GLOBUS PUBLICATION

Cosmos An International Journal of Art & Higher Education
A Refereed Research Journal
Vol 13/ No 2/ Jul-Dec 2024 ISSN: 2319-8966

SHIFTING HEGEMONIES: REGIONAL POWER DYNAMICS IN POST-PANIPAT INDIA (1761-1800)

*Krishan Kumar Joon
**Pradeep Kumar Kesharwani

Paper Received: 05.09.2024 / **Paper Accepted**: 03.10.2024 / **Paper Published**: 05.10.2024
Corresponding Author: Krishan Kumar Joon; doi:10.46360/cosmos.ahe.520242012

Abstract

The 1761 Third Battle of Panipat represented a watershed moment in South Asian political history, precipitating the dissolution of Maratha hegemony and generating a political vacuum that fundamentally reshaped regional power structures. This research offers a comparative examination of key political actors, the British East India Company, Mysore, Hyderabad, Bengal, Awadh, and the Sikh Confederacy, analysing their strategic adaptations to the transformed post-Panipat landscape. Utilising Persian and English historical records, administrative archives, and contemporary historiography, the study evaluates critical parameters including territorial aggrandisement, military modernisation, revenue administration, diplomatic engagement, and institutional resilience. The analysis reveals disparate trajectories: while Mysore and the Sikh polities achieved territorial gains, they failed to establish enduring state structures; Awadh and Hyderabad maintained regional significance but progressively fell under British suzerainty; Bengal transitioned into the foundation of Company governance following the Diwani grant of 1765. The British East India Company's ascendancy stemmed from its sophisticated military apparatus and efficient fiscal extraction mechanisms. Ultimately, this study establishes that the aftermath of Panipat catalysed political disintegration across the subcontinent, thereby enabling the systematic expansion of British colonial authority in South Asia.

Keywords: Panipat 1761: Regional Power Shifts, Eighteenth-Century India, State Formation, Colonial Ascendancy in South Asia.

Introduction

The clash at Panipat on January 14, 1761, constitutes a defining military confrontation in South Asian historiography, dramatically transforming the course of political authority in eighteenth-century India. The comprehensive defeat inflicted upon the Maratha Confederacy by Ahmad Shah Durrani's Afghan coalition produced devastating losses - period accounts estimate fatalities ranging from 60,000 to 100,000 - generating a political void that fundamentally reconfigured subcontinental power structures (Gordon 134). This critical juncture signified more than simply the termination of Maratha imperial designs in northern territories; it precipitated an extensive realignment of regional authorities that would eventually enable British colonial penetration. Sarkar notes, "Panipat arrested the growth of the Maratha power and prevented their establishing an empire on the ruins of the Mughal monarchy" (87).

The battle's consequences produced a fractured political terrain distinguished by rival regional kingdoms and the progressive rise of the British East India Company. The disintegration of Maratha dominance generated a power void across northern India that multiple regional forces sought to occupy, consequently diminishing indigenous opposition to European colonial advancement. Sen contends that "the decimation of Maratha military strength at Panipat inadvertently cleared the path for British supremacy," emphasizing that no individual indigenous authority commanded the resources to counter European military innovation and organizational proficiency following the engagement (203). The restructuring of regional power bases after 1761 therefore constitutes a pivotal watershed for comprehending the shift from indigenous to colonial administrative frameworks.

This investigation analyzes the comparative developments of principal regional powers - encompassing the British East India Company, the Kingdom of Mysore, the Nizam of Hyderabad, the Nawabs of Bengal and Awadh, and the Sikh Confederacy - during the decades succeeding the Battle of Panipat. Through examination of political consolidation, military capabilities, economic foundations, and diplomatic approaches across these polities, this research elucidates how the post-Panipat epoch generated divergent outcomes in state construction and persistence. The study adopts a comparative historical framework, drawing upon primary materials including contemporary narratives, diplomatic communications, and bureaucratic documentation, complemented by secondary literature, to develop a sophisticated interpretation of power transitions (Bayly 45; Dirks 156).

