

March 2012

No.81

**INDIA AND THE GREAT DIVERGENCE: AN ANGLO-INDIAN  
COMPARISON OF GDP PER CAPITA, 1600-1871**

Stephen Broadberry and Bishnupriya Gupta  
London School of Economics and University of Warwick

**WORKING PAPER SERIES**

Centre for Competitive Advantage in the Global Economy

Department of Economics

**INDIA AND THE GREAT DIVERGENCE: AN ANGLO-INDIAN  
COMPARISON OF GDP PER CAPITA, 1600-1871**

Stephen Broadberry, London School of Economics, [S.N.Broadberry@lse.ac.uk](mailto:S.N.Broadberry@lse.ac.uk)

and

Bishnupriya Gupta, University of Warwick, [B.Gupta@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:B.Gupta@warwick.ac.uk)

14 February 2012

File: IndianGDPpre1870v8

*Abstract:* This paper provides estimates of Indian GDP constructed from the output side for the pre-1871 period, and combines them with population estimates to track changes in living standards. Indian per capita GDP declined steadily during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries before stabilising during the nineteenth century. As British living standards increased from the mid-seventeenth century, India fell increasingly behind. Whereas in 1600, Indian per capita GDP was over 60 per cent of the British level, by 1871 it had fallen to less than 15 per cent. As well as placing the origins of the Great Divergence firmly in the early modern period, the estimates suggest a relatively prosperous India at the height of the Mughal Empire, with living standards well above bare bones subsistence.

*JEL classification:* N10, N30, N35, O10, O57

*Key words:* Indian GDP, comparison, Britain

*Acknowledgements:* This paper forms part of the Collaborative Project HI-POD supported by the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme for Research, Contract Number SSH7-CT-2008-225342. Johann Custodis provided excellent research assistance. Thanks also to Anwita Basu and Dhruva Bhaskar for data collection. We are grateful to seminar/conference participants at Beijing, Cambridge, Delhi, Montevideo and Warwick for helpful comments and suggestions.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, there has been much progress in reconstructing the historical national accounts of a number of European countries during the early modern and even the late medieval periods (Blomme and van der Wee, 1994; Malanima, 2011; Krantz, 2004; Álvarez-Nogal and Prados de la Escosura, 2007; Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Oveeton and van Leeuwen, 2011; van Zanden and van Leeuwen, 2011). This paper applies similar methods to Asia, providing estimates of Indian GDP for the period before 1871. There is a strong need for estimates of Indian GDP during the early colonial period, to assess the strong revisionist claims about Indian economic performance made recently in the context of the Great Divergence debate. Parthasarathi (1998) has made the most striking claims for south India during the eighteenth century, arguing that living standards were just as high as in Britain, while Bayly (1983) has painted a picture of a thriving north Indian economy during the eighteenth century.

This paper presents estimates of GDP constructed from the output side for the pre-1871 period, and combines them with population data. We find that Indian per capita GDP declined steadily during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries before stabilising during the nineteenth century. As British living standards increased from the mid-seventeenth century, India fell increasingly behind. Whereas in 1600, Indian per capita GDP was over 60 per cent of the British level, by 1871 it had fallen to less than 15 per cent. These estimates support the claims of Broadberry and Gupta (2006), based on wage and price data, that the Great Divergence had already begun during the early modern period. They are also consistent with a relatively prosperous India at the height of the Mughal Empire, although much of this prosperity had disappeared by the

eighteenth century. Projecting back from Maddison's (2003) widely accepted estimates of GDP per capita for the late nineteenth century in 1990 international dollars, we arrive at a per capita income in 1600 of \$682, well above the bare bones subsistence level of \$400, or a little over a dollar a day. This is more in line with the recent revisionist work on Europe, which suggests that Maddison (2003) has substantially underestimated living standards in the pre-modern world (Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen, 2011).

The paper proceeds as follows. We begin in Section II with a brief survey of the existing literature on India's long run economic performance. This is followed in Section III by an overview of methods, drawing on previous work reconstructing national income in Britain and Europe before 1800. Section IV then applies those methods to India, describing the procedures for estimating output in agriculture, industry and services, before aggregating the sectoral outputs into real GDP for India during the period 1600-1871. In Section V, these GDP estimates are then combined with data on population to derive estimates of Indian GDP per capita, and used to compare living standards in India and Britain. A new benchmark estimate of comparative GDP per capita in 1600 is also constructed, and used as a cross-check on the time series projections from the 1871 benchmark. Section V concludes.

### **III. INDIA'S LONG RUN ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE**

India's economic performance since the late sixteenth century has been the subject of enduring controversy. The travelogues of Europeans to India in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries often described great wealth and opulence, but it is not difficult to see this as reflecting their contact with the ruling classes, who enjoyed a luxurious

lifestyle with consumption of high quality food, clothing and ornaments, as well as imported luxury products. The middle class merchants and rich peasants that European travellers most frequently came into contact with also enjoyed a comfortable life-style. However, most travel accounts of Mughal India and the Deccan also noted that the majority of Indians lived in poverty (Chandra, 1982; Fukazawa, 1982). The labouring classes were seen as living in mud huts with thatched roofs, eating inferior grains, wearing rudimentary clothing and the use of footwear was relatively unknown (Moreland, 1923: 197-203). While cultural and climatic conditions may explain some of the consumption differences between India and Europe, most writers were in little doubt that the average Indian lived in poverty.

Furthermore, there is a substantial literature which attempts to chart trends in Indian living standards over time, starting from 1595. The reign of Akbar is usually seen as the peak of economic well being, and is well documented in Abū 'l-Fazl's [1595] *Ā' īn-i-Akbarī*, which meticulously reported wages and prices in the region of Agra. This has provided a reference point for real wage comparisons with later years. Desai (1972) made the striking claim that at best, the average standard of living in 1961 was no higher than in 1595, when although a labourer could afford less industrial goods such as clothing, he could buy more food, with the changing relative prices reflecting the changing productivity trends in agriculture and industry. The paper provoked some controversy over the details of the calculations (Heston, 1977; Moosvi, 1977; Desai, 1978). Nevertheless, most writers seem to accept the idea of a downward real wage trend during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries before recovery during the twentieth century, a pattern first suggested by Mukerjee (1967).

This view of Mughal India as a relatively backward economy has been challenged recently by the work of revisionist economic historians, whose work must be assessed within the wider context of changing views on the Great Divergence of living standards between Asia and Europe. Parthasarathi's (1998) characterisation of south Indian real wages as on a par with English real wages in during the eighteenth century is strikingly at variance with the older literature, but fits well with the claims of Pomeranz (2000), Frank (1998) and other world historians that the most developed parts of Asia were on the same development level as the most developed parts of Europe such as Britain and the Netherlands as late as 1800. Bayly (1983) has painted a picture of a thriving market economy in north India during the eighteenth century, which leaves a similar impression.

Broadberry and Gupta (2006) compare silver and grain wages in Britain with those in India and China during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which casts doubt on the revisionist position, suggesting that the Great Divergence was already under way during the early modern period. However, a full assessment, encompassing the ruling elites and middle classes as well as the labouring classes requires the reconstruction of national income in European and Asian countries. This paper makes a start on that process by deriving estimates of GDP and population in India between 1600 and 1870, and comparing GDP per capita between India and Britain. This is the first time series of national income estimates for India before the mid-nineteenth century, which can be seen as joining up with Heston's (1983) estimates for the period after 1870. Our comparative results are also broadly consistent with Roy's (2010a) point estimates of GDP per capita in Bengal and Britain around 1800.

### **III. AN OVERVIEW OF METHODS**

The first phase of historical national accounting focused on reconstructing national income for a small number of relatively rich countries in Western Europe and North America, and starting around 1870, at the beginning of the modern statistical age (Kuznets, 1946; Clark, 1957; Maddison, 1982). A natural development was the application of this approach to other parts of the globe, and many non-western countries now have historical national accounts reaching back to around 1870 (Maddison, 1995). For the period before 1870, there has now been a substantial period of experimentation, beginning with the study of British economic growth back to 1688 by Deane and Cole (1967).

