D O K U M E N T A T I O N E N

How Big are the Metropolitan Cities?
Metropolization in the Far East
The Demographic Dimension I

Dirk Bronger

'Urbanization' or, to be more precise the degree of urbani-
zation (urbanization quota) is considered throughout as a
major indicator of development. In the "World Development
Report 1982", to cite an example, 'urbanization' is named as
one out of 24 key 'world development indicators'.(1) Apart
from the fact that the national definitions of what is 'ur-
ban' vary significantly from country to country (from 200
inhabitants onwards in Scandinavia up to 30,000 in Japan) so
that cross-country comparisions are impossible,(2) the no-
mination of this indicator is astonishing at least for two
reasons: Firstly the designation of the degree of urbaniza-
tion as an indicator of development, obviously deduced from
the 'innovative' character of what is 'urban', is quite
questionable at least for the countries of the Third World.
The 'parasitic' nature of the cities in these countries has
been pointed out by B.F. HOSELITZ already 30 years ago.(3)
Secondly the fact has apparently been overlooked that the
interpretation of 'urbanization' in its meaning as a fast
growing demographic process is a misleading if not even
incorrect statement of what has happend in reality: The
decisive feature of the rapid demographic process in the
last 40 years which has affected first and foremost the
Developing Countries is to be seen in the particularly fast
growing concentration of the population not in the 'urban
places' in general but in the large metropolises and capital
cities of these countries. Whereas the total population of
the Developing Countries rose to 2.3 and the urban (places `
20,000) to 5.4 times within this 40 year's period (1940-
1980) the metropolitan (places ⊃ 1 million) population ran
up to 15 (!) times with the result that while in 1940 one
sixth of the urban population stayed in metropolitan cities,
this proportion rose to almost incredible 46.4 %, i.e. near-
ly each second urban dweller here lives already in a metro-
politan city.(4) Apart from the demographic primacy, how-
ever, the second aspect of the metropolization process, the
(development of the) f u n c t i o n a l primacy of these

metropolitan cities is to be considered as even more essen-
tial in respect of the overall development of these coun-
tries: the excessive concentration of political and admini-
strative functions as well as economic, social and cultural
activities in the metropolises with all its negative conse-
quences such as the alarming internal rural-urban migration
predominantly into the capital region, the emergence and
expansion of slum and squatter areas together with the mar-
ginalization of their inhabitants with the following threat
to social unrest up to the endangered existence of the state
as a political unit. To sum up: The phenomenon 'metropoliza-
tion' has to be viewed as an essential s p a t i a l feat-
ure and, in its consequences as a grave problem for the
development of the countries of the Third World.

In our contribution we will concentrate on one aspect of
the phenomenon 'metropolization', i.e. to attempt the de-
termination of the actual population size of the metropoli-
tan cities in the Far East (South-, Southeast and East
Asia). The target is to find out a standardization making an
international comparison possible resp. sensible. Starting
point of the following considerations is the fact that the
information regarding the population data especially of the
larger cities - and this refers by no means to the Develop-
ing Countries alone - varies significantly not only in the
innumerable encyclopedias but also in the professional lite-
rature. To cite the best kown source of such frequent 'con-
fusing' information: In the latest edition of the UN Demo-
graphic Yearbook (1981) the population figure of Manila (No.
28 in Tab. 1) is only quoted as 1.479 Mill.(5), on the other
hand for Beijing (No. 41) as 7.570 Mill.(6) However, the
latter figure refers to an area of 16.807 sqkm (Tab.1, col.
13) whereas Manila's number to just 38 sqkm (Tab.1, col.6),
e.g. to the historic 'City of Manila' which forms just a
reatively small portion of Metro Manila.

