



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**Bees Out of the Pandora's Box:
Economic Consequences of National
Register in Assam**

Atanu Sengupta and Sanjoy De

Burdwan University, Burdwan, WB, India

31 August 2018

Online at <https://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/88755/>

MPRA Paper No. 88755, posted 1 September 2018 02:17 UTC

Bees Out of the Pandora's Box: Economic Consequences of National Register in Assam

Atanu Sengupta
Professor
Department of Economics
Burdwan University, Burdwan, WB
Email: sengupta_atanu@yahoo.com
Mobile: 09593542847

&

Sanjoy De
Research Scholar
Department of Economics
Burdwan University, Burdwan, WB
Email: sanjoyde2000@gmail.com
Mobile: 08017214081

Abstract

In India, at present, there is a lot of hue and cry for and against the National Register of Citizens (NRC) in Assam. All the arguments are however based on false perception of migration and its ill or well effects on the economy. We have used the Census 2001 data to understand the nature and trend of migration in Assam. Our analysis suggests that the recent uproar over illegal migrants from neighboring country in Assam is more of a myth than reality and does not hold much economic justification. Firstly, official data suggests that the flow of internal migration in various districts of Assam is miniscule. Moreover it is showing a declining trend over the last few decades. The historical international migration that took place in Assam was due to mainly 'push' factor and no such 'push' factors have been in sight in the last few decades. Secondly and more importantly, migration of any form (though waning in Assam) adds to the prosperity and well-being of the state.

Introduction

In the Greek mythology, Pandora was gifted with a box. She was repeatedly told not to open the box or face the consequences. However, curiosity ruled over her defence. She opened the box. A swarm of bees emanated out of the box. Bees bite her cruelly. Sorrow was born in the world.

Recent furore in India was raised by publication of National Register of Citizens (NRC) in Assam on July 31, 2017. There was huge hue and cry due to the omission of roughly 40 lakh people from the NRC. The list of omission cuts across religions, caste, education and all other hierarchy of structure we know off. Relatives of past President of India, past Chief Minister of Assam, Vice Chancellor, government officials, army personnel, entrepreneurs, petty traders, agriculturalists, poor and destitute – they cut across all colours. They sometimes created fissures within the family. Names of the parents were included while daughters excluded. Names of the husbands included and wives excluded and vice versa.

In response to these criticisms, the ruling party made a virulent counter attack. They quote that NRC has large history starting from the days of the deceased Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. The register was first visualized on Assam Accord in 1985ⁱ. It was decided on the Accord that foreigners who have migrated to India on or after March 25, 1971, should be declared as migrants and practical steps shall be taken to oust such foreigners. The NRC was promulgated during the congress regime of Dr. Manmohan Singh under the auspices of the Supreme Court of India. The present government has the courage to publish the report and strike out the illegal immigrants who are possible threats to the sovereignty and integrity of the country.

On the other hand, the “so-called opposition” to this view has drawn on human rights and ethical issues. Migrants from other country should be treated on human considerations. The “opponents” seem to accept migrants as drain to the country’s resources. However, such drainage should be tolerated on greater logic of human rights (Patnaik, 2018).

In this conundrum of ‘supporters’ and ‘defenders’ of NRC, somewhere a line of clear thought has been lost in muddy water. There seems to be a strange “convergence” of the views of the supporters and opponents. They all find migrants to be a ‘nuisance’ – a drain of country’s resources. The supporters feel they should be scraped off, the opponents feel they should be tolerated on various ethical and social grounds (Patnaik, 2018).

There are numerous issues and points that can be raised in this context. We are however, concentrating on the economic valuation of the publication of NRC and emphasizing on the points that are of interests to the economists. In order to better understand whether there is any economic logic or not of such de-enfranchising exercise and assess the migration situation, we first evaluate the migration pattern in Assam vis-à-vis India in section 2. Section 3 deals with the inter districts migration scenario in Assam. Then we unfold the hype and delusion associated with migration in various districts in Assam both by using official statistics and through econometric technique in section 4. In section 5, we conclude.

