



THE ECONOMIC CONDITION OF INDIA DURING THE BRITISH EAST INDIA COMPANY RULE (1757-1858): A STUDY

Dr. Ram Krishna Mandal^{1*} and Ms. Bar Yakar²

¹Professor, Department of Economics, Cooch Behar Panchanan Barma University, Cooch Behar, West Bengal, India.

²Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Dera Natung Govt. College, Itanagar, Arunachal Pradesh, India.

*Corresponding Author

Dr. Ram Krishna Mandal

Professor, Department of Economics, Cooch Behar Panchanan Barma University, Cooch Behar, West Bengal, India.

Article History

Received: 01.02.2025

Accepted: 24.02.2025

Published: 22.03.2025

Abstract: India was famous for crafts and textiles in great demand in overseas markets; Delhi, Agra and Lahore were key trade and cultural hubs. The Company monopolized the sale of raw cotton and forced the Bengal weaver to pay through nose for that. So, the weaver lost in both ways, as a buyer and as a seller. On the contrary, Indian textiles had to bear heavy duties for feeding England. India had shrunk from the world's preeminent manufacturing country to an emblem of famine and want.

Objective: Examining India's economic situation during the British East India Company's administration is the study's goal. **Methodology:** All of the data used in this research was obtained from secondary sources. **Results and Discussion:** The expansion of the company's dominion was primarily manifested through two significant modalities. The initial modality entailed the unequivocal incorporation of Indian principalities, succeeded by the establishment of direct administrative control over the corresponding regions, which collectively amalgamated to constitute British India. This historical time saw significant economic changes, particularly during the British East India Company's dominance in India from the middle of the 18th century until the middle of the 19th century. During this time of significant global integration, India's old economic institutions and frameworks underwent significant changes to meet the needs of the British economy. **Findings:** India's economy was systematically exploited during the British East India Company's (EIC) administration, turning it from a thriving, independent system to a colonial one that served British interests. Deindustrialization, rising poverty, and economic outflow were the defining features of the time. **Conclusion:** Over the course of the East India Company's existence, the pre-colonial Indian economy underwent a number of changes and disturbances. The Company's local policies, which were mainly intended to enforce a British economic agenda, had a major impact on the growth of the agricultural sector, trade, commerce, and taxation systems.

Keywords: Crafts and Textiles, Famine, Administrative, Deindustrialization, Trade, Taxation.

Cite this article:

Mandal, R. K., Yakar, B., (2025). THE ECONOMIC CONDITION OF INDIA DURING THE BRITISH EAST INDIA COMPANY RULE (1757-1858): A STUDY. *ISAR Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(3), 25-30.

Introduction

The Mughal Empire, which governed Northern India from the middle of the 16th century to the middle of the 17th century, offered a secure and prosperous environment, both financially and with agricultural abundance. India was famous for crafts and textiles – in great demand in overseas markets; Delhi, Agra and Lahore were key trade and cultural hubs. According to Chandra (1989), the East India Trading Company was established on 31st December, 1600, with a Royal Charter issued by the Queen Elizabeth I empowering the company to trade in the East Indies. And since India was prosperous and rich, the corporation quickly shifted its attention to India. The first factory opened in Surat, a

port city, in 1612. It would later open factories in other ports, including Hugli, now Kolkata, and Masulipatnam, near Madras (Marshall, 2005). Hence, we can go on to see that the arrival of the European traders, especially the Britishers, on the Indian soil was the inception of the fresh economic status. The company's overseas sales of Indian goods were its primary source of income. It made consistent efforts to increase the reach of Indian goods in Britain and other countries. So, it encouraged the production of Indian manufacturers by raising their export. But this also explains why the Indian government sanctioned — and even encouraged — the Company to establish plants there [<https://www.anujindal.in/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/2.-India-under-East-India-Companys-Rule.pdf>]. The battle of Plassey fought in Bengal in 1757 made a

fundamental change in the nature of the Company's trade links with India. Now the Company could continue the expansion of its Indian commerce thanks to its political power over Bengal. Not only did the Company put political pressure on Bengali weavers to dictate terms and conditions that forced them to sell their goods at a lower and controlled price, even at a loss. They no longer worked for free either. Much of them were banned from working for Indian merchants and compelled to operate for the Company for meager wages. It thus ousted the rival traders, whether foreign or Indian, and prevented them from paying the Bengali artisans better wages for their work.

