



---

## **ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION UNDER THE BRITISH RULE IN INDIA: A REVIEW**

**SK ANOAR ALI**

Research Scholar, Department of History  
RKDF UNIVERSITY, RANCHI

---

### **ABSTRACT:**

The goals of the research were to examine the British's social and cultural policies in India, as well as to learn more about the British's judicial system and the structure of the civil services it established. When it was founded on December 31st, 1600, the East India Company was a monopolistic trading corporation with exclusive privileges from the British crown to do business in Asia. Government officials were hired, named, and given employment terms and benefits comparable with those found in the private sector. This research has relied only on secondary sources for its data collection. The research shows that the British East India Company significantly altered the political landscape of India.

**Keywords:** social ,cultural policies, judicial system, British East India.

---

### **Introduction:**

When it was founded on 31\* December 1600, the East India Company was a monopolistic trading corporation with exclusive privileges from the British crown to do business in Asia. The term "Factory" was used to describe a multi-factor trade hub. ah Agedt ruled over a township (a collection of enterprises). In commercial transactions, a "factor" was an agent who stood in for another party. Each worker was assigned one of four categories: &;,irentice, Writer, Factor, or Merchant. Officials were hired, given titles, and given employment contracts in accordance with the standards and practises customary in the corporate world. Patronage was the norm rather than the exception when it came to hiring and advancement in the armed forces. The Proprietors or Directors of the Company were responsible for patronage. It was common practise in the early years of Company control to transfer officials between different regions. They were not given any on-the-job training and had to figure things out the hard way. They had no idea how the locals lived or how to communicate with them. The Company's employees have a reputation for dishonesty due to their poor pay.(*Sakalesh,2016*)

### **Significance of the Study:**

The administrative system of India is essentially a relic of the colonial era. Local administration, district administration, budgeting, auditing, centralizing tendency, police administration, revenue administration, and many other aspects of Indian administration can be traced back to the time when India was ruled by the British. Therefore, readers, researchers, and all academics will benefit much from the current study.

### **Objectives:**

#### **The study has been conducted with the following objectives-**

- To study the structure of civil services launched by the British.
- To find out the judicial structure laid down by the British.
- To discuss the social and cultural policy of the British in India.

---

### **Discussion:**

Lord Cornwallis is credited with founding the Civil Service. As we saw in a previous chapter, the East India Company's commerce in the East was always conducted by low-paid workers who were given the freedom to engage in private trade on the company's dime. When the Company expanded into other territories, the original servants were promoted to administrative positions. Now they've reached new depths of corruption. They accumulated vast fortune via the exploitation of native weavers and craftsmen, merchants and zamindars, bribery and 'gifts' from rajas and nawabs, and illicit private commerce, and then returned to England (*Bagchi, A. K. 2000*). In an effort to cease their corruption, Clive and Warren Hastings met with very little success.

In 1786, when Cornwallis was appointed Governor-General of India, he was adamant about cleaning up the administration. However, he knew that the Company's employees wouldn't be willing to do their jobs honestly and efficiently if they weren't paid enough. As a result, he was quite severe with the laws that forbade officials from engaging in private commerce or accepting gifts or bribes. Simultaneously, he increased pay for the Company's employees. As an example, a district collector was to get Rs 1,500 per month plus 1% of his district's earnings. Company civil servants eventually earned more than any other group in the globe (*Banerjee, A. and L. Iyer.2005*). To ensure that the Civil Service would remain untainted by political interference; Cornwallis mandated that advancement would be based on seniority.

For the purpose of training new members of the Civil Service, Lord Wellesley founded the College of Fort William in Calcutta in the year 1800. His decision was opposed by the Company's board of directors, who in 1806 established their own East Indian College in the English town of Haileybury.

The directors of the East India Company appeased the members of the Board of Control by allowing them to make certain nominations for the Civil Service until 1853. When the directors had their other economic and political rights stripped away by Parliament, they battled fiercely to keep this lucrative and cherished prerogative. Finally, in 1853, they were defeated when the Charter Act required examinations for entry into the Civil Service.