The difficulties regarding the realization of this ap-
parently simple task, the determination and fixing of the
population figure to make the cross-country comparison sen-
sible are manifold in practice:(7)
1) 'Cities' are ususally demarcated by purely political
   boundaries with the consequence that their extent is
   arbitrary from a demographic-statistical as well as geo-
   graphic-functional point of view.
2) The way (intensions as well as causes) of delimiting
   cities vary significantly from country to country. Up to
   the present the units are not at all standardized.
3) For statistical, administrative or whatsoever reasons
   different delimitations especially in repect of larger

cities in most of the countries came into existence.
Again, these units have not been variously named ('city
area', 'municipal area', 'metropolitan area', 'urban
agglomeration', 'conurbation', 'urbanized area', 'metro-
politan region' etc.) but, what is more important, they
are quite seldomly defined accurately.
For computation of a Chinese city for example we have to
distinguish between three different area levels (the
latter includes always the former one):(8)
- shiqu : urban district or urban area (city proper)
- jiaoqu: suburban district (suburbs)(9)
- xian : country (under city administration)
The latter one incorporates several counties (Beijing: 9,
Shanghai: 10 etc.), i.e. often a huge agricultural um-
land. In eight cases (out of 33) it exceeds the size of
the 'New York Standard Consolidated Area' (SCSA:12.010
sqkm).
4) Definition and territorial extent of such cities - and
consequently the population density - vary not only from
country to country but also within the same place (com-
pare Shanghai - No.40 - and Taiyuan - No.52 - in Tab.1).
In other words: In the sense of DAVIS (10) 'underbounded'
and 'overbounded' cities exist side by side - making even
a national comparison all the more difficult.
5) To complete this confusion: Even within the same 'city'
different deliminations coexcist and are cited simultan-
eously even in official sources. So we have 'Bangkok
Metropolis': 1.562 sqkm as well as 'Greater Bangkok':
3.106 sqkm.
6) Last not least in the same majority of the Developing
Countries the population figures are based only on esti-
mates (although many specialists consider them as more
reliable than a great number of census data).(11)

From all these basic constraints we can derive the general
conclusion that population figures without simultaneous
information about the territorial extent for the present (as
well as the past) on which the population is based seems not
usefull at all. Regrettably however, this information is
included only very rarely.(12)
    What makes the distinction of the metropolitan population
in many countries and accordingly a comparative analysis
further difficult is the fact that the delimination of the
metropolitan a r e a is quite problematic. We mentioned
already the three existent area distinctions in China. In
India too (both countries contribute almost two third of the
metropolitan cities of the Far East (13)) we distinguish

between several administrative urban areas: 'City', 'Munici-
pal Corporation' (M.C.), 'Urban Agglomeration' (U.A.) and
sometimes even 'Metropolitan Region' (Bombay), resp. 'Na-
tional Capital Region' (Delhi).(14)
Out of all these deficiencies the next conclusions to be
deduced have to be: First a single (induvidual) area figure
for the metropolis cannot solve our problem. Second, it is
necessary to try to determine criteria for the different
area delimitations existing for the metropolitan cities in
order to achieve our target, i.e. making the population
figures for the region as a whole if not worldwide compara-
ble. It is well-known that almost each urban geographer has
his own method of deliminating the city from its umland.
Almost all of these often sophisticated indicators, however,
have the disadvantage that because of lack of data they are
far from being realizable. So we have to come down to seem-
ingly simple but practicable criteria.
Our former example of Manila and Beijing has revealed the
necessity to combine the population data with the respective
existent administrative delimination. In concrete terms we
distinguish between three size (and functional) categories
(Tab.1):
1) "Core City": In most cases it corresponds to the 'hist-
   oric city'; i.e. the metropolis existent up to the begin-
   ning of this century (the 'walled city' of Beijing (62
   sqkm), the 'city of Bombay' etc. - conf. Tab 1, col. 6,
   however, in many cases even up to around 1940 before the
   demographic 'great leap forward' began (Seoul, the 'City
   of Manila' etc. - to name likewise metropolises of to-
   day's 5-million size). As the present settlement pattern
   since then has spread far beyond these origional city
   limits (15) this delimination naturally cannot serve our
   purpose. It is true that in by far the most cases the
   'core city' is still the heart of the metropolis and its
   functional centre. This fact is to be cited as a specific
   feature of the metropolitan city. In other words: Con-
   urbations with several (independent) nuclei (core cities)
   as for example the Rhine-Ruhr Agglomeration should be a
   priori excluded.
2) "Urban Agglomeration": For our purpose two simple but
   practicable criteria, the population limit of one million
   (16) in combination with a minimum density of 2,000 in-
   habitants per sqkm will serve best. The often recommended
   density limit of 1,000 inhabitants per sqkm (17) appears
   applicable for metropolises of the Industrialized Coun-
   tries only, where the density of the metropolitan area
   concerned numbers on an average between 1,000 to 5,000

