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NOTES FROM THE EDITOR

In This Issue

We begin this issue with a memorial section dedicated to two extraordinarily gifted scholars, Reed Wadley and Robert Barrett. Both died, tragically, at the peak of their intellectual powers.

Of the two, Reed was the youngest. I first met Reed in 1994 at the BRC meetings in Pontianak. He had just come down from the Emperan, the low-lying border region of West Kalimantan, where he was then doing fieldwork. As others who knew him will attest, his vitality was palpable. It was impossible, too, to miss the seriousness with which he approached his work, his intellectual generosity, and, for me, his devotion and shared enthusiasm for all things Iban, including, in his case, ukir tanah bau (Iban, ‘shoulder tattoos’). From then on, we corresponded regularly right up to the last weeks of his life. As evidence of his strong sense of professional duty, among the last work he completed was a review of Rob Cramb’s book, Land and Longhouse, which he, like your Editor, greatly admired. As a tribute to his memory, Reed’s review appears in the Book Review section later in his volume.

Reed, in addition to being a BRC Fellow, was also a member of the Borneo Research Council’s Executive Board and his untimely death was a particularly grievous loss for the BRC, as many of us saw him as playing a pivotal role in the Council’s transition to a younger generation of active members. He was also, of course, much more. To the many of us who had the pleasure of knowing and working with him, Reed was a wonderful friend and an exemplary colleague. Even while undergoing painful medical treatment, he devoted precious time to putting in order his unpublished research notes and arranged for their deposit in archival collections in the United States, the Netherlands, and Sarawak (see “Brief Communications” in this issue), in order that this material would be available for the use of future scholars. In one of his very last email messages, he wrote that he was preparing letters of introduction and notes to be conveyed to his Iban “family” on behalf of a graduate student who was about to depart for West Kalimantan. That’s the sort of person he was. As some of you may know, in the months before his death, a colleague and friend, the historian Eric Tagliacozzo, invited those who knew Reed to record their experiences and thoughts in a memory book, which was then printed and bound in Japan and presented to Reed’s wife, Dr. Oona Paredes, as a remembrance for both her and their young son, Lucas. Following his death, Dr. George N. Appell, on behalf of the Borneo Research Council, established a special fund in Reed Wadley’s memory, the Reed L. Wadley Memorial Fund, to provide supplemental grants to graduate students in anthropology who are planning to do research in Borneo. More information on this fund can be found in Dr. Appell’s memorial for Reed that immediately follows these Notes and on the BRC website (www.borneoresearchcouncil.org).

Finally, as a further tribute, the BRB is planning, with the help of Dr. Carol Colfer and others, to put together a future special issue, or a section of a future issue, in honor of Reed which will deal with the Danau Sentarum project, to which he was deeply committed (see BRB, 2000, Vol. 31).

Dr. Appell opens our memorial section with a personal tribute to Reed, a shorter
version of which appeared in the American Anthropologist Newsletter. This is followed
by a bibliography of Reed’s published writings. Next, Dr. Carol Colfer gives us a vivid
account of her experiences of working with Reed as a professional colleague and of
knowing him over the years as a friend. Finally, we are grateful to Christina Pomianek,
who, writing as a graduate student, offers a moving appreciation of Reed as a teacher
and mentor.

Rob Barrett I knew for a somewhat longer time. We first met in 1988 at an
Iban cultural symposium in Kapit, Sarawak. Over the next year I saw much more of
Rob in the Saribas. At the time, he had begun fieldwork at Ulu Bayor. The beautiful old
Ulu Bayor longhouse was then, before the construction of an access road, most easily
reached by traveling up the Ulu Paku road, beyond the longhouse where I was working,
to Danau longhouse on the Paku River, and from there hiking across the watershed
separating the upper Paku from the Bayor stream. Shortly after he had settled in, the
people of the Ulu Bayor longhouse decided to organize a Gawai Antu celebration to
honor their recently deceased ancestors. The celebration was one of the grandest in living
memory. Over a thousand people attended, including three groups of performing bards.
Rob was appointed to the entertainment committee and I joined him in arranging for
the printing of Gawai programs and invitations to be sent to guests. We also purchased
and had engraved trophies for the Kumang and Keling beauty contests which are now
an essential part of major longhouse ceremonies in the Saribas. Rob had a great sense
of humor and took a special delight in this conjunction of modern novelties with what
continues to be an elaborate and venerable ritual occasion. But beneath his sense of fun,
Rob was also acutely sensitive to the feelings of others, and much of his humor took a
self-deprecating turn.

