CHAPTER II:

BRITISH POLICY IN THE 19TH CENTURY
The Orissa Feudatory Chiefs regarded the British as their liberator from Maratha tyranny and executed agreements and engagements binding themselves to submission and loyalty to the East India Company's Government. The British Government also followed a consolatory and liberal policy towards them. British regulations and laws were not enforced in the States. The Feudatory Chiefs were free to rule according to their prevailing administrative systems.

As the Maratha power was not totally extinguished the Company's Government considered these states as sentinels that guarded and defended the frontiers particularly from the attacks of the Marathas. Besides the British Government were engaged to consolidate its possession in other parts of the country. All these above factors in conglomeration forced the British Government to leave the Feudatory States of Orissa in the hands of Feudatory Chiefs. But some changes that took place in the policy of British Government's can be classified as:

I) Period of Non-Intervention 1803-1839
II) Period of Intervention 1840-1848
III) Repeation of Period of Non-Intervention 1849-1857
IV) Relation After 1857
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Period of Non-Intervention 1803-1839

In 1805 Regulations XII, XII and XIV regarding the administration of revenue, criminal and civil justice respectively were passed under sections 86, 13 and 11 respectively. Sixteen (16) Tributary Mahals, except Baudh-Athamalik and Pal-Lahara, were exempted from the operation of British Laws. The Feudatory Chiefs enjoyed full freedom. But this status of the Feudatory Chiefs can not be regarded as sovereign authority but as subordinate allies under the supreme authority of British Government.

In 1804 the Rajas of Narsinghpur, Hindol and Tigiria were in arrears in the payment of their tribute, but no strong majors were taken against them except the issue of ordinary Parwanas. In 1805 the Raja of Dhenkanal, Talcher, Athagarh and Hindol imposed duties on grain merchants of Cuttack town passing through their territories though all such imposts were prohibited by the British Government. This matter was petitioned by the merchants. But the British Government only issued Parwanas asking the Chiefs not to levy such duties. In 1804 the Raja of Ghumsur committed depredations in the territory of Nayagarh and Raja of Nayagarh complained it before Thomas Fortesque, the Secretary to Commissioner who in return sent a mere note to P. Cherry, the Magistrate of Ganjam to restrain the Raja of Ghumsur from doing so.
Besides this policy of leniency the British Officers were also entertaining the Rajas offering presentations. In 1805 three horses costing Rupees 560 were presented by Board of Commissioners to the Rani of Mayurbhanj and the Raja of Nilgiri and Patia.

In 1805 some proposals were made to end the lenient policy and introduce British regulations in the Tributary Mahals but the proposal was rejected by Sadar Diwani Adalat.

Succession dispute and British Intervention

The policy of non-intervention though was an accepted principle the British authorities were intervening in the internal administration of the Feudatory States to maintain peace and order. In 1812 the trouble arose in Angul when the succession was disputed. In 1815 Somanath Singh was made the right-ful owner of the State. In 1813 in a similar case in Dhenkanal the British Government had to intervene and Krishna Chandra Bhramarbar Roy Mahendra Bahadur ascended the Gadi of Dhenkanal. In 1810 the Government also intervened in Mayurbhanj in a succession disputed case and gave the decision in favour of the Raja already in the throne.

Besides these cases the British Government also intervened, in a mild form, when the Chiefs were found to have committed atrocious crimes.
Atrocities committed by the Chiefs and British Intervention

In 1813 the Chief of Dhenkanal accused of murdering Ratnakar Srichandan, Dhup Singh Jagannath Bora and Miraksree Mishra. In 1814 the Raja of Mayurbhanj also murdered his Sarbarakar, Jagannath Baya. Similarly in 1813 the Raja of Narsinghpur seized the Zamindar Beer Jena of Bogarh in Cuttack district and put him in confinement. Though the matter was petitioned no action could be taken in this matter.

The Feudatory Chiefs were expected to be the conservator of peace and distributor of justice in their states but in contrary they committed heinous crimes and homicides to which the British Government can not close their eyes. Within this period the British power became Paramount in India. So the Feudatory Chiefs were not left totally free to administer their Estates according to their whims and caprices.

