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Economy has been a dominant factor of human society in the study of the history of any period of country. It has been aptly remarked that economic factors condition the entire life of any community. Yet the study of economic history of India, specially of medieval period is of comparatively recent growth. Irfan Habib has pointed out, "Attention was perhaps first directed towards this subject by the controversy between the apologists of the British rule and its critics, about whether the Indian people were better off under their previous rulers than their present ones".[1]

In fact, in a study of modern economic historiography on medieval India, English historical writing on the period forms the focal point.[2] The servants of the East India Company looked upon the Muslims as their predecessors in governing India and their policies and administration appeared to offer "clues to the present political and administrative problems". In fact, when the reports of the mismanagement by the East India Company were current in England Horace Walpole had remarked, "We shall lose the East before we know half its history". The prophecy however, proved incorrect and the British were destined to rule over India for more than one century and a half; nor was it in their interest to remain ignorant of or to misgovern Bengal, or to lose the East. Therefore, necessity more than curiosity drove the British to explore India's history, its past institutions and administrative set-up. The 'magic wand' of self-interest soon gave rise to Persian

scholarship as well as to the study of country's history.[3].

After Elliot had asserted that the British Government had done more for the Indians in fifty years than what the Muslim rulers had done in five hundred years,[4] a conscious and unconscious comparison of Muslim administration with the British rule became more or less a general feature of the British writing on medieval India. Yet while, the polemical feelings pre-dominated in the British historical writings, an important feature which marked the contemporary historical writings was that one form of history, that is, political history and institutions, held the prime attention, while the economic aspects could be seen in the periphery.[5]

It was at the turn of the present century that W.H. Moreland, a member of the British Civil Service entered the arena; no doubt as a revenue official "groping for information". In retrospect, it was also the beginning of an altogether a new era so far as the writing of medieval Indian history was concerned, for in the process, Moreland became the pioneer of modern historiography on the economic history of medieval India by firmly laying down the foundation of the study of the economic life and conditions of medieval India in a systematic manner. Not only did Moreland introduce a new theme, viz., economic, but also added vital dimensions to the methodology by his multiple linguistic equipment, his search and study of original documents, the effective use of statistical method and his technique of illuminating the 'present in the light of the past'. Moreland showed that it was possible to reconstruct the various elements of the economic history of medieval

India.

The impact of Moreland on contemporary and later historians in the form of his supporters, elaborators, critics and those who evolved the theme further was tremendous. With his work a new vista in the form of economic history of medieval and later periods appeared. The significant research conducted by Moreland and the exposure of the numerous vital aspects of medieval Indian economy greatly inspired many historians. Among the contemporaries of Moreland, Sir Jadunath Sarkar added to the field by supplying additional information from manuscripts unknown to his predecessors and also Moreland.[6]

The work begun by Moreland attracted younger scholars also to this new field. In 1924, Balkrishna brought out a book on *Commercial Relations Between India and England 1601-1757*, in which he duly acknowledged his indebtedness to W.H. Moreland[7] and attempted to produce a comprehensive and systematic history of the rise and progress of Indo-British trade from the beginning of the seventeenth century till the establishment of British power in Bengal after Plassey in the middle of the eighteenth century. Based on original records and manuscript documents, Balkrishna "hoped that the book will prove to be a lucid commentary on the romance of the genesis and rise of the British power and trade in the Indies".[8] According to Balkrishna the Dutch and the English introduced great changes "in the nature and volume of the internal and external trades of India...."[9] It is interesting to note that Balkrishna called India the cradle of numerous arts and handicrafts at the dawn of the seventeenth century "as it had been from the remotest

---


In spinning, weaving, and dying, India excelled all other nations of the world, and this industrial supremacy continued well nigh up to the end of the eighteenth century.[10] Living, throughout India was very cheap in the beginning of the seventeenth century and people could live comfortably on a small income. "The upper classes, consisting of the military, nobility, landlords, merchants, bankers, jewellers etc., lived in great luxury,..."[11] But "With all this opulence and luxury, there was undoubtedly a great deal of poverty. There is incontestable evidence that the lower strata of society consisting of the tillers of the soil, labourers, and mechanics lived very miserably".[12]

The theme of commerce was taken up by another historian also, namely D. Pant, who discussed the commercial policies of the four great Mughal Emperors, from Akbar to Aurangzeb, in a detailed form in his work, The Commercial Policy of The Moguls (1930). An important feature that marked D. Pant's work was that as a background he also provided an economic survey of India from the earliest times up to 1556 A.D. Based on contemporary sources - Persian and European records, as well as recent works D. Pant in constructing his account of the commercial policy of the Mughals utilised Moreland's works also, such as, India at the Death of Akbar, From Akbar to Aurangzeb and Jahangir's India. In fact, Moreland's findings on currency, taxation, trade, transport, land policy, cotton and silk goods, extent of the empire and organisation, slavery, and condition of the weavers and peasants under the Mughals have been directly incorporated by D. Pant.[13]

A significant observation of D. Pant was that "Akbar was not only humane but an Economist of high order. In order to improve the material welfare of his people, he laid down very generous rules for

foreigners. He regulated taxes and customs and in various ways helped the growth of trade. He was neither 'novelty mad' like his son Jehangir nor 'trade-mad' like his grandson Shahjahan.\[14\] However, despite his appreciation for Akbar, D. Pant was not slow to point out that, "In assessing the cultivators the principle that was kept in view was: Exact from the peasant the last dam that he can pay: Leave for him just enough to exist and not to live".\[15\] Further, a labourer under the Mughals enjoyed no free will of his own, no money was available for productive enterprise, while the multiplicity of taxes served to harass the traders a great deal. The Mughals were devoid of "any idea of so taxing imports as to give encouragement to the growth of industries within their Empire.... Foreigners were taxed less than the subjects of the Empire and were further given concessions which hit indigenous industries hard. This was done not with a view to enable the foreigners to destroy the Indian manufacturer but to keep the foreigners fighting among themselves".\[16\] Besides "Trade was not free under the Moguls. Religious fanaticism, Zenana intervention, official obstructions, fiats of the kings monopolizing this or that trade and the fixation of prices at this or that level irrespective of the economic forces working in the market, and finally, the inclination of the king to earn commercial profits for himself were some of the factors which impeded the free and even flow of trade".\[17\]

However, not all the findings of Moreland appear to have been accepted unquestionably and some Indian scholars retaliated with the facts gathered by them. In fact, as pointed out by R.C. Majumdar, "Broadly speaking, nationalist history of India was originally a reaction against the British histories of India,..." and which represented the "general trend of Englishmen's views from the beginning

\[15\] Ibid., p. 59
\[16\] Ibid., p. 81
\[17\] Ibid., p. 108
to the end of British rule".[18] Thus, a nationalist answer to Moreland was provided in works like Brij Narain, Indian Economic Life, Past And Present (1929) and H.L. Chablani, The Economic Conditions of India During the Sixteenth Century, (1929). The former work, in fact, posed a potent challenge to some of the conclusions of Moreland.

Brij Narain felt that Pelsaert in his Remonstrantie had given a rather unfavourable account of the economic condition of the common people in Jahangir's time, whom he has called the "poor wretches" and "contemptible earthworms" who lived in "bitter poverty".[19] Brij Narain disagreed with Moreland also whose reliance upon Pelsaert led him to conclude that even in years of normal production, the position was such that the mass of the population lived on the margin not of comfort but of bare subsistence and were forced either to migrate to a region where the conditions seemed to be more favourable or sell themselves into slavery.[20] Restricting his inquiry only to Jahangir's time Brij Narain gathered "much trustworthy evidence", on the basis of which he found that India in the last two decades of the sixteenth and the first quarter of the seventeenth century emerged as "a country where in normal years there was extraordinary plenty and living was cheap, and given the wages that the common labourer and artisans, according to all accounts earned, they must have lived in comfort".[21] Also the purchasing power of the rupee during this period was reported by the


See, Fransisco Pelsaert, The Remonstrantie Tr. by W.H. Moreland and P.Geyl Idarah - 1 Adabiyat-1 Delli, Delhi, 1972, pp. 60-68.