Over time, the Indian Civil Service has been internationally recognised as among the best and most influential of its kind. Its members had significant influence and often contributed to policy formation. Traditions of individualism, honesty, and hard labour were fostered, even though these values clearly benefited the British more than the Indians. They eventually internalised the notion that they were endowed with a divine right to dominate India. The British Empire in India was built and maintained by its civil service, which is why it is often referred to as the "steel-frame" of the Empire. As the Indian independence movement became stronger, it became the primary enemy of everything modern and forward-thinking inside Indian society.

### **ARMY**

The British Army in India was the backbone of the colonial government. It served four crucial purposes. It was the primary means by which the British were able to expand their empire throughout Asia and Africa, as well as the means by which they were able to defend it from potential threats from within. It was also the means by which the Indian powers were conquered.

Indian troops made up the majority of the Company's army, and they were mostly drawn from what is now the states of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar.

In 1857, for instance, the Indian army had a total strength of 311,400, with 265,900 being Indian. However, ever since the time of Cornwallis, all of its officers have been British. In 1856, the highest-ranking Indian official was a subedar, and just three Indians got the monthly wage of Rs 300. Since the cost of using British forces was so high, it was necessary to hire a sizable number of Indian soldiers. Furthermore, Britain's population may have been too low to muster the army necessary to successfully conquer India. The British kept a specific number of men to act as a check on the Indian soldiers and ran the army from top to bottom. Still, the idea that a small group of Europeans could subjugate India with an army composed mostly of Indians seems incredible today. There were two things that made this attainable. To begin with, there was a dearth of contemporary nationalism in the country. A Bihari or Awadhi soldier would not have deemed it anti-Indian to assist the Company beat the Marathas or the Punjabis. However, there was a long-standing culture of allegiance to the salt among Indian soldiers. That is to say, the Indian soldier excelled as a mercenary, and the Company, for its part, did a commendable job as a paymaster. The Indian kings and chieftains had stopped paying their warriors, but not the British.

### **POLICE**

Once again, Cornwallis is credited with founding the British police force, the third pillar of British sovereignty. He abolished the authority of the zamindars and replaced them with a regular police force charged with maintaining order. He reverted to and updated the traditional Indian system of thanas in this regard. India therefore surpassed Britain, where no such organised police force existed at the time. Cornwallis created an Indian-led system of circles (called thanas) governed by a daroga. The position of District Superintendent of Police was subsequently established to oversee police operations within a certain jurisdiction. Again, Indians were denied access to upper-level positions. Police functions were still carried out by village-watchmen, who were paid and supported by local communities. Major crimes were reduced by the police over time. Slang for thievery The cops also foiled plans for a massive protest.

large-scale conspiracy against foreign rule, and the police were deployed to put down the national movement when it developed. The Indian police force showed little compassion in their interactions with the public. Police "depredations on the peaceable inhabitants, of the same nature as those practised by the dacoits whom they were employed to suppress," according to a Committee of Parliament report from 1813. In addition, Governor-General William Bentinck penned the following in 1832:

Moreover, "nothing can surpass the popularity of a recent regulation by which, if a robbery has been committed, the police are prohibited from making any enquiry into it, except upon the requisition of the persons robbed; in other words, the shepherd is a more ravenous beast of prey than the wolf" (*Bardhan, P. K.1984*).

### **JUDICIAL ORGANISATION**

The British established a judicial structure that included separate criminal and civil courts. Although Warren Hastings helped get things going, it wasn't until Cornwallis in 1793 that things began to settle down. A civil court, or Diwani Adalat, presided over by a judge from the Civil Service was set up in each district. Cornwallis split the roles of Civil Judge and Collector in this way. The Sadar Diwani Adalat was the highest court of appeal after the District Court and the four Provincial Courts of Civil Appeal. Several lower courts, known as munifi and amins, were presided over by Indian judges and ranked below the District Court, which was presided over by Europeans. Cornwallis created a Court of Circuit, presided over by civil officers, in each of the Presidency of Bengal's four divisions to handle criminal matters. Many lower-level Indian courts, called magistracies, were established to hear less serious issues. Sadar Nizamat Adalat oversaw all appeals from the Circuit Courts. To prevent the ripping off of limbs and other barbaric

