



British Colonial System and The Forests of Garhwal and Kumaon Himalayas: Consequences of colonial interventions in Himalayan Society

Surendra Singh Bisht^{1*}

¹Department of History and Archaeology, HNB Garhwal University Srinagar Garhwal, Uttarakhand, India 246174.

*Corresponding author: surendra100singh@gmail.com

Received: 15.9.2021; Revised: 13.11.2021; Accepted: 13.12.2021

©Society for Himalayan Action Research and Development

Abstract: In this paper endeavour has been made to address historical context of colonial influence on the forests of Uttarakhand Himalayas. The conflict of interest between local population, the government and the commercial forces over a period of more than 120 years of colonial regime are considered. Consequences of the scientific forest management on the forest and forest based rural economy of local folk is an important aspect of the study. It also shows that how in the name of scientific forest management, bulk of local population was alienated from their traditional forest rights, use and management of forests and, how most of the benefits of forest accrued to the government and richest classes of society. A major aspect of the study is how and in what stages a forest region was opened out and exploited for the larger colonial economic interests, what effects it had on Uttarakhand Himalayas region itself and its agriculture in the colonial period.

Key Words: Deforestation, Himalayan society, Forest policy, Kumaon, Garhwal, Uttarakhand, Colonial regime.

Introduction:

Deforestation of the Uttarakhand hills is not a new phenomenon but has a long history, being well established by the late nineteenth century. Forests have played a significant role in the development of civilization on this earth. Not only they provide means of sustenance, food, fuel, fodder and raw material for human use, but also help in maintaining a balance in our natural environment and more specifically help in maintaining soil health and productivity of natural watersheds. They support many known and unknown organisms and wildlife. Forest support local agriculture by providing green manure and fodder, preventing soil erosion and maintaining ground-water recharge. Above situation is truer in the case of himalayan society whose economic and social structure is constructed

around the primary relationship with their natural resources.

This study has been undertaken to determine causes and aspects of deforestation, destruction, impact on local folk and their way of protest against draconian colonial forest management structure, policies, rules and regulations. Attempt has also been made to review the history of forests and their use for past 120 years or so in the Uttarakhand Himalayas.

Because of paucity of reliable written primary sources and data, it is difficult to trace past history of forest use. The main available sources of information for this article are secondary, from which relevant information and data has been extracted and reviewed in the context of forestry and its use.



General History:

Uttarakhand was carved out of the state of Uttar Pradesh on 9th November 2000. As per the Census 2011 total population of the state was 10.11 million. The state is divided into 13 districts. Ninety per cent of the geographical area of state is made up of low hills, high mountains and deep valleys. The state is also divided into four climatic zones, viz., the tropical zone up to an altitude of 1000 m, sub-tropical zones ranging from 1000 to 1500 m, the cool temperate zone ranging from 1500 to 2400 m, and the sub-alpine and alpine zones begin at 2500 m (NABARD 2010). Forest cover of the state is close to two-third of total area and 14 per cent land is used for agriculture.

As far as known history of Uttarakhand is concerned, at one time it was ruled by the Katyuris dynasty. The Katyuris ruled for several centuries initially from Brahampur which is identified as modern day Joshimath town in the Alaknanda valley in Chamoli district and later from Baijnath in the Katyur valley in Almora district (Joshi L. D., 1929). After the decline of Katyiris this region was divided into many small principalities. In 14th century Ajaypal Panwar brought all the independent chiefdoms of Garhwal region under his rule, and founded the Garhwal kingdom. Unification of Kumaon took place under Som Chand in 10th century (Atkinson 1886). Panwars and Chandas soon consolidated their rule. Because of isolated nature of their territories, which were bounded on north by the higher Himalayas and

separated from Indo-Gangetic plain in the south by the Siwalik ranges. Hence neither came under the sway of Mughals nor were invaded from the north. After the unification of Nepal under the Gorkha chief Prithwinarayan Shah, Gorkhas conquered Kumaon in 1790 and Garhwal in 1804. Their rule was short-lived and after Anglo-Gorkha war in 1815, the East India Company conquered Kumaon and Garhwal both. After the end of rule of Gorkhas, Garhwal was divided by the Britishers into two parts- The eastern part called British Garhwal and western part renamed as princely state Tehri Garhwal, restored to the son of last king of Garhwal Kingdom. British Garhwal became a separate district with the Kumaun Commissionaire governed by British Empire (Sankrityayan 1953).

