INTRODUCTION

The coming into being of modern Orissa is a recent development. Before April, 1936 Orissa was divided into three parts, each attached to a separate province. Central Orissa, comprising Cuttack, Puri, Balasore and their adjoining princely states or Garjats, formed a part of the Bengal Presidency; South Orissa, comprising Ganjam and the adjoining princely states, was attached to the Madras Presidency; while Western Orissa consisting of Sambalpur and the adjoining states was a part of the Central provinces.

Since it was not a single province, what we mean by Orissa then was territories inhabited by Oriya speaking people. This has been considered Orissa proper for the purpose of our study.

Orissa came under the direct management of the British in 1803. With the British colonial regime came changes in the different streams of social life. Gradually roads were constructed in the interior. A modern administrative and judicial system was organized and the police department and

1. In total there were 26 Garjats in the 1st decade of 20th century. They were Athagarh, Athmallik, Baramba, Bananda, Baud, Bonai, Gangpur, Ghumsar, Hindol, Khurda, Keonjhar, Khandapara, Jeypore, Nilagiri, Dhenkanal, Parlakhemundi, Patna-Kalahandi, Mayurbhanj, Narasinghpur, Rairakhol, Daspalla, Ranapur, Sonepur, Mayagarh and Tigiria. See Two Bachelor of Arts, The Oriya Movement, Being A Demand For A United Province, Ganjam, 1919, p.75.
the revenue department were set up. The traditional ways of living were disturbed. The princes and the people, comprised largely of tribal population, reacted against the new colonial structure and the consolidation of colonial regime went hand in hand with serious discontent and resentment among the people.

Popular resistance to colonial rule continued throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries. Popularly known as meli and bidroha, many such local revolts occurred in different parts of Orissa. Prominent among them were Paik Bidroha (1817-24) of Khurda (Paiks were the traditional militia), Kondh Meli (1835-37) of Ghumsar, revolt in Banki (1840), revolt in Angul (1848), Sambalpur Rebellion (1829-1849 and 1857-1864), Keonjhar Praja Meli (1861-68 and 1891), Baudh Praja Meli (1862), Praja Meli in Athmallik (1863), Santhali Meli of Mayurbhanj (1866), Nilagiri Praja Meli (1875), Damapada Meli (1876), Narasinghpur Meli (1876), Nayagarh Meli (1893-95), Praja Meli in Bamanda (1908 and 1928), Nilagiri Praja Meli (1928), Daspalla Meli (1913-14), Mayurbhanj Meli (1917), Dhenkanal Meli (1922), Kanika Meli (1921-22) and Talcher Meli (1911 and 1932).²

These revolts created a long and strong tradition of defiance prior to the emergence of nationalism in Orissa. In late 19th and early 20th centuries, with the emergence of nationalism, how the intelligentsia interacted with these rebelling tribals and peasants would ultimately decide the success of national movement and the process of national integration in Orissa.

In late 19th century Orissa witnessed a national awakening. A new class of intellectuals, whom we broadly designate as nationalist intelligentsia, came into being. The intelligentsia, as a part of their programme of national awakening, started new schools for imparting education, brought out newspapers, fought the perceived social evils and tried to regenerate the people in their own light. They were convinced that the traditional society was decadent and required reformation. They found the people divided on the basis of region, religion and caste. They, on the other hand, wanted to forge a feeling of nationhood based on common political, economic, social and cultural interests that would ultimately lead to a struggle for the overthrow of British

contd...

colonial rule as well as against social evils. The story of national movement in its formative years would be a long process of preparation for the creation of such national feeling in Orissa.

Emergence of the new intelligentsia could be traced back to 1860's when Orissa fell victim to the major famine of the century. Known as Naanka Durvikhya, the great famine of 1866 took a toll of over 10 lakh human lives, which was nearly one-third of the population of the province according to official records. 3

The famine of 1866 brought about a major change in the social and political life of Orissa. The newly educated class looked afresh at the nature of British rule and the underdevelopment of the state. The famine was largely attributed to the unwise famine policy of the Government. The lower level officials, who happened to be mostly outsiders (not from Orissa), were held responsible. They supplied misinformation to the Government and greatly contributed to the famine, the intelligentsia complained. 4

Following the famine, the intellectuals began to address the people. The process of nation-making which was going

on intermittently for some years, now became particularly intense. Thus, 1866 was a turning point in the history of modern Orissa.

IA

The late 19th century intellectuals traced the source of all social and political ills to the general ignorance of people. The diffusion of knowledge, therefore, occupied a central position in their programme of action. They deeply felt the necessity of education and consequently set up schools themselves, helped the Government in its educational programme and persuaded the princes and zamindars to spread education in their areas.5

Pyari Mohan Acharya, a noted historian, started the Cuttack Academy in early 1870's which was upgraded to a high school in 1879. Madhu Sudan Rao (1853-1912), one of the first modern Oriya poets, founded the Cuttack Town High School and Fakir Mohan (1843-1918), one of the first modern prose writer in Oriya, set up a high school at Remuna in Balasore district around the same time. Radhanath Ray (1848-1908), another modern poet, served as a school

5. Fakir Mohan wrote later that at individual level he used to encourage boys of the village to join the school and even paid the tuition fees for poor boys. Senapati, Fakir Mohan Granthavali (hereafter Granthavali), Part I, Cuttack, 1963, p.57.
inspector and looked after the educational programme of the Government.  

The princely class was persuaded to open new educational institutions and to help the students financially for their higher studies. The intellectuals exhorted the princes to establish sufficient number of schools in their respective states and criticized them if they neglected education in their states. After the formation of the Utkal Union Conference, locally called Utkal Sammilani (hereafter UUC) as an organized forum of the intellectuals in 1903, regularly resolutions were passed to develop modern education in the states. All help in this regard was highly appreciated. As a result high schools came up in Bamanda, Dhenkanal and Mayurbhanj. Ramchandra Bhanj Deo, the Mayurbhanj prince, also donated a good amount of money (~.5000) to the Cuttack College (1868) and Cuttack Medical School (1875) in 1877.

The intelligentsia proposed scientific and industrial education in the schools since the traditional system

---


7. Oriya O Navasambad (hereafter QONS or Navasambad), 3 July 1895, in Report of Native Newspapers - Bengal Presidency (hereafter RNNB) for the week ending 10 August 1895. In RNNB the term 'For the Week ending' would not be repeated further.

8. Two Bachelor of Arts, *op. cit.*, Appendix-F, p.329.

of education was unsatisfactory. The UUC, which advocated the advancement of scientific and industrial education, even arranged training in 'modern agriculture and in weaving with fly-shuttle' to make the people 'self-dependent'.

Vernacular languages, as the only medium through which knowledge could be spread to the people, was a conviction common to all intellectuals. To the Dipika (Utkal Dipika), vernacular was the only means to influence the people and to reach the masses. Gangadhar Meher (1862-1924), a modern poet, wrote that one could never attain true knowledge without the love for and knowledge of one's mothertongue. Fakir Mohan argued in 1860-61 that unless vernaculars developed, people would continue to be misunderstood by the outsiders and the nation would be destined to be underdeveloped forever. He held the 'so called' educated people responsible for the problems of the society because they disliked their mother tongue and imitated alien culture. The UUC, because of its strong commitment to

11. Dipika, 16 Feb. 1895, in RNNB, 6 April, 1895.
vernaculars, urged the Government to create facilities for Oriya education in the outlying Oriya tracts (Oriya speaking areas under Madras Presidency and Central Provinces).  

Women’s education was regarded as very important, for mass education would not be successful without educating the women. In 1897, Krishna Prasad Choudhury blamed Hindu religion for the present status of women. He alleged that Hinduism prevented women from being educated. The intelligentsia demanded the opening of girls' schools and consequently their upgradation for the promotion of higher studies among girls. At individual level, Fakir Mohan started a girl's wing in the Balasore High School towards the end of 1890.