persons per sqkm.(18) As far as the metropolitan cities
in most of the Developing Countries are concerned, where
we have a by far higher density not only in respect of
the U.A. boundaries (col.2) but also quite often a com-
paratively high one within the umland, a density factor
of 1,000/sqkm seems not practicable for the aimed regio-
nal if not worldwide comparison as our compilation re-
veals (col.14): Culcatta's population would amount to 23
million , Jakarta and Shanghai to almost 20 million,
Seoul and Bombay would exceed 13 million inhabitants etc.
and accordingly large would be the metropolitan area.
Therefore a factor of 2,000/sqkm would rather meet the
present realities.
In fact our our determined "Urban Agglomeration", very
vaguely - if ever - defined in the countries concerned
(19) corresponds in most of our 72 metropolitan cities
approximately to DAVIS' 'truebounded' city. We have to
admit that in contrast to the vast majority of our far-
eastern metropolises quite a number of Chinese ones seem
'overbounded' (20) (main exception: Shanghai) causing
difficulties for the comparison.(21) Regrettably no re-
spective figures corresponding to any other state are
available for China.(22) To sum up: Despite significant
differences in the density figures (China - India) this
delimination serves best our purpose of an international
comparability in repect of metropolitan size and metro-
politan quota. It has, however, to be strongly emphasized
at this point that any formal - statistical delimination
naturally cannot solve the definition problem at all.

3) "Metropolitan Region": The reason wy this demarcation
which corresponds to the immediate zone of influece of
the metropolis, generally called its 'umland' (HOTTES
1950/54; SCHÖLLER 1953) or 'city region' (DICKINSON 1956)
(23), should be included to our discussion regarding the
demographic aspect of metropolization is twofold (24):
First, if the dynamics of metropilization continues this
category what we call "Metropolitan Region" at present
will be the metropolis of the (near) future. Second, it
allows a comparison with the Chinese xian-area. The com-
putation of the metropolitan population on this area
basis reveals a significant change of the metropolitan
proportions: Calcutta would approximately amount to one
and a half, Bombay at least to the same size as China's
largest metropolis: Shanghai.(25) Remembering again our
example of Beijing and Manila at the beginning: Trans-
ferred to the size of Beijing's municipal limits Metro-

politan Manila's population would number 13.1 million,
e.g. exceed that of Beijing of the concerned year by 5o%.

To conclude: Our discussion and the computation of the me-
tropolitan cities' population revealed the incontestable
necessity to take always the concerned area into account on
which a population figure is based. However, already this
simple statement discloses a number of difficulties: Quite
often detailed statistics are not available as it appears
from the gaps in our compilation. The area/population ratio
(and consequently the density) differs considerably even
between the metropolitan cities within the same country
(col. 9 - 30/31, 40/52 etc.). Therefore any comparison be-
comes questionable. But precisely for this reason the fixing
of an area/population ratio valid for a worldwide comparison
of the metropolitan population is unavoidable. Our consider-
ation disclosed that, taking also the availability of data
into account, our definition of "Urban Agglomeration" could
be compared most sensibly. The same method should be applied
regarding the data sets of the dynamic aspect of 'metropol-
ization' (metropolization process). Both form the precondi-
tion to derive conclusions in respect of causal correlations
between present level and process of development on one side
and primacy structure (LINSKY 1965), resp. city size distri-
bution pattern (BERRY 1970) etc. on the other. This has to
be discussed in a separate study.