Society and Economy

The social structures of Kumaon and Garhwal is almost similar and here hill society exhibits an absence of sharp class divisions with the presence of strong communal traditions, this makes Uttarakhand a fascinating exception which one is unable to fit into existing conceptualizations of social hierarchy in India (Guha R.C. 1989). This unique agrarian class structure is relevant to the various kind of movements of protest that is the subject of this study.

In the hilly region most of the cultivation was carried out along the river valleys. Two or sometimes three crops were possible throughout the last century. Arable land and



methods of crop rotation was as per the hill folk's natural environment. Usually there was a surplus production of grain, that was exported to Tibet and southwards to the plains. Having six months of grain in hand and with their diet supplement by fish, fruit vegetable, and animal flesh the hill cultivators were described by Henry Ramsey, commissioner from 1856 to 1884, as 'probably better off than any peasantry in India (Walton H. G., 1910, , Pant S.D. 1935).

Forests As a Social Institution in the Indigenous System

The best quality of cultivation in mountains was to be found in villages (1,000-1,500, masl, having access on the one hand to good forest and grazing ground and on the other to riparian field in the valleys. Village sites were usually chosen halfway up the spur below oak forests and perennial springs associated with them, and below and above cultivated field along river bed. In such situations all types of crops could be raised easily. A stable and elevated site was available for houses, and herds of cattle could be comfortably maintained. Until 1890 most villages came close to this ideal (Walton H. G., 1911).

Animal husbandry was another important feature of hill economy in addition to grain cultivation. The hill folk and their cattle migrated annually to grass rich area of the forests from tropical to temperate and alpine regions. Temporary cattle sheds were constructed there and cultivation of potato which was introduced in post-British era and

buckwheat was carried out. The sheep and goats were reared above treeline till the first snowfall. In the permanent hamlet, oak forests provided both fodder and fertilizer. Green and dry leaves which served the cattle as animal beddings were mixed with grass and excreta of the animals and fermented to give manure to the fields. In winter manure was moulded from dry leaves. Thus the forest enhanced the fertility of the agriculture fields, directly through its foliage and indirectly through the excrete of the cattle fed with fodder leaves and forest grass. Broad leaved tree also provided the villagers with fuel and small timber for house construction and agricultural implements (Heske 1931).

In the lower hills extensive "Chir" (*Pinus roxburghi*) forest served for pasture. Every year dry grasses and pine needle litter in the chir forest were burnt to make room for a fresh crop of luxuriant grass. In certain parts where pasture was scarce trees were grown and preserved for fodder (Pauw, 1896). In such multifarious ways the extensive forests were central to the successful practice of agriculture and animal husbandry. In addition, they were the prime source of medicinal herbs and in time of dearth of food as well. Forests also helped the hill people to overcome moderate food scarcity as forests were rich in fruits, edible vegetables and roots (Walton, 1911).

This dependence of the hills peasant on forest resources was institutionalized through a variety of social and cultural mechanism. Community activity continued to survive in the considerable areas in the form of village



grazing ground and by fuel and fodder reserves walled in and around villages despite official apathy. The old customary restriction on the uses of the forests operated in the following manner over large areas. While no formal management existed, practical protection was secured by customary limitation on uses. For oak forest, there was an unwritten rule which prohibited the lopping of leaves in the hot weather while the grass cut by each family was strictly regulated (Pearson 1869).

