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OHRJ : Orissa Historical Research Journal
OSA : Orissa States Agency
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PATNA REPORT : Report on the Admn. of Patna State
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PEAECR : Report of the PEAEC.
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WPO: : Working Plans Officer
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Part : I
ORISSA : ITS HISTORY AND FORESTS

The word 'Odisha' (Orissa) has been used in an inscription of the Suryavamsi Gajapatis dating back to the 15th century A.D. (Sahu:1997). But in more ancient times, no such name was in use and the territory was known under various names like Kalinga and Utkala. While the Vedas mention the existence of the Kalinga country, both Kalinga and Utkala have been mentioned in the Ramayana (Mishra:1979).

The kingdom of Kalinga extended from the Godavari river in the south to the Ganges in the north. This ancient land of Orissa was known for its warriors, maritime activities as well as for many other achievements. This is why, when Ashoka invaded Kalinga in 3rd century B.C., the victory which he gained with much difficulty, could not give him peace. He re-organised this great empire & it seems that he incorporated a portion of it under his direct control while the central part (identified as Utkala, Odra and Tosala) formed a separate province and Kalinga proper in the south formed another administrative unit (Sahu:1997).

The empire was re-established within a few centuries by the Mahameghabahanas and its glory was revived by one of their successors - Aira Kharavela - in the 1st century B.C. (Mishra & Sahu:1997). Kharavela, the greatest ever rulers of Orissa, defeated the successor of Ashoka and became the Raja Chakravarti (i.e. the King of kings) in India making the other Rajas his feudatories (Mishra:1979).

After Kharavela, a number of other dynasties ruled over this country (Orissa) and the extent of Orissa also varied according to the political changes. For ex; during the rule of Keshari dynasty (10th - 12th century A.D.), the extent of this territory was comparatively reduced; but Gajapati Kapilendra Deva (15th century A.D.) and his successor Purusottam Deva (both belonging to the Suryavamsi clan or the Solar dynasty) succeeded in extending it upto Karnataka in the south and Ganges in the north.

---

1 Said to have been named after the Udras. The Udras or Odas were a great warrior race who had been living in this country even before the Ramayana era.

2 As indicated here, Kalinga proper was actually a part of the vast country known under the same name (i.e. Kalinga). Some believe that there were three divisions of this ancient territory: Northern, Central and Southern; and these together constituted what was known as Tri-Kalinga (Mishra:1979). But subsequent research has revealed that the kingdom of Tri-Kalinga (literally meaning three Kalingas) was originally named as Tiru-Kalinga (thus having nothing to do with the number three) and was established in about 500 A.D. (Sahu:1997). Copper plates of the Eastern Chalukyas distinguish the Tri-Kalinga territory from Kalinga (Tiwari:1986) and it seems that this region constituted some south-western portions of modern Orissa, existing independent of Kalinga & Utkala (Sahu:1997).

To the west of Utkala, another kingdom was established known as Dakshina Koshala or Utkala Koshala to distinguish itself from a more ancient land in the north known as Kashi Koshala; and the territory of this kingdom (Dakshina Koshala) was later shifted to a region now identified as the present Chattisgarh region of M.P. and also the present western Orissa. Kongada was another kingdom of ancient Orissa established in the 7th century A.D. (Sahu:1997).
The era of foreign invasion of Orissa is said to have commenced from 1568 A.D. when the Afghans of Bengal invaded the country and brought it under their domination. But in 1576, the Moguls took over Orissa by defeating the Afghans. (Patnaik:1988)

From the south, the Kutab Sahi Sultan of Golconda (Hyderabad) had invaded Orissa in 1571 and imposed his rule over an area upto Tikkali - Raghunathpur (Mishra:1979). Thus the Rajas of Ganjam zamindaris became his feudatories. As these territories were to the north of his head quarters, these have been described as the Northern Circars by the British. But Aurangzeb over threw the Kutub Sahis and brought this area under his direct control in 1687 (Behera:1987).

With the death of Aurangzeb in 1707, the Mogul empire began to collapse. Taking advantage of this, the Marathas gradually established their control over Orissa by 1757. But the control over the Northern Circars had been ceded first to the French and then to the British by 1765-66 (Behera:1987). This is why southern Orissa came under the British rule much before than the other parts of the province. In 1803, the Marathas were forced to hand over the Orissa territories under their control to the British, but as the Anglo-Maratha war in India was yet to be over, in consequence of a temporary settlement reached between the two parties, the British returned Sambalpur and the Garjats attached to it to the Marathas in 1806. But they (British) got back these territories after their final victory in the last Anglo-Maratha war in 1817-18 (Dash:1969).

But Orissa did not have the official status of a separate province for a long time. Different Oriya territories remained under the control of three different Provincial Governments. Finally, after a long political battle with the Government, sincere efforts of the Oriya leaders materialised on 1st April, 1936 when Orissa was separated from the Province of Bihar and Orissa to constitute an individual province by itself.

Forest Resources of Orissa:

'A tract of forest which extends from the mouth of the Ganges to that of the Godavari' - this is how Orissa was described by the Mohammedans some centuries ago. The experience of Hiuen-Tsang was also similar who visited this province in 7th century A.D. (Mahtab:1977).

In ancient scriptures, we find reference to the following forest - regions of Orissa:

*Kalinga Van* : whole of Utkala and Kalinga, Western Ghats, and Southern Sea.

*Maitreya Van* : Konark

*Mahavan* and *Dandakaranya* : Koraput district

*Ekamra Kanan* : Bhubaneswar

Though the ancient vastness of this province has been much reduced now, still diverse forest types are found here, the major ones among them being described below:

1. Northern Tropical Semi - evergreen Forests: Found mainly in the lower hills and villages of undivided Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar, Cuttack and Puri districts.
2. Northern Tropical Moist Deciduous Forests: Excluding parts of western and southern Orissa, these forests cover most of the province, the main species being Sal. These are the most economically important forests of Orissa.29

3. Tropical Dry Deciduous Forests: Found in parts of the western districts as well as in the district of undivided Koraput, these forests contain some natural Teak.31

4. Littoral and Swamp Forests: Mostly found along the Bay of Bengal at the estuaries of rivers, these forests have been regulating the coastal ecosystem and acting as buffers against the periodic cyclonic storms4.32

South Orissa is the meeting place of two different natural forest regions of India represented by Sal and Teak respectively33. The so called tension belt between Sal & Teak can be found in the boarder areas of Kalahandi34. In more than 33% forests of Orissa, Sal is the major species(Patnaik:1999)35. Other species of importance are: Piasal, Bandhan, Asan, Sissoo, Kurum, Kasi, Kendu, Kangra, & Dhaura etc. Besides, bamboo and a great number of MFP5 are found in the forests of this province36.

Different categories of forests found here are(Patnaik:1999)17:

Sal forests : 16943 sq. miles
Teak forests : 2030 sq. miles
Miscellaneous forests : 21024 sq. miles

After the merger of Garjat States, the total area of reserved - and protected forests in Orissa increased from 2874 sq. miles to 10167 sq. miles38. After Estate abolition, the total contribution of ex-zamindary forests was more than 7700 sq. miles39. However, destruction of forests has reduced the total area considerably.
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THE GARJATS

Garjat is a term implying to the semi-independent strong-hold countries of hills and jungles. Gar (Gad) means fort, its plural form in Persian being Garjat. But the English, out of ignorance, added ‘s’ after the word to pluralize the term and though this was a mistake (Patnaik:1988), continuous use of this (i.e. Garjats) during the British rule has gained a recognition for it and for convenience, we have also used this term.

Based on their cultural, linguistic, political as well as geographical affinities, Pandit Krupasindhu Mishra has adopted the following classification of these Garjat States (Mishra:1979):

1. **The Orissa Garjats**: This group included Mayurbhanj, Dhenkanal, Talcher, Angul, Hindol, Baramba, Narsinghpur, Athagad, Tigiria, Boud, Daspalla, Nayagarh, Ranpur, Kanika and Kujang.

2. **The Sambalpur Garjats**: Besides Kalahandi and Bastar, this group included also Sambalpur and its following feudatories: Patna, Sonepur, Sakti - Bindra, Bamra, Bonai, Boud, Athmallik, Bargarh, Borasambar, Gangpur, Phuljhar, Chandrapur, Raigarh, Sarangagarh, Rairakhol, Khariar, and Nuagarh.

3. **The Ganjam Garjats**: In this group were included the kingdoms of Jeypore, Khemundi (undivided Parlakhemundi) and Ghumsur.

The Garjat status was more or less based on the following factors:

1. **Political**: The people of these areas were, in general, not under the direct control of any body else other than their ‘own’ traditional Rajas, who, in turn, had been loyal to and/or the feudatories under some Paramount authority.

---

6 This word has been found in a 16th century inscription of Raja Govinda Dev (1534-1541). A few years later, during the settlement of Orissa by Todarmalla - the Provincial Governor of the Moguls-the term Mogulbandi came into use. Accordingly, some believe that this word (Garjat) was in use before the Mogul rule in Orissa and that it has been derived from Sanskrit meaning ‘born of Gar.’

7 Pandit Krupasindhu passed away in 1926, i.e. years before Orissa became a separate province. The term ‘Orissa Garjats’ actually refers here more or less to what was known as the Cuttack Tributary Mahals or the so-called ‘Orissa proper’, and not to the Orissa of 1936 or 1947-48.

8 Other historians like Dash(1969) have described the kingdom of Sakti as independent of Bindra. According to them, Bindra was actually associated with Nuagarh comprising the kingdom of Bindra-Nuagarh.

9 For those who think that this term ‘Ganjam Garjat’ is a ‘new invention’, we quote in the following a statement from the dairy of the District Superintendent of Police, Cuttack, dating back to the year 1865; which would confirm the ancestry of this term:

   “There is a disturbance going on in the Ganjam (Madras) Gurjats regarding Meriah sacrifices”.

---
Traditionally, this Paramount authority had been the Gajapatis of Khurda. But locally, for ex., in Sambalpur Garjats, sometimes Patna and sometimes Sambalpur were having control over the 18 gars of Khariar, Sonepur, Gangpur etc. excepting Kalahandi and Bastar.

The traditional significance of the Khurda Gajapati was more than political and accordingly, some Rajas believed in rendering the Gajapati all the possible assistance not as feudatories, but as the admirers of his traditional position. For instance, Raja Hirdhara Deva (1510-1540 A.D.) of Patna (then the most important kingdom of western Orissa) sent his younger son with a large army to help Gajapati Mukunda Deva fight against the Mohammadans(Sahu:1985). Similarly, Raja Ghana Bhanja of Ghumsur led a massive military operation against the Mohammedans to restore the Gajapati’s throne during the 18th century(Behera:1987).

According to Motte(OHRJ:1952), when Raghuji Bhonsla - the Maratha Raja of Nagpur-entered Orissa, in order to reduce the power of the Gajapati, he made the feudatories of the latter independent of him (the Gajapati).

The main responsibility of the feudatory chiefs was to provide military aid and also local administration. But they had sometimes to do certain other jobs also, at the service of their paramount authority. For ex; the Raja of Darpani had to hold a mirror (darpan) before the Gajapati, during the coronation ceremony(Mishra:1979).

When Orissa was conquered by forces from outside (i.e. the Marathas, the Moguls, etc), the traditional Paramount authorities themselves became feudatories under the conquerors. Under such circumstances, some of the Garjat chiefs still remained loyal to their traditional authority, while some others took this opportunity to make themselves independent.

Besides, during the British rule, some Garjats were removed from their traditional groups and included in some other group. For example, Boud - which was a feudatory of Sambalpur, was transferred to the group of Cuttack Tributary Mahals.

Another important change was in the political recognition of some kingdoms as Garjats. For example, the British did not regard Khariar and many other such regions as Garjats.

10 Darpan or Killa Darpan was among the many so-called Qillajat Estates of Orissa. Qilla means fort and these Estates were similar to the Garjats. However, these Estates did not enjoy the special privilege of immunity from the civil and criminal laws of the British Government, unlike the officially recognised Garjats.

11 It is said that sometime during 1830s, there was a proposal to treat Jeypore & some Estates of Ganjam as Tributary States. But it could not be implemented on account of a difference of opinion between the then governments of Bengal & Madras.
status. The official recognition was not based on any definite rules or qualifications and was rather made indiscriminately\(^{12}\)\(^{11}\) (Jena:1968)\(^{11}\). On the other hand, a few other factors were responsible in some cases for the lack of this recognition. For ex; Borasambar could not get this status because, it is said, when others were being made feudatories by the British, the ruler of Borasambar was a minor and could not claim the status.\(^{12}\)

2. **Geographical**:

The territory excluding the Garjats, that was more or less under the direct control of the Paramount authority of Khurdha, was known as ‘Rajabara’ (or Rajwara)\(^{13}\). Later, when the Moguls became the Paramount authority, the area under their direct control was regarded as Mogulbandi.

Though hills and forests characterised the Garjats, the geographical extent of both Garjat and Mogulbandi Orissa varied in different times following various political changes. For ex; during the Maratha rule, the extent of Mogulbandi was confined between the Subarnarekha river & the eastern part of undivided Puri district\(^{14}\).

Geographically speaking, Khurdha itself was a kind of Garjat\(^{15}\). During British period, when Khurdha and few other States were confiscated and made ‘Khas’\(^{13}\)’, and also many former Garjats lost their status as Garjats; the extent of Garjat area was much reduced.

However, the area of western and southern Orissa, which were under the direct control of the British, did not come under the Mogulbandi as for centuries the Mogulbandi had been regarded as the tract comprising mostly the plain and open parts of the undivided districts of Puri, Cuttack and Balasore.

3. **Cultural**:

The British had described the Garjat people as 'rude & uncivilised'\(^{16}\). This was an exaggeration, but it is true that many of these people were the tribals and the temperament of the Garjat people was actually a little different from that of their Mogulbandi counterparts\(^{14}\), most probably because of the difficult geographical conditions which they faced in their day-to-day life and/or due to the oppressing administration of some of their rulers.

Still, civilization was not completely absent in the Garjats and contemporary high culture did flourish in a few areas or among some people under the royal patronage.

---

\(^{12}\) This was true even for the annual tribute. While a very big State like Mayurbhanj had to pay Rs. 1001 per annum, its neighbouring small State of Nilgiri paid Rs. 3656\(^{17}\). The two major factors that seem to be behind such indiscrimination are: care taken by the British to maintain good relations with a mighty Raja / State , and the extent to which they were satisfied / dissatisfied with a ruling Chief.

\(^{13}\) or Khas Mahal. The term ‘khas’ implied to confiscation, while ‘mahal’ means estate/area yielding revenue to the Chief / Government.

\(^{14}\) that is why they were called ‘garjatia’.
History says that at least seven semi-independent principalities, known as the Mandalas, existed already before 10th century A.D., corresponding to the following regions:

- Khinjali Mandala: Sonepur-Phulbani tract
- Khijjinga Mandala: Keonjhar-Mayurbhanj tract
- Kodalaka Mandala: Dhenkanal area
- Yamagartta Mandala: Northern part Dhenkanal region
- Airavatta Mandala: Nayagarh region and part of undivided Cuttack and Dhenkanal districts
- Bonai Mandala: Bonai-Panposh tract
- Swetaka Mandala: Sanakhemundi-Badakhemundi-Chikiti (Ganjam district)

These Mandal States were later converted into various individual States through partition or under different circumstances.

Some Paramount authorities found some of the feudatories already existing. However, these authorities sometimes created new feudatories under themselves.

The origin of the feudatories can be attributed to the following factors:

1. Creation on service tenure (for military or administrative purposes etc.)
2. Creation by being taken over through military action
3. Creation as a sign of favour to some body
4. Creation to avoid mutual political confrontation between the king and his brothers.

Raja Ananga Bhima Dev had created 16 feudatories. Sons of Gajapati Kapilendra Dev also enjoyed feudal status. When the Mohammedans, especially the Moguls, conquered Orissa; they called the Rajas of Khurdha, Kanika, Kujang and some other Garjats as zamindars (Mishra:1979). The word zamindar means land holder and the status of a Raja means something more than that. So by calling them zamindars, their status was reduced to some extent. But the Marathas called them Rajas or Qiladars (fort-holders). During British rule, a number of new zamindars came into existence when the British were in search of intermediaries for revenue administration and many of these people proved themselves to traditionally have such control over ‘their’ areas (Mishra:1979).

The Paramount authorities certainly possessed, very often, enough military capacity to confiscate their feudatories. That they still allowed these feudatories continue as hitherto was perhaps better explained by Hunter when he analysed the case in context of the Mogul invaders:

“...When at length the Muhammadans tardily penetrated into this _terra incognita_, they found it so cut up by rivers, and so strong in mountain and jungle fastness that they asserted their authority only in the longest-settled and oldest-formed part of the delta. The hills on the west, and the sea-board districts on the east, where the process of land-making still went vigorously forward,

---

15 Same happened in the case of Ganjam Garjats.
they left under the native chiefs.”

And Smith’s observation helps us to understand why the British allowed the Tributary Chiefs, to exercise certain administrative powers:

“xxx because it was considered expedient in consequence of the uncivilised character of the inhabitants and the inaccessible nature of the country”.

Revolt by the Tributary Chiefs was not a very recent phenomenon. Either due to their own political ambitions, or because of some ‘intolerable’ experience caused to them by their paramount authority, or due to some other factors, many such chiefs had revolted in the past. For ex; during the rule of Kapilendra Dev, the Rajas of Khemundi, Aul, Kanika and Kujang rose in rebellion against the Gajapati which, of course, he succeeded to suppress(Mishra:1979). In 1760, when Khurdha was attacked by the Raja of Khemundi, he was defeated by the Raja of Khurdha with the help of Marathas in return of which the Khurdha Raja mortgaged 14 Garjats then under him with the Marathas which the Garjat Chiefs could not accept and therefore many of them often revolted against the Marathas.

Similar revolts occurred during the British rule also. The Rajas of southern Orissa, one by one, started resistance movement against the British causing a serious problem for the latter for years. “All the Hill zamindaries in this district are difficult of management .......” - wrote the Collector of Ganjam to the Commanding Officer of Army (Northern Division) at Vizagapatam, in 1817. The confiscation of Mohuri zamindary was an outcome of these confrontations.

Breach of faith by the British led to the rebellion of Khurdha Raja in 1804, finally ending with the confiscation of his estate. During 1804-05, the Rajas of Kanika and Kujang also started resistance movements as a result of which the status of their territories was reduced to that of the Estates or zamindaries. Subsequently, under various circumstances, Banki, Angul and Sambalpur were annexed in 1840, 1848 and 1849 respectively.

Initially, the Cuttack and Sambalpur groups of Garjats were not much interfered by the British while the Ganjam Garjats hardly enjoyed this privilege. But later it was decided to increase the Superintendent’s power of interference (accordingly, Banki and Angul were confiscated) and the Penal Code was declared applicable to these States. However, there were subsequent periods of intervention and non-intervention.

Different Feudatory States remained under different Provincial Governments for quite some time. While Jeypore and the Ganjam Estates remained under the Government of Madras; States like Sonepur, Patna, Kalahandi, Bamra and Rairakhol remained under the Chattisgarh Division of the Central Provinces. Bonai and Gangpur remained under

---

16 It was then that the Raja had to shift his residence to Puri and since then, his successors have been known as the Rajas of Puri.
17 certain restrictions however existed. For ex; these Rajas were not authorised to exercise the powers of life and death within their territories. Also, they were not allowed to maintain their own army.
18 The Raja of Banki was convicted of multiple murder(Patnaik:1988).
the Chot Nagpur Division while others like Dhenkanal were under the Orissa (Cuttack) Divn., both these Divisions being under the control of the Bengal Government.

In 1905, States of western Orissa (Patna, Kalahandi, Bonai and Gangpur etc.) were incorporated in the Orissa Division. In 1936, when Orissa became a separate province, many or parts of the Estates/States then under the Governments of Madras and Central Provinces respectively were also transferred to this province while many / part of the Estates / States remained separated from it on the basis of linguistic and other factors.

In this new province, there were virtually two divisions, viz; British Orissa and Princely Orissa (corresponding respectively to British India and Princely India). Princely Orissa was constituted by the following 26 feudatory States:


On the other hand, the Estates remained in the British Orissa since they did not have a sovereign status like the States though they did have certain independent administration.

When the British decided to give independence to India, the sovereign status of Princely States created a problem. Many of these Rajas were not prepared to merge their States in the Indian territory and wanted to remain ‘independent’. So it was quite natural that similar situation occurred in Orissa also.

But political situation was not in favour of most of these Rajas. The Prajamandal movements had already prepared grounds in this direction and Mahatab, the then Premier of Orissa, was keenly waiting for an opportunity to foil the plans of the Rajas to remain independent.

In November 1947, situation in Nilgiri became out of control for the Raja. To counteract the popular movement in his State, the Raja had created a condition of anarchy by instigating the tribal people against the non-tribals (Samal) in protest, the Prajamandal activists and their supporters launched an armed struggle and planned for the seizure of the palace. The Raja was now forced to ask for the help of the Provincial Government to save his life. Mahtab took full advantage of this situation, sent a police force to Nilgiri (which was welcomed by the people there) and occupied the territory with the consent of the Raja. This worked as an eye-opener to many other chiefs. In December that year, when the then Home Minister of India, Sardar Patel, visited Orissa; meetings were arranged between him and the State chiefs in different phases. It did not take much time for him to persuade the rulers of ‘B’ & ‘C’ class

---

19 For ex; States like Bastar and Estates like Tikkali.
20 There was also a rumour that this merger would cause an increase in the land rent and the forest rights of people would be adversely affected. The Orissa Govt. however declared on 1-1-1948 that the forest rights enjoyed by the Garjat people would continue as hitherto until further order. (I)
21 In 1937, the status of Orissa States was raised when the Government allowed them many powers. That year, the States were divided into 3 categories: while Ranpur, Pal-Lahra and Tigiria belonged to Class ‘C’, Bamra, Boud, Dhenkanal, Saraikela, Gangpur, Keonjhar, Nayagarh were grouped under class ‘B’, which caused some difference in the judicial powers of the State Courts (for ex; while ‘A’ Class States had to get a
States for merger, but with the ‘A’ class chiefs, it was quite difficult as some of them were deadly against the merger (Nayak:1991)\(^{32}\). However, Patel himself was, as it is said, a ‘Man of Steel’ (Lauhamanabha). He made his attitude clear by declaring that the Orissa States were like ulcers on the body of the province and that they must either be cured or eliminated. He warned the Rajas that if they did not listen to his advice, they might find themselves uprooted by the people\(^{22}\). The reluctant Chiefs were also told that the Government would no more come to their rescue in case of any internal disturbance. Thereafter, the Maharaja of Patna was the first to sign the merger agreement\(^{33}\) and was followed by the Rajas of Dhenkanal, Boud, Gangpur and Sonepur etc. But the Maharaja of Kalahandi and a few others were still reluctant. So they were clearly explained that in case of their not signing the agreement, the Government would implement the merger forcefully by military action (Nayak:1991)\(^{34}\). This was enough for them and all of them now signed the agreement excepting the Maharaja of Mayurbhanj who said that he would have to consult the popular government in his State in this context\(^{23}\).

Hence, while all other States formally merged in Orissa on 1st January 1948, Mayurbhanj merged a year later\(^{24}\). This merger of the Orissa States was the first of its kind in India.

The next major step was Estate abolition. In 1952, the Estates Abolition Act was passed and accordingly, the Princely Estates and zamindaries were abolished.

The Eastern States Agency was established in 1933. It included 26 Feudatory States of Orissa and also 14 of the Chattisgarh States. It was later vivisected into three separate Agencies, viz; the Bengal States Agency (including Tripura, Cooch-Bihar and also Mayurbhanj), the Orissa States Agency and the Chattisgarh States Agency. The Political Agents appointed for these States worked under the Resident (i.e. Agent to the Governor General of India ) and the Bengal States Agency was under the direct jurisdiction of the Secretary to the Resident.\(^{38}\)

The Rajas of these States had formed what was known as the Eastern States Union, for their own cause. But all these are now stories of the past, no trace of which apparently remains.

**Feudal System Of Revenue Administration:**

Land revenue and other cesses were collected from the tenants mostly through their village headmen. Such headman was known as Pradhan in Keonjhar and Mayurbhanj, Sarbarakar in Ranpur, Dhenkanal and other neighbouring Garjats; and Gauntia, Ganju,
Bariha or Thekedar in western Orissa. The post was usually not hereditary and the headman had to perform a number of duties in the interest of both his village and the State. He was not authorised to levy / collect any cess or amount not specified by the State and was remunerated, besides with lands on service tenure called Bhogra or Heta, differently in different areas. For example:

1. Dasapalla ex-State: 5 to 8 per cent of the total collection (1917-1921)
2. Baramba ex-State: 10 to 12 1/2 per cent of the collection (1924-25)
3. Keonjhar ex-State: Rents of the Bhogra lands remitted upto 20% of the rent of the village. If the value of Bhogra land was more, the Pradhan was liable to pay for the excess amount at tenants rate (1914-15).

Barihas were the headmen of Gond villages (Patnaik:1988). Headmen of Munda villages in Gangpur were called Ganju and received their remuneration accordingly to their classes. For ex; while the Khuntkati Ganju was allowed a draw-back upto 1/4th of his collection if the valuation of his Bhogra land was less than 1/4th of the total assessment of his village, the Head Ganju had right to 25 to 45% of his collection.

The Gauntias of western Orissa were usually entitled for about 12.5% to 25% of their total collection. The Gartias and Thekadars were more or less similar to the Gauntias. In Patna, a number of Thekadars (Ticcadars) worked under one Umrah and paid their collections to the latter. The remuneration of Umrahs was not uniform, but varied from 5 to 17% of the their collection.

In Jeypore and the Estates of Ganjam, the Mustajar system was in vogue though the ryotwari system (under which there was no intermediary between the tenants and the Estate for revenue collection) was not altogether absent. The Mustajar was merely an agent for rent collection, the post being purely on contract basis; and in Jeypore Estate, for example, was entitled for about 10% of his collection. But practically his office was often found hereditary, as the headman of the village; and he had enough opportunity to collect for himself much more than his due commission as he was not required to keep any accounts or any written record of holdings in his villages.

All these intermediaries, might they be the Pradhans or the Mustajars, were restricted variously in their record-of-rights so as to prevent exploitation of the tenants by them. For ex; they had no right to evict any tenant from his village. But in actual practice, many of them did exploit the people in various ways.

Condition Of Agriculture In The Garjats:

Though major part of the princely States were forest lands, the general tendency of the Rajas was to encourage cultivation as their effort to introduce a civilised way of living in their States and also because agricultural produce, especially paddy, had been playing the most important role in the system of revenue assessment for centuries. Still, the
average ratio of cultivated lands to total lands in these areas was reported to be 1:8 by 1814 (Patnaik:1988).

Hamilton’s report reflects the situation in this regard by 1820, showing the difference of the British Orissa from the Princely Orissa (excluding those under CP and Madras Presidency) as follows:

“The first division comprehends all the low lands trending along the coast; the second, the hilly and woody interior. The British half is in general a plain, fertile, but not well cultivated or peopled; the native section is either a barren tract or wild expanse of rock, forest, and jungle, thinly inhabited, yet producing a surplus of grain beyond the consumption of its inhabitants. The inhabitants of the first may be estimated at 100 to the square mile; of the second, not more than 30 to the same area.

The principal articles of produce and manufacture in the British portion are rice and salt. The former is the staple commodity of the province and is so abundant as to admit of exportation. This division of the province is undergoing gradually a melioration, and the inhabitants although ignorant of the cause are gradually advancing in the process of civilization. The tributary part of the province presents the reverse of this picture, a great portion being unfit for culture, and lots under cultivation yielding but a scantily return. In the wilder tracts the necessaries of life are not attainable, and frequently subsistence of any sort is only procurable with the utmost difficulty” (Hamilton:1971).

And situation in parts of Orissa then under the Central Provinces and the Madras Presidency was not very different from that described by Hamilton. From east to west and north to south, the tribals of Orissa were mostly engaged in temporary (shifting) cultivation.

Still, among the principal produce of nearly all the Garjat States / Estates of the late 18th - or early 19th century were many from agriculture as given below:

Nilgiri: rice, sugar-cane, oil
Mayurbhanj: rice and oil
Dhenkanal: rice, cotton, sugar-cane
Ghumsur: paddy, dry grains, oil-seeds, sugar-cane, tobacco
Parlakhemundi: paddy and sugar-cane.
Jeypore: paddy, sugar-cane and dry grains

Inspite of their wilderness, certain areas of these Princely States / Estates were naturally favoured for cultivation. For example, in Sambalpur, the soil in the valleys was a rich loam, very suitable for production of grain or pulse. Similarly in Mayurbhanj, a large area of virgin soil of excellent quality existed. And about Ghumsur, Russel said:

“There is perhaps no part of the territories under the presidency where means of irrigation are so certain and attained at so little
cost of money or labour as in this zamindary. xxx The monsoon rains afford sufficient water without the aid of artificial reservoirs, and the natural slope of the country renders it easy to conduct it to the required spot.”(Russel:1856)

Tanks and reservoirs had been the credit of many Rajas for centuries, for it was considered to be a pious act. The Circuit Committee reported that in Parlakhemundi, the tanks were repaired at the Raja’s expense without any additional collection from the tenants. Still, irrigation facility in many of the States / Estates was not sufficient. So Maharaja Sri Ram Chandra Bhanja started irrigation projects at Haldia, Gohira and Balidiha at the cost of lakhs of rupees. In Ranpur, the Kankadajhar and Andhari irrigation projects of the Darbar period served their purpose for quite some time, but were damaged due to lack of repairing work. In Jeypore, two masonry dams were built irrigating about 1280 acres of land, during the Estate period.

Besides, some Bandhas and tanks were also constructed at different places as relief measures during the periods of scarcity and famine. Still, demands for irrigation could not be met completely.

Cultivation was being done mostly in the traditional manner. In Boud, while the women ploughed the fields, female children drove oxen. The Pauri Bhyuans of north-western Orissa used, instead of plough or plough-cattle, a type of digging stick for sowing seeds of pulses and cereals(Patnaik:1988). But some of the enlightened rulers tried in various ways to give a boost to agriculture in their areas. A separate department was established in some of the States for this purpose, and in States like Dhenkanal, Mayurbhanj and Patna, provisions were made to give loans to the people for land improvement and seed purchasing etc. (Samal:1988). Agricultural farms were established in many States and even in Parlakhemundi. In Patna, research was being undertaken to produce improved varieties of seeds and not only the Darbar made arrangements to teach scientific agriculture to the people, but also a separate marketing department was set up so as to see that cultivators would be getting financial benefit by selling their produce.

Like the Forest Advisor, an Agricultural Advisor was also appointed by the Eastern States Board of Forestry & Agricology and there was a School of Agriculture for these States at Bolangir.

This way, the condition of agriculture was improved to some extent in many Garjats during the 1st half of 20th century and potato and other European vegetables were introduced for cultivation in there areas. But rights of the peasants over their lands were hardly recognised and high land rents as well as export fees on agricultural produce (which was perhaps intended to discourage export of food grain to prevent shortage of the same) in some States made the life of general peasantry miserable (Samal:1993).

---

27 For ex; in Bonai, 8 Grain Golas were started in 1945-46 to provide paddy loans so as to save the people from agricultural indebtedness.

28 Maharaja K.C. Gajapati was an agricultural expert.
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RIGHTS CONVERSION

The conversion of forest rights was, except in a few cases where the conversion was exclusively related to such rights, actually an outcome of the conversion of land rights. For, it is the land to which the forests belong and not vice-versa.\(^*\)

This conversion process can be described through a number of its aspects, such as the extent of conversion both in area and nature, the system of conversion, and the racial factor involved. Accordingly, we can adopt the following classification:

1. **Conversion with respect to the racial factor:**

   The scheme of this conversion can be given as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unoccupied territory</th>
<th>Tribal occupation → Tribal Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-tribal occupation → Tribal Occupation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Examples:

   1.a. **Tribal to tribal conversion:**

   The Bhuyan pir of Keonjhar is said to have belonged originally to the Juanga tribals who later left the area to the Bhuyans\(^1\) (the reason thereof being not clear exactly).

   1.b. **Tribal to non-tribal conversion\(^2\):**

   This does not require any specific example as in most of the areas this has happened.

   1.c. **Non tribal to tribal conversion:**

   - The Raja of Bonai encouraged Mundas, Orams and other people from the neighbouring districts to come into his State and occupy jungle areas on easy terms (19\(^{th}\) century).\(^2\)

---

\(^*\) And thus, a land grant made by the last Somavamsi ruler Someswara Deva mentions rights of enjoyment of ivory, tiger - skin, various animals, different trees like Tamarind and Palmyra and also forests(Sah:1976).\(^4\)

\(^2\) An interesting point to be noted here is that some of the Rajas who were hereditary of the tribal chiefs, later hesitated to call themselves tribals and rather tried to create a new separate status/class for themselves e.g. Rajgonds, Rajbhuyans etc. .
• The Coles (Koles) were invited by the Raja of Keonjhar to locate themselves in the hilly area near Baitarani river, with a view to employing them in taking revenge against the neighbouring Pal-Lahra State whenever a fair opportunity might offer itself (for the purpose of ransacking).³

• Wild Khonds brought by the Maharaja of Patna on account of their special dances were settled in the Dudung village. These Khonds were allowed to practice shifting cultivation (Ramdhyan:1947).⁵

• 11 Villages of Narainpatna area (in the undivided Koraput district) were deserted with incursions of the hill-people (18th century).⁶

2. Conversion w.r.t. the system:

This refers to the systematic way in which the conversions took place. For example:

2.a. War or Confrontation:

It was an essential part of the royal traditions to extend the territories through military action against the neighbouring kingdoms. This tradition could not continue further when the British introduced permanent settlement in Orissa and the Rajas were forbidden to attack on each others' territory.³⁰

2.b. Dowry: The Zamindary of Khariar, for ex; is said to have been obtained in dowry (Impey:1865).⁷

2.c. Gifts: For ex; Vikram Deo, the Raja of Jeypore, gifted away Kasipur, Mohupatna, Mandi Bissoy, Leeligooma and Chandragiri principalities to the Patraja of Thooamul-Rampur (a zemidary in the Kalahandi ex-State) on a quit rent of Rs. 300/- only per year (Singh Deo:1939).⁸

2.d. Rights Purchase: For ex; the Raja of Ghumsur had purchased the neighbouring Surada zamindary.

3. Conversion w.r.t. the extent in area:

Such conversions can be divided into two groups:

• Inter-State (Estate): Such type of conversions crossed or reduced the existing State (Estate) boundaries and took place between two or more existing States (Estates).

• Domestic: Such conversions were more or less essentially confined within the existing State (Estate) boundaries. These refer to the following land tenures:
  i) Zamindary tenure
  ii) Lakhiraj (revenue free) tenure
  iii) Other minor tenures such as Gauntiahi, Malguzari or Service Jagirs.

³⁰ The rules of 1840 for the management of Garjat States had the following clause:

"It is hereby declared that the Rajas of Gurjat Mahals are strictly prohibited from engaging in hostilities with the Rajas of other Gurjart Mahals."⁹
4. **Conversion w.r.t. the extent in nature:**

This refers to the extent to which the tenure-holder enjoyed his rights over the trees / forests within his area. Some holders were given full proprietary rights, while some others had right to enjoy only the fruits etc. and not to the timber.

5. **Conversions of special nature:**

- Some of the grantees of Sambalpur, who had been given rent-free tenures, were denied their rights over certain forest area, by the British Government on the ground that these valuable forests would be destroyed if left in their hands.\(^\text{10}\)
- The ex-State of Khandapara originally belonged to the territory of Nayagarh and was later separated by a brother of the Nayagarh chief.
- Political conversions did not necessarily associate themselves with the conversion of forest rights of the local people and in many areas, the tribal way of life was hardly affected by such political conversions, especially in the ancient past.

Of all the kinds of conversions, the domestic ones deserve a detail study; as in the Garhjat States, where the ruler had got absolute right on all his State forests and hardly allowed the tenants to ascertain any such exclusive right even within a small area, it is quite significant to understand the conditions under which the ruler ceded his rights to any body else in his state and also how it affected the tenants (rather under-tenants) as such conversions were ultimately associated with the fate of the forests as well as with the rights /privileges of the people. The ruler might be quite liberal to the people and sincere to save his State forests, but the tenure-holder might be just the opposite.

To begin with, let us consider the Zamindary tenure. This was the most significant tenure in the ex-States and it was under this tenure that the forest area was most extensive than that was under any other tenure.

The Zamindary tenure seems to have originated in two ways: -

1. The Raja appointed a person as the Zamindar to decentralize the administration so that the burden on him (Raja) for administering the whole country directly might be relaxed to some extent.
2. To have better relations with them and their people / subjects, the Raja recognized the chieftains ruling in different parts of the country he brought under his control, as the zamindars.

Whatever their origin might be, the zamindars usually enjoyed more or less full proprietary rights in their area, paid some annual tribute to the Raja; and rendered some customary service or military service to him.

However, the zamindar – Raja relationship was not always very peaceful or normal. The reasons were many : either the Raja raised the amount of tribute to be paid, or the zamindar did not find it in his honour to render any customary service to the Raja. In Patna, taking the advantage when the Maharaja was kept in captivity by the Marathas, the zamindar of Borasambar even encroached upon the territory under the direct control of the Maharaja though he was forced later to retire to his proper side, by the British...
Government, in the first half of the 19th century (Impey: 1865) Ouseley, who toured Orissa in 1840, wrote the following note about Bamra:

"XXX the zamindars obeyed none of his orders, plundered in all directions and ordered force to force when the Raja endeavoured to coerce. XXX".12

The Zamindars, especially those who had large areas under their control, dared to act against the Raja either because of the Raja’s weakness or because of their own self confidence. Nilgiri was formerly a dependency of Mayurbhanj, but to maintain it separate and independent of Mayurbhanj, the Raja of Nilgiri paid Rs. 30000/- per annum to the Marathas who safeguarded the Raja’s interest.13

In Bonai, the only zamindar was a Bhuyan chief known as the ‘Samant’ of Kaleiposh. According to tradition, in ancient past there were five or six chieftains in the State, all belonging to the lower caste and the Samant was one of them. When a migrant Rajput came to Bonai and tried to establish his control there, the Samant rendered him necessary assistance and with the help of the latter, the Rajput got all his adversaries killed and was then recognized as the Raja of the country by the Samant. Thus, the Raja-Samant relationship had been very important in the history of Bonai and as per the custom, during the coronation ceremony of a royal successor, formal recognition of the Samant had been almost necessary.14 The Samant had 27 villages under his tenure15 and paid a nominal tribute to the Raja.

In the 19th century, this relationship came under serious tension because of various reasons. In 1861, the Raja raised the Samant’s tribute, which the latter refused to pay. A settlement was ultimately reached between the two by British intervention. In 1875, the Raja asked him to pay a marriage cess of Rs. 100; the Samant refused it saying that no such cess had ever been paid by his family. The Raja had various allegations against the Samant and had him jailed.16

There were two Gond fiefs in the State known (later) as the Jagirdars with a rank below that of the Samant and each holding 13 villages17. The Samant was to render military service to the Raja while the Gond fiefs were granted their tenure on the conditions of paying half the net land revenue of their villages and also of rendering police service. When the Raja found them very lax in performance of their duties, he took steps to appoint a regular police force and to resettle the tribute paid by the Gond fiefs.18

In the settlement of 1880-81 by Mr. Hewitt, the rent of the Gond fiefs was increased and also a police cess was imposed.19

Another feature of this settlement was that while the Raja could not claim any rent on the jungles in the area of the fiefs, the fiefs were also not allowed to sell any of their timber. But neither of the parties was satisfied with this settlement. The Raja claimed his rights over the jungle lands and also demanded dues to tassar cultivation and for the excise above the stipulated rent, while the Gond fiefs paid no rent at all for some time. When they did not yield inspite of all the efforts, the Raja ejected the Jagirdars following an order of the Commissioner of Chot Nagpur and taking undue advantage of this order, resorted to very harsh and oppressive measures to enforce his claims.20
This was the background of the disturbances in Bonai and the Samant and the Gond fiefs had their own phases in these disturbances. Interestingly enough, while the Gonds were against the Samant during the Bhuyan disturbances, the Bhuyans helped the Raja during the Gond disturbances (of the nature of plundering etc)\textsuperscript{21}. It may be noted here that the tenure of the Gond fiefs was of the nature of service tenure only which was why they had a lower rank than the Samant. However, the disturbances subsided when it was known that a British officer would visit Bonai to investigate the matter.

The Gonds submitted to the following effect, a petition to the Commissioner of Chot Nagpur Division:

"XXX

3. We are the ancient zamindars of Bonai, but the Rajah has treated us as ticcadars and has ousted us from our zamindari. We request that the title of zamindar may be given us as before.
4. We have planted date trees and the Rajah now demands rent for them, which we have never paid before. We pray that we may be exempted from this demand.
5. The Rajah has no right to the collections made by us on account of cesses from cattle-grazers, potters xxx.
6. If excessive dues are demanded for the cultivation of cocoons in our purgunnah, it is likely that this cultivation will be entirely stopped.
7. The Rajah has been in the habit of taking fees from us whenever we had occasion to hunt in our jungles, in default he used to realize a fine of Rs. 5/- from us. We pray that this custom may be abolished".\textsuperscript{22}

Besides, the petitioner also requested the Commissioner to maintain the land grants they had made in the name of the deities. Accordingly, the Commissioner made the following settlement:

1. The Gond fiefs were recommended to be called as Jagirdars.
2. As the Samant and the Raja had no right to excise in the Samant's area, so should be in the Gond chiefs' area. The Gond chiefs agreed to pay certain annual fee to the Raja to take over to the Tari\textsuperscript{31} Mahal.
3. Grazing dues were equally apportioned between the Raja and the Samant /Gond fiefs in the jurisdiction of the latter.
4. The Raja agreed to forego all fines and fees for hunting in the jungles.
5. While the Raja claimed of having collected cess on cocoons in the Samant's area before, the Samant denied this. However, it was finally agreed that the Raja might continue to levy this cess, but not at higher rates.\textsuperscript{23}

Regarding settlement of jungle rights, the Samant and the Gond chiefs appeared 'to have very uncertain ideas as to the precise nature of their claims in this respect'. The Samant first claimed the entire proprietary right in the jungles and was not prepared to leave the Rajah anything on the ground that the Samants were the original settlers, antecedent to the creation of the Raja. The Gonds also asserted a similar right. It was at last decided that

\textsuperscript{31} A kind of country liquor also known as Tori, prepared from wine palm trees.
these fiefs would pay a royalty of half the sale of timber in their respective areas to the Raja and would follow the rules prescribed for the preservation of forests in Bonai.²⁴

The Bonai forest rules recognised the following rights of the three tribal fiefs besides what has been discussed before:

1. They were not entitled to give leases.
2. They had no claim on the hides, horns and minerals found in their area.
3. They had no rights to grant any permission to use forest produce either to their ryots or to any one else without the previous sanction of the State authorities. But they had right to such produce for their own use only.
4. They were exempted from grazing duties for their own cattle only.
5. They had to bear half the cost of forest management in their illaka.
6. They and their brothers / sons were allowed to shoot in their illaka, but they had no right to allow any body else to shoot.
7. Ryots of Khalsa in the habit of getting wood or grass in the nearest zamindary forests were allowed to continue to do so and the ryots of zamindary illakas in habit of getting it from nearby Khalsa forests were also allowed to exercise their right as before provided the reserves were not to be exploited.²⁵

The Zamindars of Bamra had right to use their forests for their own domestic /agricultural needs and also to appropriate the forest cess collected in their area. Their shooting rights were similar to that of their counterparts in Bonai and their ryots had to follow the State forest rules regarding the rights and concessions of all other ryots of the State. They had no right to grant leases and the right to MFP, hides and horns etc. belonged to the State.²⁶

When Patna was under government management, the rules applicable to the zamindars were drawn up after an examination of the zamindars' rights.²⁷ Accordingly, the zamindars were allowed to use their forests for their own use and for that of their ryots. They were not entitled to levy forest cess without the permission of the Raja and also to sell any class-I timber. They had no right to export any timber without the permission of the Raja and had to pay a takoli to the latter for their forests.²⁸

In Kalahandi, the zamindars derived nominal revenue or even nothing from their forests before 1893. People of each zamindary used to enjoy forest timber free of charge in their own zamindary illaka and those living in the boundary areas used jungles of the Khalsa also without restriction. Similarly, people of the Khalsa enjoyed access to zamindary forests free of duties in the boundary areas.²⁹

In 1893, rules were framed to obtain revenue from forests and the zamindars followed a suit. The Raja imposed in 1894 a takoli at 5% on their forest revenue and raised it to 10% in 1895.³⁰ On complaint received from the zamindars, the Political Agent examined their sanands and found them "fully support the view that the Zamindars have no full rights to their forests even if they have any rights to them at all"³¹. The problem was that the zamindary pattas were quite different from those of the Brahmottardars etc. and while in the latter, full right over the trees and whateverelse found in the granted area was mentioned clearly, the zamindary pattas hardly contained any such clear confirmation (see Appendix-24). Many of the zamindars even did not possess any patta at all, perhaps because they had been recognised just on mutual understanding or verbal agreement. This went against their claim for full proprietary rights over their forests.
The zamindars of Kalahandi were entitled to enjoy their forests for themselves and for their people, and not for sale of such produce except Lac. The profits on timber sold for export from their illaka was to be divided between them and the State. They levied nistar cess and grazing fees and sold timber for local use under license, having right to half the net profit realised on the timber exported from their area. However, as per the records of later period, they were having full rights over their forests.

In Sonepur also, the zamindars used to pay a takoli for using their forests.

In Mayurbhanj, the zamindars were known as ‘Sarbarahkars’ and by the late 19th century all others except the Sarbarahkar of Kaptipada had been dispossessed of their estates by the Maharaja under various circumstances. The rights of the Kaptipada zamindar over his forests also became a matter of dispute between him and the Maharaja which is reflected in the following letter of the latter which he wrote to the Superintendent of Tributary Mahals, Orissa, on 21-11-1905:

"xxx Before the management by the Court of Wards during my minority, the forest revenue belonged to the Moharbanj State, the sarbarahkar was allowed to take as much timber as could be carried by six teams of buffaloes. I propose to levy on all forest produce exported from Kaptipada a third of the royalty prescribed by the Moharbanj Forest Manual; this will be a faire concession to the sarbarahkar. The Moharbanj State will have the power to distrain in transit any forest produce on which royalty has not been paid, such distrain being of course made within Moharbanj limits. All forest leases should be granted by the sarbarahkar with the approval of the Chief of Moharbanj."

The Maharaja's claim was not found 'unreasonable' by the Superintendent and the zamindar of Kaptipada was thus given all other rights over his forests except this transit liability.

In many ex-States, there were no zamindars. And it is also not that all the zamindars had considerable forest area. For ex; in Sonepur, out of the five zamindars of importance, only two had forests.

The lakhiraj tenures were originally revenue free tenures. In western Orissa, they were known as the Maufi (i.e. exempted from paying any revenue) tenures. Such tenures were granted for social service or religious purposes and included the following:

1. Brahmottar :- granted to Brahmins only.
2. Debottar: granted in the name of deities (through some body as trustee).
3. Khorak-Poshak : given for maintenance to members, illegitimate sons, kinsmen and relatives of the Raj family.
4. Khorposh : Usually given to the sons other than the eldest (who is entitled to succeed the Raja).

---

32 In Sambalpur, however, the Brahmottar, Devottar and some other grants were under the nisfeedary tenure. Nisfeedary tenures were paying half revenue.
There were many other lakhiraj tenures\(^{33}\) of minor importance and the significance of all such rent-free tenures can be ascertained from the fact that the lakhiraj forests of Mayurbhanj were above 40 square miles in area\(^{38}\) and the Debottar forests of the Dhenkanal forest division had an area of over 20 square miles\(^{39}\). Some of these tenure-holders were even equivalent to the zamindars (e.g. the Khorakposhkadars of Jarasingha and Agalpur, in Patna) and except Debottar grants, others had even been assessed to quit rent\(^ {34}\) from time to time, in some cases.

The rules applicable to them regarding their forests were different in different ex-States. For ex; in Khandapara, the State had the right to manage all such forests and the net revenue derived from the management of such forests was payable to the tenure-holder\(^{40}\). In Mayurbhanj, Lakhirajdars could fell or remove for sale or for own use, free of royalty but with permission, forest produce of all kinds in their territory; but in case of export, duty at 1/3 of the rates was leviable on their forest produce\(^ {41}\). In Dhenkanal, the grantees were entitled for a right similar to that described for the Mayurbhanj Lakhirajdars and had to pay forest cess if they required wood etc. from the State forests. Without paying such cess, they were not entitled to graze their cattle outside their own illaka\(^{42}\).

In Bonai, the Khorposhdars had no forest rights whatsoever over the forests in their illaka\(^{43}\).

The Gauntiahi tenures were found in western Orissa. The Gauntiahs were actually village holders or village in-charges. This tenure is said to have originated in many cases when the superior landlord, finding it difficult to assess the rents payable by each ryot, appointed or recognized a person responsible for the whole revenue fixed, allowing him to make what arrangement with the ryots\(^ {44}\). The Gauntiahs had only partial rights over the village forests or wastelands (for ex., in Sonepur, dry trees of village wastelands belonged to the Gauntiahs)\(^ {45}\). The Malguzars of Sambalpur had full proprietary rights in villages held by them and unlike the Gauntiahs, could sell timber growing on their village wastelands\(^ {47}\).

Some of the service jagirs came under the lakhiraj tenure while others were not rent free. Some of the service tenures of Jeypore were more or less like the zamindary tenures.

In the context of all the above described tenures, it must be again recalled that they were, with a few exceptions, not forest tenures directly; only forests were covered by such tenures. Most of the lakhiraj and service tenures, for ex; were actually granted mainly on the basis of agricultural intentions though the topes granted to the temples and individuals were meant for providing fruits and also, in certain cases, the intention of the granter might have included provision for firewood etc. for the grantee. So it is not surprising to find that the Mundas, Orams and other tribals, who established themselves in Bonai on the encouragement of the Raja, brought under cultivation extensive jungle areas thereby satisfying the State authorities as it enhanced the land revenue considerably\(^ {48}\). To quote Mr. P.W. Duke (1906):

"XXX It is only in very recent times and hardly now in all parts of the

\(^{33}\) Only some kinds of Lakhiraj tenure existed in any particular ex-State and not all.

\(^{34}\) Some of them were also liable to pay the forest cess, sometimes at a higher rate than the normal. It may be reminded here that many of them either did not have full rights over their forests, or had to depend on the State forests for their needs.
Garhjats that the forests have been recognized as having any intrinsic value. In old times a man got a grant of forest land not to exploit the forests but to bring the land under cultivation. The quicker he got rid of the forest the better all parties were pleased”.49

Validity and resumption of the tenures

Except Devottar and sometimes Brahmottar tenures also, all other tenures were liable for resumption due to any of the following reasons:

1. The grantee failed to serve the purpose for which he was granted the tenure.
2. The successor of the granter was no more interested to recognize the tenure.
3. Various other conditions were not fulfilled. For ex; no successor of the grantee was found to continue, etc.

Alienability of the tenures:

In this regard, different conditions applied to different tenures. For ex; the lakhiraj grants were, in general, not transferable by mortgage, sale, gift or inheritance either in whole or part without the permission of the Maharaja and also they were not liable to be brought to sale in execution of decree of any Civil or Revenue Court without such permission, in Mayurbhanj.50

The zamindary grants were hereditary, but subject to certain conditions. For ex; in many cases, a male successor was necessary to continue the tenure. The zamindars or other big tenure holders had created sub-tenures of various kinds under them which some times became a matter of dispute between them and the Raja.

In Ganjam, the British sometimes exercised their power to prevent any kind of alienation by the Estate-holders35, for ex; the Kabuliyat of Raja Ram Krishna Jugga Deo of Tikkali stated the following:

" The Right Hon’ble the President in Council of Fort St. George having granted the zamindary of Tickally to me XXX for a period of two years XXX I have agreed not to grant or give away new Mocasahs, Aghrahams, Mauniams or Enams; or in any other way to alienate the lands or Revenue of the zamindary without the XXX permission of Government XXX.” 51

Post-independence changes:

The Orissa Preservation of Private Forest Act had been passed in 1947 52 and in 1948, the Orissa Communal Forest and Private Lands (Prohibition of Alienation) Act was passed to control the undue / illegal alienations often made by many private proprietors.53

After merger, the reserved forests of the merged States were directly handed over to the Forest Department of the Government of Orissa (Singh:1997) 54. The unreserved forests of some States were under their Revenue Departments (though the forest department was

35 The British resumed many tenures in Sambalpur and some other areas under their control.
responsible for the maintenance of such forests as in Nayagarh\(^{55}\). Most of such unreserves and all the ex-zamindary forests (after the abolition of these Estates) were handed over to the Revenue Department of the Orissa Government\(^{56}\). The ex-zamindary forests were managed under the Anchal Sasan (Local Authorities of the Govt.) system except the forests of the Estates belonging to Mayurbhanj, Kalahandi and Bonai etc.\(^{57}\) which were already under the management of the Forest Department (the net profit being paid to the zamindar) after the merger of the corresponding States. During Anchal Sasan, the Government allowed to continue the rights and privileges enjoyed by the tenants during the zamindary period, granted the various MFP leased during the latter period and the zamindary schedule of rates were also continued to exist. Also realised were the shooting fees and grazing taxes\(^{58}\). On 15\(^{th}\) November 1957, all these forests (excepting a few under dispute) were handed over to the Forest Department\(^{59}\).

Other different tenures were gradually abolished in different phases except a few (for ex, Debottar grants) by the 1960s\(^{59(1)}\) and the Government gained control of many such forest areas through the forest settlement proceedings.\(^{60}\)

**CASE STUDIES**

I. KEONJHAR

**History:** Keonjhar did not exist as a separate State at least before 12\(^{th}\) century. It was then a territory under various dynasties during different periods of time.

The Bhanja dynasty had been ruling over a country called Khijjinga Mandal as early as 4\(^{th}\) and 5\(^{th}\) centuries A.D.. This country comprised the present districts of Mayurbhanj and Keonjhar and Singhbhum having its capital at Khijjinga Kota (modern Khiching in Mayurbhanj district). But the Bhanjas were forced to transfer their political headquarters from Khijjinga Kota to Hariharpur (near modern Baripada town of the Mayurbhanj district) and their kingdom was thus known as Hariharpur.

It is still not clear exactly how Keonjhar was separated from Hariharpur. According to one tradition, one Jai Singh, a Rajput from Rajastan, visited Puri in 1098. A.D. and the Gajapati Raja of Puri married his daughter to him (Jai Singh). Hariharpur at that time is said to be under the Gajapati Raja and he handed over Hariharpur to Jai Singh as dowry. Jai Singh had two sons: Adi Bhanja and Jyoti Bhanja. The kingdom was partitioned between the two and thus was Keonjhar separated from Hariharpur.

Historians have discovered the fallacy of this story\(^{61}\). However, a local tradition of the Bhuyans strongly supports the belief that Keonjhar was separated from Khijjinga Mandal.

There are two versions of this history of separation and both are related to the role of the Bhuyans. The Bhuyans themselves claim that their ancestors\(^{36}\) stole away a boy named Jyoti Bhanja from the ruling family of the Bhanjas so as to get a king of their own and organised the coronation ceremony with many kinds of material collected from the forests. According to Hunter, the tribes of this part, finding it a great hardship to have to travel through perilous forests and Mayurbhanj to obtain justice from the Raja, separated

\(^{36}\) A Bhuyan folklore says that their tribal chieftain of Karuagarh led this operation (Das:1989)\(^{66}\).
themselves, and set up the brother of the Mayurbhanj Raja as their independent chief (Hunter: 1872).

Whatever the story may be, it is a fact that the Bhuyans had been playing very important role in the history of Keonjhar since then and whenever the coronation ceremony for a new successor had been arranged, the Bhuyan chiefs had been invited to the ceremony to recognise the Raja in their traditional way (which included various customary objects furnished from forest product). The Bhuyans had been very sensitive to their role in the political history of Keonjhar and their rebellion of 1868 was an outcome of this sensitivity because they felt of having not been consulted sufficiently in the matter of recognition of Dhanurjay Bhanja by the British as the Raja of Keonjhar (Hunter: 1872):

"The slightest infringement of their old hereditary rights or the faintest appearance of any design to claim rent or to curtail their uncontrolled freedom, sets the whole mountains in a flame." 

That is what Hunter wrote before the rebellion of 1891 took place and it was perhaps one of the reasons for not reserving any forest in their area for a considerable time.

In 1838, the Raja of Pal-Lahra married his only daughter to the Prince of Keonjhar and ceded his State to the latter as dowry. However, the Raja's nephew resisted and himself became the Chief of Pal-Lahra, his State now becoming a feudatory under Keonjhar (See end-note for the controversy regarding this). According to Pandit Madan Mohan Mishra, Keonjhar had the privilege of obtaining certain supply of bamboo from Pal-Lahra in consequence of the dowry dealing.

The Raja of Keonjhar asked the Chief of Pal-Lahra to pay a tribute of Rs. 250 and once even required him to pay homage in a woman's attire (Kittoe: 1839) which the latter naturally refused and a deadly quarrel arose between the two. The British intervened and Pal-Lahra gradually became independent of Keonjhar.

**Tenures:**

The following tenures have been recorded in the Settlement Report of 1914-15 (besides the ryoti tenure):
1. Lakhiraj
2. Zamindary
3. Service jagirs etc.

Of all these, many Khorposh and service jagirs had been resumed by the State.

In Brahmottars, reclamation of waste land needed State permission and the sub-tenants under them generally did not have right to the trees in their area. In village waste, the Bhrahmottardar enjoyed the same right as any other ryots of other villages over the forest growth (Ramdhyan: 1947).

---

37 According to Hunter, Pal-Lahra contained some of the finest Sal forests to be found in the world (during the 19th century).
The rent-free Debottar and Brahmottar tenures were assessed with Nistar cess at 50% higher rate than the ordinary.71

There were two zamindaries of importance in Keonjhar: Kaliahata and Dhenka. Kaliahata was probably a vassal of Keonjhar Raja in earlier times and was the largest zamindary, full of forests and hills etc. Dhenka was first ceded to the State in 1784 by the Marathas on account of the zamindar's persistent default in the payment of revenue.72

Regarding the forest right of the zamindar of Kaliahata, Settlement Report of 1898 said:

"The zamindar heretofore would cut timber etc and enjoy forest dues from the Dandpat. It has been held to be impolitic to allow reckless destruction of valuable forests and the Superintendent agreed with the Maharaja in not granting to the zamindar, forests and such like rights. He shall have power however to reclaim the culturable fallow lands and the scrub jungle adjoining the 33 villages now settled with him, which are to be held as included in his zamindary without payment of any jama beyond what has been fixed at present during the currency of the present settlement".73

As per British Reports, the two zamindars did not have any rights over forests and enjoyed no special rights (1907)74(1). The Keonjhar Forest Act of 1946 provides that forests under all the tenure holders including zamindars would be managed by the State and the net profit would be payable to them.

Some of the Devottar establishments reportedly made their own arrangements for the management of the forests under them. For ex., the establishment or Kotha of Lord Ram Laxman of village Biragovindpur had appointed forest guard(s) for this purpose.75

II. GANGPUR

History: Gangpur formed a part of Dakshina Koshala during ancient times. It did not have any independent status for a long period, but a descendant of the Keshari dynasty of Orissa is said to have brought it under his control when the Kesharis (also known as Somavamsis) were defeated by the Gangas and migrated to this part of western Orissa.76

The last ruler of this line, Raja Deo Keshari, was murdered apparently because of his oppressive nature and the territory plunged into a state of anarchy77. When murderers and rebels oppressed the inhabitants, the zamindars of Hemgir, Sargipalli and Sarapgarh secured help from some of the neighbouring Rajas and suppressed the rebellion78. Later on, they invited (or, as tradition says, stole) one son from the Sikhar family of Sikharbhum and installed him as their Chief (hence the title Sekhar Deo). This new chief Gangdhar Sekhar Deo was especially helped by an influential Bhuyan leader of the territory, the zamindar of Sargipalli, to subjugate the other Bhuyans79. The Raja established his new capital at Gangpurgarh, the extent of his territory being not known definitely.

The rulers of Surguja had forced Gangpur to become their feudatory. Later, Balarama Deva (1540-56) of Sambalpur, who married the daughter of the Gangpur Raja, altered the position and made Gangpur free from the authority of Surguja rulers. Gangpur became a friendly feudatory of Sambalpur(Dash:1969)80. The British transferred Sambalpur and its
feudatories like Bonai and Gangpur to the Marathas by 1806, but the latter two were reverted to the British in 1818 in consequence of an agreement reached between the Marathas and the British Government. Under such circumstances, Bonai and Gangpur gained their independent status by 1821 and were no more regarded as feudatories of Sambalpur.

**Tenures:**

The Rajas of Gangpur had recognised following special tenures:

1. Zamindary
2. Khorposh
3. Parganadari
4. Bhrahmottar; Devottar and service jagir (Naukaran)
5. Ganjuani and Gauntiahi

There were four zamindaris in the State viz., Nagra, Hemgir, Sargipalli and Sarapgarh. Nagra, the largest zamindary, is said to have some kind of independent status during ancient period. The name is connected to its ruling dynasty, the Nagas. The Kesharis defeated the Nagas and the headquarter of Nagra was established at Jamseragarh (near Rourkela). It is said that when the last Keshari ruler of Nagra died issue less, the territory remained under a kind of autonomous administration by 12 leading personalities for 60 years. Later the Council decided to sale the territory to the princess of Kenjarigarh (Kinjir or Hatibari). The princess married the prince of Gangpur and Nagra was given to the latter in dowry. The princess had recognised one Lal Mohapatra as the holder of Nagra Estate on the condition of certain tribute and the descendants of Mohapatra were recognised as the zamindars of Nagra.

The ancestor of the zamindars of Hemgir is said to have received the territory as a grant from the ruler of Gangpur (or Sambalpur ?) to act as buffer to his State and to help in repelling invaders.

The other two zamindars were once very powerful; probably they were the tribal chieftains of their area and were later recognized as zamindars.

The zamindars were paying certain tribute to the Raja and rendered military service etc. to him. But the advent of railways saw degradation in their relationship.

The British Government had entered into an agreement with the Rajas to the following effect for the purpose of extending the railway line through their States:

1. Land to be given free of charge and rent (including zamindary area).
2. No duties to be levied on materials purchased from private individuals within the native States.
3. No duty to be levied upon articles 'which may be required for the construction or maintenance of the line or for the railway purposes, neither shall it levy duties on any articles conveyed by the Railway while they are in transit on the line'.
The agreement was applicable for Gangpur also. But it never said that the States / zamindaris were bound to supply timber free of charge.  

The line was passing through Nagra and Hemgir zamindaries. The zamindar of Nagra claimed compensation from the Railway for the trees cut down in his area and received it.

But the Raja said the amount actually belonged to him and even claimed (in his letter dated 26-7-1890) that the zamindar of Nagra had agreed to pay him the money received as compensation.

On the other hand, the contractors employed by Railway cut down timbers etc. wherever they pleased without listening to the complaints made by the Raja or zamindars and without any settlement of prices.

All this raised the issue of forest rights of the zamindars seriously and constant friction continued between the Raja, the zamindars and the Railways. The Raja claimed exclusive forest rights in the zamindaries and filed a petition. But his claim was rejected by the British Government on three major grounds:

1. During 1882-83, when Mr. Hewitt made his settlement of Gangpur and framed the forest rules in consultation with the Raja, the zamindars, village headmen and the ryots; he provided that the zamindars and maintenance holders of Gangpur would "make similar arrangements for their own jungles xxx". Thus, at that time also the right of these tenure-holders over their jungles was recognised by all even if indirectly or ignorantly (for the timber had not assumed any remarkable value at that time).

2. The Commissioner of Chot Nagpur expressed his favour for the zamindars as follows:

"The amount of cultivation is so extremely small that if the zamindars have no jungle rights, I can not conceive from what source they are to get any income from their estates."

3. The Raja did not point to any instance in which he had exercised the right of felling and selling timber to the exclusion of the zamindars.

Hence, the zamindars obtained full rights over their forests.

There were five sub-zamindars in Nagra (e.g. the Pradhan of Jaraikala, the Naib of Bhalulata etc.) and they were granted pattas by the Raja himself, not by the Nagra zamindar. But they had no forest rights.

The Khorposhdars of Hatibari and Birbira etc. were also having forest rights, but not for the sale of their timber. After expiry of the Khorposhdar of Birbira, the forests within his Khorposh were reverted to the State and came under the management of the State forest department. The Parganadar of Raiboga enjoyed absolute forest rights like the zamindars.

---

38 The Government later made it clear that the chiefs / zamindars were entitled only to the royalty on timber to be fixed according to the rates allowed in the case of Government forests similarly used.
39 He said that the zamindars were mere rent-Collectors.
The village headmen in the Khalsa and zamindary tribal areas, known respectively as Gauntiahs and Ganjus, did not have any forest rights. There was some dispute between the zamindar of Nagra and the Ganjus under him regarding forest rights and one of the Ganjus cut and sold every species of tree including Mohwa in defiance of the zamindar's protest.

Debottar:-

In Debottar villages, no forest rights were recognised but the collection from reclamation was being realised by the establishment which was managed by the Darbar. No cesses were paid by the establishment to the States, but the royts, who had rights similar to that of their counterparts in other villages, were paying the cesses to the establishment. Total number of Debottar village was 8 in Khalsa, 5 in Nagra, and 3 in Hemgir.

Brahmottar:

The Brahmottardars paid no rent or cess to the State, but realized Nistar cess from their tenants. However, the royts got no return in lieu of this payment. The Brahmottardars enjoyed free rights in their village forests and wastelands therein could be reclaimed without permission from the State. Total number of such villages was 2 in Khalsa, 7 in Nagra and 2 in Hatibari. Sargipalli and Sarapgarh zamindaries did not have any Debottar or Brahmottar tenures.

The zamindary forests of Hemgir did not come under the Government control at a time because of some disputes regarding compensation etc. From 5.5.1950 to 18.12.1951, these forests remained under Government management which was later discontinued. Between 18.12.1952 to 31.5.1953, both parties restrained in respect of collection. Government took possession of the zamindary on 4-3-1963 (the date of vesting being 15-6-1957) and Hemgir forest department was transferred to the control of the DFO, Sundargarh on 1st December 1964.

III. RANPUR

History: Legend has it that the State was founded in about 1727 B.C. by Biswabasab, brother of the great devotee Biswabasu (who is related to the origin of the cult of Jagananth). The family of Ranpur Rajas claimed themselves to have descended from the Solar dynasty of Orissa and accordingly some are of the opinion that Biswabasab founded the State probably during the rule of Kapilendra Deva (15th century A.D.) who started the rule of Solar dynasty in Orissa.

According to tradition, Biswabasab and Biswabasu actually belonged to a tribal race (Savara). Biswabasab conquered the Bhuyans and established his kingdom. At that time, the State is said to have extended upto Boud in the west, Chilika lake in the south, and Daya and Mahanadi rivers in the east and north respectively. But the area was later contracted. According to Hunter, it was originally of small extent, but more that 100 generations of Chiefs succeeded in extending their kingdom by constantly
annexing their neighbours' territories (Hunter:1872). And one such instance was the annexation of Patia illaka (later constituted as reserve forests) from the territory of Banpur by Raja Giridhari Narendra (1596 - 1628) of Ranpur who defeated the Raja of Banpur.

The tenures of Ranpur ex-States were of the following kind (excluding ryoti tenure):

1. Khanja (Maintenance grants to relations)
2. Rani Mahal (belonged exclusively to the Rani for her maintenance)
3. Debottar
4. Brahmottar
5. Service jagirs

Of these, the Brahmottardars had full right in trees of their villages and wasteland was portioned among the villagers. Also, no permission was necessary for reclamation. The Debottar grant recorded in the name of Lord Jagannath of Puri had given full proprietary rights to the Marfatdar (trustee). A Mango orchard of six acres was under a Debottar tenure in the Brajaballavapur mouza.

Among the service jagirs, some chowkidars in the Mal area were given only a few mango or jackfruit trees in lieu of their services, instead of any land.

The extent to which the Khanjadars exercised their rights in their area is not clear, but it is expected that they had certain right in their trees. Some of the Khanjas had been resumed by the Raja and some Khanjadars being unable to pay the required tribute / revenue (one fourth of their income) each year, relinquished one fourth of their lands to the State to redeem their tribute.