Deane and Cole's (1967) study was remarkable for the way in which the authors made efficient use of the limited range of processed data series that were available at the time. Subsequent research by many authors has dramatically extended the range of data now available, with the revised estimates of Crafts and Harley (1992) proving an important staging post. Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen (2011) have now succeeded in producing annual estimates of GDP for Britain over the period 1270-1870.

Deane and Cole's (1967) approach now seems remarkably simple in the light of the vast amount of subsequent research. Nevertheless, its simplicity and modest demands on data makes it particularly suitable as a starting point for Asian historical national accounting in the period before the wide availability of official statistics at a national level. We focus here on Deane and Cole's (1967) method for the eighteenth century, where they constructed an index of total real output, based on industry,

agriculture and services. The sector that was most firmly grounded in the data was industry. For the export industries, such as cotton, output was assumed to grow in line with exports, for which abundant data were available. For home industry, production was assumed to move in line with the physical quantities of output of leather, beer, candles and soap. Finally, since Deane and Cole had no independent data on commerce, the index of industrial output was assumed to apply also to the commercial sector. It is not much of an exaggeration, therefore, to say that the whole of the industrial and commercial sector was dependent on the export data.

For agriculture and services, by contrast, the key data series was population. For agriculture, an index of production was derived by assuming that agricultural demand grew in line with population, which amounted to assuming constant per capita corn consumption. An adjustment was then made for known imports and exports of grain, to convert demand to domestic production. For services, even in modern national accounts it is not uncommon to assume that real output moves in line with employment. Since for the eighteenth century Deane and Cole had only fragmentary evidence on employment, they assumed that service output grew in line with population. For the government sector, however, it was possible to obtain direct estimates of output from government budget sources. Finally, the individual series were combined into an index of GDP using weights for agriculture, industry and services derived from Gregory King's [1696] social tables.

It should by now be clear that Deane and Cole's (1967) estimates of British GDP in the eighteenth century are overwhelmingly dependent on the path of population and exports, with a minor role for government expenditure and a restricted



set of volume indicators for home industry. It would not be difficult to assemble a similar data set for India between 1600 and 1871, and that is what we proceed to do in the next section. However, we will not stop there, because work conducted since Deane and Cole's (1967) study suggests a number of ways of improving upon this approach, and again in ways which can be replicated with the data available for India.

First, subsequent work on the agricultural sector has allowed for a more sophisticated treatment of demand. Crafts (1976) criticised Deane and Cole's assumption of constant per capita corn consumption while real incomes were rising and the relative price of corn was changing, and Crafts (1985) recalculated the path of agricultural output in Britain with income and price elasticities derived from the experience of later developing countries. The approach was developed further by Allen (2000) using consumer theory. Allen (2000: 13-14) starts with the identity:

$$Q^A = rcN \tag{1}$$

where  $Q^A$  is real agricultural output,  $r$  is the ratio of production to consumption,  $c$  is consumption per head and  $N$  is population. Real agricultural consumption per head is assumed to be a function of its own price in real terms ( $P^A/P$ ), the price of non-agricultural goods and services in real terms ( $P^{NA}/P$ ), and real income per head ( $y$ ).

Assuming a log-linear specification, we have:

$$\ln c = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \ln(P^A / P) + \alpha_2 \ln(P^{NA} / P) + \beta \ln y \tag{2}$$

where  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  are the own-price and cross-price elasticities of demand,  $\beta$  is the income elasticity of demand and  $\alpha_0$  is a constant. Consumer theory requires that the own-price, cross-price and income elasticities should sum to zero, which sets tight constraints on the plausible values, particularly given the accumulated evidence on elasticities in developing countries (Deaton and Muellbauer, 1980: 15-16, 60-82).

For early modern Europe, Allen (2000: 14) works with an own-price elasticity of -0.6 and a cross-price elasticity of 0.1, which constrains the income elasticity to be 0.5. Allen also assumes that agricultural consumption is equal to agricultural production. For the case of India, where more limited information is available, we implement a more limited version using the grain wage (the daily wage divided by the price of grain) and an assumed income elasticity of 0.4.<sup>1</sup>

Second, a number of authors have used the share of the population living in towns as a measure of the growth of the non-agricultural sector. This approach began with Wrigley (1985), and has recently been combined with the demand approach to agriculture to provide indirect estimates of GDP in a number of European countries during the early modern period (Malanima, 2011; Álvarez-Nogal and Prados de la Escosura, 2007; Pfister, 2008). With the path of agricultural output ( $q_a$ ) derived using equations (1) and (2), overall output ( $q$ ) is derived as:

$$q = \frac{q_a}{1 - q_{na}/q} \quad (3)$$

where the share of non-agricultural output in total output ( $q_{na}/q$ ) is proxied by the urbanisation rate. The approach can be made less crude by adjusting the urbanisation rate to deal with rural industry or agricultural workers living in towns.

#### IV. ESTIMATING INDIAN NATIONAL INCOME

---

<sup>1</sup> One way to justify this would be if the cross-price elasticity is zero and real income is the wage divided by the overall price level. The own-price elasticity must then equal the negative of the real wage elasticity. But then the overall price level used to deflate the wage cancels out with the overall price level used to deflate the grain price, leaving a single term in the grain wage. The slightly lower income elasticity of 0.4 is consistent with estimates for staple grains in poor societies (Bouis, 1994).

In this section we derive estimates of Indian GDP by sector, following the basic approach of Deane and Cole (1967), but incorporating demand effects into agriculture and urbanisation effects into services.

## **1. Population**

The first full census of India was conducted non-synchronously between 1867 and 1872, but is usually presented as the first decennial census for 1871. This provides the starting point of our population estimates in Table 1. For the period 1801-1871, we use the decadal estimates of Mahalanobis and Bhattacharya (1976), who assembled information collected by the British for the three Presidencies of Bengal, Madras and Bombay, and supplemented this with assumptions about the rate of population growth in the non-enumerated regions. For earlier years, we have drawn on the estimates collected together by Visaria and Visaria (1983: 466), based on a 50-year frequency. We use the Bhattacharya estimates for 1751-1801, the mean Datta estimates to link 1600 and 1750, the Wilcox estimates to link 1600 with 1650, and log-linear interpolation for 1700.

Given the hybrid nature of the series projected back from the 1871 benchmark, it is worth noting that Habib (1982a: 164-166) provides a useful cross-check for the absolute population level in 1600, on the basis of three alternative methods of estimation. One approach, based on the cultivated area, yields an estimate of 142 million, while an alternative approach based on land revenue suggests a population of 144.3 million. A third method, based on the size of armies, suggests a population of 140 to 150 million. All three estimates are broadly consistent with our population figure of 142 million in 1600.

Indian population grew at an annual rate of 0.22 per cent over the whole period 1600-1871. However, growth was faster in the nineteenth century than during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The effect of famines is easier to identify in the nineteenth century because of the higher frequency of observations, but crises were equally prevalent in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

## **2. Agricultural output**

Rather than following Deane and Cole's (1967) assumption of constant per capita grain consumption, we estimate agricultural consumption using a demand function which allows consumers to respond to wage and price changes. Table 2 thus sets out an index of wages for unskilled labourers in India, together with indices of grain and cloth prices. The wage and grain price series are derived from Broadberry and Gupta (2006) for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, supplemented by additional information for the nineteenth century from Mukerjee (1967), and provide the most widely used index of real wages in India, the grain wage. Although the precise magnitude of the fall in the grain wage from its high level in the early seventeenth century is a matter of controversy, most scholars have acknowledged the downward trend (Desai, 1972; 1978; Moosvi, 1973; 1977; Heston, 1977). Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the scale of the Indian grain wage decline is similar to that suggested by van Zanden (1999) and Allen (2001) for early modern southern and eastern Europe, where a long period of decline steadily eroded the post-Black Death doubling of real wages.