Rob was a remarkably insightful fieldworker. He was keenly observant of
interpersonal relations, social contexts, and subtle nuances of speech. Partly, this reflected,
no doubt, his extensive clinical training as a psychiatrist, but it was also part, I think, of
his personality. News of his death brought sadness to many people in Sarawak, where
he had a large circle of friends, including many longhouse elders, whose knowledge and
understanding of human affairs he greatly admired. Rob and I shared many interests in
common, among them Iban shamanism; poetic language, verbal arts and humor; and a
number of binary metaphors, like hot/cold, seen/unseen, that function for the Iban, not
so much as oppositional, but more as complementary or mediating categories. I, for one,
profited enormously from our conversations and correspondence.

During the early 1990s, when I was a senior fellow at the Australian National
University, I saw a good deal of Rob and we corresponded regularly. Later, our
correspondence became more intermittent. This was due, I think, to the fact that Rob’s
primary career was in psychiatry, and in becoming Director of the discipline at the
Royal Adelaide Hospital, he assumed a great deal of administrative responsibility. He
also taught, had an active clinical practice, and was involved in a major cross-cultural
research project concerned with schizophrenia. It was in this latter connection that my
wife and I, later on, enjoyed a number of memorable dinners with Rob in Kuching. In his
study of schizophrenia, he had become particularly interested in auditory hallucination
and the cross-cultural problems of identifying it and other diagnostic symptoms in an
Iban cultural context. He was also interested in the genetic dimensions of schizophrenia. For pursuing this latter interest, the Saribas region was an ideal setting. The Saribas Iban have historically preserved lengthy genealogies (tusut), which, from independent evidence, appear to be remarkably reliable for at least the last 8 to 10 generations. As a consequence, by using family tusut, it is possible to trace remembered instances of sakti gila (mental illness) back through family lines over a number of generations. To affirm these links, Rob, as part of his study, also collected blood samples for DNA analysis. In this connection, Louise and I generally met him for dinner after he had made an evening run, driving blood samples down from Sri Aman, so that they could be sent aboard an early morning flight to Australia.

Rob, like his wife, Dr. Mitra Guha, was born into a medical family. His father was a biological anthropologist and professor of dentistry, who published pioneering work on Australian Aborigine dentition. While Dr. Anna Chur-Hansen, in her memorial to Rob, provides an excellent account of his work in psychiatry, and as a public citizen, I knew Rob mainly as an anthropologist. Rob studied social anthropology with Bruce Kapferer during what can only be described as the “Golden Age” of Adelaide anthropology. His Adelaide dissertation resulted in a book, The Psychiatric Team and the Social Definition of Schizophrenia (Cambridge U.P, 1996), a brilliant ethnographic account of the culture of a psychiatric hospital. Later, as Dr. Chur-Hansen notes, Rob studied medical anthropology with Byron Good and Arthur Kleinman at Harvard University.

At the University of Adelaide, Rob was able to combine his interests in psychiatry and anthropology in teaching, as well as in research. As Dr. Chur-Hansen notes, Rob designed two popular courses at the university, “Person, Culture and Medicine” and “Emotion, Culture and Medicine.” First offered in 2000, both courses remain popular with medical, psychology, social science, and health science students. Following Rob’s death, in recognition of his many contributions, the University of Adelaide established the Robert Barrett Memorial Prize to be awarded each year to a pair of students whose achievements in “Person, Culture and Medicine” and in “Emotion, Culture and Medicine” are deemed outstanding. Beginning in 2007, four awards have been made.

Dr. Anna Chur-Hansen contributes to our memorial section an extended tribute to Rob. This originally appeared in the Monash Bioethics Review. Here, we thank both Dr. Chur-Hansen and the Review editor for permission to republish it.

Finally, Dr. A.V.M. Horton concludes our memorial section with an extended account of persons associated with Negara Brunei Darussalam whose deaths occurred during the past year.