Notes

(1) The World Bank (ed.), World Development Report 1982, New
    York, Tab. 2o, pp.148 f.
(2) Stated also in the explanatory text of the same contri-
    bution (ibid., p.169).
(3) See inter alia: HOSELITZ, B.F., Generatic and Parasitic
    Cities, in: Economic Development and Cultural Change, 3
    (1955), pp.278-294.
(4) More in detail see: BRONGER,D., Metropolisierung als
    Entwicklungsproblem in den Ländern der Dritten Welt. Ein
    Beitrag zur Begriffsbestimmung, in: Geographische Zeit-
    schrift, 72 (1984), Tab.I u. Abb.I.
(5) United Nations (ed.), Demographic Yearbook 1981, New
    York 1983, p.278 (figure for 1975).
(6) Ibid.,p.273 (for 1970) - with the additional comment
    'for municipalities which may (!) contain rural area as
    well as urban centre' (p.290).
(7) For the following see already: DAVIS,K.,et al., The
    World's Metropolitan Areas, Berkley, Los Angeles 1959,

pp.3f.

(8) BRONGER,D., Metropolization in China ?, in: Geo Journal
    8 (1984), pp.139ff.

(9) According to the latest sources released by the Chinese
    government this terminology unfortunately is no more
    practiced in a standarized matter as before: In the
    Zhongguo tongji nianjian 1983 (Statistical Yearbook of
    China 1983), Hong Kong 1983, to give an example the four
    urban districts of Beijing (479 sqkm) together with the
    six suburban districts (total 2.701 sqkm) is now named
    as "shiqu"" (p.35), translated as "city proper" in the
    English version (p.35). The author is deeply grateful
    to Mrs.Dilger (Seminar of East-Asian Studies, Ruhr-
    University Bochum) for rendering accessible to him the
    Chinese source.

(10)DAVIS,K., op.cit.,pp.6ff.

(11)It is certainly no secret that the population of many
    metropolitan cities in the Third World is significantly
    higher than the official data information. For Shanghai
    for example an estimate figure of 800,000 'temporary and
    illicit migrants' were officially reported for the year
    1957 (HOWE, Ch., The Level and Structure of Employment
    and the Source of Labour Supply in Shanghai 1949-57, in:
    LEWIS,J.W.,(ed.), The City in Communist China, Stan-
    ford/Cal. 1965,p.229). For Metro Manila (636 sqkm), to
    give an idea of the extent of the data discrepancies,
    apart from the Census figures (1980: 5.926 mill.) an
    "Informal Barangay Count" was conducted in the same year
    resulting in a figure of 8.217 mill. inhabitants. The
    latter figure most likely gives a more true picture of
    the real situation because it includes the definitely
    more than one million permanent and temporary workers
    mostly from the surrounding Luzonian provinces, working
    and living most of the time in Manila together with the
    hundred thousands of students and finally the illegal
    living persons - the vast majority of them being still
    registered in their home provinces.
    These deficiencies we always have to bear in mind dis-
    cussing the whole matter, i.e. also our target here!

(12)This is true, unfortunately, also for the above men-
    tioned solid study of DAVIS (1959).

(13)Excluding Japan.

(14)See: MISRA,B., Delhi: Shaping a Metropolitan Capital -
    Legacy and Future; HONJO,M. (ed), Urbanization and Re-
    gional Development, Nagoya 1981, p.240.

(15)This fact may be considered as one of the reasons that
    for quite a number of metropolitan cities the area figu-

re is either available for a larger city area only or no
more at all (see:Tab. 1, col. 6).
(16)The arbitrary quality of each such delimination is un-
questionable. There is also no readily apparent reason
for our decision of 1 million except that 1 million is a
convenient round number.
(17)See for example: BOUSTEDT,O.,Agglomeration, in: Handwör-
terbuch der Raumforschung und Raumordnung, Vol.I, Han-
nover 1970, p.25.
(18)

Metropolis (U.A.)	Year	Area sqkm	Popula- tion (000)	Density (per sqkm)
New York SMSA	1980	3.585	9.081	2.333
Chicago SMSA	1980	9.632	7.058	733
Greater London	1981	1.579	6.804	4.308
Hamburg	1980	747	1.645	2.202