The cloth price series are derived from the records of the East India Company for the period before 1833 and from Parliamentary Papers for subsequent years (Chaudhuri, 1978; Bowen, 2007; Twomey, 1983; Sandberg, 1974). Note that the cloth wage declined by less than the grain wage during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and increased substantially during the nineteenth century as the price of cloth declined relative to the price of grain. As a result, the real consumption wage declined by much less than the grain wage, which has often been taken as an easily available index of living standards. Our real consumption wage is a weighted average of the grain wage and the cloth wage, with a weight of two-thirds given to former, consistent with budget studies for India during this period (Allen, 2009).

An index of agricultural production for the domestic market is provided in Table 3A, derived from the grain wage with the income elasticity of demand set at 0.4. The growth of demand caused by population expansion was tempered by the declining grain wage, so that total agricultural consumption increased more slowly than population. This is consistent with a Malthusian picture of diminishing returns to food production.

Turning to the impact of foreign trade, however, we see that the diminishing returns to food production were offset in the nineteenth century by the expansion of non-food agricultural crops. Table 3b provides an index of agricultural exports, derived by obtaining the value of total exports in current prices and the share of agricultural crops from Chaudhuri (1983), and deflating the resulting series of agricultural exports in current prices by the agricultural price index from Mukerjee (1967). For the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, we have assumed that

agricultural exports grew in line with domestic agricultural production. Weights for the export and domestic components of agricultural production in 1871 are obtained by projecting the share of exports in total production in 1901 back in time. Although the share of exports in total agricultural production in 1871 was only around 10 per cent, agricultural exports nevertheless had a significant impact on the path of total agricultural production in the nineteenth century, as exports of crops such as raw cotton, opium and indigo offset the diminishing returns in food production. As we shall see in the next section, the export of these non-food crops also offset a substantial decline in exports of cotton piece goods, as India's comparative advantage shifted away from manufactures.

### **3. Industrial Output**

Table 4 sets out the data for estimating the output of industry oriented towards the home market. As with agriculture, we have used a demand function approach, which can be cross-checked against other estimates of per capita cloth consumption available for the nineteenth century. We have allowed cloth consumption per capita to move in line with the cloth wage from Table 2 and an assumed income elasticity of demand of 0.5. The absolute level of cloth consumption per capita in the base year of 1871 has been set at 8.2 square yards from Roy (2011b). Roy also provides estimates of cloth consumption per capita for a number of other years, and our figure of 0.5 for the income elasticity of demand has been chosen to be consistent with these estimates.<sup>2</sup> We find per capita consumption of cloth fell between 1600 and 1811 as wages failed to keep up with rising cloth prices. However, after 1811 the price of

---

<sup>2</sup> Roy (2011b) reports figures of 8.0 square yards for 1860, 5.7 square yards for 1840, 5.1 square yards for 1820 and 5.2 to 6.7 square yards for 1795.

cloth fell sharply while money wages continued to increase. Per capita cloth consumption then increased with the rising cloth wage.

Nevertheless, domestic production did not move simply in line with consumption after 1801 because of the growing penetration of the Indian home market by imports from Britain, shown in Table 4B. In line with Roy (2011b), we find that the growing import penetration was consistent with a slight upward trend in domestic production for the home market, because of population growth. This provides quantitative support for the interpretation offered by Morris (1968) that colonialism did not lead to an absolute decline of the traditional Indian cotton textile sector.

However, before we can address fully the issue of deindustrialisation, we need to quantify developments in the export section of Indian industry. Table 5 and Figure 1 provide data on Indian textile exports to Britain for the period 1665-1834 from Chaudhuri (1978) and Bowen (2007). Although we lack data for Indian exports to other countries, it is possible to make an allowance for the growing share of Britain as an export destination using data on regional shares of bullion inflows to India from Haider (1996: 323), since the purchase of Indian textiles was financed largely with silver. The data in Figure 1 capture the healthy state of the Indian cotton textile export industry during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. After 1801, however, the industry went into decline, particularly with the growing British competition after the end of the Napoleonic Wars (Broadberry and Gupta, 2009). Table 6 charts the continued decline of the Indian textile export industry until the establishment of a modern factory based industry in Bombay during the 1850s (Morris, 1983: 572-583;

Farnie, 2004: 400-405). The current price data for the period 1851-1871 have been converted to constant prices using an index of imported cotton cloth prices from Sandberg (1974: 260), which tracks well the price of domestically produced cloth for overlapping years from Mitra (1978: 207). During this period, the price of cloth rose by just 6.3 per cent, so the deflation makes only a small difference to the nominal data.

Returning to the issue of deindustrialisation, we have to balance a sharp absolute decline in export industry against a small upward trend in domestic industry. Despite the relatively small weight of the export section by 1871, the scale of the decline was so catastrophic that the net effect was an absolute decline in Indian industrial production in the first three decades of the nineteenth century, rather than just a reduction in the share of industry in economic activity, consistent with Clingingsmith and Williamson's (2008) definition of strong rather than weak deindustrialisation. Nevertheless, the scale of Indian deindustrialisation shown here is in line with that suggested by Twomey (1983) rather than the more catastrophic domestic industrial collapse claimed by Bagchi (1976) on the basis of evidence from the state of Bihar.

#### **4. The service sector**

For domestic services and housing, Deane and Cole (1967) assumed growth in line with population. However, recent work on the long run development of the European economy suggests that service sector growth moves more closely in line with the urban population (Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen, 2011). Estimates of the urban share of the population in India are presented in Table 7 for



benchmark years, suggesting a decline in the share of the population living in cities of more than 5,000 inhabitants. Multiplying the population by the urban share, with interpolation between benchmark years, yields an estimate of the urban population, which remained fairly stable despite the growing total population.

For government services, Deane and Cole (1967) used current expenditure on government services from the budgetary accounts deflated by a price index. In the case of India, we can only measure the size of the government sector from the revenue side, but it is reasonable to assume that government expenditure moved broadly in line with revenue at least over the periods of time between the observations considered here (half centuries during the Mughal period and decades during the British period). Current price revenues are assembled from the sources listed in the notes to Table 8 and deflated using the weighted average of the grain price and cloth price indices presented in Table 2. Since the territory from which the revenue was collected varies, we have converted the revenues to a constant territorial basis by using real revenue per square mile as our indicator of the size of the government sector. Real government revenue per square mile in Table 8 fell as the Mughal Empire declined before increasing again under British rule during the nineteenth century, but surpassing the peak revenue (at the time of Akbar) only during the mid-nineteenth century. Note that the revenue per square mile was at its low point in the mid-eighteenth century whether viewed from the declining Mughal or the rising British perspective.

## **5. Sectoral shares**

To aggregate the time series for output in each of the major sectors into a total real output index, we require value added weights. The earliest sectoral value added weights for India are for 1900/01 from the work of Sivasubramonian (2000). However, these can be projected back to circa 1871 using changes in employment structure, following the procedure used by Hoffmann (1965: 389) for Germany. Essentially, this involves assuming that the sectoral distribution of value added per employee in 1900/01 acts as a good indicator of the sectoral distribution of value added per employee in 1871.

The sectoral weights for India circa 1871 are set out in Table 9. The largest sector was agriculture, and industry was largely geared towards the domestic market. Commerce accounted for 5.5 per cent of GDP, but is combined here with industry. Government, domestic services and housing together accounted for the remaining 10.3 per cent of GDP.