IV. GHUMSUR:

Ghumsur was the oldest zamindary among the Ganjam Estates. In ancient times, it was known as Khinjili and had no considerable independent status. The inhabitants were mostly tribals, especially the Khonds.

The history of the ruling Bhanja family is connected to that of the neighbouring Boud State. It is said that the ruler of Boud was a Brahmin, but had adopted two sons of one Daitary Bhanja. When he passed away, the eldest of his adopted sons, Raghunath Bhanja, became his successor. At that time, the Ghumsur region was being known as Baragadia, meaning a region of 12 strongholds where, according to tradition, 12 chieftains were ruling in different principalities. During the rule of Raghunath Bhanja, some kind of disturbances or rebellion broke out in Baragadia. So Raghunath sent his younger brother Banamali Bhanja to quell the rebellion. Banamali accomplished his mission successfully and founded his kingdom there in 9th century A.D. He built one fort on the Guma (mound) on a Sara (reservoir) and the kingdom was hence named as Gumsar or Ghumsur (Behera:1987).

With a few exceptions, the Brahmottar grants known as Sashana were given to a group of Brahmins everywhere.
It is said that his descendant Pratap Bhanja was resisted by one Khond (chief?!) named Kula when he tried to establish his capital. The Kandha was eventually killed and the capital was named after him (Kulagada or Kullada) (Behera:1987).  

In 1703, the successor to the throne was Rana Bhanja, then only a child. So a family member, Ghana Bhanja, was appointed as his regent or manager. But one day Ghana Bhanja killed the child- Raja and established himself as the ruler. The Khonds raised a massive revolt against this killing and wide spread disturbances broke out in the country. Taking advantage, a Muslim invader defeated Ghana Bhanja and kept him in confinement. However, he (the Muslim Nawab) was pleased to see Ghana Bhanja's bravery and later restored him as the Raja of Ghumsur on the condition of certain annual tribute (Behera:1987).

Ghumsur came under the imperial paramountcy of the Gangas in 12th century A.D. and then under the Solar dynasty of Orissa. Later Ghumsur and other Estates of Ganjam district came under the administration of the Kutub Sahi rulers of Golkunda and then under the rule of Moguls. When the French assumed the administration of Northern Circars, Khrisha Bhanja, the Raja of Ghumsur, refused to pay his tributes as a result of which the French sent troops to Ghumsur led by De Bussy. But Bussey could not accomplish his mission completely especially because his service was required in Madras. This made the Raja more defiant and self - confident against any foreign invasion. So when the British tried to establish their authority over the Raja, he dared not to pay his tribute to them. The English troops marched to Ghumsur and captured Vishnuchakra. The Raja finally agreed to pay his tribute. In 1771, the British raised his tribute from Rs. 30000/- to Rs. 45000/-. Naturally, Krishna Bhanja felt black - mailed and declined to pay the excess amount. After his death, the British tried to take advantage of the dispute going on between his sons and recognised the second son Vikram Bhanja, as per the will of his father, as the Raja of Ghumsur with the hope that Vikram would pay them their dues. But the latter was quite displeased, as the British had managed to hand over nine jagir villages to his elder brother Lakshman Bhanja. At that time, the British did not want to be very strict to Vikram in the fear that he might join hands with their enemies - the Marathas - if forced otherwise. So they finally restored the nine villages to Vikram Bhanja from the possession of Lakshman Bhanja. But Vikram was still against them and when negotiations failed, the Company's forces took possession of many strongholds of Ghumsur. The Raja preferred to flee to the maliahs to organise a massive revolt with the help of Khonds and meanwhile the administration of Ghumsur was taken over by the British (Behera:1987).

Vikram Bhanja tried to organise attacks on the British troops and recaptured Vishnuchakra. The Company launched another phase of military operations and the disturbances thus caused in the country ultimately led many people to leave their homes and to flee to the border areas. The Company then handed over the charge of zamindary to Lakshman Bhanja so as to appease the popular resentment over the foreign administration, but Vikram Bhanja proceeded to Madras to place his representation before the Government in 1779 to restore him his zamindary and the Company being under the pressure of the first Anglo-Maratha war, preferred peace with the latter and restored him the zamindary. But instead of paying them their dues, Vikram Bhanja continued to disregard the Company's authority and moreover had proved himself not to be a good ruler. The Company thus was forced again to depose him and hand over the charge to
Lakshman Bhanja\(^{120}\). While Lakshman Bhanja tried on his own to restore law and order in his country, the Company also appointed a manager on their side in Ghumsur with an intention to bring the Raja's administration under their direct control. But years of misrule and disturbances had ruined the country so much that many people still preferred not to return to their homes and the income gradually decreased while the Raja was expected to pay one Lakh of rupees every year to the Company. Two of the Raja's money-lenders exercised considerable control over the Estate administration under such circumstances\(^{121}\).

After the death of Vikram Bhanja, his son Srikara Bhanja succeeded him in 1790; but the young Raja soon became helpless because of the critical condition of the zamindary. He did not find any way to get rid of the heavily pending tributes and also the Company's role in the whole matter did not favour him. Frustrated and disgusted, he resigned in 1793 temporarily and went on a pilgrimage. His son Dhananjaya, who administered the zamindary in the absence of his father, was not a man of good character and was oppressive to the people. Srikara Bhanja returned home in 1795 and expelled his son from the zamindary\(^{122}\).

By mid-1799, the dues against Ghumsur had accumulated to about 4.4 lakhs, but Srikara Bhanja alleged that the Government revenue-agents and the money-lenders had squandered away a heavy amount with the plea of depositing the same with the Company's treasury. The Collector of Ganjam considered his allegations and asked him to pay only Rs. 186723/-\(^{123}\). The Raja paid some instalments, but ultimately finding the situation out of his control, fled away from the Estate and did not interfere with the management in the zamindary during his absence. The Company declared him unfit for managing his zamindary and recognised Dhananjay as the new Raja, in 1801\(^{124}\). The annual tribute to be paid was reduced from one lakh to Rs. 70000/- and Dhananjay regularly paid the same upto 1815. But the permanent settlement introduced by the British during 1803-04, under which the annual tribute was reduced by Rs. 30000/-, increased the Government's authority over the zamindary and decreased that of the Raja. Also the Raja was now liable to be removed from his position if he failed to pay his dues\(^{125}\).

In 1814, Dhananjaya was accused of murdering his mother and various other allegations against him forced the Government to take action against Dhananjay in 1815, but he escaped to the maliahs. Later he surrendered himself and was committed to trial\(^{126}\).

Meanwhile, a Khond chief, Dora Bissoi\(^{42}\), in collaboration with two of his close associates, carried out administration in Ghumsur with the approval of the Government till 1818. In 1817, a Khond rebellion broke out against the British Government and Dora took an active role in the rebellion in the subsequent years\(^{127}\).

Under such circumstances, the Government again appointed Srikara Bhanja as the zamindar in 1819 who had returned to Ghumsur, but the Raja failed to pay his arrears satisfactorily and the Government restored the zamindary in 1832 to Dhananjay who had been in confinement since 1815. Dhananjay managed the zamindary effectively and paid his tributes till 1835 regularly and the Government was pleased with him\(^{128}\).

\(^{42}\) The Commander in-Chief of the Ghumsur militia.
But since 1835, another phase of relationship began between the two parties when, it is said, on the bad advice of some persons, the Raja started to be unfriendly to the Government and withheld the payments (Behera:1987)129. The Government tried to reconcile him and when it failed, the Collector of Ganjam was directed that if the Raja did not discharge his arrears within one month from the date of announcement made to him, his zamindary would be resumed. Accordingly, as the period expired on 7th September 1935, Government troops marched towards Ghumsur. On their way, the Raja's people met them to inform that they had deposited Rs. 30000/- in Government treasury and some four or five thousand rupees was also going to be deposited. They conveyed that the Raja wanted some more time to clear the balance amount. The Collector however found that it had been too late and ordered to continue military operations (Russel:1856)130. The Raja fled to the Maliahs and appealed to the Khond chiefs for help, which was readily responded and rebellion broke out in Ghumsur against the resumption of the zamindary by the Government. But the Collector of Ganjam was of the opinion to maintain a sympathetic policy in Ghumsur and its former settlements. He also wanted to restore the institution of Rajaship in Ghumsur by appointing some body from the Bhanja family (Behera:1987)131.

Meanwhile, a report came in that Dhananjay Bhanja, who was hunted down from place to place, was found dead. The news caused wide spread disturbances, especially by the Khond chiefs132. So troops were now sent to annex the territory and in 1836, Ghumsur became a Government Estate.

Purchase of Surada zamindary:

In 1833, Dhananjay Bhanja purchased the zamindary of Surada for Rs. 8000/- when the Surada zamindar died issue-less133. The Government considered that Dhananjay had much authority and influence in Surada and also to be 'the fittest person to restore it to order134. But the Collector of Ganjam found in 1835 that the inhabitants of Surada were opposed to the rule of Ghumsur Raja135.

After the annexation of Ghumsur, Surada continued to be a part of it and both constituted what was known as the Ghumsur Taluk43.

Tenures:

Following tenures existed in Ghumsur before 1836:

1. Mokhasa (grants to the relatives or dependants of zamindars or for military service).
2. Agraharum (Brahmottar grants).
3. Debottar (etc.).

From the Agraharum villages, the Raja received no revenue as per the ancient custom135(I) and such tenure holders can be certainly expected to have full proprietary rights in their area.

Maintenance grants were given by Raja Dhanurjay Bhanja (17th century) to his two sons who were appointed as autonomous managers of one Mutha each.136

43 Sometimes, Surada was separately mentioned as Surada Taluk.
Several labourers were allowed to enjoy the produce of 13 (or more?) villages instead of
daily hire.\(^{136(1)}\)

The Rajas of Ghumsur appeared to have considered the country, beyond their capital
‘indeed all termed Maliah as a kind of independent possession’. They did not receive
much revenue from such areas probably, where many villages were given to the peons on
a small quit-rent and on military tenure(Stevenson:1916).\(^{137}\)

The quantity of granted jagirs was larger in jungles and exposed villages than that given
in the open country.\(^{138}\)

The Maliah Muthas, where mostly hill people lived, yield no revenue to the Raja though
these people were loyal to him and rendered him feudal service. The Rajas did not appear
to have exercised any considerable interference in the way of life of these tribal people,
especially the Khonds, who were very freedom-loving\(^{44}\).

\section*{V. JEYPORE}

\textbf{History}: The kingdom of Jeypore was known as Nandapur in earlier times. Nandapur,
the ancient capital of the kingdom, is situated at about 14 miles from Semiliguda of the
Pottangi tahsil\(^{139}\). The territory had been ruled by many dynasties and it appears to some
that the kingdom was conferred by Gajapati Kapilendra Deva of Orissa as a mark of
favour on one of his favorites\(^{140}\). However, family traditions of the ruling family says
that the kingdom was given to Vinayak Deo, a younger prince from Kashmir, by the last
Silavamsi (Sailavamsi) Raja Pratap Ganga Raju (who was a powerful ruler and a
feudatory of Kapilendra Deva) of Nandapur in dowry when Vinayak married the
daughter of Pratap Ganga. Vinayak Deo succeeded to throne in 1443 A.D., but after his
accession, some of his subjects rose against him and he suppressed the rebellion with the
help of a leader of the Brinjaris(Francis:1992).\(^{141}\)

The capital was transferred from Nandapur to the present Jeypore town by Maharaja Vir
Vikram Deo (1637-99).\(^{142}\)

Lala Krishna was the step brother of Viswambara II (1713-52), the Raja of Jeypore. In
1752, when Lala Krishna came into the Estate, Viziaram Raju, the Raja of Vizianagaram,
helped to drive him out so as to help Krishna's brother Vikram Deo (who was claiming
the throne) to succeed to power. In gratitude, Vikram Deo gave Raju the fiefs of Madgole,
Kasipuram (Andhra), Salur, Panchipenta, Chemudu, Sangam valsa, Belgam, Kurupam
and Meringi- all then held by Vassals of Jeypore.\(^{143}\)

In 1768, Viziaram Raju wrote to the Government of Madras that in 1752 Salabat Jung,
the Subadar of Deccan\(^{45}\), had granted him the Jeypore country as a jagir on annual
payment of Rs. 24000/-; and asked to renew the grant. The Government merely granted
him the said revenue\(^{144}\).

\(^{44}\) See Appendix19 for more details of the relationship between Khonds and the Ganjam zamindars.
\(^{45}\) Agent of the Moguls appointed to govern these territories of Southern India.
In 1775, during disturbances in Parlakhemundi, the Raja of Jeypore threatened to support the malcontents. So the British marched to Jeypore assisted by the Raja of Vizianagaram. The Raja of Jeypore surrendered and a large portion of the Estate was brought under the control of the Raja of Vizianagaram who had assisted the British. However, a few years later, frequent revolts and disturbances of the Jeyporeans because of the oppressive rule of the Vizianagaram Raja, made the latter decide to hand it back to Vikram Deo for Rs. 40000/- of which no more than three fourth was ever paid.

The Raja of Vizianagaram was still claiming the Nandapur zamindary as his jagir. The Committee of Circuit appointed by the Madras Government to enquire into the revenue system of the Northern Circars in 1784, found his claim to be unreasonable and expressed their favour to declare Jeypore as a separate zamindary. But this was made effective only after the death of the Vizianagaram Raja who, having been directed to leave his district because of his misrule and heavy arrears, rose in rebellion against the British and was killed in 1794.

In 19th century, under various disturbing circumstances, the Government assumed the control/management of the Jeypore territory in different phases. The Estate was under Court of Wards from 1889 to 1895.

**Tenures:**

In Jeypore Estate, the Debottar grants were under the management of the Darbar and some Brahmottar villages also existed.

But the most important tenures were the estates. Viswambar Deo I (1672-76) was the originator of the feudal system in Jeypore. He divided the country into a number of estates and assigned to the estate in-charge (his faithful retainer) maintenance of peace and order in that area. All other large feudal estates had been resumed by the Maharajas of Jeypore by mid-19th century except those of Bissam Katak, Kalayansingpur, Nowrangpur and Malkangiri.

Malkangiri is said to have been granted by the Maharaja on service tenure. The holder of this grant was known as Thatraja and they have to their credit some old Tamarind grooves. The grant was resumed in 1872.

Bissan Katak grant was made on service tenure to one Krishna Thatraja who had come from Parlakhemundi and cleared the jungles. He was to attend the Maharaja at Dussehra with 500 paiks. Disputes arose between his descendant Narendra Thatraja and the Maharaja of Jeypore and even fights between them occurred 4 times, the Maharaja's troops being defeated each time. The estate was finally resumed in 1926.

Kalayansingpur grant consisted of some Khond villages and was made to a kinsman of the Maharaja on service tenure. It was resumed in 1892.

Nowrangpur was granted in 1820 by the Maharaja to his nephew Krishna Deo and his brother jointly. The line of the former soon died out and the son of the latter became owner of the property. This man, Chaitanya Deo, has planted most of the topes of Nowrangpur area. After his death, the Maharaja resumed the grant in 1896; but the widows of Chaitanya Deo filed a suit against it. In 1904, a compromise was effected by...
which the estate (exclusive of its forest) was handed over to the then surviving Rani for her life-time only and the estate was resumed after her death 1912.\textsuperscript{157}

The Kotpad Pargana originally belonged to the neighbouring State of Bastar. The Raja of Bastar ceded it on a rent-free tenure to the Jeypore Maharaja in 1778 as the latter had rendered him certain assistance, but on certain conditions which were not fulfilled and the Bastar troops recaptured a part of Kotpad. Later the Marathas established their supremacy on Bastar and in 1811, are said to have granted Kotpad to the Jeypore Maharaja on certain conditions. The British later said that Kotpad belonged to British India. At last, the British Government decided to leave it to Jeypore on annual payment of Rs. 3000/- though it was still considered to be a part of British India.\textsuperscript{158}

Gunupur taluk was taken by force from Jeypore by the Maharaja of Parlakhemundi sometime in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. But it was recaptured by the Raja of Vizianagaram with the help of Company's troops who, later finding himself unable to manage it, gave it back to Jeypore.\textsuperscript{159}

In the first half of this century, the forests of Koraput district were all owned by the Maharaja of Jeypore with the exception of some comparatively insignificant areas belonging to Mokhasadars and Inamdars who were tenure holders under the Maharaja. In some cases (for ex.; Ambadola Mokhasa), these proprietors had also surrendered, by agreement, the control over their forests to the Maharaja.\textsuperscript{160}

\textit{Purchase of Madgole and Panchipenta estates:}

Vikram Deo acquired half of the Madgole estate through sale-deal executed in 1910 and his son Ramachandra Deo acquired the other half on relinquishment by the Madgole Rani in 1928.\textsuperscript{161}

Panchipenta estate was purchased by the Maharaja for six lakhs of rupees.\textsuperscript{162}
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FOREST ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

The modern concept of forest management and policy is an outcome of the experiences of the last two centuries. By mid-19th century, while demand for forest
produce was increasing considerably, scientific discoveries in the West were confirming the intimate relationship between the climate and the forests thus making the conscious administrators more & more cautious about the exploitation of forests. Hence forests now assumed an importance hardly realised before by the people & their rulers. For in ancient times, this was, in general, not the situation though forests yielded some revenue to many of the ancient rulers / administrators. The forest resource was so vast in ancient Orissa that it was even a problem because of its wild beasts and high density, thus making many regions virtually inaccessible. So, on one hand, the revenue collector hardly bothered about preserving this resource as it was just more than enough in many areas; and on the other hand, for the general people also, the need for forest conservation did not arise.

What is interesting is that, inspite of such a background, there still existed certain bars and restrictions which prevented (or at least, attempted to prevent) the people from indiscriminate exploitation of plants and trees thus either directly or indirectly helping for management and conservation of this natural resource to some extent. For example, an old Oriya Tantric text prescribes the way of extracting a herbal root as follows:

"At the end of the month on Saturday, go to the fields and find the chemedilai plant there. Prostrate before it and come back. Go to the field again on Sunday before the sunrise, make again the sacred offerings to the plant and then collect (only) one root from its eastern side."(Parija & Patnaik:1982)

The pioneers of ancient Indian civilization - the seers and yogis - who instructed this country to make sacred annual offerings to, along with the gods and great forefathers, Vanaspatis and Ausadhis in acknowledgement of the medicinal and other beneficial properties of the plants and herbs; had developed Ayurvedic encyclopaedias of the floral kingdom and were, by their spiritual and occult perception, very sensitive to various natural laws and equilibriums. They prohibited extraction of herbs from the following places, viz., temple yards, roads, funeral ground and wells (Mathan:1989). Trees of the funeral ground were generally not felled as they were believed to be a place of refuge for the departed souls. Similarly, plantations meant for community purpose, especially those raised for temples, were believed to be sacred and there was a belief that if some body caused harm to these trees or cut them, he would have a disastrous fate. So this way, a kind of reserved land and reserved species were created. Further, an ancient Oriya manuscript on Vastu prohibited the following species for use in house constructions (Moharana:1995):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dhaba</th>
<th>Mahanimba</th>
<th>Jeuta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Khaira  | Tentuli   | Sunari

---

46 See, for ex; the following note on a tradition of the tribal practitioners of human sacrifice:
"At a short distance from every village was the Meriah groove, composed of large forest trees casting a deep shade xxx. These grooves are kept sacred from axe, and were regarded by the Khonds as hunted grounds." (3)

47 And it was in conformity with this notion that the authorities of modern Mayurbhanj State strictly prohibited cutting or felling of any tree in a Jahira (concentrated place of tribal worship) except for the naturally fallen ones. (4)
To be revised and updated. We regret for unwanted changes during formatting. Contact author for clarifications either at vasundharanr@satyam.net.in or sunlit1968@yahoo.co.in.

Ancient Orissa witnessed one of the earliest environmental (if we can call it so) environmental measures during the time of king Ashoka, who, shocked by the heavy blood-shed during his famous Kalinga war, became a follower of Lord Buddha and besides raising road side plantations, ordered to stop killing of certain faunal species even for his own royal lunch. He also asked the people to prevent forest fires as destruction of many living organisms by such fires concerned him; and prohibited elephant catching operations on specified days.

The concept of scientific management of forests started gaining its base in Orissa during the later half of the 19th century when the British administrators showed interest in forest conservation for revenue collection and also to achieve administrative perfection. Like many other civil and military administrative measures, forest management soon became an important part of civil administration and the Garjat rulers also started taking interest in this direction by late 19th century or early 20th century, either due to direct influence / intervention of the British, or because of some economic intention. Accordingly, we shall discuss the Garjat forest policy of two different periods on the basis of the presence or absence of a British model behind the same.

**ERA OF NATIVE POLICY (— 1872 AD)**

Before any systematic forest policy began to be adopted in the Garjats, the attitude of the Rajas towards their forests had the following aspects:

**Revenue Oriented Policy:**

Forest resources were in use for revenue collection in various Hill States / Zamindaries and no doubt, this was one of the most important aspects of the forest policy of those times. But it does not seem that scope for commercial exploitation of forests could have been quite high in those days. Also, inaccessibility must have adversely affected any such possibility causing the amount of revenue so realised sometimes quite small. For ex; during 1780s, revenue from what the Committee of Circuit described as ‘jungly collections’ in the Badakhemundi Estate, was about Rs. 509 i.e. only 56% of the gross revenue of the Estate; wax, honey and timber being among the important productions there.

Darpan, the largest Hill Estate on the western side of the undivided Cuttack district, received about Rs. 356 a year from the fuel-wood trade towards the later half of the 19th century. Estates of Kanika and Kujang each realised about the same time, as per Hunter, ± Rs. 650 a year (Hunter:1872) as rents from the extensive grazing and

---

48 See Glossary II for botanical names.

* For ex., in 1819,a cart-load of bamboos, which some 50 years later costed about 8s. 6d. (i.e. Rs.4.43), could be bought in Banpur & conveyed to the other side of Chilika lake for a sum of 1s. (i.e. Re.0.50) only (Hunter:1872). See Appendix 2 for the exchange factor.

49 Estimated to be Rs. 9000/-.
breeding grounds stretching to the Sundarban and marine jungles (their gross revenue at that time being about ±Rs.19000 & ±Rs.7000 respectively 12).

Revenue from forests increased gradually in the 19th century giving a boost to the revenue oriented forest policy. And Hunter said that petty alienations of waste - or jungle land was another source of some of the land holders’ income (Hunter:1872).13

Defence Oriented Policy:-

“xxx Chief security of the Hill Rajas in Khurda”-remarked a British officer to signify the forest resources of the Khurdha Estate before its annexation14. In fact, from east to west and north to south , it had been the policy of the Garjat Rajas of Orissa to make the use of forests for defence purpose. Writes Hunter about his experience in the ex-State of Athagad being struck by the close overgrown site of the Chief’s fort:

“XXX” an Old man explained to me that the jungle had been planted to keep off the Marhatta Horse.”15

The preferred species for this purpose was bamboo, for one bamboo hedge is more denser that a tree to be confronted with; and also it is difficult to get rid of a bamboo hedge with axe. Kittoe signified how the bamboo thicket around the fort of Sambalpur, besides serving for the purpose of defence, also used to act as a breakwater and protected the ill-constructed walls. This thicket was cut down when it was under British possession and the fort suffered the attacks of flood in 1836(Kittoe:1839).16

Concessions To Agriculture:-

It is natural to expect that agriculture was more important than forests in the Garjats like anywhere else (except for those tribals for whom depending on forests was more comfortable than resorting to agriculture) and as such, people were encouraged to reclaim forest lands. Hunter described the policy of the Raja of Dhenkanal as follows:

“ The Maharaja told me that as he is anxious to extend cultivation, he asks no rent from any jungle tribe that will settle down. They may cut down as much as forest as they choose and cultivate the clearing as long as they please”(Hunter:1872).17

Plantations:-

Plantations in ancient times were mostly of the nature of topes or grooves; the species preferred being Mango, Jack fruit & Coconut. But there were some other kinds of plantation also. For example, the Eastern Gangas50 encouraged the plantation of Madhuka (Mohwa) to commemorate the ‘origin of their God Madhukeswara which was associated with this tree. The Sonepur plates of Janmejaya I ( Keshari dynasty ) also allude to extensive cultivation of Madhuka. Various other inscriptions suggest that plantation of Kadamba, Neam, Tamarind, Salmali and other trees were also

50 A dynasty under the rule of which the southern parts of Orissa came either from 5th or 7th century A.D18.
carried out in different parts of Orissa (Rath:1987). Topes and roadside plantations\textsuperscript{51} have been the credit of many Rajas for centuries and these were thought to be of spiritual value\textsuperscript{52}. 

Own Privileges:- The Rajas favoured the forests for one of their important privileges i.e. \textit{Shikar} or \textit{Mrugaya}. It can be accepted without any doubt that the Rajas would not tolerate, unless something special had happened, that the forest cover of their States be totally destroyed and no scope remains for the royal gaming.

We do not know if the Rajas had any policy of forest conservation in ancient times; nor do we except that\textsuperscript{53}. But there is some evidence to believe that the Rajas were not very careless or liberal always to let their forests open for commercial exploitation. For ex; a British report dating back to the 1\textsuperscript{st} half of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century described one such instance as follows:

"Saul timber abounds in the forests of Dekanal, Hindole, Nursingpore, Talchier and Angool and the Madras Government have since 1842 drawn a portion of their supplies therefrom.xxx there is much difficulty in getting timbers of the dimension\textsuperscript{54} required by Government. The full-sized trees nearest to the rivers have disappeared and the Rajas do not evince a willingness to cut these in the more distant forests and require much persuasion to induce them to afford the procured".\textsuperscript{20}

Such reluctance is perhaps reflected again in the fact that the Raja of Narsinghpur agreed at that time to furnish only 50 numbers of Sal timber to the Madras Government during a particular season\textsuperscript{21} although there was no scarcity of such timber in his State forests.

It seems that some kind of silvicultural methods existed and were followed indigenously, if not to any considerable extent. For example, Hamilton describes how people of Hindol and some other areas succeeded in harvesting the best bamboos:

"XXX They grow near the summit of the rocks and spring in July when people who collect them, having selected the strongest shoots, tie them to stakes driven into the ground and thus direct their growth to the proper shape. In this manner they grow from 10 to 20 yards long by the setting in of the dry season when their tops are cut off. If suffered to stand longer, the hollow part increases and they become weaker".\textit{(Hamilton:1971)}\textsuperscript{26}

Forest Trade:

\textsuperscript{51} For ex; Raja Ananga Bhima Deva, the 12\textsuperscript{th} century Oriya ruler, is said to have sponsored roadside plantations.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{52} Travellers like Kittoe have described the existence of many fine topes in the Garjats.

\textsuperscript{53} Gajapati Kapilendra Deva ordered to maintain, in every village, specific areas of waste land as grazing grounds for the cattle and strictly prohibited reclamation of waste- and grazing lands(Mishra:1979)\textsuperscript{23}. The attitude behind this kind of arrangement was actually religious as the cow has been an animal of spiritual importance in India for centuries. We don't know if this policy of the paramount authority was also followed in the ancient Garjats, but in the Sambalpur zamindaris, no reclamation or encroachment of \textit{Gochar} (grazing land) was allowed even during the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, without the permission of the Dy. Commissioner\textsuperscript{24}.

\textsuperscript{54} More than 16’ in length & 24” in diameter.\textsuperscript{25}
"Many of the natives are iron smelters and charcoal burners; others make a livelihood by boat building and the felling of timber xxx" - this was the remark of Hamilton (1820) about the livelihood of the Garjat people.27

Some fifty years later, Hunter's report pointed out to the fact that though Sal trees were found in the Sukinda Estate, they had not been brought in quantity into the market, or made to contribute to the revenue. But the eastern jungles along the coast supported a good river trade in fire-wood and posts for cottage building (Hunter:1872)28.

In some parts of the Garjats, tassar silk was the most common forest product. Kittoe (1839) reported that lac insect was imported and propagated in the Narsinghpur State29. And tassar & lac, along with other forest products, were exported to the Mogulbandi areas from the Garjats30 in exchange of salt etc.30(I).

Wax, honey, timber, firewood and dammer were among the important articles of forest trade. The Circuit Committee Report (1784) describes how at Rayagada, then an important trading centre of the Jeypore kingdom, merchants from within the land with wheat, wax, dammer, jungle seeds, and jaggery etc. met with those from the low countries to exchange their produce with the latter's salt, honey and cloth etc.31

Even during 4th century B.C., an important trade of Orissa was that of the elephants. Elephants of Cylon were then of comparatively bigger size and had a greater demand in India. So the Raja of Kalinga used to purchase such elephants from Cylon and the Rajas of Central and North India used to procure them from Kalinga(Mishra:1979)32. However, Huen Tsang's accounts of Kongada tells us that the country produced 'dark wild elephants prized by the neighbouring countries'32(I).55

**Trees for boundary demarcation:** In many villages given as grants, the boundaries were often fixed by trees like Aswattha, Salmali, Arjuna, Tala & bamboos etc.33

**ERA OF SYSTEMATIC CONSERVATION (1872 AD--)**

In 1872, the Superintendent of Tributary Mahals, Orissa intimated the Garjat Chiefs about his concern over the destruction and lack of systematic management of their forest and urged the Rajas to take action against the same:

"The great and unnecessary destruction of valuable forest timber trees through the tributary mahals has been noticed by government. Experience has shown that in course of time, as civilisation & cultivation advance, serious inroads have been made on the heretofore uncleared forests and every year good timber fit for building purposes is becoming more scarce and more difficult to procure. This is not the only evil. Denudation of timber on the hills affects the climate of the country and also the rainfall as well as the fertility of the soil. Moreover, the great store of timber, whether provided by nature in these provinces is uselessly dissipated without any corresponding advantage accruing to Rajahs or people in this generation; and the next generation is

55 Interestingly enough, figure of a giraffe is found carved in the famous Konark temple(13th century A.D.) reminding of some international trade link of Kalinga.33(I)
moreover deprived of a valuable source of timber supply and eventually, if the destruction proceeds even fuel will become scarce.

In issuing this notice, Government has no desire to interfere in any way with the legitimate profits obtainable by the use or sale of timber by the proprietors of tributary Estates. On the contrary, Government desires to induce careful conservation of forests, so that timber may be allowed to reach maturity and its sale become a source of permanent income to the Rajahs and at the same time, benefit the country at large.

Following are the Chief causes of useless destruction of timber:

1st: - The habit of cutting and clearing large tracts of valuable forests for toila or temporary cultivation. These toila lands are only cultivated for two or three years when the land is exhausted and lapses into useless thicket and jungle. The profit derived from such cultivation is very small to the ryots and generally little or nothing to the Rajah or zamindar.

2nd: - The practice of giving pottahs or permitting sal forests to be girdled for the sake of procuring dammer, thousands of magnificent trees, worth, if sold as timber, very large sums, are annually destroyed to procure a few seers of dammer. It is well known that exaction of dammer does not necessitate destruction of sal trees, but that a good supply can be obtained by cutting merely a portion of the bark extended over not more that quarter of the girth of the tree, and in a few years the cut heals over and the tree is fit to yield resin; whereas if is girdled completely, the tree dies and no more resin can be obtained from it. Thus the zamindar loses his valuable timber for the present and also loses his revenue for the future. Every Rajah will in future prohibit the girdling of trees to produce the finest timber for extract of dammer.

3rd: - Among many of the hill tracts, some of the finest trees are felled to procure honey. The value of honey is only a few pice to the finder and the loss of a fine tree is irreparable to the Rajah. Felling trees for honey should be prohibited. A very little additional labour and pains would secure the honey, without damaging the tree. Besides sal timber, there are many other valuable woods such as teak, sisoo, koosoom, assun, abloos, & c; & c; which are similarly destroyed: in fact, the only trees preserved systematically are the jack, mowa and mango, and these are valuable not only for timber but for fruit.

The following rules are promulgated for the information and guidance of Garjat Rajahs:-

Toila cultivation should be brought under the Raja's supervision. There are already vast tracts of scant jungle previously cleared available for toila cultivation; with these Rajahs should not interfere or prevent cultivation; but in future no Rajah should permit any new land to be cleared on which good timber is growing. Those tracts most remote from villages and where fine timber exists, should be carefully set apart and the cutting of timber within
fixed limits should be strictly prohibited without the Rajah’s express permission; and this permission should only be given to cut trees which have attained a girth of not less than three cubits at a height of three cubits from the ground. All trees in the reserved tracts of smaller growth should be strictly preserved and not allowed to be cut until they obtain a girth of three cubits. This prohibition will no way affect the convenience of the people who can cut poles, posts and plough shares as heretofore in the unreserved jungle and toila lands,—any sort of trees but those ordered to be preserved in other lands”.34

That such instructions of the Government were followed to some extent is evident from the fact that during the famine of 1880s, some of the Chiefs had to relax their forest rules as a relief measure.35

In the Sambalpur group of States (i.e. Patna, Sonepur etc), which were then in the Central Provinces the question of forest conservation was raised in 1886, when the Divisional Commissioner of Chattisgarh drew the attention of the Political Agent to the advisability of setting aside and conserving waste lands in the States. The settlement of such lands was carried out in the course of settlement operations during 1887-90, but the operation of conserving waste lands was necessarily confined to hills and jungles which had not been in actual possession of any individual.36

In Ganjam zamindaries, early steps for forest conservation were taken some time during 1910 when the Rajas of Khallikote,Dharakote &Athagad (different from the Feudatory State of the same name) classified the forests into reserves & unreserves; and restricted rights therein.37

Conservation efforts began more effectively in the States which were then under Court of Wards, but at the same time the Government tried to pressurise the Garjat Chiefs in this direction. In 1892, for example, the Offg. Secretary to the Government of Bengal advised the Divisional Commissioner of Chot Nagpur and the Superintendent of Tributary Mahals (Orissa) to the following effect:

"XXX" The Chiefs XXX should be asked to strictly prohibit the felling of immature Sal trees having a girth (at four feet from the ground) of less than six feet as suggested by the Conservator.

The Lieutenant-Governor desires that no forest leases should be granted in any of the States under Government Management without the special sanction of the Government”.38

The British authorities also helped the States to devise the forest policy. The system adopted by the States was thus more or less similar to that of the British India. The work was more facilitated with the appointment of an Agency Forest Officer exclusively for the Garjats. It should be noted here that while framing the forest rules for these States, the British authorities never ignored the rights and privileges of the people. The result of such efforts is reflected in the following Statement of the Political Agent (1925-26):

"There appears to be a general awakening of interest in forest through out the
States and not the least satisfactory is that the people themselves appear to be beginning to realise the necessity of conservation and to be less opposed than they formerly were to the restrictions now being put on the uncontrolled use or rather abuse of the forests by themselves.\(^3\)

"(Samal:1988)

By 1940, the forest administration was running on well-defined principles.

A Draft Forest Policy was prepared in 1942 by the Government for the Eastern States and was sent to the Rajas inviting their views and concurrence. This draft resolution was based very largely on the Government of India resolution No. 22F of October 19, 1894, but had been modified in places to suit conditions in these States.\(^4\) In response, while most of the States agreed to the resolution, a few declined to make any comment while some others wanted the matter to be discussed at a conference of the representatives of the States.\(^5\)

The Eastern States Forest Committee was formed with the following members:
1. The Ruler of Patna State (Chairman)
2. The Ruler of Dhenkanal
3. The Ruler of Khairargarh
4. The Ruler of Khandapara
5. The Political Agent, Orissa States.\(^6\)

Their first meeting was held in 1943 at Sambalpur. The Committee found the draft resolution 'in objectionable' and recommended it to the States for adoption 'subject to those verbal alterations obviously necessary for the application of what is a general policy to particular States'.\(^7\)

The Draft Forest Policy will appear in box (p.89). Some important aspects of Garjat forest administration/policy will now be discussed in the following.

**Forest Classification:** The forests were classified into three types, viz reserved-, protected-, and village forests.

The term reserved forest practically meant what was called 'A' class reserve. Such forests were of high commercial as well as ecological value and were essentially demarcated. No rights were, in general, admitted in such forests which were locally known as *autak* or *zapti* jungles. The so-called 'Hill Reserves' of Mayurbhanj more or less belonged to this class.

The protected forests, otherwise known as 'B' class reserves, were such demarcated forests which were of comparatively lower value than the 'A' - Class ones, specially set aside to meet the bonafide demands of the right holders (i.e. cess payers). These forests were locally known as *rakshit* jungles and the 'Plain Reserves' of Mayurbhanj served their purpose.

On the other hand, the village forests (known as Khesra, 'open' or *bahar* jungles) were generally undemarcated though some of the rules applicable for the protected forests
also applied to the Khesra\textsuperscript{56}. But in some cases, village waste was not included in such forests.

However, exceptions also existed. For ex;

1. In Tigiria, there were no 'A' Class reserves after 1940.\textsuperscript{45}

2. In most of the zamindaries and in some of the ex-States, no 'B' Class reserves existed either for some time or for ever. In Patna, such reserves were introduced in 1928\textsuperscript{46}, but in Kalahandi State, no such forests ever existed\textsuperscript{47,48}. In Hindol, it was recommended during 1940-41 that such reserves should be created for the better management of State forests and the suggestion was implemented later.\textsuperscript{48}

3. In Pal-Lahra State, no village forests existed at least up to 1932. All such forests had been included in the protected forests\textsuperscript{49}. No village forest reportedly existed in the Ghens ex-Estate of western Orissa\textsuperscript{50} and in Khandapara State (1928-31), village jungles of 18003 acres existed separately in addition to the Khesra forests of 11023 acres.\textsuperscript{51}

\textbf{Timber Classification:-}

The timbers were classified by the common people according to their needs or uses; if a certain group was specified for the manufacturing of agricultural implements, some others were meant for construction of houses.

On the other hand, scriptures classified timbers according to various properties; for ex:- one classification divided timbers into 4 groups or castes (Brahmin, Kshyatriya, Vaishya & Sudra) taking into consideration their weight and other properties, as follows (Singha:1982):

Brahmin - Soft and lighter; easily attached to or fixed with other kinds of wood.
Kshyatriya : Lighter but hard; can't not be fixed easily.
Vaishya : Soft and heavy.
Sudra  : Hard and heavy.\textsuperscript{52}

Another classification was according to the shape as given below (Moharana:1934):

Male:- thicker at the lower end.
Female:- thicker at the upper end.
Intermediate: thicker in the middle .\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{56} Some times Khesra implied to undemarcated protected forests. As per the Forest Rules of Kalahandi State, Khesra was also a protected forest (undemarcated).\textsuperscript{44}
\textsuperscript{57} However, in the Forest Rules of Kalahandi State, we find a provision for what was called Demarcated Nistar Forests more or less corresponding to the 'B' Class reserves. So it seems that provision for such forest was there in principle, but could not be implemented perhaps.
\textsuperscript{58} As per the FECR, village forest existed in the Khariar Estate\textsuperscript{56}. But the last ruler of this Estate clarified to us that besides reserve forests, there were only large bush forests and thus, no village forest existed (officially).\textsuperscript{57}
The male variety was recommended for use as a post while the intermediate one was to be rejected for such use. The female variety was allowed only as a substitute for the male one.

Modern classifications were based on the commercial value and availability of timber. In some cases, the classification adopted initially was changed to some extent. For ex; in Patna, the classification adopted before 1907 contained Harida and Mohwa in Class-I while in 1928, these two were included in Class-II.

Similarly, the classifications adopted in Patna and the neighbouring State of Sonepur differed in the manner that in Patna, Bandhan was considered as Class-I timber while in Sonepur, it belonged to Class-II though both the classifications were contemporary.

Reserved Species:- In ancient times, people were generally restricted to cut certain fruit bearing trees etc. because of a different sensitivity and not simply because of the commercial value or utility of such trees. Fruit-bearing trees appeared to them some thing like a mother or a pregnant woman even if sub- consciously. Also, the under-tenants were not allowed to cut trees in the tenure-holders' area as they hardly possessed any occupancy rights.

The modern concept of reserved species was based on the following factors:
1. Commercial value
2. Girth consideration
3. Scarcity of a species
4. Utility as well as the traditional value.

The list of reserved species of one State did not necessarily match with that of any other State because of local variation of the above factors. Also, in some cases, the list of one period differed from that prepared a few years later, though both belonged to the same State. For ex; in Patna, the earlier list included Bheru and Sunari; but in the list adopted later, these two were excluded and Simul and Palas were added.

In one exceptional case, Kanta bamboo was included in the list of reserved species in Athmalik. Canes were also considered as reserved species in Tigiria.

Such species were locally known as autak, baran or jatia trees. Sometimes they were called prohibited species. In a few cases, however, the concept of protected species was also there in addition to that of the reserved species. In Bonai for ex., Mango was declared as a protected species as a result of which the tenant was prohibited from its felling without permission even if it belonged to his own holding. The felling was permitted for personal use only free of charge; but for sale, the tenant was liable to pay a royalty. The concept of reserved species was applicable, in principle, to the Protected and Khesra forests; but actually it extended to the cultivated holdings as well as homestead lands in most States.

Scientific Management:- In this regard, the following observation of the Supt. of Trib. Mahals in 1906 seems worth quoting:

---

59 For ex., in Bonai, Kendu trees over 18” in girth were considered as reserved species.
"The advent of railways has awakened the Chiefs to the present value of their timber, and a great many of the mature Sal trees, with many that were not mature, have been cut and sold for sleepers. There is a good reason to believe, however, that most of them received inadequate prices, and that the contractors were able to abuse their cupidity and ignorance to obtain immediate profits, while only a few of the most enlightened are working their forests on a system which purports to ensure renewal of the forests and continuance of the supply. I believe that I am justified in saying that of the States in which large timber contracts have been given, only in Moharbanj, Bamra, Bonai and some of the Gangpur zamindaries has due consideration been given to the conservation of the sources of supply. Even in these, however, I do not think that the working plans really rest upon the bases systematically ascertained with technical advice or that there is any sufficient assurance that the output can be permanently kept at its present level."  

By 1930-40, considerable progress had been made in this direction. And by 1947-48, while most of the zamindary forests were managed without any working plan, the case was opposite for the State or Khalsa forests i.e. most of the States were having such working plans except a few (for ex; Sonepur).

**Acts and Rules:** A few States (for ex; Khandapara) had their own Forest Acts; but off late. The Indian Forest Act IV of 1909 was extended to the State of Keonjhar in 1915, but the State promulgated its own Act in 1946.

The ex-State Forest Acts had their significance at least in two ways:

1. It reserved their sovereign status (for the ex-Estates had no power to enact their own Forest Acts).
2. It ascertained the right of the State (Darbar) over all kinds of forests.

The Forest Acts of Keonjhar, Khandapara and Gangpur did not have any direct provision for protected forests. These were similar to each other and were framed on the basis of Indian Forest Act,1927 except for a few provisions of the latter. For ex; Sections 10,31,32,80,81 & 86 of the IFA were absent in these Acts. Besides, a distinguishing feature of these ex-State Forest Acts was a special chapter on the zamindary forests.

In western Orissa, the Central Provinces Land Revenue Act was in force in the zamindaries of Borasambar, Bijepur, Ghens etc. In the undivided districts of Cuttack, Puri and Balasore, though forest rules existed in many zamindaries, no zamindary forest (excepting Dalijora) was reserved under the Indian Forest Act though the IFA was in force throughout these districts (excluding the ex-State areas).

In Ganjam, the Madras Forest Act was in force in some Estates like Dharakote, Athgarh, Khallikote and Parlakhemundi; but in many neighbouring zamindaries, either no such Act was in force or their forest rules had not been framed under this Act.

60 Thereby, the States took over the management of all/most of their private/zamindary forests. For ex; management of the Kaptipada Estate forests were taken over under the Mayurbhanj Forest Act, from 1st April 1944.
The difference between IFA and MFA has become a matter of controversy sometimes. For ex; the PEAEC recommended for introduction of the IFA, 1927 in Jeypore Estate in place of the existing MFA, as provisions of the latter Act were not adequate enough, in their opinion, to improve the condition of forest administration in this Estate. But it was refuted on behalf of the Estate saying that necessary provisions already existed in the MFA.71

However, it is quite evident that some sort of differences did exist. The MFA of 1882 was framed on the basis of IFA, 1878 incorporating in itself certain alterations considered suitable for the local conditions. One such difference lies in the fact that while the IFA, 1927 made provision for paying the net profit to a private owner in case the latter's forest was under the management of the Government, the MFA provided for management of private forests by the Government on a lease system instead of paying the net profit to the owner72. Further, as Sri. P.K. Deo, member of the FEC observed:

"I am in favour of the Madras Forest Act as, according to this Act, the onus of proof lies on the prosecutor to prove a person guilty of theft, in case certain forest materials are alleged to have been found with him; whereas in the Indian Forest Act, the very possession of some forest material with any individual pre-supposes that he has removed them from Government forests and the onus lies on him to prove that he is not guilty. Madras Forest Act is more scientific and judicious."(Deo:1959).73

These Acts did not usually describe the schedule of rates and number of reserved species etc. which were found in the Forest Rules. But many Forest Rules included nearly all the prescriptions of the Forest Acts. For ex; the Bonai and Bamra States' Forest Rules clearly defined the rights of zamindars and other such tenure-holders over the forests of their own area. Similarly, the Ranpur Forest Rule included regulations regarding stranded/drift timber.

Most of the States were having their own Forest Rules, the contents of which were more or less similar in their principle with a few exceptions. For ex;

1. Digging up of the roots of trees and cutting of young bamboo shoots (Karada) as well as of bamboos less than 18 months old, had been prohibited in the village forests of Narsinghpore and Athmallik as per their respective Forest Rules. But the Forest Rule of Patna State (1928) made no mention of the prohibition for the cutting of young bamboos/bamboo shoots though it prohibited digging up of the roots.

2. Forests Rules of some States allowed certain concessions for the manufacturers of catechu as well as for the cultivators of tassar, because both these people utilised some reserved species for their profession. But no such provision was found in the Forest Rule of Narsingpur (1933).

3. Bonafide residents were allowed for collection of honey and wax free of charge in the protected forests of Boud and in the Khesra forests of Baramba. In Boud, the cess payers were also allowed free removal of ghothing lime (genguti). But all
such provisions (found in the Forest Rules of the respective States) did not find mention in the Khandapara Forest Rule.

**Pro-People Policy:** The forest policy of the States was to be essentially pro-people as per Government instructions. The Rajas followed this policy according to their own interest and local conditions, and as such, the policy was implemented in three different ways:

1. Strict in restrictions, liberal in concessions (Parlakhemundi Estate).
2. More against the people (Athagad State).\(^74\)
3. The Raja was strict in allowing too much concessions but started various development projects (Patna State, 1942).\(^75\)

During the famine of 1880s, the Raja of Khandapara opened his forests and relaxed the forest rules to aid his people. The Raja of Athmallik employed people in cutting timber from the jungles for sale on their own account. In Hindol and Dhenkanal, to provide employment to the people, they were engaged in cutting and conveying the timber required for sleeper operations.\(^76\)

For some time during the early years of forest management in Gangpur, people were allowed reserved species free of charge with permission.\(^77\) Also in Sonepur (before 1907), there were certain species for which royalty was to be paid, but the ryots got them free, with permission, if the trees belonged to their villages and were to be felled for cultivation.\(^78\)

If the rules became less liberal for the people later, then it was because either the tenants took undue advantage of the concessions or the Raja was oppressive or he (Raja) tried to increase the forest revenue.

**Revenue:** The income from forests increased in the States considerably since the early years of this century. In this regard, the Political Agent observed (1935-36) that this did not mean that the forests were being over-exploited always:

> "The increased revenue is the result of the opening up of areas which had hitherto remained unworked, more complete utilisation of minor forest produce and higher royalty rates in granting sleeper contracts.(Samal:1988)"

The revenue from forests was considerably influenced by the following developments:
1. Sleeper operations
2. Accessibility to bigger markets
3. War supply
4. Industrial demands

Of these factors, the war supplies, though temporary in nature, proved themselves to be a boon for the Rajas. For ex; in 1944-45, the total forest revenue of Bonai State was about Rs. 200927/- from the regular sources, whereas the timber sold as war supply fetched Rs. 190000/- in the same year.\(^80\)
War supplies not only increased the demands for charcoal and soft wood, but also made many lesser known timber species quite valuable.\(^{81}\)

**Shifting Cultivation:** By 1906, practice of shifting cultivation had been totally prohibited in some States like Boud and Athmallik, while in some other States, it was allowed to a limited scale.\(^{82}\)

In Kalahandi, the Khonds practising only shifting cultivation were exempted from all taxes. But to encourage them to resort to permanent cultivation, no plough tax was charged on the agriculturist Khonds in the Khalsa while the same was being levied on them in the zamindaries.\(^{83}\)

In Bamra, the authorities allowed certain concessions to the Khonds and the Bhuyans & each family was given an acre of forest land for shifting cultivation\(^{84}\). But they were given free bullock, seeds and land without rent for 5 years or more when they agreed in 1940 to settle down to wet cultivation. Every year, the State spent 3 to 4 thousand rupees to provide them with many such facilities. Also, they were supplied free cloth.\(^{84(1)}\)

In some States, the toila lands were assessed with land rent and forest cess.

**Waste Land Reclamation:** For reclamation of waste land, permission was necessary in most States and even certain amount was being charged against the trees felled and/or as per the land value.

In Rairakhol, the Khonds were charged Re. 1 per man of the land reclaimed from jungles\(^{85}\). In Athamallik, Rs. 5 was being charged (later abolished) per acre of land reclaimed in Khesra\(^{86}\).

And, as per the Settlement Report of 1907-11, the ryot was given full authority to break up waste lands, but with permission, in Gangpur.

**Arbour day:** The earliest reference found about the Arbour Day observed in the Garjats dates back to 1938. It was generally observed in July, but was not a fixed date for the States. Each State chose a date for this purpose according to its convenience.

To encourage people to plant trees, various measures had been taken, for ex;

1. In Athamallik, where fruit-trees were assessed with a tax; on the instance of the Forest Advisor Mr. Mooney, no such tax was levied on trees planted on this Day and such trees belonged to the planter even if on waste land (Ramdhyanii:1947).\(^{87}\)

2. In 1939, the Maharaja of Patna visited a village area in spite of rain only to celebrate this day so that people would be encouraged to follow its message. \(^{88}\)

3. To observe this Day on 7-7-1944, Cashew nut seeds, Jack fruit seeds, Teak stumps and grafts of Mango, Lemon and Orange were distributed in Ranpur.\(^{89}\)
4. On 11-7-1940, all the schools, State- and private offices remained closed in Gangpur to let people observe this Day. Every male person was required to plant at least one tree and the planter was given full right on such trees.90

5. In Bonai, a procession consisting of the members of the tree planting association and other departmental people, marched throughout the town on 9th July, 1945 to observe this Day and 6200 trees were planted.91

6. In Dhenkanal, a special notification issued on 10-6-1940 by the State Chief Minister for this purpose advised the people to plant following particular trees in specific areas:

   Homestead lands as well as premises of schools and State buildings: Tun, Sissoo, Jack fruit, Neem, Jamun, Dimiri and bamboo etc.

   Fields near villages: Mahul, Mango and Bamboo
   Near cultivated lands: Gohira
   Near tanks : Gohira, Dimiri and Karanja
   Road sides : Banyan, Mango, Jack fruit, Karanja, Tun, Kusum, Sissoo etc.92

We don't have information about any such Day being observed in the Estates. But in Parlakhemundi, it is said that the Maharaja, while on his hunting expeditions, used to persuade the local people to plant trees.93

**Plantation and Afforestation:-** In the report given by Ramsay, mention has been made about the attempts of the Sonepur Chief to reforest some of the hilly areas, some time before 1907.94

Afforestation of Jarasingha forest in Saintala Range contributed to an increase of 229 acres in the total forest area of Patna State during 1941-42.95

The Arbour Day was utilised to increase plantations. Besides, the forest departments of some of the States were engaged in routine experimental plantation projects. In Bonai, the biggest and the most successful of the plantations was that at Tada where Bandhan, Bija, Gambhari and Champ had been planted over five acres.96

Plantations of special kind were of Tung Oil (Bonai)97, Sabai grass (Mayurbhanj) and Sandal-wood etc.

It had been the traditional interest of many Rajas to plant Sandal trees and a traveller to Ganjam district in the early decades of 20th century has described to have seen a 'forest' of Sandal trees somewhere around the Badakhemundi Estate.98

In Patna, Sandal sowing had been done in the Matkai Reserve by 191599. In modern Mayurbhanj, Sandal was introduced sometime during 1928-30 and a plantation thereof existed in at Pithabata100. In Kenojhar, no natural Sandal forest apparently existed and these trees were planted in the premises of Sri Baldevjiu temple (capital town), Sri Kushaleswar temple (Deogaon) and also at few other places.101
Sandal plantations also existed in Parlakhemundi and Jeypore Estates. Raja Ramachandra Deo (1860-1889) and his son Vikram Deo arranged for such plantations in the Naketi (Nakei) hills and also at other places of the Jeypore Estate.\textsuperscript{102}

However, traditional plantations like Mango topes were not altogether stopped. Raja Natabara (1866-1905) of Khandapara continued the Nandankanan tope project of his predecessor Raja Kunjabihari (1854-66) and it is said that the tope contained about 18000 trees of Mango and Jack-fruit\textsuperscript{103}. In Rairakhol, a Mango tope of 100 trees was planted departmentally on 11-7-1943 (Arbour Day)\textsuperscript{104}.

An inter-State afforestation project is said to have been undertaken sometime in 1946-47 as a measure against flood. Initiated by Mooney, the project aimed at planting trees along the side of river Tel which passes through the ex-States of Kalahandi, Patna, Boud and Sonepur. Accordingly, Cassurina, Sissoo, Cashew, Cassia & Teak etc. were planted at Chelechila near Dharamgarh in Kalahandi; but the project could not be continued further probably due to the merger of these States.\textsuperscript{105}

**Grazing:** The situation in this regard was not uniform throughout the Garjats. For ex., as per a report of 1937:

- In Anandpur area of Keonjhar, grazing facilities were not very satisfactory.
- In Nayagarh State, cultivation was so well developed (extensive) that very little or no pasture ground was left for grazing.
- In Narsinghpur State, grazing was mostly confined in Khesra. Though it was allowed in the RFs, people did not usually send their cattle to the reserves due to the remoteness of the latter.\textsuperscript{106}

Allocation of grazing areas was sometimes controlled by certain regulations. For example, the 1936 forest rules of Rairakhol State clearly mentioned that each buffalo should be allocated a grazing ground of 3 acres and each cow / bullock, 2 acres.

**Forest Industry:**

As part of the increasing realisation of the value of forest produce, attempts were made in some ex-States/Estates to establish processing or industrial units based on such produce for better utilisation of the same.

In Jeypore Estate, a saw mill was started at Mattupada when the Estate was under Court of Wards. Later, Maharaja Vikram Deo III established another saw mill and there was even a factory for extraction of \textit{Tol} oil.\textsuperscript{107}

During the reign of Maharaja Sri Ram Chandra Bhanja Deo, a big saw mill was established at Bangiriposhi in the Mayurbhanj State\textsuperscript{108}. A seed lac factory was opened at Rairangpur in 1935, but the factory had to close down when the lac trade declined from 1943-44\textsuperscript{109}. There also existed a wood distillation plant in this State.\textsuperscript{110}

\footnote{61 Sri H.K. Patnaik, then an officer of the Orissa Forest Dept., visited this area in 1976 and found at least 2222 trees existing as remains of that plantation. But the flood of 1977 destroyed the plantation considerably.}
Small saw mills - many of which came into being with war - were operating at Hemgir, Bisra, Khandapara, and also at Rupra (Kalahandi) and Harisankar Road (Patna).111

In Bamra, the 'Tay Wood Works Factory' at Govindpur was producing axe, pick-helves, packing cases, bobbins and other textile products. Manufacture of first two products were discontinued during 1944-45 because of no demand.112

There was also a proposal to erect a ply-wood factory in Kalahandi State(1940s)113. And in Patna, a hand-made paper factory was working under the forest department.114

**Jurisdiction of Forest Department:-**

Ramdhyani said in his report that jurisdiction of the forest department of Orissa and Chattisgarh States was wide enough115. Our studies also support this statement to some extent, for ex.,

1. In Bamra, the forest rule contained provision for taxation on agricultural produce to be exported as well as on iron-ware and furniture.116
2. In Nilgiri, 'cattle department' (Veterinary department ?) was maintained by the forest department(SECR:1939).117
3. In Athagarh State, forest officials including forest guards were given wide powers of search, arrest and prosecution(SECR:1939).118
4. In Rairakhhol(1943-44), improvement of communities, water-supply & the village development of the State were maintained through the forest department62.119
5. In Boud,(1943-44), the State Tannery Dept. as well as the Geological survey operations were being supervised by the forest department.120

But no evidence has been found to show that these observations were valid for all the States. It may also be noted that lack of alternative arrangement was a factor behind the increased jurisdiction of forest department as it was not possible for all the States to maintain a separate department for each State work.

It may be reminded here that nearly all other policy aspects of the by-gone era more or less continued to exist in the era of conservation. Reclamation of wastelands was, according to the Asst. Settlement Officer of Pal-Lahra State, very necessary in the State and to facilitate the process, the officer recommended for separation of village forests from the protected forests121. In Bonai, reclamation was more important than the opening of 'B' class reserves, by 1940-41122. The only policy of previous era that the gradually lost its importance was the defence -oriented one.

---

62 Against a total receipt & expenditure of Rs. 71436 & Rs. 34614 respectively of the forest dept. ,Rs. 4832 was spent for village development by the latter(1943-44).123
CASE STUDIES

I. KEONJHAR :

Policy history: In ancient times, no forest rule or restriction is said to have existed in this ex-State. Still the hill people who had been traditionally destroying forests more than any other residents of the State for shifting cultivation or dahi chasa, had at least some common sense that helped against the total destruction of trees of the area:

"Shifting cultivation started in the month of February or March XXX. The trees were felled, bushes were cleared. A few trees were left standing on the fields to provide fruits and shade in summer season. XXX number of bigger trees were left standing to support the fruit and vegetable bearing creeps. Only branches of these trees were lopped off".124

In the abandoned toila land, the Bhuyans planted some fruit bearing trees. They preferred to plant their favourite Jackfruit trees in abandoned village areas, Fruits of the Mango trees which they planted close to the nallas and streams near their abandoned villages, were first offered to various deities and then enjoyed as a common property. Such mangoes were called Jharana sudhi. Also, their tradition was against clearing forests for the purpose of digging wells and ponds.125

Supply of timber to meet various requirements of the Royal palace and the State festivals were being administered under two special designations, viz, the Katho Bissoyee and the Gadmajhi. The former usually belonged to the general caste and his area of supervision was mostly the plains of Keonjhar126. The Gadmajhi, who was in the charge of the hilly country, belonged to the caste of non-tribal Hindus for sometime; but in 1860s, two Bhuyan Gadmajhis were appointed127. Timber required for annual car festival at the capital was removed from different jungle areas instead of one particular area. Different villages were asked to supply this timber from their nearby forests; if one village supplied timber for one wheel of the car, then another supplied timber for some other particular part. The timber thus removed was brought for technical verification by the Ratha Moharana who was to confirm if it suited the purpose128. Significantly, the chariot or car, instead of being manufactured every year, was rather being constructed in every two years, thereby saving some trees.

Another custom was that after his coronation ceremony, the new Raja used to ask the Bhuyan chiefs present about the condition of their forests and livelihood129. We however do not know if this custom was started after 1892.

In 1870, Captain Johnstone pointed out that the Keonjhar forests were being damaged due to three reasons:

1. Ringing trees for the sake of resin
2. Shifting cultivation
3. Forest fire.130

By 1885-86, the Maharaja (Dhanurjay Bhanja) had prohibited the cutting of timber trees for export & the forests had not been leased out by that time131. He introduced
in 1896 certain rules to govern the disposal of forest produce which took effect from 1st April in lower Keonjhar and from a latter date in upper Keonjhar. These rules were to prevent indiscriminate felling of *Kamasara* (valuable or 1st grade) timber (Mishra:1932). The Maharaja also opened a small department for regulating export and realising fees.

Prior to that, the tenants of the State used to get their requirements free from any part of the State, provided they exercised their rights within a radius of 4 miles from their homes in case of larger villages and two miles in case of smaller villages. Permission was necessary for taking forest produce from forests situated at a greater distance.

Except in lower Keonjhar and some parts of Upper Keonjhar, where the new rules were in force, people paid no tax for firewood or timber for domestic / agricultural uses as the condition of these people was not such as to warrant the levy of extra fees over their land rent.

The Boula forests of Anandpur sub-division are said to have suffered more than any other forests of the State from the policy of economic exploitation. Under a system known as Ghati, the contractors purchased the right to sell the forest produce from a certain area of forests each year, in the Boula area. Permits were issued to outside purchasers to procure forest produce according to their requirement. This forest was also affected by sleeper operations during mid- & late 1890s.

In 1906, Mr. B. Borah took a lease of forests, but without effecting the lease himself, he disposed his rights to the Bengal Timber Trading Company which began its operations in 1910:

"The lease did not contain any clause relating to proper management of the forests or to the economic conversion of timber; the exploitable girth was 5 feet; but there was no limit set to the number of trees to be felled in any one year or during the period of contract. For twenty years the work went on in full swing with little regard to the capacity of the forests. The result XXX was that the forest was stripped XXX, in many instances, to a pole crop."  

While the State was under the Government management (Court of Wards) since 1907, work of selecting forests for reservation was taken up. But the progress was slow for some time and when the Agency Forest Officer visited Keonjhar in 1911, it was pushed on and completed in 1924.

The selection and demarcation of the protected forests were taken up at the close of the settlement in 1915 and completed not long afterwards.

---

63 The Prajatantra (dtd. 16-12-1929) reported that about 300 acres of land in the Boula RF had been alienated to some 'selfish' Koles of Singhbhum area for reclamation purposes showing the reason to the AFO that these persons belonged to flood-affected areas (which was, in fact, not true). This resulted in a conflict between the forest dept. and the Nayabadi dept., but the Dewan appeared to be acting against the forest department.
Since 1940, extra feelings were being made to meet the urgent demands of the Defence Department as a result of which the cream of some forests was removed from the accessible areas. 140

A few years before merger, certain remarkable change in the forest policy of the State took place. Forestry was no longer regarded as a watertight compartment, but as one of the several facets of the complex problem of land utilisation:

"In pursuance of that policy, emphasis is being laid on protective forestry, typical examples in this case being the reservation of the Bhuyan pирh64 and the afforestation of the sand-inundated areas in the Anandpur Sub-division"141.

Land reclamation: - It is said that Dhanurjay Bhanja used to give areas of scrub jungle for reclamation, to the local people and received considerable revenue in lieu of that142. According to Ramdhynani, the forest officer was being consulted for land reclamation if there was some forest growth and the reclaimer had to pay royalty for the trees on this land and also some additional amount as salami if the area was large or valuable (Ramdhynani:1947)143.

Forest Area and Classification: - The forests were classified as in the following:

'A' Class reserves: 1143 sq.km.
'B' Class reserves (DPF) : 264 sq.km.
Khesra or village forests : 210 sq.km..
Total area of the State was 8018.64 sq.km.144

Reserved Species: As per the Settlement Report for 1305 Amli year (i.e. 1898 A.D.), following species were declared prohibited:

Sal Mahanimba
Piassal Tentuli
Sissoo Kusuma
Kendu Mohul
Bandhan Mango
Gambhari Panas
Asan Harida
Kuruma Bahada

Later, 27 species were notified as reserved species145:

Sal Harida Bandhan Char
Piassal Bahada Kangra Dhou
Sissoo Anla Jamun Toon
Kendu Mango Swam Kochila
Gambhari Tentuli Sarap
Kurum Mohul Bheru
Kusum Jack Arjun
Asan Khair

64 Accordingly, there were two 'A' Class RFs & one 'B' Class RF in the Bhuyan Pirh area. No RF was constituted in the Juanga Pirh.1470
Timber Classification:
Class I:- Sal, Piasal, Sisoo, Bandhan, Kendu, Gambhari, Toon, Mahanimba.
Class II:- Bheru, Kangra, Asan, Harida, Khair, Mohul, Mango, Kusum, Rohini.
Class III:- All others.¹⁴⁶

Scientific Management:-
By 1930, working plans both for protected and reserved forests had been prepared¹⁴⁷. Mooney's working plan came into force from the 1st April 1930, and some significant progress were achieved in the systematic management of reserved forests. However, having not been based upon a proper inventory of the growing stock, his plan contained some errors as a result of which considerable area of unproductive scrub jungle, which should have been excluded for yield calculation, was put into the High Forest Working Circle in the Rebna - Kalapat blocks¹⁴⁸. Efforts were made later to avoid such errors and the working plan for 1945-46, which was prepared by Mr. A.B. Lal, Offg. Forest Officer of Keonjhar State, marked, according to Mooney himself, 'not only a decided advance in forest management in Keonjhar State, but was a landmark in the progress of technical Forestry in the Eastern States. It was the first working plan to be based on a satisfactory scientific data¹⁴⁹.

Shifting Cultivation:
To what extent the shifting cultivation was allowed in Keonjhar can be ascertained from the fact that the Bhuyans and the Juanga people, who were the most important tribal races of the State, were not restricted to fell the prohibited species in their area for some time. Settlement Report for the year 1898 said:

"The prohibitory orders for felling valuable timber could not be extended to the hills inhabited by the Bhuyans and Juangas, who XXX live chiefly on toila cultivation XXX".¹⁵⁰

For a considerable period of time, the Bhuyan and Juang Pirhs did not have their forests reserved. Although some nominal restrictions as to the area within the limits of which they were entitled for shifting cultivation, did exist; still they did not seem to have been interfered much in this practice for a number of years even after the rules of 1898 came into force.

By 1936-37, more than 500 sq. miles of the State were under shifting cultivation¹⁵¹. But to encourage the Bhuyans to resort to some alternate profession, the contractors working in the Bhuyan Pirh area were asked by the State to must employ the Bhuyans. Also, the latter were allowed to extract and sell timber in the plains at very reduced rates of royalty¹⁵² (a depot was specially allotted to them in the capital town for this purpose¹⁵³).

Organisation Of The Forest Department:-

In 1898, the work started with one head mhdrir, two mhdrirs and eight peons. In 1901, the staff was increased by one mhdrir and seven peons.
In 1906, a Dehradun trained Ranger was appointed and it was due to him that the department could be placed on an organised basis.\textsuperscript{154}

\textbf{Plantation:}

The important plantations of the ex-State were of Sissoo and Casurina in the sand-inundated areas of Hatibandha and Lunia-patna.\textsuperscript{155} The Casurina project failed and was replaced by Sissoo.\textsuperscript{156} These Sissoo plantations were a big success and even attracted departmental visitors from outside.\textsuperscript{157}

\textbf{Revenue:-}

In the year 1907-08, the forest revenue of the State was Rs. 28227/-.\textsuperscript{158}

The annual receipts and expenditures vis a vis forests of the State for the years 1944-45 and 1945-46 were as follows:\textsuperscript{159}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Year & Receipt & Expenditure \\
\hline
1944-45 & Rs. 247885 & Rs. 79926 \\
1945-46 & Rs. 382047 & Rs. 83780 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{II. GANGPUR}

\textbf{Policy History:-} It seems that foundation for a systematic management of forests in the Gangpur ex-State was laid during the settlement of Mr. Hewitt, the then Divisional Commissioner of Chota Nagpur, in 1882-83. Though the details of this settlement are not known, a study of the proposed rules for Gangpur found in the British records of 1892 reveals that Mr. Hewitt's arrangements must have been a very simple one. The proposed rules contained the following provisions:

1. Restriction on the felling of certain species.
2. In each village, if the jungle was large, part of it should be RF and part URF.
3. Ryots of Khalsa bordering zamindaris but not having jungles for their domestic use, could get their requirements from the neighbouring jungles of zamindaries and vice versa.
4. Unreserves should be selected as near as possible to villages and RFs as far away as possible.
5. To declare reserves/unreserves, the Raja should consult village headmen, etc.
6. No ryot or Gauntia could sell any tree, bamboo or grass to any one without the permission of the Raja. (etc)\textsuperscript{160}

The Raja opened his forests for sleeper operations and granted regular leases for a term of years on specified terms, but little or no provision was made for the proper management of forests by limiting the number of trees should be cut. The wholesale tapping of Sal trees for resin is also believed to have commenced about this time (1890-1900).\textsuperscript{161} As a result, by 1907, the forests were recklessly exploited on all sides.\textsuperscript{162} Political Agent Mr. Cobden - Ramsay who visited Gangpur some time before 1907, has described the attitude of the Raja in his report as follows:

"The Raja informed me that at present he does practically nothing to reserve any area as forest. Here and there, he says he has reserved a small
area but hopes at the time of coming settlement to set aside definite areas as reserved forests. At present he does not appear to have gone in into the question and considered what areas should be reserved and what are his actual rights to do so as against the villagers; the question is one not free from difficulty.