The Office of Superintendent of Tributary Mahals was created in 1814 through which more accurate knowledge could be received by the British authority which will enable them to follow a system of administration in future. This office had general control over the conduct of the Rajas and to prevent the commission of crime and outrages. The Superintendent was, also, to suggest and report any other plan to be adopted in respect of all or,
any of the Tributary Mahals and upon his information and
suggestion, would depend the policy to be pursued for the
Estates. The Judge and Magistrate of Cuttack was entrusted
the post with a separate salary of Rupees 500 per month. So
the Feudatory States were brought under closer supervision
than before.

Feudatory States 1814-1839

The administration in the Feudatory did not
improve after the creation of the post of Superintendent.
But the Government was firm in its policy of non-intervention
which said,

The supreme Government should interfere
as little as possible in the internal
affairs of the protected States, that
the autonomy guaranteed to these States
by their treaties should not be inter-
fered with and that their rulers should
be given complete freedom to administer
their States in the manner they chose.

Edward Impey who succeeded Oswald reported
the Government on July 8, 1814 suggesting for the introduction
of British regulation in the Garjat States but such suggestions
were turned down.

Succession Dispute

While the policy of non-intervention was still
in force the succession disputes increased in number. In 1815
Nilgiri was involved in such a case. So the Government had to
prepare a set of rules inorder to determine the claims of.
inheritance or succession or, otherwise in the Tributary States. The proposed rules being approved by the Sadar Nizamat Adalat was enacted. The regulation 11 of 1816 provided that,

all claims to the right of inheritance or succession to any of these Tributary Mahals were to be heard, tried and determined in the first instance by the Superintendent of Tributary Mahals. In deciding such cases he was to be generally guided by the established laws and usages of the respective Mahals. But in no case, a Mahal should be liable to be divided according to the Hindu Law but should descend entirely to the person who possessed the most substantial claim according to local and family usage. In all such suits decided and orders passed by the Superintendent an appeal could be made to the Sadar Diwani Adalat provided that the petition of appeal was preferred within three months of the decision of the original decree.

The Superintendent was also directed to

adopt such prudent and proper measures as may tend to prevent the commission of acts of violence and outrage by the interposition of influence and by encouraging amicable adjustment of disputes when circumstances will admit an interference of that nature.

By the enactment of the regulation 5 of 1818 the Judge-cum-Magistrate of Cuttack ceased to act as Superintendent of Tributary Mahals and the Commissioner of Orissa became the ex-officio Superintendent of Tributary Mahals.

John Malcolm, one of the distinguished Political Officers during Lord Hastings Governor Generalship said that

It is our duty to employ all our moral influence and physical power to strengthen instead of weaken the royal instruments of the Government, namely native Princes and Chiefs.
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He also advocated that the British Government must avoid minute and vexatious interference which counteracts the purpose for which we maintain them. In dealing with the Princes or Chiefs, we must in all cases of interference bring them forward to their subjects as the prominent objects of respect and obedience.

This inchoate State Policy was best illustrated in the Feudatory States of Orissa.

Edward Impey was succeeded by Robert Ker (1818-1819). Robert Ker was able to realise the arrear tributes from the Chiefs. He also prevented them to purchase any estate in the Mughal-band area and collect custom duties from the merchants passing through their estates. Like his predecessor, he also reported on July 11, 1821, for the change of policy towards the Tributary Mahals.

In 1821, the Raja of Keonjhar obstructed the passage of British troops through his territory. The Raja of Nayagarh and Rampur not only gave asylum to Buxi Jagabandhu and other leaders of Paik Rebellion of 1817, they also facilitated their escape through their territories. Some of their subjects actively helped the rebels. W. Blunt, Commissioner-cum-Superintendent of Tributary Mahals (1820-27), was unable to bring the offenders to justice as Tributary Mahals were exempted from operation of the criminal laws. So he suggested the operation of criminal laws in the Mahals. He also suggested to appoint an Assistant to Superintendent of...
Tributary Mahals to solve the family disputes and such other cases and to perform this difficult task he wanted to recruit an Officer from military branch of the Company service.\(^{28}\)

British Government considered W. Blunts proposal a matter of great risk hence was disapproved. The proposal for appointment of an Assistant to Superintendent was also rejected.