The Company monopolized the sale of raw cotton and forced the Bengal weaver to pay through nose for that. So, the weaver lost in both ways, as a buyer and as a seller. On the contrary, Indian textiles had to bear heavy duties for feeding England. In 1600, the year the East India Company was founded, Britain accounted for 1.8% of the world's GDP; India, 22.5% of global GDP. The Bengali weaver was made to pay exorbitant prices for raw cotton, which was cornered by the Company's men. Consequently, the weaver lost in both buying and selling. Indian textiles, on the other hand, faced high tariffs to supply England.

By then, those numbers had roughly flipped: India had shrunk from the world's preeminent manufacturing country to an emblem of famine and want [<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jun/29/british-empire-india-amartya-sen>]. The present-day economist Paul Kennedy noted India's economic prowess in his 'The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers'. For the 200 years of British rule over India, he observes, "India's share in world trade, which was a very healthy 25 percent of the total world trade, came down drastically to a decimal percentage." The challenges small firms faced have long historical roots, as Harvard University Professors David Clingingsmith and Jeffrey G. Williamson note about detriments of 200 years of British colonial rule for India, an experience that, they argue, proved unreversed for the country's de-industrialisation in the 18th and 19th centuries.

India was a major player in the global textile export market until the early eighteenth century, when it saw its first notable downturn. By the middle of the nineteenth century, India had lost all of its export markets as well as a sizable chunk of its domestic market. Historically, in 1750 India had nearly 25% of the world industrial production share, but in 1900 it shrank to just 2% of the world production [<https://www.artofliving.org/in-en/culture/reads/india-and-world-trade>]. It is due to plunder of India's wealth that India was brought down. India was looted by Britain. Over most of the central subcontinent, the Marathas displaced the Mughals in the eighteenth century, while other petty regional powers like the Nizams in the south and the Nawabs in the north were largely late Mughal vassals. It was the mid-1800s, and the British imperial dominion began to proliferate into India.

The industrial landscape of India transitioned into a state of regression as it encountered various socio-economic challenges. Historically, Mughal India represented one of the most prominent and vital centers of manufacturing that significantly contributed to global commerce until the latter part of the 18th century, as highlighted by Parthasarathi in his scholarly work published in 2011. The sectors of steel production, shipbuilding, and textile manufacturing emerged as key pillars of this thriving industry.

Among the array of processed goods that were produced, one could find cotton textiles, diverse yarns, intricate threads, luxurious silks, jute products, various forms of metal ware, and essential food items such as butter, oils, and sugar, all of which played a crucial role in trade. The growth of these manufacturing sectors has been likened to the early industrial expansion observed in Western Europe during the 18th century, a period that preceded the onset of the Industrial Revolution, and this phenomenon is often referred to as a form of proto-industrialization. Furthermore, Mughal India became a significant supplier of various commodities, including cotton fabrics, an assortment of spices, peppers, indigo, luxurious silks, and saltpetre, which was utilized in the production of munitions, all of which were highly sought after by early modern Europe. For instance, Indian silks and textiles began to exert a considerable influence on the fashion trends prevalent in Europe during that era. Notably, during the late 17th and early 18th centuries, an astounding ninety-five percent of British imports originating from Asia were sourced from the manufacturing centers of Mughal India, while approximately forty percent of the Dutch imports from Asia were derived exclusively from the Bengal Subah region. It is important to note that the demand for European goods within Mughal India was comparatively low, leading to a situation where the exports from Europe to this region were predominantly limited to woollen fabrics, metal ingots, glassware, intricate mechanical clocks, weaponry—particularly the blades crafted for the renowned Firangi swords—and a select few luxury items, as described by Roy in 2010. Moreover, shipbuilding emerged as a particularly significant industry within Mughal India, especially in the economically vibrant region of Bengal Subah. Economic historian Indrajit Ray has documented that Bengal was capable of producing an impressive annual total of 223,250 tonnes of ships during the 16th and 17th centuries, a staggering figure when compared to the nineteen colonies located in North America, which collectively produced a mere 23,061 tonnes of ships in the brief period from 1769 to 1771, as noted by Ray in 2011.