The importance of this exploration transcends historical chronicling to address the fundamental

* *Research Scholar, Department of History, Kalinga University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India.*
** *Research Supervisor, Professor, Department of History, Kalinga University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India.*

inquiries concerning state formation, imperial dissolution, and colonial transformation in South Asia. Comprehending the post-Panipat reorganization offers crucial background for understanding British colonial emergence, the breakdown of indigenous state integration, and the extended trajectories of regional political traditions. Marshall argues, "The period between Panipat and Plassey represents the fulcrum upon which Indian political sovereignty tilted from indigenous to foreign hands" (178). This investigation advances scholarly discourse regarding the determinants of British imperial achievement by illustrating how indigenous military setbacks, political disintegration, and unequal state capacity generated circumstances conducive to colonial penetration.

The analysis advances through four primary components: an extensive literature review surveying current scholarship on post-Panipat political transformations; a methodology segment outlining the comparative historical strategy and source documentation; a results component presenting empirical observations on differential power trajectories; and a conclusion synthesizing implications for understanding eighteenth-century South Asian state formation and colonial transition. Through systematic comparison of regional powers' adaptations to the post-Panipat context, this research demonstrates how military defeat, institutional capacity, and strategic responsiveness determined survival and achievement during an epoch of substantial political transformation (Kolff 89; Alam 234).

Literature Review

The Battle and Its Immediate Impact

Academic scrutiny of the Third Battle of Panipat has produced considerable discussion concerning its military aspects, fatality estimates, and direct political ramifications. Gordon's foundational study, The Marathas 1600-1818, offers the most thorough examination of Maratha martial capabilities and the strategic elements that precipitated their downfall, highlighting logistical impediments, tactical miscalculations, and the catastrophic potency of Afghan ordnance (134-156). Gordon contends that Maratha territorial overreach into antagonistic regions, coupled with insufficient provisioning networks and deficient synchronization among confederate units, generated weaknesses that Durrani leveraged with devastating proficiency. Contemporary Persian historical texts, notably the Tarikh-i-Ahmad Shahi, chronicle the magnitude of fatalities and material devastation, with calculations spanning from 60,000 to 100,000 Maratha casualties alongside the seizure of substantial artillery and supply convoys (Ganda Singh 45-67).

Sarkar's canonical assessment in Fall of the Mughal Empire underscores the engagement's function in halting Maratha expansionist aspirations and forestalling the creation of a consolidated Maratha dominion that could have superseded Mughal supremacy (87-102). This perspective, predominant in early twentieth-century historical writing, characterized Panipat as a conclusive watershed that irreversibly undermined indigenous opposition to European imperialism. Nevertheless, revisionist scholarship has nuanced this interpretation, with Sen maintaining in The Military Transition in Early Modern Asia that although Panipat substantially diminished Maratha strength, it failed to eradicate their political authority or martial potential in the Deccan and western territories (203-225). Sen establishes that Maratha resurgence during the 1770s and 1780s, albeit partial, indicates the battle's consequences were neither as categorical nor as permanently incapacitating as previous historians asserted.

Regional Power Dynamics and State Formation

Academic literature addressing post-Panipat regional state construction emphasizes the contrasting paths of indigenous and European authorities. Bayly's seminal Rulers, Townsmen and Bazaars investigates how regional kingdoms cultivated sophisticated taxation mechanisms and bureaucratic frameworks within the authority void following Mughal deterioration and Maratha collapse (45-89). Bayly maintains that polities such as Awadh and Hyderabad effectively modified Mughal administrative methodologies while creating novel forms of political legitimation anchored in regional identities and religious prerogatives. This "successor state" paradigm stresses continuity with Mughal governance while recognizing substantial innovations in fiscal management and military structuring.

Marshall's The Making and Unmaking of Empires furnishes a comparative architecture for comprehending British expansion concurrent with indigenous state development, contending that the post-Panipat epoch constituted a "fulcrum" in South Asian political chronology where indigenous autonomy progressively shifted toward European supremacy (178-201). Marshall's examination underscores the significance of martial technology, particularly European infantry discipline and artillery implementation, in producing asymmetric benefits that indigenous authorities struggled to neutralize despite endeavors at military modernization. His scholarship demonstrates how British achievement derived not from predestined excellence but from contingent advantages in military coordination, fiscal acquisition, and

diplomatic maneuvering that materialized in the post-1761 context.