## **6. Total real output**

Table 10 sets out the time series for all the major sectors and the aggregate output or gross domestic product (GDP) index obtained using the 1871 sectoral weights from Table 9. Industry and commerce grew rapidly between 1650 and 1801, driven particularly by exports. Agriculture also expanded, but less rapidly. Since agriculture was the largest sector, the growth of total output was also quite modest before 1801. Total output stagnated between 1801 and 1841 as modest agricultural growth was offset by deindustrialisation. There was a return to modest total output growth between 1841 and 1871 as industrial growth returned and agricultural growth accelerated.

## **V. PER CAPITA GDP**

### **1. Time series projections**

The GDP series from Table 10 can be combined with the population data from Table 1 to establish in Table 11 the path of GDP per capita in India. Per capita GDP declined during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries before stabilising during the nineteenth century. Table 12 puts India's per capita GDP performance in an international comparative perspective. Benchmarking on the comparative India/GB per capita GDP level for 1871 from Broadberry and Gupta (2010), we see that India's comparative position deteriorated from a GDP per capita of more than 60 per cent of the British level in 1600 to just 14.5 per cent by 1871. The relative decline occurred fairly steadily throughout the period.

Table 13 converts the GDP per capita information in index number form from Table 12 into absolute levels of 1990 international dollars, as has become standard since the work of Maddison (1995). This enables us to gauge how far above bare bones subsistence India was. The World Bank's "dollar-a-day" definition of poverty suggests a per capita income level of around \$400 as a minimum, and Maddison (1995) finds a number of third world countries at this level in the modern world. Note, however, that Mughal India was well above this level. Although some decline had occurred by the mid-eighteenth century, it was only during the early nineteenth century that Indian per capita incomes fell close to bare bones subsistence.

Tables 12 and 13 have important implications for the debate over the Great Divergence. First, Parthasarathi (1998) uses a comparative real wage study of Britain

and India to support the “California School” view that living standards in the most developed parts of Asia were on a par with the most developed parts of Europe as late as the end of the eighteenth century (Frank, 1998; Pomeranz, 2000). The evidence presented in Table 12, however, suggests that Indian living standards were already substantially below the British level during the seventeenth century. This supports the view of Broadberry and Gupta (2006) that the Great Divergence was already well underway during the early modern period.

Second, although Table 13 provides evidence of a prosperous India at the height of the Mughal Empire at the time of Akbar, much of this prosperity had disappeared by the eighteenth century. However, with per capita incomes of more than 600 international dollars in 1990 prices, India was still sufficiently prosperous in the early eighteenth century to be consistent with the scale of market activity described by Bayly (1983). It is only by the beginning of the nineteenth century that most Indians were reduced to what Allen (2009) calls “bare bones” subsistence.

## **2. A cross sectional benchmark check**

The results in Tables 12 and 13 are based on time series projections from a benchmark estimate of comparative GDP per capita levels in 1871. This potentially raises serious index number problems, so it is helpful to calculate an additional benchmark estimate for comparative GDP per capita levels in 1600 to check for consistency with the levels suggested by the time series projections. Although Prados de la Escosura (2000) and Ward and Devereux (2003) claim that these index number problems are serious enough to call into question the whole validity of the time series projection methodology, Broadberry (1998; 2003; 2006) finds broad consistency

between time series projections and direct benchmarks in a number of detailed case studies during the period since the mid-nineteenth century. This is the first study to extend this methodology back to the early modern period, enabling us to confirm Broadberry's (2006) pragmatic conclusion that although index number problems exist, with careful treatment of the data it is still possible to bring time series projections and direct benchmarks together to tell a consistent story.

Nominal GDP data for the Mughal Empire circa 1600 have been constructed by Moosvi (2008), built up on a sectoral basis. The total GDP of 22,387 million dams has been converted to rupees and divided by the population, obtained by applying Moreland's [1923] ratio of 60 per cent of the total Indian population to Habib's (1982a) figure of 142 million, used here in Table 1. Dividing nominal GDP by population results in a figure of Rs 6.57 for GDP per capita in Mughal India. Nominal GDP and population data for England are taken from Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen (2011), yielding a GDP per capita figure of £5.66. Comparing the Mughal and English GDP per capita figures at the silver exchange rate of £1 = Rs 8 yields an Indian per capita GDP figure in 1600 that was just 14.5 per cent of the English level. This is broadly in line with Broadberry and Gupta's (2006) result that the Indian silver wage was just 21 per cent of the English level at the end of the sixteenth century.

However, Broadberry and Gupta (2006) also noted that at the same time, the Indian grain wage was 83 per cent of the English level. Comparing the price of wheat in India with the price of wheat in England yields a purchasing power parity (PPP) of £1 = Rs 1.63, a long way from the silver exchange rate. Using the wheat price PPP

rather than the silver exchange to compare Indian and English per capita incomes yields a much smaller difference, with Indian GDP per capita now 71.2 per cent of the English level. This is much closer to the time series projection in Table 12, where Indian GDP per capita was 61.5 per cent of the British level. Allowing for differences in territorial units (Mughal Empire versus India and England versus Great Britain) and smaller deviations from PPP for other prices suggests a broad consistency between the time series projections and the 1600 benchmark.

## **VI. CONCLUDING COMMENTS**

This paper provides estimates of Indian GDP constructed from the output side for the pre-1871 period, and combines them with population estimates to track the path of living standards. Indian per capita GDP declined steadily during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries before stabilising during the nineteenth century. As British living standards increased from the mid-seventeenth century, India fell increasingly behind. Whereas in 1600, Indian per capita GDP was over 60 per cent of the British level, by 1871 it had fallen to less than 15 per cent.

These estimates cast further doubt on the extent of the recent revisionist work which seeks to date the origins of the Great Divergence of living standards between Europe and Asia only after the Industrial Revolution (Frank, 1998; Parthasarathi, 1998; Pomeranz, 2000). The GDP per capita data, as well as the wage and price data surveyed by Broadberry and Gupta (2006), suggest strongly that the Great Divergence had already begun during the early modern period. They are also consistent with a relatively prosperous India at the height of the Mughal Empire, although much of this prosperity had disappeared by the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, India did not sink

close to the bare bones subsistence level of living standards before the early nineteenth century.

**TABLE 1: Indian population, 1600-1871**

| Year | Population level (millions) | Period    | Annual growth rate (%) |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------------------|
| 1600 | 142                         | 1600-1650 | 0.00                   |
| 1650 | 142                         | 1650-1700 | 0.29                   |
| 1700 | 164                         | 1700-1750 | 0.29                   |
| 1750 | 190                         | 1750-1801 | 0.17                   |
| 1801 | 207                         | 1801-1811 | 0.38                   |
| 1811 | 215                         | 1811-1821 | -0.48                  |
| 1821 | 205                         | 1821-1831 | 0.52                   |
| 1831 | 216                         | 1831-1841 | -0.19                  |
| 1841 | 212                         | 1841-1851 | 0.91                   |
| 1851 | 232                         | 1851-1861 | 0.51                   |
| 1861 | 244                         | 1861-1871 | 0.48                   |
| 1871 | 256                         |           |                        |
|      |                             | 1600-1801 | 0.19                   |
|      |                             | 1801-1871 | 0.30                   |
|      |                             | 1600-1871 | 0.22                   |

Sources: Mahalanobis and Bhattacharya (1976: 7); Visaria and Visaria (1983: 466).