(19)According to the latest Census of India an urban agglo-
meration is defined as 'the continuous urban spread
consisting of a core town and its adjoining urban out-
growths which may be either urban in their own right or
rural." (Census of India 1981, Series I - India, Paper 2
of 1981, New Delhi 1981, p.23).
(20)The comparatively large delimitation of Chinese U.A.'s
is mainly caused by the fact that already here a portion
of agricultural area and population is included: the
latter share aggregates to 23 % of the total (Statisti-
cal Yearbook of China 1983, p. 108), according to the
same (!) source even to 44 % (p. 107; calculated by the
author).
(21)See more in detail: BRONGER, D., Metropolization in
India and China - A Comparative Analysis, Aligarh 1984
(in press).
(22)Therefore it may be more sensible to use the 'urban'
population figures (see note 20) for comparison.
(23)A detailed discussion on this subject for which a vast
literature exists would be far beyond the frame of this
study.
(24)I am deeply indebted to several colleagues for their
assistance to determine the 'metropolitan region' of:
Indonesia (W. Rutz/Bochum), Malaysia (D. Kühne/Münster),
and South Korea (E. Dege/Kiel).
(25)For comparison of the quite large seeming area of sever-
al far-eastern metropolitan regions (see: note 18):

TAB.1: Size (Area and Population) of Metropolitan Cities in South-, Southeast- and East Asia
(C = census, E = estimates)