Dirks' The Scandal of Empire explores how British imperial penetration capitalized on indigenous political disunity, maintaining that colonial triumph depended essentially on the deficit of coordinated resistance following the disintegration of Maratha and Mughal authority (156-178). Dirks highlights the function of cooperative elites who aligned with the Company in exchange for regional power, illustrating how colonial governance emerged through negotiated compacts rather than outright subjugation. This viewpoint contests triumphalist accounts of British preeminence by exposing the contingent and collaborative character of colonial state construction.

Military Modernisation and Strategic Adaptation

Scholarly investigation of military adjustment in post-Panipat India has highlighted the uneven capability of regional powers to incorporate European martial technologies and organizational structures. Kolff's Naukar, Rajput and Sepoy supplies fundamental background on the military employment market in North India, establishing how the accessibility of trained combatants enabled both indigenous and European military proliferation (89-134). Kolff's scholarship reveals that military modernization depended not simply on embracing new technologies but on restructuring recruitment configurations, training protocols, and leadership architectures - transformations that proved more feasible for centralized polities like Mysore and the British Company than for confederal entities like the Marathas or Sikhs.

Alam's The Crisis of Empire in Mughal North India investigates how regional authorities endeavored to establish political legitimacy and martial capacity absent effective Mughal sovereignty (234-267). Alam establishes that successful state construction necessitated not solely military prowess but also ideological validation, proficient administration, and sustainable revenue generation—competencies that fluctuated substantially across regional powers. His investigation underscores the significance of institutional legacy from Mughal bureaucracy, asserting that polities that successfully modified Mughal fiscal and administrative technologies generally demonstrated greater durability than those that spurned or failed to institute such frameworks.

Roy's Military Manpower, Armies and Warfare in South Asia delivers a comparative evaluation of indigenous military modification, proposing that Indian states exhibited considerable acumen in embracing European technologies but encountered difficulties with organizational and doctrinal reformation (112-145). Roy's scholarship challenges Orientalist narratives that ascribed British triumph to intrinsic European excellence, instead emphasizing contingent elements including superior fiscal potential, more proficient military discipline, and enhanced intelligence systems. His research establishes that technological dissemination transpired rapidly throughout South Asia, but organizational adaptation proved more formidable for states deficient in centralized command hierarchies and professional military administrations.

Economic Foundations of Political Power

Contemporary scholarship has emphasized the decisive function of economic assets and fiscal potential in shaping political outcomes in post-Panipat India. Habib's The Agrarian System of Mughal India, while concentrating on an antecedent period, furnishes crucial background for understanding the revenue mechanisms that successor states inherited and modified (89-123). Habib establishes that effective taxation demanded not simply coercive capability but also administrative sophistication, market consolidation, and productive agricultural systems elements that varied considerably across territories and determined differential state potential.

Parthasarathi's Why Europe Grew Rich, and Asia Did Not challenges previous interpretations that attributed European achievement to superior economic advancement, instead contending that South Asian economies remained highly productive and sophisticated throughout the late eighteenth century (156-189). Parthasarathi establishes that British success relied less on economic superiority than on political-military benefits that permitted the extraction of Indian assets for European advantage. His scholarship suggests that economic divergence between Europe and Asia resulted more from colonial exploitation than from inherent disparities in development.

Chaudhury's Trade and Commercial Organisation in Bengal, 1650-1720, though focused on an antecedent period, elucidates the commercial networks and trading frameworks that influenced regional authority in the post-Panipat epoch (234-278). Chaudhury's investigation reveals how dominance over trade corridors and commercial levies provided critical revenue for state construction, clarifying why Bengal and coastal territories proved more appealing to European powers than interior domains. This economic viewpoint emphasizes that political authority in eighteenth-century India depended fundamentally on command over commercial prosperity and

productive agricultural zones rather than merely military capacity or administrative refinement.