The Raja informed me that ringing of trees for resin (dhona) had been forbidden.

Then the settlement of 1907-11 began and the forests, which had been reserved by the Chief at the beginning of the survey operations, were later found to be useless, in most cases, for the purpose of reservation and were therefore turned into Khesra. However, at the advice of MR. A.N. Grieve, the Agency Forest Officer from 1911-15, a policy was followed for closing the overworked forests strictly so as to give them some opportunity to recover from the abuse they had been subjected.

Arrangements for fire protection had been made since 1908. In 1920, the Gangpur Forest Rules were published under the direction of the then AFO. The next milestone was reservation of certain blocks for the sake of tenants. The work began after 1926 and by 1930, 39 blocks of B- class reserves had been created.

There were plenty of Kusum and Ghant trees in the State, but owing to the defective lease, no seed of Lac was virtually left by the lessee. To propagate and develop Lac production, liberal loans and seed Lac were given to ryots in the 1920s and other facilities were also granted to them. The result of this encouraging attempt was excellent.

The exaction of forest underlings had been so great that since the settlement of 1907-11, the sugarcane cultivation had gone down in the State Khalsa for want of fencing materials. In 1934, the Superintendent of Gangpur State took personal interest to get the cultivators free supply of such materials as a result of which sugarcane cultivation increased considerably.

**Zamindary Forests:** The zamindary forests were managed by their own staff. However, the promulgation of Gangpur State Forest Act of 1946 placed these forests under the control of the Darbar while maintaining the zamindars' right to the revenue.

In Nagra, demarcated forests had been reserved prior to the settlement of 1911. Ramsay reported that Lac cultivation in this Estate was virtually killed when the zamindar imposed tax of Re. 1 per tree. However, his successor tried to revive it by reducing the tax by 50 to 75 percent.

In Hatibari, the proprietor worked his forests himself and paid the contractor for cutting sleepers at 0-8-0 per sleeper on the condition that the tree to be cut should produce at least two sleepers. The benefit of this condition however could not be available to the forests much as the contractor, instead of selecting trees of a girth suitable for the standard size of two sleepers, gave more importance to the fact that

---

65 Ramsay however found that it was still carried on.

66 or half a Rupee. See Appendix-1.
the number of sleepers to be produced per tree should be maintained irrespective of the standard size and as a result, remarked Ramsay, many such so called sleepers were actually fit for only door jambs and not for even light railway. 174

But the most significant achievement was in the Hemgir zamindary. Prior to 1913, there was no semblance of forest conservancy in this Estate although some rules had been made to govern the disposal of forest produce. Before the introduction of such rules, tenants were paying the plough tax in lieu of their requirements and outsiders had been permitted to remove and export as much timber they liked on payment of three maunds of rice to the zamindar. And the forests had suffered considerably because of economic exploitation, shifting cultivation and other factors 175.

The selection and demarcation of the reserved forests was taken up sometime by 1910 67. When MR. Grieve visited the Estate in 1913, he advised the zamindar to take strict measures to save the over - exploited forests. He advocated a policy of strict closure to felling of all green trees and drew up a scheme for the felling of bamboo 68 on a 3 -year cycle. 176

Not only the suggestions of Mr. Grieve, but those of his successors were sincerely followed as a result of which Hemgir was able to maintain and improve its forests to such an extent that it virtually achieved a district position and glory vis a vis its forests. The sincerity of the Hemgir zamindars is evident from the following remarks of Mr. H.F. Mooney who visited the area in 1941:

"I am particularly pleased to report that vigorous action has been taken up by the zamindar on my last report". 177

**Forest area and classification:**

The forests were classified as ‘A’ class reserves, B’ class reserves (DPF) and Khesra.

According to the Settlement Report of 1929-36, the area of forests in Khalsa was as follows:
Reserved forest: 165933 acres
Protected forest: 42085 acres (including 1150 acres of Birbira Khorposh). 178

A more recent picture is available from the working plan for 1925-45 179:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Area in sq. miles</th>
<th>Area of reserved forest in sq. miles</th>
<th>Percentage of reserved forests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khalsa</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarapgarh</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargipalli</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemgir</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagra</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatibari</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 Thirty five blocks had been declared as reserved forests under the Indian Forest Act of 1878 by 1908-09. 181
68 Bamboo formed an important source of revenue in the Estate.
Reserved Species: As per the proposed rules of late 19th century, following species were restricted:

1. Mohwa, Harida and Bahada
2. Phainsi, Bandhan, Kusum, Kurum, Gambhari and Kuhwa of less than 4 cubit in circumference.
3. Sal, Bija, Kendu, Rohini and Sissoo of circumference less than a cubit.\(^{180}\)

Later, the following 25 species were declared reserved\(^{182}\):

Sal    Harida    Sunari
Sissoo  Bahada    Tentuli
Bija    Jamun    Char
Teak    Karanj    Panas
Bandhan Khair    Aam
Gambhari Kochila    Mohul
Kendu    Kurum    Palas
Arjun    Kusum
Asan    Rohini

The list was however reduced to the following 10 species by 1939.\(^{183}\)

Sal    Mohul    Bandhan    Sunari
Bija    Kusum    Harida
Sissoo  Khair    Asan

Classification of Timber:-

The rules of 1920 gave the following classification:\(^{184}\)

Class I: - Teak, Sal, Bija, Bandhan, Sissoo, Gambhar, Kendu
Class-II: - Asan, Arjun, Karam, Karaj, Kusum, Jamun, Khair, Dhamun, Rohini,
       Tentuli and Mohul.
Class III: - All others.

Scientific Management:-

The forests were managed as per working plans. The first working plan was effective from 1925-26.\(^{185}\) The forests of Hatibari, Nagra and Hemgir were also having working plans for them.

Shifting Cultivation:-

The Pab and Dhanuars were allowed to practice shifting cultivation in the unreserves, but were not allowed to fell the reserved species, as per the proposed rules of late 19th century.\(^{186}\) However, it is said that they were required in Hemgir zamindary at least to plant trees in specified areas\(^{187}\).
Plantation:

No regular plantation work was prescribed in the 1925 working plan. Between 1935 and 1940, some experimental work was done with Tung tree, but the results being not encouraging, the project was dropped. However, a Sissoo plantation had been tried at Chirubeda and there were some teak plantations in Hemgir at Bileimunda, Tumlia & Gopalpur etc.

Organisation of forest department:-
There was no forest department before 1908-09. One clerk had been employed to collect forest cess and one inspector was later appointed to collect royalty on sleepers. In 1891, one man was appointed at Rajgangpur to issue permits for house timber and collect export duties on lac, myrobalans etc. A few years later, some clerks were appointed to collect forest cess and grazing fees and in 1901, an untrained man - designated forester - was appointed with 8 forest guards under him. The department was organised gradually with the appointment of two Range Officers in 1908-09.

Revenue:-
1. Khalsa: The forest income amounted to Rs 28018/- in 1907-08. Following statement shows the revenue and expenditure for five years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1943-44</td>
<td>235674</td>
<td>32340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944-45</td>
<td>298545</td>
<td>47789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>306277</td>
<td>65629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>312764</td>
<td>75764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>315955</td>
<td>92525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Hemgir:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>28808</td>
<td>4949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-41</td>
<td>35030</td>
<td>3605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-42</td>
<td>53162</td>
<td>7576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942-43</td>
<td>82354</td>
<td>9826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-44</td>
<td>74294</td>
<td>18854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. RANPUR

Policy History:-The forests of Ranpur State were mostly concentrated in what was called the Mal region. A head man known as Mal Sirdar was the in-charge of this region, but he belonged to a higher caste. And a class of special tenure-holders - the Kath jagirdars - had been appointed on service tenure to supply firewood to the State temple (and palace?)

The forest lands reclaimed by the early Rajas of Ranpur have been known as Sankha Chakra Bati(Baliyarsingh:1988).
By 1900, there was no organisation for Forest Department in Ranpur and data on the 19th century situation is also quite insufficient:

"It appears that some sort of rules existed, but what, these can not be ascertained as no records exist".  

Still we have found evidence that by 1885-86, the Raja had taken certain preliminary steps to prohibit indiscriminate destruction of his forests as mentioned in the letter of the Superintendent of Tributary Mahals, dated 28th May, 1885:

"I have the honour to report XXX that the Rajah of Ranpore has submitted for sanction a proposal for limiting toila cultivation with a view to protect the valuable forests in his State. The proposals are, first, that a certain portion of jungle should be set apart and the toila cultivation confined to it; second, that the area so set apart should be equal in acreage to three times the area annually brought under toila cultivation; third, that one third of the land so set apart should be assessed, so that while a third is cultivated, two-thirds will be left to recover its productive powers. XXX" 

This proposal of the Raja of Ranpur was considered as a milestone towards conservation of forests in the Orissa Tributary Mahals. The Government not only sanctioned it, but also observed:

"XXX if these arrangements are found to work satisfactorily in the Runpore State, you should press them upon the attention of the Chiefs of the other Tributary States.XXX". 

This way the work began and by that year (1885-86), a code of rules had been framed & promulgated for the purpose of forest management and the boundaries of the reserved forest had been defined & 'demarcated'. As per the Settlement Report of 1900, the forest area then was about 45,000 acres. People were allowed to collect bamboos, fuel and creepers free of charge from these forests and in undemarcated reserves, cattle were allowed grazing. The sale of timber was regulated by permits and no green timber was reportedly sold.

In 1897-1900, Sal tree lease was executed by a contractor in the Mal and Patia areas for sleeper operations and he cut trees upto 4.5' girth causing great depletion.

Upto 1918, forests were managed by the police department. In 1918, the forest department started working, but permits were still issued by the ruler himself. The Ranpur State Forest Rules had been effective since 1917.

In 1929, when the Agency Forest Officer Mr. Mooney visited Ranpur, he suggested for demarcation of reserves and several other things. Accordingly, some preliminary steps were taken, but actual survey began in 1942. Still by 1945-46, the existing RFs, 

---

69 According to the Superintendent, these proposals 'being good, need no sanction'.

70 But the Ranpur Working Plan of Mathur says that forests were declared as reserves without demarcation.
though demarcated, had not been formally declared reserved awaiting the Political Agent's approval.  

Trees were first marked in 1939-40 and during that period, the first coupe was open. The price obtained for the coupes was unsatisfactory in the beginning, but gradually showed improvement. But by 1945-46, the felling operations in these coppice coupes were still far from satisfactory probably because the purchasers got the felling work done on contract basis.

The policy was not very favourable to contractors always. Felling and logging was done by axe only even upto 1945-46. One C.N Banerjee was granted a 3-year lease for working 800 sal trees per year in the Mal block with effect from 1942. Mr. Mooney visited the State in October 1944 and finding the work of Mr. Banerjee unsatisfactory, suggested for cancellation of the contract which was followed. Regarding this, the Chief Forest Advisor observed:

"The chief reason for the failure of Mr. Banerjee has been the lack of sawyers. There are no local sawyers and he was not permitted to recruit sawyers from any other State. The climate of the Mal area is very malarious and no sawyers would go to work there". 

The person, who was given the contract, later had to cart the logs to Chandpur and then to saw them up, which was very expensive and the CFA remarked “I doubt if this contractor either would get any profit”.

According to Ramdhynani, protected forest did not include cultivated holdings in Ranpur(Ramdhynani:1947).

For land acquisition (rules of 1882) for public purposes, the holder was given a notice and if there was a building, he was supplied land as well as free timber / bamboo from State forests. Compensation was also payable for the fruit trees on homestead lands(Ramdhynani:1947).

Forest Area and Classification: By 1944-45, total forest area of the State was estimated to be 126 sq. miles of which the area of 'A' Class RFs was 65 sq. miles.

However, the Settlement Report of the ex- State gives the following data:

'A' class reserves: 48260 acres.
'B' class reserves: 4000 acres.
Khesra forests: 16500 acres.

Reserved Species: Total 32 in number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sal</td>
<td>Panas</td>
<td>Suam</td>
<td>Tinia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piasal</td>
<td>Kainya</td>
<td>Asan</td>
<td>Arjun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sissoo</td>
<td>Harida</td>
<td>Kurum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandhan</td>
<td>Bahara</td>
<td>Jamun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambhari</td>
<td>Anla</td>
<td>Sidha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khair</td>
<td>Mahul</td>
<td>Kasi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aam</td>
<td>Neem</td>
<td>Palas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By a notification of 1941, all other species were disreserved except Sal, Piasal, Mohul, Bandhan, Kusum, Kochila, Khair, Jamun and Phasi.217(I)

**Classification of Timber:**
Class-I : Sal, Piasal, Sissoo, Kangra, Gambhari, Bandhan and Kendu.
Class-II:- Aam, Ghoralanja, Kurum, Jamun, Kochila, Sunari, Arjun, Suam, Mahul, Panas, Kusum, Khair, Sidha, Asan, Gund'i, Bheru, Tinia, Harida and Bahara.
Class-III:- All other species except those mentioned above.218

**Scientific Management:**

Improvement feelings were carried out in part of the area worked over for Sal between 1940 and 1945. Though this operation was neglected in 1945-46, still it was successful.219

Mutually opposite information is available regarding cultural operation. Mathur’s working plan for Ranpur forests (prepared in 1946) denies of any such operation having been undertaken:

"The trees have been retained to serve as seed bearer or for future supplies of big timber for agricultural requirements and house consumption".220

On the other hand, Administration Report of Ranpur State (1944-45) says that cultural operations were done.221

One thing is however clear that fire protection arrangements were being made222.

**Shifting cultivation:-**

Toila was prohibited in the reserves and the protection afforded to Mal area by prohibition of toila since 1900 gave good results.223

However, permission for toila was available for some time in the unreserves. The Khonds of Mal area practised shifting cultivation and only gave some produce and service in lieu of that224. In 1929, it was recommended not to give any more permission for toila225, but Ramdhyaní’s report indicates that the Khonds continued their practice and perhaps toila was still allowed somehow even in the 1940s though it was a rule that no reserved species could be cut in any toila land even if toila was permitted by the ruler226.
Except the Khonds of the Mal area, toila practised in other parts of the State was not of shifting kind. People were allowed to practice a kind of temporary cultivation known as Uthibati in the bush forests of their village area.

As per rule, such lands were subject to annual assessment.

**Plantation:**

A teak plantation was raised in the year 1942-43 at the suggestion of the CFA in the Mal block near the village Lakmudi, to convert the useless forest there into valuable teak forests.

Between 1942 and 1946, 14 hectares were planted at a cost of Rs. 443/-. The number of plants planted was 1762 in 1943-44 and 3000 in 1944-45 and the growth was promising. However, there were no plants for stumping in 1947 and further plantations had to wait for one year.

**Staff (1944-45):**

Forest Officer - 1  
Deputy Ranger - 1  
Trained Forester - 1  
Untrained Forester - 2  
Naka Moharir - 2  
Forest Guard - 16

**Revenue:**

In 1885-86, the forest revenue was Rs.2896-7-0.

The income for two financial years was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1943-44</th>
<th>1944-45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>Rs. 12102</td>
<td>13027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewood</td>
<td>3636</td>
<td>8405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo</td>
<td>3698</td>
<td>5902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFP</td>
<td>18787</td>
<td>14794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horns &amp; hides</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. &amp; other sources</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure for 1943-44 and 1944-45 was Rs. 9533/- and Rs. 8960 respectively.

7 Coppice coupes of total area of 280 acres were sold for Rs. 5970/- in 1944-45 whereas 5 coupes with an area of 190 acres were sold for Rs. 1929 in 1943-44.

---

71 As per a report of 1937, people used to lop branches of trees and burn them on their fields. Such kind of lopping was sometimes done also in the RFs.

72 In fact, there was a demand by the Ranpur Prajamandal to reduce toila cess.
IV. GHUMSUR

Policy History:- It is quite difficult to trace out the forest policy and administration of the Ghumsur Rajas as no systematic forest policy was practised in those days and also data on whatever policy / system existed is also very obscure.

Still, both British- and traditional records help us to know something about the forest policy in Ghumsur before its annexation in 1836, as described in the following:

Defence-oriented Policy:

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the Ghumsur forest policy was to make use of the forests for defence purpose, as can be ascertained from the following notes of Hamilton on Ghumsur (before 1820):

"The country in this neighbourhood is remarkably impenetrable, the forests consisting entirely of bamboos, which resist the axe better than any other species of ligneous vegetation. In former times, the inhabitants relying on these did not think it necessary to erect redoubts for the defence of the paths to their strong holds, but obstructed them with frequent barriers of bamboos wrought into a variety of entanglement" (Hamilton: 1971).

In fact, when De Bussy marched towards Ghumsur; these forests, especially the bamboos, gave his army a tough resistance; troops were employed with excessive toil and fatigue in rooting up, cutting down and endeavouring to make their way through the forest for days (Behera: 1987).

Strongholds like Vishnuchakra, Buguda and old Ghumsur were surrounded by bamboo hedges. Russel, who led the British military operations against Ghumsur rebels in 1836, has also described how the dense bamboo jungles on either side of Kullada offered very strong defensible positions. The deep ditch that protected the Raja's house had its band covered with a thick edge of bamboo (Russel: 1856).

Revenue-oriented Policy:- The Committee of Circuit had estimated the net revenue of Ghumsur to be about Rs. 164177 per annum by the year 1788. Accordingly, the income of this zamindary was the highest among the Ganjam Estates at that time.

Income from tax on trees or forest produce was quite small compared to that from other important sources, but still it had its value especially because of the severe financial crisis of the zamindary. Dananjay Bhanja seems to have exerted himself so much as he could, during his rule, from various sources (Stevenson: 1916); and expected to collect 25% more revenue from Bono soono - a kind of forest rent.

It is not known exactly what was the attitude of the Ghumsur Rajas towards reclamation of forest land or waste land. It is said that Banamali Bhanja, the founder

---

73 except for the plough tax perhaps, which amounted to Rs. 12000/- at least. However, details of forest revenue being not available, nothing can be said definitely about its significance in Ghumsur.
of Ghumsur zamindary, had cleared off jungles in his kingdom and the policy towards reclamation can be expected to be quite favourable (Behera:1987)

**Forest Area:**

In 1836, Russel made the following rough estimation about the geography of Ghumsur:

- Total: 120 coss
- Fruitful and cultivated country: 20 coss
- Mountains and jungles: 100 coss

Though Ghumsur was famous for the bamboos (which grew to considerable heights), it is not true that the country had, as Hamilton describes, only bamboo forests. The report of Col. R. H. Beddome, Conservator of Forests, Government of Madras; who visited Ghumsur twice in the second half of the 19th century, gives us a more clear picture of the actual extent and composition of Ghumsur forests. Following are some of the extracts from his letter dated 19th March 1879:

"I went much the same tour in 1864. I found that forests in much the same condition as when I saw them fourteen years ago. xxx

Captain Harris kindly calculated for me the area of the Ghumsur Taluk at 640 square miles out of this he allows 25 percent for village sites and surrounding cultivation, so that there is still 480 square miles of forest.”

Beddome classified the Ghumsur forests into following 4 types:

- Class - I :- 100 square miles of really good Sal forest.
- Class- II :- 100 square miles of Sal forest showing more or less signs of deterioration.
- Class-III :- 100 square miles of mixed (deciduous) forest of good growth.
- Class -IV :- 180 square miles of deteriorated mixed forest and scrub.

He also describes that Surada taluk had about 103 square miles of forests.

**Shifting cultivation:**

The Khonds of Ghumsur practised the shifting cultivation known as *Kumeri* and this practice seems to have continued, without any restriction, even for years after the annexation, for the British feared that any such interference might make them violent.

---

74 1 Coss (or Kos, a measure of distance in India) $\equiv$ 1.75 miles.

75 Beddome in his report of 1879 described how the forests had been considerably destroyed by the Khonds and suggested that "Government should insist on a strict reservation against felling and burning of one quarter of what is how remaining in the limits of each village xxx”. The Collector of Ganjam responded to this proposal with the following remarks:

"xxx any such interference will be a serious business and will most likely lead to disturbance; but if the matter be as urgent as he makes it
Plantations:
Traditional records tell us that as per the ancient custom, the Rajas of Ghumsur had, to their credit, a number of topes, for ex; 'Krushna Kanana Tota' by Krishna Bhanja and 'Kshyatriya Kanana Tota' by his father Ghana Bhanja. The plantations were mostly of fruit trees like Mango, Coconut and Jackfruit etc..

A visitor to Ghumsur in 1933 has given description of a tope called 'Bhoi tota', continuous for about 12 miles near Kullada(Mohanty:1935). Some believe that it was a credit of Raja Krishna Bhanja.

Revenue: Comparative Statement of the Collector of Ganjam showing the settlement for 1816-1817 and 1817-1818 gives us some idea about the income from various forest-related sources in Ghumsur zamindary (figures in approximate):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement for</th>
<th>Settlement for</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1816-1817</td>
<td>1817-1818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhaida</td>
<td>Rs. 2150/-</td>
<td>Rs.150 /-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooden tax</td>
<td>Rs. 90/-</td>
<td>Rs. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax of tamarind</td>
<td>Rs. 91.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askah Garden</td>
<td>Rs. 21 /-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be noted here that to avoid the Court processes, Raja Dhananjay Bhanja absconded himself from the zamindary in 1815 and while the Estate was under the administration of his Commander- in - Chief from 1815 to 1818, the financial condition deteriorated with the invasion by the Pindaris, an off shoot of the Maratha armies, in December 1816(Behera:1987). The Pindaris caused much destruction to the villages and crops etc. The response of the British Government was not satisfactory for the people, in protest of which a Khond up-rising broke out in February 1817. Various such disturbances left their signs in the total decrease of certain collections, as reflected in the comparative statement of accounts for 1816 to 1818. 'Askah Garden is much destroyed. ' wrote the Collector.

It was always customary for the zamindars to anticipate the revenue of the following year and accordingly, we find the following comparative statement for the years 1834-35 and 1835-36, in the letter of the Collector of Ganjam on Ghumsur zamindary:

---

76 Alhaida consisted of various sources of extra revenue including Bono Soono. The amount shown here against this account represents collections from 3 (out of total 16) Muthas only. Nothing was expected from the other Muthas as the rebels had occupied them.

77 For Alhaida only.
Demand for   Demand for   Increase
1834-35  1835-36

Bono Soono  
Tax on mango 
orchards 
( in four different places) :

1. Rottungah of 
   Duokhshangodotolo  
   Rs. 5-0-0
2. Buguda :               9-12-0
3. Gaula Bondho :    0-12-0              Rs. 16-12-0 Rs.16-12-0
4. Bhettary Singhee: 1-4-0

Gopa Koro  
Rs. 15     Rs. 15/-

V. JEYPORE

Policy History:-Jeypore, which was a part of the Vizagapatam district for some time, had the finest and the most extensive forests in the whole district. The woods were neither wholly evergreen nor wholly deciduous, but a mixture of both. Teak was the most valuable timber in Malkangiri forests while to the north of Bissam-Kattak and Gunupur were found the finest Sal in the district (Francis:1992).

In the later half of 19th century ,the Estate administration was controlled by the Government of Madras to some extent under various circumstances. In 1872, then Special Assistant Agent for Jeypore Mr. H.G, Turner reported to the Government of Madras that the Manager of the Malkangiri Taluk had given on lease, for inadequate sum, the exclusive right of timber in Malkangiri causing severe exploitation of the forests there and recommended that the forests of the Estate should be preserved from further denudation. He also showed that the shortage of water in Indravati and Saberi rivers was related to the destruction of Jeypore forests (Francis:1992).

Mr. R.H. Beddome visited the Jeypore forests in 1877 and remarked in his report the following:

"I have no where in India seen this Kumri cultivation so systematically carried out, but considering how very sparse the population is, it would cause little inconvenience to the people if 1/4 or 1/5 of the forest tract were to be reserved against the ruinous system of felling and burning. XXX"

Mr. Turner observed that unless the Madras Forest Act was made effective in the Estate, the Raja would himself not take any action if only advice were offered.
Accordingly, the Madras Forest Act was extended to Jeypore in 1891\textsuperscript{266} and work towards conservation of forests began as reflected in the following extract:

"XXX have prohibited the felling of timber less than 3 ft or more than 4ft in circumference at a height of 3 ft. from the ground and also the felling of any timber within 10 miles of Motu. xxx" (Letter dated. 16-2-1893 from the Estate Manager, to the Agent to the Governor, Vizagapatam)\textsuperscript{267}

And also:

"XXX As all valuable pieces of good forest near the road have been roughly demarcated and reserved, I think it is high time for making arrangements to preserve them. For this purpose, I propose to have 3 forest guards to look after them. XXXX (Letter dated. 12.3.1893 from the Jeypore Forest Ranger to the Estate Manager)\textsuperscript{268}

The felling of timber without a license had been prohibited by 1890\textsuperscript{269}. By a notification dated 1-9-1900, prohibition was imposed on collection of Lac and dammer (sal resin)\textsuperscript{270}.

By 1907, 324 square miles had been reserved\textsuperscript{271}. In 1916, the Jeypore Forest Rules were amended to provide for the constitution of Protected Lands and the revised rules were published in 1922. The Estate officials were given power to prohibit the removal of forest produce from Reserved and Protected Lands with the consent of the Agent and since then the policy had been to afford complete protection to the Reserved Lands and protection against shifting cultivation to the Protected Lands.\textsuperscript{272}

**Forest area and classification:**

Under Madras Forest Act, the forests of the Estate were classified as Reserved Lands and Protected Lands:\textsuperscript{78}

Total forest area : About 7000 sq. miles.
Reserved Land : 1544.53 square miles.
Protected Land : 100.61 square miles.\textsuperscript{273}

**Reserved Species:**

In 1898, there were 22 reserved species\textsuperscript{274}. Later, four more were added to the list as follows\textsuperscript{275}:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sisoo</th>
<th>Dhou</th>
<th>Mahul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bija</td>
<td>Sidha</td>
<td><em>Hardwickia Binata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal</td>
<td>Mundi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aam</td>
<td>Sondha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panas</td>
<td>Arjun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bheru</td>
<td>Mahalimbo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{78} Instead of direct provision for village forests, the term 'unreserves' was used in both Jeypore and many other Estates which followed the Madras Forest Act.
Tangini Teak
Muktamonja Tentuli
Karanja Harida
Saj Kusum
Kendu Kora
Halanda Sindhugundi

In the list of 1898, Sandal and Red Sanders had been included which were excluded later.

In Panchipenta and Madgole Estates, the number of reserved species was 17.276

**Timber Classification:**

The classification adopted during the 1890s was on a different basis:

"XXX Hitherto license have been given for logs according to an extremely rough calculation of their length and circumference and timber has been divided into 5 classes XXX".277

Accordingly, timber or large logs, 14 ft in length and more than 3'6'' in circumference without any limit belonged to the class of *Tunakalu*, while logs 18' in length and from 2'6" to 3'6" in circumference were known as *Peddakarralu*.278

The classification adopted later was as follows:

Class I- Bandhan, Kadamba, Zanita, Sirish, Bana Sirish, and Gambhari

Class II:- Black Babool, White Babool, Khair, Pansi, Jamun, Neem, Pathana Limba, and Karada

Class III:- All other species.279

**Scientific Management:-**

In this regard, suffice is to quote the remarks of Bell:

"It cannot be said that the Jeypore forests are scientifically managed. Silviculture and working plans are almost non-existent"(Bell:1945)280.

As a result of unsystematic exploitation by the contractors, the forest suffered considerably.281

The first working scheme was prepared in 196079, i.e. after the abolition of the Estate.282

**Shifting Cultivation:**

---

79 However, coupes were there286. Also, the forest admin. of Jaypore was comparatively more systematic than many of the neighbouring Estates.
During the zamindary administration, each family of hill men was given permission to fell a reasonable extent of unreserved forest, which varied with circumstances, for the purpose of shifting cultivation on payment of an assessment of an anna or two an acre. But any such practice without permission was strictly dealt with. Sri. L.N. Sahu has given some descriptions of the whole matter in his book published in the 1940s:

"Now the laws against Podu cultivation have been very severe. Poor aboriginals who are found out to be doing Podu are brought to book. They are fined by the Court some ten or twenty rupees. This they can not pay. They therefore enter jail. Afterwards when by some experience they find that life is not easy there, they shift to some other place and do the same Podu cultivation until law again grips them there".

It may be noted here that the Partially Excluded Areas Enquiry Committee of the Government Orissa, which visited Jeypore in 1939, had recommended for intensive efforts to do away with this devastating method of cultivation completely within next ten years, though at the same time it recommended for alternative arrangements for the hill-men.

**Plantation:**

Teak plantations had been raised at Calimila (Malkangiri taluk) and Motu.

Besides, the Maharaja had some Coffee plantations near Jeypore (at Mohulbhatta) and Cashew plantations in other places.

**Revenue:**

Mr. Taylor, the Estate Manager during 1891-93, made systematic efforts to increase the forest revenue of the Estate. While forwarding a license granted for felling Sal timber, the Manager sent the following note to the Agent to the Governor on 5th January 1891, which would reflect the measures he had taken in this direction:

"XXX the licensee entered into a contract with the D.P.W. without my sanction to supply some Sal timber to that Department XXX and also desired some Sal timber for private purposes.

On hearing of this, I prohibited the felling of the timber without a license and as the amount to be paid by the D.P.W. is Rs. 1-8-0 per cubic foot, I forced the royalty at 4 annas per cubic foot which will leave ample profit to the contractor.

I should not have had any objection to supplying the D.P.W departmentally with what Sal timber they required, but I cannot allow private contractors..."  

80 And vide the following extracts from the letter dated 13/4/1940 of the Collector of Koraput:

"I do not believe that the present forest administration has any real interest in preserving these forests and it will be necessary for Government to insist on the appointment of an Indian Forest Service Officer in the near future if the rate of destruction is to be checked".  

The Collector was referring here to forests affected by Podu. People told him that Podu was increasing every where.
to share enormous profits out of the Department without paying some royalty to the Estate”.

Before abolition, the Maharaja is said to have had an average income of about Rs. 950000/- from his forests.
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A FOREST POLICY FOR THE EASTERN STATES

RESOLUTION

In a view of the great extent of forest in the Eastern States Agency and its importance both to the States themselves and to the adjoining provinces of British India, it is essential to lay down a policy, which will provide for its maintenance and for its management. Not alone must its value as an economic asset to its owners be considered but due emphasis must be laid on the important bearing it has both directly and indirectly on agriculture and on the interests of the local population, which it also serves.

2. The principal object with which the State forests are managed is the public benefit. This includes, in the first place, the benefit conferred over a wide area by the influence maintaining the water supply and checking floods. It also includes the direct financial benefit derived by the State itself and the advantages enjoyed by the inhabitants of the tract in which the forest is situated. In this connection it must be borne in mind that the first claim on any forest is that of the local population and in prescribing for the management of States' forests this will become one of the primary considerations of the working plans.

3. In almost all cases, the constitution and preservation of forests involve, to a greater or less extent, the regulation of rights and the restriction of rights of use in the forest area, which may have been previously enjoyed by the inhabitants in its immediate neighbourhood. Such regulation and restriction is justified only when the advantage to be gained by the public is large; and the cardinal principle to be observed is that the rights and privileges of individuals must be limited, otherwise than for their own benefit, only in such degree as is absolutely necessary to secure that advantage.

4. The forests of the Eastern States may be broadly classed under the following headings:-

(a) Forests, the preservation of which is essential on climatic or physical grounds. They will generally fall in the category of Reserved Forest(Class A).

(b) Forests, which afford a supply of valuable timbers of commercial purposes. These also, will usually be classified as Reserved Forest (Class A).

(c) Minor Forests, classified as Reserved Forest(Class B).

(d) Village forests.

It is not intended that any attempt should be made to classify all forests under one or other of these four heads. Some forests occupy intermediate positions and parts of one and the same forest may fall under different heads. The classification is useful only as affording a basis for indicating the broad policy which should govern the treatment of each class respectively; and, in applying the general policy, the fullest consideration must be given to local circumstances.

5. It should be remembered that, subject to certain considerations, the claims of cultivation are stronger than those of forest preservation. Accordingly, wherever an effective demand for cultural land exists, which can only be met from forest areas, the land should ordinarily be relinquished without hesitation. But before considering the deforestation of already existing reserves, it must be established that there is no other land available in village forest or elsewhere, which might be of a permanent nature; temporary or shifting cultivation has no priority claim over forest. Wherever the physical conditions are such that the removal of the
protection afforded by forest growth must result, after a longer or shorter period, in the sterilisation or destruction of the soil, the case falls under the principle discussed in paragraph 7 of this Resolution. Furthermore, the honey-combing of a valuable forest by patches of cultivation must not be allowed, for it renders the proper preservation of the remaining forest almost impossible. The breaking up of any forest land for cultivation must only be permitted as a last resort and not until every other possible solution has been sought. Finally, cultivation must not be allowed so to extend as to encroach upon the minimum area of forest needed in order to, supply the general forest needs of the country in the neighbourhood of which it is situated. In many tracts, cultivation is almost impossible without the assistance of forests and it must not be allowed to destroy that upon which its existence depends.

6. The above remarks do not contemplate the disforestation of any reserved forest except as a very extreme case where the land is needed for a purpose which greatly transcends in importance the retention of the forest. They apply rather to the extension of cultivation which takes place as a normal process in the village forest and where the claims of cultivation may often be stronger than those of forest preservation. Thus in the village forests cultivation will normally have priority over the retention of forest unless the arguments in its favour are overwhelming.

7. The first class of forests are generally situated on hill slopes, where the preservation of such vegetation as exists, or the encouragement of further growth, is essential to their protection against the devastating action of hill torrents on the cultivated plains that lie below them. Here the interests to be protected are important beyond all comparison with the interest which it may be necessary to restrict and, so long as there is reasonable hope of the restriction being effectual, the lesser interests must not be allowed to stand in the way. In this connection shifting cultivation must be considered. Uncontrolled shifting cultivation is a most destructive and uneconomic method of raising crops and should be stopped, especially on the higher and steeper slopes. Elsewhere it should be regulated and controlled so, that forest land, after cultivation, is left in a condition to grow up as forest of at least as good quality as that which was felled. This must be done in such a manner as to inflict the minimum hardship on the local inhabitants, who have, from time immemorial, gained their subsistence in this way and who will have to be provided with other land or with other means of livelihood. Only by great tact and perseverance on the part of the local officials can this object be attained, but it should be preserved in; and, if the States in which this practice exists take steps to settle these people on better land and teach them improved methods of agriculture, there is little doubt that the aim will ultimately be attained and much land quite unfit for agriculture will be reclaimed and maintained under forest in localities where a covering of vegetation is most badly needed.

8. The second class of forest includes the great tracts from which our supply of the more valuable timbers is obtained. They are for the most part (though not always) essentially forest tracts, unencumbered by or with very limited rights of user; and, where this is the case, they should be managed on mainly commercial lines as valuable properties of, and sources of revenue to the State. These forests are known as Reserved Forest (Class A.). Even in these forests, however, customs of user will, in many cases, have sprung up along the margin of the forest. This user is often essential to the prosperity of the people who have enjoyed it, and the fact that its extent is limited in comparison with the area under forest renders it the
more easy to continue it in full. The needs of communities dwelling on the margins of forest tracts consist mainly in small timber for building, wood for fuel and agricultural implements, leaves for manure and fodder, thorns for fencing, grass and grazing for their cattle and edible forest products for their own consumption. Every reasonable facility should be afforded to the people concerned for the full and easy satisfaction of these needs, if not free, then at low and not at competitive rates. It should be understood that consideration of forest income are to be subordinated to that satisfaction; but at the same time, it is essential where the local demand is considerable, that some arrangement should be made to establish regular cutting so that the forest may not be destroyed in order to meet the rights of the user. This is usually best achieved by excluding an area from the main forest and including it in the category of Reserved Forest (Class B) to which reference will be made in paragraph 10.

9. There is reason to believe that some tracts have been reserved for working as a commercial proposition, which might have been managed with greater profit both to the public and to the State if the efforts of the forest department had been directed to supply the large demand of the agricultural and general population for small timber, rather than the limited demand of merchants for large timber. Even in tracts where the conditions are suited to the growth of a large timber, it should be carefully considered in each case whether it would be better, both in the interest of the people and of revenue, to work them with the object of supplying the requirements of the general, and in particular of the agricultural population.

10. The third class of forests generally consists of isolated small forests situated in densely populated tracts, or else portions of forest fringing the large reserves where the rights of user have been greatest and where the first necessity is to meet them and at the same time to preserve the forests so that they may continue to supply the local people with as much of their requirements as is consistent with maintenance of the forest. These are known as Reserved Forest (Class B). Although many such forests have already been constituted and are actually being managed systematically to meet the local demand, it may be found desirable (as has been indicated at the foot of paragraph 8) to extend their area, either by including further portions of the village forest or by transferring parts of the Reserved Forest (Class A) to this category. For, it is fundamental that the needs of the local inhabitants constitute the first call on the forests; and provision must be made to meet them before arrangements are made for exploiting the forests for commercial purposes. It is, nevertheless, important to remember that a right of user does not entitle the holder thereof to abuse it, nor may a right of user be permitted to lead to the extinction of the forest. It is therefore quite permissible to limit the right to such extent as may be necessary both in the interest of the right-holder and of the owner (the State); in order that the user may not annihilate its subject; and to protect the people from their own improvidence. To this end, these forests must be managed in a systematic manner; and, if the produce which a forest yields is not sufficient to meet in full all the requirements of the right-holders, then the quantity of material which each person may take must be limited by circumstances to what the forest is capable of yielding without deteriorating. This limitation applies equally to grazing as to the removal timber; so that an excessive number of cattle must not be permitted to graze even in the forest set aside for meeting the needs of the local agricultural community.
11. It is essential that all forests included in the above three classes should be managed systematically under the prescription of Working Plans prepared by a qualified forest officer and sanctioned by the Darbar of the State concerned. The prescriptions of such working plans must not be departed from without the advice of a qualified forest officer.

12. The fourth class of forests referred to are village forests (variously known as grami, sadharan, khesra, komosi) situated in the vicinity of villages, as their name implies, they are sometimes extensive but more frequently of small dimensions, poor in quality and heavily burdened with rights. In these forests it may be said that rights of user are unrestricted; they certainly are in the large village jungles. Elsewhere, certain restrictions regarding the species of timber that may be taken and the quantity do apply. They are used very largely as grazing grounds, although the pasturage is of very low value. Where these forests are still of such extent as to render it feasible, portions of them will be set aside to be managed under some village organisation (panchayat) solely in the interest of the village community or communities which have hitherto enjoyed rights in them. Elsewhere they will be afforded such protection as may be possible compatible with the rights with which they are burdened. But it must be recognised that in many of these areas, and more especially in the more undeveloped tracts, there is forest land which is suitable for cultivation and which will in course of time, be brought under the plough. This must not be bindered; for taking into consideration the reserved forests which have already been constituted, there is almost everywhere adequate forest to provide present and future needs of the local agricultural population. Perhaps and their greatest value lies in the fact that they provide pasture lands (admittedly of poor quality) for the villagers' cattle; and they are often the only land within a reasonable distance of the village where the cattle can be taken when the crops are in the fields. It is therefore important to delay as long as possible their disappearance; although it is admitted that in many places their disappearance is inevitable and only a matter of time.

13. It must not be supposed from any of the preceding remarks that it is intended that the States should forego all revenue from large areas of forest in which rights of user exist. The States have also got their rights and may justly expect to reap a fair income from their properties. Cases must be distinguished. But as a general principle the needs of the local population should meet with the first consideration and an adequate area of forest should be set aside for this purpose. This does not preclude the State from deriving some revenue from such forests; but the income that they may be expected to yield should be less that which the State will obtain from its remaining forests, which will be worked on commercial lines with a view to the maximum profit compatible with sound management.

14. Grazing is a matter which requires special attention. Special provision is made for this in the third and fourth classes of forest, where tenant-rights exist; but in the third class (Reserved forest : Class B) certain limitation on the number of animals admitted to graze can be imposed. Grazing in these two classes of forest is either entirely free, or a small charge is made only on cattle surplus to agricultural requirements. In the larger reserves falling in the second class, the State is entitled to derive some income from the cattle that are pastured, many of which belong to professional graziers. Here it is essential that the grazing incidents must be limited to a figure which the forest can support without injury. Consequently arrangements may be made for periodical closure of the forest or for rotational
grazing or for any other arrangement which may be found suitable for regulating the incidence of grazing. The formation of fodder reserves should be considered, especially in those parts where the people are sufficiently advanced to appreciate the use of hay in preference to pasture.

15. Such are the general principles which are to be observed in the administration of the forests of the States of the Eastern States Agency. The detailed application of these principles must depend upon an infinite variety of circumstances, which will have to be duly weighed in each case by the local authorities to whose discretion the decision must be left. Where working plans are framed for the forests, the provisions necessary for giving detailed effect to the general principles here enunciated should be embodied in them. The exercise of rights that have been recorded at Settlement will necessarily be provided for in these plans. Where further concessions are made it will be well to grant them for some such limited period as ten years, so that they may, if necessary, be revised from time to time as the circumstances on which they are moulded change.

-----------------------------
Source: Acc. No. 869 S, Orissa State Archives
ACCESS SYSTEM

The system of access to the forests and forest products, as well as to the timber and fruits of trees on homestead and cultivated lands, can be defined under the following three criteria, viz;
1. Access fee
2. Access route
3. Transit rule

**Access fee:**
This fee was realised either annually (forest cess) or immediately (schedule of rate); and the modes of payment were three, viz.,

a. In cash
b. In kind
   - In labour (bethi) i.e. thatching the royal / State buildings etc.

The assessment of the annual fee was according to:

- The land rent / measure: Nistor cess (for ex; in Khandapara, this cess was calculated per rupee of rent for the rent -payers while for rent - free holdings, the calculation was per acre of land).
- The consuming device / instrument (of timber / fuel etc):
  a. Plough tax (for agriculturists)
  b. Furnace tax (for non-agriculturists)

- The cutting device:
  a. Axe tax (in Bonai at the rate of 0-1-0 per axe for non-agriculturists)
  b. Knife tax (in Chikiti Estate of Ganjam district, at the rate of 0-5-4 per annum)

- The members in a family (a kind of fuel cess for non-agriculturists / land less people or for outsiders settled in the State for business or service):
  For ex; in Kalahandi:
  - 1-3 persons (one family): 0-8-0
  - 4-6 persons (one family): 1-0-0
  - 6 and above (one family) : 2-0-0

- The profession (on the basis of assumption that a goldsmith's consumption of fuel/forest produce, for example, is different quantitatively from that of a blacksmith).

---

81 Besides these three criteria, there was also a fourth one i.e. the access time/period (during which access was allowed). It varied according to the locality, the purpose of access etc. For ex., shooting of certain birds was not allowed for a particular time during the year.
82 However, a few exceptions did exist. For ex; in Bamra, forest cess was charged on firewood traders on a quarterly basis.
83 In Kalkala Estate, the Gouds having 10 heads of cattle had to supply ghee to the zamindar @ 1/4 seer as grazing fee and the same for every additional 5 head, the price being fixed at 0-8-0 per seer (Dalizel:1932).
84 In Sukinda Estate, the ryots had the following liability (against their right to remove timber etc. for bona fide purposes):
   - To assist during shooting expeditions and kheda.
   - To give service for one day for ploughing the landlord's own lands & for one day for weeding (Dalizel:1932).
85 In lieu of this tax, the tenants enjoyed right to certain amount of fuel and bamboo.
The distance of Nistar forests from a village (as in Patna State).

Other factors (for ex; 0-1-0 per tree in waste lands of Surangi Estate; or 0-10-0 per tree of Khajuri palm leased for toddy in Athmallik).

As regards the seigniorage rates, the assessment varied according to the following factors:

- Quality of the timber / produce, for ex;
  - Class-I, II and III timbers.
  - Salia (without thorns) and Kanta (with thorns) bamboo.

- Status of the tree (i.e. reserved species / unreserved species).

- Quantity of the produce
  With measurement:
  - with reference to the container or transporting system (ex; cart load)
  - with reference to the size /weight/volume of the material itself

Without measurement: - i.e. per tree irrespective of its size.

- Purpose of the purchaser :-
  - i) For domestic consumption.
  - ii) For sale within the State.
  - iii) For export.

- Status of the forest:
  - i) Reserve – 'A' class/ 'B' class.
  - ii) Unreserves.

Besides the fees for such forest produce, there were also grazing fees and shooting fees etc .. The grazing fee was generally realised annually and its assessment was according to the status of the forest, status of the animal (plough cattle, for ex;), species of the animal (cow / buffalo) and status of the herdsman (outsider / professional) etc. Shooting fees varied according to the kind of animal / bird etc.

History of forest cess:-

Data on the history of forest cess is rather obscure. It is said that there were taxes on forest products during the Bhauma (8th – 10th century) and the Ganga (11th to 15th century) rules. The tax on fruits, flowers and fuel wood was called bhoga during the Gupta period.

The Somavamsis (10th-12th century AD) charged trandaka, a tax for grazing & watering cattle during their rule (Mishra:1997).

The word Nistar practically implies to the requirement /consumption of forest produce for domestic and agricultural purpose, viz., plough timber, timber of house construction, fuel wood, fencing material etc. at concessional / nominal rates or without immediate

---

86 See Appendix:6.
87 History of modern forest cess is available to some extent for two ex- States viz., Baramba & Narsinghpur. In Baramba, the residents were paying nothing for the firewood / timber for their own bonafide consumption at least during the year 1882-83. Same was the situation in the neighbouring State of Narsinghpur.

Both the States remained under Court of Wards for some time during these 80s & by 1887-88, a house-rate had been introduced there as forest cess ( @ 0-4-0). In Narsinghpur (1889-90), there was also a Jalnikathkar (probably levied on the non-agriculturists for firewood consumption) the demand for it for that year being Rs. 37-5-6 only (whereas demand for house-rate was Rs. 2346-4-0) 15. However, total demand for forest cess had been reduced to Rs.1509-8-6 per annum by 1914-19, the reason thereof being unknown.
payment. It was known as Nistar Patti in Kalahandi, Ranwa in Khariar and Banakar in other areas. In Ganjam district, the term Jangala panu was used and in Rairakhol, forest cess was known as Kastakari. The plough tax, known as Halachinna in Ghumsur, Halapancha in Bonai, Halatanki in Gangpur and Nangal Panu in Jeypore also bore the same implication. Regarding their origin, the Forest Enquiry Committee Report said:

"It is indeed difficult to trace the origin of these forest cesses. xxx it was more or less a lump sum annual payment xxx. This should therefore be better termed as commutation fee rather than a tax or cess."

We however have definite evidence that the plough tax is an ancient one and it was levied in the 18th century Ganjam. A careful study of the history of these forest cesses would show that:

1. in some areas, there was no kind of forest cess at all.
2. in some other areas, the forest cess was not levied systematically or regularly (especially when the mode of payment was either in kind or in labour).
3. in some cases, some kind of forest cess was there in the past but discontinued or abolished later (as in Badakhemundi ex-Estate).
4. in a few other cases, there was a regular forest cess in the past which for one or more reasons was discontinued / abolished for some time and re-introduced later (as in Ghumsur).

In what seems to be rather an exceptional case, the cess charged by the forest establishment (consisting only one staff) in Nayagarh State prior to 1881, was levied in a very limited area i.e. within a radius of 3 miles to the headquarters. In 1881 it was extended to the whole State.

The exact nature of plough tax seems to be controversial. In Ramdhyani's report, we find two mutually contradictory (apparently) statements on the Bhuyans of Keonjhar: on one hand, he has mentioned that the Bhuyans were assessed with plough tax, and on the other hand, he said that there was no forest cess on them. In fact, during the trial of the convicts of the non-co-operation movement (1920s), it had been said that the Bhuyans paid no nistar cess (in spite of the fact that they had been paying a plough tax).

What do such mutually opposite (directly or indirectly) statements/facts suggest? They simply indicate that though forest cess had been assessed as plough tax, the real nature of this tax is perhaps something else.

In the 'Final Report on the Major Settlement Operation in Ganjam ex-Estate areas' (1938-62), the following remarks are found about the nature of Halachina:

"Originally it meant dues realised by the estate for each plough owned by the ryots as rent. But in course of time this was realised in addition to the legal rent payable by the ryots."
Now let us consider a system of assessment in the Ghumsur zamindary dating back at least to 1778 A.D. In April that year, a British report on this zamindary was sent to the Chief of Council in Ganjam with the following information:

"In this zamindary are twelve Mootahs which contain 337 villages, these are assigned over to the management of 6000 peons, constantly retained in the service of the zamindar, who grants them for their maintenance, a half share of the produce and to each a yearly sum of 8 rupees. The quantity of land allotted to each peon, is termed a Jewaka, and, on a medium, it is allowed to produce 40 Burnums of paddy - the Govt. share of which at the rate of 3/4 rupee per Burnum being the established price in Goomsur is Rs. 15.

The Hallachina or plow tax on each Jewaka: Rs. 2
General tax on each Jewaka: Rs. 2
Govt. share of the small Gramium each Jawaka: Rs. 7
Produce of each Jewaka: Rs. 26."

No doubt, the 'plow tax' mentioned in the above report is nothing but the plough tax. It is clear from this report that it was charged in addition to the rent. Now, what was the nature of this additional charge?

In the comparative statement prepared by the Collector of Ganjam on this zamindary in February 1818, we find the following sources of income (of the zamindary) mentioned:

- Income from 16 'Mootahs'
- Alhaida
- Income from 'Cuttobudde villages' (i.e. from villages which paid quit rent)
- Income from 'Condo villages'
- 'Tax'
- Askah gardens
- 'Chandanapaudee' extra lands
- 'Wooden tax'
- 'Collaudah Tobacco Lands'
- 'Tax of tamarind trees'

So there is no mention of plough tax here, most probably because the income of 16 Muthas was inclusive of this tax. If 'wooden tax' is taken as tax on fire-wood consumption and tax of tamarind trees be taken as rent / cess realised on such trees, then 'Tax' can also be taken as the general tax. As the two taxes relating to forests (fire-wood?) & trees (tamarind) have been mentioned independent of the 'Tax', the nature of plough tax also seems to be something special.

Still it is difficult to ascertain that this special nature was essentially related to the forest cess. It seems quite probable that the first character of this tax was agrarian and secondly, it probably implied to a kind of income tax.

---

88 refers here to the Raja or State/Estate.
89 Some land holders of Ganjam also used to realise an additional Hallachina called Heta Halachina as a kind of agrarian assessment.
90 However, this doesn't discard the possibility of a right to the plough timber in lieu of this tax.
Whatever it may be, it is a fact that since the beginning of the Era of Systematic Conservation, forest cess had been assessed in the form of plough tax. But some of the British administrators did not favour this kind of assessment and as per the advice of Political Agent Mr. Ramsay, plough tax was replaced by nistar cess in Sonepur from 1917.

As this tax (i.e. plough tax) suggested, by its name, a right to the plough timber openly; people in Gangpur were found reluctant in 1932 to pay Halatanki when plough timber was not available in full requirement. So the AFO and the Superintendent recommended to abolish Halatanki and substitute nistar in its place.

No doubt, nistar cess was more systematic than the plough tax. And also, there was a minimum value fixed for the nistar assessments in many ex-States. But the plough tax seemed to be a more easier kind of assessment in case of lands whose area varied frequently (e.g., temporary cultivation).

The fuel cess was only a partial form of this nistar cess or plough tax. It was known as Jalnikat masul in Boud, Chulapati (Patna and Kalahandi), Kathpancha (Bonai) and by other local names. This tax on plough - man was called Halia cess in Kalahandi and the so called Rojgari (Professional) cesses generally belonged to this class (i.e. fuel cess).

This fuel cess was assessed usually on the non-agriculturists, their requirement being presumably less than that of the plough owners as the non-agriculturists were not expected to require the plough timber. The assessment was based either on the number of members in a family, or per furnace (chulha); but sometimes, it was assessed just like the nistar cess (as in Bonai).

People having only homestead lands also used to pay this cess otherwise known as Chandna. In Nayagarh, this was known as Jhury.

The Khair rasam of Athmallik was levied on the catechu-makers, the assessment being per the furnace used, at the rate of Rs. 50/- per furnace accommodating 8 pots and engaging two men (1905-06). If the number of pots or men increased, the rate was higher.

Besides, there were taxes on tassar cocoons (see Appendix- 4) which was collected in Bonai even in the 19th century. There was also a bamboo tax in some places.

The limit of forest produce to be removed had been fixed to some extent in most areas, but it did not necessarily match in its cash value to the forest cess charged against the forest.
removal and the value of the produce allowed was more or less independent of the value of forest tax (except in a few areas like Talcher).

In Keonjhar, a scale was introduced in this connection from 1923 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nistar Cess</th>
<th>Value of the forest produce removed per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upto Re. 1</td>
<td>Rs. 3-11-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re. 1 to Rs. 5</td>
<td>Rs. 14-10-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 5 to Rs. 10</td>
<td>Rs. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 10 to Rs. 15</td>
<td>Rs. 31-10-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 15 to Rs. 20</td>
<td>Rs. 39 - 2-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was also estimated that the land less people of the State (Keonjhar) used to get fuel worth Rs. 2 in lieu of a tax of 0-4-0.51

By 1944-45, the value of produce removed in most of the States was estimated to be ten times the tax paid and in some cases, even twenty times.52

As regards the schedule of rates, some kind of such system most probably existed in the past, though not in the systematic/ orderly manner introduced later.

Grazing was either freely allowed or against certain bheti (supply of ghee / milk etc) or bethi (the agriculturist, for ex; would share his plough cattle free of cost for work in the zamindar’s land); and the system of clearly defined grazing fee appears to be a recent one and was known according to the name of the grazing animal in Ganjam (for ex; Cheli Panu after the name of goat i.e. cheli53 ) Kharkhai in Athmallik 54, Kharchari in Gangpur 55, Charau Kar in Keonjhar56 and Chari Mahasul in Hemgir 57.

Similarly shooting fee known as shikar masul or shikari rasum etc. was generally in the form of kind i.e. a share in the flesh of the killed animal or the skin / hide.

In context of studying the historicity of all these forest related fees / cesses, a knowledge of the origin of commutation rates may be useful. It is said that the question of commutation of rents in cash payments came into vogue during the Muslim rule though not on an extensive scale. The gold and silver coins though minted in those times, were not in circulation on a large scale. When the British introduced permanent settlement during early 19th century, collection of rents / fees in cash instead of kind gradually became an administrative feature, though people generally preferred paying in kind as arranging for cash payment was not only difficult but also in many cases quite expensive for them(RMELA:1938)58 . But the British demanded cash payment from the Rajas and the Rajas in turn followed the same rule though to variable extents in different areas, in their kingdoms. Besides their own convenience, the British in some cases saw another reason in introducing this system. In Keonjhar, for ex; Captain Johnstone proposed a plough tax of 0-8-0 (and a school cess) because he saw that demand to payment in service and kind might have no limit:

"The system of payment in kind is always a losing arrangement to both parties while to those who pay it is excessively harassing."59
Access Route:-

In ancient times, most of the forests were virtually inaccessible and this saved them from commercial exploitation even during the 19th century. When the Rajas realised the commercial value of their forests, they either directly or through the contractors (who had taken leases) tried to open cart tracks. Rivers were also used for transportation of timber.

When the Rajas of the native States consented to give their land free of cost for the railway in the late 19th century, one of the arguments used to induce them to make the gift was the prospective gain that would accrue to them from their timber being made accessible to the market.

However, on one hand while the advent of railways caused considerable increase in the value of forest produce, in Jeypore on the other hand, lack of railway connection made the comparatively cheaper saw-mill products of Jeypore town quite expensive for those who wanted to take them outside.

Some findings of interest in this regard have been furnished below:

- In Baramba, inaccessibility was the major factor because of which considerable forest area remained unexploited even during the 1920s.
- In Kalahandi, the Thuamul - Rampur region remained inaccessible even to the carts by 1930s, the forest produce being extracted there by pack-bullocks or colies.
- In Mayurbhanj, the State maintained a newly constructed road by early 20th century, from Baripada to Balasore, along which timber was transported (besides being floated down the Budhabalang river) in carts to the town of Balasore.

Transit rules:

It appears that there existed some kind of transit rules / system before the modern / systematic rules were introduced by the British in the recent past. In those times, the transit rule most probably centred around the transit duties, though there was perhaps no fixed principle and as Hunter writes, each land holder squeezed as much as he could out of every separate band of merchants who passed his way:

"However cheap might be the in - land markets, the tolls and custom houses along the road made the goods too dear for exportation before they reached the coast. Besides the royal officers who levied a tax at every few miles, each petty proprietor through whose estate the route lay, lined the road with hungry myrmidons. Thus in a short journey of 103 miles between Cuttack and Balasore, the tolls amounted in 1708 to thirty - two percent of the total value of the goods.

96 The British Govt. sometimes provided financial assistance to the Rajas for some major road projects in the Garjats. As Mr. Mills, the then Commissioner of Cuttack said (sometime during the first half of the 19th century):

" I consider the opening of roads through uncivilised and jungly countries as the greatest auxiliary of civilisation , and a most efficient instrument in putting down rebellion xxx."

97 For ex; in Baramba, timber and bamboos were floated down the Mahanadi to Cuttack and Puri.(Hunter:1872)
To the southward, the licensed depredators ventured on higher flights and practically anything like internal trade was rendered impossible by the incessant black mail along the roads. Thus, the transit duties on a shilling's worth of timber for forty two miles by road in Ganjam District amounted to 1s. 4d. or 133 per cent. By a river route the extortions were even greater and the cost of 8s. worth of timber mounted to 20s. 6d. for the same journey by water, and for tolls alone, irrespective of their cost of carriage". 67

Besides, there were also customs duty at certain seaports. For ex; in Tikkaly (now in Andhra Pradesh) ex-Estate of Ganjam District, customs were levied on tamarinds, turmeric and wood, along with other items as early as 1780s.68

Introduction of permit system, marking by hammers etc. were certain developments whose origin was definitely related to the British arrangements. For ex; certain hints on the history of modern permit system in the Garjats can be found in the following extracts of a letter (dated 22-10-1889) of the Conservator of Forests, Bengal:

"XXX if the adjacent native States could be induced to adopt a permit system similar to that in use in this Department with regard to the removal of forest produce from their States and if action was taken by this Department under section 41 of the Indian Forest Act their revenue will materially increase and indirectly add to our own besides affording a kind of protection to their forests. XXX"69

Gradually, the Garjats adopted a transit system more or less similar to that of the British India; but in some zamindaries, no specific timber transit rules existed even up to the year of their abolition though some kind of system in this regard was there98.70

Some features of the Garjat transit rules are:
1. No timber or other forest produce should be extracted between sun set and sun rise (Athmallik and Keonjhar ex-States).73
2. No timber could be sold or removed from village forests (Talcher and Baramba ex-States).74
3. Following fees were charged for all poles and timbers imported into the State for local sale (Nayagarh ex-State:)

   Logs : Re. 0-2-0 each
   Poles : Re. 0-0-6 each
   Fuel : Re 0-2-0 per cart load.75

In some ex-States, provision for a ground rent was there for timber removed from State forests but remaining at a place for period exceeding the specified time limit. In Boud, the

98 Even in Patna, there were no marking hammers by 191471. In Sonepur also, no proper sale / marking hammer was found to exist in 1944.72
time limit was seven days. In Bonai, if the timber was not exported during the year, Bhumikar or ground rent was to be paid at the rate of Rs. 5/- per pan (80 pieces).

The common features were check gates, depots, collection of a fee for registration of the distinct property mark of the owner (generally at the rate of Re. 1/- per each mark) if the timber was from outside the State, authorised routes, timber to be sold marked differently than that for personal use (T.P.U.) etc. Among the few exceptional features was the Jalkar (floating charge) in Bonai (Rs. 2/- per 80 pieces of certain logs).

**CASE STUDIES**

I. KEONJHAR

It is said that Nistar cess was first introduced in the State when it was under the Court of Wards from 1906-07. The fluctuating cess was imposed in 1914.

The initial assessment of nistar cess was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality or Sub-division</th>
<th>Each man of paddy or other land not being toila</th>
<th>Each man of toila</th>
<th>Each man of culturable waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sadar</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayagarh</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anandpur division</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
<td>0-0-9</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nistar cess (from 1914-15):

a. For general tenants and certain grant holders:
   - 0-2-0 per acre of wet land
   - 0-1-0 per acre of up land (goda)

b. For Lakhirajdars, rent free Debottar and Brahmottardars:
   - 0-3-0 per acre of wet land
   - 0-1-6 per acre of goda land.

c. Fluctuating nistar cess for foreigners (i.e. temporary settlers of the State who came from outside for service or other such purposes):
   - 1-8-0 (family member = 3)
   - 2-0-0 (family member >3)

Chandana cess : 0 – 4 - 0 per house hold.

Fuel cess for professionals (from 1909):

- Washerman - 1-0-0
- Potter - 1-0-0 to 0-8-0
- Blacksmith - 1-0-0 (those who smelt only)
  - 1-4-0 (those who smelt and manufacture)
- Carpenters - 4-0-0
- Goldsmith - 0-4-0

For aboriginal tribes and land less / poor classes to remove firewood, grass, fibers and leaves (from A Class reserves):
0-12-0 per annum (one head load a day)                  
1-8-0 per annum (one bahangi load a day)\(^87\)

In Bhuiyan pir, a plough tax at 0-8-0 per plough was first introduced in Johnstone’s settlement during 1870. Ploughless people were charged a poll-tax of 0-4-0\(^88\). In 1897, the plough tax and poll tax were increased to 0-13-0 and 0-6½-0 respectively and those who wanted to get rid of their customary service of providing thatching materials to the Raja and thatching the State buildings on bethi were charged additional fees at the following rates:

\[
\begin{align*}
0-3-0 & \quad \text{(per house for plough – owners)} \\
0-1\frac{1}{2}-0 & \quad \text{(per house for plough less people)}  \quad \text{\(^99\)}
\end{align*}
\]

Before the settlement of 1914-15, orchards belonging to private individuals were assessed at rates 0-2-6 to 0-4-6 per man\(^100\) as ground rent. In the settlement of 1914-15, many orchards growing on State wastelands for which the tenants were not paying any rent were recorded in the name of the State and the fruits were auctioned annually\(^90\). The Devottar institutions also realised revenue from annual auction of their orchards\(^91\).

All excisable trees were State property\(^92\).

**Schedule of Rates\(^101\):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Anandpur</th>
<th>Champua, Charigarh and Central portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Poles per tree with girth at 3' from the thick end:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a: 12'' or less(girth)</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b: 30'' to 35''</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dry logs per cft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a: 36'' to 47'' (girth)</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b: 60'' to 84'' and over</td>
<td>0-6-0</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following clarifications were found to be associated with these rates:

a. These were meant for the bonafide resident ryots.

b. The timber was to be removed from protected forests only.

c. Length of pieces not to exceed 20'.

d. All squared logs / beams to be charged 1/3 more than these rates.

Other materials:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rates per:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head load</td>
<td>Cart load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Per Maund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Wood</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo branches</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asan / Sunari bark</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatching and fodder grass</td>
<td>0-0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resins</td>
<td>Per Maund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simili cotton and Mahul</td>
<td>- do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarind</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabai grass or ropes thereof</td>
<td>per 100 maunds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bamboo:**

- Daba per 1000: 10-0-0
- Salia per 1000: 5-0-0
- Flutes each: 0-0-3

- Canes per 100 (25' long): 0-8-0
- Honey per seer: 0-0-9
- Wax: 0-1-6

**Leases (1940s):**

- Kendu Leaf: 10 years lease on payment of Rs. 4250/- (for total lease period) and annual monopoly fee of Rs. 50/-.
- Sabai grass: 5 years lease on minimum royalty of Rs. 625/-.
- Harida and Kochila: 3 years lease on an annual payment of Rs. 551/-.
- Catechu: 5 years lease on an annual payment of Rs. 1000/-.

**Grazing fee:**

It is said that Raja Balabhadra Bhanja (1762-1797) had given the Gouds (milkmen) of upper Keonjhar large herds of cattle from the booty he obtained from by plundering a neighbouring chief and in return, the Gouds were asked to pay a fee called nijog aymal in kind i.e.
1. Ghee for the use of royal family and the deities.
2. Buffaloes for slaughter at the shrine of the goddess.

Though the principle of assessment was not known, it was estimated that the total such fees given in kind was worth of Rs. 294-10-0 in cash.
In some other areas (Lower Keonjhar), the assessment was different i.e. \( \frac{1}{2} \) dhada (105 tola) of ghee per buffalo and 0-4-0 to 0-8-0 per house.\(^{102}\)\(^{96}\)

Later assessments mention grazing fee only on non-agricultural residents and outsiders for their cattle/animals at the following rates\(^{103}\)\(^{97}\):

1. **A- Class reserves:**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tenants' rates</th>
<th>outsiders' rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow/ bullock</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants/camel</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
<td>1-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **B- Class reserves:** at \( \frac{1}{2} \) the above rates.

Access routes:-

Even during 1882-83, 'very good' unmetalled roads running from village to village in the Bhuyan pîrh areas existed in Keonjhar.\(^{98}\)

Both cart tracks and river routes were in use in the State. Through Baitarani and Salandi rivers, timber was transported to other places.\(^{100}\)

**Transit Rule (salient features):**

1. No permit necessary for removing forest produce from B- Class reserves and Khesra for domestic and agricultural needs.\(^{101}\)
2. Timber was not allowed to cross the State boundary unless it bore the mark of the Forester's sale hammer and the pass-holder held a road/river pass.\(^{102}\)

Following hammer marks were used:

- **F. D.**
  - K Mark to fell trees
  - Sold
    - F.D. K Mark to remove timber for commercial purpose
    - Sold
      - T.P.U. K Mark to remove timber for personal use\(^{104}\)\(^{103}\)

---

\(^{102}\) The Gouds paying 'nijog aymul' enjoyed rent free lands and while in U. Keonjhar they were quite prosperous, in L.Keonjhar they were comparatively poor.

\(^{99}\) Payment of ghee as grazing fee was abolished & commuted in the State since 1914-15.

\(^{104}\) F.D – Forest Department

K- Keonjhar
II. GANGPUR

**Nistar cess:**

It appears from the study of some of the records that a forest cess was introduced in this State in early 20th century in the name of Halatanki at following rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5-0</td>
<td>Per plough (Cultivators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2-0</td>
<td>Per house (Non-cultivators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4-0</td>
<td>Per house (Fisherman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-8-0</td>
<td>Per house (Carpenter and Blacksmith)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before that (and even after that also) people had been paying various *panchas* (cesses) mostly in kind and free labour. For ex: the Dashera Pancha included supply of firewood to the Raja/zamindar during the Durga Puja festivals.

By 1920, a Nistar cess at the rate of 0-1-4 per rupee of land rent was in force. Same was the rate in Hemgir, Sargipali and Sarapgarh zamindaries while in Nagra and Hatibari, the rate was 0-2-0. By a proclamation, the rate was made uniform (i.e. 0-1-4) all over the State with effect from 1st April, 1939.

**Rojgari (professional) cess:**

- Washerman: 0-12-0
- Potter: 0-8-0
- Fisherman (Keot): 0-4-0
- Blacksmith: 1-4-0
  - (who repairs only)
  - Blacksmith: 2-8-0
  - (who smelts iron)
- Goldsmith: 1-4-0
- Confectioner: 3-0-0
- Brazier: 1-4-0
- Thuria (money-lender): 1-0-0
- Chamar: 0-3-0

The daily labourer or Sukbasi had to pay 0-2-0 per house. Most of these rates were in force since early 20th century. The cess on cultivators @ 0-5-0 per plough continued even in the 1940s at least in Hemgir zamindary and needless to say, it simply substituted the nistar cess, the reason being not clear.

**Axe Tax:**- 0-2-0 per axe in Hemgir for the tribals practising shifting cultivation.

**Schedule of rates** (with effect from 1920):

The following rates were meant for the personal use of bonafide ryots of the State:

---

105 According to some other reports, a Nistar cess at the rate of 15 pies per rupee of rent was charged even during 1883-90, but some British records do not support this.

106 The list was not uniform everywhere (States). For ex., Bamra Rules mention 21 different professionals in the category including the Lakharas (lac-collectors) and the Sundhis (dealers of country liquor).
Timber:

Class | Rates per cubic ft\(^{107}\). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-6-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0-3-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0-1-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green Poles | Rates per piece
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class I</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6&quot; in girth and under 1'</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2' in girth and under 2 ½'</td>
<td>1-0-0</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3' in girth and under 3 ½'</td>
<td>3-0-0</td>
<td>1-8-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For dry poles of Classes I and II, ¼ the above rates to be charged; no reduction for Class III poles.