**TABLE 2: Real wages of Indian unskilled labourers, 1600-1871 (1871=100)**

| Year | Wage  | Grain price | Cloth price | Grain wage | Cloth wage | Real consumption wage |
|------|-------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|
| 1600 | 37.7  | 18.3        | 57.1        | 205.9      | 65.9       | 159.7                 |
| 1650 | 72.3  | 40.9        | 127.6       | 176.8      | 56.7       | 137.2                 |
| 1700 | 78.3  | 46.6        | 150.6       | 168.1      | 52.0       | 129.8                 |
| 1750 | 83.5  | 61.4        | 168.3       | 136.0      | 49.6       | 107.5                 |
| 1801 | 80.3  | 67.6        | 166.7       | 118.9      | 48.2       | 95.5                  |
| 1811 | 68.1  | 70.4        | 182.6       | 96.7       | 37.3       | 77.1                  |
| 1821 | 69.9  | 67.9        | 180.4       | 103.0      | 38.7       | 81.8                  |
| 1831 | 71.1  | 73.1        | 171.8       | 97.3       | 41.4       | 78.8                  |
| 1841 | 72.3  | 61.3        | 110.3       | 117.9      | 65.5       | 100.7                 |
| 1851 | 72.9  | 63.3        | 89.0        | 115.1      | 81.9       | 104.1                 |
| 1861 | 98.8  | 105.6       | 100.0       | 93.6       | 98.8       | 95.3                  |
| 1871 | 100.0 | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0      | 100.0      | 100.0                 |

Source: Broadberry and Gupta (2006: 14); Mukerjee (1967: 58); Chaudhuri (1978); Bowen (2007); Twomey (1983); Sandberg (1974).



**TABLE 3: Indian agricultural output, 1600-1871 (1871=100)****A. Agricultural consumption**

| Year | Population | Grain wage | Consumption per capita | Total consumption |
|------|------------|------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1600 | 55.5       | 205.9      | 133.5                  | 74.0              |
| 1650 | 55.5       | 176.8      | 125.6                  | 69.7              |
| 1700 | 64.1       | 168.1      | 123.1                  | 78.9              |
| 1750 | 74.2       | 136.0      | 113.1                  | 83.9              |
| 1801 | 80.9       | 118.9      | 107.2                  | 86.6              |
| 1811 | 84.0       | 96.7       | 98.7                   | 82.9              |
| 1821 | 80.1       | 103.0      | 101.2                  | 81.0              |
| 1831 | 84.4       | 97.3       | 98.9                   | 83.4              |
| 1841 | 82.8       | 117.9      | 106.8                  | 88.5              |
| 1851 | 90.6       | 115.1      | 105.8                  | 95.9              |
| 1861 | 95.3       | 93.6       | 97.4                   | 92.8              |
| 1871 | 100.0      | 100.0      | 100.0                  | 100.0             |

**B. Agricultural exports and total production**

| Year | Agricultural exports | Agricultural production for domestic market | Total agricultural production |
|------|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1600 | 11.2                 | 74.0  | 67.8                          |
| 1650 | 10.5                 | 69.7  | 63.8                          |
| 1700 | 11.9                 | 78.9  | 72.2                          |
| 1750 | 12.7                 | 83.9  | 76.8                          |
| 1801 | 13.3                 | 86.6  | 79.3                          |
| 1811 | 14.0                 | 82.9  | 76.0                          |
| 1821 | 19.8                 | 81.0  | 74.9                          |
| 1831 | 23.7                 | 83.4  | 77.5                          |
| 1841 | 32.0                 | 88.5  | 82.8                          |
| 1851 | 51.8                 | 95.9  | 91.5                          |
| 1861 | 56.4                 | 92.8  | 89.2                          |
| 1871 | 100.0                | 100.0                                       | 100.0                         |

Sources and notes: Domestic agricultural production: derived from Tables 1 and 2, with the income elasticity of demand set at 0.4. Agricultural exports in current prices: Chaudhuri (1983: 828-837, 842-844), converted to constant prices using the grain price index from Table 2. Before 1801, agricultural exports are assumed to grow in line with domestic production. Share of agricultural exports in agricultural production in 1901 from Sivasubramonian (2000) projected back to 1871.

**TABLE 4: Cotton textile production for the domestic Indian market****A. Cloth consumption**

| Year | Population<br>(millions) | Cloth wage<br>(1871=100) | Cloth<br>consumption<br>per capita<br>(1871=100) | Cloth<br>consumption<br>per capita<br>(sq yds) | Cloth<br>consumption<br>(m yds) |
|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| 1600 | 142                      | 65.9                     | 81.2   | 6.7  | 946                             |
| 1650 | 142                      | 56.7                     | 75.3   | 6.2  | 876                             |
| 1700 | 164                      | 52.0                     | 72.1   | 5.9  | 970                             |
| 1750 | 190                      | 49.6                     | 70.5   | 5.8  | 1,098                           |
| 1801 | 207                      | 48.2                     | 69.4   | 5.7  | 1,178                           |
| 1811 | 215                      | 37.3                     | 61.1   | 5.0  | 1,076                           |
| 1821 | 205                      | 38.7                     | 62.2   | 5.1  | 1,046                           |
| 1831 | 216                      | 41.4                     | 64.3   | 5.3  | 1,139                           |
| 1841 | 212                      | 65.5                     | 81.0   | 6.6  | 1,407                           |
| 1851 | 232                      | 81.9                     | 90.5   | 7.4  | 1,722                           |
| 1861 | 244                      | 98.8                     | 99.4   | 8.2  | 1,989                           |
| 1871 | 256                      | 100.0                    | 100.0  | 8.2  | 2,099                           |

**B. Imports and domestic production**

| Year | Cotton<br>consumption<br>(m yds) | Imports<br>from Britain<br>(m yds) | Domestic<br>production<br>(m yds) | Domestic<br>production<br>(1871=100) |
|------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1600 | 946                              | 0                                  | 946                               | 72.4                                 |
| 1650 | 876                              | 0                                  | 876                               | 67.1                                 |
| 1700 | 970                              | 0                                  | 970                               | 74.3                                 |
| 1750 | 1,098                            | 0                                  | 1,098                             | 84.0                                 |
| 1801 | 1,178                            | 0                                  | 1,178                             | 90.2                                 |
| 1811 | 1,076                            | 1                                  | 1,075                             | 82.3                                 |
| 1821 | 1,046                            | 20                                 | 1,026                             | 78.6                                 |
| 1831 | 1,139                            | 38                                 | 1,101                             | 84.3                                 |
| 1841 | 1,407                            | 141                                | 1,266                             | 97.0                                 |
| 1851 | 1,722                            | 348                                | 1,374                             | 105.2                                |
| 1861 | 1,989                            | 514                                | 1,475                             | 112.9                                |
| 1871 | 2,099                            | 793                                | 1,306                             | 100.0                                |

Sources: Population: Table 1. Cotton consumption per head in 1871 from Roy (2011) and projected to other years with the cloth wage and an income elasticity of demand assumed to be 0.5. This produces estimates of per capita cloth consumption in other years broadly in line with the estimates surveyed in Roy (2011b). Imports from Britain: Sandberg (1974: 142).

**TABLE 5: Indian textile exports to Britain, 1665-1831**

| Year | Pieces    | Years   | Pieces    |
|------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| 1665 | 291,666   | 1665-69 | 139,677   |
| 1700 | 868,095   | 1700-04 | 597,978   |
| 1750 | 701,485   | 1750-54 | 632,174   |
| 1801 | 1,037,440 | 1800-04 | 1,355,304 |
| 1811 | 691,640   | 1810-14 | 901,745   |
| 1821 | 758,397   | 1820-24 | 542,117   |
| 1831 | 287,814   | 1830-34 | 192,965   |

Sources: 1665-1761: Chaudhuri (1978: Tables C.20-C.22); 1761-1834: Bowen (2007).

**FIGURE 1: East India Company imports of textiles from India (pieces)**



Sources: Chaudhuri (1978: Tables C20-C.22); Bowen (2007).

**TABLE 6: Total Indian textile exports, 1831-1871**

| Year | Thousand pieces | Value of cotton goods (Rs 000, in 1851 prices) |
|------|-----------------|--|
| 1831 | 3,000           |  |
| 1841 | 2,606           |  |
| 1851 | 2,279           | 7,355  |
| 1861 |                 | 8,365  |
| 1871 |                 | 14,865   |

Source: Piece goods exports from Twomey (1983: 42); value of cotton goods exports from Chaudhuri (1983: 833-834, 844), converted to 1851 prices using unit values of imported cotton cloth sold in the Indian market from Sandberg (1974: 260).