In 1827 Thomas Pakenham assumed the charge of Superintendent of Tributary Mahals. He refrained himself from intervening in Tributary Mahals. But in 1828 a boundary dispute arose between Mayurbhanj and Nilgiri. The Raja of Mayurbhanj petitioned the matter to Superintendent who replied that

> though the Mayurbhanj Raja's fears are not without foundation, it is not wish of the Government to interfere between the disputants except in cases affecting the tranquility of the frontier.\(^ {29}\)

Similarly in 1828 in Nayagarh a thief was put to death without a trial.\(^ {30}\) In 1827 the Government of course intervened in Athgarh and Banki. In Athgarh, Rajas uncle Gour Hari Swain committed violent action. The Superintendent intervened and checked the situation taking a serious turn.\(^ {31}\)

In Banki, Bhawani Choudhury, a leader with 22 others attacked and plundered the residence of the Raja. Being reported T. Pakenham passed orders sentencing each of the offenders with 2 years imprisonment at Cuttack. The order were submitted for confirmation\(^ {32}\) and were confirmed.\(^ {33}\)
In 1829 George Stockwell (1829-1832) succeeded T. Pakenham. A serious border dispute arose in the same year. The Raja of Ranpur attacked five garhs of Nayagarh with an army of 2000 paiks and resulting 25 persons killed, 31 wounded and a property of Rupees 10,000 plundered. The British Government, in spite of the policy of non-intervention, had to interfere and impose a fine of Rupees 10,000 on the Raja of Ranpur. But Wilkinson, the Magistrate failed to realise the fine. So on the suggestion of George Stockwell \(^{34}\) Ranpur was attached till the realisation of the fine along with other expenses to be incurred for the attachment \(^{35}\). Out of fear the Raja of Ranpur immediately paid rupees 10,000 out of which rupees 5000 was given to Raja Nayagarh as compensation \(^{36}\).

In 1831 the Raja of Angul, Somanath Singh, plundered Jumma in Daspalla. Though he was called upon by the Government to account for his conduct and pay Rupees 1,450 as compensation he avoided the payment \(^{37}\).

Temporary Attachment Of Mahals

George Stockwell made an effort to change the policy of non-intervention keeping all the above facts in view. He reported the Government on July 9 1831 advocating, collection of annual tributes and promotion of education of a minor Raja. So the Government provided that the State during the minority of Rajas or when for political reasons they were placed under attachment, would be managed by the

---
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Superintendent, through a Government Officer called Tahsildar
assisted by an influential and respectable relative of the
minor Raja. The Government permission had to be taken before
such an arrangement. The Government also recommended for
impacting education to minor sons of the Feudatory Chiefs under
the Superintendent of the Court of Wards so that
they could be withdrawn from the society of
psychopants and retainers that surrounded
them at home
and they were to be educated at Calcutta.

So it can be correctly said that because of the
constant effort of George Stockwell it was possible to inter­
vene in the internal affairs of the Tributary Mahals when the
Ruling Chief was a minor.

Attachment of Dhenkanal 1831

Raja Krishna Chandra Mahendra Bahadur died
issueless and was succeeded by Shyam Sundar who met the same
fate. He was succeeded by Bhagirathi Harichandan a minor and
Pitabas Dei, the widow of Raja Krishna Chand as his guardian.
But after one year the second Rani of Raja Ramachandra forcibly
took charge of the minor Raja with the help of her adherents
which resulted in anarchy in the state. Stockwell reporting
the matter to the Government stated

I could not remain a calm spectator of the
ruins and waste of an infant Zamindar.

So the administration of the State was taken
over and managed in the name of the minor Raja. The policy
of non-intervention was avoided temporarily for the summum bonum of the Feudatory State.

