. Educational facilities were best in this respect in khulna Division and least in Rajshahi Division. Three districts were such that they had a post office in 10% of the total localities and there were about 10 districts which had post office in 5 per cent of localities. Tubewells, which are the main source of water supply in all rural areas, were not shown in every village. There were two districts where 3/4 of the villages had tubewells and there were three districts where 4/5th of the villages did not have a tubewell.

12. The summary, generalization and comparative statement made in this paper provide a lead for an intensive study of each district or a comparative study of the districts on some specified variable. It could not be possible to present here a comprehensive study of the District Census Reports. When similar analysis is made of West Pakistan districts, regional and provincial comparison might be illuminating.

TABLE 1

Size of Households in Rural and Urban Areas, 1961

S.No	Name of District	Persons per Household		Persons per Hut		Average Number of Persons per family	
		Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	All area	Urban
111	Chittagong	5.29	5.26	4.99	5.12	4.32	3.77
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	4.77	5.66	4.66	5.33	4.59	2.74
113	Comila	5.88	5.49	5.68	5.42	4.64	4.65
114	Noakhali	5.53	5.42	5.33	5.59	4.67	4.32
115	Sylhet	6.57	5.12	6.14	5.12	4.25	4.55
121	Dacca	5.62	5.52	5.37	5.45	4.65	4.22
122	Faridpur	5.81	5.41	5.77	5.37	4.57	4.58
123	Mymensingh	5.41	5.26	5.27	5.24	4.50	4.45
131	Bakerganj	6.04	4.82	5.82	5.36	4.57	4.64
132	Jessore	6.02	5.65	6.19	5.61	4.58	4.53
133	Khulna	5.35	5.48	5.52	5.47	4.46	4.01
134	Kushtia	5.46	5.51	5.21	5.20	4.65	4.52
141	Bogra	5.71	5.07	5.42	5.03	4.12	4.66
142	Dinajpur	5.35	5.11	5.35	5.08	4.20	4.51
143	Pabna	5.74	5.70	5.59	5.67	4.74	4.78
144	Rajshahi	6.02	5.17	5.80	5.17	4.38	4.81
145	Rangpur	5.42	5.21	5.17	5.19	4.44	4.54

TABLE ...2.....

Density of Population (Persons per square mile)

S.No.	Name of District	Total Area in Square miles.	1961	1951	Difference 61-51
111	Chittagong	2,705	1,103	928	+ 175
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	5,093	76	56	+ 20
113	Comilla	2,594	1,693	1,461	+ 232
114	Noakhali	1,855	1,285	1,117	+ 88
115	Sylhet	4,785	729	639	+ 90
121	Dacca	2,882	1,768	1,413	+ 355
122	Faridpur	2,694	1,180	1,029	+ 151
123	Mymensingh	6,361	1,103	909	+ 194
131	Bakerganj	4,240	1,005	859	+ 146
132	Jessore	2,547	860	643	+ 217
133	Khulna	4,652	526	446	+ 80
134	Kushtia	1,371	851	644	+ 207
141	Bogra	1,502	1,048	851	+ 197
142	Dinajpur	2,609	655	519	+ 136
143	Pabna	1,877	1,044	844	+ 200
144	Rajshahi	3,654	769	603	+ 166
145	Rangpur	3,704	1,025	787	+ 238

TABLE - 3

Sex Ratio of the Population in 1961 and 1951.