Traditionally many villages had fuel reserve even on gaon sanjait (common village land measured by government), where the villagers cut over in regular rotation by common consent. Planting of timber trees was fairly common phenomenon. The forests preserved within their boundaries were zealously guarded by villages nearby. In Princely State Tehri, peasant strongly asserted their claim to species like bhimal (*Grewia oppositifolia*), a valuable fodder tree usually found near habitation (Raturi, 1910). In British Garhwal, Chaundkot pargana was singled out for its oak forest within village boundaries called Bani or Banjanis, where branches of trees were cut only at specified time, with the permission of the entire village community (Stowell, 1907). Even presently in remote areas, untouched by commercial exploitation of forests, one can still come across well maintained banjanis containing oak tree of quality rarely observed elsewhere (Guha 1989).

This situation was facilitated by near total control exercised by village on forests near

their habitat. The waste land and forest land never attracted the attention of former government (Pauw 1896). In such circumstances where the people exercised full control over their first habitat, co-operation of high order was exhibited by adjoining villages. Every village in the hill had fixed boundaries existing from the time of pre-Gurkha rulers and recognised by Traill in 1820 at the time of first settlement (Gairola 1936).

Forest Management in British Garhwal And Kumaon

When first land settlement was made by G.W. Traill in 1823, he demarcated village boundaries and provided some facilities to villagers like wood cutting in forest and wasteland. "Thaplas" or terraced land were reserved for agriculture and also opened the extensive forest to private individual, (Atkinson 1886).

Sir Henry Ramsay, Commissioner of Kumaon (1856-69) demarcated forest boundaries more clearly (Webber, 1902). In 1869 Major Pearson took charge of Kumaon Forest Division and separated Garhwal Forest Division from Kumaon Forest Division (Pauw, 1896) and divided it into four subdivision viz. Kotreedom, Udaipur, Chandee and Pattlidoon with special attention on following points (a) completion of good and correct forests map (b) framing regular working plan (c) opening out and thinning of the virgin forests (d) the gradual extension of forest-roads (e) completion of proper records (Pearson, 1869).



This policy went up to 1886 but did not hit actual target of forest management and preservation (Osmaston, 1921). British Government declared a new forest policy in 1873 which was better suited for forest preservation. Under this policy wastelands were notified as protected forest and were put under the charge of Deputy Commissioner (Osmaston, 1921). In 1894 British Government announced new legislation for the reservation of the following species viz. Deodar (*Cedrus deodara*), Cypress, (*Cupressus torulosa*), Chir (*Pinus roxburghii*), Box (*Buxus sempervirmes*), Sal (*Shorea robusta*), Shisham (*Dalbergia sissoo*), Tun (*Toona ciliate*) and Khair (*Acacia catachu*). Rules were also added for regulating the removal of timber of other tree species. In 1903 government divided these protected forests in two parts- Closed civil forest and Open civil forest. In closed civil forests, the District Magistrate looked after the rights and concessions of village people. In open civil forests, the villagers were allowed to cut grass, ringal and bamboo, graze cattles and quarrying of stone without any restrictions.

According to Brahmawar (1938), the forest area was first demarcated and transferred from the control of revenue official (Patwari) to that of the Divisional Forest Officer in 1911. At the time of third settlement, protected forests were classified as A, B, and C, "A" class for fulfilment of the requirement of the local people and for the sale of the forest products, "B" class for preservation of fuel and grasses, "C" class stood on the remaining forest land.

For the purpose of administration, certain regulations were also framed. The grazing of animals within Chir regeneration area or the outside a reasonable distance was prohibited. To start a new Kharak (cattle station inside the forests), the permission of Divisional Forest Officer was made necessary.

In 1914, forests were separated into North and South Garhwal Divisions. As boundaries of the reserved forests were close to the villages, the Deputy Commissioner was instructed to revise them in order to protect the interests of the villagers. Simultaneously in 1916 five year working plans were prepared by Osmaston for North Garhwal and by Bhola for South Garhwal. These schemes remained in force until 1921-22 when for South Garhwal, yet another scheme was prepared by Bhola and for North Garhwal by Osmaston and these schemes remained in force until 1930-31 (Johri, 1949). In 1927 a panchayat officer was appointed to look after the village forests and in 1930 the forest Panchayat rules were framed. In the end, the Panchayat Forests were demarcated with the consent of the villagers and it included any area, outside Municipal or cantonment limits. It generally consisted of class I Reserved Forest, Civil Forest lying within traditional boundary of a village and also portion of "nap" (measured) land with the consent of owners. Sometimes Class II Forests were also included in the Panchayat Forest (Gupta, 1968). In 1934, both the divisions, South and North were merged into one-Garhwal Division (Johri, 1949) and following new rules were framed.