The gap of communication between the rulers and the ruled was considered a major handicap of native society. The famine of 1866 was largely attributed to the lack of proper information to the authorities at the higher level. The

17. Sevak, 27 June 1885 in RNNB (date missing), 1885.
intellectuals, who did not doubt the good intentions of the colonial regime, believed that the Government would do the needful provided it was aware of the reality. If the people could convincingly communicate their grievances, the rulers would redress them, they felt. Gopal Chandra Praharaj, for example, described Queen Victoria as the 'mother' and her rule as 'motherly rule'. He advised people even to 'weep' and tell their problems to the Government, which was ready to hear their grievances. 20

This also made them realise the need for the modern press. Following the outbreak of famine, Gouri Shankar Ray and Bichitranand Das started the Utkal Dipika, the first modern Oriya newspaper, in 1866, making it possible for matters related to Orissa to be publicly debated. 21 Following the Dipika, several other newspapers were brought out from different urban pockets of the state. Fakir Mohan and Govind Patnaik brought out the Sambad Vahika from Balasore in 1868, Pyari Mohan Acharya the Utkal Putra (1873) from Berhampur, and Chaturbhuj Patnaik the Samskaraka (1883) from Cuttack. The number of newspapers which was only four by 1871, increased to 9 by 1879, 19 by 1889 and nearly 34 by the end of the century. 22

20. Gopal Chandra Praharaj, Bhagabat Tungire Sandhya (1900), Cuttack, 1903, p.117.


22. Dipika, 6 Nov. 1920.
Newspapers at the time were not business enterprises nor were the editors and journalists professionals. They were in general published as a public service and were often financed as objects of philanthropy. Fakir Mohan has described with what difficulties he and some of his friends founded the Sambad Vahika press at Balasore, for they realised that a newspaper was a necessity for arousing national consciousness among the people. Sapneswar Das, editor of the Sadhana (1923-25), later on described the newspaper as a 'public teacher' and publication of it as a 'mission'. Its publication meant service to the motherland. Referring to the personal sacrifice made by an editor and the self-interest served by editing, Das compared the editor with a man who eats from his pocket to 'fruitlessly' run behind a horse. Due to their pitiable financial condition, in two months' time five newspapers had died and two others were about to die, he wrote in April 1923. The financial constraints were probably worse and the personal sacrifices of the editor greater in late 19th century. Because the press was believed to be a mission, other newspapers, whatever their political viewpoint, were addressed as 'Sahayogi' or

24. The editor spent everything of his own to run a newspaper to gain little material benefit for himself. Sadhana, 2 April 1923.
25. Ibid.
partner and never as rivals. 26

Because of the financial constraints, many newspapers published by the intelligentsia had a very short span of life. Out of some 12 newspapers published between 1866 and 1878, all except two stopped publication after 'sometime', the Dipika reported in 1920. 27 As a way out of the financial problem, the educated princes and zamindars were often persuaded to help in the endeavour. Thus started De's press and newspaper the Utkal Darpan (1873) by zamindar Baikunth Nath De from Balasore, the Utkal Hiteishi Press and the Utkal Hiteishini (1868) by zamindar Kalipad Banerjee from Cuttack, Sudhal Press and newspaper the Sambalpur Hiteishini (1889) by Bamanda Prince Sudhal Dev, and Kishor Press and the Gadjat Basini (1900) by the Talcher prince. With little financial constraints these papers were very regular. 28 The intellectuals worked as editors in the newspapers, contributed to journals and got their literary works published in the printing presses. Radhanath, Gangadhar, Madhu Sudan Rao, Fakir Mohan and Gopinath Nanda, all of them received such help from newspapers and presses. 29

27. Dipika, 6 Nov. 1920.
29. The help was acknowledged by these writers in the preface of their works. See Gangadhar Granthavali, op. cit., pp.53, 149, 241 and 254; Radhanath Ray, Radhanath Granthavali, Cuttack, 1984, pp.31, 67 and 85.
That the existing social practices and religious beliefs acted as impediments to national progress was a conviction common to all intellectuals of the late 19th century. These practices were believed to be features of a decadent society and it was advocated that they should be replaced by new values such as freedom, reason, toleration and a sense of human dignity. Fakir Mohan outrightly rejected the existing 'Kusamskaras' (social evils) and appealed to the Oriya youth to take the lead in eradicating them, for without their eradication Orissa would never progress.  

To him the feelings against widow remarriage, the system of old marriage, caste rigidity and rigid priesthood were social evils which could be fought back by using 'logic and science'. Krishna Prasad Choudhury (who wrote between 1897 and 1920) firmly believed that the rigidity of caste should be abolished and people with intellect and clarity should be given the chance to head religious institutions, even if they were 'Sudras' by caste. In 1895 the Dipika objected to the practice of throwing dead bodies in the river from the 'sanitary point of view' and asked the Government to make the act punishable by law. 'Only prohibitory order would not do', the paper warned. In 1900

---

Gopal Chandra Praharaj also strongly felt the need for social reforms and believed that only 'true' education could make them possible. However, he was against any hasty steps in this regard lest their very purpose be defeated. The means must be convincing and approachable by the average person, he emphasised. 34

The intellectuals commitment to social reforms brought the Brahmo Movement to Orissa. In 1867-68, Fakir Mohan and his friends such as Damodar Prasad Das, Govind Das, Jaykrishna Choudhury and Bholanath Basu started discussions on the Brahmo Movement in Balasore. Meetings were regularly held. At one point Fakir Mohan along with Radhanath planned to convert into a Brahmo, which was considered a new religion in Orissa. 35 In 1870 Haranath Bhattacharya started the Utkal Brahmo Samaj at Cuttack. It sent a delegation to places like Balasore, Bhadrak and Puri to spread the new ideas. In 1872 Prasanna K. Ganguly started the Nilachal Brahmo Samaj at Puri. 36 Some other known intellectuals like Madhu Sudan Rao, Rama Shankar Ray, Bhikari Charan and Biswanath Kar were also directly associated with the movement. 37 Consequently some journals such as the Sevak (1883), the Samskarak (1884) and the Utkal Subhakar came

34. Praharaj, op. cit., p. 79.
36. N. Samantray, Odiya Sahityar Itihas, Bhubaneswar, 1964, p. 35.
out in defence of social reforms. Their very title suggests their taking reforms as a mission. 38

Formation of discussion forums and clubs in different places was also a consequence of the reform movement. Thus appeared Cuttack Youngmen's Association (1869), Cuttack College Students Association (1882), the Orissa Graduates and Undergraduates Association (1888), Puri Students Association (1882), Alochana Sabha, Cuttack (1893), and Cuttack Debating Club (1868). 39 Most of the associations were short-lived and were not able to make sustained efforts to bring about any radical social change. They mainly debated and discussed the issues and couldn't take them beyond their closed circle. 40 Nevertheless, these associations reflected the growing concern of the educated section regarding social awakening through social reforms. The common acceptance among the educated and semi-educated people of the view that the existing social conditions were depressing created a feeling of solidarity and oneness which in due course contributed powerfully to the rise of nationalism.

38. Mahapatra, op. cit., Appendix, p.60.
40. Fakir Mohan in a novel, Prayashchita (1917) accused that social reforms had become a fashion for many educated youth. They didn't do anything except debates and discussions in that regard. See Senapati, Prayashchita, Cuttack, 1987.
II

Language provided the base for the emergence of regional as well as nationalist consciousness in Orissa. The people, more particularly the intellectuals, resisted Oriya being replaced or dominated by other neighbouring languages and people. In Central Orissa it was threatened with domination by Bengali on the ground that Oriya was but a variant of Bengali language. Kanti Chandra, a Bengali and a teacher of Balasore, wrote a book *Odiya Ek Swatantra Bhsa Naye* (Oriya is not a distinct language) in 1870. In this book he argued that Oriya is but a mere dialect of Bengali. In 1870 the Deputy Inspector of School, a Bengali from Balasore, also overtly tried to displace Oriya from the Schools. In South Orissa, which was a part of Madras presidency, Oriya was not used in the offices nor was it taught in the schools. In Western Orissa, which had been attached to Central Provinces since 1862, the Chief Commission declared in 1895 that Oriya would be replaced by Hindi in order to facilitate the transfer of officials within the province. Use of Oriya as the official language in parts of Central Provinces created administrative problems which could be solved by the replacement of Oriya and by using Hindi as the only official language.


language in the provinces, the Government felt.\textsuperscript{43}

Besides the language issue, on other issues like employment and general social treatment also there was a general feeling that the people of Orissa were being dominated by non-Oriyas. In particular, the feeling of domination by Bengali elites was widely felt since the growth of Bengali middle class was comparatively more rapid than that of other neighbouring non-Oriya middle classes. Secondly, the relatively educationally advanced regions of Orissa namely Central Orissa (Cuttack, Puri, Balasore and the adjoining areas) were attached to the Bengal Presidency. The domination looked greater because the middle class there (Central Orissa) was stronger (compared to other parts of Orissa); so the reaction against the perceived domination was also sharper there. Nonetheless, the reaction in other parts was also not negligible.

Following the language controversy, Fakir Mohan and the amlas of Balasore held meetings and sent a petition to the Government against the possible abolition of Oriya from schools.\textsuperscript{44} Since lack of textbooks in Oriya was one of the complaints and basis of the threat, the intellectuals set out to write textbooks for primary school students.

\textsuperscript{43} Sambad Vahika, 7 Feb. 1895, in RNHB, 16 March 1895.