S.No.	Name of District	Females of per 1,000 male		Percent increase in population
		1961	1951	
100	EAST PAKISTAN	930	911	21.2
110	Chittagong Division	932	908	16.3
111	Chittagong	887	875	18.8
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	815	872	34.0
113	Comilla	954	932	10.9
114	Noakhali	973	909	15.1
115	Sylhet	930	914	14.1
120	Dacca Division	924	909	21.1
121	Dacca	902	899	25.1
122	Faridpur	955	930	14.6
123	Mymensingh	926	905	21.3
130	Khulna Division	929	913	22.2
131	Bakerganj	935	909	22.1
132	Jessore	921	910	33.7
133	Khulna	907	913	18.0
134	Kushtia	921	914	31.9
140	Rajshahi Division	934	918	26.9
141	Bogra	953	937	23.2
142	Dinajpur	895	879	26.2
143	Pabna	944	930	23.7
144	Rajshahi	953	943	27.5
145	Rangpur	927	902	39.1

TABLE - 4

Rural - Urban Variation between 1961 and 1951
Census Population

S.No.	Name of District	Urban	Variation	Rural	Variation
		1961 - 51 Number	1951-61 Percent	61-51 Number	51-61 %
100	EAST PAKISTAN		45.1		20.2
110	Chittagong Division		29.2	15.7	15.7
111	Chittagong	76,778	25.6	3,94,368	17.8
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	-	-	75,001	26.1
113	Comilla	22,353	19.2	5,74,353	15.6
114	Noakhali	12,650	58.6	2,99,351	15.6
115	Sylhet	9,829	16.1	4,20,393	14.0
120	Dacca Division		64.8		18.7
121	Dacca	3,42,426	83.2	6,80,538	18.6
122	Faridpur	20,931	36.3	3,83,669	14.1
123	Mymensingh	58,650	32.3	11,75,511	21.0
130	Khulna Division		54.1		21.0
131	Bekerganj	- 13,010	-9.8	6,32,592	18.0
132	Jessore	37,898	101.3	5,13,866	32.1
133	Khulna	1,03,461	150.0	2,69,753	13.4
134	Khushtia	22,730	56.1	2,59,375	30.7
140	Rajshahi Division		26.2		26.9
141	Bogra	10,551	29.0	2,85,369	23.0
142	Dinajpur	-4,592	-6.0	3,60,077	28.2
143	Pabna	30,041	43.2	3,44,716	22.8
144	Rajshahi	35,634	42.1	5,70,273	26.9
145	Rangpur	31,819	24.9	8,47,748	30.4

TABLE - 5

PERCENT POPULATION ACCORDING TO PLACE OF BIRTH
EAST PAKISTAN DISTRICTS
1961

S.No.	District of Enumeration	Place of birth		
		District of Enumeration	Other District in EAST PAK.	District in India
111	Chittagong	95.29	3.53	0.95
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	89.30	10.07	0.33
113	Comilla	98.06	1.75	0.15
114	Noakhali	98.54	1.42	0.03
115	Sylhet	95.45	3.80	0.74
121	Dacca	92.86	5.12	1.89
122	Faridpur	96.88	2.95	0.16
123	Mymensingh	98.17	1.54	0.28
131	Bakerganj	98.69	1.27	0.04
132	Jessore	90.60	7.47	1.79
133	Khulna	93.28	5.13	1.57
134	Kushtia	88.52	3.71	7.76
141	Bogra	95.84	3.19	0.07
142	Dinajpur	89.92	5.54	4.52
143	Pabna	97.66	2.06	0.28
144	Rajshahi	92.95	3.85	3.19
145	Rangpur	92.94	4.79	2.26

TABLE - 6

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY RELIGION
EAST PAKISTAN DISTRICTS. TOTAL POPULATION, 1961

S.No.	Name of District	Distribution				
		Muslims	Hindus	Schedule Caste	Christian	Others
111	Chittagong	80.70	13.34	3.22	0.10	2.63
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	11.77	11.36	1.01	2.64	73.22
113	Comilla	85.54	9.61	4.76	0.01	0.07
114	Noakhali	87.71	9.72	2.50	0.01	0.06
115	Sylhet	73.12	15.82	10.78	0.19	0.09
121	Dacca	82.49	8.70	8.39	0.42	0.01
122	Faridpur	73.83	7.19	18.67	0.29	0.02
123	Mymensingh	87.18	6.95	4.97	0.67	0.22
131	Bakerganj	82.04	6.47	10.91	0.29	0.29
132	Jessore	71.85	11.42	16.61	0.10	0.02
133	Khulna	60.20	11.67	27.75	0.33	0.05
134	Kushtia	92.00	4.71	2.86	0.43	0.00
141	Bogra	88.62	5.78	5.47	0.08	0.05
142	Dinajpur	68.63	4.84	25.88	0.52	0.12
143	Pabna	86.55	7.32	6.02	0.09	0.01
144	Rajshahi	81.74	8.89	8.42	0.30	0.65
145	Rangpur	84.11	3.85	11.93	0.75	0.35