Brij Narain, Indian Economic Life, Past and Present, Lahore, 1929, p. 2.
European travellers to be almost incredible. Brij Narain found that the accounts of the contemporary European observers from 1583 to 1638 like, Linschoten (1583-88), Van Twist (1638), Mandelso (1638), Terry (1616-19) Thomas Coryat (1612-1617), Pietro Della Valle (1623), and Peter Mundy, all confirmed the abundance and the extraordinary cheapness of all necessaries, whether it was in Cambay, Bengal, Gujarat, Cochin, Vijaynagar, Masulipatam, Agra or Broach.[22] For instance, Linschoten described Cambay as abounding in all "Kinde of victuals, as corn, rice and such like graine", butter and oil, with which Cambay supplied the neighbouring places. The whole coast of Malabar was "fruitful of all things", and "a very greene and pleasant land to behold".[23] For Mandelso who visited Gujarat in 1638, there was "no place in the world where a man might live more deliciously" than Ahmadabad.[24] Similarly, Thomas Coryat wrote to his mother in England from Agra that, he had about £ 12 with him which "will maintaine me very competently for three years in my travell with meate, drinke and clothes".[25] While reiterating the abundance and cheapness of all provisions, Brij Narain indicated that caution should be exercised while interpreting the accounts of later writers like Bernier and Tavernier whose conclusions he felt were the "results of hasty generalisation".[26] Thus, according to Bernier and Tavernier, "a considerable proportion" of the good land remained untilled from want of labourers, or that the whole country became a desert from where the peasants fled to escape the oppression of rulers. Brij Narian pointed out that, "What they saw was particular,

---

[22] For further details see Brij Narain, *Indian Economic Life, Past and Present*, pp. 2-8.
small parts of the country desolated by the tyranny of some governors, not whole provinces. The India which Bernier and Tavernier saw was not very different from the India that Linschoten, Terry, Mundy and others have described. There cannot be plenty where large parts of the country have been turned into deserts, and it is impossible to make peasants grow abundant supplies of all kinds of provisions almost all over the country by means of the whip".[27]

Regarding the wages, Brij Narain calculated from the Accounts Book kept by the Dutch Factory at Agra relating to June and July 1637 and from Hawkin's account, that the most common rate of wages for ordinary unskilled labourer in the time of Jahangir was Rs. 3 per month.[28] Under Akbar, the lowest wage paid to an ordinary unskilled labourer was 2 dams or Rs 1½ a month, so that as compared with Akbar's reign the wages appeared to have risen in Jahangir's time. In fact Brij Narain gathered much evidence to show that wages of both skilled and unskilled labourers had risen in the second decade of the seventeenth century, while there was no evidence to indicate any fall in the value of money during that period,[29] so that prices also would have been generally the same in Jahangir's time as in that of Akbar. Brij Narain, therefore, concluded that, "Judged by present standards, wages in the time of Jahangir were high, even extraordinarily high in some cases. Not only did the hired landless labourers not starve, but got more to eat than his present descendent".[30] Hence, it was not possible that a labourer who earned Rs. 3 per month would, "in normal years, be so perilously near the margin of starvation as to wish to end his misery by

[28] Ibid., p. 13.
[29] For further details see, Brij Narain, Indian Economic Life, Past And Present, pages 16-20.
surrendering his "personal freedom in return for a promise of subsistence in some foreign country". His argument was that if Coryat, an English traveller, could maintain himself "very competently" in his travels, with "meate, drinke and clothes" for 2 d. a day, a common labourer and a native of the country, could easily maintain himself perhaps on 1 d. per day. In fact, according to Brij Narain Jahangir's India was a paradise for peons. Even the weavers who in Jahangir's time represented the most important and numerous class of artisans lived in luxury when compared with their modern counterparts.

However, at the same time Brij Narain also acknowledged that, "The British Government has done more to improve Indian agriculture ad to increase production than any of our rulers in the past. Agricultural production in normal years is much greater than it ever was and, thanks to the development of irrigation and rapid means of transportation, the very meaning of the world famine has changed". He went to the extent of stating that, "At the present time the land revenue amounts to about 5 per cent of the value of the gross produce of the land. There is no instance of any ruler in the past, whether Hindu or Muhammadan, who took as land revenue so small a share of agricultural produce". Brij Narain pointed out that in Moreland's opinion the Muhammadan kings claimed such a large share of agricultural produce because, "they were monsters in human form", and he characterised their regime as "rack-renting under the whip". However, Brij Narain pointed out, "This is a very gloomy picture of rural India under Indian rulers", and that it could be explained as to why such a large proportion of agricultural produce was claimed as revenue. Thus firstly, land revenue

[33] Ibid., p. 27.
[34] Ibid., p. 29.
was the principal source of revenue in the past, secondly, the instructions to the Amil under Akbar did not suggest that the peasants were forced to cultivate the land by the whip. [37]

Moreland had indicated that in the seventeenth century land was cultivated in small holdings by peasants. [38] According to Brij Narain however, their average size was larger than the average holding at present because at that time smaller numbers were dependent on land and a smaller proportion of the total population was supported by the land. [39] Thus, "ignoring the land revenue, the cultivator of a barani or well-irrigated holding under Akbar was decidedly better off than the modern cultivator, for (1) he cultivated a larger holding and (2) the average yield of his holding was greater". [40]

Brij Narain further pointed at the origin and development of private rent under British, which had enriched only a very small class of the population. "But how is the cultivator benefited by the substitution of a new exploiter who owes him no duties, for an old, who, in theory, at any rate, was bound to take some interest in his welfare?" [41] Thus, "The cultivator today who pays 1/2 batai, in addition to his share of the land revenue, would gladly change places with the owner cultivator of the past.... The owner-cultivator of the past was not rich, but he was more prosperous in normal years than the tenant-cultivator of to-day". [42]

Also Brij Narain did not agree with Moreland's viewpoint that, "the masses of Indian consumers were too poor to buy imported goods". [43] Because, according to him, "the masses of consumers, whether

[38] W.H. Moreland, From Akbar To Auranqzeb, p. 188.
[40] Ibid., p. 35.
[41] Ibid., p. 37.
[42] Ibid., p. 38.
[43] W.H. Moreland, From Akbar to Auranqzeb, p. 53
in India or elsewhere, are always too poor to buy imposed articles of luxury. The character of the import trade is explained by the self-sufficient character of India of the past. The terrible machines which have transformed European industry and ruined Indian weavers and other hand workers, had not yet been invented, and our craftsmen were unbeaten in their art".[44]

Considering India's balance of trade before the British period, Brij Narian pointed out that, "As at the present time, exports much exceeded imports in value. But our favourable balance of trade is now a sign of our debtor position".[45] This was due to the annual drain from India in the form of Home Charges and profits of important industries. Thus, "while the balance of trade is generally in our favour, the balance of payments is against us, and we pay our debts abroad by exporting goods greater in value than that of goods imported".[46] However, the situation was different in the past, when there was a keen demand for Indian goods in the world markets, and the Indian demand for foreign goods" was no small as to be negligible... Not only the balance of trade but the balance of payments was heavily in our favour. In other words, India was a creditor country, and the world paid her tribute in silver and gold".[47]

Brij Narian further disagreed with Moreland's conclusion that there existed "a small and frugal middle class, at the opening of the seventeenth century".[48] He indicated that, "Our large and profitable foreign commerce, which made streams of gold and silver flow from many parts of the world to our country, suggests the existence of a numerous and wealthy merchant class"[49], in the pre-British period. He assumed that, "these merchants would form a middle class between the common

[45] Ibid., p. 56.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.
labourer and the artisan on the one side and the nobles on the other. A rich and influential middle class, engaged in trade and commerce, must have then existed under Akbar and Jahangir. Brij Narain indicated that there were numerous references in the sources which Moreland had consulted and which clearly invalidate his conclusion. "Moreland has either ignored them or they have escaped his attention, with the result that the evidence that he has presented to the reader creates an impression of economic India in the 17th century which is unfavourable in the extreme. As a matter of fact, no worse impression could have been created if Moreland had deliberately set himself the task of painting our Moghul Kings in the darkest colours possible." Apart from ignoring the relevant evidence, Brij Narain accused Moreland of misinterpreting the evidence. Thus, the eating of Khichri by the craftsmen was represented by Moreland "as a proof of the extreme poverty and miserable condition of the artisan class under Jahangir," while Brij Narain found recorded evidence which indicated that even Peter Mundy ate Khichri when he was in India. Similarly, with regard to the existence of a "a numerous and wealthy middle class, consisting of merchants and traders" in the 17th century, some convincing evidence had been ignored by Moreland. The contemporary Dutch accounts like those of Linschoten, Pieter Willemssen, W.G. de Jongh, Pietro Della Valle testify to existence of an affluent merchant class. Similarly the evidence of Finch, an English traveller was also of the same tenor.

Further, while Moreland pointed out that the average income of merchants "was probably not large", Brij Narain could find no reference in the sources regarding the "average" income of merchants. Moreland's remark that the merchants lived frugally and that "ostentation was as dangerous in their case as it was desirable in the case of

[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid., p. 59.
courtiers",[54] was found by Brij Narain to be of very limited application. The contemporary evidence furnished by the European travellers clearly mentioned that not only the Muslim but Hindu merchants also lived and dressed well on the West Coast.[55] Further, "Both on the coast as well as in the interior, particularly in times of stress, cases of ill-treatment of rich and powerful merchants, who had incurred the displeasure of the authorities might occur. But from isolated instances it would be wrong to conclude that the authorities had made it a rule to plunder merchants as soon as they became rich and make a display of their riches".[56] Thus the nature of the foreign commerce of India, references by contemporary writers to the wealth of the Indian merchant class, and their description of the standard of living, dress and marriage of bānias, proved conclusively "that a rich and prosperous class, spread all over the country and living on the profits of trade and commerce, existed in our period".[57]

Brij Narain outrightly rejected Moreland's explanation of the decline of Indian shipping and of the preference shown by Indian merchants for foreign vessels, which brought out, firstly, that the European navigators were superior to Indian and while the essence of Indian navigation was adaptation to stable seasons and avoidance of bad weather, the seasons and bad weather were objects of indifference to European navigators. Secondly, the Dutch and English ships were better built and finally, the Dutch and English ships offered cheaper terms and greater security to Indian merchants.[58]. According to Brij Narain Moreland had ignored that it was not merely competition but force and violence also which was the principal cause of the decline of the Indian shipping. Further, "Moreland has produced no evidence in support