Scantlings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Class - I</th>
<th>Class - II</th>
<th>Class - III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 4 cft in volume</td>
<td>0-10-0</td>
<td>0-6-0</td>
<td>0-3-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 cft in volume</td>
<td>0-12-0</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
<td>0-5-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MFP for sale within the State to the residents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cart load (bullock)</th>
<th>Head Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firewood</td>
<td>0-6-0</td>
<td>0-0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabai grass, thatching grass, dwarf date palm leaves and fibre from climbers, siali etc.</td>
<td>0-6-0</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>2-0-0</td>
<td>0-1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fodder grass: ½ the rate of Sabai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey per seer</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax per seer</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gums and resins per seer</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simili cotton per seer</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac per maund</td>
<td>1-8-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunari bark</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo per 100 (Green)</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo per 100 (Dry)</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1949, a resident (forest contractor) of Hemgir zamindary was allowed to cut and remove trees in the Bhaluatikra village forests at the following rates\(^{108}\) (towards reclamation charges):\(^{116}\)

\(^{107}\) For revised rates for village forests, see 'Rights And Concessions' (Gangpur).
\(^{108}\) It may be mentioned here that rate charts given in this chapter are not exclusive. Thus rate for logs/poles of certain size have not been quoted here.
Sal ballis\textsuperscript{109}  3" - 5" (girth) : Rs. 40/- per 100
6" - 7" : Rs 75/- per 100
9"-10" : Rs 300/- per 100
12" : Rs. 450 /- per 100

Miscellaneous ballis  3" - 5" : Rs. 20/- per 100
6" - 7" : Rs 37-8-0 /- per 100
12" : Rs . 225 /- per 100

3. Sal and bija logs  3' - 3 ½' : Rs 300/- per 100
4' - 4 ½' : Rs. 500/- per 100
6' -6 ½' : Rs 600/- per 100

4. Bamboo : Rs. 1-8-0 per 100
5. Firewood : Rs. 35 per rail wagon
8. Charcoal : 0-6-0 per bag
: Rs. 250/- per rail wagon

9. Sawn Timber : 1-4-0 per cft.
10. Tramline sleepers  3' (used in collieries) 4' : Rs. 5/- per 100
5' : Rs. 6-8-0 per 100

Leases :

\textit{Khalsa (1920s)}:\textsuperscript{118}

Sabai grass : Monopoly lease for 10 years at 0-3-0 per maund with a minimum royalty of Rs. 1000/- a year for the first five years and Rs. 2000/- a year for the next five years.

Kendu Leaf : for monopoly of export, six contractors paid Rs. 12000/- per year.

\textit{Nagra (1920s)} :\textsuperscript{119}

Sabai grass : at 0-3-0 per maund with a minimum royalty of Rs. 3000/- per year.
Kendu leaf : Monopoly fee at Rs. 8000/- per annum.

\textit{Hemgir (1940s)}:\textsuperscript{120}

Bamboo : 12-year lease on minimum royalty at Rs. 4000/- per annum for first six years and thereafter Rs. 5000/- per annum. Royalty rates varied from 1-12-0 per 100 to 0-12-0 per 100 according to the felling series.

Kendu leaf : 5-year lease at Rs. 10000/- per annum.

\textbf{Grazing fee ( all over the State)}:

\textsuperscript{109} Balli - poles (usually green) of 16' to 17' height.\textsuperscript{117}
Upto 1906-07, resident herdsmen of the State used to pay annually to their village headmen some amount of ghee and the headman was supposed to pay certain amount of the same to the Raja per annum. Outsiders were paying grazing fees.

No charges were made for plough cattle and for non-plough cattle not exceeding five heads. In Khesra forests, for non-plough cattle exceeding five heads following rates had been prescribed in the rules of 1920:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow per head</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo per head</td>
<td>0-3-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calves per head</td>
<td>½ the above rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proclamation of 1938 abolished grazing fee in the village forests (for those bonafide residents of the State who were not professional dealers in ghee and cattle) and prescribed the following rates for extra cattle for grazing in the Reserved as well as Protected forests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullock / cow per head</td>
<td>0-3-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo per head</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No fee was charged for young animals under one year. For professional dealers in ghee and cattle as well as outsiders, there were other rates.

**Access Route:**

Besides cart tracks, more than 280 miles motorable roads (November to June) of the State along with the Bengal Nagpur Railway passing through it certainly helped for accessibility to its forests. To facilitate the transport of forest produce, many forest roads were specially constructed as in Hemgir (Dhudka- Taparia road: 19 miles).

Lac and timber etc. of the neighbouring Ranchi district were exported through Rajgangpur and Biramitrapur railway stations of this State.

**Transit rules:** The Commissioner of Chot Nagpur Division reported in 1892 about a kind of export duty called *malkana* being levied on certain forest produce considered to be 'important' (comparative to others whose demand was negligible in the State) at the following rates per rupee of the price on the border of the Gangpur State:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produce</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resin</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac (1st Class)</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harra</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No duty appeared to be levied on the 'unimportant' articles like Simili cotton, bamboos, fuel and charcoal etc. The Commissioner however found that as the opening of the BNR had caused a demand for such articles and other jungle produce, the Raja had started collecting 0-0-2 per rupee of the price paid for such previously 'unimportant' articles, through the contractors appointed by him for this purpose.
The transit rules adopted later were in general similar to those of the other States.

### III. RANPUR

Fuel cess and other annual fees:

Prior to their abolition in 1939-40, following fees were paid by the professionals:\(^{131}\)

To remove fuel wood:
- Potter, Blacksmith and Washerman: 3-0-0
- Grocers (head load per day): 1-8-0 (local)
- For sale by local people (bahangi load a day): 3-0-0 (locals) and 4-8-0 (outsiders)

For professional tribes to remove bamboo:
- Local people: 3-0-0
- Outsider: 4-8-0

People also rendered certain *bethi* and *begari* in lieu of the rights / concessions allowed to them in the forests. All these services and annual cesses were abolished after the Prajamandal movements in the State\(^{110}\).

However, a special fee that still continued was Rs. 10 per furnace from the *Khairas* who came from outside the State to manufacture catechu.\(^{132}\)

#### Schedule of rates: \(^{133}\)

The following rates were in force during the mid 1940s, it is not known whether they were the revised version of any previous schedule of rates. One thing however is clear that certain fees were charged on forest produce even during the late 19th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timber</th>
<th>Rates per tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poles and round logs</td>
<td>Class I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 12&quot; girth</td>
<td>0-3-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; to under 16&quot;</td>
<td>0-6-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; to 36&quot;</td>
<td>2-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 25% for squared timber.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scantlings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 cft:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cft to 2 cft:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MFP:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firewood (from Khesra):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{110}\) According to Ramdhyani, there were proposals to introduce nistar cess (in 1940s) \(^{134}\). It was however not implemented.
Charcoal (from reserves):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Locals</th>
<th>Outsiders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4-0</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
<td>(Bahangi Load)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3-0</td>
<td>0-5-0</td>
<td>(Head load)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bamboos:

- Salia Per 100: 1-8-0
- Kanta Per 100: 3-0-0

For outside sale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bamboo of 6&quot; girth</th>
<th>Under 6&quot; girth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mal area:</td>
<td>2-0-0 / 100</td>
<td>1-4-0 / 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas:</td>
<td>3-0-0 / 100</td>
<td>2-0-0 / 100 (Kanta)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cane:

- Per 80 pieces: 1-0-0 (local people)
- Per 80 pieces: 0-10-0 (local basket makers)

Leases (1940s):

1. Kochila: It was the principal MFP exported from the State. A 3-year contract was granted to a local dealer on Rs. 900/- annually.
2. Honey: The contract brought Rs. 50/- per year.
3. Siali leaves: This contract realised Rs. 150/- per year.
4. Bamboo: The State received Rs. 47-8-0 per ton delivered at the mills, from Titagarh Paper Mills.

Grazing:

In the late 19th century, grazing was allowed 'free' in undemarcated reserves for plough cattle and cows, people had to pay in kind some milk and milk products in lieu of that and in cash, only for the buffaloes.

Grazing fees being paid in ‘A’ Class reserves were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenants</th>
<th>Outsiders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow / buffalo:</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
<td>0-12-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo:</td>
<td>0-12-0</td>
<td>1-2-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access route:

The condition of access routes in this ex-State was more or less similar to that in most of the other Garjats except that it was connected in one way or another with the Madras Trunk Road and the Howrah-Madras railway line. The Forest Department constructed some roads to facilitate extraction of forest produce one of most important among them being the Nakithana - Patia - Sankhajori project (taken up in 1940s).

Transit rules: The Ranpur Forest Rule says:
"XXX no carts can be allowed to halt in places which are not fixed by the Raja for this purpose".139

And also:

"If the Raja had good reasons to believe that the failure in removal or collection of the forest produce entered in the pass or permit was due to the negligence of the purchaser, he may order him to pay one fourth of the fees more than the fixed amount in default of which his claim will be rejected".140

The general principles of the Ranpur transit rules were similar to those of other ex-States.

IV. GHUMSUR:

• Plough tax on the land allotted to the service holders under the Raja : Rs. 2. 141
• 'Bono Soonno'111: 'Rents from forests and jungles for the right of cutting wood, grass etc. at 0-1-0 per head (Stevenson:1916).142

Besides, there were taxes on mango orchards and tamarind trees; and most probably, the Raja derived some share from the forest produce collected by the people.

There were also taxes on various professionals (oil makers, potters etc.)143 and not only the headman of the milkman caste had to pay a tax (Mohunkudopunno) but also a tax in kind or money was levied from the herdsmen under the name Gopa Koro(Stevenson:1916)144.

Some sort of transit duties were levied on articles passing to and from the Maliah regions at least at four places (Colladah, Codundah, Corchully and Punchabooty).145

V. JEYPORE:

Plough Tax: It seems from the study of records that introduction of an annual royalty system for forest produce was quite later in this ex-Estate than the system of seigniorage rates:

"It was XXX found that on account of the vast area of the Estate, with forests scattered through out, proper check could not be exercised over removal of forest products with the result that some people removed such produce without license and escaped payment; while those desirous of paying royalty found it difficult to go to a permit issuing station and get license as often as required for any produce. The Chief Forest Officer, Jeypore then devised a scheme of annual royalty system popularly know as plough tax"112(PEAECR:1940)146.

111 It is not known if this had any connection with the so called 'wooden tax' by the British as mentioned in their statement of accounts for Ghumsur in 1818. Details of this wooden tax are not available.
112 In Panchipenta and Madgole regions under the ownership of the Maharaja of Jeypore, the tax was assessed at 0-8-0 per house in case of no plough.157
This tax was introduced in 1922-23, and was supposed to be optional, recognising the right of the villagers to accept or ignore this system as per their convenience. The rates varied between 0-4-0 to 1-0-0 according to the locality and only the non-privilege holders (plough-owners) had to pay it. It was however found that the rights and concessions granted in lieu of this tax had been unduly exercised by the payers either willingly or unwillingly causing considerable damage to the forests. For this and other reasons (see: Peoples’ Movement For Forest Rights: Jeypore) this tax was discontinued in 1949.

Another system had been experimentally introduced since 1912 in the Kotpad and Umerkot ranges whereby the villagers were to pay 0-1-0 per rupee of their land rent as forest cess (PEAECR:1940).

Prior to the introduction of these commutation systems, assessments used to include, with other products, skins and arrow-root etc. But when the Estate was under Court of Wards, these payments in kind were commuted only in some parts. Where thatching grass was available, a grass rent was continued to be practised, as this thatching grass was, on one hand, necessary for the annual repair of the Estate holdings; and on the other hand, was perhaps scarcely available in other areas (Francis:1992). It may however be remembered that this grass rent was realised as a part of land rent and not as a forest cess directly. It was comparatively nominal and did not comprise a major portion of the rent.

Some royalty is also said to have been levied annually on topes / orchards for some time in the past and discontinued later, the exact details of which could not be ascertained.

Schedule of rates:

In his letter dated 5-12-1893 to the Agent to the Governor; the Dewan (Manager) of the Jeypore Estate wrote that there might be charged a small lump sum on the villagers who removed myrobalan and Ippa (Mohwa) flowers from the jungles for sale.

In the above letter, the area concerned was the Jeypore thana. In Nowrangpur area, the ryot was getting Re. 1/- or even lower per putty of myrobalan from the traders, this rate supposed to be only the cost of collection; and the concerned Forest Ranger was ordered by the Estate Manager not to collect any seigniorage on this produce and leave the ryots free in its collection (from reserved and unreserved forests). It was at the same time, observed that this right of free collection “may be given on condition that they must offer the produce for sale to the forest department at reasonable rates.”

---

113 The Partially Excluded Areas Enquiry Committee however found that some privilege holders were also assessed with this tax.
114 Thana or tahsil. The whole Estate was divided into a number of thanas for revenue and other administrative purposes.
The seigniorage rates were some times different in different areas. For ex; in Umerkote and Malkangiri areas, seigniorage at 0-4-0 per putty\textsuperscript{115} of myrobalan was being collected\textsuperscript{116} in September 1893, while no such rate was being levied in the Nowrangpur area\textsuperscript{161}. In the Mottu area of Malkangiri thana, following rates were levied in August 1893:\textsuperscript{162}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scale of rate</th>
<th>Fees per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>2-0-0</td>
<td>Maund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
<td>Maund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac</td>
<td>2-0-0</td>
<td>500lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow root</td>
<td>1-0-0</td>
<td>500lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohwa</td>
<td>1-0-0</td>
<td>500 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohwa Oil</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
<td>Kunchum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass mats</td>
<td>0-0-3</td>
<td>Each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bamboo</td>
<td>2-8-0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bamboo</td>
<td>0-12-0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding timber, in 1890, some of the teak logs ordered to auction at the upset price of 0-12-0 / cft for all sound timber was found difficult to be sold and the in-charge requested for permission to dispose of the timber at an upset price of Rs. 5/- a log irrespective of size (Malkangiri area).\textsuperscript{163}

Later on, an uniform rate was devised for the whole Estate as follows (1940s).\textsuperscript{164}

**Timber**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cart load (rough )</th>
<th>Cart load (squared)</th>
<th>Head Load (rough )</th>
<th>Head Load (squared)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>5-0-0</td>
<td>7-8-0</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
<td>0-6-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>2-8-0</td>
<td>3-12-0</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
<td>0-3-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>1-4-0</td>
<td>1-14-0</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
<td>0-1-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reserved Species : 6-0-0 per cart Load (rough)
9-0-0 Per cart Load (squared)
0-8-0 Per head load (rough)
0-12-0 Per head Load (squared)

Teak for export\textsuperscript{117} : 20-0-0 per cart load (rough)

Fire Wood:

Dead trees : 0-6-0 (cart load)
0-0-3 (head load)
0-12-0 (cart load from Rfs)

Bamboos:

\textsuperscript{115} 1 Kunchum $\equiv$ 3 kg
\textsuperscript{116} 1 Putty $\equiv$ 60 Kg\textsuperscript{165}
\textsuperscript{117} Most probably from traders / merchants
\textsuperscript{166} Timber was sold at 2/3 of the rates fixed for export purpose to the inhabitants.\textsuperscript{166}
Description | Cart Load | Head Load
--- | --- | ---
Big | 2-8-0 | 0-2-0
Small | 1-0-0 | 0-0-6 (for use within the Estate)

Other MFP:

Description | Per Maund of 25 lbs
--- | ---
Resin | 6-0-0
Lac | 6-0-0
Tamarind with seed | 0-1-6 (for export)
Tamarind | 0-0-9 (for use within the Estate)
Honey | 0-4-0
Mahul | 0-1-0
Wax | 1-12-0
Mohwa seed | 0-1-6
Thatch grass | 0-5-0 per cart load
 | 0-0-3 per head load
Sunari bark | 10-0-0 Per cart load of 1120 lbs

Leases:
Sleeper lease: granted first for five years and then for 25 years (from 1922) to the same company at minimum royalty of Rs. 38000/- per annum. Individual royalties were Rs. 2-2-0 per piece of Sal B.G. sleepers and Re. 1 to Rs. 1-8-0 per cft for rough and sawn timber of Teak respectively.\(^{167}\)

Besides, myrobalan was leased also while tamarind was sold by auction. Kendu Leaf was sold either by auction or by negotiation for a negligible amount.\(^{168}\)

Grazing fee:

This fee was paid only for grazing in the Reserved Lands at the following rates:\(^{169}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenants' rate</th>
<th>Outsiders' rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow, buffalo, bullock, ass</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calves more than 6 months old</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access route:

The extent to which the forests of this Estate were inaccessible can be judged from the fact that roads were apparently non-existent when the Madras Government first took over the direct administration of Jeypore Estate in 1863. Even carts were virtually unknown, merchandise being carried by caravans of pack bullocks.\(^{170}\)

The first major road project constructed by the British Government with much difficulty because of the unfavourable geographical conditions, in the later half of 19\(^{th}\) century, was nothing more than an excellent bullock cart track.\(^{171}\)
Rivers were not useful in some places. For ex; at Majjikota the streams being full of rocky barriers, floating was not possible (Francis:1992). 172

Understanding the success with which a small portable tramway was being used in the Nellore district by the forest department there for carrying wood, the Jeypore Estate establishment was also interested for a similar system in the late 19th century 173. No evidence however was found to confirm that it materialised ever.

Situation gradually improved later and by 1940s accessibility had increased to some extent.

Transit rules:

Before a systematic transit system could be introduced when the Estate was under Court of Wards in 1890s, there existed some sort of rules 118 as evident from the following:

"XXX it was the custom of the late Maharajah to employ boatsman to stop all logs of timber found floating down the river or stranded on the islands in its course. If these logs were properly addressed they were again placed in the river and forwarded to their destination; if not properly addressed, they were retained by the Maharajah’s officials on the assumption that they came from the Estate forests. This timber was periodically sold, one fourth of the proceeds being distributed amongst the boats men who collected the timbers and the balance of three fourths credited to the Estate. XXX" . n. 174

By 1890s pass-ports were being issued for export of timber 175. The export to the southern provinces was regulated by the Godavari transit rules which said:

"XXX all persons bringing timber down the Saberi river from Jeypore or Bastar zamindaries will be required to take out a ticket (for which no charges will be made) at the tannah at Koleru. On reaching the prescribed tannah, the officer in-charge will mark all the timber and pieces of wood with a pass hammer and grant a way permit. The timber can then be realized and pass on." 177
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RIGHTS AND CONCESSIONS

How did the consciousness/awareness of forest rights evolve? What the Madras Board of Revenue observed on this question, is relevant in case of Garjat Orissa also:

"These forest rights are, Mr. Brandis states, the result of long established custom under the old system when forests were to a certain extent regarded as the common property of any body" and when the people in the vicinity of a forest were in the habit, under varying restrictions and taxes imposed by the former rulers, of resorting it for wood, timber, grass and pasture for their cattle and for a variety of other forest produce". (Brandis:1878)

In ancient past, the reasons associated with restricting peoples' rights in forests and allowing them certain privileges or concessions therein by the rulers/proprietors were:

- revenue collection from trees/forests
- humanitarian grounds
- lack of importance to a forest area
- other interests of the Raja (for ex; the free service and offerings rendered to him by the forest tribes)
- boundary limitations (even the tribal communities had their own forest boundaries based on mutual understanding)

Later, when a systematic forest policy began to be followed aiming at forest conservation, what happened in the British India (Orissa) had more or less parallel and similar developments in the Garjats. Not only certain new restrictions (for ex; girth consideration in allowing people to fell trees) were imposed, but also the restrictions and concessions which had been there for centuries were now made more systematic and well-defined for the sake of conservation and forest revenue.

In this new phase, the policy adopted by the Garjat chiefs to recognise (allow) the rights and privileges of the people in the forests were controlled by four important factors, viz.,

1. Forest conservation (for ex; no concessions in ‘A’-class reserves) for the sake of revenue, environmental reasons and greater cause of the people (future needs for fuel etc).
2. Privilege of the king (for ex; in Ranpur, certain concessions were allowed in lieu of the bethi and begari etc. and were discontinued after the abolition of such systems).
3. Humanitarian grounds: This again had two aspects:
   i. concession allowed on such grounds (for ex; relaxation of forest rules during

119 In Keonjhar, for example, the forests were regarded as the property of the whole community in the Bhuyan pirh area and each man of the village community was allowed a portion of the forest for shifting cultivation according to his needs as well as his capacity to clear the jungles, by the village headman. The village headman was not the proprietor of forests but only the channel to settle the matter for the whole community without chaos.

120 In this matter, the Rajas generally followed the advice of the forestry experts. So the restrictions imposed on this ground were in general not by the Raja himself in fact, but by such experts. In Talcher, when the ryots were conceded full rights on certain trees, the Forest Advisor was against giving such rights to them in fear of needless destruction.
famine or allowing certain tribes for shifting cultivation).

ii. concession (right) denied on such grounds (for ex; when tenants in the Patna State demanded right to kill tiger without any license, the Raja declined to grant any such right showing the reason that killing tigers was not within the capacity of everybody and that, if inexperienced people left a tiger wounded, it would be dangerous for them).

During the era of forest conservancy in the Garjats, the situation vis a vis rights / concessions went throughout three different phases, viz.,

1. Early Phase: Restrictions less, rights and concessions allowed to people sufficiently.
2. Middle Phase: Restrictions increased, thereby depriving people of many of the rights / privileges enjoyed previously.
3. Last Phase: Some of the restrictions withdrawn, allowing people more concessions/rights.

All the three phases are illustrated by the following table showing the number of reserved species in different periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Early Phase</th>
<th>Middle Phase</th>
<th>Last Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athmallik</td>
<td>8 (?)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boud</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28 123</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranpur</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32 124</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keonjhar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhenkanal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonai</td>
<td>15 (?)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangpur</td>
<td>14 (?)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilgiri</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeypore</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, there were many exceptions, which again show various other aspects of these three phases. For ex;

1. In Bonai, rules proposed in 1892 said 11 valuable species of circumference less than 3 cubit were prohibited for cutting in the RFs, thereby implying to certain access to these species of more than 3 cubits circumference in the RFs. Later rules simply said that no rights existed in the RFs except those admitted to the aborigines for the removal of MFP only.
2. In Parlakhemundi ex-Estate, 47 species were reserved by 1909.
3. No reserved species existed in some ex-Estates (for ex; Chikiti in Ganjam district).

The rights / concessions allowed to the tenants also depended on the following factors:

---

121 This phase refers to the success of people’s movements during the 1930s and 1940s.
122 The term has been used here (with reference to the table) in a generalised sense and thus includes protected and prohibited species also. In Bonai, out of the 15 species shown under the Early Phase column, 11 were prohibited for cutting only under the specified girth in the unreserves. In some cases, the number of species in both the Early (before 1908) and Middle (1908-1935) phases were either same (more or less) or the number in Early Phase is not available.
123 Boud Rules mention 25 reserved species.
124 While Mathur mentions this number as 30, acc. to Ramdhani it was 33.

1. Individual status: Generally poor people and those belonging to lower caste or tribes enjoyed certain concessions not allowed to others. For ex., in Athmallik (1906), though Khajuri palm was being leased out for toddy (tari), the Sud and Gond tribals were allowed to tap these trees without any licence for toddy preparation.19(I)

Some tenants of higher status enjoyed certain exemptions in some ex-States (for ex; in Narsinghpur, Brahmans and relatives of the Raja were not liable to pay the forest cess).

In Athamalik (1935), State servants who were not bonafide residents of the State but came from outside, were exempted from nistar cess and grazing fees21.

2. Situation of the tenant’s holding/village with respect to the forest:

For ex., in Bonai, concessions were given to the tribes living in villages adjacent to or surrounded by the reserves for free removal of MFP from such reserves.22

In Patna, more the distance of forests; less was the Nistar cess charged on tenants.

3. Tenancy laws: In many ex-States, no such tenancy law existed and right to the trees in the tenants' holdings as well as in the waste lands varied from State to State and from time to time within a State (of course, not in all the cases). For ex;

a. The tenants had right to the fruits and leaves of the trees in their holdings126, but not to the timber thereof.

b. Even if he had a right to the timber, permission was required (and a royalty to be paid if necessary) to use it.

c. In waste lands (1930s);

i. no right to fruits on wastelands (Narsinghpur). (Ramdhyani:1947)23

ii. ryots had right to fruits on wasteland, but dry trees belonged to the village holder (Sonepur).24

iii. trees planted in waste lands belonged to the planter (Athmallik). (Ramdhyani:1947)25

iv. no rights to trees in waste lands, all fruit bearing trees on village waste leased out by the State (Nilgiri). (Ramdhyani:1947)26

d. In Orchards:

i. fruits of all orchards growing on State lands auctioned annually (Keonjhar: 1914-15).28

ii. all orchards belonged to the government, the State having right over half the fruits and the planters the other half; the State allowed its share to the poor and to those who did not have fruit trees and no none was allowed to waste the fruits of the orchards (Hindol: 1910-14).29

125 In some other areas, certain rent free grant holders had to pay this cess at a rate higher than the normal.
126 for personal use. In many ex-States, the State monopoly over certain forest produce extended even to the ryoti holdings. For ex., in Kalahandi, the ryots had to sell the Lac to the monopolist from their holdings.27
In the Orissa ex-Estates under the Madras Presidency, the Madras Estates Land Act of 1908 conceded the right to use, enjoy, cut down, carry away or dispose of all trees standing in his holding to the ryot (whereas similar rights were conferred on occupancy ryots in Orissa Tenancy Act area as late as 1938)\(^{30}\). In the ex-States of Orissa, such rights in most of the cases came after the mass movements started in the 1930s.

4. **Nistar rights:**

The rights and concessions enjoyed in lieu of the Nistar cess were not well defined in all cases. The payers were generally entitled for plough timber, bamboo and other MFP required for their domestic and agricultural needs each year.

But the right to get these timber and other MFP for bonafide use was restricted to the Khesra / protected forests (‘B’ Class reserves) at best. Access to ‘A’ class reserves was allowed only if it was not available in the forests of other class. The payers were also entitled for reserved species at concessional rates and for free grazing of their cattle in the unreserves upto a certain number of cattle\(^{127}\).

However, the principle was not followed in practice in some ex-States. In Tigriria and Narsinghpur, where people paid 0-1-0 per rupee of rent as the forest cess, the States Enquiry Committee found that they were not allowed to get wood for their domestic and agricultural implements(SECR:1939)\(^{31}\). In contrast, people of Khallikote and Athagad ex-Estates were allowed to take such timber / MFP for their bonafide use free of royalty from the unreserves even though they were not paying any forest cess(FECR:1959)\(^{32}\).

The Forest Enquiry Committee Report (1959) says that no rights or concessions existed in the ex-Anchal (ex-Estate) areas other than those recorded in the report\(^{33}\). Hemgir is a classic example to prove that this was not true\(^{128}\). But if the above statement of the Forest Enquiry Committee was true for some other ex-Estates, then the reasons thereof may be ascribed to any of the following:

1. Forest area very small, deserving strict conservation. For ex; in Patkulunda ex-Estate of western Orissa, there was only a small scrubby jungle extending over 58.60 acres and no rights and concessions existed (as per the FECR) therein.\(^{34}\)
2. The zamindar was very strict or oppressive.
3. Perhaps concessions existed, but not recorded systematically. For ex; in Parlakhemundi ex-Estate, no record of rights were available for the Forest Officer's guidance when the Govt. temporarily took over the management of the forests of this Estate.\(^{37}\)

Another subject deserving attention is the recognition of the customary rights of the tribal people for hunting in forests. The Forest Rules studied by us did not mention any thing regarding such tribal rights though restrictions for killing wild animals / birds have been mentioned especially for the *shikaris* and amateur hunters. It seems that either such concession was allowed unofficially in unreserves or was not allowed at all. On the other

\(^{127}\) In Athmalik, the following provision was there :
Bonafide residents paying more than 0-4-0 as forest cess ( 0-4-0 being the fuel cess ) were entitled to graze four heads of the goats / sheeps and 10 heads of cattle. For every 10 acres of land cultivated by him, the ryot was to get free grazing facility for seven extra cattle over an initial 10 acres.\(^{35}\)

\(^{128}\) The report records the rights and concessions admitted in only one ex-Estate of Gangpur, i.e. Nagra.\(^{36}\)
hand, many of the tribals had abandoned their nomadic way of life and had resorted to the permanent cultivation. Such people went for hunting either occasionally or once in a year during some religious festival. Even then also, permission for such annual hunt did not find any mention in the Forest Rules except in that of the Jeypore Estate. We have, however, evidence that the tribes still managed to continue their practice.

For ex; in Keonjhar, the tribals used to go for an annual hunt known as paridhi or akhini on the day of Saraswati Puja each year. This hunt continued for two days. And in Gangpur, the Oram tribals arranged such hunts during the holi festival and called it Phagun Shikar. Such hunts were considered by them to be of religious significance and any kind of adversity or prohibition experienced during such expeditions were considered as evil signs. The akhand shikar of Mayurbhanj thus means hunting without any discontinuity. In Jeypore, lazymen not interested to take part in the hunt, were forced by the female relatives to go for it and the tribals even wanted the Maharaja and his officials to join them in their expedition.

Peoples' movements during 1930s succeeded in getting some rights / concessions. For ex;
1. In Athmalik (1939), non-tenants were permitted to have reserved species at 1/2 royalty and unreserved species at 1/4 royalty, for house building purposes. Tenants were exempted from grazing fee for sheep and goat.
2. In Athagad (November 1938 ), the Darbar declared the following concessions :
   - Various forest dues (worth about Rs. 3616) pending on the tenants were exempted from payment.
   - Redemarcation of RF boundaries and provision for other forest facilities.
3. In Hindol (1939), the Raja abolished grazing fees and granted free licenses for crop protection.

Still, the situation was not much improved by the early 1940s, as reflected in the following recommendations of R.K. Ramdhyani for the Orissa and Chattisgarh ex-States:

1. Free rights of Nistar and grazing be allowed in the demarcated village boundaries with concern to conservancy; no cess / fee be levied if it did not exist already.
2. Where Nistar cess was being levied, no charge should be taken on valuable timber though control might be exercised through village panchayats.
3. In case only protected forests were available for the villagers' use, Nistar might be levied but no charge should be made on particular species though restriction might be exercised.
4. Rate of commutation should be optional and based on the the payer’s status or on an average rate of land he held.
5. Forest rules should not apply to the management of forests within the village boundaries; a Nistar Panchayat might manage it as ordered in Jashpur (in M.P.).

---

129 The Oram tradition says, “Elites play holi with colour, but the tribals play it with blood (of the animals).”
130 The tradition has forced the Forest Department of Government of Orissa to make strict arrangements so as to prevent it in the Shimlipal reserves, every year.
131 Acc. to Athmalik Rules, people paying annas 4 or less as fuel cess were called ‘non-tenants’. These people were generally homestead holders.
132 In this regard, only the following statement is found in Jashpur State Admin. Report(1943-44):
   “The total area of forests comprises 280 acres of ‘A’ Class Reserve in which tenants have no rights whatever and 146 acres of ‘B’ class reserve or raiyati rakhat: These are looked after by village Panchayats who are primarily responsible for their maintenance.” (p.14)
6. Agriculturists should get free grazing in village forests, non agriculturists should not be permitted to graze their cattle on village waste if alternative grazing in RF was available at a reasonable distance; and if allowed in village forests, they should pay the fee.
7. Monopoly on hide (for village animals), lac, tendu and harra should be abolished. The cultivator should not be compelled to sell these products to any person from his fields.
8. In respect of tendu and harra, the customary rights of the ryots in respect of their domestic needs must be safe-guarded (as provided for in some existing leases).
9. For Mohwa, States should not be permitted to give a contract outside RFs. Contracts for lac, tendu and harra should not be given out in ryoti holdings.
10. Rights to kill animals for crop protection should be given.

CASE STUDIES

I. KEONJHAR

**Forest cess:** 22 villages in lower Keonjhar were exempted from Nistar cess(1914-15) as no jungle was there in close proximity of these villages.46

The Kumardihi Jagir granted to the potters who supplied pots free to the State temples, palace and State officials, were exempted from Nistar cess.47

**A- Class RFs:** Aboriginal tribes, landless and poor people allowed to remove for sale naturally fallen firewood, bamboos and other MFP on paying the rates prescribed for them.48

Timber, bamboo and other MFP (except firewood) free to cess payers with permission, if not available in Khesra. Aboriginals permitted to remove free of charge edible fruits, roots, flower and leaves, for their own consumption.49

Combin maker Kundras permitted to remove Kurum, Kutrang and Nipukunnia on payment of 1/2 the ordinary royalty.50
Reserved species at 1/2 the royalty for the cess payers for their personal use51. For grazing, a maximum 10 plough cattle allowed free (for cess payers).52

**‘B’ - Class RFs or D.P.F.s:** Timber and firewood free for cess payers for agricultural implements according to a fixed scale. Excess over the scale, at 1/4 schedule of rate.53

Grazing free (to limited cattle) except for non- agriculturists and outsiders.54

**Khesra or U.D.P.F.s:** Unreserved and reserved species for agricultural implements free; reserved species for personal use at 1/4 schedule of rate (for cess payers etc).55

Poor and landless people, tribals, and *pans* allowed unreserved species free for own consumption as well as for sale; reserved species free for personal use.56

Firewood and MFP free for all also free grazing allowed.57
Other Concessions:

1. Men of the Savar and other tribes manufacturing charcoal permitted for the same (except between February to June each year) in the reserves from the fallen wood or trees cut from the land cleared for cultivation (if not considered valuable).

2. Timber was allowed free of royalty to the flood affected people in 1927, for the purpose of house construction.

Free grants reached a very high figure in the State (as per the Working Plan for 1945-46) i.e. about Rs. 20000/- for tenants and Rs. 10000/- for State purposes.

Right to trees in the holdings:

Right to all trees growing in the ryoti holdings allowed except for Sal trees of girth exceeding 35″ (for which 1/2 the royalty to be paid). (Ramdhanyani:1947)

It may be mentioned here that the States Enquiry Committee found in the late 1930s that when the aborigines went for permits to remove plough timber and fuel wood, they were asked to pay Rs. 5 to the Forester and Rs. 4 to the Guard and were harassed in case they refused to pay this. People also felt that many of the rights and privileges they enjoyed before 1914 or earlier had been taken away from them (for ex; they complained that additional fees were being charged on them for timber and other forest produce taken for their personal use even though they were paying a forest cess).

II. GANGPUR

Khalsa (1920s):

No sort of rights granted in the reserves though in a few cases, the residents of some villages situated within or bordering on the reserves were at times allowed to collect edible fruits, roots, myrobalans etc. at concessional rate.

In protected forests, the bonafide residents of the State were allowed timber of unreserved species and firewood for their personal bonafide use only; also free grazing for plough cattle and upto five heads of cows or she-buffaloes.

Those holding settlement parcha for arable lands, were allowed free timber of reserved species for ploughs etc, after being marked by the forest staff.

It may be noted here that requirements of the people, especially of the aboriginals were very few and simple and even professional bamboo basket-makers consumed few bamboos.

The States Enquiry Committee came to know in June -1938 that although people were paying a forest cess of 0-5-0 per yoke of bullocks (implying to the plough tax), the facilities for which they were entitled (i.e. house timber and plough timber etc; free of cost) had been gradually withdrawn. Also heavy compensation was to be paid if the grazing stock trespassed outside the village forests (grazing fee being levied inside village forests).
Many concessions were announced in favour of the people by a proclamation issued on behalf of the Regent Rani Saheba in December 1938 and the new scheme proposed for the rights and concessions was as in the following:

**Reserved Forests**

*House timber:* For cess payers at half royalty for unreserved species (green or dry) and reserved species (dry); and at full rate for reserved species (green). This rule applied for non-cess payers also.

*Fencing Materials:* At 1/2 royalty for unreserved species for both cess- and non-cess payers (thorns to be supplied only in September).

*Fuel:* At half royalty for reserved species (green or dry) and free of cost for unreserved species (green or dry) as well as for useless wood of reserved species (applicable for both cess- and non-cess payers).

*Plough timber:* Same rules as for house timber.

**Protected forests:**

*House timber:* Free for the cess payers for unreserved species and at half royalty for reserved species (green or dry).

For non-cess payers, at half royalty for both reserved and unreserved species (green or dry).

*Fencing materials:* Free for cess payers for both unreserved species and thorns.

For non-cess payers, at half royalty for these materials.

*Fuel:* Free for the cess and non-cess payers for green or dry unreserved species as well as for dry fallen branches of the reserved species.

*Plough timber:* Free for the cess payers for both reserved and unreserved species.

For non-cess payers at 0-3-0 and 0-1-6 per plough for reserved and unreserved species respectively.

**Village forests:** Same as in protected forests for house timber and fencing materials etc.

The rates for three classes of timber (dry) were revised for village forests for the personal use by bonafide ryots as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Rate (per cft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class - I</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class - II</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class - III</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards grazing, the proclamation described the following concessions:

Free grazing in village forests for the animals of bonafide agriculturists and the Sukbasis.

---

133 Special coupes were opened in reserved forests (to be opened between January to May each year except for thorns in September when these were required for fencing sugarcane *barchhas*)
Free grazing in both protected and reserved forests for 6 pairs of plough cattle and one cow and one she-buffalo per plough to a maximum of 5 cows or 3 buffaloes per holding. For animals in excess, at the rate of 0-3-0 per cow or bullock and 0-4-0 per buffalo in the area fixed by the forest officer. No charge for young animals; no browsers allowed.

No exemption for professional dealers in ghee and cattle in all the forests.

These revised rules were applicable all over to Gangpur State including the zamindaries.

**Rights to trees in ryoti holdings:**

The rules proposed in 1892 prohibited sale of any tree, bamboo or grass to any one by the ryot or by the village holder without the permission of the Raja.71

In the settlement of 1907-11, the right to enjoy the fruits and leaves of all self-grown trees within their villages was recognised for a ryot, but the right to timber of such trees was with the Raja (in Khalsa) or the zemindar (in the Estates).72

Ramdhyaní however records that there was no restriction on trees on the ryoti holdings.73

**Crop Protection:**

No right for killing wild animals for crop protection recognised as recorded by Ramdhyaní.74

2. *Nagra (1920s):*

More or less same as that in Khalsa. However, the working plan says that unlike those in the Khalsa, the tenants of Nagra were allowed to graze their cattle free of all charges in Khesra forests.75

3. *Hemgir :* As described in the working plan prepared for the Hemgir forests during late 1940s:76

"There are no briefed rights of any description in the reserved forests, but the following concessions are granted:

- The tenants are allowed free of payment for their personal use edible roots, fruits and creepers.
- They are allowed to collect thatch grass on payment of one pice per bundle.
- They are allowed green bamboos at the rate of nine annas per hundred and dry bamboos at the rate of seven annas per hundred.
- Residents are permitted to graze animals with permits in the reserved forests. Grazing of sheep, goats and pigs is strictly prohibited in the reserved forests.
- The villages situated within the reserves and having insufficient Nistar forests for grazing, are allowed to graze their cattle in the reserved forests.
- The raiyats of the estate holding settlement *parchas* are allowed free timber of reserved species from the Nistar forests for ploughs and agricultural implements. Such trees are marked by the forest staff for a village as a whole and the Gauntia of the village then distributes the trees proportionately among the raiyats."
III. RANPUR

The earliest recorded description regarding the rights and concessions allowed in the Ranpur forests probably dates back to the 1880s when the then Offg. Superintendent of Tributary Mahals sent the following note on Ranpur, in his letter to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal, on the relief measures followed in the Orissa Garjats during the famine:

"the lower classes of people such as Doms, Savars, Sweepers and others are allowed to earn their livelihood by selling fuel and bamboos which they take from the reserved forests free of charge".77

By 1940s, the picture had changed a lot. Ryots who used to get free bamboos from RFs and Khesra within the limit of one month period were required to pay, since 1944, a royalty of 0-6-0 to 0-8-0 per 100 according to the size 78. On the other hand, following concessions / rights were granted after the Prajamandal movements:

1. Full rights in trees on the tenants holdings only, Jack, Mango and Tamarind trees should not be cut without permission.
2. Fees charged for firewood in village forests were abolished (1939).
3. Number of reserved species reduced to 9.
4. Reserved species on holdings free (with permission ) for personal use.
5. Crop protection allowed; wild animals could be killed within field boundary only at night and the wounded animal was now permitted to be chased.
6. Jamul (Jamun ?) tree free for plough.
7. Free grazing in 'B' Class reserves and Khesra except for professional graziers.

The Khonds of Mal area134 were entitled for the following concessions / rights:80
1. Right to collect free and without permit, edible roots and fruits, leaves, creepers and grass for their own use and also dry fallen branches of any species for fuel.
2. Right to take wood and bamboos for domestic and agricultural purposes free on permit if sufficient materials were not available within the village ring line. Unreserved species free and reserved species at half royalty.
3. Right to graze cattle and buffaloes free and without permission upto a maximum of eight animals per tenant.

Prior to the relaxation made during the Prajamandal movement, the Ranpur Forest Rule had following provisions regarding the rights and concessions:

Reserved Forests :
1. The Kundras or professional tribes manufacturing combs permitted to remove Kurum, Kotrang and Dhobi trees at half royalty.81
2. Land less people and aboriginal tribes permitted to take for sale:82
   a. Firewood of fallen trees which were unfit for timber.
   b. Honey and wax etc. at leviable rate.
3. Persons belonging to lower classes such as Savars, Lodhas etc allowed to remove edible fruit, flowers roots, date leaves and firewood unfit for any other purpose, free of charge for their own consumption only in the condition of discharging bethi for the State / Chief.83

134 where there was a RF.
4. Basket - maker lower classes allowed to remove bamboos and canes on payment of fixed fee.84
5. Dry dead and standing Sal trees and other species and green trees of Sal and the species broken naturally might be removed subject to the conditions of sale of forest produce.85

Protected forests:
1. No permission necessary for gathering fruits and flowers of the reserved trees (total 32 in number) except mango, jack, tamarind, nux-vomica, harida, bahada, amla and Kamalgundi which were to be collected only on permission.86
2. Kusum, Palas and Bakoli trees permitted for lac and tassar rearing on permission.87
3. Khair trees might be cut for catechu manufacturing by license holders.88
4. Resin collection allowed from unreserved species to license holders.
5. License holder professionals allowed to collect Mohwa flower / fruits as well as the fruits of Karnaja, Sunari, Harida, nux-vomica etc.89
6. Tenants were allowed to cut fell or remove trees of unreserved species without permission for their domestic and agricultural needs, subject to the following conditions:
   i. No tree growing on the bank of any tank or near the side of any road/bungalow or public house/palace or building would be allowed to be felled.
   ii. Permission necessary for trees specified for removal without royalty (no such tree of less than 3 feet girth to be felled and such trees should not be cut for firewood and fencing materials or for any purpose other than for house-repairing, agricultural implements and furniture making etc).90
7. Bubble stones, ghooting, and white earth free for personal use.91
8. Honey allowed free of royalty for domestic use only.92

As per the FECR, people used to get, for bonafide purposes, reserved species at half the schedule of rate & unreserved species at one-fourth of the rates in 'B' class reserves while unreserved species was free for them in the Khesra.93

It is said that tenants of the Tangi area (residing outside the State boundary near Ranpur border) were also granted certain concessions by the Raja of Ranpur for removing forest produce from the Ranpur State forests. So these people reportedly viewed the Raja of Ranpur with much respect.94

IV. GHUMSUR

The question or rights and concessions has little relevance so far as Ghumsur before 1836 is concerned, for the forests there were subjected to conservation measures only in the later half of the 19th century by the British authorities. Also data is not available in detail regarding this subject. Still the following can be summarised:

1. Somewhere some kind of feudal impositions or restrictions perhaps existed as indicated by the phrase "Rents from forests and jungles for the right of cutting wood, grass etc," used by the Collector of Ganjam in his letter on Ghumsur zemindary.95
2. The Committee of Circuit reported in 1788 that the Raja of Ghumsur allowed half the produce (other than paddy) to the cultivators and the list of produce included dammer, cotton, wax, honey, iron and timber (besides agricultural produce).96
3. Many of the chiefs of the Maliah Muthas (situated mostly to the north of capital town Kullada) called themselves 'Omanayut':

'xxx Omanayut xxx means free. This name originally belonged to only four casts, Soura, Bhennea-Khond, Boeera and Ghatia; but now many others effect the title. xxx". (Stevenson:1916)  

The Raja exercised little or no administrative control on the hill tribes (Khonds for ex;) directly and the Hill - Chiefs who exercised such control, did not seem to have imposed any considerable restrictions on the inhabitants for forest exploitation.

4. No plough tax on Brahmontardars (and perhaps many others were exempted from it, the details thereof being not known).  

V. JEYPORE

The following note is found in the letter of the Dewan of Jeypore Estate which he wrote to the Agent to the Governor of Madras in December 1893:

"It has hitherto been the practice for the villagers in the Jaypur tannahs to enjoy or dispose of as they please the minor forest produce which they get from the jungles xxx without any charge by the Estate; and they also have been paying no tax to the Estate for wood, bamboos, thatching grass and fuel which they get from the jungles for their home use and for their agricultural purposes."  

The Dewan also mentioned in this letter that the villagers of Jeypore Estate 'have long been enjoying' these privileges.

Till February 1906, hill people were allowed for cutting trees of 3 feet girth without permit or royalty in the unreserved lands for the purpose of making ploughs. However, this concession was restricted to 2 feet under the notification of the Board of Revenue (Madras) dated 8th February 1906, thus causing difficulties to the people as it was not possible to make ploughs from small trees of only 2 feet girth.

There were 43 privilege holders in the Estate belonging to the lower classes. The rights and concessions enjoyed in the forests as per the Jeypore Forest Rules were as follows.

**Reserved Lands:**

No rights admitted except the following:

1. No license necessary for proclaimed man-eaters in the reserves. Free license given to village shikaris by the Maharaja to shoot tigers / panthers when they were unduly destructive to human beings or cattle, in the reserves adjoining villages.

2. Concession of free *Chaitra bento* (annual tribal hunt) was enjoyed by the hill people:

---

135 The Partially Excluded Areas Enquiry Committee recommended to increase this standard limit to 3 feet and this was implemented in /after 1949 for the hill tribes in protected and unreserved lands.  
136 This hunt was arranged during the Chaitra festival once in a year about which L.N. Sahu wrote.  
137 It is however not clear if the concession was valid for fifteen days, but it resulted in considerable decrease in the number of wild animals in Jeypore forests.
"The Hill tribes will be allowed to have the customary beats in Reserved Lands adjoining their villages except in those specially preserved for the Maharajah; but the concession shall be liable to withdrawal if any of the villagers set fire directly or indirectly to the Reserved Lands or if the villages fail to extinguish any fire that may occur in the said forests.”

3. Free fishing in rivers and ponds adjoining their villages for the hill tribes.

**Unreserves and Protected Lands:**

1. Inhabitants allowed to remove unreserved species without permit and royalty for personal use.
2. Privilege holders allowed to remove free of charge reserved species less than 2' feet girth for personal use without permit.
3. Firewood and bamboos, free.
4. Tamarind, shikaya, honey, edible roots and fruits, thorns, leaves of trees and shrubs of unreserved species, free.
5. Grazing: free.

In Panchipenta and Madgole Estates, where the Maharajah of Jeypore was the ‘land holder’, the inhabitants were, in addition to the above rights / concessions in the protected and unreserved forests, allowed for clearing the specified areas of reserved and unreserved lands not under permanent cultivation for planting fruit trees, Indian Beech, Common Black Plum etc. with permission.

It is worth mentioning here what R.C. Bell said in his Koraput Gazetteer:

"In certain ranges where the privilege- holders require trees of a larger girth than the permitted two feet for making their ploughs, they are also required to pay a fee, but at a lower rate than the non-privilege holders. This composition fee is unpopular both among privilege holders and others" (Bell:1945).

In some other instances, people paying the plough tax did not have any forests near their villages even within a radius of 10 to 12 miles and when they went to the distant unreserves to get their requirements, the adjoining villagers of those unreserves felt that their own rights and privileges were being encroached upon by distant villagers. In some other cases, the tax-payers finding no Estate forests nearby collected their timber from the neighbouring forests under the Mokhassadar by paying him certain royalty.

Still, both Bell and the PEAEC found that the forest concessions of the Estate were more liberal than those in the neighbouring States or Estates.
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PRIVILEGES OF THE KING / ROYAL FAMILY

The privileges enjoyed by the King and/or the royal family vis a vis forests were either directly beneficial to the Raja (and/or his family) or were indirect, i.e. exercised in the name of the Raja. The indirect privileges though did not benefit the Raja and his family immediately or directly, still the Raja wanted them in the interest of his State or administration. The forest departments of the ex-States were no doubt, working in the interest of the Raja and the forest revenue ultimately mattered more to the Raja than to anybody else in the State. This is why in ex-States like Ranpur, the pass of all sorts of forest produce was, as a rule, to be signed by the Chief himself. The liability of the Bhuyans to supply ropes for the Car (Rath) of the deities in Keonjhar and the system of 'gudam' in Jeypore more or less belonged to the class of the indirect privileges.

Whether direct or indirect, the privileges of the king can be categorized as follows:

1. **Monopoly on forest produce**: In Gangpur, for ex; the Raja tried to introduce tassar cultivation by giving a license at Rs. 4 per 200 seeds to a few cultivators with the condition that they must sell the produce only to the Raja.

2. **Bethi**: The bethi was usually forced labour without any payment. In 'ratha bethi', the tenants/villagers were asked to cut down trees and carry the timber from various distances to the place where the rath was to be constructed. In shikar bethi or hakka, the villagers were liable to join in the beating operations during the Chief's shikar (hunting) expeditions. These two systems were prevalent more or less in all the areas and in some cases, people were even nominally paid for their service. The ratha bethi was a matter of religious significance for the people and the Shikar bethi, a kind of adventure. But when people were compelled to do such works against their will, especially when they were engaged in their fields during harvesting etc., it turned out to be a curse for them. This was a major grievance of the people as in Nilgiri. The Shikar was usually frequently arranged either for the Raja or for his guests/relations, thus causing enormous difficulties for the people. Besides, people were also engaged in fighting forest fires and clearing fire lines with little or no payment. They were also asked to render bethi for other State works like thatching State buildings etc.

3. **Bheti etc.**

---

138 Except in a few cases where the Raja had allowed a popular government or some kind of democracy, as in Mayurbhanj.

139 Many plates/inscriptions have been discovered in which, while making a grant of some village etc., it has been mentioned that the grantee would be getting rights over the specified trees. Even right over the shrubs, creepers as well as branches of trees has been mentioned in some cases. This, according to some, is an indicator of the State monopoly of plant resources in those days. (Tripathy:1997)

140 In Gangpur for ex; if the Raja killed a small game like the rabbit, it went to the people. It may be mentioned here that killing the animal was more important/enjoyable for the royal hunters than enjoying its meat.

141 Particularly in areas where most of the people were non-cultivators or forest dwellers. For such people, rendering labour for the Raja's hunting expedition was often spontaneous.
In the name of Bheti (free supply rendered voluntarily), people were often forced to provide a share of their produce/collections without any payment. In ideal cases, people used to make some bheti to the Raja at their own will and in return, also received something or some favour from the Raja. This later became a regular feature and the Raja expected that people were liable to make such customary bhets. The Kabuliyat of the Bhuyan Pradhans in Keonjhar thus says:

"In the month of Chaitra, I shall xxx present myself at the ghar and in accordance with the previous custom, present bheti to the Maharaja, the Patmahadie, the Tikait Babu Saheb (Prince) and the Maharaja's dewan or Manager; and receive the customary return present".

Usually the hunters sent a portion of their shikar to the Chief/zamindar, the hill-chiefs occasionally made bhets of honey etc. But in many cases, people were bound to make 'bhets'.

Rasad was a kind of forced requisition of provision. Though provision was there for payment against rasad at market rates, it was hardly observed in practice and people were either paid nominally or even remained unpaid.

4. Kheda:

Kheda or elephant catching operation was one of the exclusive privileges of the Raja. In those days, the Kheda was organised to catch elephants either for the purpose of using them for transportation or for the purpose of selling. In Mayurbhanj for ex; 100 'fine' elephants were captured by such operations within two years, sometime in the later half of the 19th century.

People were forced to render bethi during such dangerous operations and many of them were even injured. In ex-States like Dhenkanal, this Kheda bethi was the most terrorrosome experience for the people which they were compelled to render under severely oppressive conditions.

For sometime during the 19th century, the Rajas did not enjoy absolute freedom to ascertain this privilege as they were bound to obey certain regulations of the British Government in this regard. The annoyance of the Rajas is reflected in the following letter of the Maharaja of Mayurbhanj which he wrote to the Superintendent of the Tributary Mahals, Orissa on 14-6-1880:

"The catching of elephants in my own killah is a particular privilege of mine and a source of income and advantage to me. If government keeps the privilege in its own hands and if I cannot catch elephants from the forests without your permission, and use and spend them at my own discretion, the losses which will accrue to me will be numerous. I will in this way be deprived of a privilege of long standing without any
The Maharaja of Keonjhar also had a similar complaint. Ultimately, the freedom was granted to them causing only more distress to the people.

According to a report of 1944-45, no successful Kheda had been held for some years by that time and the number of elephants was on increase. Probably the popular movements in the States forced the Rajas to decrease the frequency of such operations.

Above all these privileges, was the traditional privilege of hunting. Shooting was the prerogative of the ruler and hunting was hardly allowed to any body except the persons authorised by him. And in Mayurbhanj, three shikar roads were specially constructed during the year 1928-29 for the convenience of the Raja.

But it is a fact that many good rulers shared their experience as good hunters for the cause of people. When wild beasts damaged the properties of their tenants or killed their people, they were enthusiastic enough to proceed to the spot as to kill the animal themselves or used to appoint hunters for this purpose. Shikar expeditions also fulfilled some other purposes like providing an opportunity for conducting a direct enquiry into some local matter or making an appraisal of the local management, etc.

Needless to say, the royal family was benefited either directly or indirectly from the privileges of the Raja. Besides, there were certain special privileges which they enjoyed in different ex-States; for ex;

1. The Khorakposhakdars, who were princes, were entitled for shooting without permit and also were exempted from grazing duties for their own cattle (Bonai).
2. The Khorakposhakdars were entitled for free grants of timber etc. for their personal consumption (Patna).
3. The brothers of the Chief had a share in the king's own sleeper company 'Rajkumar Sleeper Operations' (Bamra).
4. In Nilgiri, the largest endowment was Thakur Mahal with the Senior Rani as its Marfatdar. The Thakul Mahal used to realise forest cess etc. and allotted waste lands for reclamation appropriating the income.
5. In Dhenkanal, holder of maintenance grants (for ex; the Pattayat Saheb or the younger Prince) had right to forests, mineral, timber etc. free of charge.

I. KEONJHAR

1. Bethi, Bheti and Rasad:

The States Enquiry Committee (late 1930s) found shikar beats being held in the State not less than forty times in a year.

Besides Shikar bethi, there was also the 'ratha kantha bethi' whereby people, especially the Bhuyans, were liable to render bethi for the construction and dragging of the rath and also for repairing work (such as thatching) in the palace/State buildings (kantha).

---

14 For ex; Raja Braja Kishore Chandra Singh Deo (1937-38) of Dharakote (Ganjam District) had appointed a group of hunters to save his people from wild beasts. He had himself killed at least 39 tigers.
Other liabilities of the Bhuyans included:

a. Supply of *Inda* wood and the three thick ropes made from *Panasi* (Sabai) grass to be used in the *Indaparva*\(^{146}\) festival and also to carry the *Indachatra*.\(^{24}\)

b. Making of a great leaf wall in the palace during the Dussehra festivals by using Sal timber and leaves.\(^{25}\)

c. To prepare Agira (a kind of pyre of considerable height used to commemorate the death of a legendary demon).\(^{26}\)

d. To supply timber to be used for furniture work etc. in the palace.\(^{27}\)

e. To supply fuel, straw, branches for huts etc. for the British and royal officers.\(^{28}\)

The Juangas had the following liabilities:

a. To supply broom grass.\(^{29}\)

b. To supply two thick silali ropes for the Car festival.\(^{30}\)

c. To thatch the State buildings.\(^{31}\)

d. To make fences with the material brought by themselves.\(^{32}\)

e. To supply fuel, leaf plate and labour for the officers.\(^{33}\)

f. To supply honey for the purpose of preparing medicines in the palace (in this work, they were assisted by another tribe; the Malars).\(^{34}\)

Among the three Juang pirs was one *Kathua Pir* (i.e. the block that deals in timber / wood) and the liability of this block was to supply firewood for the use in the palace as well as in different temples. It is said that initially the liability was confined only to the former i.e. supplying firewood to the palace. But during the 17th century, the latter liability was imposed.\(^{35}\)

The rath bethi is said to have started to be rendered by the Bhuyans sometime during the 18th century\(^{36}\), but this information awaits confirmation. It may be mentioned here in this connection that in lieu of some of their bethi work or rasads, provision was there, at least in principle, to provide the tribals some food or remuneration.\(^{38}\)

The non-tribal ryot was also liable to supply leaf plates and firewood free of cost to the touring officers and also to construct leaf sheds for them. He had also to supply small Sal and Simuli logs etc for the village deities free of cost within a limit of 10 miles. However, he was entitled for diet charges if he carried large logs. On the occasion of marriage, death or investiture of thread in the Raj family, he was required to supply firewood and leaf plates on payment of 0-2-0 per diem and also to construct leaf huts at the palace if required. All this he had to do in company with other ryots.\(^{39}\)

However, Ramdhyni says that there was no liability on the villagers for the maintenance of forest boundary lines.\(^{40}\)

2. Monopoly:

\(^{146}\) This festival, also known as the Shakradhwaja festival, was one of glorious traditions of Keonjhar. It was organised every year on a particular date to commemorate the legendary restoration of the heavenly kingdom to Devraj Indra, the king of gods. It was a royal festival wherein the Inda wood - a Sal log of more than 32 feet length - was the central symbol and attraction. This single piece of Sal was to be carefully chosen in the forests satisfying to various auspicious signs.\(^{37}\)
The State monopoly was in Kendu leaf, lac and hides. The Kendu leaf contract extended to village forests as well as to ryoti holdings also (Ramdhyan:1947). 41

A very different and rather unusual kind of monopoly was on a medicinal plant known as Bhraramaramari the details of which have been discussed in Appendix:22.

The Senior Rani had the right to appropriate the plough tax collected from the Bhuyans for her own expenditure. 42

Besides all these, there were appointed some hunters specially for killing the tigers and hence, they were known as the Baghuas147 (Bagh means tiger). They supplied the tiger's skin, nail and also the oil prepared from the tiger's fat, to the palace 43. But it is not known when such service tenures were created and also when abolished (if any).

II. GANGPUR

1. **Monopoly**: The State monopoly was in Lac and Kendu leaf. Tenants were allowed to rear Lac and silk worms only on such terms as might be agreed upon between them and the Chief/ zemindars (Ramdhyan:1947). 44

The Commissioner of Chot Nagpur Division describes how the Raja of Gangpur was trying to gather much more profit from the sleeper operations. In 1891-92, the Raja got an offer for sleepers at over Rs. 5 per piece, but was intending to keep the sleepers in the depot so as to sell them when the line was to be made from Cuttack to Sambalpur. The Commissioner tried to refrain him from such plan 45; it is not known whether the Raja followed his advice. But it is known that the Raja cancelled all the sleeper leases by 1901 so as to appropriate maximum profit by directly dealing in the business. In fact, a sleeper department was organised for this purpose and sleepers were extracted indiscriminately. 46

2. **Bethi and Begari etc**: Forced, unpaid labour was being exacted for Kheda and shikar operations 47; also in lieu of the concessions enjoyed by them in forests, people were liable to extinguish forest fires as well as to cut the boundary and fire lines if they lived in or close to the forests 48.

The road side plantations from Rourkela to Jaraikela is said to have been executed on begari in the 1940s (?).14849

3. **Bheti**: An Oram song says “The Raja of Gangpur has forbidden to eat Kendu and Char fruits, but if somebody enjoys them, he is to give equal amount of the same to the Raja.”50

This song probably reminded of some very old tradition, for any such thing was hardly practised during the first half of this century. However, people had to supply firewood and goat etc. to their zamindars during the Dassehra festivals without any payment 149 51

---

147 They had been given lands as jagir.
148 In the settlement of 1929-36, as the uplands were assessed to rent for the first time, in lieu of that, most of the bethis and begaris were abolished (except a few ones like fighting forest fires) including the ratha bethi, at least in principle.56
149 People living at a distance from the zamindary headquarter were sending such provisions through the nearby police station etc and were invited to take part in the celebrations / feast at the headquarters.57
The States Enquiry Committee found that people were also required to supply cotton seed, Mohwa and *Khuskhus* free of cost to the Raja and milk products etc. at the time of any ceremony in the Raj family.  

### III. RANPUR

1. **Exclusive Shikar rights:**

Shikar in the forests were forbidden except for the Raja and his favourites / guests. During Raja's shikar, if he failed to kill the game and the *Banua(s)* accompanying him achieved the credit, then also people had to say that the Raja had killed the animal.

2. **Exclusive rights over trees and fruits (in revenue lands):**

The fruits of the trees on such lands belonged to the State. If some body tried to ascertain his right over the fruits by himself, he was liable for severe punishment. The share which the palace received was naturally much more than enough and people were hardly allowed any part of it even if the fruits got rotten.

3. **Bethi:**

People were liable to do various State works on bethi in lieu of the concessions given to them in forests. These included the ratha bethi, shikar bethi, and fighting forest fires etc.

When the palace was being constructed at Chandpur, the inhabitants of the Mal area were engaged in various bethi works such as preparation of lime by collecting shooting from the forests and burning it.

4. **Rasad:** People had to supply firewood etc. whenever royal guests / British officers came on a visit to the State from outside.

5. **Monopoly:** The State monopoly was on hides, Kochila, Honey and honey comb.

6. **Abwab:** Among the various different *Abwabs*, the Raja used to realise honey from the Mal inhabitants.

7. **Kheda:** It is said that Kheda had been successfully carried out some time in the 1920s in the Patia (South) reserve forests, but data in this context is very obscure though one thing is known very clearly that by 1943, such operations had been stopped and were never carried out again.

### IV. GHUMSUR

Privileges of the Raja must have been as usual, for ex; bethi was there and even also a tax in lieu of it.

---

150 There were certain traditional beliefs behind such restrictions. For ex; no body was expected to enjoy the new crops of mango until it was offered to the deity in Dolapurnima.
Following are some of the facts clearly found mentioned in the old records, which were related to the Raja’s privileges:
1. The revenue realised on account of the forest exploitation and topes belonged to the Darbar directly.  
2. There was a tax realised in kind whereby mats were furnished to the Raja without payment.  
3. Jotta Coudee or collection of a rope for each yoke or oxen was in practice.  
4. The Raja enjoyed half the produce of the cultivators.  
5. The Hill - Chiefs and the hill tribes were liable to render feudal service in lieu of the freedom they enjoyed in their regions (Behera:1987).

V. JEYPORE

1. Monopoly in Lac:

There were naturally abundant Kusum trees in Pannaveda Mutha and the forest department collected good amount of lac from this area. Over 200 lac watchers were appointed to watch over the lac cultivation and the produce belonged to the Estate even if collected from a ryoti holding if such trees existed in his holding before 1908 or the right to them had been reserved by the Estate.

2. Exclusively preserved forests for the Maharajah’s Shikar:

There were five such reserved forests (for ex; Kunthurkal and Pennanghi reserves near Jeypore town) where even license holders were not permitted for shooting.

3. Bethi etc:

⇒ There was the Ratha bethi.
⇒ Under the peculiar system known as gudam (which was prevalent only in certain parts of the Estate), thatching grass, fuel and other materials were being purchased by the sub-ordinate Estate officials at about 20 to 25 percent rate of the actual price, from the local people. The officials were of the view that because the ryots enjoyed many privileges / concessions in the forests, the low rates of prices were justifiable. The hill tribes feared that if they refused gudam they might be involved in forest cases. When attention of the Dewan was drawn by the PEAEC in this matter in 1939, he promised to take adequate action (PEAECR:1940).

151 Villagers of Jhorigam and Umerkote ranges (including Pannaveda) conducted all operations for lac under the forest department and received Rs. 1-4-0 per maund of 25 lbs. of stick lac produced, by 1930. Lac cultivation was an age-old tradition in such areas.

152 The right to the timber and fruits of trees growing on the homestead lands had been given to the tenants of Madras Presidency in 1908. In Jeypore, this provision was effective in the ryotwari areas, but in areas where the tenants did not possess any official document for their holdings and were under control of Mustajars (rent collectors), this provision was hardly effective.

153 The Partially Excluded Areas Enquiry Committee (PEAEC) was assured by the Dewan that to abolish this annual bethi, a permanent car would be constructed.
Kheda operation were carried out in the Chandrapur area. However, it was reportedly irregular and the local people taking part in such operations were said to have been paid nominally in lieu of their service.\textsuperscript{72}

4. Bagh Bhandar:

There was a kind of small royal zoo (?) known as 'Bagh Bhandar' wherein Raja Vikram Dev II (1825-1860) is said to have kept a number of wild animals(Mohanty:1934)\textsuperscript{73}. By early decades of this century, the 'Bagh Bhandar' had gradually lost its 'glory' and was closed later\textsuperscript{74}.

---
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PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT FOR FOREST RIGHTS

In context of the movement for forest rights, following aspects may be generalised:

1. **Cause**: The movement in most of the cases were initiated by some incident not related to forest rights i.e. the immediate cause was something else, forest issues being the latent factor.

2. **Range**: The movements were either essentially localised (Bhuyan rebellion of Keonjhar) or local outbreak of some nation-wide movements (Prajamandal movements).

3. **Probability**: The movement was not possible in all the cases where the issue was there, because of the following reasons:
   - a. People were dormant
   - b. People could not dare to react.
   - c. People did not want to react because of their sense of loyalty for the Raja.
   - d. Even if some movement tried to manifest itself, it was suppressed by the Raja before it could advance further.

These factors could be overcome on one hand, by the courage of a few personalities who organised people for a struggle (for ex; Dharanidhar, who led the Keonjhar rebellion of 1891), and on the other hand, by the inspiration from the nation-wide movements like that of the Indian National Congress. In Orissa, however, the most important role was played by the Prajamandals. Prajamandal, which means peoples' group or peoples' association, had started gaining its base in Orissa by 1938 and while the Congress policy was still that of non-violence, the Prajamandal workers did not always confine themselves to any such principle (though initially most of them had started their protests in the Gandhian way) and in areas like Nilgiri, communist principles were also mixed up in the Prajamandal activities.

4. **Nature**: The nature of such movements were either comparatively peaceful (as in Patna) or violent (as in Ranpur).

5. **Results**: The movements were not completely successful (as in Ranpur) always. In some cases, either they were partially successful, or could not achieve the desired results (as in the Bhuyan rebellion of Keonjhar).

---

154 Gandhi was of the opinion that any interference in the princely India might ultimately damage the cause of the people(Pati:1993). In 1938, the Congress Working Committee passed a resolution in which the Congress members were asked not to involve themselves in any movement in the Garjats though the resolution declared its moral support for the Garjat people if they went for movements in the Gandhian way. However, some of the Congress leaders still decided to take active role in the Garjat struggles in the non-violent way. And some like Mahatab even actively supported the Prajamandal.

155 This difference in attitude finally led the Prajamandal leaders like Banamali Das and Baishnab Charan Patnaik to join the Communist Party. But most of the Prajamandal workers being in favour of the Congress, joined the latter after merger.

156 Similarly in Mogulbandi areas, the general tendency of Kissan Sabhas was anti-landlordism, but it assumed socialistic attitude (1930s).
Behind the forest grievances following factors worked:

1. Revenue-oriented policy:

To what extent the value of forest revenue was important in many States, can be ascertained from the following observations of the Settlement Officer of Hindol State in 1914:

"At present the average income from forests is Rs. 5200/- per annum. For 20 years, there will be no excess income from agricultural lands, the expenditure is generally on the increase. The expansion of income rests on better organisation and careful watch over the forests."\(^5\)

Such needs, as well as cupidity of the Rajas, resulted in various restrictions and/or increase of tax/royalty.

2. Evil nature of the ruling authorities.

3. Conservation measurers:

Many restrictions had been imposed for the sake of conservation only. But it was not always easy for the people to accept such imposition. Restrictions for killing animals for crop protection more or less belonged to such policy.