In the first Research Note of this issue, Professor Danny Wong describes an early champion of Dusun rights in colonial North Borneo, a local village leader from the Papar area known simply as Simon in the official Chartered Company documents of the time. The question Professor Wong poses is “Who was Simon?” and what propelled him to initiate legal action against the Company government for selling Dusun land to the railroad and private commercial interests?

Sadly, as the author notes, the story of Simon is virtually forgotten in Sabah today. But, a little less than a century ago, the legal action he championed resulted in
a major court case, the “Papar Land Case of 1910,” that ended in a judicial decision that found sufficient justice in the suit to withhold full exoneration of the Company, and earned Simon a reputation in the official records of the time, and, by extension, in subsequent colonial history, as a “notorious trouble-maker.” The decision brought little redress, however. Litigation continued inconclusively for another ten years, by which time Simon had returned to private life, and his story, as the years passed, was gradually forgotten, even by those whose land rights he had once championed.

Wong places the character of Simon at the center of his study, presenting his essay as an attempt “to explore the role of individuals in defending community rights in early North Borneo.” In doing so, he draws on three types of sources, what he describes as: 1) “official” documents, 2) “quasi-official” sources, and 3) more informal, personal documents, in the latter case, letters and church records. As he shows, each source views Simon from a different perspective. While the three perspectives taken together provide an interesting contrast, it is obvious that informal sources offer, in this case, the more detailed and rounded picture of Simon’s character. Thus, Professor Wong’s paper is also, he tells us, a study in historical method, demonstrating “the importance of non-conventional sources in reconstructing…local history.”

As background to the Papar Land Case, Wong notes that the Papar region was at the turn of the twentieth century the principal “rice bowl” of Sabah and that its local Kadazan/Dusun inhabitants were well-known at the time as industrious padi planters. Papar was also, for the same reason, an initial center of Company rule. From the beginning, the Chartered Company and its shareholders scrambled to secure sources of revenue, and railway construction seemed to offer an ideal solution, making it possible to open the colony’s West Coast to commercial plantation development. As a preliminary, the Company government promulgated a series of land ordinances, the provisions of which took little account of indigenous land tenure practices. Conflict was inevitable and, given the intensive nature of local Dusun farming, it first arose, not surprisingly, in the Papar District.

In petitioning against encroachments on community land and mobilizing discontent, Simon came to be portrayed by the Company government in highly negative terms, as a trouble-maker and even as a potential instigator of rebellion. His connection with the Roman Catholic Church was also noted and the invisible hand of the Church was suspected to be operating behind the scenes, using Simon as its cover. Ironically, as Wong observes, it is from this negative portrayal by the government that a picture of Simon most clearly emerged as a dedicated leader championing a cause capable of arousing the consciousness of the entire Papar Dusun community. Indeed, the Papar Land Case was soon followed by others initiated by other Kadazan/Dusun groups, revealing both the wide extent of grievances and the spreading influence of Simon himself as an early catalyst of ethnic awareness.

The principal quasi-official source that Professor Wong makes use of is the unpublished diary of G.C. Woolley. This is a somewhat surprising source given the fact that Woolley, as a Company officer, Commissioner of Lands and Collector of Land Revenue, was a major principal in the Papar Land Case. He was also the principal drafter of Company land ordinances. However, Woolley, as a traveling officer, also had
a firsthand knowledge of local land use practices and in the course of adjudicating land disputes had, in fact, had occasion to consult with Simon himself. The picture he reveals in the privacy of his diary is therefore more complex and sympathetic.

Finally, the author takes up less conventional, more personal sources. These consist mainly of the letters of Father Bernard Kurz, a pioneer Roman Catholic missionary in Papar, and the records of the local church at Limbahau and of St. Joseph Church in Papar town. From these sources, something of the everyday man emerges. Thus, we learn, for example, that Simon’s full Kadazan name is Sindurang Bulakang and that he was a prosperous landowner and family man. He was also the headman of a Papar Dusun village known today as Kampong Kopimpinan. Simon was one of the first Church converts and following his baptism, he became Father Kurz’s assistant and an active lay catechist who, in turn, baptized many others. He was also one of the first converts to be married in the Limbahau church and he and his wife became the principal lay leaders of the local Catholic community. Certainly, therefore, the official view was correct on one point. Simon had close ties to the Roman Catholic Church and its European priests and, as Wong suggests, the fact that Simon adopted the notably Western means of legal action to seek redress against the government suggests that these ties may well have influenced his actions. Yet the picture that emerges, particularly from Father Kurz’s letters, is far more interesting and reveals Simon to be a man deeply committed to serving others and, it seems, one keenly sensitive to the Church’s teachings on justice.