The Bamanqnati dispute 1832

The Raja of Mayurbhanj had strained relation with his Sarbarkars in four peerhs locally called as Kolhan-as entirely inhabited by Kolhs. An Agent to the South western Frontier was superintending over these four peerhs though they were included in the territories of the Raja of Mayurbhanj.

A dispute though arose in 1827 was settled in the Court of the Commissioner of Cuttack. Being dissatisfied Sarbarkar Madhab Das attacked a number of villages belonging to the Raja and threatened to cause more ravages in future. The Superintendent Tributary Mahals could not take any action because these peerhs were under the superintendence of the Agent of the South West Frontier.

The peerhs were transferred from South West Frontier Agency to the authority of Superintendent of the Tributary Mahals on December 5, 1831. On January 10, 1832 they were called by Stockwell to settle up their differences. But he failed to do so due to lack of evidence. He indicated that the

Sarbarakar as vassal must submit to and abide by the orders of his Feudal Chieftain.

Being dissatisfied with this decision Madhab Das burnt some villages of the Raja. Hence Stockwell proceeded against him.
sending an intimation to the Government. Though four peerhs were seized Madhab Das did not submit to him. Anticipating danger the Government in the meantime despatched a British Regiment under Colonel Doreton to that trouble spot and Captain Wilkinson was directed to send a report. Meanwhile Madhab Das submitted to Captain Wilkinson. He had to sign an agreement that he (a) would restore the property plundered by him to their owners (b) would not resort to such an action in future (c) would pay the Raja his dues and (d) would also abide by the decisions of the Government.

In April 1834 the Kols in Bamanghati being instigated by the Raja of Mayurbhanj caused disturbances. Sarbarakar sought the intervention of the Government. The Secretary to Government wrote to Wilkinson on July 21, 1834.

Interference is unnecessary as regards the interest of the Government as long as the Raja and Mahapatra and their adherents are confirmed in their possessions.

The Raja failed to suppress the rebellion. Madhab Das plundered more villages and murdered some of the inhabitants. Public chouks were burnt, Government dak was plundered, and communication between Bombay and Calcutta was paralysed. So the Government had to send troops under Captain Wilkinson and peace and order was restored. The Kol peerhs were brought under direct administration of the Government. The Raja of Mayurbhanj was allowed to rule over Bamanghati excluding four peerhs subject to suitable allowance for the maintenance of Madhab Das and his family who were sent to Singhbhum.
Disturbance in Dhenkanal 1832

In June 1832 Robert Hunter succeeded George Stockwell. In the mean while the quarrel between two Ranis Pitabas Dei and Kundan Dei was acute. Being instigated by Pitabas Dei, her adherents killed three servants of Kundan Dei namely Pindaki Rajguru, Mukunda Patnaik and Narahari Patnaik. Nityanand Srichandan and Narayan Mahamansingh were suspected as murders. Wilkinson, the Assistant Superintendent of Tributary Mahals remain in special charge of Dhenkanal. As Pitabas Dei disobeyed the authority of Wilkinson a military force, under Colonel Waters of 47 regiment was sent to Dhenkanal. Dhenkanal was seized. At the instance of Superintendent, Pitabas Dei, Nityanand Srichandan, Dasrathi Patnaik and Narayan Mahamansingh were banished and committed to jails as State prisoners. On December 1, 1836 Rani Kundan Dei restored to the possession of the State of Dhenkanal and British rule came to an end.

Narsinghpur 1832

A minor Raja succeeded to the Gadi in July 1832. The Superintendent appointed Mahasay to manage the State. The Rani submitted a petition to the Government to handover the authority in her own hand and executed an Ekrarnamah. But after few months she was found involved in many heinous crimes. She was defaulted in her payment of tribute. Hence the Superintendent reported to the Government.
It has been customary on the part of the Government to interfere in order to punish such cases of wanton torture as the present and it is in every respect that such interference should continue to be exercise.

But Government did not accept the view.