- (I) These rules superseded all previous rules and orders in force.
- (II) Bonafide resident of Garhwal meant a person, who had or whose parent had resided in Garhwal for 12 years. The term cattle was defined to include horse, ponies, mules, cows, bulls, buffaloes, sheep and goats.
- (III) The reserved forests for which these rules were framed, had under the order of Government been separated into two classes known as class I and class II reserved forests.

Class I Reserved Forests: All persons of Garhwal were permitted to graze cattle without any limit or restriction, fell or lopp trees, cut grass and exercise all other rights in class I reserve forests. No trees of deodar (*Cedrus deodara*), Cypress (*Cupressus totulosa*), Tun (*Toona ciliate*), Walnut (*Juglans regia*), mulberry (*Morus alba*), ash (*Fraxinus sps*), spruce (*Piceae morinda*), pine (*Pinus rixburghii*), maple (*Acer oblongum*), silver fir (*Ables plndrow*) or boxwood were allowed to be felled, looped or otherwise damaged without the previous permission in writing from Deputy Commissioner.

Class II Reserved Forests: All persons of Garhwal were granted the concession to graze cattles without restriction on the demarcated ground by the Forest Department. Temporary cultivation up to maximum of one acre was allowed within boundaries of this demarcated area.

In 1931 Bhola's and Osmaston's working plans which have been mentioned earlier were

revised by Brahmawar in 1938. He prepared one working plan for the whole Garhwal Division which remained in force until 1930-40. This working plan consisted of six ranges in Garhwal, viz. Ameli, Chamoli, Dhanpur, Diba, Pauri, and Pinder with 11,71,707 acre area.

But people of Garhwal were not satisfied with the above policy of Britishers and there was simmering discontentment among local people related to various restrictions with class Ii Forests and the old reserves. Government were forced to revise the previous rules on the recommendation of District Committee. Some revised rules and regulations were as follows:

New Reserves Class II

(a) Timber:

(i) The period for which timber right can be accumulated should be the same in the new and old reserves and be fixed for six years.

(ii) As timber right were not taken fully in certain reserves, the balance should be re-allotted to village.

(b) Grazing Fodder:

(i) The number of Kharak should be increased as far as possible.

(ii) Kharaks were recognised as centre of great destruction of forest life. As they prevailed throughout Garhwal, their proper watch was impossible. Cattle strayed into reserves and did irreparable damage to young plants. In order to contain the damage, government ordered that DFO should investigate and report where new kharak could safely be established.



(c) Fuel:

(i) The existing practice of taking away of dry tree fuel wood by villagers was regularized and rules were framed for this purpose.

(ii) Fallen wood for fuel was allowed in deodar "banis" forest.

Old Reserves:

Same rules were framed as for the new reserves.

Grazing and Fodder: Grazing and grass cutting was made free to all bonafide residents except in oak forest and regeneration areas of other forests.

Since the promulgation of these orders, there was no change in the forest policy up to 1947 (Report of Kumaon Forest Fact Finding Committee, Anon, 1960). The statistics available from the year 1904 to 1947 reveal that there was increase in the forest revenue. It was realized from the forest but not to the alarming level. During the years 1914-1919 and 1939-1943 there did not occur very sharp rise in the forest revenue. The actual large scale commercial exploitation of the forest started after 1947, i.e. after Independence. In 1961 revenue taken from the forest of Garhwal was Rs. 10,03,522 (Annual Progress Report of Forest Administration, 1978), whereas up to 1947 it was about Rs. 3,68,053).