**TABLE 7: Urban population in India**

| Year | Population (millions) | Urban share (%) | Urban population (millions) |
|------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1600 | 142                   | 15              | 21.3                        |
| 1650 | 142                   | 15              | 21.3                        |
| 1700 | 164                   | 14              | 23.0                        |
| 1750 | 190                   | 13              | 24.7                        |
| 1801 | 207                   | 13              | 26.9                        |
| 1811 | 215                   | 13              | 28.0                        |
| 1821 | 205                   | 12              | 24.6                        |
| 1831 | 216                   | 12              | 25.9                        |
| 1841 | 212                   | 11              | 23.3                        |
| 1851 | 232                   | 11              | 25.5                        |
| 1861 | 244                   | 10              | 24.4                        |
| 1871 | 256                   | 8.7             | 22.3                        |

Sources: Population: Table 1. Urban share: 1600, 1801: Habib (1982a: 166-171); 1871: Visaria and Visaria (1983: 519); Other years: interpolation.

**TABLE 8: Trends in the size of the government sector**

| Year | Government revenue in current prices (Rs million) | GDP deflator (1871=100) | Real government revenue (Rs million in 1871 prices) | Territory (1,000 square miles) | Real revenue per square mile (Rs in 1871 prices) |
|------|---|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 1600 | 145.9   | 31.1                    | 469.1   | 979                            | 479.1  |
| 1650 | 228.8   | 69.5                    | 329.2   | 1,200                          | 274.3  |
| 1700 | 333.5   | 80.9                    | 412.1   | 1,200                          | 343.4  |
| 1750 | 181.8   | 96.7                    | 188.0   | 1,200                          | 156.7  |
| 1766 | 16.0  | 96.7                    | 16.5  | 98                             | 168.4  |
| 1801 | 104.9   | 100.3                   | 104.5   | 247                            | 423.4  |
| 1811 | 166.8   | 107.4                   | 155.3   | 353                            | 440.4  |
| 1821 | 213.5   | 105.0                   | 203.3   | 506                            | 401.7  |
| 1831 | 220.2   | 105.7                   | 208.4   | 514                            | 405.4  |
| 1841 | 208.5   | 77.5                    | 269.2   | 597                            | 450.8  |
| 1851 | 276.3   | 71.8                    | 384.9   | 771                            | 499.3  |
| 1861 | 429.0   | 103.8                   | 413.5   | 837                            | 494.0  |
| 1871 | 514.1   | 100.0                   | 514.1   | 904                            | 568.7  |

Sources and notes: Government revenue: 1600-1700: Habib (2000: 454); 1750-1871: Banerjea (1928: 78-82, 85-86, 373-373); India Office (various years); Revenues reported in pounds from the mid-eighteenth century have been converted to rupees using an exchange rate of £1 = Rs 8 from Chaudhuri (1978) for 1750, and a rate of £1 = Rs 10 from Roy (2011a) for later years. The territory from which the revenue was raised has been derived for the Mughal period from Habib (1982b: viii) and Richards (1995: 1) and for the British period from Roy (2010b: 23); Colebrooke (1804: 16); Schwartzberg (1978: 55-56); Phillimore (1945: plate 1); Martin (1839: 273, 289, 332); Return to the House of Commons (1857: 16); India Census Commissioner (1893: 17); Bartholomew (1909: 28); Waterfield (1875: 5); India Office (various years). GDP deflator: weighted average of grain price and cloth price from Table 2.

**TABLE 9: Indian sectoral weights, 1871**

|                             | %     |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| Agriculture                 | 67.5  |
| Domestic industry           | 21.5  |
| Export industry             | 0.7   |
| Total industry and commerce | 22.2  |
| Services and housing        | 8.0   |
| Government                  | 2.3   |
| Total economy               | 100.0 |

Sources: Employment structure in 1875 from Heston (1983: 396); adjusted for value added per employee in current prices using 1900/01 data from Sivasubramonian (2000: 38, 405-408).

**TABLE 10: Indian real output (1871=100)**

| Year | Agriculture | Home industries | Export industries | Total industry and commerce | Rent and services | Government | Total real output |
|------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| 1600 | 67.8        | 72.4            | 148.6             | 80.0                        | 95.5              | 84.3       | 71.9              |
| 1650 | 63.8        | 67.1            | 148.6             | 75.3                        | 95.5              | 48.2       | 67.3              |
| 1700 | 72.2        | 74.3            | 202.0             | 87.0                        | 103.0             | 60.4       | 75.7              |
| 1750 | 76.8        | 84.0            | 213.6             | 97.0                        | 110.8             | 27.6       | 80.9              |
| 1801 | 79.3        | 90.2            | 457.9             | 127.0                       | 120.7             | 74.5       | 87.5              |
| 1811 | 76.0        | 82.3            | 304.7             | 104.6                       | 125.3             | 77.3       | 82.9              |
| 1821 | 74.9        | 78.6            | 183.2             | 89.0                        | 110.3             | 70.6       | 79.2              |
| 1831 | 77.5        | 84.3            | 65.2              | 82.4                        | 116.2             | 71.3       | 81.8              |
| 1841 | 82.8        | 97.0            | 56.6              | 92.9                        | 104.6             | 79.3       | 87.3              |
| 1851 | 91.5        | 105.2           | 49.5              | 99.6                        | 114.4             | 87.8       | 95.9              |
| 1861 | 89.2        | 112.9           | 56.3              | 107.3                       | 109.4             | 86.9       | 95.6              |
| 1871 | 100.0       | 100.0           | 100.0             | 100.0                       | 100.0             | 100.0      | 100.0             |

Sources: Agriculture: Table 3B, total agricultural production; Home industries: Table 5; Export industries: Tables 5 and 6, adjusted for the growing share of British exports during the seventeenth century using data on bullion inflows by region from Haider (1996: 323); Rent and services: Tables 1 and 7; Government: Table 8; Sectoral shares: Table 9.

**TABLE 11: Indian per capita GDP (1871=100)**

| Year | GDP   | Population | Per capita GDP |
|------|-------|------------|----------------|
| 1600 | 71.9  | 55.5       | 129.7          |
| 1650 | 67.3  | 55.5       | 121.2          |
| 1700 | 75.7  | 64.1       | 118.2          |
| 1750 | 80.9  | 74.2       | 109.0          |
| 1801 | 87.5  | 80.9       | 108.2          |
| 1811 | 82.9  | 84.0       | 98.7           |
| 1821 | 79.2  | 80.1       | 98.9           |
| 1831 | 81.8  | 84.4       | 97.0           |
| 1841 | 87.3  | 82.8       | 105.5          |
| 1851 | 95.9  | 90.6       | 105.8          |
| 1861 | 95.6  | 95.3       | 100.3          |
| 1871 | 100.0 | 100.0      | 100.0          |

Sources: GDP from Table 10; population from Table 1.

**TABLE 12: Comparative India/GB GDP per capita**

|      | Indian GDP | GB GDP     | India/GB | India/GB |
|------|------------|------------|----------|----------|
|      | per capita | per capita | GDP per  | GDP per  |
|      | 1871=100   |            | capita   | capita   |
|      |            |            |          | GB=100   |
| 1600 | 129.7      | 30.5       | 424.4    | 61.5     |
| 1650 | 121.2      | 29.9       | 405.2    | 58.8     |
| 1700 | 118.2      | 42.5       | 278.0    | 40.3     |
| 1750 | 109.0      | 46.5       | 234.3    | 34.0     |
| 1801 | 108.2      | 56.6       | 191.3    | 27.7     |
| 1811 | 98.7       | 56.2       | 175.8    | 25.5     |
| 1821 | 98.9       | 58.0       | 170.4    | 24.7     |
| 1831 | 97.0       | 63.9       | 151.7    | 22.0     |
| 1841 | 105.5      | 71.1       | 148.4    | 21.5     |
| 1851 | 105.8      | 81.5       | 129.8    | 18.8     |
| 1861 | 100.3      | 90.1       | 111.4    | 16.2     |
| 1871 | 100.0      | 100.0      | 100.0    | 14.5     |

Sources and notes: Indian GDP per capita from Table 11; GB GDP per capita 1600-1870: from Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen (2011); 1870-1871 from Deane (1968: 106); GB population: Mitchell (1988: 9-12). Comparative India/GB GDP per capita level in 1871 derived from Broadberry and Gupta (2010), adjusting from a UK to a GB basis using Irish shares of GDP and population from Crafts (2005: 56) and Feinstein (1972: Table 55).