TABLE - 7

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY RELIGION
 EAST PAKISTAN DISTRICTS.
 TOTAL POPULATION, 1951

S.No.	Name of District	Distribution				
		Muslims	Hindus	Schedule Caste	Christian	Others
111	Chittagong	77.72	14.99	3.81	-	3.48
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	6.30	11.93	2.34	1.30	78.12
113	Comilla	81.38	12.20	6.30	-	0.12
114	Noakhali	84.48	12.11	3.35	-	0.06
115	Sylhet	67.65	17.97	13.49	0.18	0.72
121	Dacca	78.52	10.16	10.37	0.47	0.49
122	Feridpur	70.68	8.27	20.35	0.34	0.35
123	Mymensingh	82.43	8.67	7.62	0.56	0.72
131	Bakerganj	79.32	6.68	12.93	0.31	0.76
132	Jessore	68.23	12.57	19.02	0.08	0.09
133	Khulna	54.43	12.99	32.13	0.22	0.23
134	Kushtia	91.16	4.93	3.05	0.43	0.44
141	Bogra	87.20	5.38	7.31	0.05	0.06
142	Dineajpur	64.52	4.82	30.31	-	0.34
143	Pabna	83.62	8.76	7.49	0.06	0.07
144	Rajshahi	80.16	8.92	10.43	0.23	0.26
145	Rangpur	79.75	4.38	15.80	0.04	0.04

TABLE - 8

NUMBER AND PERCENT (OF POPULATION 5 YEARS AND OVER) OF LITERATE PERSONS BY SEX 1961

S.No.	Name of District	Both Sexes		Male		Female		Rank
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
111	Chittagong	6,56,129	26.4	5,08,966	20.5	1,47,263	5.9	2
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	49,280	15.3	43,733	13.6	5,547	1.7	15
113	Comilla	8,89,695	24.8	6,68,786	18.27	2,20,909	6.17	4
114	Noakhali	4,80,490	24.7	3,60,349	18.5	1,20,141	6.2	5
115	Sylhet	5,78,772	20.0	4,40,757	15.3	1,38,015	4.8	9
121	Dacca	9,60,989	23.0	7,16,639	17.2	2,44,350	5.35	7
122	Faridpur	4,61,766	17.8	3,58,977	13.8	1,02,789	4.0	12
123	Mymensingh	9,91,809	17.3	7,49,257	13.0	2,42,552	4.2	14
131	Bakerganj	34,78,589	24.8	17,99,218	18.2	16,79,371	6.6	4
132	Jessore	3,68,598	20.8	2,91,114	16.4	77,494	4.4	8
133	Khulna	5,48,570	27.2	4,18,406	20.7	1,30,164	6.5	1
134	Kushtia	1,45,296	15.4	1,11,143	11.8	34,153	3.6	15
141	Bogra	2,94,805	23.0	2,27,262	17.8	67,543	5.3	6
142	Dinajpur	3,64,719	25.9	3,02,631	21.5	62,088	4.4	3
143	Pabna	2,70,802	17.1	1,98,050	12.5	72,752	4.6	13
144	Rajshahi	4,54,396	20.0	3,48,852	15.3	1,05,544	4.6	10
145	Rangpur	5,77,533	18.9	4,68,445	15.3	1,09,088	3.6	11

TABLE..9..