Forest Management in Princely State Tehri:

The exploitation of the forests of Tehri Garhwal State was relatively rapid as compared to British Garhwal due to lack of forest administration and management up to 1850. In 1850, for the first time forests were

leased out to one Mr. Wilson, who was intrepid Englishman and pioneered water transport of timber in Garhwal Himalaya. Thus river Bhagirathi was the main source of transport from Uttarkashi to downstream Rishikesh. On the expiry of Wilson's lease in 1865, the Govt. of the North-West Provinces, successfully negotiated a twenty years lease from State (Bahuguna, 1941). In 1885 the lease was re-negotiated whereby the chir forests of the Tons Valley were reverted to state control, the deodar forest remaining with the Imperial Forest Department. Although the lease was renewed for further twenty years period in 1905, however, from 1902 as an act of grace, the King was paid 80% of the net profits in lieu of an annual rental (Talloch, 1907).

King had constituted a forest department with a skeletal forest staff in 1885 and twelve years later, Pandit Keshvanand Mamgain, a native Garhwali, was called on deputation from the forest department of the N.W. Provinces to take its charge. Keshva Nand began the work of demarcating the forests and subsequently Ram Dutt Raturi as Conservator of forests demarcated the forest and wasteland into three classes:

- (i) The first class or reserved forests.
- (ii) The second class, intended for the exercise of forests concessions.
- (iii) A third class for the constitution of village forest.

While the third class remained largely inoperative for a long time, the distinction between first two classes was abolished. As



the legal proprietary right on the forests was claimed by the King, the peasantry was only allowed to exercise certain concessions notified by Durbar. Regulations fixed the amount of timber allotted to each household for various uses. Free grazing was allowed in the second and third class forests within a five mile radius of each village. Villagers could also collect dry fallen wood and cut grass in specified areas. In return the peasant were to help in extinguishing forest fire as and when these occurred. In addition, a tax of half a seer of ghee (animal fat) (approximately 500 gms) was levied on every mulching buffalo possessed by a state subject (Bahuguna, 1941). For the leased forests which were reverted to the state control in 1925, the King invited Dr. Franz, Heske, a renowned German expert to survey the forests and advise on their systematic working. Based on Heske's recommendations, forest settlement operation were embarked upon during 1929-31 and officer were sent to Forest Research Institute, Dehradun to undergo training (Garhwali Newspaper, 19240). Several new forest divisions were constituted (viz. Tehri, Uttarkashi, Yamuna and Tons). Gradually the entire forest crops of the state come to be managed under working plans. Under the state management, the extraction of revenue became more marked. While exact figures were not available, the extraction of timber was considerable especially during World War II. In the first three years of the war, over 1.4 million cubic feet of timber, double the average extraction in normal year's, was

exported annually from the Tons valley alone (Raturi, 1932). Over the time, forests came to constitute the largest single item of revenue for the Durbar, a far cry from the day when the King had leased out a seemingly valueless property for a pittance. In 1935-36 forests accounted for Rs. 3 to 7 lakhs out of gross state revenue of Rs. 17.94 lakhs that accrued to the exhaequer. As the state took greater interest in the commercial management of its woodland, villager's access to the forests was correspondingly reduced and which caused wide-spread resentment and also ugly situations of confrontation among state subjects and the forest administration.

Consequences of colonial interventions in Himalayan Society:

So far it has been witnessed that land and forest settlement operations were introduced and an impersonal autocratic form of rule was organized in this Himalayan region apparently in order to cater to vested interests of colonial rule. These operations caused widespread changes and modifications in the nature of traditional relationship of man with the agricultural land, forests and livestock during 19th and 20th century. Whether it was the native King of Tehri State or Commissioner of Kumaon both tried to gain control and domination over natural resources through administrative measures.