4. Bethi.

Many instances of the movements for forest rights are found. For ex.:

1. Nayagarh: In 1927-28, when several village forests were turned into reserved ones, this and such other acts of oppression led some people to the Political Agent to appeal for redress. But instead of getting a favourable decision, many of them were imprisoned.\(^6\)

2. In Khandapara, there was some discontent among the people regarding the high rate of fuel cess. Understanding their problem, the Superintendent of the State requested the Political Agent for his approval of a revised (reduced) rate which was granted (1932-33).\(^7\)

**CASE STUDIES**

1. **KEONJHAR**

1. *The rebellion of 1891*:

In the settlement of 1868, the Bhuyans were assessed with, for the first time, a plough tax (for plough less people, a poll or house tax of 0-4-0) and a school cess of 0-0-1 so as to commute the demands imposed upon them.\(^8\) However, the Darbar still continued to

\(^{157}\) But quite opposite view was that of the Asst. Settl. Officer of Pal- Lahra State (1932). He said that forest revenue was of fluctuating nature and thus, was not reliable enough like the land revenue. So he advocated a policy of reclamation and extension of cultivation and was against the extension of forests.\(^9\)
exploit them in various ways, as evident from the following contemporary report, ultimately causing the great revolt of 1891:

"xxx the rising is not confined to the Bhuyans and Koles now, but extended to the majority of the subjects of the Maharajah of Keonjhar.

The origin of the disturbances is chiefly attributed to the brutal treatment of the Maharaja towards the Bhuyans through his police Head-constable Narayan Pai and the Assistant Manager Bichitrananda Das. His monopoly of all their corn which he purchases at a very low rate and does not allow them to sell elsewhere and frequent harassments caused by gratuitous labour and the digging of a hill for diverting the course of a hill stream towards his gur\textsuperscript{158} have excited the Bhuyans who consider these acts as revenge taken by the Maharaja after their last rising against him in 1867."\textsuperscript{10}

The revolt was at last tactfully suppressed with military help from the British Government; but among the latent factors behind this rebellion, the plough tax is said to be one. The Raja made two settlements in 1881 and 1890 respectively and increased the plough tax (and the house tax) by 60% which the Bhuyans did not like.\textsuperscript{11}

2. The Non-Co-operation Movement of 1920-21:

In December 1920, some of the residents of the capital town gathered for a secret meeting in which some Bhuyan leaders also joined them. The resolution passed in the meeting also included demands for certain concessions/privileges vis-a-vis forests, viz;

- Abolition of Nistar cess.
- Contracts for various forest projects to be given to the local people.

The Darbar did not favour the resolution and some of the leaders were jailed.\textsuperscript{12}

3. Prajamandal Movement (1940s):

The Prajamandal leaders also demanded for certain concessions in forest rules. For ex; Bansidhar Pradhan, who himself was a Goud by cast, wanted abolition of grazing fees.\textsuperscript{13}

The achievements of the people included abolition of Shikar Bethi in 1938.\textsuperscript{14}

II. GANGPUR

The Shimko firing:

The developments that led to the firing at Shimko in the Raibaga Pargana cannot be generalised by just naming them as agrarian or freedom struggle. The matter was rather much more complicated and requires careful study of the whole thing.

In the settlement of 1928-36, the land rent was increased though the Settlement Officer, justifying his new assessments, said that the new rates were still lower than what was

\textsuperscript{158} palace.
proposed in the 1880s\textsuperscript{15}. This time particularly the tribal classes were in difficulty as the uplands, which they used to cultivate irregularly, were formerly held free of rent and in the new settlement these lands were assessed.\textsuperscript{16}

The new rents were started to be collected in 1937 \textsuperscript{17}. By that time, a no-rent campaign had been launched by mostly the Christian Mundas of Raibaga and adjacent areas. These Mundas were not the original settlers of that area and came from the neighbouring Ranchi district\textsuperscript{18}. Their agitation was engineered in Ranchi\textsuperscript{159} though the Mundas of Ranchi were paying higher rent than their brothers in Gangpur\textsuperscript{19}. The agitators being Lutheran Christians, the Darbar urged the Lutheran mission of Ranchi to intervene; in response to which a deputation of the same visited the disturbed areas and asked the people to pay the rent as they (the deputation) understood the new rates to be justified. The effort succeeded to some extent in certain areas, but the disturbances continued.\textsuperscript{20}

Part of the Munda agitation centred round forests. They claimed themselves to be the owners of all forests though no such exclusive right existed in Ranchi (Ramdhyan\textsuperscript{21}).

The Darbar administration was also not found to have a satisfactory role in the whole matter; rather many of its defects / misdeeds came to light on enquiry\textsuperscript{160}.

Raibaga was a comparatively small tenure under the Raja of Gangpur. Political Agent Ramsay, who visited this area more than 30 years before the Shimko incident, found that there was virtually no forest in the tenure-holder's villages and also no taxes on forest products like harar (harida) and mohwa\textsuperscript{22}. Before the agitation started, nistar cess was being levied even from villages which got no nistar(Ramdhyan:1947).\textsuperscript{23}

The Rani Saheba visited the Munda countries of Raiboga, Hatibari and other areas and tried to persuade the people to pay rents with the assurances to consider their grievances.\textsuperscript{24} Accordingly, on December 26, 1938, on the occasion of her second son's succession to the throne, the Rani announced several concessions including the following:

1. No nistar cess to be levied in those 170 villages within or in the vicinity of which no forests were found. The people of such areas could avail their requirements at 1/2 rates from the State forests.\textsuperscript{25}
2. Number of the reserved species was reduced to 10 from the previous 25.\textsuperscript{26}
3. Abolition of bethi and begari.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{159} The Settlement Officer of Gangpur State in his letter dated 22-10-35 to the Superintendent of the State said:

"I do not take any exception when objection is raised by those whose assessment has been proposed to enhance. But when others object whose rent I proposed to reduce, shows that there were wire pullers behind the screen and they object for the sake of objection and not for any real grievance. These wire pullers are inflating the imaginary grievances so that it may appear to be real. Most of them are Christian tenants."\textsuperscript{30}

And Mr. Connoly, who supervised the settlement operation of 1907-11, remarked about the Christian aborigines of the State that they were litigious and always ready to oppose authority.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{160} That doesn't necessarily mean that the Gangpur forests were always under strict supervision. In fact, the Commissioner of Northern Division, Govt. of Orissa alleged after merger that as early as 1919, certain areas had been let out for cultivation in the State within the RFs and due to 'very little check xxx kept over the forest', blocks of cultivation were found existing within the RFs.\textsuperscript{310}
4. Assurance to make further arrangements so that people could get timber for their
domestic / agricultural needs without any difficulty.28
5. Revisions in the grazing fee to favour people.29

To what extent this proclamation was implemented is difficult to say; for in February
1939, at her public meeting in Sargipalli, the Rani was submitted a petition for the
redressal of the following grievances (besides other issues):32

1. The forest rights enumerated in the 1910 settlement161 be restored.
2. Full rights in the boundary forest (presumably village forest) be conceded to the
villagers.
3. Right to shoot wild animals that damage and destroy crops be conceded.
4. Freedom to sell Lac, silk cocoons, mohwa, wax etc. to any merchant in the
State(SECR:1939).

That year i.e. in 1939, Nirmal Munda, the chief leader of Munda agitators in Raibaga,
came on the scene33 He was an ex-service-man34 and on the backing of some leaders in
Ranchi, tried to intensify the agitation. The Lutheran mission was again requested to
intervene, but the deputation became disappointed by his (Nirmal Munda) 'stubborn
attitude' and the secretary of the deputation reportedly wrote to the Diwan of Gangpur to
take action against Nirmal.35

Nirmal was alleged to have attacked a village chowkidar with an axe. The State police
went to arrest him, but could not succeed because of possibility of a confrontation with
the armed Mundas. Finally, when the confrontation occurred on April 25 (1939), troops
were sent to control the situation. Despite the plea made by the Magistrate, neither
Nirmal surrendered himself nor the defiant crowd agreed to disperse.36

The murder of British Political Agent in January 1939 at Ranpur had made the officers
quite cautious. So when the crowd was understood to have started attacking, troops were
ordered to open fire as a result of which more than 30162 protesters died.37

The aftermath:

In 1941, the Mundas 'drunk with the sense of having brought the Darbar on the knees',
intensified their defiance and added many new terms demanding new forest rights and
new revenue rights38. According to Ramdhynani, the Mundas were complaining that they
had to pay royalty on the reserved species inspite of the cess paid by them39.

In Nagra zemindary, one Santosh Munda complained on behalf of his villagers that all of
them had paid heavy compensations on forest cases, both for prohibited and un-prohibited
species. However, none of them was able to put forth any such concrete example.40

The Forest Officer on this incident wrote:

" From their talkings I could well understand that they want to take away all the
restrictions from over Khesra forest and to grant them exclusive right over it to

161 Which recognised the right of the people to collect timber etc. for their bonafide domestic and
agricultural use.42
162 Said to be 39.
enable them to fell and remove any timber of any species according to their sweet choice.41

When investigated, Santosh Munda was found to have not paid a single pie in way of compensation in forest cases throughout his life. Also, no trace of harassment by the forest department to the people in question was found.43

On 21-3-1941, many agitators163 (most of them being Lutheran Mundas) gathered at Kaloshiria (three miles from Kuarmunda, the Nagra headquarters) with their big lathis; but they were dispersed by the police without the use of any force.44

It was also reported that some disloyal ryots of Jalangbira were cutting prohibited trees from Khesra as well as from the reserved forests and denying the use of any forest materials to the local ryots of that village on the ground that they (the disloyal people) were the sole owners and possessors of the said forest.45

Some people alleged for having not paid the cesses and for having violated the forest laws, concealed themselves in the State and in Ranchi district for fear of undergoing imprisonment. For such people, a proclamation issued by the Darbar in December 1944 said:

"xxx in regard to the forest compensation cases, such absconders may approach the Chief Forest Officer with a petition to have the compensation against them reconsidered and reduced to such amount as they can reasonably expected to pay".46

III. RANPUR

1. The Meli of 1893:

In the settlement of 1880-81, the tenants of Ranpur ex-State were assessed at 3/4 of the land rent in cash and 1/4 in kind (i.e. grain rent). The administration collected these rents strictly and people felt oppressed47. As a result, a meli (rebellion) was set up by the tenants and the memorandum which they submitted to the Darbar, contained the following forest issues48:

1. Use of bows and other arms be allowed for protection of crops from the wild animals.
2. A portion of the killed animal be given to those people who rendered the Shikar bethi without any payment or food.
3. Materials required each year for roofing purpose be allowed free of royalty.
4. Removal of timber for cremation, be allowed from forests.
5. Grazing fees in kind be abolished and in cash, be reduced.

The Raja Benudhar Narendra Mohapatra sent a message to the British authorities that the rebels were planning to take his life. The British Commissioner came from Cuttack and instead of acting to the cause of the tenants, very tactfully managed to jail the rebel leaders for two years.(Dash:1989)49

---

163 The agitators said that till final decision on the Shimko firing, they would pay no rent.
2. **The Prajamandal Movement:**

In 1938, the memorandum submitted by the Prajamandal referred to the following grievances (forest issues):50

1. Tenants be allowed to remove timber and other forest produce without any permission or royalty.
2. Restrictions regarding protected and Khesra forests be taken away or extensive tracts of forests be left open for the convenience of the people.
3. People be allowed to remove fuel wood in their carts in those areas within the State where this was not allowed.
4. Rates of Sissoo, Piasal, Sal, Bandhan, Kurum, Lembar and Rai be reduced for the tenants and other species of timber be declared as firewood.
5. The poor and schedule - cast people, who earned their livelihood by bringing firewood and bamboo from forests, be exempted from paying any cess / royalty against that (etc.).(Baliyarsingh:1985)

Banamali Ram, President, Ranpur Prajamandal, wrote a letter (dtd. 11-10-1938) to the ruling chief requesting him for redressal of the following grievances:

"xxx the forest laws should be so amended as will really benefit the subjects. xxx
19. Rights over the fruits and timbers of trees should be conceded.
20. The right to kill wild animals damaging crops should be conceded.
21. Sufficient pastures should be supplied for grazing of cattle, specially buffaloes".(Raju:1988)51

The Darbar in a proclamation informed the people that52 (Baliyarsingh:1985):

1. tenants would be given right to the trees and fruits thereof on their holdings.
2. tenants were bound to protect the fruits of the mango, jack fruit and tamarind trees on the Government lands and could enjoy half of the collection (fruits) by sending the other half to the palace;
3. more concessions could not be given to remove forest produce for domestic and agricultural needs as it would cause reduction in the forest revenue.
4. forest area would be increased for firewood purpose wherever there was a need for it;
5. permission to remove firewood by carts would not be given for the sake of forest revenue;
6. the rules regarding Sal, Piasal, and other such timbers would continue as before, but the Forest Advisor would be consulted in this matter for the cause of the tenants.

Finding the administration still unsatisfactory, disturbances / agitations continued in Ranpur. In 1939, the Prajamandal was declared unlawful and some of its leaders were arrested. Huge crowd gathered to demand the immediate release of their leaders and the Raja wired to the Political Agent Mr. Bazelgette seeking his assistance. Bazelgette had already become a man of ill- repute because of his oppressive ways of handling disturbances. He came to Ranpur with a small force and when the mob confronted him,
he fired his revolver and killed a man. This made the mob more violent and some body hit his hand with a *thenga*\(^{164}\) as a result of which the revolver fell down from his hand. Soon he was beaten and stoned to death.\(^{53}\)

The Darbar started great repressive measures and severely punished the agitators\(^{54}\). Two people were sentenced to death though they were not directly involved in the murder.

On 25-7-1939, following concessions were announced by the Darbar (Ram:1986)\(^{54(i)}\):

1. People of the tribal classes as well as of the lower caste, who earned their livelihood by selling firewood, would no more be required to supply wood to the State and they would be getting firewood free of royalty from the open forests as hitherto.
2. People, who had not been given jagirs for ratha bethi, would be remunerated for such bethi.
3. Crop protection allowed in the fields and people could enjoy the meat of such animals, but they were not permitted to sell this meat. Horns and hides of the animals thus killed should be deposited with the Forest Department\(^{165}\).

In 1946, the Prajamandal passed a resolution for the following demands(Baliyarsingh:1985):\(^{55}\)

1. Tenants of the Mal area be allowed to kill wild animals for self - defence as well as for crop-protection, without any objection / restriction.
2. Current fees charged at high rates on the poor people who earned their livelihood by selling bamboo-products and timber / firewood be reduced to the amount charged earlier.
3. The area of village - and open forests be extended considerably and the restrictions for using thick timber as firewood be taken away.
4. Laterite stone be allowed to remove without royalty.
5. Full rights be conceded on trees in communal lands.
6. All kinds of trees be allowed for felling without any permission, in the tenants holdings (land leased to the tenants) for their use.
7. Timber be allowed to remove in sufficient quantity from the 'B' class reserves and at 1/2 the royalty from 'A' class reserves.
8. Current rate of the bamboo (per hundred) be reduced to half.
9. People be allowed, as before, to remove forest produce required for domestic and agricultural purposes, free of any payment and permit for a period of one month (in a year\(^{166}\)).

The struggle succeeded in the relaxation of certain forest rules and forest cess (including other cesses) was abolished. Other concessions have been discussed in Chapter: VI (Rights and Concessions)

\(^{164}\) Bamboo stick. It is said that many British MPs could not understand how a British officer armed with revolver could be killed just by ‘thenga’. So, for their convenience, some bamboo sticks were sent to England from the jungles of Ranpur(Rout:1984)\(^{56}\). Decades of oppression and the ill- repute of Bazelgette himself (particularly, his alleged involvement in the Dhenkanal firing) resulted in such an outcome. It may be reminded here that the murder of Bazelgette was condemned by the Indian leaders.

\(^{165}\) In 1945, there was even a campaign initiated by the Ranpur Darbar to kill more monkeys in the State.\(^{56(i)}\)

\(^{166}\) This practice was suspended since the abolition of ‘Bethi’ and Begari in 1939.
IV. GHUMSUR

No record of a movement for forest rights during the zamindary period in Ghumsur has been found. The Government's measures for the abolition of meriah as well as other political/social factors worked behind the famous Ghumsur rebellion, but it was against the British Government.

V. JEYPORE

1. Agitation against the plough tax:

The Partially Excluded Areas Enquiry Committee found that while the initial assessments of this tax were low, the rates were increased gradually as a result of which while the hill-man were paying 0-8-0 to 0-12-0 per plough, non-hill men had to pay upto Rs. 2 for the same. The enhancements were, in some cases at least, arbitrary; and without the consent of the people. Besides, the concessions / rights granted in lieu of this tax were not uniform i.e. in some places, removal of plough timber below 2' girth was allowed while in other places, the permissible limit was above 2 feet:

" There is dissatisfaction among the hill tribes on the allegation that unnecessary and undesirable hardship is being caused to them in the actual working of the scheme and among the non-hill men who allege that this tax is exacted from them though they do not remove any timber from forests".(PEAECR:1940) 

Meanwhile, the Conservator of Forests, Orissa, in course of his inspection of the Jeypore forests in 1937-38, recommended complete abolition of these forest cesses to save the forests from the felling of large trees in the name of manufacturing ploughs (which were of small size):

"xxx agitation broke out167 on the plea that an archaic tax was levied for mere possession of a plough by a cultivator". 59

Ultimately, the scheme was discontinued.60

2. Agitation for the rights of 'Podu':

The Jeypore administration had taken certain steps to save the Estate forests from the evils of this shifting cultivation (though these steps were not adequate enough to eradicate the system completely) against which the tribals expressed their anger:

" The Savaras have on several occasions recently burnt down and cultivated hill slopes within reserved lands in defiance of prohibition".(Bell:1945) 61

---

167 in Nowrangpur area. Monopoly on lac is said to be another cause behind the agitation63. It may be noted here that propaganda against bethi and plough tax was going on all over the district even during 1938.64
Similarly in 1938, the Dangria Kandhas (Khonds) cleared jungles for podu cultivations in Kalyansinghpur area.62

3. Other incidents:
- During late 1930s, some local people ignored the forest rules and timber was 'illegally' taken for the purpose of building the congress ashrams65. The President of the District Congress Committee however alleged that though people had right to take such timber for building such ashrams, the forest officials had confiscated it.66
- In 1939, there was a slight unrest in Gunupur among the Kumutis with regard to granting of a monopoly of Mohwa flowers and seeds67. The trouble was later settled.68 In Umerkote and other places, relation between people and forest officials was strained because of bribes taken by the latter on threats of prosecution.69

The 'Prajabani', a weekly local newspaper, in its issue dtd. 11-9-1939 said:

"The Estate spends no money for improving the Estate's forests though it gets a large income of about five lakhs from the forest. Most of the rangers have no knowledge of the forest science and the forest officials never care to explain the forest rules to the tenants. The officials aim at supplementing their legitimate salaries through unfair means by threatening the illiterate tenants. The tenants do not sometimes get even fuel or timber for their agricultural implements, but the Estate keeps no information as to how the officials despatch timber through Salur to their friends or relatives".

People were asked by the activists not to pay tax / royalty on head loads168 and were encouraged to remove timber from the Mokhasa forest without payment71. Mr. Radhakrishna Biswas Roy, one of the leading freedom fighters of the locality, even told people that if the forest officials were beating them for not paying the royalty, then they (people) should also respond accordingly to the officials72.

-----------------------------------------------
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Part : II
THE PEACOCK COUNTRY
(Mayurbhanj State)

This is how Mayurbhanj was otherwise known to some British observers (Hunter:1872) 1; for the State owes its name to the peacock (Mayur) and peacock being the royal symbol in the State, its killing was strictly prohibited.

Mayurbhanj was the biggest Garjat in Orissa. Hamilton gave the following description of the State dating back to the early decades of 19th century:

"xxx It is xxx much infested by wild elephants, which frequently destroy the crops. The hills yield timber of various sizes, which is floated down to Balasore and other ports. Iron, dammer and lac, are procured in considerable quantities and the country is susceptible of much improvement. xxx". (Hamilton:1971) 2

Prior to the establishment of a separate Forest Department in the State in 1895, forests were managed by the Revenue Department 3. It seems that forest management received due attention after one of the most enlightened rulers of Orissa - Maharaja Sriram Chandra Bhanja Dev took charge of the State. Prior to that, during his father Krushna Chandra Bhanja Dev's rule upto 1882, the forest policy was revenue-oriented though the forest revenue was still comparatively small. Certain timber leases had been given which expired in 1885-86. Since then, upto 1904, most of the exploitation was carried out departmentally 4.

It was during the rule of Maharaja Krushna Chandra Bhanja that certain disturbances occurred in Mayurbhanj during 1880-82 with forest issues as a major factor behind the insurrection. It was the practice of the State administration to purchase fruits and other forest produce from the forest dwellers through a number of license-holder monopolists appointed in each Pargana. The monopolists used to pay certain fees to the State in lieu of their license. But the Superintendent of Tributary Mahals (Orissa) advised the Raja to impose a tax on forest goods instead of granting such monopolies:

"Accordingly the Maharaja abolished the old system of granting licenses. Under the new system, firewood and timber brought by the people for home consumption, as well as the articles brought for sale, were taxed. Although under the old system, the persons who collected forest produce for sale, were not obtaining the full price of their labour, yet, as the tax was paid indirectly, they thought that the articles were not subjected to taxation and as now under the revised system these, as well as the articles brought for home consumption, were taxed directly and it affected all the people, they felt that to be a grievance" 1695

Finally a settlement was reached to the following effect: 6

169 These facts relating to the 'insurrection' of 1880-82 could not however be independently confirmed except for the fact that fuel cess was being charged @ 0-4-0 7. The AAR of Orissa Tributary Mahals for the year 1889-90 mentions that fuel cess in the State was then being levied at the following rates 8: each widow: 0-1-6, each family of cultivators:0-6-0 and each family of labourers:0-3-6
1. Reduction of fuel cess from 0-4-0 to 0-2-0 for the agriculturists, 0-1-0 for the wage earner poor people, and 0-0-6 for the widows / poor housewives.
2. Imposition of separate taxes on timber - and firewood merchants.
3. Provision for Ratha bethi and some other bethis.*

In 1882, the State came under Court of Wards (upto 1890). Details of forest revenue of Mayurbhanj for the year 1882-83 has been given as follows:9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand (in Rupees)</th>
<th>Actual Receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax on timber: 12444-8-3</td>
<td>22302-0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungle produce (tassar, honey, fuel etc.) 9371-8-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghaut tax 17-0-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangipoorea (monopoly on dead Sal trees) 146-0-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cess on small timber taken to mogul bundi 2-0-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cess on canes etc. 303-0-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But the actual receipt was Rs. 14636-2- 5 1/2.

Besides, there were also the following sources of revenue not shown as forest revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Actual Receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuskar* On Brahmins 234-4-0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskar On Pans 8-0-0</td>
<td>5-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathoori rent On slates, stones etc. 5-0-0</td>
<td>5-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing tax On mogul bundi cattle 279-14-0</td>
<td>245-2-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross revenue of the State for that year was about Rs. 203232/-. By 1884-85, stoppage of the cutting of timber trees had caused a decrease in the forest revenue. By next year, cutting of certain valuable trees had been prohibited & certain small forests had been reserved against the cutting of any trees.10

As per the AAR of Orissa Trib. Mahals for the year 1989-90, the list of prohibited species in the State included Sal, Assan, Piasal, Dhau, Gambhari, Pipal, Tamarind & Banyan:

"This prohibition is well respected by the people, who have free access into all forests. Grazing fees used to be levied on the cattle of non-residents170, but have lately been relinquished, as not being worth the cost & trouble of collecting. Bamboos are exported from the Bamanghati hills, fuel is exported to Balasore, and none but Sal timbers are allowed to be cut for export."11

Maharaja Sriram Chandra was a remarkable administrator. He assumed power in 189012 and took some important steps towards introducing a systematic forest conservation in his State. In 1894, the then Dy. Conservator of Forests of the British Government Mr. C.L. Hatt was consulted in the matter, who drew up an exhaustive report

* a cess on Kus grass. This grass is used by the Brahmins in sacred rituals while lower cast people prepared certain grass- wares/mats from it.
170 Most probably the mogulbundi residents.
To be revised and updated. We regret for unwanted changes during formatting. Contact author for clarifications either at vasundharanr@satyam.net.in or sunlit1968@yahoo.co.in.

on the forests of the State and also a preliminary working plan. As per his report of 1895-96, following data is available:

Area of the State : 4243 sq. miles
Area of the forests : 1762.30 sq. miles of which 331.7 sq. miles mature sal and rest: mixed forests.

Area of RFs : 1039.22 sq. miles of which Similipal range : 922.35 sq. miles

During the year 1884-94, the annual revenue from forests never exceeded Rs. 30000/-; but by 1907-08, it reached nearly Rs. 250000/- per year.

Maharaja Sriram Chandra promulgated a Tenancy Act for the benefit of his subjects and abolished all illegal abwabs. Formerly, lac rearers had to pay a fee of Re. 1/- on each tree of lac cultivation; by early 20th century, this liability was not there.

Following annual professional fees have been recorded in the Mayrubhanj Forest Manual of 1911:

Potters: 0-8-0 (Mayurbhanj Proper)
1-0-0 (Bamanghati and Panchpir sub-divisions)

Gold- and silversmith, brassier: 1-8-0

Carpenters: Rs. 4/- (for using unreserved species)
Rs. 8/- (for using 2nd class timber)

Iron-smelters: Re. 1/- for consuming charcoal.

For plucking seed cocoon from Sal trees in the RFs, 0-8-0 for the whole season.

For fishers (using net) and hunters (using traps to catch animals) in lieu of their access to the RF: Rs. 2

For professional bamboo-extractors and manufacturers of basket, mats etc. (who obtained bamboos from RFs and protected forests): Rs. 2

The Manual reported that fuel cess had been abolished in Baripada (capital town), Bahalda, Karanjia and in certain other villages surrounding Baripada.

Following are some other extracts from the said Manual:

Reserved species: 27 + all other trees of over 4 feet in girth at 4 feet from ground.

Class - I timber: Sal, Piasal and Sissoo
Class - II timber: Rest of reserved species
Class - III timber: All others

Rights and concessions:

---

171 For a small portion i.e. for about 88 square miles of forests.
172 The FECR however recorded 30 reserved species without any reference to girth.
Special privileges were enjoyed by the ryots of Bamaghati who paid a bamboo cess\textsuperscript{173}. They were allowed to remove for domestic use only, 10 dry Sal posts of 2 feet girth and 2 sagar\textsuperscript{174} loads of bamboo per annum, under a free permit.\textsuperscript{21}

General ryots of the State were allowed for domestic use, under free permit:

1. Unreserved species except Dhao tree, for the manufacture of axles, etc.
2. All brush wood, thorns, fibre, twings and branches fallen to the ground, without permit.

Payers of fuel-cess were allowed to remove all dead trees of unreserved species and also small branches and twigs of specified green trees, without any permit or royalty.\textsuperscript{23}

**Right in trees:**

All trees and timber situated on the homestead lands of occupancy ryots were considered as their property and they had right to use parts of such trees freely for sale etc., provided no restriction was there in their pattas, Trees standing on cultivated lands of such ryots were allowed for felling by him with permission and without permission if grown on his occupancy land.\textsuperscript{24}

Grazing was free in protected forests as well as for those who resided in the RFs. Those residing outside RFs, but having no facility to pasture their cattle in the protected forests, were also exempted from grazing duties in the RFs for domestic purposes. But no grazing was allowed in plantation areas and for grazing beyond limit fees were charged.\textsuperscript{25}. For wasteland reclamation, leases were of the three following categories:\textsuperscript{26}

- **A- Class:** area exceeding 500 man
- **B- Class:** area between 500 to 100 man
- **C- Class:** area less than 100 man

No lease was required for area less than or equal to 20 man for ryots of the State if no reserved species and RF were involved.

In lieu of concessions, following were the services to be rendered by the ryots of the State:\textsuperscript{27}

1. To assist in extinguishing forest fire.
2. To assist in demarcation and survey work.
3. To keep demarcation or other forest lines free from undergrowth.

The sad and unnatural death of Maharaja Sriram Chandra Bhanja was also linked to the forests. In January 1912, the Maharaja arranged a shoot for some officers of the Bengal Nagpur Railway whom he had invited for consultation for extending his light railway to the forest areas for exploitation of his timber resources. During the shoot, the Maharaja and his attendant were fired at by mistake, by one accompanying person. His attendant succumbed to death shortly after the accident and the Maharaja's injury ultimately led to septicaemia (blood - poisoning ) causing his death some days after.\textsuperscript{28}

---

\textsuperscript{173} A tax on professional bamboo-users.
\textsuperscript{174} This word used in italic in Cobden – Ramsay’s ‘Feudatory States of Orissa’ probably referred to what is locally known as ‘sagad’ (cart).
The State again came under Court of Wards from 1912 (to 1920). In 1914-15, the following changes were made:\textsuperscript{29}

1. Abolition of the issue of free permits for unreserved materials taken by the riots from protected forests.
2. Exclusion of four species of trees from the reserved list.
3. Abolition of import duty on tassar cocoons.
4. Enhancement of export duty on charcoal from Rs. 6 to Rs. 9-6-0 per 100 maunds.

The forests of Similipal constituted about $\frac{5}{8}$ of the total forest area of the Mayurbhanj State and as such, about three-fourths of the activities in the matters of exploitation, organisation and building of roads and rest houses in the State was confined to these forests\textsuperscript{30}. For extension of the State light railway, a co-partner was needed to finance and undertake the construction work and accordingly, M/S. B.B. & Co.- then a lease holder of forests in the State- executed in this regard an agreement with the State on the condition of getting a 30 years monopoly lease in Similipal for timber extraction as well as for the collection and export of myrobalan etc\textsuperscript{175}. The lease was actually implemented after the Maharaja’s death and continued for the period of 1916 to 1946.\textsuperscript{31}

During 1945-46, issue of all permits inside the Similipal Reserve was entirely stopped to help solve fire protection problem\textsuperscript{32}. And a working plan for the Reserve was drawn up for the first time for the period of 1947-48 to 1966-67.\textsuperscript{33}

A policy of rigid conservation was followed at least during 1944-45 when even war exploitation was stopped and tapping of resin was prohibited.\textsuperscript{34}

A 10- year scheme for reforestation of some of the denuded hills of Bamanghati was implemented from the year 1945-46\textsuperscript{35}. As regards plantation, following were some of the worth – noting projects of the State (as in 1945-46):\textsuperscript{36}

- Sabai grass plantation at Jamsole – 1130 acres
- Bamboo plantation at Mahamaru – 470.7 acres

Besides, there was a plantation complex at Pithabata having even Tea and Coffee plantations.\textsuperscript{37}
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STATES OF INFAMOUS ADMINISTRATION
( Nilgiri, Talcher and Dhenkanal )

I. Nilgiri :-

Forest administration had been introduced in Nilgiri already by 1885-86 as said in the AAR of the Orissa Tributary Mahals for that year:

"The forests of Nilgiri contain valuable trees of splendid girth and size. The whole forest used to be leased out for a triffling sum: no restrictions were put on the lessee. Had this system of reckless waste and destruction been continued, the forests would have been completely denuded of timber trees within a few years.

The manager has taken timely precaution, and strictly reserved all valuable timbers and prohibited the cutting of saplings. A farmer is allowed to remove only wood, and dead and dried trees not more than three feet in girth. xxx" 1

The Supt. of Trib. Mahals visited the State in 1905 and commented the following in his inspection notes of 9-11-1905:

“The income of the Forest Department, besides Rs. 5000 for fuel, consists of many small items of which the largest is Rs. 1400 for Sabai grass and the next Rs. 700 for tussar, the total income coming to Rs. 9960. To obtain this, a staff of 41 persons costing Rs. 5562, is maintained. This is bad in every sense. It is probably that these people levy illegally far more than their legitimate pay and that to get a net income of about Rs. 4000, the Raja is the cause of more than three times as much being extracted from the people”. 2

The Supt. therefore recommended to decrease the staff to the necessary number and also to introduce contract system to simplify the whole business.

The Agency Forest Officer visited the State in 1914 and a regular coppice felling series, said to be first of its kind in Orissa Garjats, was laid out on a 30 years rotation in Tinkonia block on his advice. The first working plan was drawn up in 1932. 3

Grieve, the Agency Forest Officer, in his inspection notes of 1914-26, recommended for the revision of the Nilgiri forest rules. He mentioned how the royalty system for Class-I, II and III timbers was more than 4 times of what was reasonable. 4

Following an increase in the land rent, the forest cess also increased. On one hand, people had no right to kill the elephants destroying their crops, and on the other hand the Raja took this opportunity to capture elephants by employing people without payment for his own interest. In addition to that, the Raja frequently used to arrange shikar and people were forced to render shikar bethi for all such expeditions. 5
Under such circumstances, when the Raja forced the people to pay a marriage cess (for his daughter's marriage) at 50% of the land rent, people could not tolerate any more and this caused the unrest of 1928. At last, with the mediation of C.F. Andrews (then a national leader), the Raja agreed to the following effect:  

1. To decrease the frequency of shikar and to arrange them so as not to interfere with the harvest.  
2. To suspend Kheda for 5 years.  
3. To pay compensation to those who had been wounded during Kheda and Shikar.  

By this time, the Raja of Nilgiri had died and his successor Kishore Chandra became the new Chief. He was 24 and was apparently ignorant of the forest administration of his predecessor. The Pol. Agent reportedly advised him to consult old people in this matter. The Raja informed the Political Agent that people had right to the timber etc. of trees on their homestead and cultivated lands except for the reserved species (including fruit-bearing ones); and also to the timber of naturally fallen fruit bearing trees on homestead lands.  

However, the reality was found otherwise when the States Enquiry Committee took evidence in Nilgiri some 10 years later. As one witness said:  

“Previously we obtained timbers of unreserved species by paying ¼ of royalty. We could cut trees as we wished from the Kalabadi (homestead) land. xxx one compartment in every coup forest used to be granted for the subjects at concession rates. xxx We enjoyed fruits such as mango, tamarind, Karanja, etc. from Mahal land, we obtained all kinds of wood free if the house was burnt. Now all these privileges are withdrawn. The number of reserved species is gradually on the increase” (SECR: 1939)  

The Committee also found that people had no right over the trees on their own land.  

Many such grievances led to the Prajamandal movement in Nilgiri, in 1938. In May 1938, the Yubak Sakha Samity first started a civil disobedience movement against State restrictions on public meetings and processions, but no memorandum had been given to the Raja. The State Prajamandal was organised in June that year and when the Darbar ignored the Prajamandal memorandum, the movement became more stronger which the Raja failed to suppress. Intervention of Political Agent led the Raja to issue a proclamation to the following effect, on 20-8-38:  

- Full rights on all kinds of trees conceded to the tenants in ryoti as well as lakhiraj homestead and orchard lands.  
- Certain portion of the coppice coupes would be reserved for the domestic consumption of tenants.  
- Tenants now allowed to sell / export the fruits of tamarind, kochila, harida, bahada, pagda, mohul and simul, without any tax.  

---  

176 Only forest issues have been taken here.
On 4-10-1938, the Darbar also declared permission for the killing of all crop-destroying animals (except elephant). Besides, the system of supplying straw and fuel to the palace at nominal price was also reportedly abolished.11

Ramdhyanı’s report on Nilgiri contained the following information12:

1. Ryots still complained lack of rights in trees on their holdings, lack of right to fruit on waste lands and lack of grazing land etc.
2. No right to trees on waste lands, but grazing in village waste free.
3. Right to kill animals for crop protection found to exist only on paper.
4. Reserved species reduced from 24 to 11, but unreserved species less available than reserved trees, in Khesra.
5. Timber allowed to cut from certain forests at ½ royalty, between December 15 to June 30.
6. Khesra did not include individual trees or groups of trees within village limits or cultivators’ lands.
7. Reserved species of less than 3 feet girth on cultivated land allowed to cut without permission, but sale of trees only on royalty.
8. For every reserved species cut, the ryot was bound to plant two trees on his holdings.
9. Under-tenants (Shikmi ryots) given same rights as other ryots over the trees.
10. Service jagirdars, who were rent free, enjoyed fruits of trees on their holdings but no right to the trees themselves.
11. The area allowed for nistar was not sufficient.
12. Tassar was sold in Khesra on monopoly.
13. Residents were bound to render assistance in clearing forest boundary lines (though remuneration had been prescribed for that).( Ramdhyanı:1947)

In January 1947, forest rules in the State were still found to be rigorous, by the Nilgiri Prajamandal. But the Darbar's view was that as reclamation had proceeded greatly, forest conservancy was a necessity in the interest of the people.13

II. Talcher:

In Talcher, steps towards forest conservation had been taken already by 1880s. Raja Ramachandra Harichandand, who came to power in 1875, started the process14 and as the Offg. Supt. of Trib. Mahals wrote to the Chief Secy. (to the GOB) on 9th August 1888:

"The forests have been reserved. The trees are young and not fit for cutting.
There was no forest revenue."15

The Raja reserved 13 species16. Forest rules were framed in 1901 and by 1912, 17 blocks had been reserved.17

Commercial exploitation started in 1919. Regular management of forests was thought of in 1937 and a working scheme was prepared that year. But heavy feelings were allowed for war supply during 1943-45.18

Raja Kishore Chandra (1891-1945), like his predecessor Ramachandra Harichandand, was much interested in gaming and had reportedly killed 106 tigers; but later preferred animal keeping instead of hunting.19
Minimum demands of Talcher Prajamandal included demand for the modification of forest laws. The Prajamandal decided that since the Raja had not taken necessary steps against their memorandum, people would no more give taxes and violating forest rules etc.; they would establish local self-government in different areas.

The Raja started taking oppressing measures against the Prajamandal activists as well as other people. As a result, in November 1938, mass exodus began and more than 75% of the total State population moved to the neighbouring British territory of Angul. The Prajamandal leaders were closely associated with this exodus and they tried to use it for a nation-wide response for the cause of Talcher people, which succeeded in its purpose of course gradually. Gandhi and many other leaders expressed their grave concern over the situation and both the British Government as well as the Congress leaders wanted immediate settlement as a result of which in March 1939, the two parties entered into a pact (known as the Hennessy - Mahatab Pact) which provided for reduction of the miscellaneous cess and also for killing wild animals without any penalty or fee for crop protection, besides other things.

But, as the Prajamandal leader, Pabitra Mohan Pradhan described, this pact was a mandachukti to them and so the Prajamandal decided to continue its struggle till all the demands were fulfilled. The situation was worsening. Crops of the people had been left unharvested twice in their fields. At last, the Governor General of India decided to pay a visit to the refugee camp and sent a message to the Raja of Talcher that if he failed to satisfy and get back his people before the proposed visit, Talcher would be confiscated. The Raja got frightened and declared on 23-6-39 that all the demands of Prajamandal were fulfilled. Accordingly, the refugees went back to their homeland on 26-6-1939. Needless to say, the Talcher Prajamandal’s exodus-movement achieved a distinct glory, rare of its kind.

Ramdhyan reported that in 1939, the tenants of Talcher were granted full rights on recorded species though it was not clear if they had the right to sell reserved species. His observations also included the following:

1. Grazing free, outside RFs.
2. The fee levied formerly on each animal shot in crop-protection no more charged, but of the animals shot, the hides / horns went to the State.
3. Fuel allowed free.
4. Misc. cess reduced from 0-5-0 to 0-3-0.
5. Reserved species : 10.
6. The cess-payer allowed to take trees of unreserved species up to six times the equivalent of the fee paid by him.
7. Proposed export duties on camel, ass, cotton, hen etc. seemed to have been dropped.

---

177 This miscellaneous cess included ten cesses two of them being for supplying fuel to the palace and for providing timber for the car festival (as commutation charges for such kinds of bethi).
178 The pact was rejected by the Raja also. While Hennessy had made it clear that he had no authority to negotiate on behalf of the Raja, Mahatab was not an authorised representative of the refugees. Mahatab put forward certain conditions the fulfilment of which, he believed, by the Raja, would lead to the return of the refugees; and Hennessy agreed that the conditions should be fulfilled.
8. Brahmottardars paid quit rent and cesses, but no such liability on Debottars and certain Chakran\textsuperscript{179} grants(Ramdhyani:1947).

III. Dhenkanal:-

Mooney was of the view that there was no kind of forest conservancy in Dhenkanal prior to 1903\textsuperscript{29}. But the AAR of the Orissa Trib. Mahals for the year 1887-88 reveals that this was not true\textsuperscript{180}:

"In Dhenkanal, there were formerly no restrictions on the felling of timber trees, and a few years ago the late Manager, Baboo Banamali Singh, prohibited the cutting of a few carefully selected species of trees, and there are now beautiful forests of young sal trees over most of the hills in the State. Xxx the cutting of standing green trees is not allowed.xxx\textsuperscript{30}

The State was then under Court of Wards and the British authority stressed, in the year 1889-90, on necessary arrangements to be made for proper conservancy and for the levy of fees on timber & other forest produce of the State\textsuperscript{181}. 31

The Extra Asst. Conservator of Forests Mr. Mee visited the State in 1903 and prepared a report on the State’s forests, but his proposals were mostly not implemented by the Darbar. In 1905, a Forest Officer was appointed and demarcation work started under his supervision\textsuperscript{32}. By 1905, forest rules had been introduced but were not very objectionable for the people. In lieu of a forest cess, besides timber for domestic / agricultural implements etc, the tenants were allowed grazing facilities in the unreserves as well as to gather fruit and honey from the forests. No permission was required to use 16 species of unreserved timber for bonafide domestic / agricultural purposes(SECR:1939)\textsuperscript{33}.

In 1918, the ruler died and the State came under the Court of Wards. During the famine of 1918-19, forests were thrown upon to the tenants as relief measure, causing severe destruction (50% discount was then available on royalty to the tenants). Besides, there was also extraction for sleepers.\textsuperscript{34}

The AFO assumed control of the forests in 1919\textsuperscript{35}. Forest rules were revised and this, along with other factors, caused distress among the people leading to the first phase of agitation in the early 1920s which was not much successful\textsuperscript{35}. 36

The Settlement Report of 1923-24 recorded the following rights of the tenants, besides the right for getting forest produce for bonafide purposes:\textsuperscript{38}

1. Resident tenants of villages allowed to enjoy fruits of certain State orchards, but as a concession, not right; and bound to plant new trees when any of these trees died or got destroyed. Timber of all such trees belonged to the State.
2. Ryots allowed to enjoy all fruits of trees in their lands and to cut and use for own bonafide purpose trees planted by them in homestead or cultivated lands.
3. Ryots under Lakhirajdars had the same rights as of the State ryots.

\textsuperscript{179}Chakran grant: a kind of service tenure.
\textsuperscript{180}In fact, demand of forest revenue decreased in the State during 1884-85 due to the strict enforcement of forest regulations and the prevention of indiscriminate cutting of timber trees at nominal rates.\textsuperscript{36}
\textsuperscript{181}No fuel rate was being levied in the State by 1889-90.\textsuperscript{37}
Towards the end of that decade, a working plan was prepared by Mooney for the RFs of Dhenkanal. In his introductory note in that plan, Mooney made the following remarks:

“A word of warning is necessary. There is a great danger that this State will become denuded of timber in the next twenty or thirty years unless a firm and farsighted forest policy is introduced and unswervingly pursued”.39

It may seem that what followed next was because of such remarks made by Mooney. But the real factor was something else, and it was the evil nature of the ruling authorities.

Gradually, many privileges formerly allowed to the tenants in the forests were taken away.40 Revised forest rules as well as their misuse by the State administration to exploit / oppress the people virtually ruined them(Mishra:1996)41. In addition to that, there was apparently no rule of law and civil rights of the people were severely violated by the Raja, his relations and his officials / police. Under such conditions, the Dhenkanal Prajamandal published and circulated its memorandum in August 1938 which included the following forest issues(Mishra:1996):42

1. Reintroduction of the 1906 forest rules.
2. Free grazing be allowed in both Khesra and reserved forests.
3. The illegal power given to forest officers for searching homes, etc. at their own will, be taken away.
4. The timber of trees felled in the forest land allowed for reclamation be, instead of being forcefully sold to the reclamer, auctioned in public.
5. Many portions of Khesra had been debarred for the public use and given on Lakhiraj tenure to the royal relations for their own commercial purpose. This being entirely unlawful, such portions should be restored for public use as before.
6. Landless people be exempted from forest cess.
7. Permission be granted for free enjoyment of mohul fruits and jungly roots, as well as for head load removal of firewood for sale.
8. People should be reimbursed for the illegal exaction made from them by the forest staff.

In response, the Darbar published its announcement in the Dhenkanal State Gazette dated 29-8-38, to the following effect(Mishra:1996).43

1. Full rights on all unreserved species in the private lands. Enjoyment of fruit and flower etc. of reserved species on such lands allowed alongwith unrestricted sale of such timber within the State on permission.
2. Free grazing in Khesra.
3. Tenants allowed to procure bamboo from protected forests excluding coupes and to graze their cattle in such forests excepting coupes of five years age and below.
4. Rate of fuel wood reduced form 0-4-0 to 0-2-0 per cart load in coupes.
5. Lower cast tenants allowed to collect MFP like honey, wax, Tol, Mohul flower, Sabai grass, creepers etc. as much as they required even for sale within the State. Others

---

182 Many such things made the Nilgiri, Talcher and Dhenkanal Rajas and their administration infamous. Particularly in Dhenkanal, dignity of women was very unsafe.
allowed a similar concession, but they had to sell (if any) such produce only to the State monopolist\textsuperscript{183}.

6. Forest offences to be detected only in the forest and on the way. Search warrants to be issued only by orders of the Magistrate having jurisdiction and on the report of the forest officials where there was reasonable ground for suspicion for timbers stolen and kept unused by an offender in his house.

7. All forest offences detected would be reported to the Conservator of Forests and the Magistrate having jurisdiction over them within three days from the date of detection.

8 (a) Any compromise before a subordinate forest official to be withdrawn within 10 days by the offender by a petition, with or without assigning any reason therefor.

b) Any enhancement of compensation by the Forest Department must require previous assent of the offender. No enhancement without his consent.

9 The concerned authorities would fix from time to time the minimum price of MFP having monopolists for their sale to them by the tenants; would notify such rates to the people, and see that the monopolists paid reasonable prices to the tenants.

10 Areas of open forests to be extended according to necessity after the enquiries.

11 Agricultural implements now allowed free of royalty from open forests and coupes of protected forests.

12 Right to shoot wild animals for crop protection, restored as before.

13 Previously, leases of jungle land were granted after valuation was made of the trees thereover. Henceforward, in lieu thereof, leases would be granted and the timbers put to auction afterwards.

But this announcement had little effect on the people. On one hand, the Raja has lost the faith of the people; and on the other hand, such concessions appeared to be more on pen and paper than being implemented actually\textsuperscript{(Mishra:1996)44}. It was the strategy of many Rajas to make such kinds of official announcements chiefly to convince the British authorities and others that they had acted as per the ideal norms, so it is quite easy to understand why the people of Dhenkanal were hardly satisfied with such announcement of August 1938.

The Raja tried to crush the Prajamandal movements with the help of military power. Human rights were severely violated by the troops as well as State officials. Following the call of Prajamandal, exodus began from 23-9-1938; but heavy rains made life of the people more miserable and many died due to unhealthy conditions\textsuperscript{(Mishra:1996)46}.

The Prajamandal, on 1-10-38, called for a mass boycott to the Raja and his officials and asked the refugees to come back to the State. On one hand, the Raja continued his oppressive measures; on the other hand, people became so rebellious that in Kamakshyanagar and Bhuban areas, forest officials went on leave and other State officials were under much fear\textsuperscript{47}.

Political Agent Bezelgettee was acting in favour of the Raja and British forces had been sent to Dhenkanal accordingly\textsuperscript{48}. On 10\textsuperscript{th} October 1938, troops entered at midnight into

\textsuperscript{183} State monopoly of Lac, Mohwa, Cocoons, Catechu etc. was a major forest grievance of the Dhenkanal people.\textsuperscript{45}
Bhuban village and started making arrests on various allegations (supposed to be false) of forest offence etc. 49

As they marched ahead causing suffering to the people, confrontation with the latter led to the killing of 7 people in firing 184, including a 12-year old brave boatman (boy) Baji Rout who dared to deny his service to the troops waiting to cross a river. 50

Many such incidences finally went against the Raja and even the British Government took measures so as to reduce the power of the Raja as well as to control the State administration in favour of the people. One such measure was the appointment of a new Chief Minister for the State, Mr. A.K. Khan. Khan was a good administrator and he made many changes in the system of forest administration to suit the people 51. Also the Raja was forced by the Govt. to leave the State (in 1944). 52

To satisfy the people, the Darbar had announced the following concessions in an extraordinary Gazette, dated 3rd June 1939:53

1. Number of reserved species reduced from 27 to 11.
2. Rate of royalty of reserved species reduced in Khesra to 3/4th.
3. Fuel and fencing materials of unreserved species to be removed free from coupes or from open forest provided a cutting charge of 0-1-0 per cart-load would be charged if the work in the coupe done departmentally.
4. Rate of bamboo for tenants from reserved forests reduced from 0-8-0 to 0-6-0.
5. Plough timber, if not available in Khesra or protected forests, allowed from the RFs at 0-2-0 for that of reserved species and 0-1-0 for that of unreserved species, provided the felling and conversion was done by the tenants.
6. Dry and fallen branches even of reserved species fit only for fuel allowed free from the protected and Khesra forests.
7. Rates of dry and fallen trees in the Ranjagarh RF reduced to ½.
8. Tenants now allowed to clear jungle up to 50 feet around their fields. Reserved species under 18" girth and unreserved species might be removed free, felling of Kochila, Mahul and Kusum being strictly prohibited.
9. The Bharati hill portion of Bhuban protected forest now declared as Khesra.
10. Landless people exempted from forest cess
11. Free grazing for calves under six months in the RFs.

Ramdhyanri reported that though elephants mostly destroyed crops, still their killing was not allowed for crop protection in Dhenkanal State. Monopoly was on Lac, Cocoon, Sabai grass, Kendu Leaf, Myrobalan, Hides, tamarind and Sunari bark; and for reclamation of waste land, certain fee was charged(Ramdhyani:1947). 55

Work for redemarcation of boundaries, which began in 1939, was completed by early 1942 & area of the RFs was reduced from 414.4 sq. km. to 297.85 sq. km. 56

-----------------------------------------
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THE MOGULBANDI EXPERIENCE

The feudal system of forest management in Orissa Garjats had its parallel also in the so-called Mogulbandi area. There were a large number of small and big zamindars in the districts of undivided Puri, Cuttack and Balasore having full proprietary right over their own Estate forests and the experience of their people was more or less similar to that of the Garjat people.

The zamindars recognised the rights of their tenants on the basis of the latter's status as 'thani' (resident cultivators) or 'pahi' (non-resident cultivators). The thani ryots enjoyed communal rights to pasture, firewood, and thatching grass\textsuperscript{185}. On the other hand, the pahi tenants usually had lesser rights than their thani counterparts for a long time\textsuperscript{1}; and in Kanika zamindari, there was even a separate forest pass (permit) for them known as the 'pahi pass''\textsuperscript{2}.

As regards rights in trees, the zamindar was the primary owner of every timber tree of his Estate unless this right was specifically alienated to lakhiraj holders etc. Maddox has described (1890-1900 AD) the situation in this regard in three different districts, as follows:\textsuperscript{3}

1. **Cuttack** :-
   - All ryots allowed to cut bamboos, canes, and non-timber trees standing on their holdings.
   - Both thani and pahi ryots allowed to enjoy fruit of all trees on their lands.
   - In case of a tree on thani land, neither zamindar nor ryots could cut down the tree without the other's consent and when it died or was cut down, each was entitled half the wood.
   - A pahi ryot had no right whatever in the wood of a tree on his land unless planted by himself, in which case he was generally considered a half owner.

2. **Puri** :-
   - The rights differed in different zamindaris. In Kotdes, for ex; while the thani ryot had full rights to plant, enjoy, and cut trees in their own lands in areas under the direct control of zamindar; he could not cut any tree without the permission of the *muqaddam* (a tenure-holder similar to the Gauntihas) in *muquaddami* villages. In most of the villages, the pahi ryots had no rights to cut any tree without permission; but in some cases their right to bamboo grown on their homestead lands was admitted.
   - In some other areas, both thani and pahi ryots enjoyed the produce, but could not cut except bamboo or trees they had planted themselves.

3. **Balasore** :-

\textsuperscript{185} The rent paid by thani ryots was higher than that for the pahi tenants.
In this district, the thani and pahi ryots enjoyed the fruits of trees on their lands without payment but were not allowed to cut down any tree without the permission of zamindar. On thani lands, the zamindar used to get half the value of a tree cut down and to get full value if the tree belonged to a pahi ryot. If the pahi tenant had planted that tree himself, then the zamindar took half the value.

A thani ryot might cut bamboo for domestic and other uses from the clumps in his homestead without payment. He was also entitled to cut wood from trees in his homestead for agricultural purposes only and not for fuel. In many parts, similar privileges were enjoyed by the pahi ryots.

**Killa Darpan** was one of the most important jungle zamindaris of Mogulbandi having more than 8 acres of thatching grass and more than 400 acres of jungles. The Settlement Report of 1901 has recorded the rights of the tenants there as follows:

"The resident tenants are allowed to take for their own consumption house timber, fuel, small bamboo and twine for thatching houses from any jungle in the estate for which they have to pay as below:

The western villages neighbouring the hill and jungles would hitherto pay little or nominally as jungles were dense and any step by the proprietor for levying a jungle due could not be strictly enforced. Their liability to pay to not thereby interrupted. Of the rest, a resident family having a bullock cart pays Re. 1/- and one for fetching by loads on his own head, five annas per annum as jungle due. The matter of realising jungle dues has not yet any established principle. As to taking stones, it is at the proprietor's discretion to allow any body to do so."

In **Kujang**, which was one of the largest coastal Estates of Orissa, following species were prohibited:

Khair, Kendu, Pulang, Kochila, Mango, Jack, Bel, Gambhari, Patarkoruam, etc.

As per the revised forest rules of 1938, no cutting or appropriation of any forest produce from the RFs was allowed. Forest cess was known as Bankar, assessed at 0-4-0 per family. The payers of Bankar were allowed access to the forests three times a year as follows:

1st Instalment (June):
Bankar cess was deposited and a permit was issued for 10 maunds of fuel.

2nd Instalment (October):
Free permit issued for 10 maunds of fuel.

3rd Instalment (March):
Free permit issued for 10 maunds of fuel as well as for timber and MFP etc. in specific quantities for domestic / agricultural purposes.

---

186 Four to eight annas per 100 cft was being charged for ghothing lime.
187 The Oriya proprietors of this Estate had to hand it over to the Raja of Vardhaman (West Bengal) when it was sold because of their heavy debt, in 1868.
If specified time expired, the cess payer had to pay penalty of Re. 1/- . He had to pay Bankar irrespective of whether he removed wood or not.\(^8\)

Professional wood-cutters had to pay double the schedule of rates for the forest produce\(^11\). Other fees charged by the zamindar were as follows:\(^12\)

- **Golla Masul**: rent at 0-8-0 per 1000 bamboo and 0-2-0 per piece of wood stored in any sale depot.
- **Bhela Masul**: at Rs. 4 per bhela (raft) of bamboo passing through the rivers of Kujang.
- **Kilapotha**: at Rs. 3 for each boat for one year, that passed through the Kujang rivers carrying commodities of business.

As regards forest administration, it was not very systematic in many cases. Dompara was the only zamindary in Mogulbandi to have a working plan\(^13\). The zamindars / Rajas already had a tradition of revenue-oriented forest policy\(^18\) but some of them, who had considerable forest resources, introduced forest rules, reserved certain forest areas and had a forest staff for this purpose.

Grazing fee varied in different areas. By the end of 19\(^{th}\) century, people used to give 1/2 seer of ghee for each buffalo and 0-4-0 for each cow, to the zamindar in lieu of the grazing facilities in the Coast Canal area of Balasore (Mohapatra:1987)\(^14\) . In Kanika, before the Estate abolition, grazing fee was 0-8-0 for each buffalo per annum\(^19\), in the unreserves (Mohanty:1992)\(^15\).

In zamindaris like Sukinda and Kanika etc., various shooting restrictions were there\(^16\).

**Dalijora** was one of those many zamindaris which the Oriya zamindars lost to the Bengali proprietors under various circumstances. The Mandals had purchased Dalijora from the Oriya zamindar and as Dalizel said, they appeared "to have allowed their tenants too free a hand in cutting jungle\(^19\)" so that there was danger of disappearance (Dalizel:1932)\(^17\). In 1931, the Maharaja of Panchkote (West Bengal) took perpetual lease of this Estate. He applied under section 38 of the Indian Forest Act, 1927 desiring to have 4546 acres of jungle in this area to be managed by the Government as a RF and accordingly entered into an agreement for a term of 50 years. The plan was implemented in 1937, but the Maharaja still retained the following rights / concessions:\(^18\)

1. He was given right to shooting and no permit for shooting was to be allowed to any body without his consent. An area of 20 acres in six different localities within the RF was specially set apart for the Maharaja's shikar.
2. He had concession to remove forest produce for reasonable domestic use, but not violating the working plan.

\(^8\) A 25- year felling cycle along with two felling series had been suggested in 1927 for the Kujang forest blocks (Mohanty:1992)\(^19\). We don't know to what extent it was implemented.

\(^9\) For ex., the zamindars of North Balasore used to levy grazing fee and fuel cess in the jal pahi areas (i.e. a kind of prairie, the long grass of which, when dry, was used as a fuel and the ash of this fuel was used for washing purpose).\(^20\)

\(^10\) Also charged was a transit fee or road tax (patha kara) per each buffalo.\(^20\)

\(^11\) No fee was charged on the resident tenants for removing timber etc. for their own use.
Situated in the Chilika Lake, the largest Island-Estate of the province was Parikud, which was actually a group of Islands. Casurina jungles & topes were to be found in this Estate; besides, the Raja had reserved the 4 km. (approx.) strip of jungle (extending from Nuapara to Gurubai) exclusively for the requirements of palace/royal family as it contained valuable timber trees like Teak & Sal etc. Spotted deer were found in abundance in this 'reserved' strip and the Estate had only a few forest guards to regulate its jungle/plant resources.21

Before Estate abolition, there was reportedly no regular forest cess in Parikud. Topes on communal lands were leased out by the Raja & royalty was charged on certain produce like *pulanga* (the oil of which had been a local substitute for Kerosene). People paid either to the Estate or to the private proprietors (tenure-holders) for their required timber/produce or managed somehow to remove firewood etc. from the adjacent jungles.22

Nalavana -now said to be the favourite of migratory birds only second to Lake Victoria in the United States- was under the control of the Parikud Raja. A historical sketch of this small Island is found in Hunter's description as follows:

"Half-way across the lake is Nalbana, literally the Reed Forest; an island about five miles in circumference, and scarcely any where rising more than a few inches above the level of water. XXX The Island was an unbroken expanse of high grasses, without a single habitation, or tillage of sort. But hundreds of coffin-shaped canoes clustered around its margin, waiting for the bundles of sedge which parties of thatchers from the mainland were busy cutting." (Hunter: 1872)

And the accounts of the Parikud Estate, as furnished by Hunter, mention only one source of jungle revenue i.e. payments received against the long grass & thatching materials removed from Nalavana amounting to about £ 30 (which was only 4.29% of the gross Estate revenue)25. But the present successor of the last ruler of the Estate did not find any such revenue being realised from Nalavana by his father.26 However, shooting being prohibited in the Estate without the prior permission of the Raja, Rs. 15 was to be deposited to obtain a permit (valid for a week) for shooting in Nalavan area & as he himself said, professional exporters took enough advantage of this facility. Besides, members, friends & guests of the royal family often visited this area to enjoy the privilege of shooting (even the King of Greece is said to have visited Nalavana in 1930s) & the house-boat of the Raja was used for such camping purposes.27

It is said that some years before the advent of Independence, the zamindars leased out extensive forest areas to people even from outside Orissa.28 Immigration of Bengali people to the coastal areas of Kujang and Kanika etc. adversely affected the forest resources.29 Besides encroachment, a kind of native reclamation known as 'Kandha Chasa' or 'Pahi Chasa' has also damaged the forests considerably in Kujang and other areas.30

---

* This privilege of the Parikud royal family continued for some time after the Estate abolition. But in 1974, Nalavana was declared as a bird sanctuary & the forest dept. is said to have taken significant measures to protect the birds.
Maddox reported of certain objections raised by the National Society of Balasore regarding the non-recognition of thani tenant's right to fuel, thatching grass and grazing in some Estates / areas. But the zamindars of Mogulbandi were also affected by the wave of popular uprising in other parts of Orissa. Issues were raised during such movements either because of the anti-people forest administration in some Estates or as a principle of protest against feudal rule. Some of these forest-related protests have been briefed below:

1. In Sukinda, 12 Pans cut down about 50 Sal trees in December 1937.
2. In Panchikote, tenants were encouraged by the freedom-fighters to cut away the jungle bushes without Estate permission and 30 tenants of Gourpal village cut down in 1938 19 trees accordingly (the timber was left where it was cut down).
3. Some discontent was reported in 1937 among the tenants of Dharmasala and Barchana jungle areas of Madhupur and Darpa. In Darpa, tenants cut fuel from the forests without paying fees, but the Estate felt powerless to resist.
4. In Balasore district, villagers of Kandara organised a meeting on 30-3-1939 to protest against the action of zamindar in not allowing them to bring fuel and leaves from the jungle.
5. In Dalijora (1948), local people represented to the Government against the indiscriminate exploitation of forests by the proprietors.
6. In Parikud, the Gandhians demanded for the withdrawal of restrictions on gachha (tree) & machha (fish).

In Kanika, the system of forest management was somewhat different in many respects from that of the Feudatory States. For ex., there were only two types of forests in the Estate viz., 'Reserved' and 'Protected'. Different blocks of Protected forests were closed and opened in rotation and people had to collect their bonafide requirements from the opened blocks.

Raja revised the forest cess of 0-8-0 & introduced a new rate at 6 pies per rupee of rent which was collected from all ryots indiscriminately. The tenants were against this revision & the settlement authorities pointed out its unfairness to the people. So the Raja decided in 1928 to go back to the old system (i.e. 0-8-0 per hearth), but also ordered to reduce the quantity of firewood allowed against the cess from 100 maunds to 50 maunds and also, timber for house-building purpose was no more allowed. Only following agricultural implements were granted (Dalizel: 1932).

| Nangal (plough) | - | 2 pieces |
| Kanti | - | 2 pieces |
| Isa | - | 2 pieces |
| Juali | - | 1 piece |

---

192 For ex; as the Oriya newspaper *Desha Katha* reported on 22-11-1938, inspite of the Dompara Raja's generous free grants of house building timber etc. to the people of flood prone villages, some persons asked the people to cut down trees in the zamindary forest.

193 The Raja of Panchkote had reportedly alienated about 500 acres of jungle land & the protesters expressed their concern for this alienated area.

194 The Kanika Rules of 1951 however mention that tenants can get these materials as well as specified quantities of forest produce (creepers etc.) for roofing/thatching purposes, by purchasing forest pass at 1-0-6 (for pahi tenants, this rate as well as the rights allowed in lieu of that were different).
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SMALL, YET CENTRAL
(Boud State)

This ex-State seems to have derived its name from that of Lord Buddha, for Buddhist remains discovered in Boud clearly suggest that some time in the past it was a great Buddhist centre.

However, the original inhabitants of the State were the tribals, mostly the Khonds. It is said that the Khonds were forced to leave the Angul - Sambalpur region in some ancient past and settled down in the Boud - Kondhomal region:

"xxx Throughout this wild tract, the Kandhas claim an indefeasible right in the soil. They assert that the whole of Bod, and all the neighbouring country, was once their and that they have been gradually pushed back into the recesses of the hills by unscrupulous invaders. They deny that they ever acknowledged the rule of their oppressors and consider themselves as wrongfully ousted, so that no length of time can bar their inalienable right to the soil. Xxx The Kandhs say that they were pushed eastwards from Salberia, in Sambalpur, the ancient home of their race. (Hunter:1872)"

The State lost vast forest-clad areas in four important phases as follows:

1. **Separation of Athmallik**:

   The ex-State of Athmallik seems to have remained as a feudatory of Boud for centuries. But the feudatory chief of Athmallik (Samanta) asked the British Government to recognise his territory as a separate State. Accordingly, the British recognised the Samanta as a zamindar. In 1894, Athmallik was officially recognised as a separate State.

2. **Separation of Daspalla**:

   The ex-State of Daspalla also belonged to Boud, but separated gradually since the 15th century under different circumstances.

3. **Separation of Kondhomals**:

   The Khonds of Kondhomals were only nominally subject to the Boud Raja. When the British Government established merriah agency to stop the human sacrifice among the Khonds in the neighbouring district of Ghumsur, it also wanted to effect the same in

---

195 The name of Angul is said to be associated with that of a Khond who was known as Anu and was a chieftain of that area, later defeated.

196 The Khonds however say that they forced one of the early settlers of Sambalpur, the Kurmis, to leave the region to them (Khonds). Hence they regard the Kurmis as their 'elder brothers'. (Dash:1969)
the Kondhomals. But the Raja of Boud was not in a position to control the region and finally ceded this territory to the British in 1855\textsuperscript{197}.4

4. **Separation of Panchar Pargana:**

There are three views regarding this separation. Ramsay says that the Raja of Boud obtained a loan from the Sonepur Raja and made over the Panchar Pargana to the latter for the liquidation of this debt. The second view suggests that for rendering military help to Boud in times of trouble, the Sonepur Raja was allowed to enjoy the revenue rights of this Pargana\textsuperscript{8}. And a third view indicates that the Pargana was given in dowry to the Sonepur Raja\textsuperscript{9}.

Between 1856 to 1885, people of Boud reportedly paid 0-3-0 / year as forest cess:

"There was some export trade (mainly with the coastal districts along Mahanadi) and charges were levied on the forest produce thus exported as per assessments made by the panchayats"\textsuperscript{10}.

Raja Jogendra Dev (1876-1913) took significant measures towards forest administration. Formerly, there was no restriction on the cutting of bamboo & timber trees. Since the close of the year 1884-85, forest regulations were introduced according to which land was not to be cleared for toila cultivation without permission\textsuperscript{11}. The forest rules were in force from 1887 when a Forest Inspector was appointed. About this time, nistar cess was raised from 0-3-0 to 0-8-0 for agriculturists and to 0-6-0 for land-less people. Between 1885 and 1913, 26 blocks were declared reserves, but demarcation was completed in 1930\textsuperscript{12}.

Ramsay, who visited Boud sometime in early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, described the State forest administration with the following notes:\textsuperscript{13}

1. No RF, no fire protection. The two forests worked under sleeper lease were formerly reserved (Dimrikhol and Samapaju forests).
2. No demarcation between State and village forests.
3. The condition for cutting measurements of 4 feet in girth at 3 feet from the ground was not there in the sleeper lease agreement, but was imposed later after being advised by the Supt. of Trib. Mahals.

---

\textsuperscript{197} In 1904, the Boud Raja urged the British Govt. to restore Kondhomals to him saying that this area was never annexed by the Govt. to the British territories. The Raja also alleged that about 4.5 sq. miles of jungle lands of Boud proper had been included within Kondhomals during the demarcation of 1903\textsuperscript{6} (no line of demarcation existed between Boud and Kondhomals upto 1903\textsuperscript{5}). It is not known whether the Raja's plea for forestlands was favoured, but the Kondhomal region was never returned to him.

\textsuperscript{8} This statement that Panchayats in Boud had some revenue rights on their local forests has now intrigued the departmental higher authority (under who supervision the working plans are prepared) the basic reason behind it being the lack of documentary evidence in support of the existence of Panchayats in Boud. However, we have found some official information which clearly indicate that some kind of Panchayat system did exist in the State at least by 1885. For ex., as the Supt. of Orissa Trib. Mahals wrote to the Secretary to the GOB on 22\textsuperscript{nd} July 1885, Sarbarakars of Boud had from a long time been empowered to try petty criminal cases with the aid of punchayats and to inflict on conviction, a penalty of fine not exceeding Rs.2. It was the arrangement that half the fines so levied should go to the State treasury, the other half being appropriated by the Sarbarakar. But it was found that this power had been abused, fines of greater amount being imposed; and also that the State's share in the fine so realised had not been paid during the year 1884-85 by the Sarbarakars. So the Raja was obliged to withdraw this power from them.\textsuperscript{14}
Permission however was given to cut any timber for regular paddy cultivation and if trees were valuable, they were sold by the Forest Officer. But, Khair, Mohwa, Char, Kendu, Harida, Kuchila and Bahara were never allowed to be cut.