Beginning and Ending of East India Company Rule in India

The term "company rule" in the context of India specifically pertains to the authoritative governance exercised by the British East India Company over the vast subcontinent. Various historical accounts suggest that the commencement of this dominion can be traced back to the pivotal Battle of Plassey, which occurred in the year 1757. Following this significant military engagement, the Nawab of Bengal ultimately capitulated, thereby surrendering his territories to the East India Company in the year 1765, at which point the Diwani, or the right to collect taxes in the regions of Bengal and Bihar, was formally conferred upon the Company. The establishment of the Company's capital in Calcutta, which is presently known as Kolkata, took place in 1773, leading to the appointment of Warren Hastings as its inaugural Governor-General, thereby marking the commencement of the Company's direct involvement in the governance of the region. This system of rule and administration persisted uninterrupted until the year 1858, when the British government assumed direct responsibility for the governance of India in what became known as the British Raj, a transition that was precipitated by the widespread Indian uprising of 1857 and the consequential political ramifications stemming from the Government of India Act of 1858.

Objective: Examining India's economic situation during the British East India Company's administration is the study's goal.

Methodology

All of the data used in this research was obtained from secondary sources. To achieve the study's objective, a variety of published and unpublished research articles, papers, books, government reports, etc., have been examined. After a survey of the literature, a variety of topics have been brought up and investigated according to their nature.

Results and Discussion

The fate of Nawab Sirajddaula, who holds the distinction of being the final independent monarch of Bengal, has been subjected to misrepresentation by various foreign historians who have portrayed his character in a manner that is heavily skewed and lacking in accuracy.

It would be more realistic to characterize Nawab Sirajddaula as an autonomous, liberal, and secular ruler who attempted to negotiate the challenges of government during a time of severe political unrest and outside threats. It is more accurate to describe the encounter in which Nawab Sirajddaula was defeated by the British on the Palashi battlefield as a farce masquerading as a war than as a real contest. This conflict was essentially a skirmish that was enmeshed in a horrific plot that was carried out in the name of battle and ultimately threatened Bengali autonomy. Scholars generally agree that Sirajddaula's attempts to change his character, which directly conflicted with the objectives of the English East India Company, were the catalyst for the Battle of Palashi. It is important to note that even Sirajddaula's critics were unable to locate any concrete evidence of his claimed abominable behavior when he became Nawab, despite the widespread belief that the English East India Company committed any horrible atrocities against him.

Consequently, it becomes increasingly difficult to locate any substantial evidence that would be used against him. It would be more accurate to describe Nawab Sirajddaula as a fervent nationalist, accusing the British of being foreign enemies and the people who plotted against him of betraying him. During his brief tenure as Nawab of Bengal, which began on April 15, 1756, Sirajddaula demonstrated a keen understanding of the perilous situation facing the East India Company. Because he thought that some of the British's actions were blatantly anti-national, the Nawab took a firm stance against them. During his fifteen months in office, he has shown no signs of immaturity, insanity, or brutal rule. According to Doe, "Bengal was the richest and most populous country in the world, boasting a superior agricultural system." It is important to acknowledge that common farmers and crafters also enjoyed some degree of peace and prosperity, even though the region's wealth was concentrated among the merchant and aristocratic groups. Because they were fully aware of the appalling conditions in their nation, the Nawabs of Bengal managed to escape tyranny during their rule. It would be a blatant falsehood to say that Nawab Sirajddaula tormented his countrymen because he was a kind and giving man.

Even if his style of government did not turn into a dictatorship, the battle of Palashi, which took place on June 23, 1757, serves as a sobering reminder of how a whole nation's destiny was handed

over to a foreign power under the guise of conflict. India's independence ended prematurely as a result of the Nawab's eventual defeat. Brave and honest, Nawab Sirajddaula was the victim of a carefully thought-out attempt to topple his regime. The Plassey pillage is the historical term for the extensive pillaging that the English East India Company carried out throughout Bengal over a twenty-year period following the Battle of Plassey.