The practical need to 'stabilize the tax system' prompted the British at the outset of the colonial rule to introduce a modern form of private property. In the Himalayan region the



requirements of commercial capitalism forced the State to invoke and assert the dormant 'proprietary claims' on forest resources in its favour and usurp the traditional prescriptive rights of the rural community (Saklani, 1987). On the opposite, the private ownership rights were granted to an individual over agricultural land tenure which was traditionally owned by the native King alone. These two contradictory trends of usurpation of natural rights on forest resources and granting of proprietary tenure on agricultural land had far reaching consequences which deserve further attention. The establishment of forest department and implementation of conservancy practices changed the traditional relationship between the state and the peasantry. The forests were no more to be treated as community property. The prescriptive rights of peasantry over forest products, honoured since time immemorial ended. Instead, these rights in their modified form were granted as 'concessions' by the generous state. The modification of 'natural rights' into 'concessions' was a painful change and created various new situations of confrontation between state and the peasantry. The traditional activities of the villagers in the forest like grazing, lopping, cutting of trees for agricultural and domestic uses became penal offense. Spectra of fines, imprisonment and other harassments haunted the people. On its side, the biggest problem confronted by the State was how to reconcile the contradictory claims of forest conservancy and management on the one hand, and unchecked use of forests for its needs by the peasantry, which was

causing law and order problems and other disturbances. A British forest officer reported that in the popular perception the 'forest department has been created for a running fight with the villagers' (Mac Nair, 1907). Commissioner of Kumaon, Henry Ramsay appeared to side with the peasants by claiming that 'the villagers had prescriptive rights to grass, grazing, timber and firewood and even realizing dues from the outsiders who fed their cattle in the grazing lands within the village boundaries'. He further conceded that 'State had granted proprietary rights over land to people and similarly they have some right over the forest also. Another sympathetic officer, Nelson (1916) remarked that the encroachment on forest rights of the people looked like 'robbing them of their own property'. In an editorial note, local Hindi monthly newspaper 'Garhwal Samachar' (1914) wrote "since the day forest department set foot on our land (Garhwal), it has curtailed our freedom sickles have been snatched from the hands of our women cutting grass in the forest". The same paper published on Jan. 1914 about new forest settlements that it is a scheme 'to ruin human settlements and grow forests on them'. Opposed to these views and guided by the demands of colonial apparatus, British officials justified the claim on the basis of the assumption of 'right of conquest over forest'. (Ameri, 1876) thereby nullifying village or individual claims. This also justified sale of large-scale forest lands in the hands of tea planters.



The ecological changes and consequent peasant resistance due to colonial exploitation of forest resources have become the subject of few studies in recent past (Saklani, 1987; 1992; Pathak, 1980; Guha, 1989; Rawat, 1991). However, these studies have in general failed to appreciate basic differences in the nature of peasant resistance as found in the British administered territories of Kumaon commissioner and Princely State of Tehri Garhwal. In British territories forest movement reached its peak in 1921, when large tracts of forests were put to fire by the peasants. About 321 miles of forest were damaged and 6,400 mounds of resin was destroyed deliberately by the local people. The arson of 1921 was apparently explicit expression of local forest grievances in an atmosphere surcharged and motivated with the Gandhian Nationalist Movement. The forest issues were hotly debated among the local educated leaders and reformers like Tara Dutt Gairola, Badri Dutt Pandey, Govind Ballabh Pant, Mukandi Lal and Ansuya Prasad Bahuguna (Shakti Hindi Newspaper, 14 July 1925). During the forest movements of Tehri State in 1901, 1907 and 1930, state forest officials were manhandled, forest boundary pillars were removed. To quell the disturbances army action was contemplated in 1907, and in 1930 it was executed, hundreds of people were injured, wounded and few died in Rawain region.

There were some basic differences in the ideology, objectives, strategy and nature of leadership of forest movements of peasant of

Tehri State which were called 'Dhandak' (Saklani, 1987) and movements of Kumaon Commissioner related to the forest issues. The movement of Kumaon were protestations against exploitative 'Alien Rule' and they generally gained the momentum in an atmosphere surcharged by the Gandhian National Movement. The educated middle class leadership was the spokesperson of the movement and they were well informed critics of colonial economic policies. The Dhandak (a traditional form of peasant resistance found in Tehri State), on the contrary were targeted mainly against rapacious local officials and were devoid of any explicit ideology and programme. The Dhandak were launched and led within the state by the peasant leadership which mobilized the masses primarily around local issues. These traditional forms of protests, however serious or violent may have been always melted on the personal intervention or assurances of the King (Saklani, 87; Guha, 89).