5. No shifting cultivation allowed.
6. People allowed to cut Sal timber free of cost for plough, after informing the nearest police station.
7. Chamars, Pans and Gonds were bound to sell the hides to contractors. The contractors had to sell it to the village shoe-maker at only two pais profit.

The Raja tried his utmost to persuade the Khonds to give up Podu and resort to wet cultivation, as a result of which Podu was stopped by 1925. In 1920, the forest rules were revised and a working plan was drawn up by Mooney for 1936-56.15

By 1940-41, two-third of the total State area was still covered by forests, the details of which were as follows:16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teak forests</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal forests</td>
<td>85000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry mixed type</td>
<td>88000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo forests</td>
<td>39000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ramdhynani made the following observations on Boud 17:

1. The Devottar, Brahmottar and maintenance -grant- holders had to pay forest cess. The maufidars did not have right to allot wasteland, but some ignored this restriction.
2. Khonds paid forest cess, but other cesses and revenue according to their capacity.
3. Reclamation needed permission. Of the trees felled, unreserved species under 5 feet girth being left to the applicant; others were sold at 1/2 royalty or auctioned. The rule was more lighter in the Kondhomal portion of the State.
4. Nistar cess revised as follows:
   (Since / before 1931)
   - 0-1-0 per acre of wet land
   - 0-0-6 per acre of high land

5. All wasteland included in Khesra and no grazing fee therein.
6. On cultivated lands, trees (except fruit- bearing ones) allowed to be cut for bonafide use with permission free of charge.
7. Monopolies : Sabai grass, lac, honey, Kochila, wax, and Kendu leaf

Regarding plantations, a visitor to Boud in 1944 has described road- side plantation in Boud town as well as from Boud to Manumunda which mostly included Neem trees(Nayak:1966)18.

During the Prajamandal movements (which could start in Boud off late in 1945 because of the strict and oppressive measures taken by the State against such movements), the grievances of people included forest issues. Some people even cut trees from the reserved
forests in protest of the same. But the movement is said to have failed in bringing about any substantial change in the condition of the people\textsuperscript{19} though the Boud Darbar informed to the Government in 1946 that it had liberalised forest- and shikar rules and had given some concessions in grazing fees\textsuperscript{20}.
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TOWARDS FURTHER WEST
(Borasambar, Khariar, Sonepur, Patna and Kalahandi)

The kingdom of Sambalpur was named after the local Shimul trees (Impey: 1865) \(^1\). In this country, which Motte found "as mountainous & woody as the worst country I have hitherto passed" (Motte: 1952)\(^2\), the administrative system of the Rajas was more or less similar to that of the other Garjat Rajas and the tenure-holders enjoyed more or less similar forest rights/privileges in their area like their counterparts in other Garjats\(^3\).

After the British took over Sambalpur, they gradually introduced systematic forest policy in that region to check irregular exploitation of forests. For example, a notification dated 26-10-1891 prevented seven trees (Mango, Mohwa, Achar, Jamun, Harida, Bahada and fruit bearing Kendu) for felling by the Malguzars without permission of the Government\(^4\). Also, for giving forest leases in the Malguzari forests, permission of the Deputy Commissioner was necessary and certain specifications were there for exploitation of these forest resources. In his proceedings dated 4-5-1891, the Chief Commissioner of Central Provinces also laid stress on the fact that introduction of separate assessment of zamindari forests must in no way be allowed to affect any rights possessed by ryots or sub-ordinate holders to free nistar\(^5\).

In 1869, it was proposed that leaving a portion of the zamindari forests to the zamindars for the use of local people, the Govt. should exclude the remainder as Govt. property. However, this proposal was not implemented and the zamindars were given full rights over their forests with a provision for separate assessment for these zamindari forests\(^6\). These zamindars of Sambalpur mostly had a revenue-oriented forest policy. Transit rules were defective in most of these Estates and except Borasambar, most of them did not have a regular forest staff because of their small forest area\(^7\). And unlike Rampur, most of these zamindaris did not have any working plan\(^8\).

I. Borasambar: Borasambar was one of the most important independent Estates of this region with an area of 840 sq.miles. A Settlement Report of 1880s says that there was no distinct division of this zamindari into a tract of hill and forest and a tract of well-cultivated open country\(^9\).

In 1875, revenue from lac, forest dues and grazing amounted to Rs. 500; the gross revenue then being about Rs. 14736 \(^10\). Until 1887, when the Dy. Commissioner Mr. Goodridge made arrangements for the entertainment of a small forest establishment, the income from this source was trifling. In 1887-88, it amounted however to about Rs. 1350 and gradually increased; though, due to its remoteness from the main lines of traffic etc., the forest revenue was not expected to increase strikingly\(^11\).

By 1889, when the Estate was under Court of Wards, 8 forest blocks had been formed by demarcation\(^12\); but there was no attempt to form village forests. It was not considered necessary probably because no village was further than about 8 miles from the nearest zamindari forest. Some scrub jungle and patches of forest land mixed up with the cultivated land had been included in the village area and it was left to the option of the people to retain a certain portion as village jungle or to extend cultivation as they thought.
fit. However, they were not expected to cut the prohibited species. For local grazing, there was no problem\textsuperscript{13}.

Towards the end of 1880s, a forest cess @ 0-8-0 was also introduced as advised by the Government\textsuperscript{14}.

In RFs, cess payers used to get firewood, leaves, thatch grass and fruits free. In village forests, timber for domestic / agricultural uses as well as firewood, bamboo, MFP and grazing were free to them, as per the FECR \textsuperscript{15}.

During freedom movement activities in Sambalpur district, a Congress leader suggested at a meeting on 20-9-1937 at Bheuria that the Govt. be submitted a petition about the Raja (of Borasambar)'s not allowing the people fuel and timber from the jungle\textsuperscript{16}. He also tried to persuade the tenants of Borasambar to violate forest rules and to stop paying grazing fees, etc. and offered himself to lead them to the RFs of the Estate to cut what they wanted. However, the villagers did not reportedly agree to him in fear of prosecution \textsuperscript{17}.

A few years later, when the Sambalpur Land Laws Committee visited the Estate headquarters (Padampur), the local Congress Committee demanded for the following:

- Fuel cess & grazing fee should be abolished.
- Zamindars, Thikadars & ryots should have equal forest rights (SLLC: 1940)\textsuperscript{18}.

But such demands remained mostly unfulfilled.

II. Khariar: Another important independent zamindari of western Orissa was Khariar. Before 1-4-1936, it was in the Central Provinces and the zamindar was more interested in revenue as regards his forests. Shifting cultivation was not prohibited and there were no effective measures taken for fire protection and conservation \textsuperscript{19}.

In 1903, 14 blocks were declared reserved but mostly without demarcation and survey. Other forests were left free to the people without any restriction till 1913 \textsuperscript{20}.

When the Estate was under Court of Wards during 1912-20, the Government initiated conservation programme. Between 1921-1930, the zamindar leased out Bija, Sal and Teak forests @ Rs. 0-6-0 per cft. for trees over 4.5 feet girth 'without any heed to the threat by the Deputy Commissioner, Raipur for taking action'. However, at the initiative of the Dy. Commissioner, scientific management of the Estate forests was planned; demarcation work was undertaken in 1934-35 and a provisional working scheme was drawn up for 1939-40 to 1943-44. But due to certain defects in the scheme, unregulated feelings continued. Also, war supplies heavily affected the forests. Besides, due to defective transit system, unauthorised excess removal was widespread \textsuperscript{21}.

The species reserved were Teak, Bija, Sal, Sahaj, Sissoo, Khair, Bandhan and Achu (Bakli). The zamindar had right over all the fruit trees. Tenants might enjoy the fruits free but selling such fruits was allowed only to the person appointed by the zamindar. Timber of dead trees and fruit of fruit trees in the tenant's holding belonged to the right holder of the patta. The tenant was allowed to remove for own use, free of cost, small and miscellaneous trees upto 2 feet girth standing on his holdings.\textsuperscript{22}
Tenants were allowed to remove firewood of unreserved species, grass and other MFP as well as timber of some class-I and class-II species below 2 feet girth free from the village forests within their village limits. But cess payers were allowed such materials beyond their own village limits. Royalty was to be paid by all tenants for bamboo even for the household work and grazing in village forests was free.

In 1938, the Congressites started inducing the tenants to stop paying grazing dues etc. to the Khariar zamindar. As a result, in December that year, the latter reported to have faced great difficulty in realising the forest dues.

Giving witness before the SLLC, the local Congress Committee demanded for abolition of grazing fee in the village forests. Tenants wanted that no permission should be required for grazing in the RFs & that, no fee should be charged for timber for agricultural use. Even the Thikadars wanted for certain concessions for themselves (for example, reclamation of village forests without permission). The zamindar of Khariar announced reduction in the rates of forest cess & grazing fees, in October 1939; and the FECR says that grazing was allowed free in the 'village forests'.

Following the example of the Maharaja of Parlakhemundi, the zamindar of Khariar Lal Anup Singh Deo prepared an agreement paper to hand over his forests to the Government of Orissa for better management, for a period of 5 years from July 1947. The proposed agreement was similar in all other general features to that between the Parlakhemundi Maharaja and the Government of Orissa with some of the following exceptions:

2. Clause 16 of this agreement said:

   "xxx this agreement shall relate tax(?) only to the Forests mentioned xxx and delineated in the map xxx but shall not extend to any forest in any of the inhabited villages in which, according to village administration paper, the tenants and residents have a right to nistar".

Accordingly, the zamindar applied to the Govt. of Orissa; but neither did the Govt. implement it, nor was the applicant shown any reason thereof:

**III. Sonepur:** Sonepur was a comparatively small Garjat in western Orissa. Cobden-Ramsay's notes of early 20th century say that the ex-State had little forest in most parts. No sleeper operations were then (i.e. before 1905-06) going on and there were apparently no trees for sleepers. Mohwa tree was absolutely forbidden to be cut and the schedule of rates of that period were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class-I timber: Sal, Teak, Bija, Sissoo, Mohwa and Harida.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1' to 1.5' circumference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

198 It may be reminded here that there was in fact no *gramya jungle* (village forest) in the Estate as clarified to us by its last ruler Lal Anup Singh Deo. So it may be presumed that the so-called village forests probably implied here to the unreserved inferior jungles near/of the villages.
For one cart load of these trees (if dry): 1-0-0

Class: II :- Bandhan, Kendu, Sahaj, Khair, Bheru, Char, Dhaura, Rohini, Bahada, Haland, Maokha, Kasi and Jamun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load Type</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Cart Load</td>
<td>0-10-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Head Load</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Head Loads</td>
<td>0-1-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class III :- Karla, Aila, Mai, Ghants, Palas, Dhatuki, Gindda.

Barks, leaves, grass and Class-II trees worth of 'noux' were also included in this third group. And the rate was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load Type</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cart Load</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Load</td>
<td>0-0-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides, bamboo was charged at 0-8-0 per hundred.

Commutation fee was charged per yoke. Other fees were (for professionals):

- Ash fee per person : Rs. 3
- Charcoal fee per person : Rs. 3
- Tassar fee per person : Rs. 4

Ramsay found only two of the zamindaris having considerable forests in the State. Earlier, their zamindars used to give their own licenses in the forests and levied plough tax. But by early 20th century, they were asked to pay a forest takoli in lieu of which a five years lease was granted to them for their forests. Accordingly, the zamindars of Pachara and Komsara were paying Rs. 100 and Rs. 468 respectively as forest takoli at that time. 30(1).

The SEC reported that grievances of the Sonepur people included the following 31:

1. Abolition of unpaid labour realised for shikar and for forest protection, etc..
2. Abolition of the system of license for cutting trees on one's own land and grant of full rights over trees on one's own land. (SECR: 1939)

The Sonepur State Code (Vol-1, corrected upto August 1939) declared that the system of realising forced labour by and free supply of rations to the State officers 'does not exist' in the State and that those who had been willingly rendering unpaid personal labour instead of paying any additional cess in cash, would now be paying an additional Road and Public Works Cess instead of unpaid personal labour. It was also provided that labour demanded for State works would be paid for. However, villagers' duty to extinguish forest fires continued as hitherto 32.

As regards right over trees, the Code said:

"The trees standing on the lands of one person do belong to the person and the trees, if not fallen baran trees, can be felled and appropriated by that person; but other
trees, called baran trees, can only be appropriated by that person when these trees die naturally by taking the permission of the State"33.

For felling and appropriation of baran (i.e. prohibited) trees, royalty was to be paid34.

Ramdhanyi's report says that ryots of Sonepur had right to the fruits in wasteland. Persons living within 5 miles of forest had to pay the forest cess and there was no restriction for crop protection. Shooting license was reduced from Rs. 6 to Rs. 2 per annum (Ramdhanyi: 1947)35 and grazing fee was abolished in villages lying beyond 3 miles from the outskirts of forests36.

Ramsay mentioned in his report that the forests of Sonepur were being demarcated during his visit and that certain areas were entirely reserved to cutting 37. However, both Ramdhanyi38 and Mooney (1944) have said in their reports that no demarcation work had been undertaken. Mooney, in his inspection notes of March-April 1944, said that despite the lack of demarcation, provision for reserved species saved even some poor forests of the State though there was great pressure on them from population / cultivation. However, during this visit, he found, contrary to his belief that the State had little or no forests, considerably more forests, if not extensive 39.

By that time, out of the total State area of about 961 sq.miles, area of the RFs was 60 sq.miles and that of the village forests, 139 sq.miles 40. Reserved species were 11 19941. Mooney expressed dissatisfaction over the fact that the Darbar deferred for so long in employing the Forest Advisor and that the Forest Department was not organised 30 years ago as could so easily have been done 42.

In village forests, ryots were allowed to clear or break up any forest area for cultivation or other purpose with permission. They were also allowed to cut Palas (a reserved species) if found to interfere in their cultivation 43.

Systematic management could start in the State only in the late 1940s 44. A Working Plan was under preparation by the time of merger 45, but such a Plan could be completed and implemented to the required extent only after the merger.

IV. Patna: In 1871, the State of Patna came under Government management. Regarding a proposal for the management of State forests, Major C.B. Lucie Smith, the Offg. Commissioner of Chattisgarh Division, made the following comments in his letter dtd. 28-02-1872 to the Secretary to the Chief Commissioner in Central Provinces:

"If the Deputy Commissioner considers it advisable to introduce a system of forest conservancy into Patna, then a scheme should be carefully worked out and submitted for the Chief Commissioner's orders, but I would not look to forest dues as a source of income. The revenue to be obtained is inconsiderable, while the restrictions involved cannot but be irksome to the people." 46

While no revenue was being realised from lac collections during the Raja's time, the Dy. Commissioner of Sambalpur (local authority for supervising the management of Patna 199The Sonepur Forest Rule mentions 16 reserved species. It seems that the number was later reduced to 11 47, but we don't have evidence to confirm which of these two numbers was earlier.
State under Court of Wards) had given a lease for lac by 1872-73, the revenue thus realised that year being Rs. 140. During 1873-74, total forest revenue (including revenue from ferries) amounted to Rs. 478 (against the total State revenue of Rs 28768) of which Rs. 390 came from the lac lease and the rest from the people of Sonepur who exploited the Patna forests their own use. There were no restrictions on the people of Patna for forest use excepting the inconvenience caused due to the lac monopoly. The Dy. Commissioner reported to the higher authorities about his endeavour to arrange for the proper remuneration for the labour of the wilder tribes (affected by the monopoly lease) in propagating & collecting lac.

Forest rules in the State were first drawn up in 1889 and the forests were divided into:

A. Patna State Khalsa

B. Malguzari forests (in case of Gaontia, Umra and Birtia villages)

C. Zamindari forests

When Ramsay visited the State, area of the State forest (apart from village forest) was about 159 sq.miles. In the Malguzari forests, people were allowed free use of timber and other forest produce with exception of class-I and II timber as well as of resin, cocoon, skin and palm juice. Payers of plough tax (0-4-0 per plough) were entitled to take class-II timber from both the State and Malguzari forests. At that time, the zamindars were levying no commutation fee in their area and granting no license to cut though there was nothing to restrict them for it.

Ramsay also said that there was no large lac or tassar industry in the State and people mostly depended on cultivation though there was considerable forest area.

In 1907, 21 blocks were notified as 'reserved'; but were selected for shikar purposes because the timber value of these blocks was little while games therein were plenty. In 1910 - 11, all zamindari forests were taken over and managed by the State. In 1916, a rough working plan was drawn up, but could not be implemented fully.

Owing to the opening of Raipur Vizianagaram railway in 1931, there was a brisk demand for poles and fuel; and so, some of the blocks were worked on coppice system. Teak timber worth about Rs. 75 was sold to Vizianagaram in 1935-36.

In his inspection note of January 1940, Mooney made the following remarks:

"I should like to report to the ruler that steady progress is being made in the management of his forests. The forest administration of Patna State has been laid on sound foundations and considerable progress has been made.

---

200 The term 'Malguzari' implies to rent; but the Malguzars of Sambalpur were Estate holders enjoying about 40 to 55% of the total valuation of their villages. Their practical difference from the Gauntias was not very great though they were in a more advantageous position than the latter.

201 The Birtias were Brahmin tenure-holders (as in Sonepur) having right to appropriate a portion of the rent collected by them. Malguzari forests of Patna were most probably the forest areas coming under the charge of various intermediaries (Gauntias, etc.) other than the zamindars.

202 Another working plan was drawn up for the RFs of Patna State some 21 years later. The forests were worked under Coppice system.
in erecting the super structure during the past six or seven years.”

There were plantations of Teak, Babul and Khair etc. in the State.

According to Ramdhyani, village waste was not included in the village forests of the State, but belonged to Thekedars and the State. Brahmottardars had full rights in all wastelands and trees etc. in their area. Ryots were expected to look after roadside trees and water them, and but timber of such trees belonged to the State and the ryot had to plant new ones if any such tree died. But ryots were allowed to enjoy the fruit of road side trees (Ramdhyani: 1947).

The State monopoly, according to Ramdhyani, was in Harida, Kendu leaf, Char, gum, Khair, Sunari bark and Sabai grass. Lac was collected and sold departmentally. Mohwa flowers had to be sold, if some body wanted to sell them, for a period of one month to the excise contractor only.

Nistar cess was calculated as follows (FECR: 1959):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance of the village from forests</th>
<th>Rate per acre of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paddy lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 miles</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 miles</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 miles</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For landless people, the rate was 0-4-0 per house.

During the phase of Prajamandal movements in Orissa, a memorandum was given to the Maharaja of Patna which included the following demands.

1. Crop protection be allowed without any fee and right to kill wild animals like tiger without license be conceded.
2. Grazing fee be abolished.
3. Enough forest area be provided for the tenants' use.
4. Lease of Tol (Mohwa seed) oil be cancelled.

The Maharaja told the people that free and unrestricted grazing should not be allowed as it might lead to soil erosion etc. Still, grazing fee was reduced in the RF to 0-4-0 from 0-6-0 and 0-2-0 from 0-3-0 for each buffalo and cow respectively; and in 1939, grazing fee was abolished in about 400 villages which formerly paid it for nothing.

Nistar cess was made optional by a proclamation of 1939 and royalty on unprohibited species was reduced (Ramdhyani: 1947).

Proclamation of 1938 gave right over trees of reserved species in homestead and cultivated holdings, if planted by the person. Contract for Tol oil was decided to be cancelled after its expiry date in March 1939, but an export fee on this oil was

203 However, the local organisation of the people -Krushak Sangha- found enough reasons to issue an ultimatum for acceptance of their demand (which included grant of full rights to the tenants over the trees) before 1st April 1947. (Jena: 1988)
introduced. The ruler also decided to allow people for crop protection, but skin of the dead animals was to be deposited with the police.

In 1936-37, different forest areas of the State were as follows:

- Reserved Forest: 190372 acre
- Protected Forest: 78910 acre
- Village Forest: 201885 acre

In 1922-23, forest revenue of the State was Rs. 149121; but in 1935-36, it reached about Rs. 242125.

As per the Patna State Preservation of Faunal Act (1942) & Rules, there were at least five sanctuaries in the State, two of them being meant for the birds.

There was a provision for monopoly right to export bamboo-wares, this right being sold by bidding (Patna Dipika: 1943).

V. Kalahandi: Kalahandi was not a feudatory of Sambalpur, but an independent State for quite some time, paying tribute to no body. Later it came under the dominion of the Marathas and paid them a tribute.

Ramsay says in his report that at that time(1905-06) there were no RFs though demarcation between State and village forests had been done in the Khalsa area. "I am inclined to think that reservation is required." - he said regarding the State forests. He also reported that the State buildings were not looked after by PWD and people had to thatch and repair the palace as well as to supply fuel to it. The zamindars had their own forest staff.

Though the Commissioner of Chattisgarh advised for conservation measures in these western States in 1880s, no action seems to have been taken on this in Kalahandi for some time. The first RF was constituted in 1909 and when Mooney visited the State in 1924, he found the Forest Department in extremely backward condition and forests reserved only in name being exploited by the people as per their wish. From 1925, some progress was made and a working plan for the Khalsa RFs was implemented in the mid -1930s.

Forest rule of the State was introduced in 1923. The State monopoly was in Harida, Sabai grass, Mohwa seed, Soap nut, Wild jute, Kendu leaf, brooms, Antia bark, Sindur powder, gum of Grindol, Dhaura and Babul, Wax and Semel cotton etc.. Ryots had to sell their lac to the monopolist from their holdings. (Ramdhyan: 1947)

Ramdhyan reported that no fruit tree could be cut in the village forests but enjoyment of the fruit was allowed to the ryots as per the village custom. Cutting of trees was not permitted generally on land under dry cultivation and a fee was to be paid for trees permitted to cut. For reclamation, nazrana was charged in addition to royalty.

By 1942-43, the total area of RFs was 350 square miles and that of village forests near about 472 sq.miles. Administration Report for that year said:
"Steps are being taken to extend the existing blocks of the reserved forest area so as to meet the growing demand of the increased population as well as to save the hills from erosion and further denudation. This scheme would concentrate the jhuming cultivation to some extent which was going on throughout the hill areas at random" 81.

In 1914-15, there was a proposal to classify the forests of the State as in the following:

1. RFs for the production of large sized timber.
2. Coppice felling series for supplying the nistar demands of the people in forest-less tracts.
3. Protected Village Forests. 81(I)

There were no B- Class forests; but to meet the local demands, some Praja (People's) Coupes were opened in the RFs wherefrom the villagers were allowed to remove the unreserved species and bamboo free of charge for domestic purpose, with special permission 82.

For bonafide residents, teak per tree was charged at Rs. 15 for personal (other than house building) purpose 204. Rate of other trees were as follows 83.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prohibited Species</th>
<th>Unprohibited Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBP 205 OHBP</td>
<td>HBP OHBP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not exceeding 1'girth: 0-1-0</td>
<td>0-2-0 0-0-6 0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not exceeding 2'girth: 0-2-0</td>
<td>0-4-0 0-1-0 0-2-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual license fee for ashes was Re. 1/- 84.

Forest cess at the rate of 0-2-0 was heaviest in the State 85. Ramdhyani said that in some cases, forests meant for Nistar rights were 12 miles distant from the village 86.

As per the SECR, grazing fee was also quite high in the State 87. But Ramdhyani and the FECR differ from each other in their notes on this subject 206. According to the FECR, grazing was free in the village forests and in RFs, fees for each bullock and buffalo of bona fide tenants were 0-4-0 and 0-6-0 respectively 88. However, Ramdhyani said in his report that these rates were 0-2-0 and 0-3-0 respectively and that the rate of grazing fee was same in both Khesra and RF. His report also said that plough cattle and equal number of cows were exempted from the fee and that the fee was payable only in villages within 2 miles from any forest 89.

In 1943-44, management of zamindari forests were brought under the State forest department. 90

204 Selling of teak trees was regulated by various restrictions.
205 HBP-House building purpose.
206 OHBP- Other than HBP. 
206 Notes of Ramdhyani in this regard probably recorded certain concessions given by the Darbar after the Prajamandal movements, but we lack direct evidence to confirm this.
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DYNASTY OF THE GREAT GAJAPATI
(Parlakhemundi Estate)

Parlakhemundi was at one time the most important kingdom of southern Orissa and its rulers were distinguished by the title of Gajapati in token of their descent from the Gajapati kings of Orissa. Later in the 17th century, significant portion of this kingdom was given by the ruler to his son which was subsequently subdivided to constitute the independent Estates of Badakhemundi (Peddakimedi or formerly Vizianagar) and Sanakhemundi (Chinnakimedi or formerly Pratapgiri).

Russel, in his report of 1830s, has described the extent of this Estate as about 42 miles from east to west and 40 miles from north to south. The eastern valley was most open while the western valley was most jungly. But the Estate area was much reduced in the 19th century when the British separated and resumed the Maliah portion of the country to reduce the military power of Parlakhemundi:

"In 1884 the Rajah of Parlakhemundi brought a suit in the Agent's Court for the possession of the Parlakhemundi Maliahs and more especially the forests and waste lands thereof the management of which had been taken over by Government under a special forest establishment. This suit was decided by the Acting Agent on the 5th July 1898, when a decree was given in favour of the plaintiff in the respect of the waste lands and forests only. The Agent's decision was reversed by the High Court in October, 1900 when the zemindar was declared to have no right to any portion of the maliahs."

Area of the Estate was finally reduced to 639 square miles of which area of the plains was about 285 sq. miles while that of the Mal region (a portion still retained by the Estate) was about 354 sq. miles.

Administrative system was similar in this kingdom to that of the other Rajas, For ex; Russel's report mentions of a Bissoyee who had been appointed by the ruler to furnish firewood etc. to the palace. The rulers had granted many beneficial tenures (religious etc) some of which were resumed by the British.

Wax, honey and timber were among the principal produce of the country even in the 18th century. Forests continued to be a source of income to the Estate and in 1885, revenue from this source was about Rs. 900. This revenue however increased considerably during Maharaja K.C. Gajapatis' time.

Efforts towards conservation of the Parlakhemundi Estate forests were made some time in early 20th century when the Estate was under Court of Wards:

207 The Doras and Bissoyees who had been appointed on military tenure in the Maliahs by the Parlakhemundi Rajas caused serious trouble to the British when the country rose up against the latter in the 19th century.
"Steps were in progress to device a scheme for the conservancy of forests in the Parlakhemundi estate.\(^{208}\)\(^{10}\)

In 1908, on application of the Estate Manager, provisions of Sections 4 to 19 and Section 26 of the Madras Forest Act of 1882 were extended to Parlakhemundi.\(^{11}\)

The Court of Wards was discontinued for Parlakhemundi Estate in 1913 and Maharaja Krushna Chandra Gajapati assumed the charge of his Estate. He was a very enlightened ruler and was known for his remarkable punctuality, generosity and administrative success. He applied to the Madras Government for the continuation of Section 26 of the Madras Forest Act in his Estate which was granted\(^{12}\) and himself took interest in the management of his forest resources. In course of our interview with them, old people recalled the Maharaja's strict administrative vigil over the Estate forests\(^{13}\).

The Madras Forest Manual(1912) described following 47 trees as reserved species in the Parlakhemundi Estate:\(^{14}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree</th>
<th>Alternative Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teak</td>
<td>Sabaji, Jamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sissoo</td>
<td>Surisi, Kora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal</td>
<td>Sanapatu, Kotako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piasal</td>
<td>Kendu, Barakoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harida</td>
<td>Halanda, Nadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentuli</td>
<td>Dhan(^{209}) Charo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohula</td>
<td>Phasi, Amla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambo</td>
<td>Sidda, Neem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panas</td>
<td>Mundimundi, Bhallia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhoru</td>
<td>Sohun, Sundaragundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muktamanja</td>
<td>Arjun, Sundari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangani</td>
<td>Kusum, Mahanimba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korangi</td>
<td>Salap, Bandhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khair</td>
<td>Kaitha, Keri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaria</td>
<td>Tala, Kasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babuli</td>
<td>Khajuri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Maharaja or his agent / manager had been given power of the Forest Officer by the Madras Government\(^{15}\). The number of reserved\(^{210}\) species was however reduced later to 21 reportedly after the Maharaja was elected as the Premier (now Chief Minister) of Orissa province\(^{16}\).

According to the FECR, there was no forest cess in Parlakhemundi Estate\(^{17}\). However the Committee of Circuit reported in 1780s that in customs, Re. 1/- was being collected in

---

\(^{208}\) Despite this report of 1906-07, no working scheme for the forests before Estate abolition ever existed in Parlakhemundi as per the sources of Forest Dept. of the Govt. of Orissa.\(^{18}\)

\(^{209}\) Anogeissus latifolia \(^{19}\). It may be noted here that many of the local names had been recorded in the Madras Forest Manual in a distorted manner.

\(^{210}\) Teak, Sal, Sandal, Sissoo, Red Sanders, Piasal, Harida, Tentuli, Amla, Panas, Ebony, Bhoru, Aran wood, Muktamanja, Khair, Wild outmug, Poonspur, Cinaman, Mohul, Haland and Jhamao(FECR:1959).\(^{20}\)
this Estate per 1000, for the liberty of cutting wood. Also professional taxes were realised at that time from carpenters (Rs. 3 each), lamp oil makers (Rs. 5 each), gingely oil mills (Rs. 5 each) etc. Green gardens were charged Rs. 3 each and merchants from outside had to pay transit duties (for ex; Rs. 8 per 100 bullock loads of cotton). 21

Regarding rights and concessions, the Parlakhemundi Plan says that grazing of cattle, cutting of grass, collection of firewood, thorns, leaves of trees and materials required for domestic/ agricultural use were allowed free of charge to the neighbouring villages in the reserved lands. The Saoras living within the reserves were enjoying the same privileges, but were charged fees as per the schedule of rate when they brought the forest produce for sale in the market. 22

The area of reserve forests in the Estate was about 14923 acres. Mature Sal, Piasal and Teak timber were being exploited from the reserves. About 52429 acres of forest along the hill sides had been left for the use of tenants for domestic/ agricultural purposes. If their required timber was not available in the unreserves, they were allowed to collect the same from the reserves on permit. 23

The Madras Forest Manual mentioned that no person was allowed in the reserved lands of the Estate to boil catechu, distil wood-oil or burn lime or charcoal. The restriction was applicable for unreserved lands also unless otherwise specified. 24

Inspite of the Maharaja’s personal attention for the management of his forests, adequate measures were still lacking. The forests were in charge of the Estate Engineer who had a staff of 3 Foresters, 71 Forest Guards and 26 Watchers - all untrained. The Maharaja then applied for the management of his forests by the Government of Orissa which was implemented from October 1944. 25

The forests were worked comprising of 14 felling series, but as the portions of the Parlakhemundi Estate in the Madras province were also under the management of Orissa Government, the Government of Madras raised serious objections. So such portions (forests) were handed back to the Estate by the Orissa Government 26. Meanwhile, an agreement between the Maharaja and the Government of Orissa was formally executed and the forests were officially taken over from 4-12-1946 for the period of 1-10-1944 to 31-3-1950 i.e. for five and half years. Salient features of this agreement are as follows: 27

1. The pay and allowances of the Forest Settlement Officer and the cost of his establishment and contingent expenditure should be payable by the Provincial Government.
2. The cost of settlement, surveying, demarcation and conservancy would be paid by the owner.
3. The Forest Officer appointed by the Government of Orissa "shall render assistance to the Estate in securing that labour for Estate Savaras to apply in return for forest concessions enjoyed by them provided that such assistance is not incompatible with the efficient management of the forest by the Forest Department of the Provincial Government".
4. The Forest Officer should prepare and might revise a working plan in respect of the said forest. However, the owner was entitled for suggesting for any modification in the plan.
5. The cost to be charged upon the owner for management, conservation and working etc. of his forests should not, without the consent of the owner given in writing, exceed the sum of Rs. 6000/- per year.

6. The owner would bear the expenses for the services of the Forest Officer.

7. The owner was allowed to remove free of cost, timber and other forest produce for his bonafide domestic use provided that any such removal was not deviating from the working plan. The value of all such produce so removed was to be treated as the surplus payable to the owner.

8. The owner reserved the right for shooting for himself and for his nominee in these forests and no shooting permit was to be granted by the Forest Officer without the consent of the owner.

9. The owner also reserved the right over minerals situated in the said forest area.

10. The owner was entitled, after obtaining the previous permission of the Revenue Commissioner, to stop or divert any public or private way or water course in the forest.

Both reserves and unreserves were covered by this agreement. The Act applicable was the Madras Forest Act, but Estate forests coming under the jurisdiction of the Government of Madras (i.e. lying outside the Province of Orissa) were not coming under this agreement.

Untrained staff, limitations in expenditure and time as well as 'frequent interference by the owner' caused various difficulties in a very effective management of the Estate forests by the Government of Orissa. Still, the condition of forests improved and to introduce systematic working, coupes were opened to meet the demands of the people. After expiry of the period of agreement, the forests were again handed over to the Maharaja.28

Teak plantations of the Estate period still (1999-2000) exist. Besides separate plantations, Teak trees are also found in considerable number in the premises of BN palace of the Maharaja.

The Maharaja had a very intimate relationship with his Estate tribals. It is said that while on visit to the tribal areas, he used to put on tribal costumes(Sahu:1992)29.

He was a very good hunter and motorable hunting roads are said to have been specially maintained in the Estate forests for this purpose30.

The Maharaja's personality made his people so loyal to him that any agitation against him was to be regarded as a very exceptional event. Still some agrarian agitation was there in the Estate during the phase of similar movements in Ganjam.

However, in Russel's report we find an interesting note regarding forest grievances of the people. In 1819, when disturbances broke out in the Estate by the then Rani (widow)'s followers against the British who had appointed a manager on their behalf in this Estate to establish their control; during an enquiry, upon told to point out at any particular act of the manager which the Bissoyees considered most oppressive, they (Bissoyees ) alleged that he had cut down their Mohwa trees. But this allegation was found to be untrue later(Russel:1856).31
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MORE ON THE SOUTHERN ESTATES  
(Ganjam district)

Forest management in most of the Ganjam zamindaris was neither systematic nor satisfactory. The forests were exploited very irregularly for commercial purpose as well as for tenants' use. Some sorts of rules probably existed\(^{211}\), but due to lack of records, are difficult to ascertain.\(^{1}\)

Forest produce was being removed by the tenants with the help of fixed value permits issued at certain gates by the gate keepers stationed at each gate. Schedule of rates were different for the bonafide consumption of tenants than for the traders.\(^{2}\)

The unreserves were open to grazing in most of these Estates, grazing fee being charged only in the RFs.\(^{3}\)

The Circuit Committee reported in 1788 that only few of the Ganjam zamindaris had timber as one of their significant productions. It is surprising to find that though the Committee's report describes the Bargarh zamindary as having been 'overrun with wood,' timber and other forest produce have not been mentioned in the list of natural productions of this zamindary.\(^{4}\)

The FECR says that there was no forest cess in the Badakhemundi Estate(FECR:1959)\(^{5}\). However, the Circuit Committee report indicates that there was plough tax in this zamindary at least during the 18\(^{th}\) century\(^*\).\(^{6}\)

The Estate had certain forest staff. Of the total Estate revenue of about Rs. 4 lakhs, nearly 25% came from the forests. \textit{Patala garuda} was among the important commercial forest produce and besides attempts for its regeneration, restriction existed for large quantity extraction of this herb. Bamboo and Sabai grass were among the produce leased out.\(^{7}\) Tenants were getting their requirements at concessional rates.\(^{8}\)

For Class-I & II timber, permit was to be issued by the Darbar itself. Foresters / Rangers were authorised to issue permit for class-III timber.\(^{9}\)

Cultural operations are said to be absent in the Ganjam Estates\(^{10}\). However, it seems that there were some plantations (for ex; Teak plantation at Machaghara near Tampa in Badakhemundi\(^ {11}\)).

Though in some of these zamindaris, the forests were worked on the basis of common sense (for ex; in Badakhemundi, particular areas of bamboo were restricted for felling to allow regeneration\(^ {12}\)), only one Estate - Dharakote - is said to have an working plan. This plan had two working circles.\(^ {13}\)

\(^{211}\) For ex; the concept of reserved species, timber classification, schedule of rates etc. were prevalent. Besides, in Estates like Badakhemundi, certain shooting restrictions are also said to have existed.\(^ {14}\)

* In Digapahandi (one of the most important villages of Badakhemundi which became the residing place of the zamindar) for ex; plough tax for 1777 was Rs. 99; for 1781, Rs. 110 ; and for 1782, Rs. 131.\(^ {15}\)
1. Coppice Working Circle:

It included all the RFs. Rotation was fixed at 40 years and the treatment prescribed was simple coppice with standards. No cultural operations were prescribed.

2. Bamboo Working Circle:

It included all good bamboo areas for working on a 4 years' rotation. No cutting rules were prescribed.

It is however difficult to ascertain the merits of this scheme. For on one hand, the Dharakote forest staff were mostly untrained; and on the other hand, no records are available to know the extent to which it was implemented.\textsuperscript{16}

Fire protection arrangements in these southern Estates were also not satisfactory.\textsuperscript{17}

Regarding a boundary dispute between the Estate of Khallikote & the neighbouring Govt. district of Banpur, the Jr. Asst. Agent, in his letter dated 29\textsuperscript{th} April 1840 observed:

"xxx Ryots of both districts, had more than once cause into collision whilst employed, in cutting wood, in the belt of Jungle, which forms the subject of dispute."\textsuperscript{18}

But ryots of many Ganjam zamindaris rose up against their own rulers during the 30s & 40s of 20\textsuperscript{th} century on account of their own agrarian grievances. Three of such incidents were as in the following:

- As a part of this protest, 'Kissan Committee' was formed at Nuapentho in 1937 to take steps to get the forest taxation by the Surangi zamindar reduced.\textsuperscript{19}
- At a meeting on 9\textsuperscript{th} June 1938, a resolution was moved by the President of the Taluk Congress Committee urging the Raja of Khallikote to allow his ryots to take timber from the adjoining forests on free permit\textsuperscript{20}. In another development, resolution passed at the meeting of Ryot's Association of Kudala on 19-2-1939 urged the Raja for abolition of grazing fees in the unreserves.\textsuperscript{21}
- The District Ryots' Conference held at Takaraada of Sheragada zamindary on 14-11-1946 called for the seizure of zamindary forests (and other properties of the zamindar) and the movement finally led to the killing of 6 people\textsuperscript{212} in firing at Takarada on 24-5-1948.\textsuperscript{22}

Some of the fees / schedule of rates of interest in a few zamindaris of Ganjam are being quoted here:

1. **Surangi ex-Estate:**\textsuperscript{23}
   - Plough of 2\textsuperscript{nd} class timber - Rs. 4-8-0 per cart load
   - Door frame of 1\textsuperscript{st} class timber - Rs. 8/- per cart load

\textsuperscript{*} As the FECR mentions that there was no grazing fee in the unreserves of the Khallikote Estate\textsuperscript{24}, it seems that this demand had been fulfilled.

\textsuperscript{212} Communists were actively involved in this movement, but the people killed were neither members of the communist party nor of the ryots' association.\textsuperscript{25}
Basket per *bhar* : 0-4-0  
*Khajuri & Phulo Chanchuni* (brooms) : Re. 1/- per cart load  
*Ambasodha* : 0-4-0 per *bhar*.

2. **Badakhemundi ex-Estate:**  
*Dantakathi* per head load : 0-1-0  
*Ambulo* per head load : 0-1-0

3. **Jarada ex-Estate:**  
Plough tax at Rs. 1-8-0. In lieu of that, the ryots were entitled for 4 cartloads of fuel, 4 head loads of bamboos, 4 *bhars* of *kanika* (very young, immature bamboo) and 2 ploughs.

4. **Grazing fee in RFs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dharakote ex-Estate</th>
<th>Khallikote and Athagad ex-Estates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow: 0-2-0</td>
<td>0-3-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo: 0-3-0</td>
<td>0-6-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep: 0-1-0</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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GLIMPSES FROM THE AGENCY AREAS
(Ganjam Maliahs)
There is a belief among many well-wishers of the tribal community that formerly the forest–dweller non-agrarian tribals were never assessed with any kind of forest tax and that, they even resisted any attempt whenever and wherever made to impose such a tax on them, till the mid-or late 19th century, when, under the British influence and changing colonial scenario, this situation was altered in many areas.

If this belief confines itself only to a forest tax in cash, then it may be accepted as a general principle. But if we go beyond any such limitation and investigate the whole matter in detail, then we certainly find reasons to believe that even before the so-called British influence, the agrarian and non-agrarian forest dwellers did use to share their produce / collection with their administrators in different quantities in different areas; and sometimes even at the expense of their livelihood.

The ‘Mamool’ system of the Orissa Agency areas bore in itself traces of this historical fact. The Agency areas of Orissa were mostly the forest–clad hilly areas(Maliahs) inhabiting the tribal people and as such, quite different in their system of administration, culture as well as environment from those of the plains. Such areas were mostly under the control of the Rajas of Parlakhemundi. (Parlakhemundi Maliahs), Ghumsur (Ghumsur Maliahs), Boud (Kondhomals) and other Garjat Chiefs, but later resumed by the British Government, except in a few cases, under different circumstances. The first Agency to be officially declared was in 1845 to check human sacrifices in the Ghumsur Maliahs. The Collector of Ganjam was appointed as Agent to the Governor (hence the name Agency) and was given the Sessions Judge power. These areas (then under the Madras Presidency) were removed from the jurisdiction of the ordinary Courts and laws. Originally, the rules prescribed for the trial of civil suits by Panchayats; but it was later revised and the course of procedure for the trial of civil suits was made simpler than that in the Civil Procedure Code. However, both Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code were in force there, but there was no trial by jury(Francis:1992).

These Agency tracts were divided into a number of Muthas, each Mutha constituting one or a group of villages. The right holders of these Muthas were known as Muthadar or Hill-Chief, most of whom were the zamindars / Rajas of the neighbouring plains (for ex; the Raja of Badakhemundi was the Muthadar of the Badakhemundi Maliah Muthas). The head of each Mutha was called Patro or Bissoyee in Maliahs of Badakhemundi and Parlakhemundi respectively and his sub-ordinate was called Hodadar, having a number of sentries (Paiks ) and other officials under him. These official set up was, of course, not uniform everywhere and some small Maliahs did not have any Mutha - Head at all. But most of the Mutha - Heads and their officials were non-tribals in general though they appointed village servants both from the tribal and non tribal communities and the village headmen appointed in the tribal areas were invariably tribals.

How did the non-tribal people get the recognition as Mutha - Head? Some of them were definitely appointed by the Rajas / zamindars either on service tenure , or for other reasons (for ex; ancestor of the Bissoyee of Lahuniagad or Lavanyakota in the Parlakhemundi Maliahs was a warrior from Khurdha area ). The Rajas wanted to prevent

---

213 In Ghumsur Maliahs, they were mostly known as Malikas.
incursions of the hill people into the plains and accordingly made appointments on military tenure as in the Parlakhemundi and Ghumsur ex-Estates. On the other hand, another view suggests that some of the Mutha Heads originally came from the plains as money-lenders.

These Mutha administrators and some of their subordinates were having agricultural lands for their own maintenance. Their tribal (and in some cases, the non-tribal) subjects were used to do bethi for them. This is why the Madras Estates Land Act Committee found the Agency tracts more or less similar to the other ex-State / ex-Estate areas so far as the Raja – ryot relationship was concerned.

The word Mamool’ is said to be of Persian origin and was the Agency counterpart of the bheti system. That this system was originally voluntary in many areas, is reflected in the following utterances of the Khond head-man which, as per the custom, he repeated during the coronation ceremony of the ‘Patro’, signifying the transfer of power (in a certain area):

“ We were impure, the Gods refused to take our offerings. We therefore brought you from Jorasingi (in Patna State) and made you our king. We do not know the language of the Sahibs, therefore you are to convey the wishes of the Sahibs to us and our wants to them, act then as the intermediary between us. We have given you rice. We have given you plantains and pumpkins. Do you go about your area looking after our welfare as you would look to the welfare of your children?”

Gradually, the Mamool system became complicated and compulsory. Still, the system was not uniform everywhere and varied in quantity and nature in different areas. Of the various Mamools and bethi systems prevalent in different areas, some of the forest-related ones are being described below as recorded in Taylor’s Memoir:

1. **Sanakhemundi Maliahs:**
   - *Sonepur Mutha:* The non tribal paiks paid Rs.13 as Rajah’s share of the animals killed in Shikar.
   - *Godapur Mutha:* 12 villages used to make the car for Lord Jagannath (local deity).

2. **Badakhemundi Maliahs:**
   - *Jenapoda village:* All turmeric raised from this inam village was sent by the Patro to the Rajah.

---

214 It may be noted here that centuries of Mohammedan rule had left its traces in many forms, one of which was the linguistic remains; i.e. many words used by the Mohammedans continued to exist and even the British Government used them. Thus we find a description: Nistar rights as per Wajib-ul-urz, wherein Wajib-ul-urz means village administration paper.

215 The Khond head-man used to present a turban to the ‘Patro’ to formally recognise the latter's authority.

216 especially in the 19th century. Interestingly, the non-Khond Mutha - Head was receiving more Mamools than his Khond counterpart in some areas.
• **Tubarsingi village (devottar tenure of Lord Jagannath):** Villagers liable to thatch the temple and do bethi for car-construction. 19
  • **Raisingi village:** Re. 1 and 4 planks for the car of Lord Jagannath.20
  • **Bhoypadra** and some other villages supplied bamboos for the car.21
  • **Konkoda** and some other villages: supplied one toom of honey each, for the Lord.22
  • **Tamala Mutha:** certain villages supplied (each) to the Raja one or two kavadi loads of fruits and vegetables four times a year, while some others supplied thatch and rope for the Raja’s house as well as for the temple car.23

3. **Ronaba Taluk:**
   • **Gondibedo Mutha:** Thigh portion of the game (killed) to be given to the zamindar.24

4. **Jarada Maliahs:**
   • The Souras paid 24 brooms, 700 bundles of *Rella* grass, 4 tooms of Mohwa, 4 bamboo baskets and also 8 bamboo mats for religious purposes, to the zamindar. The zamindar also paid certain Mamools to the Souras (for ex; rice). In Loborogondo village, the Souras paid 100 bundles of *Rella* grass to the Bissoyee and the latter also paid them Rs.2.25
     - The Souras of Doya Ambo village supplied 6 kavadi loads of fire wood to the storekeeper.26

5. **Parlakhemundi Maliahs:**
   • **Teppasingi village:** 3 iguana skins, 1 to the temple, 1 to the Bissoyee and 1 to a subordinate official; also to the Bissoyee, honey 2 addas per house. Another official used to get (take) fruit of 3 orange trees and 2 mangoes.27

As stated earlier, the Mamools were modified in some places under various circumstances. For ex; if a temple of Lord Jagannath was constructed in a village, the liability of the inhabitants of that village was expected to increase and the villagers had to supply timber etc. for the construction of the Lord’s car. Later the British Government intervened in cases under dispute and revised (in a few cases, even abolished) the Mamools mostly in favour of the payers.28 However, there were cases in which villagers stopped paying Mamools for years or were assessed very lightly. But in considerable cases, the old system continued more or less without revision and the payers did not experience any difficulty in paying such Mamools.220

Taylor describes how the Bissoyee of Gumma Mutha (Parlakhemundi Maliahs) used to lease out the whole of the fruit trees, which surrounded the Munisingi village, at any rate to the low country contractors, to the utter exclusion of all Sourah rights. As punishment, Taylor, then the Agent to the Governor, interdicted him from the receipt of any fruit at all from that village, provisionally. Also due to the objection of villagers, castor oil was remitted from the list of Mamools in that village.31

---

217 Toom- a Volume measure
218 Kavadi means 'Bhar'
219 for ex; Khonds.
220 As told to Taylor by such villagers themselves.
In their report published in 1938, the Madras Estates Land Act Committee made the following remarks on the Agency areas of Ganjam, Vizagapatam and Godavari districts:

“Hill-men have deposed that the officers who had been going there or even other visitors had been compelling them to do service without remuneration and that illegal exactions had been made at every turn, if they make any attempt to take forest produce into the plains for putting them in the market and getting money in return”.

The Partially Excluded Areas Enquiry Committee, set up in 1938 by the Government of Orissa, recommended to abolish the collection of Mamools or to convert them into cash. So a Mamools Enquiry Commission was set up in 1946. The Commission’s report described, for example, how the hunters got very little or negligible amount of their game after giving the Mutha officials their ‘dues’ (Hunt Mamool). On recommendation of the Commission, the Government abolished in 1949 all bethi work for Government constructions as well as for the Mutha officials along with all kinds of Mamools except those connected with some religious purpose. The religious Mamools were left to the option of the people. Subsequently, following the report of the Mutha - Head Abolition Committee, the Mutha - Head system as well as the offices of Muthadars were abolished in 1954.

It may be noted here that except Korada, Ronaba, Pandakhol and Chakkapad, other areas under the Agency were removed from the Agency jurisdiction in 1866. The remaining four continued to be under Agency administration till 1953 when the Ganjam and Vizagapatam Act (by which the Agency was constituted) was repealed and normal administration was extended over these areas.

**Agency Forests:**

Except in the Maliahs under private ownership, all other Maliah forests were under the administration of the Government forest department. The Partially Excluded Areas Committee pointed out the following aspects of the Agency forests under Government administration:

1. No reserved or protected forests in Kondhomals, no rules or restrictions regarding forests.
2. No protected or village forests in the Parlakhemundi Maliahs. The rights of hill tribes in the forests unsettled, though certain concessions had been allowed to them.
3. In Ghumsur and other Maliahs, certain forests had been reserved, but no village forests in the Pandakhole agency (Surada).
4. The Khonds were in an advantageous position, for they enjoyed greater concessions than the Savaras and other aborigines. Forest was plentiful in the Khond areas than in the area of other aborigines.
5. The system of rights and concessions was not uniform everywhere though the bonafide Agency inhabitants were allowed to take whatever forest produce required for their own consumption except timbers from the reserves and unreserves.

---

221 Taylor’s memoir, originally published in the beginning of 20th century, mentions that some of the Mamools had already been converted into cash by that time, in some areas.
The forest area under private administration was comparatively small. Ronoba and Korada were two independent petty zamindars neighbouring Ghumsur taluk (Russel:1856). Col. Beddome, in his report dated 19-3-1879, described the forest policy of these two zamindars as follows:

“xxx the former (Ronoba) is calculated xxx at 38 and the latter (Korada) at 35 square miles, 75 per cent of which is probably forest xxxx. The right to fell in both the zamindaries were leased to contractors for a very small sum222 xxx.”37

Prior to 1820, these two tracts were united and known by the name Ronoba. The Raja Raghunath Bhuya enjoyed 2/3 of the revenue and his brother Arjuna, the military chieftain, enjoyed 1/3. Bloodshed to seize power among their sons led to the partition38. From Taylor’s Memoir, it appears that the right of these two zamindars over their forests was not recognised by the Government for some time. But in January 1893, this right was conceded to them39.

Soon after that, the Korada Chief leased out for 8 years all the timber in the two Muthas on Rs. 4425. The lessee himself was a Muthadar and allowed free felling on a fee of Re. 1 per bandy load of the timber drawn out. As a result, when the lease expired in 1900, there was no timber tree worth removing for miles and the forests suffered severe denudation.40

Regarding the Badakhemundi Maliahs223, the son of the former Mutha – Head of Khajuripada Mutha told us that there was no considerable restriction imposed by the Raja for forest use except the prohibition of killing elephants and peacocks. The Sours used to ask the permission of the Mutha - Head for shifting cultivation and in return, gave 1/8 of the their productions (hill cultivation)41. The Raja hardly visited their area, and as a Soura villager recalled, the villagers had to shoulder the Raja’s Palkin as well as to do bethi for road work42. Also the Patros of various Muthas used to pay him (Raja), along with certain amount in cash, different produce in fixed quantities which included turmeric, jackfruit & plantains etc.43

Now let us come back to our introductory topic of this chapter i.e. the question of forest dues collected from the tribals prior to the British influence and consider the following facts:

1. The Committee of Circuit reported (in 1780s) that in Parlakhemundi, while on one hand the Saora people were paid Rs. 3000/- not to make any disturbance in the country; they were, on the other hand, charged certain fees while bringing down timbers.46

---

222 For ex; for a sum of Rs. 200 on a 6 -year lease in one of these zamindaries.44
223 Management of the Agency forests of Badakhemundi and Badagada Estates vested with their respective zamindars in 1874 and 1877 respectively. The zamindars arranged neither for demarcation / survey nor for the scientific management / working of these forests.45
2. Accounts of Ghumsur zamindary for the year 1816 show that certain collections used to be realised by the State (Estate) from the ‘Condo’ (Kandha or Khond) villages, the amount realised that year being about Rs. 102224.47.

3. In 1870, the Bhuyans of Keonjhar were assessed for the first time with an annual tax in cash so as to save them from the unlimited assessments in kind and labour imposed on them previously for decades (or centuries?).

4. The head-man of Khonds in the Bara Mal area of Banpur (undivided Puri dist.) used to present to the Raja 4 baskets of vegetables & 4 mats on certain occasions. He collected plough tax @ 0-4-0 & also certain other rents/taxes in kind from these Khond villagers.

Many such examples clearly suggest that even prior to the so-called British influence, tribals (both agrarian and non-agrarian) of many areas used to pay, though mostly in kind, either to the State or to their immediate authority, certain fees even against the consumption of forest produce. If such payment was totally absent in any area, then it might be due to any of the following reasons:

1. Virtual inaccessibility of that area.
2. Comparatively insignificant number and earning of these people.
3. The Raja wanted to maintain a peaceful relationship particularly when these people were very wild and barbaric.
4. Revenue demands of the State were easily fulfilled from other sources.
5. The Chief was lacking the necessary administrative power to impose any such assessment.

It is also wrong to believe than the British first and always taught the Rajas to assess the tribals with forest cess and themselves followed the same policy. Rather the British Government in a proclamation declared that if the Khonds agreed to stop human sacrifice, then no tax would be imposed on them. In 1875, the Khonds of Kondhomals agreed to pay a plough tax, but not only it was regarded as a voluntary contribution (and was actually collected accordingly) but also the Government agreed to add an equal contribution, the total constituting the ‘Khondmals Road Fund’ which was utilised for the construction of roads, inspection bungalows, wells etc. In fact, when the Raja of Boud requested for restoration of this region to him, the Government clearly stated that it would continue to manage the tract inspite of the fact that the management of Kondhomals was not profitable to the Government financially.

In addition, the Government also took measures to prevent alienation of the land of tribals to non-tribals (this measure was also followed in some ex-States) and did not allow the Maliah –owners of the neighbouring plains to make undue exactions from their Maliah-subjects.

---

224 The details of this collection are not available, so it is not known if it included any forest dues. But it proves that the Khonds of Ghumsur were not totally unassessed.

225 Taylor, for ex; made the following remarks on the Head of the Goddapur Mutha; ‘xxx He is a very weak youth with no influence in his Muttah. Consequently, it is harder to get a fowl or a seer of gram in his muttah than to build a bungalow in any other.xxx”
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Part : III
BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS GARJAT FORESTS

On 27-2-1872, the Divisional Commissioner of Orissa, Mr. T.E. Revenshaw wrote a letter to the following effect, to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Revenue Department:

"xxx as water wears away stone, so judicious and continuous pressure and influence may effect a change in the habits and customs, prejudices and privileges, of the inhabitants of the Orissa hill tracts. To peremptorily prohibit waste of timber, and to introduce systematic conservancy, would be simply impracticable. Neither is our control over the tributary Rajah sufficiently close, or the Rajah's control over the people sufficiently defined, to admit of the possibility of carrying out any detailed system. All that can now be done is on the way of influence and advice. Such advice has been heretofore freely offered, and may now be embodied in the enclosed letter or order to each tributary Rajah, the force of which will be enhanced if issued with the approval of Government. The kind of timber to be preserved, and the supply to be fixed, have been fixed after reference to the Conservator of Forests." 1

The letter or order which Revenshaw sent for approval of the Government so as to send it to the Garjat Chiefs, was approved by the Government of Bengal and has been included in Chapter: IV.

The increasing influence of the British Government in this regard can be further ascertained from the following letter of H.J. Cotton, Offg. Chief Secretary (GOB) to the Divisional Commissioner of Chot Nagpur, dated 10.06.1892:

"xxx The Lieutenant-Governor considers that Government should exercise the same control over the Tributary States in respect of forests as it does at present in respect of mines, and it has been expressly stipulated in the revised sanads, which it is proposed to grant to the Chiefs, that they shall make no concession of forest rights without your advice and the sanction of Government." 2

Accordingly, the timber lease granted by the Raja of Bonai to M/s. Gillanders Arbuthnot and Company (agents of M/s. Deer & Co.) was declared invalid by the Government of Bengal in 1892 because the company refused to act according to the scheme proposed by the Divisional Commissioner of Chot Nagpur to save the forests from indiscriminate exploitation, showing reason that no such scheme was included in their agreement with the Raja. 3

As the Government was seeing the need of forest conservation in the Garjats as 'a matter of the greatest importance', it even offered the services of its own Forest Department, without any profit, to facilitate the same and in the States/Zamindaries under the direct management of the Government (i.e Court of Wards), such plans were already started to be implemented and the negotiation in this regard finally materialised in the appointment of one Agency Forest Officer.
By 1907, the Govt. of Bengal had realised that the existing arrangements for ensuring proper conservation of Garjat forests were far from satisfactory. So it proposed that year for appointing a Dy. Conservator of Forests exclusively for this purpose; but the concerned departments of the Govt. of India did not appear convinced for the necessity of any such appointment. The Bengal Govt. wrote to them that the proposal should not be ignored as the following factors were closely associated with the denudation of the Garjat forests:

- Catchment areas of some of the rivers flowing in the adjoining British territories were likely to be badly affected as being situated in the Garjat areas.
- The timber market of Bengal might face a 'timber famine' being dependent on the supply from the Garjats.
- Greater part of the forests so destroyed could not be replaced by any form of permanent cultivation.

It also clarified that the officer so appointed would also supervise forests of those Garjats which were under the management of the Government, and the Chief Secy. to the GOB wrote to the Secy. to the Govt. of India that "the economic future of most of the Orissa States lies in the conservation and reasonable exploitation of their forests."

Interestingly, even Mr. Dundas Whiffin, Forest Manager, Bengal Timber Trading Company, advocated for the proper arrangement in this direction as, in his opinion, "a lease holder, who has a long lease, will always do his best to conserve & nurse the forest as far as lies in his power."

Ultimately, the endeavour succeeded and the appointment was approved.

The influence of the Government over Garjat forest administration was working through two important designations, viz., the Political Agent and the Agency Forest Officer. Of these two officers, the Political Agent was the higher authority and important decisions taken by the Garjat Chiefs regarding their forests needed approval of the Political Agent to be in force. Before the appointment of the Agency Forest Officer (hereinafter AFO), the Political Agent (hereinafter PA) had to manage such affairs directly. After the AFO began his work, the PA managed it through him. The PA was not bound to accept the suggestions of the AFO and there are instances in which he made necessary modifications in the AFO's schemes/proposals. For ex., in his inspection notes of Rairakhol State in December 1929, the AFO suggested that fuel cess at a rate of 0-2-0 per rupee would be reasonable for the State; but the PA found it high enough and recommended a rate of 0-1-0.

While the PA was from a political or administrative background, the AFO was a man having experiences in the field of forestry. The first AFO to take charge was Mr. Grieve who started his work in 1910 and Cooper & Mooney were his successors. The beginning of AFO's work for Garjat forests made it possible to manage these forests in the required manner and it is because of this reason perhaps that the era of systematic management of Garjat forests is said to have actually began in 1910.

The principle on which the AFO (and the PA) worked seems to be of a balancing nature between the people, the forests, and the State's revenue interest. For ex., the AFO
suggested in January 1915 for making Khair a reserved tree in Patna since he found the catechu business quite promising in that State. On the other hand, the lease for Sal resin at Rs. 80/- per annum in Rairakhol State was disapproved by the AFO during his inspection in March-1928. However, the number of reserved species in Kalahandi was suggested for reduction from 16 to 6 by Mooney.

The AFO was later designated as the Chief Forest Advisor. His office was at Sambalpur and the Garjats contributed for his remuneration and other expenses. It is not that all the Garjats placed their forests under the control of the AFO/CFA (Chief Forest Advisor) from the beginning. Ramsay, in his inspection notes on Bamra before 1907, described how the Raja was against any such arrangement:

"The Chief is not willing to avail himself of the services of the Agency Forest Officer, and I had a long discussion with him on the subject, pointing out to him that he had no idea of the resources of his forests, what areas should be open to cutting & what reserved xxx."

Ramdhyan reported that States like Talcher and Sonepur were not under the control of the CFA. Perhaps such States did not want any kind of intervention by the CFA in their way of managing forests (but some of them did consult the CFA occasionally) and this might be a reason behind the demand put forward by some of the Garjat Chiefs that the office of the CFA should be placed under the authority of the Eastern States Board of Forestry & Agricology (Mahtab:1974). In fact, while negotiations for appointing the AFO were going on, it had been apprehended that the Rajas would be suspicious of interference by this appointment and as an officer of the Finance Dept. of Govt. of India said:

"There is nothing which a Native State dislikes more than having its forests improved at the instance of the Government."

Though the Government had the authority to force the Rajas to yield to this arrangement, the concerned Committee did not want to use this 'weapon'; rather it advised that the AFO should start his work first in Garjats under the management of Government and if he could establish himself as a successful & tactful officer, the Rajas would be interested to avail his advice. Hence, in 1914-15, while the services of the AFO were being utilised by Boud, Bonai, Dasapalla, Kalahandi, Nayagarh, Nilgiri, Pal-Lahra, Patna & Rairakhol, he had paid special visits to Gangpur & Talcher on request by their Chiefs 'who desired the benefit of the opinion of the Agency Forest Officer as to working of their forests.'

The control of the British Government over the Kheda operations in the Garjats for some time caused considerable discontent among the Chiefs. The rules for the preservation and capture of elephants in the Cuttack Tributary Mahals have been described in the letter dated 20-3-1880 of A. Smith, Offg. Superintendent of Tributary Mahals, as follows:

* By that time, there were reserves, prohibited trees as well as fire lines etc. already in Bamra. What Ramsay perhaps meant to say was that for systematic management of forests, the services of AFO was necessary.
1. "The right to elephants within the Cuttack Tributary Mehals is reserved by Government" and license is necessary to catch elephants in these areas. The license, available from the Superintendent, will be valid for one year only and may be given to others than the Chiefs of the States with the sanction of Government.

2. No wild elephant can be injured or killed, except in defence of person and property.

3. "Every hunting ground should have at least two years rest, and when therefore a lease is granted to catch elephants in any locality, no new lease will be granted to catch elephants in the same locality during the next two succeeding years, unless it is proved to the satisfaction of the Superintendent that under the license no steps had during the year been taken to catch elephants."

4. "Government shall have the right of pre-emption in respect of every elephant caught by the licensee on his own account, or under his authority, which measures six feet or above; and it may purchase such elephants from the licensee at the under-mentioned prices, viz:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 to 7 1/2 feet</td>
<td>Rs.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1/2 to 8 feet</td>
<td>Rs.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 8 1/2 feet</td>
<td>Rs.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1/2 feet upward</td>
<td>Rs.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Milk calves will go with their mothers."

The licensee has to make an offer, for disposal of the captured elephants measuring 6' or above, first to the Government at the above prices. In case the Government does not purchase the elephants, then the licensee has to pay a royalty of Rs. 100 for every elephant captured. If the licensee is some body other than the Chief of the State, then he has to pay, in addition to the above royalty, rent at the rate determined by the Superintendent of Tributary Mahals.

5. In case of unauthorised killing, injury or capture of elephants, the person is liable to pay penalty not exceeding Rs. 500 for every elephant. "The elephant, if caught, shall be confiscated, and if any male elephant is killed, its tusk shall become the property of the Government."\(^{24}\)

Smith also stated that *Mila Shikar* or catching elephants by noosing should not be permitted. However, he did not think it necessary to provide this in the rules.\(^{25}\)

The provision for license and royalty was the main reason behind the discontent of the Rajas. The Raja of Bonai had to pay a royalty at the rate of 5% on the 6 elephants worth about Rs. 4500/- captured by him, some time in the 1890s. Later, however, the Government withdrew both these provisions (i.e. license and royalty).\(^{26}\)

The British introduced forest cess in some of the States /Zamindaris under the Court of Wards (for ex., in Borasambar Estate). The Government also made arrangements with the Garjat Chiefs to guard against the spread of forest fires into British India.\(^{27}\)

Following are certain examples which would reveal some other aspects of the relationship between the Rajas and the British Govt. (often represented by the AFO) as regards the Garjat forests:
• The Supt. of Orissa Trib. Mahals, to the Chief Secy. to the GOB, on 23-7-1886
(on the State of Narsingpur):

"Owing to the foolishness of the late Chief. the forests of the State have been
denuded of valuable timber trees, and they wanted some respite. Immediately
after the State was brought under the Government management, I visited the
killah and found that the valuable trees and bamboos of the forest were being
recklessly cut and removed without restriction, and I prohibited the cutting of
trees. xxxThe people of the State are allowed to use only the unimportant and
dead trees for building their houses, and making agricultural implements
without payment of fees". 28

• The Supt. of Trib. Mahals, to the Chief Secretary to the GOB, on 29-6-1906
(regarding the appointment of Foresters on a very small salary in the States of
Narsinghpur, Baramba, Pal-Lahra & Nayagarh )∗:

"The temptations to such a man to cheat the State & oppress the raiyats are
excessive, and I have no doubt are frequently yielded to. It is in fact hardly
right to introduce forest administration unless we are prepared to so control it
as to make it inoffensive to the people."29

• Mooney’s letter to the PA, Chattisgarh States, on 15-01-1943:

"The Kalahandi Darbar has just granted Kendu leaf contracts in the Khalsa
portion of the State and in Mahulpatna Estate(under management) for
periods of five and six years respectively. The annual value of the contracts
are Rs. 40000/- for the Khalsa and Rs. 6306/-for Mohulpatna. These are
actually good rates and I have nothing to say against them, but I wish to
point out that I was not consulted by the Darbar, although, I understand that
it was laid down by the Political Department that the Darbar would consult
me on all forest leases. This is a most important principle and I do not think
the Darbar should be permitted to deviate from it.

xxxIf the present Maharaja is to be permitted to flout advice given to him
by the Political Department, matters will continue to stagnate as they did in
the time of his father; and forest administration will make no progress." 30

• Mooney’s letter to the Dewans of Dasapalla, Ranpur, Boud, Narsinghpur and
Athmallik on 14-3-1944:

"The Western India Match Company are having the greatest difficulty
in obtaining their requirements and softwoods, especially simul, for match
manufacture. I have been specially requested by the Resident to give all possible
aid to the Company in obtaining their requirements.

∗ Most of these States had been under the Court of Wards for quite some time during the late 19th century
and none of them was likely to have more than one Forester on a very small salary. 32
My proposal is that the Darber should grant a lease for three years to the firm for the extraction of simul, pani patuli, chatian & ambada logs xxx."31

Besides, the British also took measures to organise the forest department in the Garjats and in Boud, when Political Agent Ramsay found the Raja expending the good amount of advance deposit received against the sleeper leases probably for some marriage ceremony, he did not approve it.33

A few years before merger, the States were allowed to exercise more autonomy as regards their forests which led to the foundation of the Eastern States Board of Forestry & Agricology. And the resolution adopted at a meeting on 11-3-1945 said:

" xxxx the Board wishes to reaffirm its desire that the Chief Forest Advisor should act purely in an advisory capacity in all States. The Board sees no advantage in using the Chief Forest Advisor in any other capacity during the present transitional state."34
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THE COURSE OF DEVOLUTION

Forests, in general, had long been the common property of villagers, forest tribes & local inhabitants; and hardly any restriction except that of the forest taxes, was ever imposed on the people till the Forest Department was created (Brandis:1878)¹. Again, as the Madras Board of Revenue observed, forest taxes no more indicated that the forests belonged to the State (Brandis: 1878)².

Rural people in Orissa had long been enjoying a kind of autonomous or semi-autonomous administration at their village level through local bodies called Panchayats. Panchayat means a five-member village committee which used to control such administration and though it was mostly concerned with social, religious or other such matters, revenue administration was also its responsibility even during the rule of Keshari Dynasty³ & this revenue power more or less continued to exist at least upto the Mogul period (Mishra:1979)⁴. The revenue rights of Panchayats were recognized by the rulers probably because they (Panchayats) were responsible to collect and pay to the State various rents/cesses charged on the people (villagers) by the rulers (Mishra: 1979)⁵.