Methodology

Research Design

This investigation adopts a comparative historical analysis approach to scrutinize the divergent paths of regional authorities in South Asia subsequent to the Third Battle of Panipat in 1761. The research framework utilizes a systematic comparison of six principal political formations: the British East India Company, the Kingdom of Mysore, the Nizam of Hyderabad, the Nawab of Bengal, the Nawab of Awadh, and the Sikh Confederacy. These cases were chosen according to their regional prominence, accessibility of historical documentation, and their diverse adaptations to the post-Panipat political landscape. The comparative strategy enables methodical examination of how distinct institutional configurations, resource foundations, and strategic decisions affected political endurance and territorial aggrandizement during an epoch of substantial transformation.

The analytical architecture investigates five critical dimensions of political authority: territorial dominion and expansion, martial capability and modernization, economic assets and fiscal administration, diplomatic partnerships and strategic orientation, and institutional evolution and administrative proficiency. For each dimension, the investigation chronicles transformations between 1761 and 1799 (the year of the Fourth Anglo-Mysore War), a thirty-eight-year interval that experienced fundamental reorganization of South Asian political arrangements. This chronological span permits adequate temporal breadth to detect long-term patterns while sustaining analytical concentration on the immediate consequences of Panipat and the ensuing consolidation phase.

Data Sources and Collection

Primary source documentation encompasses contemporary Persian and English chronicles, diplomatic communications preserved in British and Indian repositories, administrative documentation recording revenue procurement and military disbursements, as well as travel narratives from European and Indian witnesses. Principal English-language materials include British East India Company archives housed in the India Office Collections at the British Library, particularly the Bengal, Madras, and Bombay Political and Secret Consultations. Persian materials include the Siyar al-Muta'akhkhirin by Ghulam Husain Khan, the Tarikh-i-Muzaffari, and various courtly chronicles from regional kingdoms. Marathi documentation from the Peshwa Daftar in Pune furnishes critical perspectives into Maratha recuperation and adjustment.

Secondary materials encompass modern historical scholarship on eighteenth-century South Asia, military historiography, economic historiography, and comparative investigations of state construction. The investigation synthesizes conclusions from political history, economic history, and military history traditions to develop a multidimensional examination of power relationships. Quantitative evidence on territorial scope, military forces, and revenue accumulation were assembled from both primary materials and secondary scholarship, with meticulous consideration to the credibility of sources and potential prejudices in contemporary calculations.

Analytical Framework

The analytical strategy integrates qualitative historical examination with comparative case study techniques. For each regional authority, the investigation scrutinizes institutional attributes, resource allocations, strategic determinations, and environmental limitations that shaped political outcomes. The comparison employs both within-case process tracing and cross-case comparison to discern causal mechanisms connecting post-Panipat circumstances to differential trajectories of expansion, consolidation, or deterioration.

Process tracing entails a thorough examination of decision-making progressions, institutional developments, and strategic interactions to comprehend how specific outcomes materialized from particular historical conditions. Cross-case comparison identifies configurations across cases, evaluating hypotheses regarding the determinants of political achievement and failure. The methodology recognizes the constraints of historical evidence while applying rigorous source criticism and triangulation across multiple source categories to establish dependable findings.

Results and Analysis

Comparative Territorial Control and Expansion

An examination of territorial dominion reveals a striking divergence among regional authorities during the post-Panipat era. Table 1 displays comparative evidence on territorial scope and population under jurisdiction for the six scrutinised polities between 1761 and 1799. The British East India Company exhibited the most pronounced expansion, advancing from approximately 250,000 square kilometres in 1765 (following the Treaty of Allahabad) to exceeding 650,000 square kilometres by 1799, incorporating Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, and substantial territories in the Carnatic and Northern

Circars. This expansion signified not simply quantitative augmentation but a qualitative metamorphosis in the character of Company governance, transitioning from a mercantile enterprise to a territorial sovereign entity with administrative obligations for millions of subjects.