\textsuperscript{44} Senapati, Granthavali (1963), p.55.
Madhusudan Rao wrote the learner's book, *Barna Bodh*, while a creative writer like Fakir Mohan wrote the mathematics primer, *Ankamala*, for the primary students. Gangadhar Meher, a great poet, translated a few poems from Hindi to suit the primary standard, whereas Radhanath wrote books on all subjects from geography to mathematics for the primary school students. Bicchad Charan Patnaik and Gouri Shankar Ray also wrote textbooks to meet the demand of the day. 45

To counter the undermining of linguistic and cultural tradition of Orissa, the intellectuals gradually shaped a glorious past that would sustain their regional identity. Accordingly, Pyari Mohan Acharya wrote the *History of Orissa*, Gopal Chandra Acharya wrote the *Sri Jagannath O Chaitanya*, and Jatindra M. Singh wrote the *Odisar Chitra*. 46 Orissa and its culture were glorified in these works. Others like Fakir Mohan sang that the land of Utkal was the greatest in the whole of India, for in Utkal existed the gateway to heaven (*Swaragadwar*). 47 Radhanath Ray in his *Mahayatra* (1896)


made the Pandavas turn to Orissa in the course of their final journey to heaven, for he wrote, 'if all the lands will be compared with leaves (of a plant) then Utkal will be the flower'. When Fakir Mohan wrote that the great medieval hero Shivaji had visited Orissa, Radhanath brought the Pandavas to Orissa to prove her greatness. Rama Shankar Ray recalled the greatness of the medieval Orissan empire in his play, Kanchi Kaveri (1880-81), in which the Orissan king Purushottam Dev defeated the king of Vijaynagar and won Kanchi.

In South Orissa, the feeling took the shape of an upsurge against the domination of Telugu middle class. As a part of the upsurge William Mohanty started in 1876, an Oriya weekly, Swadeshi, from Ganjam. It was followed by the publication of Ganjam Odisa Hitabadini from Parlakhemundi in 1899. Some socio-cultural organisations like Ganjam Utkal Hitabadini Sabha (1881) and Utkal Hiteishini Sabha (1881) were also organised to stimulate cultural and linguistic feeling among the people. The process culminated in the petition to the Government by Utkal Hitabadini Sabha in 1869 demanding introduction of Oriya in the government.

48. Radhanath Granthavali, p.204.
50. Mahapatra, op. cit., Appendix, p.60.
offices. In 1870 a meeting was organized at Rasulkonda to highlight the language issue.\textsuperscript{52} In 1887, a protective policy was demanded in Ganjam, which meant right of the Oriya tenants to maintain their revenue records in Oriya and to send representations in Oriya.\textsuperscript{53} The efforts resulted in the recognition of Oriya as the official language in Ganjam and as a subject of study in the Madras University in 1890.\textsuperscript{54}

In Western Orissa, the upsurge took the form of a constitutional agitation in true moderate tradition. Sambalpur as the main urban centre of the region became the centre of the agitation. Before the notification regarding replacement of Oriya by Hindi was made public, Chandra Sekhar Behera, then a clerk at Nagpur Secretariat, broke the news in Sambalpur. Consequently a meeting was held on 13 July 1894 expressing unhappiness over the proposal.\textsuperscript{55} After the notification, another meeting was held on 13 June 1895 where a memorandum was drafted demanding revocation of the government order. Some resolutions were passed stipulating that the memorandum be printed in Oriya as well as in English, that the memorandum printed in Oriya be sent to the villages around Sambalpur

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{52} Dipika, 18 Oct. 1873 quoted in Gangadhar Granthavali, Preface, pp.34-35.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Sevak, 15 Dec. 1886, in RNN Bengal, 8 Jan. 1887.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Two Bachelor of Arts, op. cit., pp.23-24.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Sambalpur Hiteishini (hereafter SH), 25 July 1894, in C.R. Mishra, Freedom Movement In Sambalpur, Delhi, 1984, p.149.
\end{itemize}
with a request to form local committees to demand revocation of the government order, that signatures be collected on the memorandum from as many people as possible, and that funds be collected from the public to meet the expenditure of printing, etc. 56

In 1896 Hindi replaced Oriya as the court language in Sambalpur. Court records were maintained in Hindi. Orders were passed to entertain documents for registration of land in Hindi. In the primary schools Hindi was made compulsory from class three onwards. 57 Following this, between 1896 and 1901, several meetings were held, memoranda sent and petitions written to restore Oriya in Sambalpur. A delegation also went to Nagpur in 1901 to apprise the Government of the situation. Madan Mohan Mishra, Balabhadra Supakar, Dharanidhar Mishra, and Chandra Sekhar Behera were the leaders of the agitation. 58

On the literary front, numerous poems and creative essays were published, which appealed to the people.

58. Dipika, 30 March 1895, in RNNB, 18th May 1895. Dipika, 20 & 27 April and 4 May 1895, in RNNB, 8 June 1895, SH, 27 Feb. 1901, in RNNB, 16 March 1901.
particularly influential sections like princes, zamindars, and educated persons, to demand the restoration of Oriya in Sambalpur. The lead was taken by Gangadhar Meher, a poet from Sambalpur locality. Following the order of abolition, he composed the poems, Bharati Rodana (Language Weeps) and the Utkal Bharatinka Nibedana (Appeal of Utkal Language), and published them in Sambalpur Hiteishini. Fakir Mohan in his poem Utkal Bhramana lamented that Mr. Woodburn, (the Chief Commissioner of Central Provinces during whose tenure the abolition was proposed) might be a good administrator otherwise, but had caused a great loss to the people of Orissa.

In 1901 the order was revoked and Oriya restored in Sambalpur by the Chief Commissioner of Central Provinces, Andrew Fraser, who was highly praised by Oriya intellectuals for this. A club was named after him (Fraser Club) in Sambalpur as a mark of respect.

The language agitation in Sambalpur which was the prelude to the forthcoming agitation for the amalgamation of Oriya speaking tracts under one administration reflected

---

60. Senapati, Granthavali (1957), p.207.
61. See C.R. Mishra, op. cit., pp.177-80; Dipika, 12 July 1902, in RNNB, 26 July 1902; Sambad Vahika, 17 July 1902, in RNNB, 2 Aug. 1902.
the growing political maturity of the leadership in Orissa. The movement used all the tactics that the early nationalists working in other parts of India had used: Petitions, signature campaigns, public meetings and delegations formed part of the agitation. Though the intelligentsia spearheaded the agitation, efforts were made to mobilise the rural people to create strong pressure. Agitational literature was printed in Oriya, branch committees were formed in the villages and signature campaigns were organised to involve the people. When the Chief Commissioner visited Sambalpur, people from the villages stood on the roadside and apprised him of their concern for Oriya language. This showed the intelligentsia's awareness of the need to take a common issue to the common people. The process to take modern politics to the people began. Attempts were made to involve them more and more in the modern political process.

One notable result of the language agitation was the emergence of unity among the Oriya intellectuals. Madhu Sudan Das, a leader from Cuttack, advocated the restoration of Oriya in Sambalpur so intensely that he was unanimously nominated in a meeting at Sambalpur in 1896 to represent the municipalities of Orissa in the Legislative Council.

The *Dipika* and the *Sambad Vahika* and other newspapers from Central Orissa whole-heartedly supported the cause of the agitation. 64 A close co-ordination of Oriya intellectuals broadened the scope for the growth of a political Orissa, as a part of greater and unified India.

III

Mushroom growth of several socio-cultural organisations was another significant development of the post-famine period. They grew because of the intellectuals' concern for the all round development of Orissa. Notables among these organisations were the National Society of Balasore (1878), Utkal Sabha of Cuttack (1882) and Utkal Hiteishini Sabha of Parlakhemundi (1881). Till the formation of Utkal Union Conference in 1903 these organisations worked as the centre of all social and political activities in the state. They were also associated with newspapers like *Sambad Vahika*, *Utkal Dipika*, *Utkal Darpan* and *Swadeshi*. They represented an all Orissa character and possessed an all India vision which got expressed through these newspapers. Besides newspapers, other forms like meetings, petitions and memorandums were also used to express the intellectuals' viewpoints on different socio-political issues. Besides the above mentioned newspapers, there were many other newspapers and journals such as *Samaskaraka*, *Sevak*, *Navasambad*, *Gadjar Basini* and the *Sambalpur Hiteishini*. All these papers and journals were

64. *Dipika*, 30 March 1895, in RNNB, 18 May 1895; *Dipika*, 20, 27 April & 4 May in RNNB, 8 June 1895.
a major forum of nationalist agitation and very influential creators of public opinion. In the absence of a recognised political party, the press along with the few socio-cultural associations played the role of the opposition in matters of day to day administration.