[56] Ibid., p. 63.
[57] Ibid., p. 65.
[58] W.H. Moreland, From Akbar to Aurangzeb, pp. 87-88.
of his view that the crews of Indian vessels "must often have been wanting in experience during emergencies. For many centuries, before the arrival of European navigators in Indian waters, India had been carrying on the coasting as well as the over-seas trade".[59] Moreover, since both the Dutch and the English had some of their ships built in India, Brij Narain pointed out that, "It is reasonable to suppose that the Dutch and the English would not be anxious to have any of their ships built in India unless those ships were both cheap and strong".[60] Finally, "the preference for Dutch or English vessels is explained not by superiority of Dutch or English navigators, the superior construction of their ships, their supposed independence of the seasons or bad weather, or the cheapness of their rates, but by the fact of the greater degree of security offered by them in a special sense".[61] Thus, while the Indian ships could deal with Indian or Eastern pirates they were almost defenseless before the new dangers posed by the Portuguese, the Dutch and the English who indulged freely in capturing and sinking Indian vessels. For fighting also, the European ships were better equipped. According to Brij Narain, "The evidence in favour of the view that injury to Indian shipping was not the result, largely, of peaceful competition, is overwhelming and it is easily found in the sources most of which have been used by Moreland. That Moreland completely ignores this evidence is probably due to his preconceived notions about the

[60] Ibid., p. 72.
[61] Ibid., p. 73.
superiority of European navigators and European ships".\[62\]

Talking of famines, Brij Narian pointed out that while Moreland had been indefatigable in his search for famines in the first half of the 17th century, "it is improper to make dogmatic assertions on the basis of insufficient material".\[63\] Moreland had prepared a list of famines between 1640 and 1650 in his work, \textit{From Akbar to Aurangzeb} and had claimed, "I do not think the record of the years from 1640 to 1650, imperfect as it may be, has been exceeded in the course of any decade in modern times".\[64\] Brij Narain however after analysing Moreland's list, found that, "this record is not half so "depressing" as that of the decade 1890-91 to 1899-1900".\[65\] The mortality rate in the famines of 1896-97 and 1899-1900, which were the severest to have afflicted India, reached about 5 millions. Further, the fact that the Mughal kings were not indifferent to the suffering of the famine victims, is clearly brought out by the organisation of relief by Shah Jahan as described in the \textit{Padshah Nama} of Muhammad Amin Kazwini, as well as in \textit{Shah Jahan Nama}.

\[62\] Brij Narain, \textit{Indian Economic Life. Past and Present}, p.74. Jadunath Sarkar, \textit{Shivaji And His times}, Orient Longman, Delhi, 1973. pp. 250-251, points out that, "In picturing Shivaji's navy one must banish from our minds the idea derived from Europe of a line of man-o'-war boldly sailing into the boundless open sea and defeating an opposing fleet by superior manoeuvring and gunfire. The Maratha fighting vessels were meant for work in the coastal waters only ....." as for fighting the Marathas had "Cumbrous gun-boats called \textit{ghurabs}". Besides even in gun-power, Shivaji's largest vessels were inferior to third-rate English or Portuguese fighting ships.

\[63\] Brij Narain, \textit{Indian Economic Life, Past and Present}, p.89.
of Inayat Khan. However, Moreland, on the basis of the narratives of van twist and Mundy, criticised the measures adopted by Shah Jahan to relieve distress in Gujarat in 1630 as tardy and inadequate, though he did not find it "easy to suggest what more could have been done". Brij Narain concluded his argument by pointing out that "One would be glad to know what relief was provided by the East-India company for the famine-stricken people in Bengal in 1769-70 and the efforts made by the country to save life". Thus lengthy arguments fully substantiated by evidence were offered by Brij Narain to contradict some of the findings of Moreland and to show that "Mogul India at the beginning of the 17th century was not a very unhappy India in ordinary years".

Brij Narain was followed by H.L. Chablani, whose object in writing, The Economic Conditions of India During The Sixteenth Century (1929) was "to arouse interest in a much neglected aspect of Indian history and to correct the impression created by Mr. Moreland's writings...". Chablani based his study on the accounts of foreign travellers, who visited India in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and the chronicles and memoirs of Indian historians.

[66] Kazwini, Padshah Nama, in Elliot & Dowson, ed. History of India as told by its own Historians, vii, 24-5. Also see Inayat Khan, Shah Jahan Nama, Ed. & completed by W.E. Begley & Z.A. Desai, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1990, p. 62. "His Majesty, with the Most exuberant kindness decreed that assessed victuals should be daily distributed in charity among the poor and indigent of Burhanpur, Gujarat and Surat at his private expenses". Further "Nearly 70 lakhs worth of taxes were remitted for the purpose of restoring the country to its former flourishing condition and the people to affluence and contentment".

[69] Ibid, p. 85.
[70] H.L. Chablani, The Economic Conditions of India During the Sixteenth Century, Delhi, 1929, Preface.
In the first place, Chablani's estimate of the population of India in the sixteenth century differed widely from that made by Moreland in *India at the Death of Akbar*. According to Chablani, with the exceptions of Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Karachi and Kanpur, which were created by the British, "most of the important cities of today are a legacy of the past to modern India"[71] and that against the gains accruing from the modern cities, "we must set off the disappearance of those fair-sized ports on the Western Coast from Sind to Ceylon which impressed Barbosa with the importance of India's coasting and foreign trade"[72]. In Chablani's viewpoint, Moreland had failed to take into account such important factors, as the long wars fought by Sher Shah and Akbar which had resulted in substantial loss of human life and a temporary decrease in cultivation, as also the bloody battle at Talikota in 1565, which must have resulted in a decrease of population in India at the end of Akbar's reign. Further, Chablani also pointed out "serious errors in his (Moreland's) estimate even on the data on which he has relied and the method he has followed"[73]. Moreland had put the nominal strength of the Vijaynagar army at about one million and that of the Deccan army at half the numbers of Vijaynagar, but then "he performs the arithmetical feat of putting the total strength of the armies of Vijaynagar and the Deccan Kingdoms at only a million, and concludes on the basis of proportion mobilised in France and Germany before 1914, that the total population of the Southern territories was 30 times this number", which according to Chablani, was "plainly a gross under estimate"[74]. Further, Chablani indicated that according to Nicolo

[72] Ibid., p. 24.
[73] Ibid., p. 24. W.H. Moreland in *India at the Death of Akbar*, put the estimate of India's population to somewhere around 100 million, p. 21.
Conti Vijaynagar army consisted of "a million men and upwards", Abdur Razzak put its strength at 11 lakhs and Domingos Paes recorded that the Vijaynagar King had an army of one million. Further, according to the author of Roterio or a Journal of the First Voyage of Vasco de Gama (1497-1499), the Zamorin alone could muster one lakh troops. Nikitin recorded that the Sultan of Bidar had personal troops amounting to 3 lakhs, while one of the noblemen had 2 lakhs and another had 1 lakh of men. According to Chabiani, the numerical strength of the Vijaynagar army including its dependencies was 1 million and the fighting strength of the five Deccan Kingdoms was 1 million. When calculated on Moreland's own basis of calculation, Chabiani put the estimate of population for the South at 75 million. Orissa was left out by Moreland, but Chabiani on the basis of contemporary evidence, estimated its population to have been at least half of Vijaynagar. Thus, the total population of the region outside Akbar's dominions was calculated by Chabiani to be 97½ millions, which "was only 2½ millions less than Moreland's estimate for India including Akbar's Empire".[75].

For Northern India, Moreland had not followed the basis he used in his estimate for the South on the plea that "the strength of the Moghul forces was unknown".[76] However, Chabiani pointed out that "so far as capacity to furnish soldiers is an index to the total strength of a population, the truth is just the opposite".[77] As a matter of fact according to Chabiani far more definite and reliable information in this respect was available for Akbar's dominions than for the South. Thus in Ain I Book II of Ain-i-Akbari, Abul Fazl makes a definite statement that "the Zamindars of the country furnish more than four million four hundred thousand men as shall be detailed below".[78] In Chabiani's

[75] H.L. Chabiani, The Economic Conditions of India During the Sixteenth Century, p. 27.
[77] H.L. Chabiani, The Economic Conditions of India During the Sixteenth Century, p. 28.
opinion a better method of calculating population in Akbar's dominions could be adopted. Thus on the basis of the revenue figures for Akbar's Empire furnished by Nizamuddin Ahmad at 640 crores, "this would mean a capacity for furnishing 64 lakhs of horsemen; and assuming that the entire army consisted of cavalry, this would give us, on Moreland's method a population of 192 millions in Akbar's dominion".[79] Chablani's estimate for the whole of India reached a total of 289 millions minus a reasonable allowance for double counting in the case of Ahmadnagar which had been included in this estimate both in the Bahmani Kingdom and Akbar's empire.[80]

Chablani also disagreed with the "ingenious theory of nakedness" of people in India, So "laboriously built" up by Moreland.[81] He pointed out that contemporary evidence with regard to clothing ought to be read with great care and that it was unsafe to generalise about the whole country on the basis of a statement from a traveller, who saw only a very limited part of it.[82] In fact, Chablani quoted extensively from contemporary accounts to contradict Moreland's viewpoint. Thus he found that the evidence of the very first modern travellers itself upset Moreland's theory. For instance, Mahaun, the Chinese traveller, reported that the people of Bengal, "...wear white cloth turbans and long loose robes with a round collar which they put on over their head, and which is fastened in at the waist by a broad coloured handkerchief; they wear painted leather shoes. The King and his officers all dress like Muhamadans; their head dress and clothes are becomingly arranged".[83] Nicolo de Conti, who visited Gujarat,