STUDENTS ATTENDING SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES BY SEX
(PERCENT OF POPULATION IN EACH AGE-GROUP)1961

S.No.	Name of District	All Ages			5-9			10-14			15-19		
		B	M	F	B	M	F	B	M	F	B	M	F
111	Chittagong	7.09	9.65	3.71	10.96	13.93	7.86	23.49	31.25	13.46	12.06	17.67	2.32
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	2.58	3.64	1.23	4.65	6.49	2.70	8.98	13.50	3.63	3.21	5.13	1.01
113	Comilla	5.11	11.27	4.29	14.40	18.54	10.07	25.63	37.71	15.27	10.85	19.62	2.43
114	Noakhali	7.29	11.23	3.24	11.10	14.46	7.46	23.63	33.90	10.92	11.47	22.37	1.30
115	Sylhet	5.80	8.19	3.17	12.75	16.88	8.47	18.99	25.70	10.21	6.57	11.70	1.66
121	Dacca	5.98	8.27	3.37	8.35	10.52	6.10	20.88	26.80	13.19	9.80	16.43	3.01
122	Faridpur	4.81	7.16	2.32	6.89	9.08	4.64	19.76	27.62	10.20	7.70	14.44	.92
123	Mymensingh	4.34	6.22	2.25	7.63	9.72	5.44	17.03	22.27	9.63	6.88	13.34	.73
131	Bakerganj	6.29	8.95	3.44	8.72	10.81	6.60	24.08	32.24	14.21	10.09	18.54	1.71
132	Jessore	5.81	7.61	1.79	8.75	11.78	5.52	22.06	32.16	9.86	9.22	17.77	.96
133	Khulna	6.62	9.39	3.48	11.06	14.19	7.86	26.09	35.87	13.89	9.45	17.87	1.42
134	Kushtia	4.40	6.38	2.21	6.41	8.03	4.69	15.59	21.59	6.70	6.92	12.91	1.22
141	Bogra	6.95	10.04	3.65	13.35	17.37	9.19	25.22	33.50	13.81	9.30	18.00	2.12
142	Dinajpur	6.42	9.50	2.88	12.90	17.52	8.03	22.57	32.91	9.12	7.42	14.57	.85
143	Pabna	5.17	7.10	3.08	6.41	8.13	4.57	13.89	19.05	11.01	9.99	16.51	3.56
144	Rajshahi	6.32	9.16	3.28	9.29	11.92	6.48	19.55	26.85	10.79	9.43	16.94	2.98
145	Hangpur	5.10	7.56	2.38	9.74	12.87	6.42	19.44	28.17	8.16	6.88	13.87	.67

AGE STRUCTURE OF THE POPULATION OF THE DISTRICTS AS
COMPARED TO THE PROVINCIAL AVERAGE (INDEX OF 100)

BOTH SEXES 1961

S.No.	Name of District	Age Group													
		0	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60+
100	EAST PAKISTAN	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
111	Chittagong	93	91	94	117	103	104	101	105	101	102	103	111	100	92
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	105	87	86	115	110	113	115	115	115	95	102	105	96	75
113	Comilla	92	103	103	100	97	94	95	97	101	99	103	104	102	104
114	Noakhali	96	102	106	110	101	90	91	94	94	97	98	106	103	97
115	Sylhet	106	93	96	101	103	104	104	105	103	101	103	104	93	103
121	Dacca	97	99	101	103	98	103	99	98	100	99	96	97	97	104
122	Faridpur	106	100	101	106	97	96	94	98	96	104	96	105	89	107
123	Mymensingh	95	100	104	90	101	99	103	100	102	100	100	104	98	104
131	Bakerganj	101	101	103	107	100	97	97	101	99	97	94	97	90	94
132	Jessore	119	95	94	109	102	105	95	94	94	99	102	97	104	102
133	Khulna	105	95	95	103	112	105	106	91	95	101	99	96	111	105
134	Kushtia	131	101	96	110	100	101	102	92	92	92	97	96	100	102
141	Bogra	97	104	98	85	93	103	102	104	103	100	104	105	111	108
142	Dinajpur	74	101	97	94	109	104	112	103	114	94	109	90	100	81
143	Pabna	108	104	107	99	88	91	92	96	100	98	95	100	100	100
144	Rajshahi	114	102	96	96	104	106	101	102	88	97	97	96	96	98
145	Rangpur	75	108	101	88	98	100	100	104	105	100	98	99	95	92

TABLE.....11...