Usually the village head-man was the head of the Panchayat or vice versa⁶. The responsibility of the Panchayat practically centred around him. This way, both the systems i.e. the Panchayat and the village head-man existed simultaneously and when, in due course of time, due to the advent of colonial administration* & other factors, the Panchayat system gradually collapsed or was reduced to a role mainly at the social level; the village head-man system continued to exist and gradually became more recognized than the Panchayats though now the revenue rights of the village head-man was not to the extent enjoyed by the ancient Panchayats.

Still, the Panchayat system seems to have continued to exist in the 19th century with its revenue powers, at least in some parts of Orissa as indicated by the fact that Panchayats in Boud used to assess the forest produce exported from the villages⁷. Also, in Parlakhemundi maliahs, the Panchayats used to decide the kind and quantity of *mamools* to be paid to the local Hill-Chief by the villagers (Taylor:1969)⁸.

The reason behind the forest rights of Panchayats seems to be any of the following:-

1. Little significance of forest revenue for the Raja.
2. Generosity of the Raja.
3. Administrative convenience.
4. Inaccessibility & other such factors because of which it was quite difficult for the Raja to assert his claim over the forest revenue of a region.

Then, when the forests became one of the major sources of revenue to the Raja & also their conservation gained more and more importance, proprietary rights of

* It should not however be concluded that the British were entirely against this system. In fact, they had supported the role of Panchayats in the remote areas for solving judicial and other such matters of local interest*. It seems that endeavour to adopt more modern & more systematic arrangements probably led them to ignore the Panchayats in course of time.
Panchayats or village head-men over the forests of their area seemed to be quite against these two perceptions. How the revenue factor led to a conflict between the Rajas and their zamindars, has already been described in Chapter-III. If some tenure holders still continued to enjoy their proprietary forest rights either fully or partially, then it was because of some special reasons (religious & political, or little significance of the forest area under the possession of the tenure holder).

Almost in all the Garjats, the village head-men were given the responsibility of protecting the forests of the area under their charge. For example, the Sarbarakaripatta of Baramba State (1924-25) said:

"You shall preserve all the reserve, protected forests of the State as well as the forests within your village boundary. xxx"

And Kabuliyat of the Sarbarakar of the Khond villages in Khandapara (1928-31) said:

"I will preserve all forests and will not allow any tree of the reserved species to be cut, removed, damaged, or destroyed without the permission of the State. xxx"

The Jeypore forest rules mention that the village head-man should see that the privileges allowed to the ryots are not abused. And Ramdhyni reported that in Keonjhar, no permit was necessary in the B-class & Khesra forests for removing forest produce for bonafide purposes. The village head-man used to regulate this system by keeping a list with himself, and this arrangement went on satisfactorily (Ramdhyni:1947).

Though no proprietary forest rights of the village head-men were recognised (unless they had any forest or jungle in their own service lands called jagirs), in some areas they used to enjoy very limited timber- or revenue rights in this regard. For ex.,

- In Borasambar zamindary (western Orissa), the timber of the trees (when dry) planted by local people in the waste lands belonged to the village head-man (Thikadar). Flowers, fruits and timber of naturally grown trees in waste lands and unclaimed house sides also belonged to him.

- In Dhenkanal (1923-24) & Pal-Lahra (1932), the Sarbarakar (head-man) was entitled for a commission 6 ¼ % from the total forest cess collected in his village.

As a result of the Prajamandal movements, various administrative reforms were promised or implemented by the rulers in many Garjats. One such measure was the re-introduction of Panchayat (or similar) system in States like Bonai, Rairakhol and Narsinghpur by mid-1940s. But practically, the power given to such Panchayats was very nominal and they did not possess any forest right.

The Mayurbhanj Darbar established five Praja Sabhas (representing five different localities of the State) in 1939, two-third of the members of which were elected by the people. The objective was to enable the people to take an intelligent interest in the work of administration. Exercising this power, the Sadar Praja Sabha discussed on providing timber to the poor peasants for their domestic/agricultural needs. The Baripada Praja Sabha was 'critical' about the Darbar policy of supplying wooden sleepers to the British Govt. at the cost of forest wealth of the State during the war & one of its members...
advocated the removal of restrictions on getting the timber from the forests (Praharaj:1988)\textsuperscript{17}. But the Praja Sabhas did not have the power to get their decisions implemented by the Darbar\textsuperscript{18}.

In Nayagarh, forest grievances were among the most important factors leading to the Prajamandal movement. The Forest Guards seemed to be as powerful as the Chief Conservator of today\textsuperscript{19}. In addition to various forest restrictions faced by the people, the Raja ordered for collection of grazing fees in a time not convenient for the people. So the Prajamandal called for the non-payment of grazing fees which was followed by the people\textsuperscript{20}. As the administration started oppressing the people in various ways, the Nayagarh Prajamandal established a kind of parallel administration at village level by forming Panchayats\textsuperscript{21}. These Panchayats organised the village people to fight for their rights in future (Dash:1992). Activists violated forest laws, people cut timber/bamboo etc. from the RFs & the struggle gradually became stronger.

So the Raja was forced to issue a proclamation in 1939 in which, besides exempting villages having no Khesra forest for their use within 3 miles (from their village) from the forest cess, a promise was made that management of Khesra would be entrusted to a Panchayat or village committee (Ramdhyani: 1947)\textsuperscript{22}. However, though Panchayats were officially introduced in the State during 1941-42\textsuperscript{23}, the promise of giving the management right of Khesra to them or to the village committees was never fulfilled\textsuperscript{24}.

As per the settlement between the Raja & the Prajamandal, an interim ministry was formed in 1947 with the Raja's brother as the Premier and two Prajamandal members - Sridhar Das and Banchanidhi Senapati- as ministers. The Premier was not authorised to interfere in the portfolio of any minister. The ministers tried to benefit the people as much as possible and besides taking many other decisions in this direction, abolished grazing fees. Certain boundary restrictions in forests were also abolished and some Protected forests were converted into Khesra (Dash:1992)\textsuperscript{25}.

In Athagarh, there were only two kinds of forests as per the rules of 1924: 'Reserved' and 'Protected' (Ramdhyani:1947)\textsuperscript{26}. As a result of Prajamandal movements in the State, the Raja declared various concessions in an extra-ordinary issue of the State Gazette published on 8th April, 1940. Among the forest concessions, besides the abolition of grazing fees\textsuperscript{27} and relaxation in reclamation rules, the Gazette also contained the following clauses:

11. Every village will be allotted blocks of forests as Khesra and protected forests as close to the village as possible which the villagers will use free of any charges for all purposes such as fuel, agricultural implements, jhati, medha, house building material etc. and the use of such forests will be regulated by village Panchayat.

12. In case of calamities such as fire accident, wash-out by floods etc., free supply of necessary timber and bamboo will be allowed to the affected villagers from Reserve

\textsuperscript{17} As clarified by Sri Sridhar Das, President, Nayagarh Prajamandal (1947); there was no need for taking over the forest management by these Panchayats. The Prajamandal encouraged violation of forest rules & accordingly, people removed forest produce as per their own will. But the Panchayats did not realise any revenue from the forests\textsuperscript{28}.

\textsuperscript{27} Not applicable for non-resident outsiders.
Forest. Only in case of well-to-do persons, half the royalty will be charged for such supply. The village Panchayat's recommendation\textsuperscript{226} as to whether one is well-to-do or not, will be considered in such cases.

19. Killing of wild boars on the fields is allowed; but for each boar killed, the killer will pay annas two to the Panchayat fund."

Khesra forests were formed; but as regards other promises, the Diwan of Athagarh State, in response to the letter dtd. 16-12-1946 of the Political Agent, who wanted to know 'if any changes in the announcement and concessions granted therein to the people xxx have been made', gave the following clarifications\textsuperscript{29} in his letter dtd. 27-04-1947 corresponding to the clauses of the Gazette already described before:

"xxxx

11. It was notified that 'every village will be allowed' village Khesra for purpose of fuel, agricultural implements and house building materials etc. except reserved species of trees which they collect on payment of royalty at tenants rate. But this clause could not be given effect to in all cases due to many villages being away from the forest. But as a rule, the tenants enjoy all the privileges mentioned in the declarations and get their requirements from the nearest Khesras. Of course, there was no Panchayat at the time of declaration which has been set up quite recently. Now the Panchayats generally recommend the cases. The clamour is from the tenants who have no Khesras near their village, but these can not be helped.

12. This is done."

The Diwan also mentioned that the fee charged on wild boars for crop protection had been abolished. So there was no question of any such amount (i.e. Re. 0-2-0) going to the Panchayat fund."

Rajendra Narayan Singh Deo- the Maharaja of Patna (1933-48) - was one of the most enlightened rulers of modern Orissa. In 1939, the Patna State Panchayat Act was promulgated & accordingly, Panchayats were established all over the State.

The State adopted, in principle, the Draft Forest Policy (prepared for the Eastern States) & the same was published in the Patna State Gazette\textsuperscript{30} (Extra-ordinary) of 15\textsuperscript{th} May 1943 under the title: A Forest Policy for the Patna State. However, it did not allow the Panchayats any forest right\textsuperscript{31}. The Panchayat Act said that planting & preservation of trees was one of the duties of the Panchayats, but it was maintained at the same time that the duties of the village head-men (who used to be the head of these Panchayats) would continue as before.\textsuperscript{32}

Provision was there that some of the fines realised in the village would go to the Panchayat fund. The Panchayat Act did not make it clear if this included also fine charged

\textsuperscript{*} In course of our interview with Sri Krushna Chandra Barik and Sri Lingaraj Jena at Athagarh on 21st January, 2000; both these veterans categorically denied of any significant forest rights of the Panchayats in Athagarh State.
for the illegal cutting of trees, but a notification of 1943 asked the Panchayats to separately mention, in the Panchayat Fund Account Book, the penalties realised against the illegal cutting of prohibited species. Another notification of 1944 declared that the Panchayats should keep an eye on the illicit felling of forest trees and that, people should report to the Panchayat about any such thing taking place & the Panchayat, in turn, should report it to the Forest Department. Provision was also made to reward the reporting person.

The Maharaja had inspired the people in various ways for afforestation and preservation of forests. In the Gazette, people were invited to plant trees in the open areas of Reserved & Protected forests on the following conditions:

1. The planter would have full rights on the tree, but not to the land.
2. The land for such plantation was to be specified by the Forest Officer.
3. Trees to be planted were to be selected by the Forest Officers.
4. The State reserved right to remove such trees if necessary; but in that case, the tree thus removed would go to the planter.

In early 1947, the Inspector General of Forests to the Government of India visited Patna & was intimated about the Maharaja's proposal 'to take co-operation of people in forest management, through village committees or Panchayats, a policy becoming popular in Panjab'. But the IG found certain constitutional/legal amendments necessary for implementing this proposal:

“There is one unusual difficulty here, there has been no allocation of rights to particular forests; any resident of the State has right in any forest. The only way out of the difficulty appears to be to assign, through the Panchayat Act, the management or control of rights to a selected local Panchayat which will be responsible for whatever protection & management duties are entrusted to it, without prejudice to rights of user. The Panchayat Act may require amending to enable this policy to be followed.” (Hamilton:1947)

But no such devolution of forest rights actually took place in the State, probably the time required for its implementation could not be available due to merger. The Praja Sabha in the State passed a resolution (1944-45) to utilise the village improvement cess for collecting Neem- and Sal seeds etc. & extract oil from them to manufacture/prepare soaps & medicines therefrom; but we don’t know if it was implemented.

A Committee, known as the Sambalpur Land Laws Committee (SLLC), was formed in 1939 by the Government of Orissa to enquire into the existing land laws in the district as well as to recommend for the necessary revisions. Giving witness before the Committee, tenants at Padampur (the headquarters of Borasambar zamindary) demanded for the following (SLLC:1940):

- Zemindary jungle should be converted into Gramya Jungle (village forest) without any compensation to the zamindar, but Panchayats should be constituted for its management.

*mostly fruit trees were supposed to be recommended.
There should be an advisory committee who might decide what fee should be paid to the zamindar.40

In the wazib-ul-urz approved by the Government for the zamindary areas of Sambalpur in 1925, there was a provision that with four members nominated by the villagers to assist the Gauntia/Thekedar, Panchayats should be formed in the Gauntiahi/Thekedari villages for administrative convenience and that, such Panchayats would regulate irrigation and other such village necessities. But there was no mention of any kind of forest regulation by the Panchayats41. However, in Gauntiahi/Malguzari villages under the direct control of the Government in the district, the village ‘Panch’ seemed to have certain role in the administration of tenants’ rights in village forests (for ex., they used to allow non-cultivator residents of their village to take required forest produce). The District Congress Committee(DCC) as well as the tenants expressed their view before the Land Laws Committee that similar system should be introduced in the zamindary areas42. The DCC also wanted that the right of selling Kendu leaf from village forests, and waste lands should rest with the ‘Panch’ ( SLLC : 1940)43.

Accordingly, the SLLC made the following recommendations:–

- " Xxx maintenance of village boundaries and clearance of forest growth on the same should remain in the hands of the village Panchayat.xxx" 44
- In case of Kendu trees standing on the village common lands, the village Panchayat should be authorised to sell their leaves and use the proceeds for the improvement of the village45
- Occupancy tenants should be the absolute owner of all trees standing on their holdings.46

But the zamindars were against allowing any such ‘extra’ concessions/rights to the tenants. As the Deputy Commissioner of Sambalpur reported on 28th October 1940:

“The Congress-men are trying to enlist the support of the tenants in favour of the Sambalpur Land Laws Committee, but the Gauntias* and Zamindars are also busy in assailing the recommendations of the Committee.”47

Hence, the demands of the Padampur tenants were never fulfilled by the Estate administration. Only the village grazing ground ( gochar ) was left at the disposal of the villagers through the Gauntia, grazing being free therein48

Though the Government had suggested for the transfer of management of village forests to the Panchayats in the Draft Forest Policy prepared for the Eastern States, no such provision was made in the Model Forest Act prepared a few years later by the CFA in consultation with the Government of India for these States (that is why the Forest Acts of Gangpur, Keonjhar and Khandapara etc. resemble each other so perfectly). Even, Section 80 of the IFA, 1927 –which provides for the management of forests or waste land in which the Government and some other party/person be jointly interested- did not find a place in this Forest Act. Perhaps the scope for joint interest in forest management/revenue was not tolerable by the feudal authorities.

---

* The ryots were liable for such maintenance, as per the wazib-ul-urz.49
* In fact, a meeting of some of the Gauntias, held at Sambalpur on 11-12-1937, resolved that the Gauntias would individually grant contracts for the collection of Kendu leaf and disregard any such contract given by the Government.50
Gram Parishads (local bodies similar to Panchayats) were introduced in Narsinghpur State. They did not possess any forest rights, but were made responsible for 'making orchards' as well as for the control of forest fire. Preservation of forests was not included in the list of responsibilities of such Parishads. However, they were entitled to impose a fine not exceeding Rs.5 if their orders for discharging such obligations(duties) were violated and the amount so collected belonged to the Gram Parishad fund.51

As per the Nilgiri State Panchayat Act52 of 1946, the Panchayats had the power to:-

- Prohibit or regulate the steeping of hemp in or near bunds, rivers, nallas etc. within 220 yards of the Basti (Section :33e).
- Regulate grazing of cattle so as to prevent damage of crops(Section :33h).

Besides, the Panchayats of Nilgiri were liable for the following duties also:

- Planting and preservation of trees (optional duty, Section: 32c).
- Preservation of forests (obligatory duty, Section 30 i).

Taking care of grazing grounds was also a duty of the Panchayat (Section:31i). But there was no opportunity for exercising revenue/management rights over any forest by these Panchayats in the State.

The Bonai Darbar ‘wished’ to establish a Praja Parishad (‘representative assembly’) in the State, but the draft order issued in this regard in 1946 did not contain ‘forest’ in the list of matters relating to which discussion was allowed in the ‘assembly’. However, the revised order of 1947 allowed discussion on this subject (i.e. forest)53, but to what extent the people were benefited by such ‘reforms’, can be judged from the fact that even after merger, the Bonai Prajamandal had to put forward its demand for the abolition of commutation fee for bethi, abolition of monopoly in Kendu leaf, lac & tassar, as well as for full rights in Khesra, in a resolution passed on 5th March 1948.54

All such instances point out to the extent to which the Rajas/zamindars were reluctant to allow any real devolution of our concern. It was quite difficult for them to share their revenue ‘rights’ with the people. Another important factor was that they perhaps did not find their people reliable for any such local management of forests. In fact, taking advantage of the reduction in the number of reserved species, the people of Ranpur had reportedly degraded many village forests55. So it is not surprising to find that while assuring the Political Agent that his ' Darbar will take steps to introduce ' the system of management of Khesra forests by the Panchayats 'under proper safeguard'; the Raja of Dhenkanal, in his letter dated 24th February 1943, also remarked that in his State ' it has to be introduced cautiously in view of what happened in 1938-39.56

However, forests continued to be a common property even upto the 1940s in case of the Brahmottar tenure holders. For as explained before, Brahmottar village actually

* It has been alleged in the Revised Working Plan for the RFs of Dhenkanal Forest Division (1979-80 to 1988-99) that the concessions granted by the ruler of Dhenkanal caused destruction of the forests (p.21). In fact, the Orissa Administration Committee(1958), while recommending for the Panchayat management of forests, reminded of the failure of such experiments in the Madras Presidency and suggested for various measures to prevent any possible degradation caused by such devolution.57 So far as Dhenkanal is concerned; we were told by Sri Baishnab Charan Patnaik (who led the Dhenkanal Prajamandal during 1938-47) that the Panchayats there had not been given any revenue/management rights of forests.58
belongs to a group of Brahmins & not to any single person (with a few exceptions). It is another matter that most of the Brahmottar forests remained without proper management until the State imposed its authority over it, but the fact that the right of the Brahmin community over their village forests under such tenures remained almost unaffected (more or less) inspite of the increasingly value of forests*, can certainly be taken as something exceptional.

A very limited kind of devolution (if we can really call it so) took place in Baramba. Groves of fruit trees on State waste lands there had been auctioned for some time. But later the tenants were given full rights to enjoy fruits of all trees in such lands & the Sarbarakar as well as members of the village committee (Gram Parishad), who were given the charge of distribution of such fruits, were entitled to get 1/8th of the produce ( Ramdhyani:1947 )

And in Jeypore, villagers continued to enjoy the right of allowing forest produce to the non-cess-payer residents of their village, on the basis of mutual understanding. Forest cess was paid by those who had cultivating lands. Removal of forest produce by the landless residents of the village for bonafide purposes was possible if the cess-paying residents agreed to that. But this arrangement was valid for the inferior forests of the village. In some cases, the villagers are said to have taken care of such village forests, planted trees therein; and even resisted the attempt by people from other areas to exercise the nistar rights in these forests(PEAECR:1940)

A very curious development took place in Saraikela, then still under the jurisdiction of the Government of Orissa. Commenting on the Draft Forest Policy, the Saraikela Darbar had said:

“It is apprehended that Panchayats, who will be constituted from amongst the people having rights over forests, will always try to satisfy the immediate needs of the local people without taking into consideration their future interest in the forests for which their maintenance is so badly needed.”

In April 1948, the Prajatantra – an Oriya Daily- reported that some tribals of Saraikela, alongwith the Pattayat(younger prince)’s own party ‘Praja Samiti’, had themselves established be-aain (illegal) Panchayatiraj in the Shuchung Pargana of Govindpur. These people reportedly penalised & also punished people who removed timber from the jungles without their consent; they even refused to recognise the permit issued by the Forest Dept. of Orissa & when asked, explained that as the Orissa Government had dismissed the Panchayatiraj introduced by the Saraikela Raja (in December 1947), they were obliged to assert these Panchayati rights by forming Panchayats themselves.

It may be mentioned here that the Praja Samiti was formed, with the support of the Raja, against the Praja Mandal. The Pattayat & some of his supporters were later arrested on various criminal charges.

---

Ψ As Ramdhyani found in Bamra.

* Villagers had the privilege of distributing their share of fruits as per the village custom in many States. In Baramba, auctioning had been started on the advice of Mooney.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abwab</td>
<td>Miscellaneous cesses, often considered as illegal exactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adda</td>
<td>See: Toom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambosodha</td>
<td>Sweetened &amp; dried mango pulp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulo</td>
<td>Salted &amp; dried mango pieces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amlı</td>
<td>Revenue year calculated traditionally from August/September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranya</td>
<td>Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autak</td>
<td>Restricted, reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ausadhi</td>
<td>Medicinal plants/ herbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagait</td>
<td>Orchards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahangi</td>
<td>Bhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandh(Bund)</td>
<td>Literally meaning dam, but here implies to a pond like reservoir of water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banua</td>
<td>Professional hunters (local).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baran</td>
<td>Prohibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barchhas</td>
<td>Sugarcane fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begari</td>
<td>Often connotes the meaning of bethi though specifically it means free or forced carriage of luggage etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benapat</td>
<td>Androdragon miliaceus, a kind of scented grass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhandar</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidi</td>
<td>A sort of country cigar prepared from Kendu leaf; generally used by poor people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bono(van)</td>
<td>Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnum(Bharanam)</td>
<td>260 seers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamar</td>
<td>A Hindu lower caste dealing in animal skin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chowkidar</td>
<td>Watchman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuda</td>
<td>Flat rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula</td>
<td>Hearth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakshina</td>
<td>Sacrificial fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dammer(tree)</td>
<td>Sal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandapat</td>
<td>Revenue division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dantakathi</td>
<td>Brush wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar</td>
<td>Holder (for ex., Brahmottadar).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewan</td>
<td>Superintendent or Manager of a State/ Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolapurnima</td>
<td>A religious day of the Hindus associated with Holi (the festival of colours).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>A Hindu lower caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dussehra</td>
<td>A festival of the Divine Mother celebrated by the Hindus in September/October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enam</td>
<td>Gift/grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasli</td>
<td>Harvest year same as Amli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gajapati</td>
<td>Literally meaning ‘Lord of the elephants’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gola</td>
<td>A granary or store-house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopa</td>
<td>Hindu milk-men caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hala</td>
<td>Plough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illaka</td>
<td>Region/ area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagir</td>
<td>Lands/property given on service tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jama</td>
<td>Deposit /tribute/rent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jatia: Of high grade/quality.
Jhuti: Fencing materials.
Jhunning: Shifting cultivation.
Kabuliyyat: A written agreement.
Karan: Village accountant.
Katho(Kath): Wood/timber.
Khalsa: Area under direct administration of the Raja.
Khoraki: Diet Charges.
Khuntkati: Implies to land reclamation.
Khuskhus: A kind of mat prepared from Benapat.
Kissan: Farmer.
Koro(kara): Tax.
Kumuti: A business community of southern Orissa.
Kunda: Decorated/carved.
Kundra: A lower caste people.
Kutra: Barking deer.
Lathi: Bamboo stick.
Lodha: A lower caste.
Madhya: Central.
Maharaja: The great king.
Mahasul: Fee.
Maina: A bird (female parrot).
Mal: Forest-clad areas with/without hills.
Man: As land measure: .33 to 1.21 of an acre. As volume measure, varies from 3 to 4 seers.
Masul: Royalty/fee.
Matha: A Hindu monastery.
Maund: 40 seers i.e. approx. 37.3242 kg. Known as Mahan in Oriya.
Mauniam: Beneficial tenures.
Medha: Wooden post.
Meriah: Human sacrifice.
Moharana: Here implies to the carpenter.
Mouza: Village(s).
Muharrir: Clerk.
Naka: Check gate.
Nilgai: Boselaphus tragocamelus.
Narangi: A kind of sweet lemon.
Nayabadi: Newly reclaimed land.
Nayak: Leader.
Nazrana: A gift or present, but more particularly implying to sums exacted on various occasions.
Paika: Hereditary landed militia.
Palkin: A box lifter for travelling in (borne on the shoulders of 4 to 6 persons).
Pan: A Hindu lower caste.
Panch: Five member village committee.
Panu: Fee/cess.
Parcha: Form (abstract of the detailed record of each tenancy).
Patta(pottah): Lease given to a ryot showing his land, the rent thereon & the
period of lease.

Pir(Pirh): Block(group of villages).
Podu: Shifting cultivation.
Prakalpa: Project.
Raja: King.
Rajput: A great race (Hindu) of India, the hereditary profession of which is that of arms.
Rani: Queen.
Rasam: Custom.
Ryot: A subject, particularly a farmer.
Sabha: Meeting/conference/organisation.
Saheb: Persons addressed with honour, often implying to the Europeans.
Saheba: Addressed to woman with honour.
Salami: Offering or free gift made against some favour.
Samasthanam: Establishment.
Sambar: Cervus unicolor niger.
Sanand: A document conferring privileges under the seal of the ruling authority.
Sardar: Head-man/leader/commander.
Seer: Approx. 9 kg.
Sepoy: Soldier.
Shikar(mrugaya): Hunting/game killed during hunting expedition.
Sindur: Vermillion.
Soura(Savar): A tribe.
Tabha: A kind of lemon(Citron).
Tahsil: A revenue area.
Takoli: Tribute.
Taluk: Region/area.
Tantric(k): Practitioner of Tantra(an occult science of the Hindus).
Tassar: Natural silk.
Thekedar(Thikadar): Contractor/lease-holder.
Tikait: 1st son of the Raja.
Toila: Podu cultivation/land(not of shifting kind always).
Tol: Mohwa seed.
Tola: Approx. 0.0125 seer.
Toom: 4 1/3 addas or 3.25 seers.
Tota: Tope.

Uthibati: A kind of toila cultivation. No patta was granted on such cultivated lands, but as in Ranpur, the Forest Department used to assess such lands area-wise and crop-wise.  
Vanaspati: Vegetation.
Vastu: Hindu concept of engineering & architecture.

-------------------

### GLOSSARY-II

*Botanical Names of Certain Plant Species*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aam</td>
<td>Mangifera Indica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amla</td>
<td>Phyllanthus emblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anantamul</td>
<td>Hemidesmus indicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjun</td>
<td>Terminalia arjuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assan</td>
<td>Terminalia tomentosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahada</td>
<td>Terminalia Tomentosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandhan</td>
<td>Ougeinia dalbergioides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bani</td>
<td>Avicannia alba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar(Banyan)</td>
<td>Ficus bergalensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barenga</td>
<td>Grewia elstica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel</td>
<td>Aegle marmelos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhalia</td>
<td>Semicarpus anacardium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bheru</td>
<td>Chlorixylon swietenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borokoli</td>
<td>Zizyphus jujuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Char</td>
<td>Buchananja Latifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemedilai</td>
<td>Hemidesmus indicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daba Bamboo</td>
<td>Bambusa arundinacea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhou</td>
<td>Anogesissus latifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimiri</td>
<td>Ficus glomerata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumkurdu</td>
<td>Gardenia Latifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambhari</td>
<td>Gmelina arboarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gharkhair</td>
<td>Albizzia ordoratissima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gohira</td>
<td>Acacia bucophlaea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaria</td>
<td>Acacia leucophloea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haland</td>
<td>Adina coordifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harida(Harra/ Harar)</td>
<td>Terminalia Chebula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hental</td>
<td>Phoeni paludosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeuta</td>
<td>Artocarpus lakoocha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumun</td>
<td>Eugenia Jambolana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadamba</td>
<td>Anthocephalus Kadamba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitha</td>
<td>Aegle marmelos (Feronia elephantum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamalagundi</td>
<td>Mallotus philippinensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanranja</td>
<td>Xyilia xylocarpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanso</td>
<td>Hymenodictyon excelsum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karanga</td>
<td>Pongamia glabra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasi</td>
<td>Bridelaia retusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendu(Tendu)</td>
<td>Diospyros melanoxylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaira</td>
<td>Acacia Catechu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khajuri</td>
<td>Phoenix Sylvesteris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kochila</td>
<td>Strychnos nux-vomica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kundehi</td>
<td>Careya arboarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurum</td>
<td>Adina cordifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusum</td>
<td>Schleichera trijuga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahanimba</td>
<td>Cedrela Toona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahul (mohula or mohwa)</td>
<td>Madhuka Latifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitkunia</td>
<td>Mitragyna parvifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muktammonja</td>
<td>Sapindus trifolius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundimundia</td>
<td>Mitragyna pariviflora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimba (Neem)</td>
<td>Azadiracta indica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palasa</td>
<td>Butea frondosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panas</td>
<td>Arotocarpus integrifoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parhel</td>
<td>Stereospermum swaveolens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patala garuda</td>
<td>Rouvolfia serpentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phansi (Phasi)</td>
<td>Anogeissus accuminata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piasal (bija)</td>
<td>Pterocarpus marsupium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipal (Osto)</td>
<td>Ficus religiosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rai</td>
<td>Dillenia Pentagyna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohini</td>
<td>Soymida febrifuga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabaigrass</td>
<td>Eulaliopsis binata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saguwan</td>
<td>Tectona grandis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahaj</td>
<td>Terminalia tomentossa (alata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal</td>
<td>Shorea robusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salap</td>
<td>Caryota urena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salia/Kanta Bamboo</td>
<td>Dendrocalamus strictus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sehna</td>
<td>Legerstroemia parviflora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sersuan</td>
<td>Albizzia lebbek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimuli (Salmali)</td>
<td>Bombax malabaricum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siali</td>
<td>Bauhinia vahli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidda</td>
<td>Legerstroemia parviflora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirish</td>
<td>Albizzia lebbek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sissoo</td>
<td>Dalberjia Latifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunari</td>
<td>Cassia fistula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundari</td>
<td>Horitica minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala</td>
<td>Borassus flabellifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangaani</td>
<td>Xyilia xylocarpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentuli (Kainya)</td>
<td>Tamarindus Indica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentra</td>
<td>Albizzia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinia</td>
<td>Albizzia lebbek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tun</td>
<td>Cedrela toona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulanga (Punanga)</td>
<td>Calophyllum inophyllum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDICES
Appendix-1

Indian Currency / Coinage

1 Rupee = 16 annas

1 anna = 12 pahis (pies) / pahula

One Rupee, 8 annas and 7 pahula can be written as: 1-8-7

Some centuries before, 1 Rupee was worth 46 to 56 paise\textsuperscript{228}. Later, 1 Rupee was made equivalent to 64 paise and thus, 1 anna was worth 4 paise. In 1957, the anna system was abolished\textsuperscript{2} and one Rupee was made equivalent to 100 paise on the basis of decimal system (accordingly, one anna was worth 6.25 paise).

The value of paisa\textsuperscript{229} in kind during 16th century has been given as follows\textsuperscript{3}:

1 paisa = 50 to 80 Cowries\textsuperscript{230} (\textit{cypraea moneta}) in different places

= 35 to 40 Badams (bitter almonds i.e. \textit{Amygdalus communis})

Appendix-2

Exchange Rate

1. Observations of the Madras Estates Land Act Committee\textsuperscript{4}:

The ancient customary rate that had prevailed in India during the Hindu and Mahammadan periods and also for a long time after the British advent, was:

1 Rupee = £ 0-1-4 = 1s.4d\textsuperscript{231}.

\[ \Rightarrow 1 \text{ British Pound} = \text{Rs. 15/-} \]

The enhancement of Rupee ratio from 1s.4d. to 2s. was:

- in or about 1818
- in or about 1865
- in or about 1920

1 Rupee = 2s

\[ \Rightarrow 1 \text{ Pound} = \text{Rs. 10/-}. \]

The ratio increased from 1s. 4d. to 1s. 6d in 1927-28:

1 Rupee - 1s. 6d.

\[ \Rightarrow 1 \text{ Pound} = \text{Rs. 13.33} \]

\textsuperscript{228} Gold coins were called \textit{asarpi}; silver coins, \textit{zarbi} and copper coins, \textit{paisa}\textsuperscript{Dash: 1969}\textsuperscript{5}.

\textsuperscript{229} Otherwise known as 'pice', the plural of which is written as 'paise'. In the anna system of coinage, the pice was distinguished by a central hole & accordingly, was called \textit{kana paisa}. In the decimal system of coinage, the hole disappeared and now the paisa was called \textit{nua paisa}.

\textsuperscript{230} Hamilton gives a picture of the currency of Orissa in the early decades of 19th century as follows\textsuperscript{6}:

"More than one fourth of the circulation xxx is carried on by cowries; copper one tenth; gold one fortieth and silver three-fifths. xxx" (Hamilton: 1971)

\textsuperscript{231} Shilling (s) & pense (d) are the British counterparts of the Indian anna and pahi respectively\textsuperscript{7}.

1 Pound = 20 shilling and 1 shilling = 12 pense
2. Terry's valuation (Ball: 1889)\(^8\):

During 17\(^{th}\) century, the Rupee ratio was as follows:
1 Rupee (ordinary) = 2s.3d.
=> 1 Pound = Rs. 8.88.

1 Gold-mohur\(^{232}\) (Gold Rupee)
= 31s.6d. to 32s.
=> 1 Pound = 0.63 Gold Rupee to 0.62 Gold Rupee.

3. Government records\(^9\):

1 Rupee = 2s.3d. (Report of the Select Committee of 1831-32).
1 Rupee = 2s. (1834-1856)
1 Rupee = 1s. 10 ½ d. (1856)
1870-71 : 1 Rupee = 1s. 10d.
1871-72 : 1 Rupee = 1s. 11d.
1872-75 : 1 Rupee = 1s. 10d.
1875-76 : 1 Rupee = 1s. 09d.
1876-77 : 1 Rupee = 1s. 08d.
1885-86 : 1 Rupee = 1s. 6.25d.

The average value:

By 1950s, 1 Pound was approximately equivalent to Rs. 15/-.\(^{10}\). So the average ratio for three and half centuries i.e. from 17\(^{th}\) century to 1950s can be taken as:

1 British Pound \(\cong\) Rs. 12/-\(^{233}\)

Appendix-3

Schedule of Rates

(Government of Orissa)

1. Angul Divn. (1942)\(^{11}\):

Class I poles (green or dry of any length, per piece):

Under 4" diameter over bark : 0-1-0
10" to 12" diameter : 1-8-0

Logs per cft.-

12" - 16" dia : 0-6-0
16" - 20" dia : 0-8-0
20" and over : 0-10-0

\(^{232}\) This refers most probably to the Mogul coins. It may be noted here that some local variations did exist. For ex., one \textit{mulki} Rupee of Sambalpur area was actually worth approximately 0-6-0 during 18\(^{th}\) century.\(^{12}\)

\(^{233}\) We don't claim that our calculations of exchange rate are very accurate, nor did we have that opportunity. Still, an attempt has been made here to give the reader atleast a rough picture of the exchange rates of some historical past that find mention in our report.
Firewood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Load</td>
<td>0-0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart (bullock) load</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charcoal per maund: 0-2-0
Bamboo (Salia and Daba) per five or fraction thereof: 0-1-0

Sabai Grass:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cart (bullock) load</td>
<td>1-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head load</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honey per seer: 0-3-0
Wax per seer: 0-3-0
Horns per seer: 0-4-0

Thorns for fencing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cart (bullock) load</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head load</td>
<td>0-0-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grazing free per animal per year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffaloes</td>
<td>0-12-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows, Bullocks and</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Berhampur range of Ghumsur North Division (1938-46)\textsuperscript{13}:

Class I poles any length:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 4&quot; dia over bark per 10 pieces</td>
<td>0-7-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&quot; to 12&quot; dia per pole</td>
<td>3-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class I logs of any length per cft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; - 16&quot; dia</td>
<td>1-2-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16&quot;-20&quot; dia</td>
<td>1-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&quot; and over</td>
<td>0-14-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salia bamboo per 10 pieces or fraction thereof: 0-1-6

Firewood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cart (bullock) load</td>
<td>1-2-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head load</td>
<td>0-1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey per seer</td>
<td>0-4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax per seer</td>
<td>0-4-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Babuli (Sabai) Grass:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cart load</td>
<td>1-14-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head load</td>
<td>0-3-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tamarind:
Appendix - 4
Schedules of Rates
(ex-States / ex-Zamindaries)

1. Fruits (Athmallik, 1933) 14:
Char Per 2 Seers : 0-4-0
Kendu Per 5 Seers : 0-0-3
Jamun Per 5 Seers : 0-0-3
Mango Per 5 Seers : 0-0-6
Mahul(green) Per 5 Seers : 0-0-3
Mahul(dry) Per 5 Seers : 0-1-0
Karanja, Kochila, Kusum, Bhalia, Tentuli, Harida, Bahada & Anla per maund: 0-2-0
Other fruits per maund : 0-1-0

2. Stones and minerals (Narsinghpur, 1933) 15:
Limestone per 100 cft : 1-0-0
Rock lime per 100 cft : 1-0-0
Building stone per 100 cft : 0-8-0
Granite per 100 cft : 3-0-0
Laterite per 100 cft : 0-8-0
White Earth(tilak mati) per 100 cft: 1-0-0
Red Earth (geru) per 100 cft : 1-0-0

The lohars who carried iron ore on head, paid 4 pieces of iron to the Chief in Athmallik directly (1905-06). The payment was known as 'Lohari' 16.

Iron smelters of Mayurbhanj had to pay Re. 1 for utilising iron ore, per annum (1911)17.

In Jeypore, Rs. 6 was charged annually per family, for washing gold in the Kollab river and its tributaries (1942); and iron ore was charged at 0-2-0 per maund of 25 lbs 18.

In Bamra(1924), coal was charged at the following rates:18(I)
Head load :0-1-6
Cart load(bullock):1-12-0
Cart load(buffalo :2-8-0

3. Ashes234 (Bonai, 1926) 19:

---

234 Ash was used for various purposes. The fish-dealers used it for handling the dead fish with ease, the housewives used it for cleansing their utensils. But perhaps the most important users of this material were
4. Tassar Cocoons:

_Dalkati_235 or _kusa masul_ (Boud, 1905) : Rs. 12 per _bari_ (1 _bari_ = 200 seed cocoons)\textsuperscript{20}.

Tassar cocoons (Nilgiri\textsuperscript{236})\textsuperscript{21} : Rs. 5 per Kahan\textsuperscript{237}
Tassar seeds (Nilgiri)\textsuperscript{22} : Rs. 15 per Kahan

Tassar cocoons : 0-12-0 per Kahan (Mayurbhanj, 1911)\textsuperscript{23}
Tassar cocoons per 1000 : Re. 1 (Jeypore, 1942)\textsuperscript{24}

5. Medicinal Plants / Herbs:

Mayurbhanj (1911)\textsuperscript{25} : _Anantamool_ per maund : 0-2-0
Nux- vom per maund : 0-1-0

Nilgiri\textsuperscript{26} : _Gaja pippali_ per maund : 0-6-0
_Bana halidi_ per maund : 0-12-0

Keonjhar (1915)\textsuperscript{27} : Anantamool per maund : 0-4-0
Nux- vomica (Kuchila) per maund : 0-1-0

Jeypore (1942)\textsuperscript{28} : Medicinal herbs per head load : 0-1-0

6. Leaves

Jeypore (1942)\textsuperscript{29}:
_Siali leaves_ : 0-0-3 per head load
_Mohul leaves_ : 0-0-3 per head load
_Palas leaves_ : 0-0-3 per head load

Nilgiri\textsuperscript{30}:
_Kendu leaf_ : 1-0-0 per maund
_Sal leaf_ : 0-0-9 per maund
_Date palm leaves_ : 0-0-6 per maund

Keonjhar (1915)\textsuperscript{31}:
_Leaves_ : 0-0-3 per head load
 : 0-4-0 per cart load

---

*the washermen who collected ash of some selected timber (probably having washing-soda-like properties) like Assan, Amthi, Tentuli etc. for their washing business.*\textsuperscript{236}

*Dalkati means lopping of branches. In Bamanghati area of Mayurbhanj (1886), this fee was charged @ 0-5-0 per person cutting the branches of Assan trees for tassar cultivation and @ 0-8-0 per tree of Kusum for lac cultivation.*\textsuperscript{25}

*all the rates of Nilgiri ex-State, as quoted here, seem to be in force by the time of merger at least.*\textsuperscript{237}

1 Kahan = 16 pons
1 pon = 80 pieces
7. **Hides:**

Nilgiri:\n
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hide Type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sambar skin (big)</td>
<td>1-0-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer skin (big)</td>
<td>1-12-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bison skin (big)</td>
<td>2-8-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger skin (big)</td>
<td>5-0-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger skin (medium)</td>
<td>1-0-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard skin (big)</td>
<td>2-0-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard skin (medium)</td>
<td>1-0-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear skin (big)</td>
<td>1-0-0 each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keonjhar (1915)\n
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hide Type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiger skin</td>
<td>2-0-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard / Panther skin</td>
<td>1-0-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambar skin</td>
<td>0-8-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer skin</td>
<td>0-6-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bison skin</td>
<td>0-12-0 each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Horns:**

Mayurbhanj (1911):\n
Horns of Sambar / Deer etc. per maund: 0-12-0

Nilgiri:\n
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horn Type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bison horn (big) per pair</td>
<td>1-8-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambar horn (big) per pair</td>
<td>0-12-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted deer horn (medium) per pair</td>
<td>0-6-0 each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeypore (1942):\n
Sambar horns: 0-12-0 per maund of 25 lbs.

9. **Birds and Animals (Keonjhar, 1915):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bird Type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peacock</td>
<td>0-2-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot</td>
<td>0-0-3 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maina</td>
<td>0-1-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other wild birds</td>
<td>0-0-6 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger</td>
<td>5-0-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard/Panther</td>
<td>2-0-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear/Deer/Sambar etc.</td>
<td>0-8-0 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other wild animals</td>
<td>0-4-0 each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Other animal / bird products:**
Nilgiri 39:
- Ivory\(^{238}\) (Class - I) : Rs. 15 per seer
- Ivory (Class - II) : Rs. 10 per seer
- Ivory (Class - III) : Rs. 6 per seer
- Ivory (Class - IV) : Rs. 4 per seer

Keonjhar (1915) 40:
- Feathers of wild birds per seer : 0-4-0

Bamra (1924) 40(I):
- Bones per maund : 0-8-0

Jeypore (1942) 41:
- Musk \(^{239}\) : 0-2-0 per maund of 25 lbs.

It is said that nominal royalty was charged in Kanika on eggs of the sea turtles. 41(I)

### Appendix-5

**Shooting Rules**

1. **Keonjhar (1915) 42**:
   - Shooting permitted for license holder only from 1\(^{st}\) October to 31\(^{st}\) March.
   - No body can kill, catch or wound any elephant\(^{240}\). Female deer and bison are prohibited to be killed.

2. **Bonai (1926) 43**:
   - Prohibited for killing: Female or immature males of bison, deer or antelope, and male deer with horns in velvet.
   - Between 1\(^{st}\) April to 15\(^{th}\) September, following birds can not be killed: partridges, spur fowl, jungles fowl, ducks, geese and heals.

3. **Jeypore (1941) 44**:

Prohibited for shooting: elephant, nilgai, females or immature males of bison, sambar and spotted deer, Antelopes or immature males of wild buffaloes.

### Appendix-6

**Shooting Fees**

1. **Shikari Rasam (Athmallik, 1906) 45**:
   - License fee : 0-8-0
   - In addition to that, following fees were charged per each animal / bird killed:
     - Sambar : 2-0-0
     - Boar : 2-0-0
     - Spotted deer : 1-0-0
     - Peacock : 0-2-0 ( no fee to be charged if the hunter provided a wing for the office use).

---

\(^{238}\) Ordinarily sold by auction.

\(^{239}\) It is not known if this actually referred to the musk of plant origin i.e. *Abelmoschus Moschatus*\(^{?}\).47

\(^{240}\) It is said that even the Raja of Keonjhar declined to kill elephants probably because of some religious reasons. Besides, killing of peacocks was also prohibited \(^{47}(I)\).
2. **Shikari Masul** (Boud, 1906) \(^{46}\):
   Only a leg of the animal to be given to the Chief. The hide of the spotted deer was also to be given to the Chief who used to give it to the pilgrims.

3. **Kanika** (1951).\(^{46(1)}\)
   Rs. 7-8-0 for each crocodile.

3. **Jeypore** (1941) \(^{48}\):
   - License fee for hill tribes : Rs. 2
   - License fee for other permanent residents : Rs. 5
   - License fee for touring officials : Rs. 10
   - License fee for visitors : Rs. 50

---

**Appendix-7**

**Reward for killing destructive animals for self-protection, etc.**

* (Talcher, 1937) \(^{49}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Reward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man eater tiger</td>
<td>15-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man eater leopard</td>
<td>10-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bears biting men</td>
<td>7-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild dog</td>
<td>5-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venomous snakes with hood</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venomous snakes without hood</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix-8**

**Fees charged for crop protection**

* (Athagad, 1947) \(^{50}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sambar</td>
<td>Rs. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Rs. 2-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutra</td>
<td>Rs. 1-4-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilgai</td>
<td>Rs. 2-8-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix-9**

**Remuneration for forest bethi**

1. **Keonjhar** (1930) \(^{51}\):
   One seer chuda & 6 paise per day, for kheda bethi\(^{241}\).

2. **Bonai** (1941) \(^{52}\):

---

\(^{241}\) The Prajatantra (then an weekly news paper) reported in its publication dtd. 8-12-1930 that people of the Anandpur locality were under serious tension for the proposed kheda operation in their area as they had been asked by the authorities to render compulsory services at their own arrangement inspite of the fact that their crops were ready for immediate harvesting. The Weekly again reported on 22-12-1930 that the new Raja (who had taken charge recently), after coming to know the distress of the people, visited the area & assured for compensation.
For forest line clearance, Re. 1 per mile of RF line and Rs. 1-8-0 per mile on common boundary line\(^{242}\). For repairs to Forest Beat Houses, payment made according to the quality and extent of work done.

### Appendix- 10

**Import duties (Sonepur, 1945)** \(^{53}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produce</th>
<th>Rate per head load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal &amp; coal</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire wood and cow dung cakes</td>
<td>0-0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles manufactured of bamboo or wood</td>
<td>0-0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teak &amp; Sal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. shaped beams &amp; planks</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. unshaped beams</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ballis</td>
<td>0-0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other wood:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. shaped beams &amp; planks</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. unshaped beams</td>
<td>0-0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ballis</td>
<td>0-0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatching grass</td>
<td>1.5 pies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix: 11

**Export duties (Bamra, 1945)** \(^{54}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produce/ article</th>
<th>Rate per maund (unless otherwise specified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mohwa</td>
<td>no export</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khus-khus</td>
<td>1-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey</td>
<td>4-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>5-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tol seeds</td>
<td>0-6-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusum seeds</td>
<td>0-10-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Char seeds</td>
<td>1-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harida</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahada</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amla</td>
<td>0-2-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarind</td>
<td>0-4-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunda cut (big)</td>
<td>0-8-0 each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{242}\) As per ODG, Sundargarh(p.321); it was Rs.3 per mile of forest line clearance.

\(^{243}\) Except for the first four articles & the last one, all other articles were import-duty-free. It may be noted here that the data furnished in Appendices 10 & 11 are not exclusive. Also, customs duty was levied only in some of the States(and not in all) and only some of them had some forest produce in this list.\(^{55}\)
Wooden sandal 0-0-3 for 2 pairs
Chair 0-2-0 each
Almirah (large) 1-0-0 each
Almirah (small) 0-8-0 each
Table (large) 0-8-0 each
Table (small) 0-4-0 each
Bench 0-4-0 each
Stool 0-1-0 each
Bamboo basket 0-0-3 for four
Mat (large) 0-0-3 each
Umbrella made of date palm leaves 0-0-3 each
Umbrella made of other leaves 0-0-3 for two
*Kula* (winnower): large 0-0-3 for four
Bobbins 0-8-0 to 1-0-0 per gross according to size
Handles of all kinds 0-0-3 per rupee of sale price
Bamboo & timber 0-0-3 per rupee of royalty paid

**Appendix – 12**

**Market Prices**

1. *Statement showing market prices f.o.r. Hemgir Road Station*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of produce</th>
<th>Rate in 1944-45 (?)</th>
<th>Pre-War Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire wood</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Rs. 45/- per wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>Rs. 750/- per wagon</td>
<td>Rs. 315/- per wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tramline sleepers</td>
<td>Rs. 12/- per 100</td>
<td>Rs. 6/- per 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3ft. long)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawn Timber</td>
<td>Rs. 2-12-0 per cft.</td>
<td>Rs. 0-12-0 per cft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballis (5&quot; to 8&quot; diam.)</td>
<td>Rs. 150/- to</td>
<td>Rs. 35 to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs. 200/- per 100</td>
<td>Rs. 112/- per 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. *Market price at Cuttack (mid-1930s)*:

Sawn Timber

- **Sal**: 1-2-0 to 1-8-0 Per cft.
- **Piasal**: 1-0-0 to 2-0-0 Per cft.
- **Sissoo**: 1-12-0 to 3-0-0 Per cft.
- **Gambhar**: 1-0-0 to 2-0-0 Per cft.
- **Bandhan**: 0-10-0 to 1-8-0 Per cft.
- **Teak**: 2-0-0 to 4-0-0 Per cft.
- **Misc. Species**: 0-8-0 Per cft.

- **Sal Logs**: 0-8-0 to 1-0-0 Per cft.
- **Piasal Logs**: 0-10-0 to 1-2-0 Per cft.

- **Myrobalan**: 0-6-0 to 0-8-0 Per Seer
To be revised and updated. We regret for unwanted changes during formatting. Contact author for clarifications either at vasundharanr@satyam.net.in or sunlit1968@yahoo.co.in.

Mahua flowers: 0-6-0 Per Seer
Mahua seeds: 0-2-0 Per Seer
Honey: 0-10-0 Per Seer
Horns: 0-6-0 Per Seer

3. Market price at Bhadrak (Balasore, 1890-1900) 58:

Fuel wood per seer: 0-0-3
Bamboo (medium size) of length 13": 1-0-0 (8 pieces)
Mango tree: Rs. 3 to Rs. 7 (per tree)
Banyan tree: Rs. 10

Other trees were sold in consideration of the quantity of fuel and average, at 0-4-0 per maund.

Appendix 13

Statement showing the cost of collection and selling price during 1949 in Jeypore Estate 245:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the produce</th>
<th>Collection cost</th>
<th>Selling Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamarind for ½ maund</td>
<td>Rs. 10</td>
<td>Rs. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrobalans for ½ maund</td>
<td>Rs. 3-7-0</td>
<td>Rs. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohua flowers for ½ maund</td>
<td>Rs. 1-8-0</td>
<td>Rs. 2-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendu leaves 1 bag</td>
<td>Rs. 4-0-0</td>
<td>Rs. 35/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild brooms 100 nos.</td>
<td>Rs. 9-8-0</td>
<td>Rs. 25/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siali leaves 30 seers</td>
<td>Rs. 8-12-0</td>
<td>Rs. 11/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohwa seeds for ½ maund</td>
<td>Rs. 7-12-0</td>
<td>Rs. 30/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix: 14

Statement showing cost for extracting BG sleeper to Sambalpur (Rairakhol, 1933) 60:

Sawing including felling and logging: 0-9-0
Stacking and dragging: 0-2-0
Carting: 1-12-0
Supervision: 0-4-0
Rejection, etc.: 0-6-0
Total: 3-1-0

The Railway price of BG sleeper at Sambalpur was Rs 7.

244 Royalty on Mahua flowers hardly find mention in the Garjat forest rules. We only know that in Nilgiri, it was charged @ 1-4-0 per maund. In Parlakhemundi, the rate seems to be 8-7-0 per cart load & 0-3-0 per head load. 570
245 MFP were sold by auction/ negotiation by the forest department.
Before 1933, cost of sawing including felling and logging was 0-14-0; but fall in the market price of sleeper reduced the rate.

**Appendix- 15**

**Statement showing the approximate value of forest produce exported from different sea-ports of Ganjam district**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>1829</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1831</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo horns</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2675 Pieces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboos</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1300 pieces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo mats</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>52 (1400 pieces)</td>
<td>53(1420 pieces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap nuts</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor oil seeds</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dammer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dammer planks</td>
<td>2717</td>
<td>2308</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1099 pieces)</td>
<td>(915 pieces)</td>
<td>(400 pieces)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dammer leaves</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61030 pieces)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(17647 pieces)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dammer wood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarind</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>3325</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Read also the following extracts of the letter dated 18-3-1836 of the Collector of Ganjam:

“xxx The greatest portion of the export is brought from the hill countries running parallel to the coast and country cart is the usual mode of conveyancy xxxx. There is no direct export to London or any parts of Europe from Ganjam xxxx.

The following are articles produced in the District which are in demand in Europe-

Timber, xxx, lack, Bees Wax, Turmeric, Dammer, Ginger, Hemp, Horns, Hides-

The hill countries are unexplored and their natural productions quite unknown”.
Appendix- 16

**Area of RFs in some ex-States (1944-45)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of State</th>
<th>Total area in sq. miles</th>
<th>Area of RFs in sq. miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athagad</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athamallik</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamra</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baramba</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boud</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonai</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daspalla</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhenkanal</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangpur</td>
<td>2492</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindol</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keonjhar</td>
<td>3096</td>
<td>1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khandapara</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narsinghpur</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayagarh</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilgiri</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pal-Lahra</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rairakhol</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranpur</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonepur</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talcher</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigiria</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix- 17

**Penalty for violation of forest rules (Ranpur, 1917?)**

Any person violating the rules prescribed for State forests, should be punished ‘with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months or with a fine not exceeding Rs. 500/- or with both and in addition to such punishment, compensation for damage done to the forest may be paid if the magistrate thinks desirable.’

Penalty for cattle trespassing into a reserved forest or in any portion of a protected forest which had been closed to grazing as follows:

- For each elephant: Rs. 1000/-
- For each buffalo / camel: Rs. 200/-
- For each horse, mare, bull, bullock, cow, pony, colt & filly: Rs. 80/-
- For each ram, goat and pig etc.: Rs. 40/-

---

247 It is not clear however if these also included ‘B’ Class reserves. But it included area proposed to be reserved during the year mentioned.

248 According to this report, Saraikela had 60 sq.miles of reserve forests while Kharsawan had 34 sq. miles of the same.
Appendix- 18

Selections from the Record of Rights

1. Nilgiri (as recorded in the Settlement Report of 1917-22):
   - No ryot can cut or consume any tree standing on his lands, but is entitled to fruits.
   - No ryot can grow miscellaneous crops in any unassessed Bagiat (orchard).

2. Baramba (as per the Settlement Report of 1924-25):
   - No ryot can grow miscellaneous crops on orchard lands but can plant fruit trees in the openings.
   - No ryot can cut any dead or windfall tree from State or private orchards and enjoy it.
   - The ryots should distribute fruits of State orchards, after they ripe, among themselves according to the custom prevailing in the village after the Chief takes his share.
   - Every ryot is bound to supply wood on payment of Khoraki for the construction of car.
   - Every ryot is bound to supply grass from Benapat for thatching of old palace and other State houses on receipt of Khoraki only.

3. Jeypore (as recorded in the Final Report on the Major Settlement Operations in Koraput district: (1938-64):
   - ‘As the right to all species of trees xxx standing on the patta land belong to the Samasthanam by custom prevailing in the Samasthanam and by the conditions of this contract’, the ryot has no right ‘to lop any branches of the trees and palmyra leaves or fell any trees’. He ‘should not waste or use the fruit of any fruit bearing trees on the patta land during the period of lease’.
   - ‘As the rights to beds & bunds of tanks belong to the Samasthanam’, the ryot has ‘no right whatever to remove or use the trees, palmyra leaves, fruits, thatch etc. grass which grow on such beds & bunds xxx’.

Appendix- 19

The Khonds & their Rajas

Read the following extracts of the letter dated 24-4-1842 of Captain McPherson, Principal Assistant to the Agent to the Governor in Ganjam 65:

“ The relation of these Khond tribes to the zemindaries in which they are respectively included was originally founded here, as I believe, in all similar cases elsewhere, upon a single common want, and was accompanied by forms which marked the relative power and civilization of the parties. Mutual aid against aggression was its first condition, whilst the Khonds, besides, generally assisted the Rajas in their offensive investiture, which were performed
at their accession by the patriarchs of the most important tribes; while the heads of the primitive races received from them in return, not as vassals, but as inferiors in ranks and civilization, the recognition of their ancient dignities, and such honorary apppellations as they were pleased to bestow.

The Khonds made also certain offerings of produce which did not impart any thing resembling feudal dependence, and the other chief public acts, by which they manifested their attachment, seem to have been that of the Dasserah festivals to eat buffaloes offered in sacrifice at the Hindu capitals, and that of giving their aid to drag the cars at the feast of Juggernauth; and generally speaking the same relation subsists between the same parties at the present day”.

Also read the following:

“The primary divisions or classes among the Khonds are three - namely, the Maliahs, or high landers, who were originally independent of the Zemindars, and to this day pay no tribute to them; the Benniahs, who occupy the outskirts of the hills and pay rents for the lands they hold; or account it by service at their choice; and the Bhetiah, a servile who hold lands on the condition of labour only. xxx”

Appendix- 20
Ex-State Kendu Leaf Policy

Kendu leaf produced in the Garjat States, especially in those of western Orissa, was of superior quality than those of other areas. The Garjat Chiefs had realised its commercial value and most of them monopolised it, which, though yielded considerable revenue to the State, went more or less against the poor people who depended on its collection for their livelihood.

In Patna, wherefrom Kendu leaf was exported to Calcutta and Madras, the Kendu leaf contractor had the sole right to sell bidis also and the lease agreement did not mention for payment to the cultivators for the leaves. Similarly, in Kalahandi, the Kendu leaf cultivators did not usually get more than the plucking charges because of the defective State rules.

---

249 The Maliah & Benniah Khonds of Ganjam district are said to be corresponding to the Dangria & Kachharia Khonds in other parts of Orissa respectively.
250 Bethias i.e. those who render bethi.
251 From April 1944, import duty @ 0-4-0 per thousand of Bidis was being charged in the State.
The State of Gangpur is said to have played a distinct role in the ex-State Kendu leaf trade:

“Prior to about 1925, Kendu leaves had virtually no market since the bidi, which is manufactured from them, only began to come into prominence around 1910 or even later. Gangpur was the first State in what was then the Orissa Feudatory States to develop business, and in 1924 the State secured some Rs. 22000/- from this source and was the envy of all other States in the areas. Since then, the industry has grown out of all proportion and has extended its activities to quite remote parts”.

In certain ex-States, the Kendu leaf monopoly extended even to cultivated holdings. In Sonepur, according to Ramdhyani, private consumption was however allowed in spite of the monopoly.

Some attempts were made, perhaps lately, to ensure that the pluckers got reasonable price. In Rairakhol, a five year lease (Kendu leaf), granted since 1941, fetched about one third of the total forest revenue. The monopoly extended to cultivated areas only, but as per the Standard Kendu Leaf Contract Paper prepared by the CFA (which the Garjats were supposed to follow), the agreement paper signed between the Dewan of Rairakhol State and M/S. Atha & Co. in 1946 contained the following clauses:

- Kendu leaves over 12" girth were prohibited for cutting.
- The lessee had no right to interfere with the removal of any Kendu tree or the fruit of it from any part whatsoever of the State if such tree/fruit was required for State purposes for local use only.
- (Clause:8)
  “Tenants of the State may collect the fruit & leaves of Kendu trees for their own bonafide use and the purchaser shall not interfere with their right to do so. But they shall not be entitled to sell or export Kendu leaves to which the purchaser shall have the sole right & title under this license”.

No rate was fixed in the lease agreement, but the purchaser was reportedly asked to employ inhabitants of the State at fair and reasonable rates and was not expected to employ any person found objectionable by the State Forest Officer.

In Athmallik, the monopoly was in both the State forests and cultivated lands. The contractor was found paying on average 0-0-1 only per 500/600 leaves. A separate order was passed whereby the contractor was required to pay 0-0-3 per 400 leaves, but it was not followed practically everywhere. Interestingly, most of the ex-State forest rules did not mention any specific rate for Kendu leaves in their schedule of rates.
At Service of the Great Lord

Orissa for centuries, has identified itself with the name of Lord Jagannath of Puri; and Puri was even simply known as ‘Jagannath’. The cult of Jagannath (literally meaning, Lord of the Universe) has certain mysterious greatness of distinction which has attracted people from all over the world to Puri in spite of the denial of access to the non-Hindus to the temple interior and a few other negative factors.

The cult itself dates back at least to 12th century A.D. and the images / idols of Jagannath & his accompanying two (or three, including Sudarshan) deities, which are carved in some distinguished variety of Neem wood (and not sandal wood as Adul Fazel described), have a shape or figure which does not exactly resemble the usual human-like images of gods and helps us to go beyond our limited conceptions or popular imaginations of the Almighty.

The Gajapati Raja of Khurdha, who had control over the Jagannath temple, enjoyed his special status also because of the great Lord (Jagannath) and the Garjat Chiefs, who were feudatories under him, had to obey certain restrictions whenever they wanted to visit the temple.

Each year the four divinities come out of the temple to visit their aunt’s house (temple) and it is then that people, irrespective of their caste and religion, get an opportunity to see them. The carriage used for the deities is called Rath, an ‘immense machine’ (as Hamilton described in 1820) resembling the general form of the temple; and the festival is called ‘Rath Yatra’ or Car Festival, usually observed during June-July.

It is said that a few centuries before, a river was flowing across the route to the deities’ aunt’s house. So total six Raths had to be constructed each year, three used on either side of the river to complete the journey of the deities. But by 16th century, this river was managed to be buried there and thus, the number of Raths required was reduced to three (Baliyarsing: 1998).

The Garjat Chiefs, either because of their devotion for Lord Jagannath or being urged or asked by the Gajapati, were sending certain provisions to Puri either regularly or irregularly. Motte, for example, found the Raja of Boud sending fruit and money etc. as his (Raja) annual tribute for the Lord, during his visit in the 18th century. According to Dr. Hermann Kulke, iron necessary for the cars was procured from Dhenkanal and Talcher while Ranpur provided ropes for their construction and dragging.

But the most important requirement was timber. The Raths were demolished and newly constructed each year for the great Lord was not expected to ride an old carriage. So each year, huge amount of timber was required for the re-construction and the major supply came from Daspalla. It is said that formerly the timber was being procured from Banpur area, but in the year 1670-71 (during the rule of Mukunda Deva) Daspalla started sending the supply (Mishra: 1979). However, there are reports that people were sent by the

252 Sometimes the restrictions imposed by the Gajapati were humiliating to them causing discontent.
253 However, at least during the late 1940s, no such supply was being carried out from Ranpur.
Gajapati in 1749, to Banpur to procure timbers from the forest on the boundaries of Ghumsur and Athagad (a zamindary of Ganjam) probably because of some difficulty in getting/bringing the timber from Daspalla and in return, the Rajas of these two Estates were honoured with turbans specially sent from the temple (Kulke: 1982)87, which had considerable religious and political significance. But Daspalla continued to be the regular supplier and during the Maratha rule in Orissa, when the Raja of Daspalla annexed the Jorum (Jormuha) pragana from Angul in 1775, the Marathas exempted him from the tribute to be paid for this annexed tract, in consideration of the Raja supplying, free of all cost, ‘all timber’ required for the Puri Car festival25488.

Mooney, in his working plan for the Daspalla forests prepared during the late 1930s, gives a detail description of the supply89:

“xxx the State supplies annually to Puri all the timber required for xxx the Jaganath Rath xxx. The approximate value of timber so supplied free is nearly Rs. 1000/- and the details of what is required is as follows”:

- Asan 2 ft girth…………………500
- Dhaura 3ft girth………………..290
- Phasi logs 12 ft x 5 ½ ft ………60
- Arjun, Jamun logs 12 ft x 5 ½…..12

But these 862 pieces of timber were not sufficient and an additional supply of considerable quantity belonging even to species other than those mentioned (for ex., Kadamba) have been procured from the Ranpur forests25590.

The whole process was carried out under a number of designations. First, the Kathakata paikas would carry the royal requisition for timber, from Puri to Daspalla. The Charcheita paikas would present holy food and other religious objects of Sri Jagannath to the Aranya Nayaks of Daspalla and Ranpur; and invite them for the felling operations. The Katali Nayaks were engaged in the felling operations directly (Sahu:1999)91.

The timber from Daspalla was rafted down in the Mahanadi (Bruttanga) river, attached with 7 boats. The water level required for the purpose was 33 feet or more; and precautions were taken to ensure that the logs would not sink. It was taking three days to reach the destination92 i.e. Hulahulia ghat near Kathapola, just few miles away from Puri. From there, the timber were carted to Puri, the carts being sent by some of the Maths of Puri who, in return, were entitled to get the holy rope used for dragging the cars93.

Needless to say, that alternative arrangements were made if the water-way became unpassable or timber could not be procured from Daspalla (Kulke: 1982)94.

Models of Puri were imitated in different parts of Orissa and many Garjat Chiefs built local Jagannath temples; even local car festivals were organised regularly. The timber

254 It is said that the Gajapati asked the Raja of Daspalla to supply timber for the Raths and the latter agreed95.

255 During the Darbar period, such timber was being transported from the Ranpur State Forests first to Kalupada Pentha by carts wherefrom it was being floated down the Chilika lake to reach its destination96.
required for such local Raths was supplied first by the local people and later by the ex-State forest departments (though people were still engaged in cutting & carrying the timber mostly on bethi, the role of the forest department being confined to selection/marking of the timber/tree and supervising the whole operation).

Raja Sarangadhara Narendra (1727-1754) initiated the Rath Yatra at Ranpur. Total five Raths were constructed each year in Ranpur, three big ones like those of Puri and two small ones for two other deities. The annual requirements were as follows.

- Green sal 2' to 6' girth - 193 pieces
- Misc. timber 1' to 4' girth - 1126 pieces
- Cane - 800 pieces
- Bamboos of girth 6' and over - 146 pieces
- Fiber (creepers etc.) for ropes - 24 cart loads.

These requirements were mostly supplied from the Mal area. The Forest Adviser of Orissa States suggested in 1946 to discontinue the annual construction of Raths in Ranpur so as to check such huge consumption through he was not against the supply of timber for repairs and also for reconstruction when the Raths got old. After merger, construction of two small Raths have been stopped and the Forest Adviser’s suggestion have been followed to some extent.

Government has been trying to reduce/control the annual timber consumption for the Puri Raths, especially when Phasi timber in the Daspalla forests is decreasing considerably. On one hand, a separate plantation project (Jagannatha Vana Prakalpa) has been initiated for the purpose and on the other hand, the head carpenters in charge of the construction of each Rath have been suggested to use timber of other species as substitutes. The carpenters believe, according to their tradition, that different species are suitable for different parts of the Rath; but they also understand the present position and are gradually willing to follow the government advice on trial basis at least. It may be noted here that they and their forefathers have been constructing such huge Raths based on indigenous engineering and it is natural that they would not like to take any risk as life of thousands is associated with their work. But as one of them told us, they have already been making adjustments as sometimes the timber supplied was found lower in the required girth/quality. So we can expect that in the coming years, the age-old tradition of Puri Raths would undergo certain changes as per the ground reality.

Appendix-22

Bhamaramari: The Legend of Keonjhar Forests

For centuries, the name of Keonjhar was associated with that of a medicinal plant or tree. This plant, known as Bhramaramari, was recognised by its capacity to attract and kill black-bees (bhramara) and hence the name (i.e. killer of the black-bees).

Bhramaramari was hailed for its power to cure leprosy. Royal records of Keonjhar prove that not only leprosy patients came from far and near to Keonjhar in search of this medicine, but also the Keonjhar Darbar received royal requisitions from other States for the same and responded accordingly.
This plant was found somewhere in the south-eastern forests of Keonjhar; a local tribal priest known as Dehuri had the family tradition of locating this plant and collecting its timber. Certain rituals were associated with the whole process as Bhramaramari was being considered as a divine medicine and each year, according to the royal custom of Keonjhar, a royal requisition accompanied by various objects of worship was being sent to the Dehuri, who, after following the traditional rituals, collected some portion (timber) from the Bhramaramari plant and sent it to the palace where it was being received with honour and stored. Patients and their relatives who came from various places in the hope of getting their medicine, were distributed the little amount of timber required for the purpose free of cost, from the palace, this timber being the central ingredient in the mixture of 22 different herbs. This way, what seemed to be a kind of monopoly of the Keonjhar Rajas, actually turned out to be in the interest of the people for whom it was no more required to wander here and there in search of the herb.