[80] Ibid.
[82] H.L. Chablani, The Economic Conditions of India During the Sixteenth Century, p. 86.
Vijaynagar and the country on the banks of the Ganga wrote, "The style of dress is different in different regions. Wool is very little used. There is great abundance of flex and silk, and of these they make their garments. Almost all, both men and women, wear a linnen cloth bound round the body, so as to cover the front of the person, and descending as low as the knees and over this a garment of linnen or silk, which with the men, descends to just below the knees, and with the women, to the ankles. They cannot wear more clothing on account of the great heat, and for the same reason they only wear sandals with purple and golden ties".[84] Abdur Razzak's description is restricted only to Calicut when he says that, "the blacks of this country go about with nearly naked bodies, wearing only pieces of cloth called langots extending from their navels to above their knees.... The king and the beggar, both go about in this way. As to the Mussulmans, they dress themselves in magnificent apparel after the manner of the Arabs, and manifest luxury in every particular".[85]

Chablani discussed the evidence of the same travellers as was quoted by Moreland. He found that travellers like Nikitin, Varthema and Barbosa whom Moreland quoted in support of his thesis, did not really support Moreland. Chablani indicated that "for later European travellers it is necessary to remember that judged by the standard of foreign nations, Europeans or Muslim, a respectable Hindu with a dhoti on and with his shirt and turban laid aside on a warm summer, will appear even to day naked.... It is significant to note that none of the earlier or later European travellers describes any of the Muslims or Christians of India as naked.... This in itself suggests that poverty had nothing to do with the so-called nakedness of the Hindus".[86]

---

[85] Abdur Razzaq, quoted in H.L. Chablani, The Economic Conditions of India During the Sixteenth Century, p. 89.
Ralph Fitch whom Moreland had quoted in support of his conclusion, also did not connect people's nakedness with their poverty. In fact, abundance of cotton cloth, riches and nakedness are all mentioned side by side, raising a presumption that the wearing of only a dhoti was "nakedness" in the eyes of the observer".[87] The next authority of Moreland was Pietro Della Valle, but according to Chablani, "It is amusing to see him quoting Della Valle on the clothing of the native inhabitants of Goa, the majority of whom were admittedly slaves of the inhuman Portuguese, and passing over entirely Valle's fuller description of the people's clothing elsewhere".[88] According to Chablani, The real explanation of light clothing in summer is given firstly by Conti, and reiterated by Terry in the following words:

"Gorgeous apparell is prohibited by the sunne's heat;
the king himself being commonly vested with a garment
of pure white calico lawnnne".[89]

Radhakamal Mukherji's *The economic History of India 1600-1800* was originally published in 1931 in the *Journal of U.P. Historical Society* (reprinted 1967), in which he dealt with such themes as agriculture, population and prices, movement of real wages during four centuries, the social stratification, industries and markets, trade and commerce and the economic decline. Although Radhakamal Mukherji utilised the information yielded by Moreland's works yet he did not contradict Moreland directly and in fact, he accepted Moreland's estimate of population in 1605 as 100 million.[90] However, the main thrust of his monograph was to argue that India was a land of cheap and plenty living in the period 1600-1800 and that the wages of agricultural worker or

[88] Ibid., p. 100.
daily labourer in Mughal India were higher.[91] and also indicated the standards of living in respect of the consumption of cloth, sugar and "virtual banishment of ghee and milk products from the dietary habits of the lower classes".[92]

Radhakamal Mukherji pointed out that "the seventeenth century saw India as the agricultural mother of Asia and the industrial workshop of the world. The end of the eighteenth century witnessed the rapid decline of Indian industries, the complete ruin of Indian trade and shipping, and the loss of her political sovereignty". [93] Further, "the epoch, 1600-1800 thus represents at once the golden age of Indian trade and industry and the beginning of her economic downfall that was as sudden as it was complete and unprecedented". [94]

Talking about social stratification, Radhakamal Mukherji indicated that albeit a middle class consisting of shopkeepers, traders, merchants, bankers as well as physicians and the writer-caste existed in Mughal India and there were merchants also who were thrifty and rich, and physicians also, who earned large fortunes by their practise, but it was not powerful. [95]

In the post-independence era more scholars seem to have taken the cue from Moreland in varying degrees, and the chosen field of Moreland has been further developed by them. In 1953 Tapan Raychaudhuri brought out Bengal Under Akbar and Jahangir, which "was in

[94] Ibid, p. xxii.
[95] Ibid, p. 68.
many ways a pioneer work"[96] Apart from the fact that it was an attempt to study the history of an individual region, it presented an introductory and informative account of the social and economic history of Bengal during the later 16th and early 17th century. Several topics of economic importance were covered by the author, such as , land revenue administration in Bengal,[97] the advent of the Europeans, where Tapan Ray Chaudhuri dealt with the Portuguese activities in Bengal, Beginnings of Dutch trade with Bengal, Bengal's first contacts with the English, growth and pattern of Portuguese trade with Bengal, pattern of Dutch trade with Bengal, results of the European commercial activities, and Portuguese settlements - a barrier to Mughal centralisation, have also been discussed.[98] While discussing the economic background the author has also dealt with social classes, class relation, state of agriculture in Bengal, industrial production and commerce of Bengal. A Chapter has been devoted to the Portuguese, their settlements,


[97] Tapan Ray Chaudhuri, Bengal Under Akbar and Jahangir, Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi, Second Impression 1969, see Chapter, Mughal Rule In India, pp. 49-93.

[98] Ibid., pp. 94-118.
Portuguese merchants, soldiers, pirates and outlaws, priests and missionaries, the daily life of Portuguese citizens and finally their relation with the local people.

Although Tapan Ray Chaudhuri used the information rendered by Moreland's works, yet he differed with him on the point of the "comparative insignificance of middle classes",[99] in Akbar's India and the absence of such important professions as journalism, education, and law. However, Moreland had admitted that the former "statement is possibly less applicable to Bengal then to other parts of India",[100] and also confessed his failure to speak with authority on the subject due to his ignorance of the Bengali language. According to Tapan Ray Chaudhuri, "As a matter of fact, Bengal in the period under review had a numerous middle class to which belonged a variety of professions. This class of course, was different in character from the modern counterpart. But that fact in no way indicates its "comparative insignificance" nor does Bernier's comment that "a man must, be either of the highest rank or live miserably" apply to Mughal Bengal".[101] Among the professional classes in Bengal, the Brahmins stood at the top of the social ladder. The teachers, scholars and priests were "reverenced by the common natives more like Gods than men". The Vaidyas or native medicine men, who constituted a separate caste in Bengal also occupied a position of importance. Besides, a section of professional classes also consisted of poets, musicians, dancers and the like who earned their living mainly by entertaining the rich Zamindars, Chiefs, and officers who patronised them, and to a lesser degree the public in general.[102]

[100] Ibid., pp. 24-25. f.n.
[102] Ibid, p. 198. "Many of the famous Bengali poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries - Mukundrama, Ruparama and Kshemananda, for instance - were directly maintained by local Chiefs".
To Aligarh belong a large number of works by eminent historians who, while making use of Moreland's extensive range of works have not only carried further and supplemented Moreland's findings but have also in the light of new source material pointed out the errors in some of the conclusions of Moreland. Nevertheless none has denied or disputed Moreland's pioneering effort so far as emphasising the economic aspect of history and thereby giving a new direction to history is concerned.

In carrying further, contradicting and in the process supplementing the trend begun by Moreland, the contributions of Irfan Habib remain unsurpassed. As a matter of fact, Irfan Habib acknowledged Moreland as a pioneer, but one some of whose findings needed to be corrected. Thus, his seminal work, *The Agrarian System of Mughal India, 1556-1707*, published in 1963, was undertaken "in the belief, firstly, that a clarification of the problems of agrarian history would generally help in improving our understanding of the general, specially political, history of the period; and secondly, that there is much to be added to our present state of knowledge of the subject from the mass of Persian MS. material such as contemporary administrative records, letters, administrative and accountancy manuals and the lesser known chronicles, besides the better known historical works and the European sources".[103] It was largely on the basis of these new sources that Irfan Habib, on certain points, found himself in disagreement with W.H. Moreland. While surveying the extent of the cultivated area in the Mughal period, Irfan Habib did not completely agree with Moreland's suggestion that the land covered by measurement be identified with the 'total cropped area' of modern statistics.[104] According to Irfan


Habib, "It included this certainly, but we should speak more properly, perhaps, of the area sown, since the measured area also included the nabud, or area affected by crop-failure".[105] Besides, measurement was also extended to land considered as cultivable, and some uncultivable land, such as the land under habitation, tanks, nala, and jungle was also measured. Thus, "the measured area of the Mughal records then corresponds broadly to the area covered by three categories in modern agricultural statistics: 'The area cropped (or sown)', 'current fallows' and 'cultivable wastes other than fallows'".[106]

Irfan Habib has called Moreland a pioneer in the comparative study of the measured area statistics of the Mughal period with the figures for the cultivable area relating to the period around the beginning of the present century. According to Irfan Habib, Moreland had chosen to work with the latter figures, "under the conviction that this was the time when India felt the full economic effects of British rule in their most unalloyed form and so provides a good vantage point for comparison with conditions in the best days of the earlier Empire".[107]