On economic front, the intelligentsia drew the attention of the government to the growing poverty of the people, which was attributed to high taxation, decline of native industries like salt manufacture and poor salary to low level officials among other things, (Details are to be found in RNNB of the years 1868-1900). Referring to the decrease in consumption of salt in Balasore district, the Navasambad wrote in 1895 that poverty was the main reason behind it. Due to extreme poverty ordinary meals were becoming simpler and extra-ordinary meals served on marriage and festivals less sumptuous day by day. Consequently consumption of every article including salt decreased, the paper concluded. 65 As early as 1886, the Sevak questioned 'those educated countrymen who were under the impression that Indian people were making general material progress under the British Government'. 66 The Navasambad criticised the provision of Municipal tax on kerosene, a necessary commodity of the poor. 67 The Dipika described the pilgrim tax as an

65. OONS, 16 Oct. 1895, in RNNB, 30 Nov. 1895.
67. OONS, 4 Sept. 1895, in RNNB, 26 Oct. 1895.
extra-burden on the pilgrims, who were not necessarily rich and whose 'troubles and distresses were more than enough'.  

Decline of native salt industry worried the intelligentsia because it resulted in the loss of employment to a large number of people in the coastal regions.  

What a pity that we must look up to Liverpool for our salt? What can illustrate the misfortune of India more than this? the Dipika asked. 'No humane Government having the least affection for its subjects would adopt a cruel measure calculated to deprive a large number of men of their living', the Samskaraka commented. The main point of their objection was that the people who lost employment by the destruction of indigenous salt industry could not be absorbed by the new salt industry. The Dipika challenged: 'If the Government feels that Liverpool salt was profitable (as a business to the people) let it prepare and employ the people in the same way as the Ponga salt (local salt) had done'.  

Excess expenditure on defence, high salary of the Viceroy and the members of his Executive Council, the system

68. Dipika, 10 Feb. 1868, in RNNB, 22 Feb. 1868.  
70. Dipika, 3 Dec. 1887, in RNNB, 7 Jan. 1888.  
73. 'Frontier defences were great enemies of Indian people' - Dipika, 21 April 1888, in RNNB, 19 May 1888.  
74. Utkal Darpan, 9 June 1885, in RNNB, (undated), 1885.
of taxation by which 'the interests of Indian people had been subordinated to those of English manufacturers, who would have otherwise raised a hue and cry in the English parliament in the name of free trade' 75 and poor salary to the amlas and ministerial officers, 'despite the phenomenal rise in cost of living', 76 were some of the issues taken up by the intellectuals. The remedy was found in the Indian's power to control the Indian budget. 'The natives must be given the power to check the waste of public money', they suggested. 77

On the political front, they argued that people's loyalty to the Government was of little value because the latter continued to suspect the natives. For example, the Arms Act had rendered the people 'helpless and defenceless'. 78 Poor enrolment of natives in higher military service and assignment of little responsibility to the Indian princes in the military department were also cited as proofs. 79 The Government was urged to repeal the Arms Act 80 and to give responsibility to the Indians in the military department; 'otherwise distrust would breed distrust in its turn'.

75. Samskaraka, 7 April 1887, in RNNB, 23 April, 1887.
76. Samskaraka, 14 April 1887, in RNNB, 30 April 1887.
77. Dipika, 21 April 1888, in RNNB, 19 May 1888.
78. Dipika, 26 Jan. 1895, in RNNB, 2 March 1895.
79. Sevak, 18 and 22 Dec. 1886, in RNNB, 8 Jan. 1887.
80. OONS, 7 Aug. 1895, in RNNB, 14 Sept. 1895.
they warned. 

In administration, they demanded the Indianisation of public services, for that would reduce the expenditure of the Government as well as generate confidence among Indians that they could rule themselves; more power to judiciary; and both nomination and competition in public service, because 'nomination alone leads to favouritism and misuse of patronage and power, and free and open competition alone without reference to local usages, social status and other important considerations, is equally mischievous'.

The intellectuals and their local organisations were equally receptive to the nationalists and the national movement outside Orissa. The three main organisations, Utkal Sabha, National Society and Utkal Hiteishini Sabha interacted with outside organisations like Indian Association (1883), All India National Conference (1885) and subsequently with Indian National Congress. They regularly sent delegates to the annual sessions of the Congress from 1886 onwards.

---

83. In contrast, the Government was accused of trying to lower the prestige of judiciary - a policy always fraught with evil and danger, *Dipika*, 23 March 1895, in *RNNB*, 27 April 1895.
84. *Samskaraka*, 31 March 1887, in *RNNB*, 23 April 1887.
85. Baikunth Nath De of National Society, attended the Calcutta Congress of 1886, Madhu Sudan Das and Gouri Shankar Ray of Utkal Sabha attended the Allahabad Congress of 1888. In 1890 Janaki Nath Bose of Utkal contd...
The different sabhas held meetings to nominate delegates to the Congress and discussed the Congress session and the resolutions passed there at length after the return of the delegates from the Calcutta. Reports on the Congress used to appear regularly in the local newspapers before and after the Congress session. People were urged by the Press to take interest in public matters and in the Congress. Before the Congress session, suggestions were put forward to be taken up there for discussion.

The close tie between the Congress and the Orissa intellectuals is also brought out by the latter's efforts to spread the Congress message in the interior. This got expressed in literature, for example in a novel by Praharaj. In the novel, Bhagabat Tungire Sandhya (completed in 1900) the novelist brought the nationalist minded educated youth

---

Sabra, in 1895 five delegates from Utkal Hiteishini Sabha and in 1901 four delegates from Utkal Sabha and five from National Society attended the Congress. [Rep. on INC, 1886, 1888, 1890, 1895 and 1901, Delegates List.]

86. Dipika Printing Press complex used to serve the purpose of a hall for public meetings on such occasions, Samskaraka, 2 Feb. 1888, in RNNB, 18 Feb. 1888; Dipika, OONS, both of 15 Dec. 1894, in RNNB, 12 Jan. 1895.

87. Samskaraka suggested to the Congress of 1887 to urge the government to introduce a representative element into the council to discuss financial matters. Samskaraka, 7 April 1887, in RNNB, 23 April 1887. Also see P.K. Mishra, 'First Half Century of the Congress Movement in Orissa: A Review', in Indian History Congress Proceedings, Waltier, 1979, pp.637-39.
to the village with the Congress message. The villagers were grateful to the youth - for the message, which taught them to demand justice and fairplay from the 'ma-bap' British Government. They learnt that they could get that only through forging unity among themselves. The Utkal Sahitya the Press, Cuttack, had translated the Constitution of Congress in Oriya and sold it in the market, the youth informed the villagers. 88

The intellectuals while lending their support to the Congress realised that it did not represent the mass of people. Nonetheless, they asserted that it represented the educated India, the intelligent 'souls' of the country who 'guide, protect and consolidate' the rights and interests of the people. 89

Their identification with the Congress is explained by two features. One, that the Congress had emerged as the central political platform at the all-India level within a very short span of time. Two, there was a spontaneous urge among the intellectuals to come together on a broad national platform. The timely formation of the Congress in 1885 served the purpose.

IV

On 30 and 31 December 1903 when the annual session of the Congress was being held in Madras, many of the intellectuals of Orissa met in Cuttack and formed an organisation called Utkal Sammilani, which is translated as Utkal Union Conference (UUC). Presided over by the prince of Mayurbhanj, Sriram Chandra Bhanj Deo, and 'graced' by the Commissioner of Orissa, K.G. Gupta, the conference thanked the Government for its policy on territorial redistribution, while Congress 'viewed it (policy on territorial re-distribution) with deep concern' at Madras. Further, the conference decided to remain above 'all politics' at a time when hectic political activities were on to popularise the Congress movement.90

The conference was to primarily look after the interests of Orissa, especially on the issue of union of Oriya speaking tracts under one administration. According to the conference sources, more than 2000 people including 335 delegates from the outlying Oriya speaking tracts, (Sambalpur, Ganjam and Medinipur) attended and strove for the unity of Oriya people.91

The formation of UUC, a movement for a linguistic and cultural identity of the Orissa people, appears to have developed in opposition to the National Congress. Regional consciousness for a moment seemed to have overlapped the

91. Ibid.
nationalist consciousness of the intellectuals. But in reality it was not so. Both the feeling for a linguistic and cultural identity and the sentiments against colonial domination seemed to have grown simultaneously by complementing each other even after 1903. Whenever there was tension between the two, it was not due to mutual opposition, but due to some other local conditions. Here we would discuss this aspect in brief.

While participating in the Congress, the Orissa leadership fully realised that the cultural and linguistic demands of the Oriyas, particularly the union (of Orissa) issue, which were attributed to the 'influx of a large population of neighbouring communities', could be taken up only by a regional platform. The Congress could not take them up unless they assumed a proportion of national concern. In any case the Congress had adopted the policy of not taking up any local or non-Indianwide issue, leaving such issues to local and provincial conferences.