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION IN PERCENT IN EACH AGE-GROUP, 1961.
BOTH SEXES

S.No.	Name of District	Age Group													
		0	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60 +
100	EAST PAKISTAN	2.72	15.48	10.7	9.1	7.7	7.5	7.9	6.4	5.5	4.7	3.6	3.4	2.1	5.2
111	Chittagong	2.52	14.15	17.55	10.61	7.91	7.79	8.01	6.72	5.58	4.78	3.72	3.78	2.09	4.80
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	2.87	13.58	16.05	10.49	8.47	8.46	9.10	7.36	6.35	4.47	3.67	3.56	2.01	3.88
113	Comilla	2.50	15.87	19.34	9.08	7.45	7.05	7.52	6.22	5.57	4.63	3.69	3.54	2.14	5.41
114	Noakhali	2.60	15.86	19.87	10.01	7.75	6.76	7.15	5.99	5.19	4.54	3.51	3.59	2.16	5.03
115	Sylhet	2.88	14.34	17.95	9.15	7.96	7.83	8.18	6.73	5.67	4.76	3.72	3.55	1.95	5.34
121	Dacca	2.64	15.37	18.84	9.34	7.57	7.72	7.86	6.29	5.52	4.67	3.45	3.30	2.03	5.40
122	Faridpur	2.89	15.47	18.98	9.61	7.46	7.20	7.42	6.28	5.30	4.89	3.46	3.58	1.88	5.55
123	Mymensingh	2.58	15.49	19.41	8.21	7.76	7.41	8.10	6.39	5.60	4.68	3.61	3.55	2.05	5.42
131	Bakerganj	2.74	15.64	19.30	9.77	7.69	7.31	7.68	6.44	5.44	4.54	3.38	3.31	1.88	4.89
132	Jessore	3.24	14.72	17.66	9.92	7.85	7.90	7.54	5.99	5.16	4.64	3.66	3.30	2.19	5.30
133	Khulna	2.86	14.75	17.78	9.34	8.59	7.89	8.35	5.81	5.23	4.76	3.58	3.28	2.33	5.45
134	Kushtia	3.55	15.67	18.03	10.04	7.70	7.57	8.07	5.88	5.04	4.34	3.49	3.26	2.09	5.28
141	Bogra	2.65	16.08	18.29	7.78	7.14	7.74	8.02	6.63	5.66	4.72	3.75	3.57	2.33	5.64
142	Dinagpur	2.02	15.58	18.12	8.59	8.40	7.82	8.85	6.60	6.29	4.43	3.91	3.07	2.09	4.21
143	Pabna	2.93	16.12	20.08	9.05	6.79	6.79	7.26	6.16	5.48	4.60	3.42	3.39	2.10	5.84
144	Rajshahi	3.11	15.85	17.92	8.77	7.98	7.94	7.95	6.51	4.84	4.56	3.49	3.27	2.01	5.09
145	Rangpur	2.58	16.74	18.97	7.98	7.55	7.47	7.92	6.64	5.80	4.68	3.53	3.37	1.99	4.77

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY DISTRICTS, 1961.