The money gained from this heinous looting was essential in igniting England's industrial revolution and solidifying the predatory methods that defined British colonial control. The historian Speer appropriately noted this phenomenon when he said that "the welfare state has become a plunderous state," emphasizing how a society that had previously prioritized the welfare of its citizens had shifted to one that placed a higher priority on obtaining wealth at the expense of the general public. The British East India Company took over Bengal after the Battle of Plassey, and as a direct result of their systematic looting and ruthless exploitation of the native population, the disastrous incident known as the 'Manvantar of the Cursed Seventy-Six' took place in 1770, or 1176 in Bengali calendar years. More than 1.50 crore people perished in this terrible famine, a tragedy that is chronicled in Chowdhury (2013) and Maitra (2023), highlighting the terrible human cost of colonial exploitation and the disastrous effects of imperial greed.

Emperor Shah Alam II was necessitated to appoint the company as the diwan, or fiscal administrator, of Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa subsequent to its victory at the Battle of Plassey in 1757 led by Robert Clive, and subsequently again at the Battle of Buxar in Bihar in 1764. Consequently, by the year 1773, the Company had effectively consolidated control over a substantial expanse of the lower Gangetic plain. Furthermore, it incrementally broadened its domain of influence to encompass Madras and Bombay. Extensive territories of India situated south of the Sutlej River remained under its jurisdiction following the Anglo-Mysore Wars (1766–1799) and the Anglo-Maratha Wars (1772–1818). The Company faced no imminent threat from any indigenous force subsequent to the defeat of the Marathas (Markovits, 2004).

The expansion of the company's dominion was primarily manifested through two significant modalities. The initial modality entailed the unequivocal incorporation of Indian principalities, succeeded by the establishment of direct administrative control over the corresponding regions, which collectively amalgamated to constitute British India. The incorporated regions comprised the North-Western Provinces (including Rohilkhand, Gorakhpur, and the Doab) (1801), Delhi (1803), Assam (Ahom Kingdom 1828), and Sindh (1843). Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, and Kashmir were assimilated subsequent to the Anglo-Sikh Wars during the interval from 1849 to 1856 (the duration of the Marquess of Dalhousie's governorship); however, Kashmir was swiftly ceded under the Treaty of Amritsar (1850) to the Dogra dynasty of Jammu, thereby attaining recognition as a princely state. The annexation of Berar transpired in 1854, followed by the incorporation of the state of Oudh two years later. The second modality concerned the exertion of authority through treaties in which Indian sovereigns conceded to the company's supremacy in return for circumscribed internal autonomy.

Given the fiscal limitations within which the Company functioned, it became essential to establish robust political foundations for its

governance framework. The paramount form of such support was cultivated through the subsidiary alliances established with Indian sovereigns during the preliminary 75 years of the Company's dominion. By the early 19th century, the regions administered by these sovereigns represented approximately two-thirds of the Indian subcontinent. When an Indian ruler, possessing the capacity to protect his domain, sought to form such an alliance, the Company regarded it as a financially prudent approach for indirect governance, which alleviated the economic strains of direct administration and the political complexities inherent in securing the loyalty of foreign subjects (Brown, 1994).

In exchange, the Company undertook the obligation for the "protection of these subordinate allies and conferred upon them customary esteem and emblems of distinction." The implementation of subsidiary alliances enabled the formation of princely states administered by Hindu Maharajas and Muslim nawabs. Among these princely states, notable examples include: Cochin (1791), Jaipur (1794), Travancore (1795), Hyderabad (1798), Mysore (1799), Cis-Sutlej Hill States (1815), Central India Agency (1819), Cutch and Gujarat Gaikwad territories (1807–1820), Rajputana (1818), and Bahawalpur (1833) (Ludden, 2002). The Company inherited a fiscal collection system from the Mughal Empire, in which the majority of the tax obligations were disproportionately borne by the agricultural producers (<https://www.anujjindal.in/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/2.-India-under-East-India-Company-Rule.pdf>).