2. Assam and India: Migration Scenario

Perhaps the most important asset of the poor in developing counties is labor. The movement of labor can happen across occupations, sectors and of course across geographical areas. Historically, it has been observed that several successful development and growth episodes have been set off through productive movement of labor or in its popular acronym - migration. Development economists have long been investigating the relationship between migration, wages, employment market and capital accumulation (Lewis 1954;

Fei and Ranis 1964; Harris and Todaro 1970; Stark and Bloom 1985). Lewis (1954) and Fei and Ranis (1964) beautifully showed how the migration of surplus labor from traditional agrarian sector to the modern industrial sector could help in capital accumulation. However, in India, which possesses its own ethos and which has been under colonial rule for around two hundred years, the migration picture is very intricate and sensitive too. As of 2001, in India, the share of internal migrants in total population is 30%. But, this number is deceptively large. With a closer look at the Census 2001, the migration delusion is busted. Among the total internal migrants, two-thirds are intra-district migrants.ⁱⁱ Among the intra-district migrants over half are women migrating due to marriage.

Migration may arise due to a variety of reasons – some consciously and other of force and displacement.ⁱⁱⁱ The impact of migration is also a very contentious issue. Without delving much into the theoretical analysis of the impacts of migration, it can be simplistically said that the flow of a pool of people brings more flexibility in the labor market of the host area. The problem of labor shortage, if any, is diminished as migrants offer supply of cheap labor. The immigrants are even willing to do unskilled jobs, while some immigrants may actually be very skillful too. Another positive aspect is the huge scope of cultural diversity and enrichment of the arts, science and various other finer aspects of the receiving region.

On the other hand, migration has its share of disadvantages to the receiving region too. A large pool of a new set of people put strain on the available resources. Housing and health care facilities are severely pressurized. Racial and ethnic tensions may sometimes destabilize the social fabric of the host region. The threat of job loss to the alien migrants creates panic too. Given this unresolved enigma of the net positive or negative effects of the impact migration towards the receiving region, we look at the migration scenario in India as well as in Assam.

We first compare the migration rate of Assam to that of rest of India. The latest migration figure is available in Census 2001. According to the Census 2001, there was a decline of migrants by 13.4% from other countries to India between 1991 and 2001.

Marriage was cited as a pre-dominant reason for migration. The main reasons of migration were marriage (43.8%), moved with households (21%) and work/employment (14.7%). Among the male migrants, the most important reason for migration is work/employment. Out of total 32.8 million total male migrants, 12.3 million cited work/employment as the reason for migration.

It is true that “about 65.2% of these migrants from the neighbouring countries had migrated to India at least 20 years back perhaps at the time of partition and later during the Bangladesh war in 1971. In comparison to 1991, there is 31.6% decline in international migration to India (excluding J&K) in 2001. This is due to substantial decline in the number of recent migration and death of earlier migrants due to old age” (Census of India 2001, Data Highlights).

Table1: Inter-state Migration based on Last Residence (0-9), Migration rate and Population Growth – 15 Major States

States	In-migrants from other states (2001)	Out-migrants (2001)	From other countries (2001)	Migration Rate (per 100) 1991-2001	Growth rate of population 1991-2001
Bihar	460,782	2,241,413	57,724	-2.7	28.62
Uttar Pradesh	1,079,055	3,810,701	32,110	-2	25.85
Assam	121,803	281,510	5,053	-0.7	18.92
Orissa	229,687	440,893	3,931	-0.7	16.25
Tamil Nadu	270,473	674,304	25,671	-0.7	11.72
Chhattisgarh	338,793	444,679	2,615	-0.6	18.27
Kerala	235,087	431,821	32,077	-0.6	9.43
Rajasthan	723,639	997,196	11,873	-0.6	28.41
Jharkhand	502,764	616,160	2,309	-0.5	23.36

Madhya Pradesh	814,670	842,937	6,939	0	24.26
Karnataka	879,106	769,111	20,533	0.3	17.51
West Bengal	724,524	730,226	259,204	0.4	17.77
Gujarat	1,125,818	451,458	14,800	1.7	22.66
Punjab	811,060	501,285	26,861	1.7	20.1
Maharashtra	3,231,612	896,988	48,394	3	22.73
India	16,826,879	16,826,879	740,867	0.09	21.54