With the help of the narratives of Tavernier and Terry, Irfan Habib contradicted Moreland's belief that "the large consumption of sweetmeats is a comparatively modern feature of Indian life".[108]

[105] For more details see, Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India, 1556-1707, p. 5.
[107] Ibid., p. 10.
[108] W.H. Moreland, India at the Death of Akbar, p. 254. Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India 1556-1707, p. 92 n, quotes Tavernier, I, 238, who declared that "even in the smallest villages... sugar and other sweetmeats, dry and liquid, can be procured in abundance". Cf. also Terry, Early Travels, p. 325, who says the vegetarian 'Gentiles' live upon "herbs and Milke and butter and cheese and sweetmeats, of which they make divers kindes".
Further, with regard to the price of salt, Moreland in his article, "The Value of Money at the Court of Akbar" (1918), had shown that its price in terms of wheat at the time of the Ain was double than in the modern times.[109] For the modern price Moreland had taken the rates prevalent in the Lucknow market. Irfan Habib pointed out, "It is curious, however, that the price of salt current in the Kanpur market in 1890 (vide Crooke, North Western Provinces, p. 272) was practically double the rate quoted by Moreland and therefore in relative terms nearly equal to the price given in the Ain. The fall in the price of salt is due apparently to the reductions in costs of transport rather than any changes in the method of production".[110]

Irfan Habib felt that despite the fact that the ganungo and the Chaudhuri were very well known terms, but the position and functions of these two local officials in Mughal times had not been adequately appreciated in modern studies.[111] Thus, Moreland, while subscribing to the opinion held by Charles Elliot in his Chronicles of Oonao, that "no material difference existed between the work done by the Canoongoe and the Chowdhrie"[112] and that the only purpose of the double office was for one to be a check on the other, suggested that these two officials only rose in importance when 'group assessment' replaced the 'regulation system' of Akbar.[113] This was however, a mistaken belief according to Irfan Habib, who has outlined the position and functions of the ganungo and the Chaudhuri in details and has also pointed out that, "while the ganungo's work was largely directed towards the preparation of revenue assessment the Chaudhuri was chiefly concerned with its

[111] Ibid., p. 287.
collection". [114]

While discussing the instructions and orders passed in Aurangzeb’s reign, which indicated that the land revenue should everywhere amount to half the produce, Irfan Habib pointed out that it was difficult to say how far this meant a change from previous conditions, because already “in parts of Gujarat where the land was exceptionally fertile, the revenue continued to exceed the newly fixed maximum despite Imperial structures. Further, in Kashmir, Sind and the Dakhin ordinary lands were paying half the produce in revenue before Aurangzeb’s accession, so that there the new rate simply recognised the existing practice. The real question is whether in the central provinces it implied any increase in the revenue demand”. [115] Moreland firmly believed that such an increase did take place and the revenue demand went up from one-third to one-half. [116] However, according to Irfan Habib the increase postulated by Moreland was more apparent than real, because Moreland, “assumed that the demand under Zabt during Akbar’s reign did not exceed one-third of the actual produce.... this was really not the case in practice and the real rate came probably to much above one-third. On the other hand, there is no proof that Aurangzeb set about reformulating the Zabt revenue rates on the basis of half of the crop rate.... Moreover, when in one instance we are able to compare cash rates from the later years of Aurangzeb with the corresponding rates in the Ain for the same locality (Lahore), no real increase can be shown, once allowance has been made for the rise in prices during the intervening period”. [117]

Irfan Habib further pointed out that while the claim of the British administration that under them the 'food famines' had

[115] Ibid., p. 195.
been converted into work famines, was of little concern, but "in so far as attempts have been made to contrast the terrible conditions of the famines under the Mughals with the acclaimed contentment and plenty enjoyed under British rule", a few facts were produced by him to highlight the "propriety of this comparison".[118] Thus, even Moreland would not restrain himself from boasting that under the British rule, "the very idea of a food-famine has been banished from all but the few tracts still inaccessible".[119] Irfan Habib countered this statement by pointing out that, "Twenty years after this was written - in 1943-4 - nearly three and a half million people died of starvation in Bengal and all the medieval horrors were re-enacted on a scale truly befitting 'modern' times".[120]

Yet disagreements apart, Irfan Habib has made full use of Moreland's informative works and articles, as is revealed in the wide-range of topics covered by him. He has paid due credit to Moreland for the interpretations of certain terms also. For instance, Irfan Habib indicated that among the modern writers, Moreland was probably the first to put forward the view that the Zamindar in Mughal times really meant a vassal Chief and could not exist in the directly administered territories of the Empire,[121] and in fact this was the generally accepted view about Zamindar.[122] According to Irfan Habib, Moreland was also the first modern writer to appreciate the essential aspects of the Jagir system. He rejected the world 'fief' by which Jagir had till [118] For details see, Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1556-1707), p. 100n.
[120] Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1556-1707), p. 100n.
then been rendered and substituted for it "revenue assignment" or simply 'Assignment'.[123] Of course, the role it played in the determination and collapse of the Mughal Empire was first brought out by Irfan Habib [124] and its implication in the Deccan, specially, Golconda as analysed by J.F. Richards has presented a new angle to it.[125] Finally, Irfan Habib also acknowledged that it was Moreland who "brought out the most significant features of the Mansab organisation of the Mughals".[126]

Moreland's emphasis on the economic aspect has been of great help, indirectly, in studying other institutions also, for instance the political institutions. This is clearly and most appropriately borne out by M. Athar Ali's work, *The Mughal Nobility Under Aurangzeb* (1966). Athar Ali recognised Moreland's effort in illumining a number of essential features of the Mansabdari system,[127] which were indeed utilised by him in his study [128]. However, he pointed out that beyond the exposition that "the Zat rank indicated the personal status of the officer, and also, through sanctioned schedules, his personal pay; and the Sawar rank determined the military contingent he was to maintain and indicated the payment to be made to him for maintaining this

---

[124] Ibid, pp. 269-270.
contingent", much still "remained obscure" about the Mansabdari system. Thus, an important object of Athar Ali's study was to provide a clear view of the functioning of the Mansabdari System under Aurangzeb. Besides, Athar Ali was also "indebted to Moreland for a clear exposition of the basic features" of the Jagir System. However, he felt that there were still some aspects of the system which stood in need of a detailed treatment. Thus, the problems which the Jagirdar's (holders of Jagirs) faced in the work of revenue collection and government, specially in the 17th century", "the ways in which the Emperor sought to restrain the authority of the Jagirdars - and the extent to which he succeeded in it", and "whether the system under Aurangzeb was the same, in all essential features, as under his predecessors, or whether there were changes in it, or again whether it was showing any signs of stress and strain",[129] all these factors, in fact, required a careful study. This aspect has been analysed by Athar Ali in his work.[130]

However, with regard to the prevalence of escheat system under the Mughals, Athar Ali differed from Moreland who had suggested that, since the escheat system created great insecurity for the nobles, they spent huge amounts on luxuries and did not save and invest.[131] Athar Ali did not agree with Bernier also who denounced it as 'a barbarous' custom. He pointed out that such statements implied "that the Emperor in practise excercised his rights over his noble's property and confiscated it entirely or the larger part of it"[132]. But this was far from truth, because firstly, "All the nobles were not spend thrifts; many of them saved and accumulated large amounts".[133] Secondly, in effect, "the Emperor did not confiscate the entire property of a noble; he only took

[131] W.H. Moreland, India At The Death of Akbar, pp. 245-246.
[133] Ibid., p. 68.
his Mutaiba and if he chose, something more". Thirdly, "In fact every noble felt confident that his wealth, after meeting the mutaiba would remain with his heirs,... This was why they amassed wealth and accumulated riches".

An attempt to fill the gap in Moreland's study of The Agrarian System of Moslem India was made by N.A. Siddiqi in his work Land Revenue Administration Under The Mughals, 1700-1750 (1970). While Moreland had dealt with the agrarian developments in the eighteenth century, but in N.A. Siddiqi's opinion, "the study is brief and no attempt has been made to correlate it with the other administrative developments of the Empire. Moreover, his study is based mainly on British records and he has made little attempt to utilise contemporary Persian sources which are rich in information and enable us to reconstruct the picture of the land revenue administration in an intelligible way". Besides, no other work had clearly brought "out the nature and extent of the administrative and agrarian crisis, which had become quite marked by the last quarter of the seventeenth century and tended to be acute in the first half of the eighteenth century". N.A. Siddiqi in his work pointed out that "the agrarian crisis coupled with the crisis in the Jagirdari system tended to impair the economic and administrative stability of the State. It also greatly weakened the military power of the Empire, so that it was left with little vitality to resist the revolts from within and aggression from outside".

N.A. Siddiqi also refuted Moreland's use of the term peasant. According to Moreland "the peasantry included the brother-hood or village Zamindars, the peasants living in the village, and the

---

[135] Ibid., p. 68.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Ibid., p. 3.
peasants living in another village and coming in to work". [139] N.A. Siddiqi held that the word peasant signified "cultivator, who regardless of his having enjoyed or not enjoyed occupancy rights, did not have the right either to sell or to mortgage the land tilled by him". [140] This has been substantiated by the Persian sources which "clearly differentiated between persons who belonged to the socio-economic class of the Zamindars and those who came from the unprivileged mass of ryots." [141] Thus, the use of the word peasant in a sense which ignored the essential difference between the two important sections of the rural community was a little misleading in N.A. Siddiqi's opinion.