92. The theory, that regional consciousness in Orissa was posed against nationalist consciousness, has found advocates in Nivedita Mohanti, Oriya Nationalism: Quest for a United Orissa, 1866-1936, New Delhi, 1982; P. Kar, op. cit., p.65; K.M. Patra, et. al., History of Orissa..., op. cit. and in many others. D. Rutherford, who wrote the foreword for Nivedita Mohanti, believed it 'to be an upsurge for emancipation from a dominant and much stronger neighbours rather than from British rule', see Foreword in Nivedita Mohanti, op. cit.

93. Two Bachelor of Arts, op. cit., p.17; Senapati, Granthavali (1957), p.201.

94. Dipika, 9 April 1888, in RNNB, 28 April 1888.
Accepting the constraints of the Congress, Madhu Sudan Das contacted some nationalists such as Surendranath Banerjee from Bengal to organise a Bengal provincial conference. The purpose of the conference would be to take up issues of regional importance. When the idea was finalised the Utkal Sabha organised a public meeting in the first week of October 1888 and publicly supported the move. Madhu Sudan Das explained there that the conference would be the meant for local problems while the Congress would take up national problems. Thus the two associations (Provincial Conference and National Congress) would be complementary to each other.

In 1888 the first session of the Provincial Conference was held in Bengal. The different sabhas sent their delegates to it. The Orissa delegates in the subsequent sessions of the conference were so enthusiastic that in 1901 a proposal was put forward to hold its session in Cuttack. But the cordial relation could not be maintained for long. In the proposed Orissa session delegates from the outlying, non-Bengal tracts -- Ganjam and Sambalpur -- were not allowed to join. They were Oriya speaking, but didn't belong to the Bengal Presidency.

95. Dipika, 6 Oct. 1888, in RNNB, 10 Nov. 1888.
96. Dipika, 13 July 1901, in RNNB, 27 July 1901.
could not invite the people beyond the provincial boundary. On the other hand, the Oriya intellectuals felt that the amalgamation issue could not be pursued in the Conference without the participation of people from different Oriya speaking tracts. This created a rift between the Orissa intellectuals and the leaders of the Conference leading to the withdrawal of the former from the Conference. Now a new alternative was looked for.  

Another development which provoked the Orissa intellectuals to organise a regional platform of their own was the Government's proposal on territorial re-distribution. In 1903 the Government mooted a proposal for re-distribution of territories which, if implemented, would have helped in the process of amalgamation of Oriya speaking tracts under one administration. The proposal stipulated that considering 'race, language, administrative convenience and territorial integrity', Sambalpur with five adjoining Oriya feudatory states (of the Central Provinces), Orissa division and a part of the Singhbhum district of the Chota Nagpur division (of Bengal) and Ganjam district, Ganjam Agency and Vizagpatam Agency tract (of Madras Presidency) should be amalgamated together.

97. Dipika, 18 April 1903, in RNN-Bengal, May 1903.
to form a homogenous unit within the Bengal presidency. The Government of India planned to unite the whole of the Oriya speaking people, both hill and plain, under one administration.

The proposal did not find favour in the Congress circles. Matters came to a head when the Madras Congress of 1903 hotly debated the issue and finally rejected the official proposal. While moving a resolution against the proposed territorial re-distribution, J. Choudhury of Bengal said: 'This Congress views with deep concern the present policy of the Government of India in breaking up territorial divisions which have been of long standing and are closely united by ethnological, legislative, social and administrative relations and the Congress deprecates . . . . the separation of the District of Ganjam and the agency tracts of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam Districts from the Madras Presidency'.

G. Raghava Rao, while seconding the resolution, said that Oriyas living in Madras presidency were not a minority and were getting special attention and privileges for being


100. Rep. on INC, 1903, p. 128.
a backward class. Secondly the proposed transfer would create problems for the Telugus in the Ganjam areas, whereas the Oriyas were there under Madras administration for over a century and a half and were used to it. 'There was no complaint from them', he added. 101

But the resolution opposing the proposal of transfer was not supported by all present in the Congress session. For example, V. Krishna Swami Iyer strongly objected to the passing of the resolution on 'issues involving people with considerable differences of opinion'. The Oriyas were anxious to be with Orissa, whereas the Telugus of Ganjam were opposed to that. On such matters, 'Congress should not be invited to pronounce its opinion', he pointed out and moved an amendment to the resolution. The amendment was, however, rejected and the original resolution was passed by the Congress. 102

The Orissa delegates (five in number in 1903) could not or did not speak their feelings in the open session, though they might have done so in private or in the subjects session, nor did they approve of the passing of the resolution. 103 They returned with a strong urge to join the

101. Ibid., p.130.
102. Rep. on INC, 1903, p.133.
regional platform to pursue Oriya issues. The result was the UUC.

In any case, before the resolution was actually passed at Madras, all preparations had been made for such an organisation.104 In January 1903 Madhu Sudan Das in a gathering of some princes, zamindars and educated persons had mooted the idea and taken the responsibility of organising a conference for the purpose.105 In South Orissa also similar efforts had been made by people like Harihar Panda, Sribatsa Panda, Prince of Khalikote, Balaram Maharana, Parasuram Patra and a few others. The result was the convention of Jatiy Samity in April 1903.106 In December 1903 the samity merged in UUC.

Formation of UUC in 1903 did not lead to a break in all intellectuals relations with the Congress, nor did it mean the withdrawal of the entire Orissa leadership from broad national politics. In 1903 itself, Utkal Sabha the forerunner of UUC, sent delegates to the Congress at a time when UUC was being organised in Orissa.107

104. This explained the existence of so many causes, and not alone of the Resolution at Madras, behind the formation of UUC.

105. Dipika, 14 March 1903, in P. Kar, op. cit., p.50.

106. Two Bachelor of Arts, op. cit., pp.24-25.

the session, Dipika, the unofficial organ of UUC, in an optimistic voice, noted that the Congress movement was becoming firm day by day. The song, regularly sung in the opening session of the UUC from 1903, was called Bharat Gitika or the Song of India. It was specially composed by Radhanath Ray for UUC and declared: 'India thou art the mother of us all...'. In 1907, Madhu Sudan Das, the main architect of UUC, organised a public reception for the delegates who had attended the Calcutta Congress in 1906. Before this meeting at Cuttack, Dipika had described the Calcutta Congress as the 'largest of its kind ever held in India'.

The split within the Congress in 1907 and the ban on the song 'Bande Mataram' by the British caused worry in the mind of many of Oriya political leaders which again reflected their concern for the Congress and nationalism. While some blamed the Extremists and their leader, Balgangadhar Tilak, for the indiscipline and the consequent split in the Congress, some others blamed both the Extremists and the Moderates.

Some others felt it to be a shame on the part of all Indians who 'became objects of laughter before the whole world'.

In December 1906, the **Dipika** was sad to note that the Sanskrit meaning of 'Bande Mataram' was misinterpreted by an Englishman. When the Lt. Governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam revoked the prohibitory order on the slogan, it not only welcomed the news but also asked the people to use the expression 'Bande Mataram' in place of Salam, namaste and other forms of traditional greetings. 'That would be a fitting reply to those Englishmen, who disliked the slogan', the paper concluded.

Sometime before the newspaper comment, in fact, a man in Bangiriposi near Baripada shouted Bande Mataram at seeing the Police Superintendent, an Englishman, to annoy him.

However, after 1903, the reaction of the intellectuals to the national movement and the Congress was not uniform. What we explained above was just the reaction of one section of the intelligentsia. Another section, broadly speaking, opposed the national movement, the Congress and its programme of confrontation with the Government through 'boycott'.

'anti-partition movement', etc. This section believed that the National Congress and its programme, 'which were distasteful to the authorities', were the brain-child of some 'Bengali' elites, who were 'indifferent and unsympathetic to Orissa' and urged that the people (of Orissa) to remain aloof from them. They believed that the 'Oriyas could never hope to expect any good by joining movements'. They even objected to the use of 'Bande Mataram' slogan in the UUC session in 1908.