Source: Census 2001

The net migration (difference between in-migration and out-migration) is highest for Maharashtra, followed by Delhi, Gujarat and Haryana. Assam has a migration rate of -0.7% between 1991 and 2001, whereas over this time frame population grew 18.9% in the state. For the country as a whole, between 1991 and 2001, migration rate is 0.09%, whereas population grew by 21.5%. Other than Assam, other states where number of out-migrants exceeded the number of in-migrants in 2001 were Bihar (-2.7%), Uttar Pradesh (-2%), Manipur (-1.4%), Nagaland (-1.4%), Orissa (-0.7%), Tamil Nadu (-0.7%), Chhattisgarh (-0.6%), Kerala (-0.6%), Rajasthan (-0.6%), Jharkhand (-0.5%), Jammu & Kashmir (-0.4%) and Mizoram (-0.1%). In all other states, except Madhya Pradesh, migration rate was positive. In Madhya Pradesh, migration rate was zero. Migration rate was highest in Daman & Diu (44.1%), which was followed by Dadra & Nagar (33%), Chandigarh (21.4%), Delhi (18.7%), Pondicherry (8.8%), Goa (8%) and other states.

Now, if we look at the migration pattern according to the duration of residence, we find that for majority of the states, as of 2001, a large volume of migrants came to their present location at least more than twenty years ago. In India, as a whole, more than 32% of the migrants came to their present location at least before 1981. Around 15% of the total migrants of the country did not specify the duration of their stay at the current location. Again, more than 22% reportedly came to their current location between 1981 and 1991. In Assam, as of 2001, around 27.8% of the migrants came to their current place at least 20 years ago. About 9.4% of the migrants in Assam did not divulge anything about the duration of their stay at the present location. Around 39% of the total migrants in Assam are dwelling in the present location since 1991. However, decomposition of the total migrants into various categories – migration from other states, international migration and migration from other districts of the same state – provides a clear picture of the gravity of the international migration, which came to the limelight due to the publication of NRC.

In fact, Assam is never a precariously affected state of in-migration, at least between 1991-2001, as per the latest available record. Most of the in-migration is of historical in nature—the huge pool of workers in the tea plantation and due to the effect of 1971 Bangladesh war. It must thus be argued that the present NRC debate cannot be related to either the flow of migration or its present status. In most cases, it is like correcting a long historical record of the foregone years. Economists have little to contribute in this politically sensitive issue.

The second issue is more of a theoretical nature. In most debates, the argument seems to visualize the migrants as a set of people who should be viewed as very vulnerable sections – either to be pitied or thrown away. This indeed is not an economic arena.

In economics, migrants can be treated as flow of human resources. It is true that such resources could put strain on local facilities and resources, however, it is also true that they themselves create new avenues and resources through the productive contributions of skills and endeavours.^{iv} The human capital that is embedded in them may create new vistas that is unimaginable to the locales. Institutions, ideas and the growth potentials of the migrants are huge. This is not to justify any illegal migrants but to keep the pros and cons of migration open. This chapter is missing in the current NRC controversy.

USA today and most of the European countries would have been poorer in terms of human capital and technology had not the migrants poured their endeavours into them. We know the plight of Germany when the Nazi regime ousted the Jews in the outcry of migration. German science and culture deteriorated while USA prospered. The deterioration was so heavy that the country that produced almost all the (barring few) proponents of modern Physics, would not produce atom bombs while USA did themselves treating it as the ‘gift of Hitler’. NRC debate eerily reminds us the Nuremberg’s law promulgated by Hitler to identify and oust the Jews to make Germany ‘pure’ from the effect of migration.