India under British East India Company rule: The British East India Company, which underwent a gradual expansion of its political influence in India commencing in 1757, strategically employed the considerable revenues generated from the territories under its administration to acquire Indian raw materials, spices, and a diverse array of commodities. As a result, the continuous influx of precious metals that had historically permeated India through international trade was completely halted. The Colonial administration predominantly allocated land revenue towards military operations both within India and in Europe, thereby leaving minimal resources available for the advancement of the Indian subcontinent. Within a relatively concise timeframe of 80 years (1780-1860 CE), marked by Colonial subjugation, India underwent a transformation from a role as an exporter of processed goods, receiving compensation in bullion, to that of an exporter of raw materials and a consumer of manufactured items.

Predominantly, India served as a significant exporter of high-quality cotton and silk to various markets across Europe, Asia, and Africa; by the mid-19th century, specifically the 1850s, the export landscape was predominantly comprised of raw materials, including raw cotton, opium, and indigo, which represented the majority of India's international trade. The relentless exploitation inherent in British colonial governance systematically dismantled the economic framework of India. The Indian populace endured recurrent famines, experienced one of the lowest life expectancies on a global scale, faced widespread malnutrition, and demonstrated markedly high illiteracy rates. As articulated by the British economist Angus Maddison, the share of India's global income witnessed a dramatic decline from 27% in the year 1700 AD (in comparison to Europe's 23%) to a mere 3% by the year 1950 (Maddison, 1995, 2001 & 2003).

India changed dramatically between 1780 and 1860, going from exporting processed commodities that were paid for with bullion to exporting raw resources and importing manufactured goods [Robb 2011, pp. 131–34]. India's economy dropped from being the world's largest to the second-largest by 1820, coming in second only to China (Maddison, 2006, p. 638). British economic policies gave them a monopoly on India's enormous market and cotton supplies [James Cypher, 2014; Paul Bairoch, 1995]. How much money did Britain take out of India? Around \$45 trillion over 173 years, according to a well-known economist: During the roughly 200 years when Britain dominated India, there was a great deal of pain and starvation. Over these two centuries, India's riches was steadily depleted. Prominent economist Utsa Patnaik, who has studied the fiscal connections between Colonial India and Britain in great detail, has attempted to answer a topic that many Indians find very interesting: how much money did the British take from India? India still struggles to escape poverty as a result of Britain's embezzlement of almost \$45 trillion, according to Patnaik's recently published article by Columbia University Press (<https://www.businesstoday.in/latest/economy-politics/story/this-economist-says-britain-took-away-usd-45-trillion-from-india-in-173-years-111689-2018-11-19>).

The state of the economy overall during the East India Company's rule

This historical time saw significant economic changes, particularly during the British East India Company's dominance in India from the middle of the 18th century until the middle of the 19th century. During this time of significant global integration, India's old economic institutions and frameworks underwent significant changes to meet the needs of the British economy.

Agrarian Economy

An important part of the Indian economy at the time, the country's agrarian sector was significantly impacted by the analysis of the East India Company's operating frameworks. Established in 1793, the Permanent Settlement regarding Bengal sought to create a system of fixed revenue based on land. But this system made it easier for Zamindars to exploit the people, which led to widespread poverty and circumstances akin to famine in society [Bayly, 1988].

Trade and Commerce

Cotton, silk, indigo, tea, and opium were among the essential goods that the Company had significant control over. India became a significant source of raw materials for British businesses and a market for their finished goods as a result. Due to local manufacturers' inability to compete with the comparatively cheaper British goods, this trade dynamic resulted in the demise of several industrial businesses that had previously controlled India's handicraft output [Habib, 1982].

Revenue and Taxation

Land revenue, customs charges, and trade taxes were all included in the more organised and efficient tax collecting system that the East India Company established. Such high taxes often caused great hardship for local producers and dealers engaged in economic activity. Making as much money as they could for the British crown was their primary objective [Roy, 2011].

Infrastructure and Investment

It is important that the company built infrastructure to facilitate resource extraction and exports, even when its exploitative behaviors against the populace are obviously evident. Their programs included transportation infrastructure, such as ports, railroads, and highways; livestock markets; and infrastructure development. These developments helped the Company maintain its economic hegemony in Britain, but they also paved the way for India's development of contemporary infrastructure [Derbyshire, 1987].