MALES

S.No.	Name of District	Age Group													
		0	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60 +
100	EAST PAKISTAN	2.74	14.65	18.49	9.91	7.29	6.93	7.60	6.43	5.91	4.76	3.86	3.59	2.32	5.55
111	Chittagong	2.38	13.34	16.88	11.29	8.32	7.87	7.86	6.70	5.92	4.78	3.97	3.78	2.28	4.63
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	2.64	12.24	14.76	10.32	8.21	8.58	9.54	8.01	7.20	4.86	3.95	3.60	2.10	3.99
113	Comilla	2.44	15.38	19.32	9.97	7.13	6.34	6.94	5.96	5.72	4.63	3.96	3.68	2.48	6.06
114	Noakhali	2.58	15.80	20.37	10.92	7.35	5.81	6.33	5.60	5.25	4.44	3.70	3.65	2.49	5.70
115	Sylhet	2.75	13.70	17.60	10.01	7.51	7.12	7.86	6.70	6.09	4.83	4.02	3.76	2.26	5.79
121	Dacca	2.52	14.46	18.22	10.04	7.28	7.50	7.83	6.35	5.92	4.80	3.67	3.41	2.28	5.73
122	Faridpur	2.86	14.85	18.84	10.32	7.31	6.66	7.01	6.13	5.60	5.02	3.78	3.70	2.11	5.80
123	Mymensingh	2.47	14.56	19.13	9.26	7.03	6.74	7.75	6.41	5.92	4.81	3.87	3.76	2.39	5.90
131	Bakerganj	2.69	15.09	18.90	10.42	7.46	6.59	7.25	6.46	5.74	4.68	3.71	3.47	2.16	5.39
132	Jessore	3.11	14.86	17.53	10.43	7.41	7.26	7.55	6.17	5.75	4.67	4.04	3.55	2.36	5.32
133	Khulna	2.74	13.76	17.15	9.89	8.00	7.75	8.54	6.43	5.95	4.61	3.63	3.41	2.47	5.67
134	Kushtia	3.38	14.91	17.77	10.72	7.21	7.30	8.34	6.24	5.39	4.42	3.68	3.36	2.19	5.07
141	Bogra	2.55	15.39	18.16	8.80	6.30	6.63	7.60	6.85	6.16	4.83	4.04	3.82	2.66	6.20
142	Dinajpur	1.92	14.57	17.65	9.21	7.62	7.11	8.67	6.85	6.82	4.77	4.39	3.36	2.37	4.70
143	Pabna	2.84	15.33	20.15	10.00	6.55	6.08	6.88	6.25	5.81	4.74	2.69	3.50	2.32	5.86
144	Rajshahi	3.06	15.25	18.06	9.34	7.19	7.16	7.81	6.76	6.05	4.75	3.73	3.39	2.16	5.27
145	Rangpur	2.46	15.80	18.81	8.66	6.85	6.76	7.65	6.82	6.34	4.97	3.97	3.57	2.28	5.05

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY DISTRICTS, 1961.