Table 2: Percentage of Migrants According to Duration of Residence

Last Residence	Less than 1 year	1-4 Years	5-9 Years	10-19 Years	20+ Years	Duration not stated
India	2.82	15.03	13.40	22.09	32.14	14.52
Assam	3.32	21.07	15.35	23.04	27.79	9.43

Source: Census 2001

3. The Panorama of Assamese Migration: Inter District Scenario

The issue of migration is not a recent phenomenon in Assam. This process of movement of people has been happening since the British colonial period. However, from the last two available migration data of Census 2001 and 1991, we see that over these two time frames, there has been a distinct decline in the share of migrants in almost all the districts for all types of migration – from other states, from other countries and internal migration. Again, it is evident that in both the time points, among these three types of migration, the share of internal migrants i.e., migration across districts has been highest for all the twenty three districts.

For the districts of Barpeta, Nagaon, Karimganj and Cachar, both for 1991 and 2001, the share of international migrants in district population was higher than that of the share of migrants from other states. In 1991, in the districts of Bongaigaon, Goalpara, Morigaon, Hailakandi, the share of international migrants in total population was higher than the share of the migrants from other states in total population. However, in 2001, for these four states, this trend reversed and the share of the international migrants in total population came lower than the share of migration from other states.

Now, we look at the migration profile in Assam according to the duration of residence and place of original residence (Table A.2). As of 2001, more than 45% of the total migrants of Assam have entered the state at least a decade ago, that is before 1991. Slightly over

30% of the migrants have not stated anything about the duration of their stay in the state. For all the districts, except Kokrajhar, the share of migrants who entered the districts more than two decades ago, that is at least before 1981, is highest among various categories of migrants according to the duration of residence.

Now, if we look into the total international migration and migration from Bangladesh (from where the majority of the international migrants have come to the state), we see that the share of total international migrants in total migrants in the state is below 2% and roughly 1.7% from Bangladesh as of 2001. In the last two decades, i.e., between 1981-2001, only 0.17% of the total migrants in Assam came from various other countries, whereas 0.11% came from Bangladesh. Again, 1.6% and 1.5% of the total migrants in Assam came to the state from various other countries and Bangladesh at least before 1981. The same trend is more or less witnessed across the districts.

Only two districts where migration rate from international countries as a percentage of total district migrants is over 5% as of 2001 are 5.8% in Cachar and 6.8% in Karimganj. The corresponding figures for these two districts from migration from Bangladesh are 5.7% and 6.7% respectively. For these two districts, 4.4% and 5.7% Bangladeshi migrants came to this state before 1981.

All these amply indicate the fact that migration in Assam has mostly its roots perhaps in the Bangladesh war of 1971. The subsequent consecutive decadal decline in the share of international migration in various districts of Assam indicates the issue of international migration in the state is more of a hype than reality.

4. Myths and Reality: The Significance of Migration Rates

Now we are at the cross-roads to check the impact of migration in Assam. Before entering into that task, we review some related studies both at the international and country level. IMF (2016) study finds that immigration raises the per capita GDP of advanced host countries, particularly though enhancing the labor productivity. Both the low-skilled and high-skilled migrants add to the existing skill sets of the population of the host country. Lall et al. (2006) surveyed the existing theoretical models of rural-urban migration in developing countries. They found that migration can be beneficial or at least be turned into a beneficial phenomenon. They are of the opinion that general migration restrictions are not desirable. Chandrasekhar and Sharma (2014) analyses the issue of internal migration for education and employment among the youth in India aged between 15-32 years. The study finds the states with better job opportunities such as Delhi, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Karnataka are gainers with respect to human capital, whereas traditionally backward states of Bihar, UP, Orissa, Rajasthan are losing human capital. In the south, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh are possibly losing out workers to Karnataka and Maharashtra. Again, the study of Roy and Debnath (2011), using pooled cross sectional data for fifteen major states in India found that net migration is positively influenced by the level of per capita income and the level of road infrastructure and negatively influenced by unemployment rate and cost of living. However, The overwhelming majority of people who migrate do so inside their own country. According to the United Nations (2017) data, internal migration in the world is three times higher than international migration. The migration situation India is of special interest due to a host of factors comprising large heterogeneity across different regions, peculiar demographic characteristics, wide variation in per capital income, unevenness in agriculture and industrial attainments across regions.