In 1833 the states of Banki and Tigiria claimed over an embankment. The matter became serious when the Superintendent drew the attention of the Government. But the Government advised him to solve the dispute without much interference to their respective rights.

In October 1833 a boundary dispute arose between Banki and Athagarh. Hunter instructed William Wilkinson, Assistant Superintendent of Khurda Division if exigency would warrant to post a force to maintain peace and order and never to intervene further.

From Non-Interference to Interference

In 1836 Henry Ricketts assumed the office of Superintendent and Commissioner. He was interested to introduce a regular system of management in the Tributary Mahals. In the mean time some incidents took place during his period which helped him to change British policy from non-interference to interference.

In 1836 the servants of the Raja killed six persons. When the Raja was asked to hand over the murders he did not comply.

Same year the Rajas of Banki and Tigiria invaded each others territory by burning and plundering.
to 60 villages and causing deaths to several Paiks and ryots. With the interference of Superintendent the matter was settled.

In 1838 the Raja of Banki confined three merchants in a forgery case and Superintendent could not take any action as the Raja had the right to apprehend and confine any of his subjects. In the same State eight travellers with Rupees 4345 were found missing. When the Rajas was asked to inquire and report he failed to ascertain their fate. Though Henry Ricketts wanted to take strong action against those arrogant Raja he was restrained to do so by the Government.

In 1837 the inhabitants of Ranpur murdered Bamdeb Mallick of Zilla Khoorda. But H. Ricketts could not do anything as it was not under his purview. Similarly Dooma Naik and Dooti Naik inhabitants of Khoorda committed high-way robbery at 10.00 A.M. but no action could be taken.

On 22 February 1838 at midnight about 30 persons attacked the house of Gour Maharana of village Itami, wounded him and his wife, burnt his mother with "torches" and looted property valued rupees 2215-2-3 further wounded Bhaik Mullick and his wife who attempted to seize them.

The above facts were reported to the Government. Ricketts further said that either the company make the Feudatory Chiefs independent and irresponsible "by which we may escape from the discreditable position we now occupy with respect to Garjat Mahals" or "increase interference and the establishment of a defined system of management."
He submitted the draft rules to the Government on January 21, 1839 but it was disapproved by the Governor-General in Council. It was pointed out the proposal would tend to weaken injuriously the influence of the Rajas over their subjects.

Period of Intervention 1840-1848

Henry Ricketts was succeeded by A.J.M. Mills as Commissioner and Superintendent. His period was a period of intervention in the affairs of Tributary Mahals. A.J.M. Mills was instructed by the Government to draw up some short, clear and well-defined regulations making the Raja responsible to the Superintendent in case of murder, homicide and heinous offences, without, however, interfering so much as to make them amenable to Civil courts of the Superintendent in case of between Raja and their creditors.

Mill submitted the revised set of rules on September 17, 1840, which included abolition of Meriah sacrifice and the practice of Sati. The Government disapproved the rules with instruction to the Superintendent, not to interfere too much... at the same time he would see that the power of life and death be in no case exercised by the Rajas, that Sutee and sacrifices be stopped as far as possible that the Rajas be not permitted to enter into hostilities with each other... that the Superintendent should exercise the power of sentencing the criminals of the Tributary Mahals to imprisonment for seven years and in case of any severe punishment the matter should be first reported to the Government of Bengal.
The Court of Directors opined through their dispatch on December 14 1842 that the object of the Superintendent should be

not to weaken the influence of the Rajas but to interfere with their authority only in case of a political nature and for the prevention of cruelty, oppression and crimes of an aggravated nature.

This avoided the policy of non-intervention which had hitherto been constantly followed by the British Government. By the application of this policy Banki (in 1840) was annexed.

Annexation of Banki 1840

In 1840 Raja Jagannath Srichandan was found guilty of heinous murder. A.J.M. Mills, wanted to give him an exemplary punishment to warn other Tributary Chiefs for their oppressive and cruel acts. As a result the Raja was banished and kept as a state prisoner and his state was made Khas permanently.