Economic and Social Repercussions

Significant social repercussions resulted from the East India Company's actions regarding economic and social impacts. India's economy, which was mostly decentralised, barter-based, and dependent on local communities, was severely disrupted. In order to maintain stability, the Europeans put exporting cash crops ahead of growing food to feed the expanding rural populations, which led to food shortages and famines [Davis 2001].

The handloom and handicraft industries experienced a severe decline due to British economic policies, which resulted in fewer job opportunities and decreased demand. For instance, the production of yarn in the handloom industry decreased from 419 million pounds in 1850 to 240 million pounds in 1900 (Williamson and Clingingsmit, 2005). Under the company's direction, several of India's domestic manufacturing industries saw a dramatic downturn (Broadberry and Gupta, 2005).

Findings

India's economy was systematically exploited during the British East India Company's (EIC) administration, turning it from a thriving, independent system to a colonial one that served British interests. Deindustrialization, rising poverty, and economic outflow were the defining features of the time.

1. **Agricultural Distress & Land Revenue Exploitation:** Through Permanent Settlement (1793), the Ryotwari System, and the Mahalwari System, the British imposed exploitative land revenue regimes that disrupted rural economies by imposing high fees on village communities. Famines and food shortages resulted from farmers being compelled to grow cash crops (cotton, opium, and indigo) for British enterprises (e.g., Bengal Famine of 1770).

2. **Deindustrialization & Decline of Handicrafts:** In order to promote British industrial products, India's famed shipbuilding, metalworking, and textile industries were methodically decimated. Native businesses collapsed as a result of high tariffs on Indian goods in Britain, while British goods entered India duty-free. Rural poverty increased as artisans lost their jobs and became farm laborers.

3. **Wealth Drain:** This type of economic exploitation was systematic. Dadabhai Naoroji's "Drain Theory" described how British policies caused Indian riches to leave the country. British officers' wages, commercial gains, and tax money were remitted to England. Without sufficient returns, Indian goods were exported. Indian wealth was used to pay for significant military expenditures (for British wars).

4. **Ruin of Indigenous commerce & Commerce:** The EIC controlled important industries like cotton and indigo, and the British

monopolized Indian commerce. India became as a market for British-made goods as well as a source of raw resources. The traditional merchant classes lost their power, and the economies of towns like Surat, Dhaka, and Murshidabad suffered.

5. **Famine & Growing Poverty:** Millions of people died during the repeated famines brought on by economic mismanagement (the Bengal Famine of 1770 and the Madras Famine of 1782). Since collecting taxes was the British government's first concern, no humanitarian efforts were made. As rural debt increased, peasants were forced to turn to moneylenders, which kept them in a never-ending state of poverty.

6. **Infrastructure Impact:** The British built railroads, telegraphs, and postal systems, but mostly for resource exploitation and military control. The primary purpose of roads was to make it easier to carry raw materials to ports (Calcutta, Bombay, Madras).

7. **British Monopoly over Banking & Finance:** As British banks seized power, indigenous banking systems deteriorated. Indian farmers and businessmen were deeply indebted as a result of high-interest loans from British financiers.

Conclusion

Regardless of how the East India Company's economic practices affected the Indian populace, Great Britain was the primary beneficiary of this monopolistic form of imperialism. Very little infrastructure was improved, and the overall effects were still highly unfavorable, including demodernization, economic collapse, and an increase in poverty among Indians. Over the course of the East India Company's existence, the pre-colonial Indian economy underwent a number of changes and disturbances. The Company's local policies, which were mainly intended to enforce a British economic agenda, had a major impact on the growth of the agricultural sector, trade, commerce, and taxation systems. They also helped to build infrastructure throughout Indian possessions. However, the Indian population was primarily harmed by several of these measures.

A deeply repressive Zamindari elite emerged as a result of the Permanent Settlement and other land income structures established by the Company, which in turn caused the peasantry to become poor. The handicrafts sector was destroyed by the reliance created by British mercantilist policies, which placed a strong emphasis on trade monopolisation and the exploitation of cash crops grown for export. Local producers and traders were heavily burdened by the methodical and intensified tax collection, which further fuelled economic strife and hardship.