No	Country	Metropolis	Source	Year	A Core City Area (sqkm)	A Core City Population (000)	A Core City Density/ sqkm	A+B U.A. Area (sqkm)	A+B U.A. Population (000)	A+B U.A. Density sqkm	A+B U.A. Metropolitan Quota (MQ)	A+B+C Area (sqkm)	A+B+C Population (000)	A+B+C Density/ sqkm	A+B+C Metropolitan Quota (MQ)	Description (additional areas)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1	PAKISTAN	Karachi	C	1981				1,993	5,353	2,686	11.2	1,772	3,512	1,982		Tehsil: Lahore
2		Lahore	C	1981				332(1)	2,922	3,289		2,007	2,035	1,014		" : Faisalabad
3		Faisalabad	C	1981	28				1,092							
4	INDIA	Calcutta	C	1981	104	3,305	31,779	852	9,194	10,788	6.2	22,783	23,533	1,033	12.0	District: Nadia,Haora,Hugli,24 Parganas
5		Bombay	C	1981	69	3,196	46,304	603(2)	8,243(2)	13,671		17,309	13,081	756		" : Thane, Raigarh
6		Delhi	C	1981	541(3)	5,729	10,595	1,483(4)	6,220	4,194		10,655	10,255	962		" : Rohtak,Gurgaon,Ghaziabad
7		Madras	C	1981	170	3,277	19,276	572	4,289	7,499		8,033	6,893	858		" : Chengalpattu
8		Bangalore	C	1981	228	2,629	11,556	366	2,922	7,991		8,005	4,948	618		" : Bangalore
9		Ahmadabad	C	1981	98	2,060	20,988	222	2,548	11,471		8,707	3,876	445		" : Ahmadabad
10		Hyderabad	C	1981	171	2,093	12,233	379	2,546	6,715		7,710	3,843	498		" : Rangareddi
12		Kanpur	C	1981	262	1,487	5,683	299	1,639	5,482		6,176	3,742	606		" : Kanpur
11		Pune	C	1981	139	1,203	8,670	344	1,686	4,899		15,642	4,164	266		" : Pune
13		Nagpur	C	1981	218	1,219	5,603	237	1,302	5,495		9,931	2,589	261		" : Nagpur
14		Jaipur	C	1981	181	977	5,391	210	1,015	4,831		14,068	3,421	243		
15		Lucknow	C	1981	104	896	8,649	146	1,008	6,907		2,528	2,015	797		District: Lucknow
16	SRI LANKA	Colombo	C	1981	39	586	15,064	695(5)	1,698	2,443	11.4	2,094	3,087	1,474	20.8	" : Colombo,Gampaha
17	BANGLA DESH	Dacca (Dhaka)	C	1981	34			350(6)	3,459	9,882	5.6	6,988	10,123	1,449	16.7	" : Dacca
18		Chittagong	C	1981	13			326	1,388	4,255		5,076	4,458	878		Subdivision: Chittagong N & S
19	BURMA	Rangoon	C(7)	1983				518	3,974	7,671	11.3					
20	THAILAND	Bangkok	C	1980				1,556(8)	5,154	3,312	11.6	3,106	6,077	1,957	13.7	Changwat: Phra Nakorn,Thon Buri,Nonthaburi
21	MALAYSIA	Kuala Lumpur	C	1980				243(9)	920	3,786	6.8	1,359	1,559	1,147	11.6	& District Petaling, Kelang /Prakan
22	SINGAPORE	Singapore	C	1980				618	2,414(10)	3,905	100.0					
23	INDONESIA	Jakarta	C	1980				590	6,503	11,023	8.4	5,674	11,917	2,100	18.6	Kabupaten: Tanggerang,Bekasi,Bogor & Kota:Bogor
24		Surabaya	C	1980				274	2,028	7,400		3,816	4,661	1,222		" : Sidoarjo,Lamongan,Gresik
25		Bandung	C	1980				81	1,463	18,002		3,255	4,132	1,269		" : Bandung
26		Medan	C	1980				265	1,379	5,208		9,450	3,491	369		" : Deli Serdang,Langkat&Kota:Binjai & Tebing Tinggi
27		Semarang	C	1980				335	1,027	3,068		3,366	3,195	949		" : Semarang,Kendal,Demak&Kota:Salatiya
28	PHILIPPINES	Metro Manila	C	1980	38	1,630	42,571	636	5,926	9,318	12.3	4,895	8,594	1,756	17.9	Metro Manila & 60 municipalities
29	VIETNAM	Ho-Chi-Minh City	C	1979				1,845	3,420	1,854	13.8	14,815(12)	7,866	531	(43.3)(11)	Provinces: Long An(11),Tien Giang (11) Ben Tre(11),Dong Thap (11)
30		Hanoi		1979				597	2,571	4,307		19,878(13)	9,405	473		" : Ha Son Binh(11),Yinh Phu(11) Ha Bac (11), Hai Hung
31		Haiphong	C	1979				1,515	1,279	844		6,381(13)	5,567	872		" : Ha Nam Ninh, Thai Binh
32	HONG KONG	Hongkong	C	1981	9(14)	799	87,802	1,061	5,110(15)	4,816	100.0	1,077	5,379(16)	4,994	100.0	Hongkong & Macao
33	TAIWAN	Taibei	E	1983				272	2,349	8,636	19.4	2,457	5,168	2,103	40.3	Taibei + Jilong Shi & Taibei Xian
34		Gaoxiong	E	1983				154	1,253	8,136		2,947	2,298	780		Gaoxiong Shi & Xian
35	KOREA-S	Seoul	C	1980	35	345	9,818	607	8,367	13,777	38.0	12,349	13,366	1,082	54.8	"Capital Region"(City of Seoul & Gyeonggi Do)
36		Pusan	C	1980				432	3,160	7,310		4,620	4,975	1,077		Masan Si,Ulsan Si,Chianhae Si,Ch'angwon Si Miryang Gun,Koje Gun, Uich'ang Gun, Kimhae Gun, Yangsan Gun, Ulju Gun
37		Taegu	C	1980				180(17)	1,607	8,944		1,797	2,179	1,212		Kumi Si,Talsong Gun, Ch'ilgok Gun, Kyongsan Gun
38		Incheon	C	1980				201	1,085	5,406		included in Seoul M.R.				
39	KOREA-N	Pjongjang	E	1980	141	1,283			1,700		9.5					
40	CHINA	Shanghai	C	1982		5,840(18)	41,418	230	6,321	27,483	6.7	6,186	11,860	1,917		
41		Beijing	C	1982	479(19)			2,701	5,598	2,073		16,807	9,231	549		
42		Tianjin	C	1982				4,276	5,143	1,203		11,305	7,764	687		
43		Shenyang	E	1982	164	2,940(20)	17,927	3,495	4,020	1,150		8,515	5,140	604		
44		Wuhan	E	1982	172			1,557	3,230	2,075		4,480	4,180	933		
45		Guangzhou	E	1982				1,345	3,148	2,341		11,757	5,629	477		
46		Chongqing	E	1982				1,521	2,650	1,742		9,848	6,510	661		
47		Harbin	E	1982	156	2,150	13,782	1,637	2,550	1,558		1,637	2,550	1,558		
48		Chengdu	E	1982	40	1,239	30,975	1,447	2,470	1,707		3,861	4,020	1,041		
49		Zibo	E	1982					2,234			7,000(22)				
50		Xi'an	E	1982	157			861	2,184	2,537		2,441	2,940	1,204		
51		Nanjing	E	1982	41			867	2,130	2,457		4,718	3,744	794		
52		Taiyuan	E	1982	168	1,211	7,207	3,044	1,750	575		6,988	2,200	315		
53		Changchun	E	1982	104			1,116	1,740	1,559		18,881(21)	5,750	305		
54		Dalian	E	1982				1,003	1,480	1,476		12,573	4,720	375		
55		Lanzhou	E	1982				2,122	1,430	674		14,414	2,400	167		
56		Kunming	E	1982	22	560(20)	25,455		1,443			6,593	1,991	302		
57		Zhengzhou	E	1982	80	840(20)	10,500		1,424			1,748	1,910(20)	1,093		including counties (Xian) under city's administration
58		Tangshan	E	1982					1,333			16,000(22)				
59		Jinan	E	1982	78	867	11,120	483	1,320	2,733		4,875	3,350	687		
60		Guiyang	E	1982	54	734	13,593	170	1,314	7,729		2,436	1,296(20)	532		
61		Qiqihar	E	1982					1,222			5,000(22)				
62		Anshan	E	1982					1,210			4,000(22)				
63		Fushun	E	1982					1,190			10,500(22)				
64		Qingdao	E	1982				244	1,180	4,836		5,966	4,260	714		
65		Hangzhou	E	1982				430	1,180	2,744		16,596	5,281	318		
66		Fuzhou	E	1982	34				1,122			3,208	1,650	514		
67		Changcha	E	1982	53	810(20)	15,283	352	1,072	3,045		3,995	2,487	622		
68		Jilin	E	1982					1,071			20,000(22)				
69		Shijiazhuang	E	1982		720		322	1,070	3,323		15,000(22)				
70		Nanchang	E	1982	117	820	7,009	561	1,046	1,865		4,791	2,489	520		
71		Baotou	E	1982					1,042			10,500(22)				
72		Huainan	E	1982					1,036							