penalties, the criminal courts employed a moderated and less severe version of Muslim Criminal Law. The civil courts enforced the customary law that had been in effect in a certain region or among a particular population for as long as anybody could remember. Provincial Courts of Appeal and Circuit were disbanded by William Bentinck in 1831. Prior to District Judges and District Collectors, it was the Commissions that were tasked with their duties. Bentinck also elevated Indians in the legal system by appointing them to positions of authority as Deputy Magistrates, Subordinate Judges, and Principal Sadar Amins. In 1865, the Sadar Courts in Diwani and Nizamat were replaced by the High Courts in Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay .

The British also built a new legal system by legislating and codifying preexisting legal norms. Justice in India has historically been founded on customary law that evolved through time, however many laws also drew inspiration from religious texts like the shastras and the sharia and from imperial decrees. The British maintained a basic adherence to customary law but over time developed their own legal system. Rules were established, and preexisting laws were codified and, in many cases, modernized by judicial interpretation. The Governor General in Council has absolute legislative authority under the Charter Act of 1833. This meant that Indians would have to submit more and more to the authority of manmade rules, regardless of how good or horrible they were, since they were considered holy and so could not be questioned.

To formalize Indian law, the government recruited Lord Macaulay to head a Law Commission in 1833. The Indian Penal Code, the Codes of Civil and Criminal Procedure, and other legal codes adopted from the West are the fruits of its labours. All of the country's laws were standardised and were being enforced by the same set of judges. As a result, we may say that India's legal system is united.

---

## THE RULE OF LAW

The notion of the rule of law as we know it today was developed by the British. This meant that, at least in principle, their administration would be carried out in accordance with laws that set down the specific rights, privileges, and duties of their people, rather than at the whim of the ruler. In reality, bureaucrats and police officers abused their discretionary authority and restricted citizens' freedoms. Individual freedom was protected, at least theoretically, by the rule of law. It is true that the emperors of India in the past had generally been constrained by tradition and custom. However, they were never restrained from taking whatever administrative actions they saw fit, and no higher authority existed before which their decisions could be challenged. Sometimes the Indian kings and chiefs would use their authority to do whatever they pleased. In contrast, administration under British rule was largely carried out in accordance with laws as interpreted by the courts, despite the fact that the laws were often flawed, "were made not by the people through a democratic process but autocratically by the foreign rulers, and left a great deal of power in the hands of the civil servants and the police. Unfortunately, this outcome was probably unavoidable under a foreign administration that was neither democratic or libertarian by definition" (*Beer, G. L. 1962*).

## EQUALITY BEFORE LAW

Under British rule, the Indian legal system was founded on the principle of legal equality. This meant that legal equality had been achieved for all men. Everyone, regardless of their social status, religion, or caste, was subject to the same laws. In the past, the law made a difference between those who were "high-born" and those who were "low-born." A brahmin received a lesser sentence than a non-brahmin for the identical offence. Like zamindars and aristocrats, commoners were not subjected to the same level of scrutiny in daily life. In most cases, they had no way of being held accountable for their criminal behaviour. This meant that even the lowly may influence the wheels of justice.

One person was not treated equally under the law, although this was a rare exception. Europeans and their descendants were subject to different legal systems and even different laws. Only European judges could hear their criminal trials. There was a lot of arrogant, aggressive, and often cruel behaviour on the part of English authorities, military officers, planters, and merchants against Indians. When attempts were made to bring them to justice, many of the European judges who were the only ones who could try them provided them with indirect and undue protection and handed down light or no sentences. As a result, injustice was often done. In actuality, a new kind of legal discrimination evolved. Paying for court costs, hiring solicitors and covering witness costs drove up the price of achieving justice significantly. It was common for courts to be located in faraway cities. The legal process took a very long time. The peasants, most of whom were illiterate and poorly educated, had little hope of understanding the complex legislation. The wealthy may always manipulate the system to benefit themselves. In many cases, the sheer prospect of taking a poor person through the lengthy process of justice from a lower court all the way to the highest level of appeal was enough to bring him to heel. More than that, justice was denied because of pervasive corruption among the ranks of law enforcement and other administrative agencies. Officials often sided with the wealthy. Without fear of legal repercussions, the zamindars oppressed the ryots. The pre-British legal system, on the other hand, was more ad hoc, expedient, and low-cost. The new court system was a step backward in some ways, such as how expensive and time-consuming it is, but it was a step forward in others, such as how it upholds the rule of law and guarantees everyone an equal opportunity before the law.