Nilgiri

In 1840 the Raja of Nilgiri died and was succeeded by his minor son with the guardianship of his Rani. Because of mis-government in the state the ryots revolted the feud became so serious that A.J.M. Mills had to intervene in it. Having failed to reconcile both the parties he put the state under attachment. The State was administered by Rapton, the Assistant Superintendent of Tributary Mahals, Balasore.
A monthly allowance was given to the Rani to maintain her and her children. The Government was also moved to promote education of the minor Raja and to make him capable of managing his state in future. It was approved. As the Raja attained majority the State was restored to him. In another occasion he had to interfere in the State and drive the Rani out of Nilgiri.

Athgarh

Srikaran Bewarta Patnaik incurred a heavy debt and heavily defaulted in the payment of tribute to the Government. So the State was put under attachment giving an allowance of Rupees 500 per month to the Raja and Rupees 150 to the Tahasildar establishment. The rest was deposited in the Treasury of the Killah. Looking at the financial position of the state the annual tribute was fixed as Rupees 4445 instead of Rupees 6748. The state subsequently restored to Raja in 1847.

Narsinghpur

In 1844 the Raja of Narsinghpur was fined Rupees 200 by Lieutenant Hicks, Assistant Superintendent of Tributary Mahals for his "contumacious behaviour" and it was approved by the Superintendent.

Mills also intervened in the internal affairs of Athmallick, Athgarh, Nayagarh and Narsinghpur. In
1846 Mills was requested by the Raja of Dhenkanal to intervene in the state administration. He though avoided it later on because of repeated request be intervened.

In 1846 the people agitated and complained against the Raja. So the State was put under Khas management. After the settlement of dispute the state was restored to the Raja in December 1846.

Khandpara

After the death of Raja he was succeeded by his minor son. The Rani was incapable to run the administration. So the management was taken under Khas. The minor Raja was put under the charge of Deputy Collector Ram Prasad Roy at Cuttack and given education under a Pandit till he attained majority. In 1846 Mill interfered in the internal affairs of Hindol and was able to bring reconciliation between the Raja and his rebellious uncle.

Annexation of Angul 1848

Raja Somanath Singh of Angul was asked for help by Bira Kahnar, the influential leader of Kandhas of Boudh. Raja assured his full support. He even consented to lend his troops and sent emissaries in different directions to enlist support for the Kandhas.

Being supported by the Raja the Kandh rebels resisted the British troops more effectively. In October 1846 it was decided "to break off the alleged connexion of..."
the Raja of Angul with the Kandhas. Therefore, "it be found necessary to employ a military force against the Khond in support of the authority of Government." Mills alleged the Raja and his subject were supporting the Kandhs. So he recommended with a serious note to the Government of Bengal regarding the attitude of the Raja. So the state was confiscated as the Raja was "found to be preparing to wage war against the Paramount Power" and helping the Kandhs to rise in revolt against the authorities.

The policy of intervention helped considerably in maintaining peace and order in the Tributary Mahals. The policy was applied in the Tributary Mahals, except Banki and Angul, with great care.

Policy of Non-Intervention 1849-1857

In March 1847, A.J.M. Mills was succeeded by Francis Gouldsbury as the Commissioner and Superintendent of the Tributary Mahals. He followed the policy of non-intervention. But only when the Rajas did not comply with the Parwana aiming at the welfare of their own Mahals or, cared little for the repeated instructions issued by the Government.

Navagarh

The Raja collected revenue from the jagir lands held by the Paiks under the plea of non-requirement of a large number of Paiks. But he was opposed by Paik leaders like Kamal Lochan Paikray, his son Udhab Samantray and Ganga-
dnar Singh. It caused a rebellion against the Raja. So Francis Gouldsbury issued proclamations on Paiks Dulbeheras, Dullais, to obtain from all unlawful combination and outrages or breach of peace on pain of punishment.

The Raja was also advised to put his killah under attachment which the Raja did not accede. He did not even respond to the Parwana for sending the Bewarta for a settlement when the representative of the other party attended. In this situation Gouldsbury recommended the Government to place Nayagarh under attachment and it received Government's approval. Then the rebel insurgents were expelled from the state. Raja was also banished to Cuttack with a monthly allowance of Rupees 500 per month. The feud was pacified.