The two sections of intellectuals represented two different political trends in Orissa. The one which interacted with Congress was the 'liberal' consisting of princes and zamindars. The Utkal Darpan owned by zamindar Baikuntha Nath De, the Sambalpur Hiteishini owned by Bamanda Prince Sudhal Dev, and the Gadjat Basini, owned by the Talcher Prince Kishor Chandra Dev were the advocates of the 'loyalist' trend. Opposition to the Congress could be seen mainly in these newspapers. In the beginning of the 20th century, a third trend appeared in Orissa politics which found many ardent supporters of the Congress in it. We may describe

118. SH, 10 Feb. 1906, in RNNB, 3 March 1906.
119. Ibid.
121. Utkal Darpan, 12 March 1906, in RNNB, 31 March 1906.
122. OONS, 22 April 1908, in RNNB, 23 May 1908.
them as the 'moderate nationalists'. Briefly speaking while the 'loyalists' opposed the Congress and preached loyalty to the British Government, the 'moderate nationalists' urged the merger of UUC with the Congress. The 'liberals', on the other hand, vacillated between these two trends. The UUC which was an amalgam of all the three trends witnessed an intense struggle between the three during 1903-1920.123

Despite interaction with the Congress, the liberals followed a policy which could 'not be very intimate' in regard to the Congress and the national movement after 1903. On the other hand, they looked to interaction with the loyalists. The nationalist tendency of early 20th century which was on the increase due to the growing contradiction between colonialism and the Indian people could not be absorbed, nor could it be well represented, by the liberals. This was the main cause of the emergence of the moderate nationalist trend in Orissa.

The loyalists opposed the Congress and preached perpetual loyalty to the British. The liberals sometimes succumbed to their pressure in spite of their broad understanding of nationalism. In the early years the UUC was

123. We use the terms 'liberals' and 'moderate nationalists' for convenience of our analysis. They should be understood in the context they have been referred to, and not in the all India context.
dominated by the loyalists; in 1908 it passed a resolution not to allow the use of 'Bande Mataram' in its sessions. Parikud Prince, while presiding over the session at Puri in 1908, drew a clear cut line of difference between UUC and 'politics' by which he meant the politics of the Congress. The loyalists accused the Congress of having 'disregarded the claims of smaller nationalities in the interest of larger ones'. The Sambad Vahika, a supposed organ of the liberals from Balasore, like the loyalists, criticized the Congress leaders as 'misguided reformers' and 'false prophets' who were 'blind to the manifold blessings which Britain conferred on India'.

The liberal's 'not so intimate' relation with the Congress was seen to be a general apathy by the moderate nationalists. They criticized the liberal leaders as 'so-called leaders' and as 'handful of sychophants', and described the UUC policy - supposedly that of general apathy to the Congress and loyalty to the Government - as that of

124. Between 1903 and 1912 none but a loyalist presided over the UUC, nor could anybody else head the reception committee. See Two Bachelor of Arts, op. cit., Appendix F, pp.328-34.

125. OONS, 22 April 1908 and Dipika, 25 April 1908, in RNNB, 23 May 1908.

126. Two Bachelor of Arts, op. cit., p.31.

127. Sambad Vahika, 12 March 1908, in RNNB, 18 April 1908.
'mendicancy' and 'begging' which had achieved 'nothing' for Orissa.\textsuperscript{128}

Thus, in the first decade of 20th century moderate nationalists grew as a reaction to liberal politics in Orissa. Their growth coincided with the decline of, and disillusionment with, the liberals. The two developments—decline of liberals and the rise of moderate nationalists—went side by side culminating in the taking over of the UUC, the political platform of all political trends, by the latter at the Chakradharpur session of the UUC in 1920. The change was not sudden. It had been preceded by so many developments leading to the growing strength of the moderate nationalists.

Working within the broad UUC framework the moderate nationalists had been making attempts for a more meaningful and close relation with the nationalists outside Orissa, particularly with the National Congress. The liberals' 'not very intimate' relations with the Congress could not satisfy them. The Congress was fast becoming an all-India movement and was taking a confrontationist attitude towards the Government. This was explicit in the Anti-Partition and the boycott movement of 1906. The liberals and the UUC, because of their dilemma, instead of coming closer to the Congress started drifting away from it during this time.

\textsuperscript{128} Dipika, 25 April 1908 and OONS, 29 April 1908, \textit{In RNNB}, 30 May 1908.
The liberals supported the Swadeshi idea because it was essential 'for the industrial development of the country';\textsuperscript{129} they advised the peasantry to 'grow cotton at a large scale'.\textsuperscript{130} But they opposed the 'boycott' of foreign goods, because the 'time had not arrived to manage business by the help of indigenous means and appliances'.\textsuperscript{131} They desired the Congress to grow fast, but opposed the slogan of 'boycott' and even the slogan of 'Bande Mataram', because they ('boycott' and 'Bande Mataram') had their origin in the Anti-Partition Movement in Bengal in which the 'Oriyas were not personally interested'.\textsuperscript{132}

This was a dilemma, deep rooted in the politics of the liberals. Nonetheless it was a reality which did not perfectly fit the growing nationalist feeling of the moderate nationalists and the latter strongly opposed the attitude of the liberals. The moderate nationalists participated in the boycott and anti-partition movement against the wishes of the liberals.\textsuperscript{133} The attitude adopted by the UUC in 1908 was criticized. The \textit{Navasambad}, which was more critical of the
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Government than other newspapers of the time, pointed out in 1908 a series of 'defects' in the UUC position. It criticised the UUC for adopting 'mendicant' and 'begging' policy to solve problems, for working independently of the National Congress, for prohibiting the shouting of 'Bande Mataram', and for making use of foreign cloth in the conference pandal.\textsuperscript{134} An anonymous letter published in the \textit{Dipika} also criticised the UUC leadership because 'Bande Mataram' was prohibited in the conference of 1908, because no 'relation' could be established with the National Congress and because the UUC was 'loyal' to the core. It described the leaders of the UUC as 'handful of sychophants' and 'so-called' leaders and criticised them for having achieved nothing because of their loyalty.\textsuperscript{135} Madhu Sudan Das, the supposedly unchallenged leader of the UUC, hence of Orissa, was severely criticized by the \textit{Navasambad} for 'he was not straightforward and steadfast in his principles as well as in his conduct'.\textsuperscript{136}

In later years the criticism of UUC for its alleged apathy to the Congress and loyalty to the British increased. In 1917, Jadumani Mangaraj, a youth leader, sharply criticised the liberal stalwart, Madhu Sudan Das. This led to the withdrawal of the young volunteers from the UUC just
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before the beginning of its annual session.\textsuperscript{137} The timely arrival of a band of 'Satyavadi'\textsuperscript{138} students no doubt saved the situation, but the incident further strengthened the position of the moderate nationalists in the UUC. The teachers and students of Satyavadi worked as volunteers during the conference and Gopabandhu as their spokesman openly criticized the British Government in the midst of the liberals and loyalists.\textsuperscript{139}

In 1918, along with the Government, the UUC leadership was blamed for the miseries of Orissa. In its annual conference, while Gopabandhu appealed to the people to think beyond the interests of Orissa, Chandra Sekhar Behera, a moderate nationalist from Sambalpur, in a more direct criticism said that when the neighbours of Orissa had taken a longer leap under the British administration (because of their confrontationist attitude), Oriyas were still stagnating.\textsuperscript{140} While articulating his feeling about the liberals, Harekrishna Mahatab, a volunteer of the UUC and an activist among the moderates in 1918, wrote later that he never heard anything
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on Indian nationalism from Madhu Sudan Das; unification of Orissa and attack on Bengali domination was the only politics of Orissa then. 141

The parochial approach of the liberals to the neighbouring people, especially the Bengalis, was also a cause of the disenchantment of the young cadres with liberal politics and provoked them to look towards the Congress more and more for leadership. It was an open secret that the Orissa Union movement, while fighting out the linguistic and cultural domination of the neighbouring elites, had been tainted with regional feelings. A newspaper (the Navasambad), brought out by a domiciled Bengali, was condemned as the paper of 'Kaligali' (Bengal) and was accused of not being faithful to Orissa. 142 In 1908 UUC's decision not to shout the slogan 'Bande Mataram' and not to support 'boycott' was defended in the liberal press on the ground that these had their origin in the 'partition of Bengal' in which the Oriyas were not personally interested. 143 The loyalists, of course, gave open expression to their parochial feelings and preferred British officers' rule to the rule by 'Bengali' and 'Mahratti' officers. 144

142. Samskaraka, 24 Feb. 1887, in RNNB, 19 March 1887.
143. Sambad Vahika, 7 May 1908, in RNNB, 13 June 1908.
144. Utkal Darpan, 24 Feb. 1906, in RNNB, 3 March 1906.
The young nationalists sharply reacted to such parochialism. They had, of course, strong commitments to the linguistic and cultural development of Orissa like their liberal counterparts. But they were against any parochial feelings. Later in 1925, while referring to the linguistic issue, Gopabandhu said that union of Oriya speaking tracts was not merely a political problem, rather it was a national and social problem of the people of Orissa. In 1904, when the UUC decided to allow only Oriya delegates and observers to attend its annual session, Gopabandhu wrote a protest letter to Madhu Sudan Das at whose instance a few Bengali students had been prevented from attending the session. This protest represented the growing trend of opposition to the liberals and their parochial feelings.