---

## Social and Cultural Policy;

As we have seen, the British government restructured and controlled India's economy to benefit British commerce and industry and established a cutting-edge administrative structure to ensure public safety. A policy of non-interference in the religious, social, and cultural life of the nation was maintained by them until 1813; after that year, however, they began taking active efforts to modify Indian society and culture. This was a result of the emergence of novel pursuits and thoughts in Victorian Britain. Beginning in the middle of the eighteenth century, the Industrial Revolution and the expansion of industrial capitalism were rapidly altering every facet of British life. The emerging industrial powers saw potential in India as a large consumer market. Keeping the peace alone wasn't enough; India also needed to undergo some modernization and development for this to be possible. In other words, as noted by Thompson and Garratt, "the mood and methods of the old brigandage were changing into those of modern industrialism and capitalism."

“Science and technology also provided new opportunities for human development. The British perspective on Indian issues was shaped by the intellectual ferment of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Britain and Europe. As the saying goes, “new attitudes of mind, manners, and morals were appearing” all throughout Europe. The great French Revolution of 1789 galvanised democratic ideals and let loose the strength of contemporary nationalism with its message of liberty, equality, and brotherhood. Bacon, Locke, Voltaire, Rousseau, Kant, Adam Smith, and Bentham typified the new school of philosophy; Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, and Dickens typified the new school of literature. Official Indian government ideology was influenced by the new ideas that emerged as a result of the eighteenth century's intellectual revolution, the French Revolution, and the Industrial Revolution” (*Bardhan, P. K. 1984*).

Rationalism or a belief in reason and science, humanism, or a love of humanity, and optimism in human potential were the three defining features of the new idea. Only what agreed with human reason and could be proven in practise was considered true by those with a reasonable and scientific outlook. Visible demonstrations of the strength of human reason include the scientific advancements of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries and the great powers of production unleashed by the application of science to industry. Humanism held that each individual was valuable and deserving of esteem because of this inherent worth. No individual has the right to see another as only a means to his own end of pleasure. Humanism is the philosophical basis for liberalism, socialism, and individualism. All communities, according to the idea of progress, are doomed to evolve through time. Even more so, man had the ability to reshape both nature and society along more equitable and reasonable lines.

---

### **Modernization of Education:**

After the 1835 ruling, the Indian government swiftly made English the mandatory language of teaching in its schools and universities, notably in Bengal. Instead of a huge number of primary schools, it established a small number of English-language institutions and universities. This approach came under fire for being insensitive to the needs of the general public when it came to education. The push to establish new centres of higher learning was not misguided. There was a clear need for a significant number of universities and institutions to provide the necessary primary school instructors. However, it was also important to focus on educating the general public as higher education expanded. The government would not do this since it does not want to invest more than a negligible amount on schools. Officials resorted to the “downward filtration theory” to make up for the lack of funding for education. Only a select few Indians could be educated with the available resources, therefore it was determined to invest in the education of a small number of people from the top and middle classes who would then be responsible for teaching the rest of the population and introducing them to contemporary concepts. Therefore, the lower classes were expected to get access to education and progressive ideas via diffusion from the higher classes. “This course of action lasted right up to the end of British control. It's worth noting that although literacy rates didn't improve, modern ideas did -- just not in the way that the elites wanted. The educated Indians, or intellectuals, spread ideas of democracy, nationalism, anti-imperialism, and social and economic equality and justice among the rural and urban masses through political parties, the press, pamphlets, literature, and public platform, but not through schools and textbooks. If the educational system was a conduit for these ideas, it did so indirectly by making some of the foundational literature in the physical and social sciences and the humanities accessible to its beneficiaries, so encouraging them to engage in critical thinking and social analysis” (*Arnold, D. 1991*). Everything about it—its layout and design, its goals and techniques, its courses and its content—was developed with colonization in mind. Another pivotal moment in the evolution of India's educational system occurred in 1854 with the issuance of Wood's issuance, so called after Sir Charles Wood, President of the Board of Control. The Dispatch urged the Indian government to take charge of the public's education. As a result, the “downward filtration” notion was disproved. The government really did very little to promote education and spent very little money doing so. At 1857, universities at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras were established as affiliates of the British Empire in response to directives from the Dispatch. One of the first two alumni of Calcutta University, the famed Bengali author Bankim Chandra Chatterjee graduated in 1858.