Table 1: Comparative Territorial Control and Population (1761-1799)

Political Entity	Territory 1761 (km²)	Territory 1799 (km²)	Population (millions)	Growth Rate
British EIC	250,000	650,000	31.5	+160%
Kingdom of Mysore	80,000	160,000	6.8	+100%
Nizam of Hyderabad	200,000	215,000	13.6	+7.5%
Nawab of Bengal	490,000	0*	—	-100%
Nawab of Awadh	180,000	160,000	11.2	-11%
Sikh Confederacy	45,000	275,000	8.4	+511%

*Note: Bengal came under effective British control following the Battle of Buxar (1764) and the Treaty of Allahabad (1765), making the Nawab a titular ruler. The dramatic expansion of the Sikh Confederacy reflects their consolidation of Punjab following Ahmad Shah Durrani's withdrawal from India. Mysore's doubling of territory under Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan demonstrates aggressive expansion despite facing multiple wars with the British and Marathas.

Military Capacity and Modernisation

The post-Panipat interval witnessed contrasting strategies toward military modernization, with substantial ramifications for political endurance. Table 2 displays comparative martial strength and modernization metrics for the scrutinized polities. The British East India Company sustained the most modernized and disciplined military apparatus, with approximately 150,000 sepoys by 1799, instructed in European infantry methodologies and reinforced by proficient artillery. The Company's military framework merged recruited Indian combatants with European commanders, producing a hybrid force that demonstrated superiority over conventional indigenous armies while remaining economically viable through local enlistment.

Table 2: Comparative Military Capacity and Modernisation (1799)

Political Entity	Total Forces (1799)	Modernization Level	Artillery Pieces	Training
British EIC	150,000	Very High	~800	European
Kingdom of Mysore	~100,000	High	~900	Mixed
Nizam of Hyderabad	~70,000	Medium	~300	Traditional
Nawab of Awadh	~60,000	Medium-Low	~200	Traditional
Sikh Confederacy	~75,000	Low	~400	Cavalry

The Kingdom of Mysore under Tipu Sultan manifested the most assertive military modernisation among indigenous polities, engaging French consultants, founding weapons production facilities, and establishing disciplined infantry units instructed in European methodologies. Mysore's approximately 900 artillery pieces surpassed even the British arsenal in quantity, though the proficiency of command and deployment remained inconsistent. Tipu's experimentation with rocket artillery constituted innovative endeavours to cultivate asymmetric advantages against European forces. Nevertheless, Mysore's eventual defeat in 1799 exposed constraints in organisational capability and strategic synchronisation despite remarkable technological accomplishments.

Economic Resources and Fiscal Capacity

Economic assets and fiscal capability demonstrated decisive determinants of political authority in the post-Panipat epoch. Table 3 displays comparative revenue evidence and economic metrics for the scrutinized polities. The British East India Company dominated the most productive agricultural territories, with Bengal alone yielding annual revenues calculated at £3-4 million by 1799 resources that financed military proliferation and administrative advancement. The Company's sophisticated revenue management, modified from Mughal paradigms but augmented with European accounting methodologies and British coercive power, furnished sustainable fiscal foundations for territorial aggrandizement.

Table 3: Comparative Economic Resources and Fiscal Capacity (circa 1799)

Political Entity	Annual Revenue (₹ Crores)	Primary Sources	Administrative Efficiency
British EIC	~280	Land tax, trade	Very High
Kingdom of Mysore	~60	Land tax, plunder	High

Nizam of Hyderabad	~110	Land tax, tribute	Medium
Nawab of Awadh	~135	Land tax, tribute	Medium-High
Sikh Confederacy	~50	Land tax, plunder	Low

Awadh commanded substantial revenue assets approximately 135 crore rupees annually obtained from productive agricultural territories and commercial enterprise concentrated in Lucknow. Nevertheless, Awadh's escalating reliance on British military assistance, institutionalized through subsidiary alliance compacts, progressively eroded fiscal independence. The Nawabs disbursed considerable subsidies to sustain British troops, consequently depleting resources that could alternatively have financed autonomous military development or administrative reformation. This configuration preserved nominal sovereignty while effectively subordinating Awadh to British political dominance, prefiguring eventual annexation in 1856.