In evolving full studies of the varied aspects of major cities of North India like Lahore, Agra, Allahabad, Patna, Jaunpur, Qanauj, Benaras, Mathura and Delhi, to which Moreland had made only occasional references, the works of Hameeda Khatoon Naqvi are of immense value. Her earlier works, Urban Centres and Industries in Upper India, 1556-1803, 1968 and Urbanisation and Urban Centres Under The Great Mughals, 1556-1707, 1972, were investigations into the urban economic life of Northern India, the provenance of the Mughal Empire, an aspect which she felt had not so far received the attention it deserved. Her attempt was to consider the cities "in a more systematic manner in so far as the sources available permit". [142].

H.K. Naqvi pointed out that "Moreland placed considerable stress upon the cities as centres of consumption, but they were also great centres of manufacture. From Akbar's day to that of Aurangzeb, stress was constantly laid upon the production of valuable [139] W.H. Moreland, The Agrarian System of Moslem India, p. 161.
[140] N.A. Siddiqi, Land Revenue Administration Under the Mughals 1700-1750, p. 10 "Such a cultivator in the Persian chronicles and documents is described as mazara, asami or raaya".
[141] Ibid., p. 10.
crops whose manufacture into finished goods would be the task of urban centres... Had they not fulfilled this vital function, had they been no more then parasites, mere consumers of rural wealth they could not have so long survived and flourished".[143].

Agricultural, Industrial and Urban Dynamism Under the Sultans of Delhi, 1206-1555 (1986), was in fact, a backward projection of H.K. Naqvi's previous work, Urban Centres And Industries In Upper India 1556-1605. "The realisation that a forceful undercurrent of the continuity element runs all along the era of Muslim domination from 1206-1707, both in regard to growth and proliferation of urban centres and urbanisational process of the crafts was a feature that eventually",[144] stimulated her to investigate the period 1206-1555. Also "In the elaboration of the foundation, growth and multiplication of the urban complexes as introduced by the first Sultans of Delhi, the study focuses the initial challenges that confronted them".[145]

However, it is Shireen Moosvi, by whom the importance of the statistical data in the Ain-i-Akbari has been adequately recognised and who has made tremendous contributions in the field of medieval economic history, by studying and analysing the data and also by correcting some of Moreland's statements. In fact, a unique feature of her articles and the recently published work, The Economy of The Mughal Empire C. 1595 A Statistical Study (1987), is the utilization of the abundant statistical data of the Ain-i-Akbari relating to agricultural production, land revenue, local claims to agrarian surplus, the distribution of surplus among the ruling class, the urban economy, money supply and foreign trade, and population, which enabled her to reach more precise conclusions regarding some points. She found it difficult to accept

[143]  H.K. Naqvi, Urban Centres And Industries In Upper India, 1556-1803, p. 4.
[145]  Ibid.
Moreland's description of Ain-i-Akbari as a "hastily edikd collection of official papers",[146] because according to her there is,"constant indication of extreme care taken by Abul Fazl in presenting his information, especially quantitative data".[147] The contents of the Ain-i-Akbari were logically arranged and Abul Fazl himself was concerned with the maintenance of precision and accuracy. Thus, while "the Ain-i-Akbari must form the bedrock of any quantitative study of the economy of the Mughal Empire", Shireen Moosvi agreed with Moreland that the Ain-i-Akbari should also be supplemented by Akbarnama of Abul Fazl.[148] However, she did not agree with Moreland's suggestion that arazi was equivalent to "gross-cropped area" rather than the 'net cropped area' of modern statistics.[149] Her study, on the other hand indicated that, "arazi could not only have comprised the entire gross-cropped area but must also have included current fallows and portions of cultivable waste as well as some part at least of uncultivable waste ...."[150]

The importance of the study of statistical data of the Ain-i-Akbari was highlighted by Shireen Moosvi when she pointed out that although the evolution of Akbar's land revenue policy had been studied by Moreland and Irfan Habib, yet, important as their interpretations were, a number of their hypotheses had yet remained untested by actual recourse to the Ain's statistics; and there appeared to be certain loose ends, too, in their arguments that the statistics could have conceivably tied up. Thus, while on land revenue demand, her effort at first was, to

[148] Ibid., p. 19.
[150] Shireen Moosvi, The Economy of the Mughal Empire, p. 41. For more details see pp. 39-41.
"check every existing assumption or inference with the Ain's text and statistics, and to see whether the received picture of the evolution of Akbar's revenue policy can be made more precise, and wherever necessary, modified".[151]

While Shireen Moosvi acknowledged Moreland as the pioneer in the field of forming an estimate of India's population in or about 1600, yet Moreland's estimate of the population of India at 100 millions in 1605 did not tally with hers, which worked out to around 145 millions in 1601.[152] Besides, Shireen Moosvi found Moreland's basic assumptions, as also his results apparently questionable. She pointed out that the weakness in Moreland's basic assumptions tended to undermine the credibility of his estimate of the population of Northern India, where he took the arazi figures of the Ain-i-Akbari to mean the gross cropped-area. According to Shireen Moosvi, "the arazi of the Ain could not have represented the gross cropped-area but was the area measured for revenue purposes, which included uncultivable waste in varying proportions. Besides measurement had not been completed everywhere. Further, she indicated that "in deducing the size of population from the extent of cultivation, Moreland implicitly ignores the size of the urban population".[153] As for the Deccan and Southern India, Shireen Moosvi found Moreland's assumptions as still weaker, for, "The army civilian ratio is not only arbitrary but undependable", and she found it "curious too that Moreland has not adopted the same method of counting troops in making an estimate of the population of Akbar's Empire", especially since the data for it was available in the Ain-i-Akbari and Lahori's official estimates.[154] She believed that, "the statistics of area, yields, revenue rates and jama in the Ain-i-Akbari should furnish us a

[151] For the result of Shireen Moosvi's attempt, see, The Economy of the Mughal Empire, Chapter on Land Revenue Demand, pp. 95-125.
[152] Shireen Moosvi, The Economy of the Mughal Empire, p. 405.
[153] Ibid., p. 396.
[154] Ibid., pp. 396-397.
means of estimating the population in the Sixteenth century which we, surely cannot ignore", and that Moreland's method though in essence valid could be "followed only with certain qualifications and refinements".[155] Thus, the relative extent of cultivation derived from the Ain-i-Akbari could serve as a basis for working out the population of the period.[156]

While discussing the prices, Shireen Moosvi refuted Moreland's suggestion that the prices given in the Ain-i-Akbari were the wholesale prices. According to her prices were the retail prices current at Agra during the last quarter of the sixteenth century.[157] Also she did not agree with Moreland's contention that real minimum wages in 1595 and 1910-14 stood at about the same level.[158] Rather, she found that, as a matter of fact, the real wages of unskilled labourers had fallen by half.[159]

The findings of W.H. Moreland were acknowledged by S.S. Kulshreshtha, who in his work, The Development of Trade And Industry Under the Mughals (1964), has quoted Moreland extensively.[160] He also accepted Moreland's method of estimating the population as also his estimate on the basis of the strength of the armies in the South and the

---

[156] For more details on Shireen Moosvi's method, see, Shireen Moosvi, The Economy Of the Mughal Empire, pp. 399-406.
[157] Ibid., pp. 322-325.
extent of cultivation in the North.[161]

Jagadish Narayan Sarkar is another notable historian who has made valuable contribution in medieval economic history. His *Studies in Economic Life in Mughal India* (1975) incorporated a series of research papers, which were based on European and Persian sources and the author conducted an analytical survey of some facts of economic life and organization "without any reference to any pre-conceived theories".[162] Emphasis was laid particularly on the industrial and commercial history of the period. While Jagadish Narayan Sarkar acknowledged Moreland's contribution and pointed out that "Broadly speaking, the two companion volumes of the late W.H. Moreland, written respectively in 1920 and 1923 represent even now the last work on Indian economic history of the period.[163] Yet "with all deference to Moreland's scholarship and research acumen it has to be admitted that his approach is not always dispassionate".[164] Thus, Moreland's *India at the Death of Akbar* was written to prove certain points of view, viz., to prove the superiority of the British rule over their Mughal predecessors and that India's economy under the British administration in the beginning of 20th century, though poverties stricken was still better, than under Akbar, in terms of per capita income and consumption. Besides, Jagadish Narayan Sarkar felt that the scope of the two works of Moreland is limited, it goes down only till 1658, while "the economic development of the whole momentous reign of Aurangzeb of 50 years, marked by significant developments, the greatest extension of Mughal Empire, the rise of the Marathas, the long Deccan wars, the consequent beginnings of administrative decline, the growing interest of foreign merchants, territorial settlements (e.g., the Dutch in Malabar, the English in

[163] Ibid., p. 379.
[164] Ibid., p. 379.
Bombay, the French in Pondicherry) have been left untouched".[165] Moreover, he also pointed out that the sources used by Moreland were limited, though much fresh materials had been discovered. Nevertheless, Jagadish Narayan Sarkar has made use of Moreland's works in examining a wide range of topics.