However, in order to statistically analyze how different variables pertaining to migration, operational agricultural holdings, poverty, literacy, percentage of people engaged in agricultural activities and percentage of people engaged in non-agricultural activities are related with per capita gross district domestic product (PGDDP), we employ both ordinary least squares (OLS) and weighted least

squares (WLS) methods. The values of the variables for the 23 districts in Assam are taken from 2001 Census and 2001 Agricultural Census.

We first check the impact of the variables - percentage of total migration, operational agricultural holding and poverty on PGDDP. In Model 1A, we use the OLS method and in Model 1B, we employ WLS method. Both the models depict percentage of total migration as a positive factor influencing PGDDP. In Model 1A, operational agricultural land holdings has a negative relationship with the PGDDP. However, the relationship between poverty and PGDDP turns out to be ambiguous.

Now, we introduce a few more variables pertaining to literacy rate, percentage of people engaged in agricultural activities and percentage of people engaged in non-agricultural activities and check their relationships with PGDDP again by using OLS and WLS methods in Models 2A and 2B respectively. In Model 2A, percentage of total migration and percentage of people engaged in non-agricultural activities turn out to be the variables positively influencing PGDDP. The operational holding bears a negative relation with PGDDP. In Model 2B, again, percentage of total migration and percentage of people engaged in non-agricultural activities turn out the variables positively impacting PGDDP. Operational agricultural land holdings and poverty negatively affect PGDDP.

In all these models, one factor that turns out to be the sole factor unambiguously affecting PGDDP is percentage of total migration. Perhaps, huge inherent human capital embedded in migrants has indelible impact on the domestic product of the host area. Flexible supply of labor, skill transformation and indomitable power of the vibrant flow of lives through migrants outweigh the cost of pressure on the available resources due to the addition of a huge pool of people.

5. Out off the Pandora's Box

Our analysis suggests that the recent pandemonium over illegal migrants from neighbouring country in Assam is more of a myth than reality. First of all, official data suggests that the flow of internal migration in various districts of Assam is miniscule in recent years and moreover it is showing a declining trend over the last few decades. The historical international migration that took place in Assam was due to mainly ‘push’ factor and no such ‘push’ factors have been in sight in the last few decades. Secondly and more importantly, migration of any form (though waning in Assam) adds to the prosperity and well-being of the state. The recent uproar over NRC in Assam and the issue of illegal migration do not hold much economic justification.

Table 3: Regression Results

Dependent Variable: Per capita gross district domestic product

	Model 1A (OLS)			Model 1B (WLS)			Model 2A (OLS)			Model 2B (WLS)		
	Coef.	t	P> t	Coef.	t	P> t	Coef.	t	P> t	Coef.	t	P> t
% of total migration	1642.74	2.03	0.056	2521.73	2.45	0.024	1456.42	2.15	0.047	1435.89	1.9	0.083
Size of operational agricultural holdings	-0.0673	-1.98	0.063	-0.0598	-1.56	0.135	-0.0564	-1.75	0.1	-0.0764	-2.9	0.01
Index of poverty	-22036	-2.24	0.037	9244.07	1.99	0.061	-2988.5	-0.24	0.816	-19919	-2.4	0.031
constant	25554.8	4.15	0.001	4005.52	2.19	0.041	90.0349	0.43	0.675	77.5365	0.4	0.701
% of people engaged in agricultural activities	-	-	-	-	-	-	56992.2	0.91	0.377	56505.2	1.7	0.107
% of people engaged in non-agricultural activities	-	-	-	-	-	-	129273	2.07	0.055	110396	2.2	0.044
constant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-13445	-0.5	0.623	45.8627	0	0.977
R-squared	0.3023			0.582			0.6189			0.8406		
Adj R-squared	0.1922			0.516			0.476			0.7809		

Our analysis shows that the preparation of NRC in Assam and dropping of the names of 40 lakh people from that list and the consequent furore over the incidence of illegal immigration do not have a strong economic justification. The episode of migration in Assam is mostly historical in nature with a significant decline in their numbers in recent decades.