It would be interesting to consider the question as to why the forest movements in Tehri State were more violent. Obviously, the hurt due to forest restrictions was deeper for the peasantry of Tehri State whose peasants had no proprietary rights or private ownership over land as opposed to their counterparts in British Garhwal. The only private property available to an individual or to a village community in the Princely State was in the form of animal herds. The forest restrictions imposed on grazing provoked them more deeply as encroachment on grazing rights appeared like



undue restriction on this only 'private property' right available to them for the maintenance of livestock wealth (Saklani, 1992). Our investigations show that what had hurt the peasantry deepest was curtailment of traditional grazing rights. One of the main resentments which caused violent outburst among the pastoralists of Tehri State around the Kunjani patti (1904-1905). Khas patti (1906-1907) and rawain region (1930) was due to the severe restrictions imposed on the traditional grazing rights by bringing reserve forest demarcations nearer to village boundaries (Bijlwan, 1990). Therefore, different conceptions of property and ownership in British India and Princely State which had hitherto not been noticed by the social scientists could be one of the factors for varying intensity of peasant resistance.

Comparatively we also find relative lack of intervention of religious elements in the movements of Princely State. The Tehri State movements did not involve priests and saints (ascetics) for seeking moral-religious sanctions for their acts. Whereas the symbols from the Hindu epics were invoked in the Kumaon movement of 1921 for 'characterizing the colonial government as evil and demons' (Guha, 1989). But conception of such symbolism was out of question in the polity of Tehri State where the person of King was venerated as living embodiment of God-Badrinath (Bolanda Badrinath). Some of these fundamental differences in the political and economic structure of Tehri State and British

Commissionaire have been overlooked by the social scientists so far.

The turmoil and agitations due to forest questions forced both King and the British administrators to concede liberal forest concessions on their respective sides. The state was forced to mellow down its aggressive assertion of proprietary rights and retrieve considerably its interfering tentacles from the forests. However, the issues of economic greed of the State and wreck less use of the forests by the peasantry remain unsettled even today.

References

- Ammeri, C.F. 1876: On forest rights in India.
Brandis, D. and Smythies, A. (eds).
Report of the proceedings of the
Forest Conference, Simla, India.
- Annual Administrative Report of Tehri
Garhwal State 1930, Tehri, U.P.,
India.
- Annual Progress Report of Forest
Administration, 1978 in U.P. 1975-76,
Nainital, India
- Anon, A. 1960: The Report of the Kumaon
forest fact and finding Committee,
Lucknow, U.P. India.
- Atkinson, E.T., 1886: The Himalayan
Gazetteer, Allahabad, U.P., India.
- Bahuguna, M.N., 1941: Working Plan for the
Tehri Forest Division, Tehri Garhwal
State, 1939-40 to 1969-70.
- Batten, J.H., 1851: Report on the settlement of
district of Garhwal in India (Edited)