In his work on Mughal Economy: Organization and Working,(1987) Jagadish Narayan Sarkar while utilizing the information furnished by Moreland's works, has also criticized some of Moreland's statements. Thus while he agreed that copper was a costly metal, but he also pointed out that it was "not such a costly luxury as Moreland presumes".[166] Further, Jagadish Narayan Sarkar did not agree with Moreland's contention that industrial organisation in the modern sense of the term did not exist in Mughal India. Such a comparison according to him was hardly fair. On the other hand, he suggested that, "A more reasonable test would be comparison with contemporary countries. It would appear that the varied arts and handicrafts, ...., indicated the existence of an organization that was more advanced than that of contemporary Europe", [167] though it should also be remembered that the Indian technology was deficient. He also felt that, "Moreland had minimized the adverse effects of the advent of the English and the Dutch on Indian shipping. It declined not as a result of peaceful competition but of a calculated policy of violent piracy. The lot of the Indian merchants and shippers was not even half so bad under the Arab domination and even the Portuguese domination (subject to Cartaze) as under the Dutch and the English".[168]

[167] Ibid., p. 75.
[168] Ibid., pp. 171-172.
Further, Jagadish Narayan Sarkar disagreed with Moreland's opinion on the 'comparative insignificance of the middle classes', and who had devoted hardly two pages to middle classes in his pioneer study. But this was Moreland's conclusion sixty years before. Since then "considerable research has been made which has practically revolutionised the concept of the middle classes in medieval India, as propounded by Bernier and Moreland".[169] In fact, Jagadish Narayan Sarkar, found it "very surprising that Moreland has completely ignored the evidence of Dutch and Italian sources regarding the existence specially at coastal towns of numerous body of merchants and trading classes, constituting a very wealthy middle class".[170]

A new dimension to the field of the economic history was added by H.C. Verma's Medieval Routes to India : Baghdad To Delhi, A Study of Trade And Military Routes (1978). H.C. Verma added to our knowledge of routes which the traders followed in the medieval period. He "felt that for a correct appreciation of the pattern of trade and the movement of army in medieval India the study of routes in the north-west regions will be of immense importance. It has to be linked up with the study of routes under the Caliphate for, it would give us a total picture of the entire network of the routes in the medieval period".[171]

Another work, Dynamics of Urban Life In Pre-Mughal India, 1986 was taken up by H.C. Verma because he felt that the study on the process of urbanization in pre-Mughal India (apart from the work of H.K. Naqvi published in the same year) was yet to attract the attention of the


[170] Ibid. For details see pp. 254-260. "Several Merchants in Gujarat and Bengal possessed amazing wealth. Virji Vohra owning 8 million rupees conducting a trade comparable to East India Companies".

II.C. Verma pointed out that "The city by itself is nothing but an abstraction unless it is fed with concrete entities of varying natures. The elements by which a city is conceptualised are the functional integration of its residents, its social and economic structures, mobility and the transportation system".[172] In fact, mobility was an "important moving force in the growth of urbanization".[173]

H.C. Verma has brought out how India before 1200 A.D. was dominated by the feudal forces, which precluded "any effort towards the emergence of an integrated State structure and a uniform agricultural production system. Instead, there arose a class of a subject peasantry and the mobility of the rural population was almost blunted".[174] With the establishment of the Turkish power in Northern India things began to change. Feudal elements were replaced by a centralised State polity. H.C. Verma pointed out that, "Although the Turks did not build too many cities, they made alterations in the town planning and, thus changed the character of the towns. Instead of the caste-character of the towns in the pre-Turkish period there was now greater emphasis on its class character".[175] He also found how the towns and villages flourished more under the patronage of the Turkish ruling class than under the grantees and the local potentates for they were by their nature more oppressive and less productive. Besides, an important feature that guided and influenced the urban way of life in medieval India was that, as time passed, reconciliation and understanding between the Hindus and Muslims, rather than confrontation and liquidation of each other became

[173] Ibid., xv.
[174] Ibid, xi.
[175] Ibid, xii. In fact, "One of reasons for the growth of towns in the Turkish period was that the workers, skilled and unskilled who generally belonged to the non-regular castes (antyaja) how lived within the four walls of the city".
the mainstay of the political, social and economic life of the people. H.C. Verma also suggested that the rise and decline of urban centres in medieval India should be studied in terms of the rise and decline of trade and commerce and not in comparison with the Western system of civilization which was based on industry.

An informative work on Road and Communications in Mughal India by Abul Khair Muhammad Farooque appeared in 1977. The author, while making full use of Moreland's information,[176] attempted to reconstruct a coherent picture of Mughal roads, travel and transport, for this according to him was "a most significant aspect of Mughal India", [177] but one which had attracted little attention of the scholars. Even Moreland had only briefly touched the problems of travel and transport from an economic standpoint. Farooque based his studies based on Persian sources, though the accounts of European travellers were also consulted.

In 1982, Tapan Raychaudhuri and Irfan Habib edited The Cambridge Economic History of India, C. 1200 - C. 1750, Vol. I. In bringing out this momentous volume, comprised of twenty-eight chapters on Geographic and Economic Background to the Mughal Road and Communication System, Roads and Bridges in Mughal India, Travel and Transport, The Postal System, Customs and Rehdari.

[176] Abul Khair Muhammad Farooque, Roads and Communication in Mughal India, Idarah-i-Adabiyyat-i-Delli, Delhi, 1977, see chapters on Geographic and Economic Background to the Mughal Road and Communication System, Roads and Bridges in Mughal India, Travel and Transport, The Postal System, Customs and Rehdari.

[177] Ibid., xx.
The editors were led by a dual purpose, namely, "a statement of the existing knowledge and the initiation of enquiry into areas which still await research in any depth". The editors pointed out that despite the appearance of the two pioneer works of Moreland on the Mughal economy, "The economic history of India for long remained a peripheral feature of historiography". At any rate, however, at present our knowledge of Indian economy in the pre-British period has come a long way, since Moreland published his studies and broadly speaking, the economic history of India in the sixteenth and seventeenth century is now better investigated than in the previous centuries. In fact, interest in medieval Indian economy is no longer confined to British and Indian scholars, rather scholars from U.S.A, U.S.S.R. and Japan are also increasingly drawn to it. A striking feature of this volume spanning over six and a half centuries is that it has drawn

[178] Tapan Raychaudhuri and Irfan Habib, ed., *The Cambridge Economic History of India, C. 1200 - C. 1750*, Vol. I, Orient Longman, Delhi, 1982, Incorporates Articles on themes as: The Geographical Background :South India:Some General Considerations of the Region and its Early History:Economic Conditions before 1200 ;Agrarian Economy; Non-Agricultural Production and Urban Economy ;the Currency System; Vijaynagar C 1350-1564;the Maritime Trade of India; Population; The State and the Economy of the Mughal Empire in South, Maharashtra and Deccan; The Systems of Agricultural Production in Mughal India and South India; Agrarian Relations and land revenue in North India; The Medieval Deccan and Maharashtra; non-Agricultural Production in Mughal India; Maharashtra and the Deccan, South India; Inland Trade; Monetary System and Prices; European Trade with India, Indian Merchants and the Trade in the Indian Ocean; Towns and Cities and Standards of living.
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contributions not only from India but also from England, U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Japan and Hawaii. This in itself goes out to prove the increasing popularity of Moreland's chosen field. The works and articles, written, translated and edited by W.H. Moreland have been fully utilized by the contributors of the volume.[181] As a matter of fact their reliance on Moreland's findings was even noted by the reviewers of this volume - H.K. Naqvi and Harbans Mukhia. Thus, H.K. Naqvi, charged the authors to have been "extremely choosy and usually manifest an ingrained affinity to the sixty year old Morelandian biases, concepts and overtones in general."[182] Similarly, Harbans Mukhia, that, "most of the themes dealt within this volume are rather orthodox: agrarian system, trade, towns, etc. and most of these contributions are based on a study of the texts, such as has been made by Moreland more than a half century ago, further, their historiography..."
has not made a significant departure from either the areas of research or its methodology that marked Moreland’s work”.[183]

However, to think that the authors have totally complied with Moreland’s findings is not completely true. For instance, Simon Digby pointed out that in his article, "The Ships of the Arabian Sea about A.D.1500", Moreland had excluded the shipping of the Bay of Bengal on the ground of lack of evidence. In Digby’s opinion, "If not wholly lacking, it is meagre and insubstantial but some conclusions may yet be drawn from it".[184] Similarly, Irfan Habib too detected weaknesses in the method Moreland employed to reach an estimate of population for 1605 and that the population of 100 million estimated for the same year was also low. Irfan Habib placed the population between 140 and 150 million.[185] Satish Chandra also felt that Moreland’s judgement that women did not wear blouses with their Sari, and treated this as an illustration of the paucity of clothing, needed to be qualified. "There was no emphasis on covering of the breasts in Indian tradition. In Malabar, both men and women, irrespective of their means remained naked above the waist. In the rural areas of eastern India, till recent times wearing of a blouse was not common. However, a blouse (Choli or angiya) was worn by ordinary women in rural areas of other regions.[186] Further, Moreland found no shoe mentioned anywhere north of the Narmada except in Bengal and thus ascribed the absence of shoes to the high cost


of leather. Satish Chandra pointed out that, "Contemporary Hindi poets, like Tulsidas and Surdas, however, mention Panahi and upanaha, being different types of shoes worn by the city and rural folk. Perhaps they were used by the richer section in the villages.[187] The poor did not wear shoes and went barefoot. At any rate, the volume with its extensive bibliography and informative contents is undoubtedly of immense help to the researchers.