On top of it, our analysis further statistically shows that migrants have positive impact on the growth of the districts of Assam. The huge positive effects of the huge pool of human resources outscore the negative externalities associated with them in the host area.

At the end of our discussion, we again come to the story of Pandora. After the bees were set free, she quickly closed the box. From within the box came a sweet murmur ‘please let us out’. Pandora was determined not to open the box again. She would not make the mistake second time. The murmur became more intense with continuous pleading noted with sweet tones of humility. At last, Pandora’s resolve was broken. Her kind heart felt for those locked in. She opened the box again. Came a sweet breeze that filled the world and healed the bee bite. Hope was born. Today not only Assam, but the entire India is hoping such a gentle breeze to come out.

Perhaps, a time has come when we can go with the idea of Noam Chomsky. In his book, *Democracy and Power - The Delhi Lectures* Chomsky (2014) spoke of world state with flexible borders where people can move wherever he/she wish and stay there. Common sense economics says that it will increase production, efficiency and lead to the general growth in the pool of knowledge. Sadly, the political tutelage will never allow this to happen. Documents like Nuremberg’s law and NRC will be created again and again to turn down the tide of universal brotherhood. In a different context, Swami Vivekananda once stated, “Sectarianism, bigotry, and its horrible descendant, fanaticism, have long possessed this beautiful earth. They have filled the earth with violence, drenched it often and often with human blood, destroyed civilization and sent whole nations to despair. Had it not been for these horrible demons, human society would be far more advanced than it is now.”

References:

Census (2001): *Data Highlights –Table D1, D2 & D3*, Government of India.

Chandrasekhar, S and Sharma, A (2014):“Internal Migration for Education and Employment among Youth in India,”*Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research Working Paper*, Mumbai.

Chomsky, Noam (2014): *Democracy and Power. The Delhi Lectures*, Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers.

Fei, John, C. H. and Ranis, Gustav (1964):*Development of Surplus Labour Economy: Theory and Policy*, Homewood, Illinois: Richard A. Irwin, Inc.

Harris, J and Todaro, M.P (1970): “Migration, unemployment and development: A two-sector Analysis,”*American Economic Review*, Vol 60, No 1, 126-142.

International Monetary Fund (2016): “World Economic Outlook,” October. Washington, D.C.

Lall, Somik V., Selod, Harris and Shalizi, Zmarak (2006):“Rural-Urban Migration In Developing Countries: A Survey Of Theoretical Predictions And Empirical Findings,”*World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3915*, May.

Lewis, W.A. (1954):“Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labor,” *The Manchester School*, 22 (2): 139–191.

Stark, Oded and David E. Bloom (1985): “The new economics of labor migration,” *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 75, No. 2, pp. 173-178.

Patnaik, Prabhat (2018): “Refugees and resources,” *The Telegraph*, 15 August, <https://www.telegraphindia.com/opinion/refugees-and-resources-252195> .

Roy, Niranjana and Debnath, Avijit (2011):“Impact of Migration on Economic Development: A Study of some selected State,”*IPEDR*, Vol.5, IACSIT Press, Singapore.

United Nations (2017):“Migration and Its Impact on Cities,” World Economic Forum.

ⁱ The Assam Accord ruled against the large-scale presence of illegal Bangladeshi migrants in Assam. The Assam Accord promised to detect and deport all ‘foreigners’ from Assam’s soil.

ⁱⁱ The latest detailed migration tables are available in Census 2001 and for earlier censuses. The detailed migration tables are not available in Census 2011.

ⁱⁱⁱThe refugees who fled persecution in erstwhile East Pakistan prior to the birth of Bangladesh in 1971, and came to India were forced to do so. The need to escape grinding poverty back home was the main ‘push’ factor behind such movement.

^{iv}In India too, there are examples of migrants doing wonders. In the epic Mahabharata, the Pandavas, after being deprived of their share of Hastinapur, were deported to the barren, and deadly animal infested Khandvaprastha. In an utterly new place, just with their sheer zeal and enthusiasm, the Pandava successfully converted this place to Indraprastha – the plain of the God Indra.