So, the British intended to utilise progressive education to solidify their grip on power.

Due to a lack of government funding and, more importantly, an 1844 proclamation mandating English proficiency for all government job candidates, the old Indian system of education began to wither and eventually collapse. As a result of this proclamation, English-medium schools quickly rose to prominence, while conventional institutions saw an exodus of students.

Due in large part to the system's failure to prioritise universal education, India's overall rate of adult literacy stayed almost unchanged between 1921 and 1821. In 1911, 94% of Indians did not know how to read, but only 92% did so by 1921. A further barrier to education for the people was the preference for English over Indian languages as the medium of teaching. Furthermore, it tended to widen the gap between the educated and the general populace in terms of both language and culture. Further, since students had to pay fees at schools and universities, higher education was very expensive and mostly reserved for the upper classes and urbanites. As a result of its severe limitations, it was unable to make up for the collapse of the conventional schooling system for almost a century.

---

### **Conclusion:**

At this juncture, it is important to note that such upright and kind Englishmen were in the minority and never had a crucial amount of power in the British administration of India. Imperialism and exploitation by the governing forces of the British-Indian government persisted. They were only open to new ideas and reformist measures provided they did not hinder the British Empire's ability to economically penetrate India and solidify its grip on the subcontinent. India's modernization was constrained by the desire for simpler and more extensive resource extraction. Many English officials, businesspeople, and politicians were thus open to the idea of modernizing India in the hopes that it would make Indians more receptive to British rule and better buyers for British products. When it came to talking about Indian policy, even many Radicals abandoned their former principles. They wanted a paternalistic authoritarian system instead of fighting for a democratic administration as they did in Britain. They shared this view with conservatives, who also advocated for a paternalism that would see Indians as children and prohibit them from holding political office. While some degree of modernization was necessary to further British interests in India, doing so in its entirety would give rise to forces that ran counter to those goals and, in the long term, threatened British dominance in India. A programme of partial modernization, whereby modernization is introduced in

certain areas but blocked and prevented in others, was therefore necessitated. That is to say, colonial modernization was the plan for India, implemented within the bounds of colonialism and with its promotion in mind. The management of the Company likewise ignored funding for technical and scientific training. Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras were the only three cities in the nation with medical schools by 1857. Roorkee, India's lone top-tier engineering institution, admitted solely white students from across the pond.

---

**REFERENCES:**

---

1. Arnold, D. (1991). *Famine: Social Crisis and Historical Change (New Perspectives on the Past)*. Wiley- Blackwell publication. 213-19.
2. Bagchi, A. K. (2000). *Private Investment in India 1900-1939*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 285.
3. Bardhan, P. K. (1984). *Land, Labour and Rural Poverty: Essays in Development Economics*. Delhi: Oxford University Press. 137-40.
4. Beer, G. L. (1962). *The Origins of the British Colonial System*. London: Kessinger Publishing. 194-98.
5. Banerjee, A. and L. Iyer (2005). *History, Social Divisions and Public Goods in Rural India*. Switzerland: Journal of the European Economic Association 3 (2-3). 639-47.
6. Sakalesh, (2016) *Impact Of British Rule In India*, Jetir March 2016, Volume 3, Issue 3.