In his conclusion, Professor Wong tells us that his purpose in writing about this early champion of Dusun rights was not to “rediscover” Simon. Yet, I think, the character he presents is too compelling a figure to merit his current anonymity. Rather, he seems to deserve a more enduring place in the collective historical memory of Sabah and one hopes that Professor Wong will again take up his story in the future.

In the next paper, Andrew Smith, a frequent contributor to the *BRB*, returns to a topic he has touched on, or explored, in a series of earlier papers, namely, the lives and trading activities of early nineteenth-century sea captains and country traders in what is now West Kalimantan. The present paper deals, as its title indicates, with the last seven years (1808-1815) in the life of Captain Daniel Smith (no known relation, the author informs me!), a country trader based in Penang whose voyages made him a frequent visitor to Pontianak. Here, as the author relates, he became a close trading associate of Sultan Kassim, a relationship obviously fraught with complications. The essay illustrates the precarious lives led by these ship captains. It also shows us that, for a brief time at the beginning of the nineteenth century, British maritime traders operating in Asian waters had to cope not only with local pirates, but also, for a time, with French and American privateers as well.

The next paper by Professor Bob Reece, “An Interview with Dr. Hj. Zaini Ahmad, Kuala Lumpur, 1985,” deals with the life story of a more recent historical figure. Zaini Ahmad was, from the 1950s, a founding member of Partai Ra’ayat Brunei (PRB), one of the first formally constituted political parties in northern Borneo, and was its executive secretary in 1962 at the time of the Brunei Rebellion. His story thus sheds light on what Professor Reece aptly describes as “the origins of formal political life
in the region.” The interview concentrates on Zaini’s family history and his early life experiences as these influenced his political thinking. As Reece observes, these matters are important, as there is a dearth of biographic information on the significant political figures of twentieth century Borneo. The interview also sheds light on the origins of the Brunei Rebellion, a watershed event in modern political history. In Sabah and Sarawak, the Rebellion effectively ended local opposition to Malaysia, while in Brunei it had, paradoxically, the opposite effect, sealing Brunei’s separation. In this connection, Zaini’s account of his family’s links to the Brunei Malay aristocracy and his relationship with Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin are particularly interesting. The irony, as Reece notes, is that Brunei went, as a result of the Rebellion and its aftermath, from being a center of early political activism to one of almost complete political stultification. However, beneath the Indonesian-inspired nationalism of Sheikh Azahari, there were clearly conservative undercurrents at work, and that a popular rebellion should end in the creation of a “neo-traditional” monarchy is perhaps not so surprising.

The next three papers, all of them by anthropologists, describe aspects of contemporary social life in three small ethnic communities in Sarawak—the Lahanan of the Balui region, the Penan of the upper Tutoh, and the Punan Vuhang of the upper Balui headwaters.

In the first of these papers, Jennifer Alexander describes the socio-cultural changes that have transformed Lahanan society from the time of Malaysian independence to the present. Dr. Alexander began fieldwork among the Lahanan in 1987-88 and since then has made repeated visits to the community, most recently in 2006. At the time of her original study, the Lahanan longhouse in which she worked, at Long Pangai, then on the main Balui River, was one of fifteen longhouses, the others of different ethnic groups that had been singled out by the Sarawak government for relocation in order to make way for the construction of the Bakun Dam. Dr. Alexander returned to the community in 1999, shortly after its relocation to the Sungai Asap resettlement area, and again in 2001, 2002, and 2006. As a result, her paper also documents the consequences of relocation over a span of nearly a decade.