Pal-Lahara

Gouldsbury also intervened in the internal affairs of Pal-Lahara. When two Sarbarakars Bamdeb Bytab and Bimbadhar Gartia with held the payment of collection. Even he employed force under intimation to the Government.

Boundary Disputes

The boundary dispute between Nilgiri and Mayurbhanj was long standing and serious. The Superintendent being informed by the Government called for both the parties and settled the matter. He also settled the boundary.
dispute between the Raja of Dhenkanal and Talcher through arbitrators\textsuperscript{103}. He also tried to introduce a system of regular laws to Feudatory States but the Government did not approve it\textsuperscript{104}.

**Henry Ricketts Report for Non-Intervention**

Henry Ricketts, the erstwhile Superintendent of Tributary Mahals visited Orissa in the capacity of Member of Board of Revenue towards the end of 1853 and submitted a report advocating to follow the policy of non-intervention in the Feudatory States. His view was concurred by the Government of Bengal. The Government's final resolution on this issue was communicated which said

> The guiding principle of non-intervention except in serious cases, a principle heretofore steadily maintained by the Government must be carefully adhered to by the Superintendent and not departed from in any instance without special sanction\textsuperscript{105}.

On March 3, 1854 E. A. Samuells (1854-56) assumed the office of Superintendent of Tributary Mahals. In his tenure he followed the policy of non-intervention. Samuells was succeeded by G. F. Cockburn in October 1856. Nothing remarkable happened during his tenure except imposition of fine of Rupees 200 on Raja of Mayurbhanj and attachment of Athgarh\textsuperscript{106}.

**Revolution of 1857 and British Relation with the Tributary Mahals**

The Revolution of 1857 had no trace of any
sign even in the border states. In the other hand the Raja of Keonjhar deputed
a force of 500 fighting men under the command of a Sirdar to Chaibans to report to
Lieutenant Birch, the Senior Assistant Commissioner of Singhbhum Division and further
requested the Government to authorise him to apprehend the mutineers.

He further provided secret information about the rise of Kolhs and their march to Porahat. The Raja of Mayurbhanj was issued
a Parwana on the basis of above information to restrain the Kolhs living his jurisdiction. Raja's Diwan, Chandra Shekhar Mahapatra did an excellent job preventing the mutineers.

The Raja Keonjhar contributed an elephant to the British Government as a mark of loyalty.

The Raja of Mayurbhanj pacified the Santals of his state who attempted to rise against British authorities at Jaleswar. He also contributed an elephant and sent it to Raniganj. He wrote a letter to his son-in-law, the rebel Raja of Porahat to surrender to the British Government. The Raja of Nilgiri contributed an elephant to the British Government, as a token of loyalty during the Revolt.

In return the British Government conferred on the Raja of Keonjhar, the title Mahadhee Raj Bahadoor, a present of Rupees Five hundred worth and "remission in perpetuity of Rupees one thousand of his tribute, and on his Diwan conferred the title 'Rai Bahadur', Khilat worth Rupees 500 besides a life pension of Rupees two hundred per annum. The Government also conferred on the Raja of Mayurbhanj "the
title Maharajdee Raj Bahadoor and a Khilat as suitable acknowledgement of his loyal conduct and confirm him as the faithful adherent.  

Policy towards Sambalpur Group of States 1803-1857

In 1803 when the Feudatory States came under British control they were left as master of their land and people so long as they paid their tributes, rendered feudal service and obeisance and showed good behaviour. Further engagements entrusted the Chiefs the right of judicial and police administration. Thus the Rajas of Sambalpur exercise uncontrolled jurisdiction in all matters connected with the Government of Estates.

These states remained under the political control and supervision of the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces who was assisted by an Assistant or Political Agent stationed at Sambalpur. The British Government only interfered in the internal affairs of the state to prevent gross injustice. Thus the Feudatory Chiefs had plenary judicial powers in revenue and civil and also in criminal cases subject to confirmation by the Chief Commissioner of sentences of death or, imprisonment for terms exceeding seven years.