Many of the young nationalists had had a wide social exposure. Gopabandhu, Nilakantha, Godavarish, Krupasindhu Mishra and many others had studied in Calcutta and came in contact with many nationalist leaders of Bengal. Even Mahatab who had studied only in the local school at Bhadrak in Balasore district strongly reacted to parochialism right from the school days because he was 'indoctrinated to nationalism' by his teacher who happened to be a Bengali. So when he heard the liberal leaders spreading 'venom against

Bengalis', it was distasteful to him.\textsuperscript{147}

Another reason why the liberals' politics could not attract the young nationalists was the intermixing of the former with the loyalists. The liberals' dependency on the loyalists had grown so much that the loyalists exercised an upper hand in UUC politics. In the first 10 years of UUC, between 1903 and 1912 none other than a loyalist presided over the annual UUC session. The chairman of the reception committee was also always a loyalist. For the first time in 1913 (Puri session), a liberal, Madhu Sudan Das, presided over the session which was again followed by the presidentship of loyalists till 1916. The presidents and chairmen of reception committee were no doubt nominal heads of the conference, but this fact reflected the loyalist domination of the UUC.\textsuperscript{148} Moreover, the major portion of UUC funds came from the princes and zamindars.\textsuperscript{149} The loyalists felt themselves to be indispensable in the Orissa movement also because of the liberals' dependence on them. They claimed all credit for the movement and totally ignored the contribution of the 'educated people'.\textsuperscript{150}

\textsuperscript{147} Mahatab, \textit{Sadhanan Patha}, p.10.

\textsuperscript{148} See Two Bachelor of Arts, \textit{op. cit.}, Appendix-F, pp.329-36.

\textsuperscript{149} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{150} Gadjat Basini, 2 May 1908, in \textit{RNNB}, 6 June 1908.
In reality the loyalists had succeeded in preventing the UUC from evolving into an anti-colonial movement. More than that they themselves engaged in feudal oppression in the states and zamindari estates and tried to co-opt and prevent the intelligentsia from reacting against this oppression. During the local anti-feudal revolts of the late 19th century intellectuals like Fakir Mohan and Madhu Sudan Das were contacted by the different princes,151 who were also leaders of the informal Oriya movement, to help in the isolation and suppression of the movements and to liaison with the government officials to absolve the concerned prince from all blame. These and other intellectuals had helped the feudal elements who were engaged in feudal oppression of the tribal people and the peasants.152

The moderate nationalists were the second generation of the newly educated as also the second general modern political leaders. They had overcome the initial hurdles on which their liberal counterparts had stumbled. They had realised that feudal elements could not give any real help to a modern political movement, especially if it was

151. Example of Bhuyan Meli described by Senapati himself, Atmajivana Charita, p. 148.

152. Fakir Mohan with a note of confession said to have helped a melisardar in later life as a prayaschit to his guilt. Senapati, Granthavali, (1963), p. 90.
anti-colonial. Hence they planned for an independent movement free from feudal control. 153

In their move to develop independently the moderate nationalists founded the Satyavadi school in 1909 and two nationalist newspapers, *Satyavadi* and *Samaj* in 1913 and 1919 respectively. Satyavadi school, founded at Sakhigopal village in Puri district, was an open school on the model of Ravindranath Tagore's Viswa Bharati. It provided education with a view to make the students self-sufficient. It also aimed at making 'good human beings'. 154 The school recruited many of the young nationalists as teachers and became a centre of nationalist politics in later years. The

153. In 1906, Gopabandhu, soon after his education, started a high school in the Nilagiri princely state. The local prince provided the funds. Some of Gopabandhu's nationalist colleagues like Harihar Das and Umacharan Das also joined. All of them hoped to evolve the institution into a national school. But that could not be possible because the Political Agent interfered and the prince dared not protest. Consequently, Gopabandhu and his colleagues left the school. Radhanath Rath (ed.), in *GBR*, Vol.1, Cuttack, 1976, p.5. Gopabandhu became the state lawyer of Mayurbhanj princely state in 1912. There he witnessed that the Political Agent assaulted a native without any real cause. The incident passed away without any protest from the prince. Gopabandhu resented this and left the service to resume independent legal practice at Cuttack. S.C. Das, *op. cit.*, p.39. Nilakantha was said to have protested against bethi (un-paid labour) in Khandapada by refusing to lead a team of students from Satyavadi (some time in 1910-11) to visit the princely state. Nilakantha Das, *Gravanthavali*, Vol.1, Cuttack, 1963, p.77.

154. The resolution passed in the UUC of 1913 on Satyavadi, quoted in *GBR*, vol.1, p.8.
nationalist press was also founded in the school premises later. In one word, we may say that it was like a Gandhian Ashram of the Non-Cooperation and Civil Disobedience days. No doubt the school and the press got some occasional help from the feudal elements, but they remained under the control of the young nationalists and helped them to freely propagate their nationalist ideas. 155

V

After initial success, the UUC soon began to decline. In 1904 Ganjam could not be transferred to Orissa, in 1911 the joint province of Bihar and Orissa was carved out, neglecting the demand for the union of Oriya areas. The politics of petitions and representations failed to fetch justice. All this disenchanted even the liberals with their own politics towards the latter half of the first decade of the 20th century. They increasingly tended to adopt a more confrontationist stance towards the government and to develop more intimate relations with the National Congress. They now viewed their alliance with the loyalists as a political stumbling block and gradually drifted apart from them.

Referring to the partition of Bengal which had been welcomed earlier, the Dipika pointed out in December 1905 that it had proved unfortunate in various ways. It could
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satisfy neither the people of Orissa nor the people of Bengal. Oriya people of Ganjam, Phuljhar, Padampur, and Khariar (all were outlying tracts) were thoroughly disgusted, the paper reported. 156 The UUC had hoped that Ganjam would be transferred soon to Orissa. On 8th January 1904, a memorandum signed by 6,600 people from Ganjam had been sent in this regard. But the hopes were belied. 157

Referring to the proposal to separate the province of Bihar and Orissa from Bengal, the Dipika not only raised strong objection to it in 1911, but preferred Orissa to be at least with Bengal and not with Bihar. 158 After the province was carved out the liberals demanded at least a separate university for Orissa and the location of the high court at a centrally located place. 159 In September 1912, a memorandum was sent to the viceroy to reconsider the joint province issue. 160 As a way out, the liberals proposed for a separate Orissa province – because it was not even administratively 'convenient to transfer it either to any of the states'. Moreover, they complained that poor Orissa was being
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'kicked hither and thither' unnecessarily.\textsuperscript{161}

The liberals had hoped in late 19th century that the establishment of communication links between the Government and the people would solve many problems of the society. Accordingly newspapers had been started and Government informed about the public grievances. But even after more than 40 years, the problems remained. Instead of coming forward to fight injustice, the loyalists asked the people to be more loyal to the Government and to remain above all politics.\textsuperscript{162} Disenchanted liberals began to overcome their illusions regarding the loyalists. Referring to the attitude of loyalists, Madhu Sudan Das was believed to have said: 'Unlike Bengal, Orissa lacks a strong educated middle class. We should not expect the Rajas, zamindars and mahants to protest against any acts of the British'.\textsuperscript{163}

The liberals began to publish reports on feudal oppression and the consequent people's protests in the nationalist newspapers during this period. The \textit{Sambad Vahika} (7 May 1908) and the \textit{Star of Utkal} (undated) complained that Dhenkanal prince was doing no relief work. As a result many people were leaving the state because of

\textsuperscript{161} Dipika, 14 Sept. 1912, in RNNB, 28 Sept. 1912.

\textsuperscript{162} Parikud Prince, in his presidential speech at Puri UUC of 1908. Dipika, 25 April 1908, in RNNB, 30 May 1908.

\textsuperscript{163} Quoted in Surendra Mohanti, \textit{Kulabridha}, Cuttack, 1978, p.33.
starvation. In 1912 the Dipika published reports about the feudal oppression in Baramba state. Many people, it reported, had fled the state. Petitions had also been sent to the Political Agent, Deputy Commissioner of Angul and Commissioner of Orissa, the paper reported. Such reports were conspicuously absent in the nationalist press of the late 19th century. They were the result of their increasing disillusionment with the loyalists.