Appendix

Table A.1: Percentage of Migrants

	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001
district	From other states	From other states	From other countries	From other countries	Internal migrants	Internal migrants
Dhubri	1.83	1.34	1.07	0.47	2.96	2.42
Kokrajhar	2.44	1.93	1.66	0.93	6.5	5.29
Bongaigaon	2.66	2.25	2.82	1.4	10.79	9.12
Goalpara	1.26	1.07	1.84	0.95	6.2	6.07

Barpeta	0.63	0.4	1.55	0.55	3.19	2.91
Nalbari	1.01	0.56	0.97	0.49	7.28	5.63
Kamrup	4.68	4.3	1.39	0.64	10.48	11.31
Darrang	2	1.21	1.53	0.65	5.84	4.48
Sonitpur	2.87	2.08	1.27	0.63	7.2	7.13
Lakhimpur	1.51	1.45	0.81	0.33	6.15	5.83
Dhemaji	2.15	1.66	1.49	0.53	20.38	13.66
Morigaon	0.93	0.56	1.22	0.52	6	4.75
Nagaon	1.6	1.11	2.56	1.13	3.72	3.49
Golaghat	2.24	2.07	0.34	0.18	8.72	6.96
Jorhat	2.12	2.33	0.27	0.14	5.26	5.16
Sibsagar	1.88	1.97	0.21	0.11	4.54	5.14
Dibrugarh	3.93	2.92	0.65	0.3	6.8	6.19
Tinsukia	5.45	4.43	1.23	0.69	7.91	7.02
KarbiAnglong	4.74	3.53	1.57	0.82	9.5	7.4
N.C.Hills	4.04	2.92	1.33	0.64	14.75	10.82
Karimganj	1.77	1.24	3.56	1.61	2.92	2.24
Hailakandi	1.37	0.95	1.41	0.59	4.53	3.91
Cachar	1.59	1.33	2.98	1.63	3.36	2.37
Assam	2.39	1.94	1.51	0.71	6.49	5.76

Table A.2: Percentage of Migrants According to Duration of Residence and Place (District Wise)

district		Total migrants	Less than 1 year	1-4 Years	5-9 Years	10-19 Years	20+ Years	Duration not stated
Dhubri	Total	100.00	2.25	17.20	15.36	23.46	30.23	11.49
Dhubri	Last residence outside India	1.69	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.04	1.55	0.07
Dhubri	Bangladesh	1.59	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.03	1.47	0.06
Kokrajhar	Total	100.00	1.07	16.85	19.50	12.44	19.16	30.98
Kokrajhar	Last residence outside India	1.94	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.06	1.72	0.12
Kokrajhar	Bangladesh	1.86	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.05	1.66	0.12
Bongaigaon	Total	100.00	2.00	13.63	13.60	22.04	32.95	15.79
Bongaigaon	Last residence outside India	3.41	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.08	3.17	0.11
Bongaigaon	Bangladesh	3.29	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.07	3.07	0.11
Goalpara	Total	100.00	2.80	15.91	13.54	23.30	28.30	16.14
Goalpara	Last residence outside India	2.06	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.04	1.90	0.08

Goalpara	Bangladesh	1.93	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.03	1.81	0.07
Barpeta	Total	100.00	1.78	13.50	14.22	21.58	31.00	17.90
Barpeta	Last residence outside India	1.58	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.05	1.42	0.08
Barpeta	Bangladesh	1.54	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.04	1.39	0.07
Nalbari	Total	100.00	0.81	7.35	7.64	14.81	26.31	43.08
Nalbari	Last residence outside India	0.88	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.80	0.04
Nalbari	Bangladesh	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.63	0.03
Kamrup	Total	100.00	1.23	11.84	10.98	17.68	22.82	35.45
Kamrup	Last residence outside India	1.17	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.92	0.10
Kamrup	Bangladesh	0.85	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.73	0.06
Darrang	Total	100.00	1.68	11.27	11.02	19.12	32.04	24.88
Darrang	Last residence outside India	1.82	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.05	1.60	0.12
Darrang	Bangladesh	1.57	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.03	1.39	0.11
Sonitpur	Total	100.00	1.84	12.03	12.67	17.69	25.02	30.75
Sonitpur	Last residence outside India	1.65	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.05	1.43	0.10
Sonitpur	Bangladesh	1.38	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.03	1.25	0.07