Despite the fact that ports, railroads, and other infrastructure were built supposedly to facilitate the exploitation and export of natural resources and other commodities, these projects were inherently anti-national and benefited the colonial authority at the expense of India. This situation demonstrated the detrimental social and economic effects of the Company's policies by encouraging the systematic disregard of staple food crops in favour of cash crops, which led to frequent famines and food shortages.

In summary, the socioeconomic circumstances in India during the rule of the East India Company were marked by a deindustrialisation and colonial-style looting process, as well as a widespread rise in poverty that affected the great majority of Indians. As a result, the main changes to the structure were certain

infrastructure changes, but the overall effect was negative, negatively affecting the people's quality of life and making poverty and economic marginalisation in India worse. India went from being a thriving economy to a dependent colony under the British East India Company, experiencing widespread poverty, industrial decline, agricultural hardship, and economic drain. India's economic underpinnings were eroded during this time, opening the door for direct British Crown authority in 1858.

References

1. Bayly, C. A. (1988). *Indian society and the making of the British Empire*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Brown, J. M. (1994). *Modern India: The origins of an Asian democracy* (pp. 67-68). Oxford University Press.
3. Chandra, B. (1989). *India's struggle for independence*. Penguin Books India.
4. Chowdhury, S. (2013). *Palashi unknown story*. Ananda Publishers. (Original work published in Bengali).
5. Derbyshire, I. D. (1987). Economic change and the railways in North India, 1860–1914. *European Economic Review*, 31(4), 719-737. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0014-2921\(87\)90006-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0014-2921(87)90006-4)
6. Davis, M. (2001). *Late Victorian holocausts: El Niño famines and the making of the Third World*. Verso Books.
7. Habib, I. (1982). *An atlas of the Mughal empire: Political and economic maps with detailed notes, bibliography, and index*. Oxford University Press.
8. Cypher, J. (2014). *The process of economic development*. Routledge.
9. Ludden, D. (2002). *India and South Asia: A short history* (p. 133). One World.
10. Maitra, A. K. (2023). *Shirajuddaulah*. Dey's Publishing. (Original work published in Bengali).
11. Maddison, A. (1995). *Monitoring the world economy, 1820–1992* (p. 30). OECD.
12. Maddison, A. (2001). *The world economy: A millennial perspective* (p. 236). OECD Development Centre.
13. Maddison, A. (2003). *Development centre studies: The world economy historical statistics*. OECD.
14. Maddison, A. (2006). *Contours of the world economy 1–2030 AD: Essays in macro-economic history* (p. 379). Oxford University Press.
15. Markovits, C. (2004, February). *A history of modern India, 1480-1950*. Anthem Press.
16. Marshall, P. J. (2005). *The making and unmaking of empires: Britain, India, and America c. 1750–1783*. Oxford University Press.
17. Bairoch, P. (1995). *Economics and world history: Myths and paradoxes* (pp. 95–104). University of Chicago Press.
18. Parthasarathi, P. (2011). *Why Europe grew rich and Asia did not: Global economic divergence, 1600–1850* (pp. 39–45). Cambridge University Press.
19. Ray, I. (2011). *Bengal industries and the British industrial revolution (1757–1857)* (p. 174). Routledge.
20. Roy, T. (2011). *The economic history of India, 1857–1947*. Oxford University Press.
21. Roy, T. (2010). The long globalization and textile producers in India. In L. Heerma van Voss, E. Hiemstra-Kuperus, & E. van Nederveen Meerkerk (Eds.), *The Ashgate companion to the history of textile workers, 1650–2000* (p. 255). Ashgate Publishing.
22. Robb, P. (2011). *A history of India* (pp. 99–100). Macmillan.

Web Links

- a. <https://www.anujjindal.in/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/2.-India-under-East-India-Companys-Rule.pdf>
- b. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jun/29/british-empire-india-amartya-sen>
- c. <https://www.artofliving.org/in-en/culture/reads/india-and-world-trade>
- d. <https://www.businesstoday.in/latest/economy-politics/story/this-economist-says-britain-took-away-usd-45-trillion-from-india-in-173-years-111689-2018-11-19>
- e. <https://www.anujjindal.in/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/2.-India-under-East-India-Companys-Rule.pdf>