**TABLE 13: Indian and British GDP per capita, 1600-1871 (1990 international dollars)**

| Year | Indian GDP | GB GDP     |
|------|------------|------------|
|      | per capita | per capita |
| 1600 | 682        | 1,123      |
| 1650 | 638        | 1,100      |
| 1700 | 622        | 1,563      |
| 1750 | 573        | 1,710      |
| 1801 | 569        | 2,080      |
| 1811 | 519        | 2,065      |
| 1821 | 520        | 2,133      |
| 1831 | 510        | 2,349      |
| 1841 | 555        | 2,613      |
| 1851 | 556        | 2,997      |
| 1861 | 528        | 3,311      |
| 1871 | 526        | 3,657      |

Source: Derived from Table 11 and Maddison (2003).

**TABLE 14: A benchmark estimate of India/GB GDP per capita, circa 1600**

---

|                                   |        |
|-----------------------------------|--------|
| <b>Mughal Empire</b>              |        |
| Nominal GDP (Rs m)                | 559.68 |
| Population (m)                    | 85.2   |
| GDP per capita (Rs)               | 6.57   |
| <b>England</b>                    |        |
| Nominal GDP (£m)                  | 23.28  |
| Population (m)                    | 4.11   |
| GDP per capita (£)                | 5.66   |
| <b>Exchange rates</b>             |        |
| Silver exchange rate (Rs per £)   | 8.00   |
| Wheat price PPP (Rs per £)        | 1.63   |
| <b>Comparative GDP per capita</b> |        |
| At silver exchange rate           | 14.5   |
| At wheat price PPP                | 71.2   |

---

Sources and notes: Mughal Empire: Nominal GDP in dams from Moosvi (2008: 2-3), noting that a rupee is 40 dams (Habib, 2000: 440); Population obtained by applying Moreland's [1923] ratio of 60 per cent of total Indian population to Habib's (1982a) figure of 142 million; England: nominal GDP and population from Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen (2011); Silver exchange rate: Chaudhuri (1978: 471); PPP: Indian wheat price from Abū'l-Fazl (1595: 65. Price of Rs 0.30 per man of 55.32 lb is equal to Rs 0.005424 per lb (Heston, 1977: 393); English wheat price of 32 s per quarter of 480 lb from Mitchell (1988: 754) is equal to £0.00333 per lb. An Indian price of Rs 0.005424 per lb and an English price of £0.00333 per lb yields a wheat price PPP of £1 = Rs 1.63.



## REFERENCES

- Abū 'l-Fazl [1595] (1927), *The Ā'īn-i-Akbarī*. Translated into English by H.Blochman, Delhi: Low Price Publications.
- Allen, R.C. (2000), "Economic Structure and Agricultural Productivity in Europe, 1300-1800", *European Review of Economic History*, 3, 1-25.
- Allen, R.C. (2001), "The Great Divergence in European Wages and Prices from the Middle Ages to the First World War", *Explorations in Economic History*, 38, 411-447.
- Allen, R.C. (2009), *The British Industrial Revolution in Global Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Álvarez-Nogal, C. and Prados de la Escosura, L. (2007), "The Decline of Spain (1500-1850): Conjectural Estimates", *European Review of Economic History*, 11, 319-366.
- Bagchi, A.K. (1976), "De-industrialization in India in the Nineteenth Century: Some Theoretical Implications", *Journal of Development Studies*, 12, 135-164.
- Banerjea, P. (1928), *Indian Finance in the Days of the Company*, London: Macmillan.
- Bartholomew, J.G. (ed.) (1909), *Imperial Gazetteer of India, volume 26, Atlas*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bayly, C.A. (1983), *Rulers, Townsmen and Bazaars: North Indian Society in the Age of British Expansion, 1770-1870*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blomme, J. and van der Wee, H. (1994), "The Belgian Economy in a Long-Term Historical Perspective: Economic Development in Flanders and Brabant, 1500-1812", in Maddison, A. and van der Wee, H. (eds.), *Economic Growth and Structural Change: Comparative Approaches over the Long Run*, Milan: International Economic History Congress, 77-96.
- Bouis, H.E. (1994), "The Effect of Income on Demand for Food in Poor Countries: Are our Food Consumption Databases Giving Us Reliable Estimates?", *Journal of Development Economics*, 44, 199-226.
- Bowen, H. (2007), "East India Company: Trade and Domestic Financial Statistics, 1755-1838", UK Data Archive, <http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/findingData/snDescription.asp?sn=5690>.
- Broadberry, S.N. (1998), "How did the United States and Germany Overtake Britain? A Sectoral Analysis of Comparative Productivity Levels, 1870-1990", *Journal of Economic History*, 58, 375-407.
- Broadberry, S.N. (2003), "Relative per capita Income Levels in the United Kingdom and the United States since 1870: Reconciling Time-Series Projections and Direct Benchmark Estimates", *Journal of Economic History*, 63, 852-863.

- Broadberry, S.N. (2006), *Market Services and the Productivity Race, 1850-2000: British Performance in International Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Broadberry, S.N., Campbell, B., Klein, A., Overton, M. and van Leeuwen, B. (2011), "British Economic Growth, 1270-1870", London School of Economics, <http://www2.lse.ac.uk/economicHistory/whosWho/profiles/sbroadberry.aspx>.
- Broadberry, S.N. and Gupta, B. (2006), "The Early Modern Great Divergence: Wages, Prices and Economic Development in Europe and Asia, 1500-1800", *Economic History Review*, 59, 2-31.
- Broadberry, S.N. and Gupta, B. (2009), "Lancashire, India and Shifting Competitive Advantage in Cotton textiles, 1700-1850: The neglected Role of Factor Prices", *Economic History Review*, 62, 279-305.
- Broadberry, S.N. and Gupta, B. (2010), "The Historical Roots of India's Service-Led development: A Sectoral Analysis of Anglo-Indian Productivity Differences, 1870-2000", *Explorations in Economic History*, 47, 264-278.
- Chandra, S. (1982), "Standard of Living 1: Mughal India", in Raychaudhuri, T. and Habib, I. (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of India, Volume 1: c. 1200-1750*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 458-471.
- Chaudhuri, K.N. (1978), *The Trading World of Asia and the English East India Company, 1660-1760*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaudhuri, K.N. (1983), "Foreign Trade and Balance of Payments (1757-1947)", in Kumar, D. and Desai, M. (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of India, Volume 2: c.1757-c.1970*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 804-877.
- Clark, C. (1957), *The Conditions of Economic Progress*, (third edition), London: Macmillan.
- Clingingsmith, D. and Williamson, J.G. (2008), "Deindustrialization in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century India: Mughal Decline, Climate Shocks and British Industrial Ascent", *Explorations in Economic History*, 45, 209-234.
- Colebrooke, H.T. (1804), *Remarks on the Husbandry and Internal Commerce of Bengal*, Calcutta: Government Press.
- Crafts, N.F.R. (1976), "English Economic Growth in the Eighteenth Century: A Re-examination of Deane and Cole's Estimates", *Economic History Review*, 29, 226-235.
- Crafts, N.F.R. (1985), *British Economic Growth during the Industrial Revolution*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Crafts, N.F.R. (2005), "Regional GDP in Britain, 1871-1911", *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 52, 54-64.
- Crafts, N.F.R. and Harley, C.K. (1992), "Output Growth and the Industrial Revolution: A Restatement of the Crafts-Harley View", *Economic History Review*, 45, 703-730.
- Deane, P. and Cole, W.A. (1967), *British Economic Growth, 1688-1959*, (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deaton, A. and Muellbauer, J. (1980), *Economics and Consumer Behaviour*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.
- Desai, A.V.(1972) "Population and Standards of Living in Akbar's Time", *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 9, 43-62.
- Desai, A.V. (1978), "Population and Standards of Living in Akbar's Time: A Second Look", *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 15, 53-79.
- Farnie, D.A. (2004), "The Role of Cotton Textiles in the Economic Development of India, 1600-1990", in Farnie, D.A. and Jeremy, D.J. (eds.), *The Fibre that Changed the World: The Cotton Industry in International Perspective, 1600-1990s*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 395-430.
- Feinstein, C.H. (1972), *National Income, Expenditure and Output of the United Kingdom, 1855-1965*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frank, A.G. (1998), *ReOrient: The Silver Age in Asia and the World Economy*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fukazawa, H. (1982), "Standard of Living 2: Maharashtra and the Deccan", in Raychaudhuri, T. and Habib, I. (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of India, Volume 1: c. 1200-1750*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 471-477.
- Habib, I. (1982a), "Population", in Raychaudhuri, T. And Habib, I. (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of India, Volume 1: c.1200-c.1750* , Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163-171.
- Habib, I. (1982b), *An Atlas of the Mughal Empire: Political and Economic Maps with Detailed Notes*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Habib, I. (2000), *The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1526-1707)*, Delhi: Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haider, N. (1996), "Precious Metal Flows and Currency Circulation in the Mughal Empire", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 39, 298-364.