FEMALES

S.No.	Name of District	Age Group													
		0	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60 +
100	EAST PAKISTAN	2.83	16.30	19.03	8.32	8.10	8.12	8.16	6.31	5.12	4.55	3.27	3.27	1.78	4.80
111	Chittagong	2.67	15.07	18.30	9.84	7.44	7.69	8.19	6.74	5.20	4.78	3.44	3.78	1.87	4.99
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	3.15	14.99	17.64	10.69	8.79	8.31	8.56	6.55	5.30	3.99	3.33	3.06	1.90	3.74
113	Comilla	2.56	16.38	19.37	8.15	7.78	7.80	8.13	6.49	5.40	4.64	3.41	3.38	1.78	4.72
114	Noakhali	2.61	15.91	19.36	9.07	8.16	7.74	7.98	6.39	5.12	4.64	3.32	3.53	1.82	4.35
115	Sylhet	3.01	15.02	18.32	8.23	8.45	8.60	8.52	6.78	5.21	4.69	3.39	3.32	1.62	4.85
121	Dacca	2.77	16.38	19.53	8.57	7.89	7.97	7.90	6.22	5.08	4.52	3.21	3.17	1.75	5.03
122	Faridpur	2.92	16.11	19.13	8.88	7.62	7.77	7.85	6.44	4.99	4.77	3.14	3.45	1.64	5.30
123	Mymensingh	2.71	16.50	19.71	7.07	7.96	8.14	8.49	6.57	5.26	4.53	3.33	3.33	2.58	6.36
131	Bakerganj	2.80	16.21	19.71	9.09	7.94	8.07	8.13	5.43	5.12	4.39	3.03	3.13	1.58	4.37
132	Jessore	3.39	16.48	17.81	9.37	8.33	8.60	7.53	5.80	4.53	4.61	3.25	3.03	2.00	5.27
133	Khulna	2.99	15.84	18.48	8.74	9.24	8.04	8.15	5.12	4.44	4.92	3.53	3.13	2.18	5.21
134	Kushtia	3.72	16.49	18.30	9.31	8.23	7.86	7.79	5.48	4.67	4.26	3.28	3.14	1.97	5.49
141	Bogra	2.75	16.80	18.43	6.71	8.02	8.90	8.46	6.40	5.14	4.60	3.44	3.31	1.99	5.05
142	Dinajpur	2.14	16.72	18.64	7.91	9.28	8.62	9.06	6.33	5.70	4.05	3.36	2.76	1.77	3.66
143	Pabna	3.04	16.95	20.00	8.04	7.04	7.54	7.67	6.06	5.12	4.45	3.13	3.27	1.86	5.83
144	Rajshahi	3.17	16.48	17.77	8.17	8.79	8.75	8.09	6.24	5.06	4.35	3.23	3.14	1.85	4.91
145	Rangpur	2.71	17.75	19.14	7.24	8.31	8.24	8.22	6.44	5.23	4.37	3.05	3.15	1.68	4.46

TABLE.....14.....
 PERCENT OF POPULATION IN LABOUR FORCE
 BOTH SEXES, 1961

S.No.	Name of District	Civilian Labour Force		Women doing households	Dependent Over age 10	Dependent Under age 10
		Working	Looking after work			
100	EAST PAKISTAN	34.1	.2	21.8	6.9	37.0
111	Chittagong	37.1	.7	17.9	10.1	34.2
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	55.8	.1	5.8	5.9	32.4
113	Comilla	46.4	.2	8.2	7.5	37.7
114	Noakhali	36.7	.5	16.4	8.2	38.3
115	Sylhet	37.2	.1	18.3	9.2	35.2
121	Dacca	29.4	.2	23.8	9.8	36.8
122	Faridpur	29.3	0	27.2	6.2	37.3
123	Mymensingh	38.5	.1	19.5	4.4	37.5
131	Bakerganj	28.4	.1	26.4	7.5	37.6
132	Jessore	30.2	.1	26.5	6.6	36.6
133	Khulna	30.8	.2	26.5	7.2	35.3
134	Kushtia	31.0	.3	26.1	5.3	37.3
141	Bogra	29.5	.1	27.0	6.4	37.0
142	Dinajpur	34.6	.1	25.3	4.3	35.7
143	Pabna	28.1	.1	26.2	6.5	39.1
144	Rajshahi	30.1	.1	26.8	6.1	36.9
145	Rangpur	33.1	0	24.3	4.3	38.3