Lakhimpur	Total	100.00	2.26	12.61	11.43	20.19	33.24	20.27
Lakhimpur	Last residence outside India	0.80	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.69	0.03
Lakhimpur	Bangladesh	0.55	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.49	0.02
Dhemaji	Total	100.00	1.17	7.97	7.72	17.48	31.47	34.19
Dhemaji	Last residence outside India	0.73	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.61	0.04
Dhemaji	Bangladesh	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.42	0.03
Morigaon	Total	100.00	2.44	11.83	11.47	20.63	26.58	27.05
Morigaon	Last residence outside India	1.36	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.05	1.23	0.04
Morigaon	Bangladesh	1.20	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.04	1.10	0.04
Nagaon	Total	100.00	1.50	10.86	10.60	17.81	30.83	28.39
Nagaon	Last residence outside India	3.28	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.09	2.88	0.24
Nagaon	Bangladesh	3.08	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.08	2.73	0.22
Golaghat	Total	100.00	2.16	10.64	10.27	18.29	28.18	30.46
Golaghat	Last residence outside India	0.40	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.34	0.02
Golaghat	Bangladesh	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00
Jorhat	Total	100.00	1.36	10.71	8.19	14.24	20.55	44.95

Jorhat	Last residence outside India	0.36	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.27	0.04
Jorhat	Bangladesh	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.22	0.01
Sibsagar	Total	100.00	1.78	13.84	10.90	18.05	23.24	32.19
Sibsagar	Last residence outside India	0.33	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.26	0.03
Sibsagar	Bangladesh	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.01
Dibrugarh	Total	100.00	1.26	9.78	8.23	15.51	22.98	42.24
Dibrugarh	Last residence outside India	0.70	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.02	0.51	0.04
Dibrugarh	Bangladesh	0.43	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.38	0.02
Tinsukia	Total	100.00	1.29	9.60	9.09	16.35	27.72	35.96
Tinsukia	Last residence outside India	1.78	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.09	1.53	0.11
Tinsukia	Bangladesh	1.05	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.94	0.06
KarbiAnglong	Total	100.00	1.20	8.68	8.84	14.91	24.72	41.65
KarbiAnglong	Last residence outside India	1.82	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.14	1.40	0.18
KarbiAnglong	Bangladesh	0.99	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.87	0.06
N.C.Hills	Total	100.00	2.37	11.33	12.30	17.85	17.14	39.01

N.C.Hills	Last residence outside India	1.31	0.01	0.07	0.07	0.25	0.84	0.07
N.C.Hills	Bangladesh	0.42	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.34	0.01
Karimganj	Total	100.00	0.88	8.82	9.88	18.15	32.09	30.18
Karimganj	Last residence outside India	6.80	0.01	0.07	0.11	0.35	5.80	0.47
Karimganj	Bangladesh	6.71	0.01	0.07	0.11	0.34	5.74	0.45
Hailakandi	Total	100.00	1.79	12.02	12.62	22.64	32.25	18.67
Hailakandi	Last residence outside India	2.00	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.13	1.64	0.13
Hailakandi	Bangladesh	1.95	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.12	1.61	0.13
Cachar	Total	100.00	1.21	10.40	10.32	18.38	29.50	30.18
Cachar	Last residence outside India	5.82	0.02	0.11	0.22	0.53	4.50	0.44
Cachar	Bangladesh	5.65	0.01	0.09	0.20	0.50	4.42	0.43
Assam	Total	100.00	1.56	11.72	11.33	18.16	27.17	30.06
Assam	Last residence outside India	1.93	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.10	1.63	0.12
Assam	Bangladesh	1.69	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.07	1.47	0.10

Source: Census 2001