- Heston, A.W. (1977), "The Standard of Living in Akbar's Time: A Comment", *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 14, 391-396.
- Heston, A. (1983), "National Income", in Kumar, D. and Desai, M. (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of India, Volume 2: c.1757-c.1970*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 463-532.
- Hoffmann, W.G. (1965), *Das Wachstum der deutschen Wirtschaft seit der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Hossain, H. (1988) *The Company Weavers of Bengal*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- India Census Commissioner, Baines, J.A. (1893), *Census of India 1891, General Report [and General Tables]*. London: Printed for the Indian Government by Eyre and Spottiswoode.
- India Office (various years), *Statistical Abstract Relating to British India*, London: HMSO.
- King, G. [1696] (1936), "Natural and Political Observations and Conclusions upon the State and Condition of England", in Barnett, G.E. (ed.), *Two Tracts by Gregory King*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Krantz, O. (2004), "An Estimate of Swedish GDP in 1571", in Heikkinen, S. and van Zanden, J.L. (eds.), *Exploring Economic Growth: Essays in Measurement and Analysis*, Amsterdam: Aksant, 105-130.
- Kuznets, S. (1946), *National Product since 1869*, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Maddison, A. (1982), *Phases of Capitalist Development*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maddison, A. (1995), *Monitoring the World Economy, 1820-1992*, Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Maddison, A. (2003), *The World Economy: Historical Statistics*, Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Malanima, P. (2011), "The Long Decline of a Leading Economy: GDP in Central and Northern Italy, 1300-1913", *European Review of Economic History*, 15, 169-219.
- Mahalanobis, P.C. and Bhattacharya, D. (1976), "Growth of Population in India and Pakistan, 1801-1961", *Artha Vijnana*, 18, 1-10.
- Martin, R. M. (1839), *Statistics of the Colonies of the British Empire*, London: W.H. Allen & Co.

- Mitchell, B.R. (1988), *British Historical Statistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mitra, D.B. (1978), *The Cotton Weavers of Bengal*, Calcutta: Firma KLM.
- Moosvi, S. (1973), "Production, Consumption and Population in Akbar's Time", *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 10, 181-195.
- Moosvi, S. (1977), "Note on Professor Alan Heston's 'Standard of Living in Akbar's Time: A Comment'", *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 14, 397-401.
- Moosvi, S. (2008), *People, Taxation and Trade in Mughal India*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moreland, W.H. [1923] (1990), *From Akbar to Aurangzeb: A Study in Indian Economic History*, Delhi: Low Price Publications.
- Morris, M.D. (1968), "Towards a Reinterpretation of Nineteenth Century Indian Economic History", *Journal of Economic History*, 23, 606-618.
- Morris, M.D. (1983), "The Growth of Large-Scale Industry to 1947", in Kumar, D. and Desai, M. (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of India, Volume 2: c. 1757-c. 1970*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 553-676.
- Mukerjee, R. (1967), *The Economic History of India, 1600-1800*, Allahabad.
- Parthasarathi, P. (1998), "Rethinking Wages and Competitiveness in the Eighteenth Century: Britain and South India", *Past and Present*, 158, 79-109.
- Pfister, U. (2008), "German Economic Growth, 1500-1850", Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster.
- Phillimore, R.E. (1945), *Historical Records of the Survey of India, vol.1, 18<sup>th</sup> century*, Dehra Dun: Surveyor General.
- Pomeranz, K. (2000), *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Prados de la Escosura, L. (2000), "International Comparisons of Real Product, 1820-1990", *Explorations in Economic History*, 37, 1-41.
- Return to an Order of the House of Commons, dated 23 July 1857. "A Return of the Area and Population of Each Division of Each Presidency of India, from the Latest Inquiries; Comprising, also the Area and Estimated Population of Native States", printed 28 July 1857.
- Richards, J.F. (1995), *The Mughal Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Roy, T. (2010a), “Economic Conditions in Early Modern Bengal: A Contribution to the Divergence Debate”, *Journal of Economic History*, 70, 179-194.
- Roy, T. (2010b), “Rethinking the Origins of British India: State Formation and Military-Fiscal Undertakings in an Eighteenth Century World Region”, Economic History Working Papers, 142/10, London: Department of Economic History, London School of Economics, <http://www2.lse.ac.uk/economicHistory/workingPapers/2010/WP142.pdf>.
- Roy, T. (2011a), *The Economic History of India, 1857-1947*, (3<sup>rd</sup> edition), Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Roy, T. (2011b), “Consumption of Cotton Cloth in India, 1795-1940”, *Australian Economic History Review*, (forthcoming).
- Sandberg, L.G. (1974), *Lancashire in Decline: A Study in Entrepreneurship, Technology and International Trade*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Schwartzberg, J.E. (1978), *A Historical Atlas of South Asia*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sivasubramanian, S. (2000), *The National Income of India in the Twentieth Century*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Twomey, M.J. (1983), “Employment in Nineteenth Century Indian Textiles”, *Explorations in Economic History*, 20, 37-57.
- Visaria, L. and Visaria, P. (1983), “Population (1757-1947)”, in Kumar, D. and Desai, M. (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of India, Volume 2: c.1757 - c.1970*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 463-532.
- Ward, M. and Devereux, J. (2003), “Measuring British Decline: Direct Versus Long-Span Income Measures”, *Journal of Economic History*, 63, 826-851.
- Waterfield, H. (1875), *Memorandum on the Census of British India 1871-72*, London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.
- Wrigley, E.A. (1985), “Urban Growth and Agricultural Change: England and the Continent in the Early Modern Period”, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 15, 683-728.
- van Zanden, J.L. (1999), “Wages and the Standard of Living in Europe, 1500-1800”, *European Review of Economic History*, 3, 175-197.
- van Zanden, J.L. and van Leeuwen, B. (2011), “The Origins of Modern Economic Growth? Holland between 1500 and 1800”, Utrecht University and University of Warwick.