It is said that Raja Dhanurjay Bhanja himself suffered from leprosy and though he was gradually recovering from the disease, he died before being cured completely.

Keonjhar remained under the Court of Wards from 1907. Still the tradition continued from some time. Later, the Raja of Keonjhar perhaps no more wanted to be associated with the system directly and authorised his royal physician (Ayurvedic) to take the responsibility. Accordingly, the physician was paying certain amount to the Dehuri who was supplying him the timber of Bhramaramari. Patients collected either the timber or the ready-made mixture from this physician (called Vaidya) on payment of certain fees. A leaflet describing the formula of the mixture as well as the dosage was distributed to the patients by the Vaidya. After his death, his son and grand son tried to continue the tradition, but during 1990s it was no more alive. On one hand, the grand son of the Vaidya, who assumed an active role in this business in comparison to his brothers, died suddenly; and on the other hand, modern systems of treatment had reduced the demand of this traditional cure.

The Dehuri revealed to us some thing more interesting. He said that he had never seen the Bhramaramari tree and that the tree had been extinct by his father’s life time. His father, however, had helped him recognise Sahajamari, a plant having some of the properties of Bhramaramari. Sahajamari has also been described in ayurvedic texts to have the power of curing leprosy and the Dehuri, like his father, had been actually supplying the roots of Sahajamari to the Vaidya and his successors, as well as to those who came to him directly. According to him, using Sahajamari as a substitute has also cured leprosy patients.

Many questions still remain unanswered. For ex., is Bhramaramari still found in Keonjhar, as claimed by some people? Or, is Sahajamari genetically related to Bhramaramari? The answers are not known definitely, neither did we have the opportunity to probe into the whole matter without any limitation. Further research might enlighten us in this regard.
Appendix-23

Where forests yield oranges

‘Forests of excellent orange trees’ – this is what A.M. Russel, then the Settlement Officer of Sambalpur (1875), discovered near the famous Narsinghanath temple (situated on the Gandhamardan hills of Borasambar ex-Estate)\(^{256}\)\(^{110}\).

Elliott, in his report on the Kalahandi State (1856), had described that orange of fine quality was being cultivated in the State in considerable quantity; but the cultivation was not indigenous and was perhaps introduced from some neighbouring country like Jeypore\(^{111}\).

Besides British efforts, sometimes the Rajas and the local people had started orange cultivation on their own interest. In Mayurbhanj State, for ex., orange plantations had been tried at the Pithabata complex\(^{112}\).

Climatic conditions around the Ramagiri hills of southern Orissa being very favourable for this cultivation, orange was produced in considerable quantity there by the 1\(^{st}\) half of 20\(^{th}\) century. Surprisingly however, as found by a young visitor to this area in 1948, this fruit, helping a lot of local tribals to earn their bread, was collected in such a huge quantity that the tribals shared their produce willingly with the local officers as bhets (free of cost), but they themselves could not enjoy ‘even a single orange’. And the reason he discovered thereof was something very unusual and it was their own religious belief. Unless until a particular religious day (Nuakhai, i.e. first enjoyment of the new crop) was observed, nobody was expected to taste it\(^{113}\). But by the time this day came, it was too late; for nature cannot wait to continue providing ripe oranges even after the season is over.

The ex-Zamindari of Surangi is situated in this climatic region and had been one of the most important orange producing regions of Orissa\(^{114}\). It also had some ‘Kamala vana’ (orange forests) at least during the early decades of 20\(^{th}\) century\(^{114(0)}\). These tribals used to sell their produce at Surangi- the headquarters of this Zamindari. It is not clear if they enjoyed any concession in this regard, but following were the rates of royalty charged on oranges and other like fruits in the Surangi ex-Estate by the forest officials\(^{115}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fruit</th>
<th>Per Cart Load</th>
<th>Per Bhar</th>
<th>Per Head Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>4-0-0</td>
<td>0-5-4</td>
<td>0-2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon &amp; Tabha</td>
<td>1-4-0</td>
<td>0-1-8</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naranga(i)</td>
<td>0-12-0</td>
<td>0-1-0</td>
<td>0-0-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{256}\) We however were told by the Borasambar royal family that what they had been finding in that area for the last two generations were some Narangi trees (and not orange trees), that too not in a very huge number\(^{116}\).
Appendix– 24

A Zamindari Patta

“This zamindary pottah is granted to brother Padman Singh, and it is to the effect that the two garhs, Thuamal and Deypur, were given to you. Since today you, your son and grandson etc., will enjoy the zamindary on zamindary tenure, paying me annually a sum of Rs. 300 as revenue and supplying me 300 sepoys and being in my service.

If any one will break the above-mentioned conditions, the zamindary will be taken away from him. The Maharaja of Kalahandi has consent to the writing of this copper pottah. The sun and the moon bear witness to it. Dated 13th day of the moon, fortnight of the month of Chait of Samat 1739257.

Durga Madhab Singh” 117.

Appendix– 25

Brahmottar Pattas

1. Grant made by Raja Nrusingha Narayan Bhanja (1727-36) of Keonjhar 118:

"xxx circumstances led me to kill some Brahmmins in my kingdom and to counteract the effects of that sin xxx, I have founded and granted one village named Narsinghpur. xxx I have also granted all the trees, fishes, xxx, tenants and subjects within that village boundary for the income of the holders of this village".

2. Grant made by Raja Sarangadhara Narendra (1727-54) of Ranpur in the name of his spiritual master119:

"xxx having received the Holy Name from Sri Gosain Mohaprabhu, I hereby grant xxx, from Kandha Nuagada xxx, from Purunabasta xxx, from Pataberena village xxx and also one Mango tope along with 80 trees as sacrificial fee. I have granted the trees, fishes, xxx, timber, stones xxx of this land xxx in perpetuity. xxx The more garhs I shall annex by the blessings of Sri Gosain Mahaprabhu, shall grant him 100 Kahans258 of land per each such garh xxx".

257 i.e. 1682 A.D.
258 Here a land measure.
3. Grant made by the Thatraja\textsuperscript{259} of Bissam-Katak \textsuperscript{120}:

"xxxxxxxxxx
From this day onwards, by cutting down & planting trees xxx in this village xxx, enjoy xxx so long as the moon lasts xxx".

Appendix-26

Forest politics: damaging tribal non-tribal relationship

The importance of forests has sometimes made them and also the people dependent on them, victims of political conspiracy. For ex., as the Prajatantra (dtd. 3-4-1948) alleged, people in the Saraikela State were forced to recognise the authority of the Bihar Government over the local forests though the area was still under the jurisdiction of Orissa Government. It seems that officers of the Bihar Government were behind this kind of harassment and the role of the local rulers was also found to be controversial in the whole matter.

The Kanika royal family alleges that the Praja meli of Kanika (1920s) was also politically motivated. According to this ‘concept’, it all started when the Gouds were restricted in their habit of exploiting the leaves of a local plant (which were believed to increase the density of the milk considerably when consumed by the buffaloes, thus creating ample opportunity for adulteration) indiscriminately. It is said that the protest thus started led to litigation and finally assumed the form of a meli with support from the leaders of Orissa\textsuperscript{260}\textsuperscript{121}.

In 1941, it was reported to the Deshamangal Committee (which was created in support of the Gangpur Raja) that some of the ‘disloyal’ people were denying the use of any forest material to the local ryots (non-tribal) saying that the village forest of their area was existing for the Adivasi (tribals) alone \textsuperscript{122}. These disloyal people seem to be non other than the local Mundas who had been agitating since 1930s. In June 1947, a non tribal leader Padmanava Pati held a meeting at village Kanerkella of Hatibari (one of the areas affected by Munda agitations) and asked the people ‘not to allow Adivasis fuel from Khasra forest’. Pati also organised some rituals for the well being of the ruler & his subjects \textsuperscript{123}.

The reports from the State of Gangpur show a trend the reverse of which was found in Saraikela and Nilgiri. In all the three States, one factor i.e. some grievances of the local tribals, appears to have created the platform for what happened later; but while in Gangpur the tribals themselves led to an increasing conflict with the non-tribals thereby

---

\textsuperscript{259} Military chieftain or commander of troops  
\textsuperscript{260} This allegation however does not appear to disapprove the fact that people in the Kanika zamindari were being variously exploited by the ruler. Relationship between the Raja & the tenants was worse even during 1930s and though the ruler announced certain concessions (e.g., free use of forest produce on the eastern side of the river Matai and recognition of the right of tenants to the trees of their holdings, etc.) in 1937, the tenants considered it inadequate. \textsuperscript{120}\textsuperscript{120}
creating an opportunity for political exploitation of the situation; in Saraikela & Nilgiri, the Rajas appeared to have resorted to the policy of ‘divide & rule’ to counter-act the anti-feudal movements in their States. Creating an opportunity for political exploitation of the situation; in Saraikela & Nilgiri, the Rajas appeared to have resorted to the policy of ‘divide & rule’ to counter-act the anti-feudal movements in their States. Creating an opportunity for political exploitation of the situation; in Saraikela & Nilgiri, the Rajas appeared to have resorted to the policy of ‘divide & rule’ to counter-act the anti-feudal movements in their States. 

In Nilgiri, there was already some discontent among the tribals regarding their land / agrarian rights. These people alleged they had been deprived of their rights sometimes by the non-tribals. The Raja arranged for exploiting this grievance in his favour and the tribals started wide-spread disturbances like plundering and forcefully seized the paddy in the fields of non-tribals.

Forest grievance was also another factor exploited by the Raja for his purpose. For ex., he decided to leave to the tribals the only couple of Athakhunta region and the latter promised him all possible help. This decision caused great difficulty for thousands of non-tribal residents of that area who had been depending on the same couple for bonafide requirements. The Forest Officer realised the problem and reported to the Raja accordingly, but the ruler reproached him saying that he (the officer) was a Prajamandalist.

The disturbances ultimately led to the declaration of independence by the Prajamandal as the Raja did not respond to its ultimatum for controlling the situation. On 4th November 1947, the Prajamandal formed its won (parallel) ‘Government’ called ‘Ajad Nilagiri Sarkar’. But as the Orissa Government took over the administration of Nilgiri on 14th November in favour of the Prajamandal, the latter declared that there was no more need for interference by the Ajad Nilagiri Sarkar & also requested to the Govt. of Orissa to take the following measures:

- Newly reclaimed lands be first allotted to the land-less people, especially to the tribals & scheduled caste people on priority basis.
- Tribals & other people be freely allowed to sell the MFP as per the schedule of rate fixed by the Government.
- Forest rules be relaxed so as to grant more privileges to the tribals for hunting purposes.

Appendix: 27

Tribal tradition of forest conservancy

It was the belief of the Madras Estates Land Act Committee that if ‘the rules observed by the ancestors of the present hill-tribes have been strictly followed, there would have been no danger of denudation of forests xxx’.

During his visit to an area in northern Orissa, Kittoe found how with his arrival, the males of a village managed to flee to the jungle (probably in fear):

“ It is the common practice throughout these provinces; the instant strangers are perceived, off the people run (as if their lives were at stake) and hid in the depths of jungle in a moment:- it is to facilitate their escape that the jungle is never

261 But in all the three States, tribal leaders from Ranchi were actively involved.
entirely cleared near the villages; a narrow belt connected with the forest is usually to be found”. (Kittoe: 1839) 129

In Mayurbhanj, the Santals had a tradition of burying their dead under Sal trees. That is how the British found a *jahira* (small Sal forest) in ‘every’ Santal village. During the Settlement Operations in Bamanghati area of the State, the authorities also proposed to make use of this traditional practice for forest conservation purposes 130.

Appendix-28 131

**List of reserved species in some ex-States / Estates**

*Talcher*
Sal, Piasal, Kendu, Kusum, Mohula, Khair, Asan, Simal, Sissoo, Bandhan.

*Narsinghpur*

*Tigiria*
Sal, Bija, Sissoo, Gambhari, Kusum, Kurum, Kendu, Harida, Amba, Khair, Bandhana, Kongra, Suam or Rohini, Sunari, Kamalagundi, Bara, Pipal or Osta, Neem, Jamun, Asan Canes, Palas.

*Baramba*
Sal, Bija, Sissoo, Gammar, Kusum, Kurum, Kendu, Harida, Amba, Khair, Tentuli, Mahula, Panas, Kuchila, Bandhan, Kongara, Suam Sunari, Kamalagundi, Bara, Pipal, Neem, Jamun, Asan, Palas.

*Athagarh*
Sal, Piasal, Sissoo, Gambhar, Kusum, Kurum, Kendu, Harida, Amla, Mango, Khair, Tentuli, Mahula, Panas, Kuchila, Bandhana, Kongra, Suam, Salap, Saguan, Arjun, Karanja, Sunari, Bahada, Jamun, Nageswar, Asan, Char, Palas.

*Athamalik*
Sal, Bija, Kurum, Sissoo, Amba, Mahula, Gambhari, Bandhan, Khajuri, Kusum, Palas.

*Mayurbhanj*

*Boudh*
Sal, Bija, Sissoo, Bandhan, Kendu, Gambhari, Khair, Amba, Kochila, Panas, Tentuli, Harida, Mohula, Kamalagundi, Bela, Kusum, Jamu, Sunari, Suam, Char, Kurum, Tal, Khajuri, Simal, Teak, Amla, Bahada and Asan.

*Patna*
Teak, Sal, Bandhan, Mahul, Bijja, Kusum, Kendu, Palas, Sissoo, Harida, Simul, Khair.
Sonepur
Teak, Sal, Bandhan, Mahul, Sissoo, Bija, Kusum, Khair, Rohini, Palas, Harida, Gambhari, Sahaj, Anla, Mundi, Halanda.

Bonai
Sal, Sissoo, Bija, Bandhan, Kurum, Kendu, Kusum, Mahul, Am and Palas.

Bamra
Sal, Sissoo, Piasal, Bandhan, Gambhari, Sahaj, Khair, Kurum, Rohini, Karanj, Suam, Mahul, Palas, Kendu, Harida, Char, Kusum, and other edible fruit bearing trees.

Hindol
Sal, Piasal, Sissoo, Gambhari, Khair, Mahula, Bandhan, Kendu, Kochila, Kusum, Amba, Kurum.

Pal-Lahra
Saguan, Sal, Piasal, Sissoo, Gambhari, Kendu, Kusum, Kurum, Asan, Harida, Bahada, Anla, Ambo, Tentuli, Mahula, Panas, Kochila, Khair, Bandhan, Kongra, Suam, Nageswar, Jamu, Sarap, Sunari and Palas.

Dhenkanal
Sal, Piasal, Kangra, Sunari, Mahula, Kusum, Kochila, Rohini, Bandhan, Khair, Khajuri.

Kalahandi
Teak, Sal, Sissoo, Bija, Bandhan, Kendu, Sahaj, Khair, Harida, Kusum, Sunari, Tentuli, Char, Panasha, Mango, Mahula, Lodha, Bahada, Halanda, Dhau, Sina, Mundi and Rohini.

Navagarh
Sal, Piasal, Sissoo, Bandhan, Ghosara, Kendu, Gambhari, Amba, Khair, Kuchila, Panas, Tentuli, Harida, Mohula, Gundi, Neem, Bela, Kaitha, Kusum, Sunari, Karanja, Suam, Char, Kurum, Jamun, Baro, Sagun, Churangia, Simul, Bheru, Tala, Sarap and Khajuri. 262

Daspalla
Sal, Piasal, Sissoo, Bandhan, Amba, Khair, Kuchila, Panas, Harida, Mohula, Kamalagundi, Kusum, Sunari, Kurum, Khajuri and Phasi.

Khandapara
Sal, Piasal, Sissoo, Bandhan, Kendu, Gambhari, Amba, Khair, Kuchila, Panas, Tentuli, Harida, Mohula, Kamalagundi, Neem, Kusum, Karanja, Suam, Char, Jamun, Baro, Osoth, Sunari, Anla, Kurum.

Rairakhol
Sal, Piasal, Sissoo, Gambhari, Kusum, Harida, Amba, Mohul, Tamarind, Khair, Bandhan, Jamun, Asan, Kendu, Arjun.

262 The number was later reduced to12. 131(l)
Nilgiri
Sal, Bija, Kendu, Harida, Kusum, Mahul, Kochila, Bandhan, Assan, Sunari, Char.

Dharakote
Teak, Sissoo, Piasal, Harida, Tentuli, Salua, Mohula, Amba, Panas, Bheru, Muktamanja, Karanja, Sahaj, Khair, Kendu and Sahan.

Khalikote and Athagado

Bodokhemundi
Bahada, Harida, Amba, Muktamunja, Kainya, Mohua, Panas, Sundargundi, Koitho.

Sanakhemundi
Mango, Tamarind, Mohul, Sal, Bija, Sissoo, Karam (Haland), Janu, Teak, Gambhar, Mundi.

Jarada
Sal, Piasal, Sissoo, Khalasahaj, Tangini, Bheru, Kasi, Harida, Mohula, Gambhar, Sunari, Halanda, Kendu, Jack, Amba, Tamarind, Soapnut, Teak, Babul, Kusum

Appendix-29
Concessions on reserved species
(Bamra:1924)

- Catechu makers allowed to cut Khair trees of or over 2’ girth.
- Lac cultivation allowed in Assan trees in specified areas.
- Branches of Kusum, Palas, Barakoli and Dumburi trees for a girth of 6" or less can be cut for lac cultivation.

Appendix-30
A Raja's 'Masterplan'

Kanika was the largest coastal Estate of Orissa with an area of 440 sq. miles and had extensive mangrove forests. It seems that the rulers of this Estate had realised the ecological significance of the mangroves at least a few decades before the Estate abolition & besides having a strict regulation for their forest resources, did not allow Hental (one of the most important mangrove species) to be cut for domestic/agricultural purposes though it was considered to be very useful for house building etc. Only leaves (pincha) of this plant were allowed in specified quantity for roofing purposes (Mohanty:1992).

Also, some of the coastal forest tracts were either reserved (for ex., from Gahiramatha to Uttarapurvanasi and the eastern as well as southern jungles of the saline embankment
from Gopinathpur mausa to Baro mausa; and the Banipahi jungles of Balasore coast) or protected.  

Shailendra Narayan Bhanja Deo was the last ruler (1949-) of this zamindari. He did not possess any technical qualification, but his interests led him to develop significant expertise in oceanic and meteorological sciences. So it is not surprising to know that he was the Chairman of Orissa Floods Enquiry Committee (Mohanty: 1999).

The subjects of his interest also included forests. "He was very keen on that…" recalled an ex-PCCF of Orissa. And thus resulted his 'Masterplan' of afforestation as a protective measure against cyclones.

As per this plan, there should be a three-phase afforestation along the coast: the first phase should comprise of shrub jungles; the second phase, of mangroves (for at least five kilometres across the zone); and the third phase, of casurina plantations (Mohanty: 1999).

Unfortunately, it is alleged, this and many other suggestions of Shailendra Narayan were not given due importance. But the super cyclone of 1999 has certainly made it urgent to reconsider such plans of the late Raja & we can hope that all the concerned departments & organisations would take steps in this direction.

Appendix-31

Mooney: The Pioneer of Garjat Forestry

For some of his colleagues, he was almost like a superman (of forestry); and for the departmental staff of a generation next of his, he has become a legend. A personification of sincerity, dutifulness and diligence; he was Dr. H.F. Mooney, I.F.S.; the pioneer of Garjat forestry.

As AFO/CFA, Mooney remained in service for about 20 years from 1928 till the year of merger with a break of 5 years from 1930 (FECR: 1959). It was a crucial period: while on one hand he had to advance the work started by his predecessors in favour of the Garjat forests, war demands as well as Prajamandal agitations were two of his major concerns requiring changes in the contemporary policy. But he often managed to cope with the situation successfully.

There are many legends about his peculiar temperament. For ex., how he gave promotion to a subordinate official who had refused to allow him stay in a forest rest house as (Mooney) had failed to provide documentary evidence in support of his identity & claim to use the rest house, or how violently he reacted while finding a staff lax in his duty. Also, Sri Raj Kishore Bhanja remembers how, during a visit of Mooney to the Nakithana-Patia site in Ranpur, he (Bhanja) & his colleagues had to face an irritated Mooney Saheb simply because they had cleared away some of the bushes for his convenience. They did not know the Saheb's ideology that a forester should move through the forests on 'as is where is' basis.

Mooney had his own way of getting his purpose fulfilled by the ruling chiefs. Raja Kadamba Keshari Deo of Bonai recalled before us (1999) how, during his days as a
student in the famous Raj Kumar College (which used to have students from the royal families) at Raipur, Dr. Mooney would occasionally pay visits to their college and would try to intimate the princes with their own (State) forest resources through his interesting lectures/demonstrations.\footnote{Mooney’s role was not free from controversy. Sometimes, his advice and measures seemed to go against the people. His entire energy during the World War-II was devoted ‘to looking after the interests of the States in their relation to the war effort’.\footnote{Still, one thing is clear that he did a lot for the preservation of the ex-State forests. As he himself said in the 1940s, he wanted to continue his service as he was now interested in the post-war reconstruction. He also reportedly tried sometimes for the development of forest-dwellers & even helped a poor boy of Keonjhar financially for his education. The Annual Administration Report of Rairakhol State for the year 1943-44 acknowledges Mooney’s role in the improvement of communications, water-supply as well as in village development of the State ‘for which the services of the Chief Forest Adviser were readily available’.

Mooney was the Secretary to the Eastern States Board of Forestry & Agricology. He has to his credit, a supplement to the Botany of Bihar & Orissa (by Haines) and also a number of working plans. It is said that his working plans used to be comparatively simple & concise because he was of the opinion that such plans should be so prepared that the lower-grade officials, who actually implement the plan in the field, could easily understand & follow them.

This Irish gentleman seemed to love Orissa & was quite interested particularly in the Shimilipal forests which was not under his control.

He was intimately involved with the Nicholson’s Forest School at Champua, (Keonjhar) & was sending New Year messages etc. to this School even after leaving India.

The Orissa Government has named the Forest Guard School at Angul after him in his honour. He was so active that he toured extensively in the forests throughout the year and even used to type his official documents himself instead of waiting for the concerned staff. Often he wandered through the forests just with an axe without taking any modern weapon for self-defense, that too on foot. Also, he was very attentive & remembered sharply which plant was found where.

He was amongst the few missionaries of forestry who still lives in the memories of his contemporary staff as well as in the legacies.}

\footnote{It is not surprising to know that the Maharaja of Patna, then the Chairman of Eastern States Board of Forestry & Agriculture (later Agricology) favoured for an extension of 3 years of Mooney’s tenure.}
Appendix-32

Rules for Rimi

(Bamra:1924)

1. No rimi shall be flayed or cut into pieces before it is examined by a Forest Officer. Persons finding any rimi shall forthwith send information to the nearest Forest Officer and have it examined by a Forest Officer before it is cut up & meat divided amongst the villagers who are according to the existing custom, entitled to the meat.

2. Where there is a likelihood of the Rimi becoming petrified, the man in possession of the 'Rimi' shall have it examined by a school master & Punchaet(Panchayat) of his village before the 'Rimi' is flayed or cut up. The horns and hide shall be sent to the Forest Officer having jurisdiction over the village.

3. Any person or persons violating the above conditions or making any fraud in respect of such 'Rimi' shall be liable to pay the State double the fee fixed for shooting such animal.

Appendix 33

Gender bias in forest regulation

In 1946, the Dewan of Nilgiri State wrote to the Political Agent that while under the Gangpur Panchayat Act only males were entitled for voting in the Panchayat elections, both males and females 'have been made eligible for standing for election to the Panchayat as well as for voting', in the Nilgiri Panchayat Act though the latter was drawn on the lines of the Gangpur Panchayat Act.

Forest rules of different ex-States hardly mention about any concession for women. Only the following concessions have been found therein:

- Forest(fuel) cess on widows was either free or the lowest in Mayurbhanj State.
- In Patna and Athmallik, lower caste male firewood sellers were charged 1-8-0 as the annual license fee while the female sellers had to pay 0-12-0 i.e. 50% less.
- In Khandapara, the lower caste male fuelwood sellers had to pay 0-8-0 per month while the females were required to pay 0-4-0 only (per month).

Appendix-34

Legal status of village forests

Forest rules in Narsinghpur State were introduced in 1933. As per these rules, consideration was to be given to the amount of Khesra left before reservation could be made. Ironically however, almost all the reservation had been completed by the time of introduction of these rules. So there was little scope left for giving any such 'due consideration'.

---

Rimi means & includes the carcass of any wild animal excluding such as have been shot or otherwise killed by man. (Bonai Rules)
In States like Rairakhol and Narsinghpur, some Khesra forests were outside the village boundary while in the Sambalpur zamindaris, some forests within the village area had been restricted to the tenants for free access and were treated like reserved forests. It seems that inferiority (in comparison to the value of reserved forests) was often a major factor, which decided the status of any forest as Khesra irrespective of its occurrence with respect to the village boundary.

In Boud, Khesra included all wasteland while in Patna, village waste was not included in Khesra.

In principle, Khesra was meant for the requirements of the local villagers. But practically, the States often used to see it just like any other sources of revenue. For ex., timber from Khesra was generally not for export in the Athmallik State, but the rules provided that the State might allow such exports. In fact, war supplies had been made by this State from its Khesra forests. In Nilgiri, the rules provided sale of timber from Khesra to the traders.

This simply shows that not the villagers but the State was the actual right-owner of the village forests.

In some States, these village forests were under the dual control of the Forest Department and Revenue Department. One of the reasons behind this dual control seems to be the provision for reclamation of such forests. For ex., in Athmallik State, for reclamation of Khesra, the Revenue Department was the sanctioning authority; but the Forest Department was to clarify if any valuable trees existed in the area proposed for reclamation. Also, permits for removing forest produce from such forests were issued by the Forest Department. It was the Revenue Department which collected the forest cess, but the Forest Department used to collect the royalty on forest produce.

In Nayagarh, Khesra (or, Protected Khesra) existed independent of gramya jungle (literally meaning, village forests). Gramya jungles were essentially within the village boundary. For villages having no gramya jungle, Khesras had been created and portions of Khesra had been allotted for such villages. Each of such villages had rights only in its corresponding portion of Khesra.

Both Khesra & gramya jungles were under the Revenue Department (in Nayagarh). It was this department which used to allow timbers of reserved species (in Khesra) to the fire affected people etc.. Leases for reclamation in Khesra were being given by the Revenue Department on the basis of the valuation report provided by the Forest Department.

In Ranpur, Khesra was under the Forest Department; but no leases were granted in Khesra. People of one village could get forest produce from the Khesra near other villages on permission from the Forest Department.

In Hindol, the area of RFs was increased by 20 sq. miles during the Settlement operations between 1912-1921, at the expense of village forests. People in Gangpur reportedly expressed their discontent regarding the conversion of some Khesra forests of the State into reserves in 1947.
To be revised and updated. We regret for unwanted changes during formatting. Contact author for clarifications either at vasundharanr@satyam.net.in or sunlit1968@yahoo.co.in.

Appendix-35

Braving the King's anger: A little known Forester

His name was Anam Pradhan, the meaning of the first name being ‘unnamed’ on ‘nameless’. He joined the Athmallik State services as a clerk in 1941, but was recommended for Forester's training because of his qualification (i.e. matriculation with second class). After training, he joined the State Forest Department as a Trained Forester in 1943.

Activities of the Prajamandal were going on in Athmallik and other States in the 1940s. In 1945, the Raja of Athmallik sent a Police Officer to Pradhan asking for registering a false case against the State Prajamandal chief. The plan was that these officials would cut down some trees themselves & allege that the Prajamandal chief had done this offence, as a result of which he (the activist) could be arrested.

But Pradhan refused to obey this ‘order’ saying that this was unlawful. So he was soon transferred to an area which was geographically more difficult than his former workplace. The Raja thought now that he had punished sufficiently to the disobedient Forester, but Pradhan told the Raja's man that he was quite comfortable in this new area and that he did not repent for not obeying the Raja's order. Needless to say, he was retransferred, this time as a Road Ranger whose job was to supervise the construction of wooden culverts along the Bainda-Angul road as the Forest Department was in charge of such constructions. The Raja again tried to know if Pradhan was repenting this time, but Pradhan's view was otherwise. So he was reverted from the post of Road Ranger to that of a Forester (Working Plans). As per the rules, the Working Plans Forester was to get Rs.50 per month i.e. much more than what the ordinary Foresters and the Road Rangers were getting. But Pradhan was paid Rs. 40 though he still got Rs. 10 more than his salary as a Road Ranger.

In 1947, he attended a meeting of the State Prajamandal. The Police reported this to the Raja & Pradhan was issued a show-cause notice against various charges (including the one of 'disobediency' mentioned earlier). He asked permission to meet the Raja (so as to submit his explanations) which was granted. But the Raja was not satisfied with these explanations and said to Pradhan: "Alright, I will see where you will take shelter". To this, Pradhan suddenly reacted:" So long I am active, I don't care for the help of my parents; what to speak of you?"

No wonder that he was soon dismissed from service. He was then a young man of 25-26, and the way he reacted to the Raja's remarks could have been fatal for him. But somehow it did not cost his life and in 1949, he was re-appointed by the Orissa Government. But the courage he showed was rare of its kind.

---

265 His elder brother was in Prajamandal.
266 It seems that the Raja of Athmallik wanted to punish Pradhan simply because his (Raja) ego was hurt by Pradhan's daring nature and not because of any evil attitude. As Pradhan himself admitted, this Raja dismissed a Police Officer when he found that the latter had taken a bribe of Rs. 1000 from the local people. He asked the officer to explain why, inspite of the miserable condition of the State tenants, did he take the...
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SUPPLEMENTS
DEVELOPMENTS IN THE BRITISH AREA

Rights conversion: Except for the proprietary rights of the zamindars over their Estate forests, hardly any other tenure of importance was recognised / existing during the British rule the reasons thereof being many, for ex;
1. Resumption of many tenures by the government on various grounds.
2. Most of the Devottar tenures lacked considerable forest area.

In fact, the claim of some of the Maufidars of Sambalpur over a forestland was refuted by the Dy. Commissioner of Sambalpur on the following ground in 1892:

“xxx it seems highly inadvisable that forest covered hills of this kind, the jungle growth on which has a well known effect on the water supply of the neighbourhood, should be left in private hands. If it is, it will be rapidly denuded and forest which, if properly conserved, will be useful to the people for generations, will be felled and destroyed in a few years. I am therefore of opinion that these hills should be converted into Government forest”.

Forest administration & policy: In the year 1815, the Madras Board of Revenue sent the following letter to the Collector of Ganjam inviting information on the forest area under his charge (e.g, the value and extent of them) and his suggestions for preservation and improvement of these forests:

“xxxxx
You will understand that it is not so much the desire of the Board to raise any revenue from this source, as to prevent injury to which the woods are now stated to be exposed, from the felling of young trees, the wanton destruction of valuable wood and the waste to timber, and to enable the inhabitants and the cultivators to obtain, in the most easy manner and at the cheapest rate, such materials as are necessary for the preparation of their instruments of agriculture and household furniture – at the same time where timber, from its nature is either an article of considerable value or has become an article of considerable export trade, it seems proper that it should be made liable to payment of some xxx moderate tax xxx”.

Some half century later, the revenue-oriented policy had taken such a strong ground that the Conservator of Forests (Madras Presidency) proposed to create a monopoly of the
produce of hill forests\textsuperscript{267}iii. This also specified the increasing hold of the forest department or government over the resources which people had been utilising for centuries for their own benefit, perhaps the forest department wanted to compensate the expenses accrued due to the conservation policy by imposing /continuing the revenue oriented policy simultaneously\textsuperscript{268}. In fact, although a Working Plan was sanctioned for the Barpahar area of Sambalpur in 1898, conservation was ignored for the sake of sleeper extraction causing destruction of the forests by the end of 19th century\textsuperscript{iv}.

In Puri Division, all forests were declared as ‘protected’ in 1880. First notification of reservation came out in 1885. In 1892, some forests were disreserved & declared as PFs, but three of them were rereserved in 1911. Working scheme for the RFs of the Division was introduced by the end of 19th century, and in 1903 it was decided to develop the forests & to open them to systematic exploitation\textsuperscript{v}.

In Angul, exploitation of forests had begun before 1883 and the first reserve of the region was notified in 1883. The first working plan was for the period 1908-09 to 1922-23.\textsuperscript{vi}

In Sambalpur area, destruction of forests led to the Moberly report of 1908. He recommended to reserve certain areas of wasteland ‘which were situated in localities where it was essential to supplement the existing supply of forest produce and which were undergoing rapid destruction or had been actually denuded of forest, should be constituted into reserves and that all wastelands should be notified as Protected Forests, the object of the latter proposal being to delay & not necessary to stop altogether the process of forest destruction.” Hence all Govt wastelands were notified as PFs in 1909 & 19 blocks were reserved in 1916.\textsuperscript{vii}

The forests of Parlakhemundi, which were found virtually impenetrable in 1834, had lost much of their resource by 1881 because of Kumeri and the indiscriminate felling for sale. In 1881, C.F. MacCartie urged “not the abolition of Saora axe-cultivation--- but the ‘absolute protection from the axe of the low country speculator for many years’” \textsuperscript{viii}. Following various such recommendations, certain executive rules were framed in 1901 to preserve the Maliah forests\textsuperscript{x}.

In Ghumsur, the Collector of Ganjam issued orders in 1858 against the indiscriminate felling of trees for the extension of cultivation as well as for the demands of towns and large villages. But it was not successful. Forests continued to be destroyed by the permit/lease holders, by the forest department (revenue-oriented extractions) and by the practitioners of Podu. Recommendations for preserving the local forests were implemented only after the passing of the Madras Forest Act in 1882. Although an area of about six square miles of forests had been closed to felling as early as 1866-67, reserves were actually notified in & after the Madras Forest Act was passed. Arrangements for fire

\textsuperscript{267} Responding to this proposal, most of the District Collectors recommended that this must be negatived. The Collector of Ganjam, in his letter dtd. 3-12-1870, indicated that if this proposal was implemented, the amount of revenue derived would be very small while livelihood of the hill people would be badly affected in various ways.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{268} In perhaps a rare exception, management of the Puri reserves from the late 19th century to the early 20th century was not revenue oriented. The revenue then derived from such forests was limited to 30% of the expenditure incurred on the development of forests, and fellings were very light & not of commercial nature.\textsuperscript{11}
protection had been made by 1890s, but systematic fire protection was introduced a few years later. Timber transit rules were imposed in 1896-97 and scientific management could begin only in the early 20th century.\textsuperscript{12}

**Forest classification:** The forests were usually classified as Reserved Forests and Protected Forests (Demarcated and/or Undemarcated). In the areas coming under the Madras Forest Act, there were Reserved Lands\textsuperscript{269} and Unreserves.

**Timber classification:** Timbers were classified differently in different divisions for the commercial purposes. For ex.,

1. Angul(1943):
   
   - **Class I** - Sal, Piasal, Teak, Sissoo, Sisham, Bandhan & Gambhar.
   - **Class II** - Assan, Arjun, Dhaura, Kurum, Tentra, Jamun, Sidha, Kusum, Amba, Mahul, Phasi, Dhaman, Khair, Kasi, Kanso, Mitkunia and Karada.\textsuperscript{270}
   - **Class III** - All others.\textsuperscript{13}

2. Sambalpur & Barpahar (1942):
   
   - **Class I** - Teak, Sal, Piasal, Sissoo, Bandhan, Karla, Haland, Gamhar, Sahaj, Khair, Mundi, Sarsuan & Garkhair.
   - **Class II** - Mohul, Dhaura, Dumkurdu, Dhaman, Barenga, Kusum, Bheru, Sehna, Rohini, Sunari, Kendu, Simul, Jamu, Rai, Moi, Ambo, Kundehi, Bahada, & Parhel.
   - **Class III** - All others.\textsuperscript{14}

**Reserved species:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khurdha (1933)</th>
<th>Angul (1911)</th>
<th>Parlakhemundi (date unknown)</th>
<th>Sambalpur (1911)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mango</td>
<td>Mango</td>
<td>Mango</td>
<td>Mango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarind</td>
<td>Tamarind</td>
<td>Tamarind</td>
<td>Tamarind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohwa</td>
<td>Mahul</td>
<td>Dhau</td>
<td>Mohwa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{269} The Annual Progress Report on Forest Admn. in Orissa for the year 1943-44 clarifies that Reserved Lands were the lands demarcated for reservation\textsuperscript{15}. In 1906-07, 38400 acres of Reserved Lands in the Pondakhol Agency were notified as RFs.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{270} Khair, Kasi, Kanso and Mitkunia were not included in the 1922(1928) rules.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{271} The FECR mentions 23 species under this list\textsuperscript{23}. As per Angul PF Rules of 1922(1928), forest produce of the following species were not allowed for cutting/removal without license: Kusum, Sunari, Kochila, Harida, Palas, Barkoli & Khair.\textsuperscript{24}
Shifting cultivation:

In 1879, Conservator of Forests Col. Beddome sent the following note to the higher authority on the Agency forests of Ghumsur:

“xxx This department has never had any jurisdiction in the country above ghat known as the Maliahs or the Khond country, and I believe it has always been the wish of Government that there should be as little interference as possible in these hill tracts, but I must bring to the notice of Government the systematic & complete destruction of all forests that is going on. xxxx there is now but little forest remaining anywhere above ghat. I would suggest that Government should insist on a strict reservation against felling & burning of one quarter of what is now remaining in the limits of each village and that the Khonds should be given to understand that it will be only on their carrying out a plan of this nature that Government will abstain from interference in the matter.” 22

Commenting on Beddome’s recommendation, the then Collector of Ganjam, though agreed to Beddome in principle, remarked:

“xxxx as the Khond cultivates only that he may have food to eat, but has no idea of cultivating to sell the produce and so enrich himself, I do not see reason to think things will get worse up in the hills.” 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kochila</th>
<th>Jamu</th>
<th>Panas</th>
<th>Achar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panas</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Sunari</td>
<td>Tal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neem</td>
<td>Neem</td>
<td>Mohul</td>
<td>Khajur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel</td>
<td>Kendu</td>
<td>Mahanim</td>
<td>Bel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendu</td>
<td>Hog-plum (Amra)</td>
<td>Bheru</td>
<td>Harida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harida</td>
<td>Char</td>
<td>Sissoo</td>
<td>Bahada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundí</td>
<td>Harida</td>
<td>Jamu</td>
<td>Kusum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusum</td>
<td>Kusíla</td>
<td>Sidha</td>
<td>Neem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunari</td>
<td>Khair</td>
<td>Sirís</td>
<td>Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suam</td>
<td>Gundi</td>
<td>Sundaragundi</td>
<td>Kendu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal</td>
<td>Bahara</td>
<td>Karanja</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piasal</td>
<td>Amla</td>
<td>Piasal</td>
<td>Jamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sissoo</td>
<td>Simuli</td>
<td>Piasal</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyan</td>
<td>Punanga</td>
<td>Sal</td>
<td>Teak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teak</td>
<td>Karanja</td>
<td>Harida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not included in the 1911 list)</td>
<td>Telai</td>
<td>Terminalia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kusum</td>
<td>tementosa 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bija</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahanim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sissoo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bandhan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamhari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asan²⁷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21/
The first RF in this Agency area was notified in 1887. Minchin’s Working Plan for Ghumsur forests suggested in 1921 to stop Podu cultivation by providing the Khonds an alternative livelihood through employment for various forest works and except in Chandragiri Agency, where the genuine inhabitants were permitted for Podu in the unreserves (except on land within 100 feet of the banks of any stream or water course), this temporary cultivation was not allowed officially in other areas.

In the Agency areas of Parlakhemundi, the Savaras were allowed shifting cultivation in the unreserves. As they demanded for allocation of land for such purpose in the reserves, the Conservator Mr. Nicholson proposed a scheme in the late 1930s of controlled toila cultivation under which areas of forest in the reserves were to be handed over to the tribals in rotation for cultivation purposes and they were expected to plant & tend therein a certain number of valuable fruit trees like Tamarind. Some Savaras accepted this scheme while others did not.

The Partially Excluded Areas Enquiry Committee recommended in 1940 for the abolition of Podu at the earliest & suggested various measures for that purpose like encouraging the Savaras to migrate to such areas (e.g. Gunupur taluk of Koraput district) where there was enough forest land to sustain their practice of temporary cultivation for years and to establish fair price shops for providing the Savaras their daily needs at cheaper rates. The Govt established such shops, but the Savaras did not care to utilise this facility. Also, they could not pay up readily & their need could not be supplied enough. Hence such shops failed and Podu cultivation continued in some areas.

**Access system:**

One of the earliest records of how access was regulated by the Government in the Parlakhemundi Maliahs is available from a report of 1867:

“In addition to the contract system, permits are also sold at the Manager’s office at the rate of one Rupee each. The permit entitles the holder to fell and carry away a single log from the forests at his own expenses. On jungle wood and firewood cut below the ghats, seigniorage is paid.”

Another report of 1896 reveals a different aspect of the system (in the Parlakhemundi Maliahs):

“There is nothing like competition among the contractors, each man really contracts for as many logs as he chooses and is paid at a …… rate of Rs. 2.4.0 for each log he brings to Kinchilingy; a minimum girth of 3 ft. & length of 16 or 17 ft. is fixed by the contract.”

---

272 As the Conservator of Forests Mr. Nicholson once remarked, the Khonds were not useful in forest work. Still, they were employed at places for demarcation work, etc. 34

273 Eastern ghat hill ranges of the Maliahs.
As regards forest cess, the system was not uniform throughout the province. For ex;

1. There were areas (e.g. Parlakhemundi & Ghumsur Divisions) where no nistar cess was in force.\(^{36}\)
2. In Angul, there was no nistar cess as such, but the professionals like potters etc. had to pay an annual license fee of Re. 1 against their excess consumption of firewood.\(^{37}\)
3. In Khurdha, bankar was introduced in 1895 \(\@\) 0-0-6 per the rupee of rent\(^{38}\). Besides, the professionals (potters etc.) had to pay an ‘industrial tax’ \(^{39}\).

Access was, in general, regulated more systematically than in the Garjat area and the extent to which forest roads were opened in British area was also more.

The cess or schedule of rate remained constant throughout both space & time (for a particular forest division) in some cases while it changed to some extent in some other cases. For ex., in Khurdha area, the rate of forest cess remained constant, but the grazing fee changed slightly in course of time as below:

As per the Bengal Forest Manual of 1911, the Khurdha Protected Forest Rules mentioned only the following grazing fees for the professional graziers: \(^{40}\)

- Buffalo of any age: 0-8-0 per year
- Any other animal of any age: 0-4-0 per year

However, rules of 1933 specify that in excess of the limits (for which free grazing was allowed in the demarcated & undemarcated forests of Khurdha), the privilege-holders\(^{274}\) should pay as per the rates below:\(^{41}\)

- Each sheep or goat: Re.1 per year
- Each buffalo or pony: 0-8-0 per year
- Each cow/bullock/bull: 0-4-0 per year

In 1942, residents of some specified areas of Sambalpur East & West divisions paid 0-0-9 per headload of firewood while residents of the rest of the divisions paid 0-0-6 for the same.\(^{42}\)

A distinguishing feature of the rules in force in the Sambalpur area (1936-42) was that graziers encamping in the RFs were to be charged an encampment fee of 0-2-0 per buffalo & 0-1-0 per bullock/pony, for a maximum period of one year. \(^{43}\)

**Rights & Concessions:**

1. **Puri Division:**

   “No rights are admitted in the RFs. Concessions are limited to permission to removal by all local villagers of fruits and flowers, medicinal herbs etc. for their bonafide consumption provided that when the produce of commercial value is removed, the amount is limited to (say ) one seer at a time etc..”

   (Revised Working Plan for the RFs of Puri Division: 1944-45 to 1953-54, Para 19)

---

\(^{274}\) Cess-payers, landless people and the indigenous tribes of the estate.
In DPFs & UDPFs:

Timber: Green timber of unreserved species free. Dry timer of all species except Sal, Piasal & Sissoo free with permit.

Firewood: As above (for DPFs) and free for UDPFs.

M.F.P: Free except those leased out i.e. Kuchila, Sunari bark, Myrabolans, Karanja

Bamboo: Free

Grazing: Free only in UDPFs.  

2. **Angul**:

   ‘A’ class RFs:

   Timber: Bija and Bandhan trees from 4 blocks and Sal from one block is allowed at concessional rate to bonafide tenants for bonafide use, provided not available in the nearby PFs.

   Timber except Sissoo, Gambhar, Piasal & Teak can be allowed to bonafide tenants from selection coupes at 50% of the schedule of rate (plus felling charges) if not available in DPFs or UDPFs.

   Firewood: Not allowed.

   Bamboo: Available at concessional rate from the tenants’ bamboo coupes.

   MFP: Not allowed.

   Grazing: No free grazing.

   ‘B’ class RFs or DPFs:

   Timber: Available from coupe contractors at concessional rate.

   Firewood: As above.

   Bamboo: Available to tenants at concessional rate from the coupes.

   Grazing: Free for non-professional graziers[^275] (tenants).

Khesra or UDPFs:

Timber: Unreserved species free, reserved species at concessional rate.

Firewood: Unreserved species free.

Bamboo: Free

MFP: Free except Kusum, Sunari, Kuchila, Myrabolan, Khair & Palas.

Grazing: Free[^45]

Rules of 1922 mention that in undemarcated areas, Bheru, Kasi, Kantasira, Kangra, Roni, Tentra, Dhau & Churiana can’t be cut for firewood or fencing purposes etc; but can be removed for house construction / repairing and manufacturing agricultural implements[^46].

[^275]: Person possessing more than 4 bullocks per each acre of land cultivated by him is called professional grazier as per the Angul PF rules of 1922[^51]. As per the 1933 Khurdha PF rules, a cultivator was entitled to free grazing of maximum two heads of cattle for each area(acre?) of land cultivated by him.
3. Sambalpur:

No rights admitted in the RFs. As concession, fruits & flowers allowed for bonafide personal consumption “provided that when produce of a commercial value is removed, the amount is limited to one seer at a time. Free grants of timber, bamboos & thatch grass are made in times of calamity, such as flood or fire”. (Second Revised Working Plan for the RFs of the Sambalpur East Division, 1931-32 to 1950-51, p.14)

Besides, some melas (fairs) of regional importance were allowed in the RFs. In Khesras or unreserves, timber of reserved species was free with permission from the Dy. Commissioner. For free removal of the unreserved species, permission from Panchayats was needed. Firewood, MFP & grazing were also free and though free removal of bamboos was allowed, clumps less than two years growth were not to be cut.

4. Ghumsur:

No rights to forest produce in the RFs except those admitted to the Khonds. In 1906, the Khonds agreed to assist the Government in protecting the forests from fire and in return of that, were allowed free removal of MFP, free grazing, free removal of dry firewood, bamboos and timbers required by them for their own use.

In 1927-28 & 1933-34, these concessions available to the Khonds were formally stopped by the District Forest Officer following severe fire seasons on both seasons. However, the effect of this stoppage on the Khonds was not appreciable.

In Chandragiri Agency, where a commutation fee was in force unlike other parts of the concerned forest division(s), the genuine inhabitants were allowed free removal of timber of unreserved species and other produce from the unreserves for their actual home consumption and were also allowed to practice Podu cultivation.

5. Parlakhemundi:

In Reserved Forests:

No concessions except that bamboos could be taken free by the Agency people. The District Forest officer had the power to make free grants of timber and bamboos to the extent of Rs. 50 in the case of individual and Rs. 250 in case of communities. This free grant could be given either from the Reserves or Unreserves.

---

276It is interesting to refer here to the following note:

“Although, strictly speaking, the Kondh must arm himself with a concession chit before he can enter the forests even for collection of his requirements of firewood, he does not, in actual practice, wait for such a chit; he just helps himself to whatever he wants. The chit can come later if it needs must”.

(Revised Working Plan for the RFs of the Russelkonda Division: 1939-40 to 1958-59, Part –1, typed copy, p.27)
Grazing free for the Agency people.

In Unreserves:

Bamboos & grazing free to the Agency people.\textsuperscript{53}

**Privileges of the authorities:** In his letter dtd. 26\textsuperscript{th} March 1890 to the Chief Commissioner of Central Provinces, the Secretary to the Govt of India observed that “xxx the policy of Government has always been to discourage the system of the bhet begari xxx”\textsuperscript{54}. But practically, the system continued either under a legal status (e.g. compulsory labour was paid for, etc.) or due to the oppressive nature of certain individuals.

The Mamools Enquiry Committee set up by the Govt of Orissa in 1946-47 reported that the aborigines of the Ganjam Agency areas had to supply fuel to the bungalows when the officers camped.\textsuperscript{55}

In his autobiography, Bharat Chandra Nayak - who served under the British as an administrative officer - has described how Kheda operations were carried out in Angul under the supervision of the Dy. Commissioner in 1911. Local people had to render bethi for the purpose similar to the system prevalent in the Garjats (Nayak : 1966).\textsuperscript{56}

Needless to say, the Govt officers often exercised, either legally or illegally, as if a special right to sporting/gaming in the forests which common people could hardly afford

**People’s movement for forest rights:**

1. **Angul agitation of 1889:**
   A few years after reservation work began in Angul, the district along with other regions of Orissa was struck by severe famine. The Government was quite late in taking adequate steps to help those people for whom the famine was more severe as a result of reserving forests and hence there was widespread agitation throughout the district:

   “xxx An Officer was placed on special duty to report on the matter and as a result of his findings which were accepted by Sir John Edgar\textsuperscript{277}, it was decided to move back the boundaries of the reserved forests which it was alleged, passed too close to village lands and had included in the reserved forests, orchards and lands for the cultivation”.\textsuperscript{57}

2. **Savara movements in Parlakhemundi:**

Savaras or Saoras were the dominating tribes of Parlakhemundi Maliahs. By the early decade of 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the Govt. of Madras had declared that the legal rights in Maliah

\textsuperscript{277} Quoting from Brownfield’s diary of 14-9-1889, Sir John Edgar, Chief Secretary to the GOB sent the following note to the Govt. of India on 20-11-1889:

“ The privileges xxx enjoyed by the people of Angul in the forests ever since the estate came into the possession of Government and perhaps for many years before, were not of much money value, but they enabled the people to live”.\textsuperscript{54}
3. Discontent in Khurdha area:

In 1879, the Settlement Officer of Khurdha, referring to the destruction of forests in the area, recommended that “the exclusive rights of Government to all forests and forest produce …… should be definitely maintained.”

In 1915, the Board of Revenue made it clear that “the jungle rights ……… have been held by Government ……… to be not rights, but privileges which are subject to withdrawal by Government……..”

Irregularities of the 1915 settlement of the DPFs of Khurdha area brought about hardship on the tenants by the inclusion of their lands in the forest area. This gradually led to some agitations & Pandit Godavarish Mishra, a local MLA, raised the issue of forest grievances of the people of Khurdha in the Orissa Assembly in September 1937. The Government then decided to set up a committee (Khurdha Forest Enquiry Committee) to look into this matter. The committee stressed on the fact that rights of the people in the forests should be recognised as ‘rights’ and not as privileges. Besides, there were many other recommendations of the committee, for ex;

- Boundary lines be shifted to a distance of 15 to 20 chains from the village proper both in case of DPFs and RFs.
- Unrestricted shooting of wild animals be allowed in the PFs.

278 The Savaras justified their work by saying that since unreserved areas had become sterile, areas in the Reserves were needed for shifting cultivation.

279 For ex; the local peasants violated forest laws in 1922 and cut away a number of trees in the forests.
• Grazing areas be increased and grazing should be allowed in the RFs in lieu of a grazing fee.
• Removal of honey, wax and mohwa fruits / flowers be allowed in the PFs.
• Khurdha Protected Forest Rules be amended (etc.).

Following these recommendations, the lines of certain DPFs were shifted back where too close to the villages.

4. Other incidents:
• Cultivators from Cuttack & Puri districts gathered at Cuttack on 1st September 1937 to observe ‘Kissan Day’. ‘Abolition of forest tax’ was amongst the placards displayed by them.
• Resolution passed at a Kissan meeting in the Sambalpur town on the same day (i.e. 1-9-1937) included the following demands:
  i. to give free rights to the tenants to bring forest produce for domestic & agricultural purposes, from the government forests;
  ii. to give free rights for grazing cattle therein.
• When the Governor of Orissa visited certain forest areas of Angul on 2nd January 1938 in connection with a proposal of the forest department for conversion of the PFs into RFs, several parties of villagers lined the road with placards protesting against it & stopped his car. They were assured that their representation would be regarded.
• In the Kissan conference held at Baltikra, Bargarh on 4th December 1938, the government was urged to:
  i. allow the peasants to kill wild animals for crop protection;
  ii. construct new roads in jungles;
  iii. clear off jungles near about the villages;
  iv. allow free grazing of cattle in the forests (etc.).
• In the Ryot’s conference held at Kullada on 29-6-1938, a resolution was passed requesting the government to allow free grazing of cattle in the RFs.

Scope for devolution: Malley & King have mentioned in their Sambalpur Gazetteer that a proposal had been submitted to the Government for managing village forests through a co-operative society, but the Govt. decided to apply section 3 of the Indian Forest Act to reserve such forests (Malley & King : 1932).

It seems that the role of Panchayats in the Protected Forests of Sambalpur had long been recognised by the government, unparalleled of its kind in Orissa under the British rule. As early as 1911, the Sambalpur Protected Forest Rules had the following provisions not found in the Khurdha & Angul Protected Forest Rules:

• “xxx before any timber is cut from any area which has been set apart as a village forest reserve, the permission of the village Panchayat shall be obtained, both as regards species & amount xxx.”
• No trees growing on a village site shall be cut green without the permission of the Panchayat.

Even the Dy. Commissioner was to consider the objection(if any) of the Panchayats before granting permits to any person for removing any forest produce free of charge for a public purpose and to any cultivator of a village to remove forest produce to another
village for his own private use. Again, if a person did not require self-grown trees of any reserve species (excepting Mango, Mohwa & Kusum) in the land cleared by him for cultivation, house construction etc. (on permission) either in village forests or culturable lands, such trees were to be distributed by the Panchayat to the needy residents of the village for their own use. \[77\]

Such role of the Panchayats continued more or less up to the early 1940s at least as evident from the report of the Sambalpur Land Laws Committee. \[78\]

In the Agency areas of Orissa, the Madras Govt. had recognised a role of the village headman (Maliko) for regulating the removal of forest produce. For ex; the tribals had to leave 8 species of trees felled by them in the land approved for reclamation, in charge of the Maliko. \[79\]

Some forests which were useful for the supply of the ordinary needs of the tenants and over which the Forest Department was prepared to relinquish control, were transferred by the Madras Govt. to the village Panchayats in some areas of the Madras Presidency. For ex; all grass reserves in the Bellary district were handed over in this way. \[281\] The question of introducing a Forest Panchayat system for certain suitable reserves of Ganjam was also considered, but “No Panchayats were actually formed as the villagers were not sufficiently advanced to manage reserves for themselves in the manner recommended by the Forest Committee. A determined attempt to initiate the system in Sondasolia reserve was made by the Collector and the District Forest Officer. It seems however that the inhabitants of the neighbouring villages regarded the scheme with complete indifference and apathy. The people were not obvious to the advantages of maintaining forest on the hillsides but had no desire for responsibility (Minchin: 1921).” \[81\]

In the erstwhile Puri Forest Division (now, Khurdha Division), produce from the annual coupes of DPFs were being distributed during 1930s through the agency of the committees of local people known as Group Panchayats. This was as per the prescriptions of Hart’s working scheme (which was in force since 1929) under which not more than 10 villages formed a Group or Unit to be represented by seven men two of which must be good Sarbarakars. \[82\]

These Group Panchayats were required to prepare lists of requirements of the persons in their areas by the middle of July each year & submit the same to the Range Officer by the 1\textsuperscript{st} week of August. The fellings were to be supervised by both the Panchayat-Sarbarakars and the Forest Dept. staff and all disputes with regard to fellings were to be decided by the Range Officer & the Panchayat-Sarbarakars. \[83\]

The Sarbarakars issued permits to the tenants. These Committees included influential people and were not necessarily of uniform size and length. \[84\]

But due to administrative defects or other reasons, these Panchayats failed to function properly and some of the members lost confidence of the people. \[85\] Pointing out to this problem, the Annual Progress Report on Forest Administration in Orissa for the year 1936-37 said:

280 Sal, Arjuna etc.
281 “According to the Report of the Forest Enquiry Committee (1959) this experiment of the Madras Govt “proved very costly and the forests were depleted of forest growth”. 88
“xxx It is reported that, as in previous years, there is still some slackness on the part of the coupe presidents and Panchayat members attending to the felling operations in the coupes and the proper distribution of produce to the tenants. xxx No steps appear to have been taken by the civil authorities to replace the Panchayat Sarbarakars who have shown slackness in their work. But the matter is under consideration of the Revenue Commissioner with a view to revising the present system of management through Panchayats”.

The same report for the year 1937-38 said that Group Panchayats usually displayed little interest in their job i.e felling and distribution of forest produce.

In 1938, the Khurda Forest Enquiry Committee found that the Forest Department was not able to manage effectively both the RFs and DPFs each having different aims and also because of different geographical conditions. Protection and scientific management of many unreserved forests was difficult as these were scattered and interspersed among the villages. Also, people were not happy with the system of forest administration in the locality. Considering all such factors and mentioning the dissatisfactory functioning of the Group Panchayats, the Committee recommended that Forest Panchayats should be constituted in the region and both demarcated as well as undemarcated forests should be handed over to such Panchayats for management. Details of this proposed Forest Panchayat have been briefly presented in the box. But there is no evidence that the Govt. implemented this proposal. Rather it appears from the report of the Forest Enquiry Committee that the system of distributing forest produce through coupe committees more or less continued as before.

Forest Panchayats: constitution and responsibility

Policy: “Forest Panchayats are small committees composed of the representatives of the cess-paying tenants of Khurdha to whom, as agents of Government, the management of the demarcated as well as the undemarcated protected forest has been transferred”. The purpose of transferring this management right to forest panchayats is to give the ryots an interest in the preservation of the areas entrusted to them.

These Panchayats are expected to work in the best interest of the village community. They are expected to prevent illicit felling or grazing in the forests, protect the forests from fire and to improve the forests. They will have power to lease out wastelands of UDPFs for cultivation purposes.

The Panchayat members will be elected by simple voting among the villagers. They will have to carry out the orders of the Central Forest Committee of the Collector and the

---

282 Not only some intellectuals of Khurdha, but also some officers of the Govt. felt the need of such kind of devolution.
DFO. A Panchayat may have a paid secretary though the members are expected to work without any personal gain.

**Sources of revenue:** Main items of receipts of the Forest Panchayats are:
1. Share of 75% of the total amount of forest cess (of their area).
2. Grazing fee and professional taxes\(^{283}\).
3. Compounding fees and compensations.
4. A share from the sale proceeds of such reserved trees and their produce as, notwithstanding their growing in the PFs, are utilised by the Government.

**Objects of expenditure of the funds:**
1. Watcher’s pay.
2. Maintenance & improvement of forest (afforestation etc.).
3. Maintenance of boundary lines and boundary pillars.\(^{x}\)

---
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DECLINE OF A PROFESSION: THE LAKHARA LIVELIHOOD

Note: In March 2000, a research team of VASUNDHARA visited village Barham of Athmallik area to carry out certain investigations in the context of local management of forests and devolution policy. This village inhabited some Sankhari families who told this team that during the Darbar period (i.e. before the merger of Athmallik ex-State) they enjoyed exclusive privilege of propagating & collecting lac in all kinds of forests of the State and that, after merger, this privilege of theirs was lost. However, they themselves could not explain exactly how it happened. Also, there was some doubt regarding their claim that this privilege was available also in the RFs.

So the undersigned was asked to enquire into the matter & find out the facts. This report has accordingly been prepared on the basis of the author’s personal communication in May 2000 with some of the Sankhari people of Bainda (Nakhara Sahi), formerly one of the most important lac trading centers of the Athmallik ex-State; as well as the information available on this subject in some publications.

The report is by no means exclusive, still it can provide clues that can be helpful for further research on the subject.

Bikash Rath

The Bangle - maker Sankharis:

Sankha is a special kind of bangle which has been a very essential item in the marriage ceremonies of Hindu Oriyas. The bride has to wear new Sankha at the time of her marriage this being one of the most auspicious signs of a married woman. Widows are not expected to wear such bangles.

This special bangle is prepared from lac by the traditional Sankha manufacturers known as Sankharis. As these people depend on lac for their livelihood, they have been collecting or cultivating this forest produce for generations. So they have been otherwise known as the Lakharas (Nakharas).

Privileges of the Sankharis:

Old people of the Sankhari villages say that they had exclusive rights for the collection & propagation of lac in both Reserve and Khesra forests during the Darbar period. But neither the Athmallik State Forest Rules(1933) nor the Working Plan prepared for the Athmallik State forests (w.e.f. 1946) mention this. In reserved forests, especially in ‘A’ class reserves, such kind of rights were hardly admitted and the restrictions were often strictly implemented during the pre-merger days. Also, the Athmallik Forest Rules even do not mention of the concessions usually allowed to the lac cultivators on reserved species (i.e. lopping the branches of trees like Kusum, Palas etc.). Hence, it does not seem that this privilege had any legal status.

When asked to explain why such exclusive right was allowed to them, these people give the following reasons (of course not unanimously):
1. The strong effect of casteism in the society whereby people of one caste were not expected to follow the profession of the other castes. Hence, there was no question of the involvement of any other caste people in this profession directly (i.e. collection / propagation of Sankha etc.)

2. Collection/ cultivation of lac was considered to be an inferior job by some people as it involved a lot of insect handling.

3. The knowledge / experience in this field was more or less exclusive to the Lakhara.

4. The Raja allowed them this privilege, as they had no other means of livelihood.

But the real reason seems to be elsewhere.

In Kalahandi State, the lac-monopoly- holder was allowed to propagate / collect lac in certain forests (Ramdhyani: 1949). In Athmallik State also, the monopoly holder was allowed a similar privilege in all State forests (Ramdhyani: 1949). It seems that as this lessee depended on the Lakhara for his business, his right to propagate or collect lac in all the State forests virtually worked as a privilege for the Lakhara also who, working for him, were allowed to grow/collect lac in any forest of the State.

They also claim that initially they had the privilege of growing lac in the trees of other tenants (on the basis of mutual understanding). In this context, Ramdhyani observes the following in his report on the Athmallik State:

"If there is lac on a cultivated holding and the cultivator himself does not propagate lac on it, other people may propagate lac on that tree. xxx There is no order enabling one person to propagate lac on the tree of another and recently some people complained about this. The objection has been allowed but only because the cultivator himself wanted to propagate lac". (Ramdhyani: 1949)

Cultivation tradition:

These people used to go for lac cultivation twice a year: once in Ashadha (June-July) & again in Pausa (December-January). Before starting the cultivation, they observed certain religious customs like taking food without any salt, wearing new clothes and performing puja.

The produce was being harvested in Jyestha (May-June) & Margashira (November-December). However, yield of the Ashadha cultivation was often very less as rain water washed away a lot of insects, etc..

Each family was given its own area for cultivation. 'One village (particular forest area) for one family' - this was the general rule. The allotment was on the basis of a mutual settlement in the community & more or less continued for generations. However, there was no such hard & fast rule that a person having a bigger family would get a larger forest area.
Women did not take part in the lac rearing process. They only assisted during the collection & also in Sankha - making.

Decline of the tradition:

It is said that by early 1950s, these people experienced various difficulties in lac cultivation/collection. The direct & indirect inferences that can be drawn from their descriptions are as follows:

1. Other people (irrespective of the caste) also asserted their claim over the forests for lac cultivation / collection (as the value of lac was increasing gradually).
2. The lac which the Sankharis cultivated, was often found 'stolen' from the cultivation area, thus demoralising these people.
3. Formerly they used to propagate lac in the trees of other tenants & sometimes paid to the owner of the tree for that. After merger, this was no longer easier as the tree-owners' were no more under the fear of any royal administration and the Govt. of Orissa had confirmed that people were the right-holders of the trees of their holdings. Some of the owners had been offered half the share of the produce, but still many denied access to their trees (or demanded more share?).

But it seems that after merger, either the system of giving a monopoly lease for lac was gradually withdrawn or certain other changes took place which affected the lessee's right to propagate lac in all (?) the State forests. Again, as the exclusive privilege (?) of the Sankharis does not seem to have any direct or legal recognition from the Darbar administration, it may be presumed that the Orissa Government would not have recognised it any more.

Gradual depletion of forests must have adversely affected the livelihood of these people. For example, once the densely forested Nakhari Sahi near Badagola (Bainda) is now almost bare of trees.

The present situation:

"Even the Raja could not afford what we used to earn." - said an old man of Nakhara Sahi recalling the bygone days of prosperity in excitement. This simply indicates that they used to earn a lot from their business as on one hand they paid nothing (?) to the Raja or to any body else against their cultivation / collection (of lac) and on the other hand, very little or almost nothing was their investment for this cultivation while the gain was significantx.

Similarly, for Sankha- making, the investment was very negligible as they did not have to purchase lac from others.

But for the last 4/5 decades, the situation has changed so much that now they have to depend on other means of livelihood. Lac is no more available with ease; for making a pair of Sankha, about 50 gm. lac (worth about Rs. 3.75) is required which they have to purchase. Including labour charges etc., the total investment seems to be around (±) Rs. 6. Selling price of a pair of Sankhas is around (±) Rs. 10. This way the gain seems to be
approx. Rs. 4 per pair i.e. decreased (say) almost by 50% when compared to the gain of 1940-50.

Again, demand for Sankha has also decreased in the past few years, particularly in urban areas. So these people now make Sankha either on order or on special occasions (like festivals etc. when the scope for marketing is more). Hence, lac & Sankha are no more their principle means of livelihood. Rather, many of them work as labourers.

**How they can be helped:**

They themselves do not seem to have any definite proposal for reviving their tradition. But it seems that these people can be allotted required forest area under the CFM scheme. If the trees for lac rearing are no more available in such area, they may be assisted in raising a plantation of such trees.

They believe that if they get facilities to start lac cultivation on their own, then their age-old tradition can be fully revivedix.

**Ex-State Lac Policy**

In most of the States, lac was under monopoly lease. In some States, the cultivators were allowed to lop branches of reserved species like Kusum & Palas etc. for lac propagation.

In 1930s, the major lac-growing area in Orissa was the Sambalpur-Gangpur region, the production being estimated at between 3000 & 6000 maunds per annum. So Gangpur was then the leading lac-producer among the Orissa Feudatory States.(Glover:1937)

Rairakhol was the neighbouring State of Athmallik. There were areas in this State quite suitable for lac cultivation, but the tenants did not seem to have much interest in it (i.e. cultivation). So it was decided to start it departmentally and accordingly an expert was appointed to supervise the introduction of lac cultivation by 1926.

Following figures show the revenue realised from lac in Rairakhol State:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Forest Revenue( in rupees)</th>
<th>Revenue from lac( in rupees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921-22</td>
<td>47881</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923-24</td>
<td>40572</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-25</td>
<td>52078</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-26</td>
<td>39200</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was proposed in 1926 that the State would act as the selling agent while the tenants would have to sell their lac to the State. Of the net profit realised, the State was to get 25% while the cultivator, 75%. The market price at that time was about Rs. 45 per maund (a fair average) & it was estimated that the net profit per maund would be around Rs. 40 (Mooney:1926). Since the cultivator wanted immediate cash payment after delivery, Mooney- the Agency Forest Officer - advised that he(cultivator) should be so paid partially at the time of delivery & and the rest after the sales.

(contd. on next page)
Still, by June 1934, there were no lac cultivators in the State. The monopoly holder was expected to pay the tenants "at fair rates to be mutually agreed upon with the consent of the State authority". On the other hand, departmental lac cultivation had been often unsuccessful between 1927-1933.

By 1940s, the monopoly holder was propagating his own lac & purchasing from the growers. He was expected to pay the growers according to the price of shellac at Calcutta market.

Forest rules of only few States mention that the Sankhari people had to pay a forest cess. For ex., in Narsinghpur (1933) they had to pay Re. 1 per house, but as fuel cess.

Professional fee charged annually in some ex-States on the Lakhara for removing fuel & other forest produce are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bamra (1924)</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonai (1926)</td>
<td>0-8-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For traders & outsiders for export as well as for trade & contract work within the State, following fee was charged on lac in some of the ex-States:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayurbhanj (1911)</td>
<td>2-8-0 per maund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangpur (1920)</td>
<td>1-8-0 per maund (for sale within the State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamra (1924)</td>
<td>1-8-0 per maund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athmallik (1933)</td>
<td>1-8-0 per maund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narsinghpur (1933)</td>
<td>2-8-0 per maund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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