The disillusionment among the liberals brought them closer to the Indian National Congress. While for the loyalist-run Sambalpur Hiteishini, 'the Congress was the source of all Indian troubles', the Dipika argued in 1908 that the 'partition of Bengal' and 'ill-treatment of the Indians in South Africa' were the two major causes of Indian unrest. While in 1906 it had written that the time had not arrived for boycott of foreign goods, in February 1908, referring to the ill-treatment of Indians in South Africa, it urged for the boycott of British goods. In this way Indians could make their displeasure known to the British, it pointed out. The liberals now hoped that Indians
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belonging to all parts of the British Empire would make common cause with Mr. Gandhi, who was 'working for Indians in South Africa', and would save their 'national honour' from the 'misguided colonial Government'.\footnote{Dipika, 1 Feb. 1908, in RNNB, 14 March 1908.}  Their earlier stance to struggle primarily at the regional level was being given up. A broad national platform, even broader than the National Congress, was now sought to save 'national honour'.

The relations with the Congress were further strengthened when the annual session of the Congress was held in Bankipur in the Bihar and Orissa Province. Congress leaders from Bihar came to Orissa before the session and sought the liberals' help in the organisation of the ensuing Congress session. Subsequently Madhu Sudan Das was elected to the Subjects Committee of the Bankipur Congress.\footnote{Surendra Mohanti, Kulabriddha, pp.121-23. Subsequently, Madhu Sudan Das was elected to Subject Committee of Congress. \textit{Report on INC, 1912}, Introduction.}  In 1915 and 1916 Madhu Sudan was again elected to the AICC in the Bombay and Lucknow Congress respectively.\footnote{\textit{Rep. on INC, 1915}, Appendix-B and for 1916, Appendix-B.}  In September 1911, at the instance of Madhu Sudan, a District Congress Committee (hereafter DCC) under the Bihar and Orissa Provincial Congress was organised at Cuttack.\footnote{\textit{Dipika}, 28 Sept. 1911, in RNNB, 12 Oct. 1912.}
Failure of the UUC to achieve any results was attributed to the failure of the liberals to emerge as a strong pressure group within it. This is what Madhu Sudan was believed to have told Gopabandhu in 1912. He had said that the British Government always gave priority to people's pressure rather than to reason. Petitions and representations all meant nothing. Problems could be solved only through people's movement, he said. 172 This feeling was reflected in the liberals' attempt to move towards mass politics.

The lead was taken by Madhu Sudan, who organised the Praja Pratinidhi Sabha in September 1912. It was a representative body of the ryots. In the first session held at Cuttack more than 700 ryots from the different localities attended. The Praja Pratinidhi Sabha demanded voting rights for ryots and discussed various issues like local self government, chaukidari tax, and panchayats. 173 Around the same time the liberals organized public meetings at Puri and Berhampur to demand representation of ryots in the Legislative Council and the transfer of Ganjam to Orissa Division. 174

By 1914, the Dipika, although working within the broad framework of loyalty to the Government, acknowledged
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the changing political colour of the UUC. It asked people to be firm in their devotion to the Raj (raj-bhakti) till the demands were fulfilled, but it also urged them to organise political movements and to open branches of the UUC at different places. It pointed out that the UUC was no longer apolitical and had decided to organise political movements on various issues. 175

The liberals' shift was, however, not sufficient to reconcile the moderate nationalists. The change in latter was very fast and so swift that the former failed to catch up. Hence, the differences between the two remained throughout the period.

In the post-1912 phase Orissa witnessed a general disillusionment with liberal politics and attraction towards moderate nationalists. The Congress was identified more and more with the moderate nationalists. The liberals, despite their broad nationalist understanding, were accused of being unattached to the Congress movement and unaware of the growth of 'national currents'. 176 Hence a confrontation which was intermittently going on between the two trends since the Swadeshi Movement in 1905-06 became intense now.


It culminated in the taking over of the UUC by the moderate nationalists and the formation the Utkal Provincial Congress Committee (hereafter UPCC) in December 1920. The confrontation gradually marginalised the liberals and established the moderate nationalists as the spokesmen of the linguistic and cultural movement of Orissa as well as the advocates of nationalism in Orissa. (Discussed in Chapter III) It also exposed the loyalists and cast them out from the politics of the national movement.

In 1913 the confrontation with the liberals was begun by the students. When the UUC session was over at Puri, they organised a students conference at the UUC pandal and decided to affiliate it with the Bihar Chhatra Sammilani, the students wing of Congress in Bihar.\(^{177}\) The loyalists and liberals objected to it and sponsored a Yubak Samity (youth wing) to contain the students. Formed in 1914 and presided over by a loyalist, Khalikote Prince Brikram Dev, the Samity objected to the idea of a students' organisation outside the UUC and even asked the students, who were supposedly not 'political' matured enough', to involve principals and similar other officials in the movement.\(^{178}\)
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As a reaction, the Oriya students of Madras Presidency organised the Odiya Chhatra Samity and criticized the 'elders' (liberals) for their 'meanness'. The differences between the UUC sponsored body and the moderate nationalists' body of students reached climax when two separate students conferences were held in March 1918. The struggle was finally over in 1920 when the students' conference held along with the UUC at Chakradharpur forced the President, Biswanath Kar, an elderly liberal leader, to accept the Congress creed. Biswanath Kar, who strongly objected to the students' participation in the Congress, had to ultimately accept the students' verdict, leading to the Yubak Samity's merger with the 'national current'.

The difference between the two trends spread to literature. As in politics, the two trends had emerged as two distinct literary groups in modern Oriya literature. The liberals, known as Madhu-Radhanath Gosthi, (after the name of Madhu Sudan Rao and Radhanath Ray, initiators of modern literature in Oriya), had to confront the Satyavadi Gosthi, whose origin could be directly traced to the Satyavadi school and moderate nationalism during 1905-10. Like the UUC,


the Utkal Sahitya Samaj (1903), formed the same year and at the same venue as the UUC, was the umbrella organisation of all literary trends. In the consequent confrontation, the moderate nationalists tried to capture it in 1918 when the Sahitya Samaj held its annual session at Cuttack. In a bid to capture it, the moderate nationalists proposed some names to the executive committee. Biswanath Kar, the President and a liberal leader, opposed the move. When Godavarish Mishra, a Satyavadi leader, wanted to speak, he was not allowed to do so. Mishra violated the norms and spoke against the president. Jagabandhu Singh, his colleague, who had been nominated for a literary award, refused to accept it from Biswanath Kar. Mishra and Singh condemned the president as an 'oppressive zamindar' and the 'worthless soul' of Sahitya Samaj. Others joined them. The conference ended in the taking over of the Sahitya Samaj by the Satyavadi Gosti and the acceptance of their leadership by the liberals.183

In UUC, the moderate nationalists took three years to take over the leadership. From 1917 onwards intense confrontation between the two trends began. In the first phase the moderate nationalists marginalised the loyalists by joining hands with the liberals. That the loyalists

were losing political control of the UUC was evident from
the fact that from 1917 onwards they could not be nominated
to preside over the UUC. In 1917 and 1918, the liberal
leaders Fakir Mohan and Madhu Sudan Das presided over the
UUC. This was followed by the taking over of the confe-
rence by the moderate nationalists in 1919 (president
Chandra Sekhar Behera) and 1920 (President Jagabandhu
Singh). 184

In the UUC of 1917, held at Cuttack, Gopabandhu
criticized the conference for not having achieved anything
for Orissa. 185 In 1918 and 1919, the liberals were accused
of not being aware of 'national currents'. Gopabandhu
urged them to merge the Orissa movement with the Congress
and to be an 'integral part of Indian mainstream'. 186
Chandra Sekhar Behera, in his presidential address to
the UUC of 1919 held at Puri, urged the people of Orissa
to join the national movement en masse, lest Orissa be
neglected by the British Government perpetually. 187 Some
of the resolutions passed in the conference such as condem-
nation of Punjab killings of 1919, criticism of the Montague-
Chelmsford Reforms of 1918, criticism of the Government
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for its neglect of relief at the time of flood and famine in Orissa in 1919 and a demand for suspension of rent or revenue collection till the famine situation improved, marked a clearcut change in the UUC's attitude towards Government. 188 The moderate nationalists instead of breaking away from the UUC had paved the way for its merger in the Congress.

In 1920 the UUC was organised at Chakradharpur. Much before the session, the liberals realised that it had been taken over by the moderate nationalists. Madhu Sudan Das, who was supposed to preside over it, refused to do so. The moderate nationalists had offered the position to him to make the liberals a part of the Congress. 189 Many of the liberals also joined the moderate nationalists. 190 In the session, the liberals were reduced to a minority.

When Gopabandhu proposed to join the Non-Cooperation Movement and to form the UPCC in Orissa, only a few liberals like Biswanath Kar, Braja Sundar Das and Srichandra Ghose raised objection on the ground that the time for such action had not yet arrived. Gopabandhu's resolution was, however, passed, with 127 voting in its favour and 16 against it. 191 The UUC had been taken over by the moderate nationalists. The UPCC was formed and the non-cooperation pledge was henceforth taken by the UPCC with full vigour and all enthusiasm.
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