Another economic aspect to have received the attention of the scholars is the monetary system of the Imperial Mughals. Despite various researches in this field, "The Mughal Monetary System and the process of imperial monetary integration has not received coherent systematic study by scholars of the period."[188] To fill this gap, recently, J.F. Richards, edited The Imperial Monetary System of Mughal India, (1987), which was a collaborative, "attempt to address important issues in the monetary integration of Mughal or immediate post-Mughal India."[189] According to J.F. Richards, "Like the State which created it, the Mughal Monetary System was powerful, flexible, pervasive, and long lived".[190] He found it striking that, "This enormous mint output for over a two centuries occurred in a region lacking any significant output of silver and gold and with only limited copper production".[191] The authors of the work, both Indian and foreign, have based their study on original sources. Wherever essential they have picked up the


[189] Ibid., Preface, vii.
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information from Moreland's works also.[192]

Russian scholars have also made significant contribution by devoting their attention to the economic life of Mughal India. [193] Prominent amongst them are Pavlov, Alaev, Madame Anatova and A.I. Chicherov. Chicherov's Indian Economic Development in the 16th-18th Centuries, Outline History of Crafts And Trade (1971) is an important addition to our existing knowledge of economic history. He has also utilized Moreland's works in his book.[194]

With the growing importance of the Oceanic studies in modern times Ashin Dasgupta's and M.N. Pearson ed. work, India And the Indian Ocean 1500-1800, 1987, is highly informative. This volume which has attracted contribution from India and abroad focuses on the maritime history of India from 1500 to 1800, on the history of the Indian Ocean in this period, and on the intricate connections between these two. Other topics covered include, trade, economic history and European merchants as well as local traders. Moreover, "a crucial theme is that while the Europeans obviously were present in the ocean area, their role was not central. Rather, they participated with varying success, in an


M.N. Pearson while surveying India and Indian Ocean in the sixteenth century found that Moreland's *India At the Death of Akbar* was still useful for a sketch of the Indian economy at 1600. According to Arasaratnam, "An essential starting point for any student of the commerce of India and the Indian Ocean is the work of W.H. Moreland. In his two major works,..., Moreland has amassed all the evidence then available on India's foreign trade with the regions to the West and the east of the Indian Ocean. Moreland's findings have had a lasting impact on all subsequent historiography which did not progress much further until the late 1950's. When it began to do so, it was mainly in the form of intensive studies of particular trading regions or of European trading powers." Thus, even if at times the British Civil Servant in Moreland had the upper hand over the historian in him, his extraordinary service to the cause of history of medieval Indian economy cannot be denied. The myriad range of his works and articles discussed in Chapters III, IV, V, VI, VII, evince that Moreland was not only a pragmatic and practical land revenue administrator, but also a pioneering historian of Indian economy; which ranged from land revenue, the Indian peasant, prices wages, value of money, coinage, commerce and feudalism to non-agricultural production, famines Indian poverty and the "Drain" of India's wealth. What is more he related the study of Indian economy to geography and other aspects of history too, specially political

---
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institutions, administrative set-up and social environment.[199] In fact, his conclusion was that, "next only to the weather, the administration was the dominant factor in the economic life of the country".[200]

What is more significant, with all the advance in the economic historiography of medieval India, the works of Moreland, with all their drawbacks are still hailed as the 'classics',[201] in the sense of providing a terra firma for a systematic study of economic history of the period. Thus, India at the Death of Akbar, aimed at presenting a 'sketch' and a frame-work of the economic life of India at the opening of the seventeenth century. No historian before him had endeavoured such a comprehensive account and "with all its drawbacks it along with its companion volume, From Akbar to Aurangzeb represents even now the last word on Indian economic history of the period".[202] Similarly The Agrarian System of Moslem India (1929) which offered a chronological account from thirteenth to eighteenth centuries of the prevalent practices of land revenue administration, which Moreland called "an essay in institutional history", even after sixty two years of its publication and the partial criticism, still remains without a parallel as a connected account of the theme for five centuries of Muslim rule in India.

In fact, amongst other things, Moreland attracted attention towards several significant themes and points of Indian economy also. "His attempt to assess the population of India towards the beginning of

[200] Ibid., xii.
[201] Irfan Habib, "Problems of the Study of the Economic History of Medieval India", in Problems of Historical Writing in India, ed. by S. Gopal and Romila Thapar, p. 77.
the seventeenth century, his analysis of the role of the consuming classes, ... his trenchant remarks on the position of the peasants, the urban workers, the middle class and the serfs ... led to a lively debate among Indian Historians".[203] Moreland put the study of Indian economy in proper perspective by relating it with comparative geography [204] as well as other aspects of history. The first point is apparent in his comparison of the figures of Abul Fazl and the British period. Also, as Moreland perceived, political institutions, administrative set-up, the specific features of the society- the caste system, and labour mobility,[205] all had their impact on economy and vice versa. Thus it was Moreland who perhaps for the first time brought to notice that Jagir, the great agrarian institution of the Muslim times as well as the group assessment, go back to an early period of Hindu Culture;[206] that one-half of the grant of Suyurghal during Akbar's time consisted of waste-land for the improvement and extension of cultivation, [207] that the institution of the Grant-under-seal (Altamgha) was of central Asiatic origin,[208] that the master of the peasant's destiny were not

the king and the collector but the farmer and the assignee;[209] and that, had the land been fully occupied in medieval India, the administration would have been forced to change its attitude as was to happen in the nineteenth century.[210] It was Moreland who was a forerunner of Irfan Habib, J.F. Richards, Athar Ali and N.A. Siddiqi in seeking the reasons for the unpopularity of the land assignments in the later Muslim rule, "not in the changes in administrative practice but in the conditions of the time, the decline in agricultural production and the weakening of the central authority",[211] and also pointed to the existence of Taluq or 'Dependency' that came to replace it in the course of the eighteenth century.[212] Despite the dogmatic viewpoints of some of the nationalist historians Moreland's assertion that one of the basic flaws of Indian economy was the insistence on hoarding of gold and silver, that had "drained the life blood",[213] of the Indian economy is still a theme worth pursuing.

Moreland's works also focus on the parasitic existence of the nobility, the demotivating or rather negative influence exercised by the administration on production and the exploitation and oppression of peasants. In fact the paramount concern which Moreland felt for the Indian peasant does not appear to have been assessed or appreciated in the proper perspective.[214] Moreland's study of the Indian peasant presents a consistently humane approach with strong undercurrents of sympathy for the Indian peasant even if a better fate awaited him in the benevolent fold of Pax Britannica. It was Moreland who emphasized the

[210] Ibid., pp. 207-208.
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[213] W.H. Moreland, "Some Thoughts about the "Drain" in India", Asiatic Review, 1920, pp. 35-38. See also, India at the Death of Akbar, pp. 87, 266.
need to bring 'the shadowy figure in the background', forward to give
him a share of the limelight alongside the captains of war, industry and
administration,[215] for "a kingdom had three essential constituents,
the Sovereign who ruled it, the Army which supported the throne and the
Peasantry which paid for both".[216] In fact Moreland found Indian
peasant neither "placid nor contented ... They have their ideals of a
better life, but they have also, what is the fashion just now to call an
inhibition, which prevents those ideals from being translated into
action".[217]

Some of the present historians have trade, with considerable
validity questioned one of the basic factors of Moreland's undertaking
of analysing the numerous aspects of economic history of the previous
period, that is, to illuminate the present in the light of the past,
that arose from his contention that the past would help to explain the
present and "will ensure a proper prospective". In practical terms it
meant proving the superiority of British rule over the preceding one
summed up in that "India of the seventeenth century must have been an
inferno for the ordinary man".[218] One cannot entirely overlook J.C.
Morison's view "whether we are better or worse than our ancestors is a
matter utterly indifferent to scientific history",[219] or that "a more
reasonable test would be a comparison with contemporary countries";[220]
while a number of nationalist historians found it totally unfair to
compare seventeenth century India to the early years of the twentieth
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Working, p. 75.
century. Even presently it is being felt that "The working hypothesis of most modern historians that a society must be studied in its own terms ... seems not to have greatly influenced the study of medieval Indian history".

Finally, while some of the conclusions of Moreland could be questioned in the light of the progress in the specific area or of different interpretations, there is no denying the fact that Moreland, through his belief in the primacy of economic forces in the study of history added a new dimension, not only thematically but also contributed widely in the methodology by his multiple linguistic equipment, the following of the Rankian 'Cult of the Document', by virtually initiating the statistical method of analysis, he firmly laid the edifice for a systematic study of his chosen field. In the spirit of a true historian Moreland believed in eternal progress to be the soul of history. In his introduction to The Agrarian System of Moslem India, Moreland had stated that more sources "would enable some future student to convert this essay into a history by correcting my mistakes and filling the gaps in my information". While Moreland's call is being answered and the evolution of economic history as an inseparable part of comprehensive history is being attention to, the voluminous works, translations and numerous articles and papers of Moreland still remain pointers, pedestals as well as stimulants for the progress of historical knowledge of his chosen field. Viewed from this standpoint the vast contribution of Moreland assure him a unique place as the pioneering historian of medieval Indian economy.

[221] Dadabhai Naoroji, Poverty and the Un-British Rule In India, London, 1901 "it is useless for the British to compare themselves with the past native rulers. If the British do not show themselves to be vastly superior in proportion to their superior enlightenment and civilization, if India does not prosper and progress under them far more largely, there will be no justification for their existence in India", p. 192.
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