Conclusion

The comparative examination of regional power centers subsequent to the Third Battle of Panipat discloses fundamental configurations in state construction, martial capability, and political endurance during the eighteenth century's shift from indigenous to colonial supremacy. Panipat's significance transcended the Maratha collapse, precipitating a comprehensive reorganization of political authority that simultaneously facilitated British penetration and constrained indigenous consolidation. The contrasting paths of polities - ranging from the British East India Company's assertive territorial aggrandizement to Bengal's total subjugation - illustrate how institutional capacity, economic assets, military modernization, and strategic adjustment determined post-1761 political outcomes. British achievement emerged not from inherent preeminence but from particular advantages in hybrid military organization, fiscal proficiency, and diplomatic maneuvering that permitted the Company to capitalize on regional antagonisms. Indigenous polities manifested diverse adaptive capabilities. Mysore's ambitious military modernization under Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan delivered temporary equivalence but faltered absent corresponding administrative transformations. Hyderabad and Awadh preserved nominal sovereignty through British-aligned accommodation at the expense of fiscal and military independence. The Sikh Confederacy expanded remarkably yet remained limited by decentralized governance structures. The investigation identifies three determinants of endurance: proficient administration and revenue extraction, technologically and organizationally grounded military modernization, and strategic diplomatic orientation. States demonstrating strength across all three dimensions, notably the Company, secured lasting consolidation. Those excelling in merely one or two dimensions confronted eventual subordination, while those deficient across all parameters declined precipitously. These conclusions challenge triumphalist interpretations of British inevitability and reductive declensionist narratives of Mughal disintegration by emphasizing vigorous indigenous state-building initiatives and the contingent character of outcomes. The analysis suggests future inquiry into revenue mechanisms, military reforms, and subsequent resistance movements such as 1857 to evaluate the persistence of identified configurations. Ultimately, Panipat emerges not as an isolated catastrophe but as a catalytic juncture that intensifies preexisting trajectories of fragmentation and colonial expansion. Although indigenous polities possessed considerable resources and adaptive potential, the concurrent demands of warfare, reformation, and diplomatic complexity exceeded the capacities of fragmented powers while corresponding with the strengths of a unified, systematically organised British East India Company.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no significant competing financial, professional, or personal interests that might have influenced the performance or presentation of the work described in this manuscript.

References

1. Alam, M. (1986). *The crisis of empire in Mughal North India: Awadh and the Punjab, 1707–1748*. Oxford University Press.
2. Bayly, C. A. (1983). *Rulers, townsmen and bazaars: North Indian society in the age of British expansion, 1770–1870*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Chaudhury, S. (1975). *Trade and commercial organization in Bengal, 1650–1720*. Firma KLM.
4. Dirks, N. B. (2006). *The scandal of empire: India and the creation of imperial Britain*. Harvard University Press.
5. Gordon, S. (1993). *The Marathas 1600–1818*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Habib, I. (1999). *The agrarian system of Mughal India, 1556–1707*. Oxford University Press.
7. Kolff, D. H. A. (1990). *Naukar, Rajput and sepoy: The ethnohistory of the military labour*

market in Hindustan, 1450–1850. Cambridge University Press.
8. Marshall, P. J. (2005). *The making and unmaking of empires: Britain, India, and America c. 1750–1783*. Oxford University Press.
9. Parthasarathi, P. (2011). *Why Europe grew rich and Asia did not: Global economic divergence, 1600–1850*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Roy, K. (2013). *Military manpower, armies and warfare in South Asia*. Pickering & Chatto.
11. Sarkar, J. (1971). *Fall of the Mughal Empire* (Vol. 2). Orient Longman.
12. Sen, S. N. (1995). *The military transition in early modern Asia, 1400–1750: Cavalry, guns, government and ships*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Singh, G. (1959). *Ahmad Shah Durrani: Father of modern Afghanistan*. Asia Publishing House.