Notes: (1) Municipal Corporation (M.C.). (2) "Bombay Metropolitan Region": 3.860 sqkm - 10,724 inhabitants. (3) U.A. (4) Union Territory.
(5) Colombo District. (6) Dacca Statistical Metropolitan Area (SMA). (7) preliminary figures. (8) Bangkok (Phra Nakon) & Thon Buri Changwats.
(9) Wilayah Persekutuan. (10) 2,472 (estimate 1982). (11) belong only partly to the MR. (12) Some portions of Song Be & Tay Ninh & Dong Nai belong
also to the Ho-Chi-Minh M.R. (13) may to be considered as a single MR. (14) Kowloon. (15) 1982 year-end estimate: 5.233 mill.
((16) June 1982 estimate. (17) since 1981: 455.09 sqkm. (18) 31.12.1982 (Zukang 1982); according to other Chinese sources:
150 sqkm - 6.01 mill.pop.(ESCAP, 1982: 112). (19) = 4 urban district "walled citiy": 61.8 sqkm. (20) 1981. (21) according to another official
source: 19,380 sqkm - 5,754,166 inhabitants (Zhongguo Baike Nianjian 1983). (22) computed by the author from: Zhonghua renmingongheguo fen sheng
District Provincial Atlas of China, 1977.
Sources: Census figures; TAIWAN: Statistical Yearbook of the Republic of China 1983; KOREA DEM REP: Statistisches Bundesamt Wiesbaden (ed.):
Länderbericht Demokratische Volksrepublik Korea 1984; CHINA: Statistical Yearbook of China 1983; Zhongguo Baike Nianjian 1983; VIETNAM: The Far
East and Australasia 1982/83, p. 1214.

Metropolis (M.R.)	Year	Area (sqkm)	Population ('000)	Density (per sqkm)
New York SCSA	1980	12.010	15,796	1,315
Chicago SCSA	1980	12.062	7,870	652
Reg.Parisienne	1975	12.007	9,865	822
Hamburg	1980	7.341	2,812	383