Every other order, decree or sentence passed by the Rajas concerning revenue, civil and criminal matters was final. But they were to abide by the instructions and advices given by the Chief Commissioner or, the Political Agent.
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Unlike the Tributary Mahals, the Sambalpur group of States were protected states. The Rajas were free to administer their States according to their own law, customs and traditions.

The cause of leniency was because of the change of sovereign power. The States came under British administration in 1803; in 1806 they were restored to Marathas and reverted to British in 1818 and finally ceded to them in 1827.

In 1819 the British administration tightened its grip over the Sambalpur States. The Rajas lost their power to give capital punishment and appeal against their decision could be made to Political Agent.

In 1821 the judicial and Police Power of the Chiefs were further restricted. The Chiefs promised without the orders of the Sarkar I will not take human life and will take fines for offenses committed, only according to custom and not improperly. If any one found dissatisfied, I will obey whatever orders the Sarkar gives in the matters.

So the Chiefs were amenable to Government courts for murder, homicide, mutilation gross cruelty and other heinous crimes. But in the Civil and revenue matter the Rajas continue to exercise absolute power as before.

On 17 February 1827 the Chiefs of Patna, Rairakhol, Sonepur and Bamra and on 22 February 1827 the Chief of Sambalpur promised to decide all civil cases impartially and petty criminal offences. So the power of Rajas of
Sambalpur Group of States were wider than the Chiefs of Tributary Mahals. Only they were restricted to award capital punishment which needed confirmation from an officer nominated by the British Government.

These States included in the South West Frontier Agency created by Regulation XIII of 1833 with Headquarters at Ranchi. They were placed under control and supervision of an Agent to Governor-General, South West Frontier. In 1849 some changes took place as Sambalpur lapsed to British Government. A new office of Principal Assistant of the Agent for the South West Frontier was created.

In 1854 by another administrative change took place, the designation of the Agent of South West Frontier was changed to Commissioner of Chhotnagpur and that of Principal Assistant to Senior Assistant Commissioner. All the States in Central Province and Chhotnagpur were transferred to the control of the Commissioner of Chhotnagpur. During the revolt of 1857 Sambalpur States were in turmoil but they were brought to normalcy after the Surrender of Surendra Sai.

**British Policy after 1857**

After the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 the Queen's Declaration said

We hereby announce to the Native Princes of India that all treaties and engagements made with them by or under the authority of the Honourable East India Company are by us accepted and scrupulously maintained and we look for like observance on their future.

Ph. D. THESIS
We shall respect the right, dignity and honour of our Native Princes as our own and we desire that they as well as our own subjects should enjoy that prosperity and that social advancement which can be secured by internal peace and good government.

But as Orissa the Feudatory States had remained unaffected during the Revolt of 1857 the new policy of British Government had no impact on them.

In 1861 the management of Sambalpur group of States transferred from the control of Ranchi to that of Commissioner and Superintendent of Tributary Mahals except Gangpur and Bonai.

In the year 1894 new Sanads were issued to the Feudatory Chiefs which limited their powers. So the Feudatory Chiefs of Orissa submitted a memorandum to the Viceroy. Consequently revised Sanads were issued by Lord Minto in 1908 replacing the limitations of Criminal powers of the Rajas as laid down in the Sanads of 1894 by liberal clauses.

Thus the above survey shows that during the 19th century the British Policy towards Orissa Feudatory States was marked by Intervention and non-intervention alternately. Though the guiding principle of mutual relationship was one of non-intervention the British had reserved for them the authority to interfere as and when necessary. Political expediency was therefore the main criterion which determined British attitude towards the Feudatory States. By and
large, the Feudatory Chiefs due to lack of education, experience and wisdom tended to be autocratic in internal administration. This was contrary to the Rule of Law which the British wanted to enforce. Such discretionary powers exercised by the Paramount authority was in the best interest of the common man.
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