- Official Reports on the Provinces of Kumaon, Calcutta.
- Bijlwan, R.s., 1990: Tehri Rajya Mein Gramin Jan Sangarsh Ka Itihas, D. Phil Thesis, H.N.B. Garhwal University, Srinagar Garhwal, U.P., India.
- Brahamwar, R.N., 1938: Working Plan for the Garhwal Forest Division, 1930-31 to 1939-40, Allahabad, U.P., India.
- Census of India 1891: Registrar, General and Census Commissioner, New Delhi, India.
- Dabral, S.P., 1968: Uttarakhand Ka Itihas, Bir Gatha Prakashan, Dugadda-Garhwal, U.P., India.
- Dobhal, R.P., 1924: Revenue Settlement Report- Tehri State, Babat, U.P., India.
- Gairola, T.D., 1936: Selected Revenue Decisions of Kumaon, Allahabad, U.P., India.
- Garhwal Samachar, 1914: Monthly, May-June, Dugadda, U.P., India.
- Garhwali New Paper, 1924: Dehradun, U.P., India.
- Guha, R., 1989: The Unquiet Woods, Oxford University Press, Delhi, India.
- Gupta, R.D., 1968: Working Plan for the Pithoragarh Forest Division, 1968-69 to 1977-78, Nainital, India.
- Heske, F., 1931: Problem der Waldeshatung in Himalaya, Tharndfer Frostlichien Fahrbuch Vol. 82, No. 8.
- Johri, C.M., 1949: Working Plan for Garhwal Forest Division Circle, U.P. 1940-41 to 1954-55, Allahabad, U.P., India.
- Joshi L. D., 1929: The Khasa Family Law, Allahabad.
- Mac Nair, D.C., 1907: Note on Forest administration for my successor, Garhwal, U.P., India.
- NABARD (2010) State Focus Paper Uttarakhand. Mumbai, India: National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development
- Nelson, J.C., 1916: Forest Settlement Report of the Garhwal District, Lucknow, U.P., India.
- Niesslien, E., 1984: Can historical research be of the help in forest policy decision? In Steen, H.K. (ed), History of Sustained Yield Forestry: A Symposium, pp. 16-22, Forestry History Society.
- Osmaston, A.E., 1921: Working Plan for the North Garhwal Forest Division 1921-22 to 1930-31, Allahabad, U.P., India.
- Pragana Pratap Nagar Jila Tehri Ki Assessment Report 1965: Lucknow, U.P., India.
- Pathak, Shekhar, 1980: Uttarakhand Main Collie Begar Pratha 1815-1949, Ph.D. Thesis, History eptt. Kumaon University, Nainital, U.P., India.
- Pant S. D., 1935, Social Economy of the Himalayans, London.
- Pauw, E.K., 1896: Report on the tenth settlement of Garhwal district, Allahabad, U.P., India.
- Pearson, M.G.E., 1869: Report on forest of Garhwal and Kumaon, Allahabad, U.P., India.



- Raturi, H.K., 1910: Garhwal Varnan, Bombay, India.
- Raturi, P.D., 1932: Working Plan for the Jamuna Forest Division, Tehri Garhwal State 1932-33 to 1952-53.
- Rawat, A.S., 1987: Garhwal Himalaya, A Historical Survey (1815-1947), Delhi, India.
- Rawat, A.S., 1991: History of Forest Management Conflicts and their Impact in the Central Himalaya.
- Rawat, A.S. (ed), History of Forestry in India, New Delhi, India.
- Saklani, A., 1987: The History of a Himalayan Princely State: Change Conflicts and awakening, Delhi, India.
- Saklani, A., 1992: Colonialism and Emerging Crisis in Uttarakhand Society in 19th and 20th Century, Indian History Congress, New Delhi.
- Sankrityayan, R., 1953: Garhwal, Allahabad, U.P., India.
- Shakti Hindi Newspaper: 1925, Almora.
- Stowell, V.A., 1907: A Manual of the Land Tenures of Kumaon Division, Allahabad, U.P., India.
- Talloch, J.C., 1907: Working Plan for the leased deodar forest in Tehri Garhwal, U.P., India.
- Tehri Garhwal Rajya Ki Bhumi Sambandhi Adhikar Niyam Tatha Vidhan 1941, Dehradun, U.P.India.
- The Imperial Gazetteer 1908: Oxford, U.K.
- Tirmizi, H.A.I., 1979: Edict from Mughal Haren, New Delhi.
- Traill, G.W., 1820: Statistical Sketch of Kumaon Asiatic Research, Allahabad, U.P., India.
- Tucker, R.P., 1983: The British colonial system and the forests of Western Himalaya, 1815, 1914 (in Tucker, R.P. and Richard J.F. (ed), Global deforestation and nineteenth century World Economy), Durham, N.C., Duke Policy Studies.
- Walton H. G., 1911, British Garhwal : A Gazetteer, Allahabad.
- Webber T. W., 1902, The Forests of Upper India and their Inhabitants, London.