TABLE....15....
 NUMBER OF CERTAIN AMENITIES PER
 100 VILLAGES, 1961

S.No:	Name of District	Primary School	Middle School	High School	Post Office	Dispensary	Tube Well
111	Chittagong	51.28	10.77	4.53	11.54	4.96	34.36
112	Chittagong Hill Tracts	29.24	3.69		4.67	2.95	18.18
113	Comilla	27.14	2.20	9.95	5.72	1.15	59.88
114	Noakhali	30.77	8.75	11.65	6.23	1.72	52.74
115	Sylhet	21.47	0.71	0.43	1.90	0.78	19.48
121	Dacca	26.56	2.20	6.24	5.96	1.99	43.12
122	Faridpur	33.34	1.88	8.96	8.23	3.89	76.46
123	Mymensingh	25.17	3.80	5.18	5.29	2.18	55.14
131	Bakerganj	47.86	5.56	12.60	11.07	0.70	53.75
132	Jessore	33.44	1.52	5.41	6.67	2.42	62.88
133	Khulna	40.18	2.90	6.78	10.69	3.51	57.50
134	Kushtia	31.64	2.53	2.85	6.71	4.94	62.72
141	Bogra	30.00	2.72	4.33	3.36	2.44	78.37
142	Dinajpur	28.71	2.69	0.10	3.17	0.55	20.78
143	Pabna	28.78	1.60	3.46	4.88	2.26	51.57
144	Rajshahi	20.90	3.52	2.36	2.90	2.50	31.51
145	Rangpur	31.33	6.08	0.03	4.19	2.11	36.60

REFERENCES

1. Akhtar, Jamila Literacy and Education: fifth release from the 1961 Census of Pakistan. The Pakistan Development Review, Vol. 3, No. 3, 424-442.
2. Gustafson, Eric and Choudhry, Azizul Haque. "The Cottage Industry of Pakistan" (Unpublished Paper) Pakistan Institute of Development Economics.
3. Haroon, K, and Jan, Y.A. Main Economic characteristics of the people of Pakistan: sixth release from the 1961 Census of Pakistan. The Pakistan Development Review, Volume 4, No. 2, pp. 314-331.
4. Hashmi, Sultan Main features of the Demographic Conditions in Pakistan, Karachi Central Statistical Office, 1963.
5. Jillani, M.S. Changes in Levels of Education attainment in Pakistan 1951-1961. The Pakistan Development Review, Vol: 4, No. 1, pp. 69-92.
6. Krotki, Karol First release from the Second Population Census of Pakistan, 1961, The Pakistan Development Review, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 57-77.
7. Krotki; Karol Population, size growth and age distribution in fourth release from the "1961 Census of Pakistan." The Pakistan Development Review, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 279-305.
8. Pakistan: Agriculture Census Commissioner Agriculture Census 1960, East Pakistan.
9. Pakistan: Bureau of Education. Progress of Education - 1964
10. Pakistan: Population Census Commissioner Report of Population Census 1951, Volume 3, East Pakistan 1951.
11. Volume 9, Administrative Report 1951.
12. Bulletin No. 2, Final Tables of Population by sex, urban, rural, religion and non-Pakistanis 1961.
13. Bulletin No. 3, Population by Age, Sex and Marital status 1961.
14. Bulletin No. 4, Population by Sex, Literacy and Education 1961.
15. Bulletin No. 5, Economic Characteristics 1961.
16. Bulletin No. 6, Cottage Industries 1961.
17. Pakistan: Population Census Commission. Report Volume 2, Population Census Reports and Tables for East Pakistan (1961).

18. District Census Report Bakerganj.
19. District Census Report Bogra.
20. District Census Report Chittagong.
21. District Census Report
Chittagong Hill Tracts.
22. District Census Report Comilla.
23. District Census Report Dacca.
24. District Census Report Dinajpur.
25. District Census Report Faridpur.
26. District Census Report Jessore.
27. District Census Report Khulna.
28. District Census Report Kushtia.
29. District Census Report Mymensingh.
30. District Census Report Noakhali.
31. District Census Report Pabna.
32. District Census Report Rajshahi.
33. District Census Report Rangpur.
34. District Census Report Sylhet.
35. Razzaque, Abdul The Problem of Sex Ratio in
Pakistan. Unpublished thesis
submitted to Demographic Training
and Research Centre, Chembur:
1964.
36. Sanaullah, M. Second and third release from the
second population census of
Pakistan 1961. The Pakistan
Development Review, Volume 2,
No. 1, pp.106-113.
37. Visaria, Pravin The Sex Ratio of the Population
of India. Unpublished Ph.D.
Disertation presented to Princeton
University U.S.A., 1963.

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 Licence.

To view a copy of the licence please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>