As Dr. Alexander makes clear, the Lahanan and their Balui neighbors were already experiencing rapid socio-economic change well before their forced resettlement. These changes involved, among other things, improved river transport, the introduction of schools and health clinics, cash crops, and participation in elections and party politics. Another dramatic change she describes was the religious conversion of the Lahanan from Adat Bungan to Roman Catholicism. By the 1990s, the Lahanan were already actively involved in a modern market economy, and this involvement, as she notes, strongly influenced the way in which they sought to deal with government resettlement plans. Since their relocation, it is now obvious that little prior planning had gone into the question of how the settlers would make a living once they were moved. In place of extensive ancestral lands, each family at Sungai Atap has been allotted a small three-acre plot, insufficient to cultivate effectively as a source of household livelihood. As a consequence, Dr. Alexander tells us that “the possibilities [present before] of acquiring wealth through diligence and knowledge of farming have drastically declined.” To secure an income, most persons must now leave the community to find work elsewhere.
Those most able to do so have been mainly men, with the result that women, who were once the mainstay of the subsistence economy, have been largely left behind by recent developments. Despite these adversities, some community members have made a remarkable accommodation, and, in general, despite their growing dispersal and forced resettlement among other ethnic groups, or, perhaps, because of these things, the Lahanan have recently formed their own community association, based in Miri town, and are in the process today of actively reasserting their cultural uniqueness.

In the next paper, Jayl Langub reports on the findings of a study, originally commissioned by the International Tropical Timber Organization, that examines the present socio-economic conditions of seven Penan communities living in the vicinity of a newly created National Park, Pulong Tau, in the far northeastern interior of Sarawak. Langub describes four of these communities as “settled” and three as “semi-settled.” The settled groups practice hill-rice cultivation, supplemented by crops of cassava, while the semi-settled groups, although also planting cassava, and, in some cases, small amounts of rice, continue to subsist primarily by hunting and gathering. Rice cultivation, he tells us, began in the early 1960s and, interestingly, three of the four settled groups have grown sufficient rice in recent years to meet their entire annual food needs. Having close contacts with the Kelabit, some even express an interest in adopting Kelabit methods of irrigated wet-rice cultivation. Yet, in all seven communities, wild sago continues to be collected and is still favored over rice by those 50 years of age or older. Government proposals to regroup these seven Penan communities in a single large settlement were regarded as impractical and met with little, or no, support. On the other hand, the creation of the Pulong Tau (‘Our Forest’ in Penan) National Park was strongly favored. The local Penan have experienced at first-hand the destruction caused by logging, and they look upon the creation of the park as a way of preserving some remnants of a forested environment. As Langub nicely shows, park planning accords well with traditional Penan ideals regarding the use of their ancestral tana’ pengurip, or community foraging areas.

The Penan communities described by Langub adopted an evangelical form of Christianity in the 1950s, as a result of contacts with nearby Kelabit, Kenyah, and Kayan communities. Today, Christianity, Langub tells us, functions not only as a community institution, but has also broadened the Penan world, strengthening their ties with surrounding non-Penan groups.

In the paper that follows, Henry Chan describes another small community of former hunter-gatherers, the Punan Vuhang (also known as “Punan Busang” in the ethnographic literature), who live today in a single longhouse at Long Lidem in the upper headwaters of the Balui river system. Like the Penan described by Langub, the Punan Vuhang, too, have embraced evangelical Christianity. In this connection, Dr. Chan begins his paper with an interesting incident. In 1994, several decades after their conversion, a former shaman had a dream in which he met two female otu dokget spirits who, now bereft of human contact and offerings, were, they revealed, suffering from famine. In the shaman’s dream, the spirits, who had formerly aided human beings, appealed for sympathy. Next morning, three of the former shaman’s nephews went to the forest to hunt and each returned successfully with a wild boar. Seeing this as a sign, the former
shaman used a small amount of meat to make offerings to the spirits, while at the same time he appealed directly to the Christian God to show them compassion.

As Dr. Chan observes, from a Punan Vuhang perspective, these and other spirits continue to inhabit the surrounding universe, even though people no longer have much to do with them. From the accounts of elderly informants, he reconstructs a picture of the complex Punan Vuhang cosmos and describes the ways in which people, including shamans, formerly dealt with its various kinds of spirit inhabitants. The present paper is the first in a two-part series. The second part, to appear in the next *BRB*, will examine Punan Vuhang death rituals and notions relating to the spirits of the dead. Finally, in his conclusions, Dr. Chan raises a more general question concerning Borneo hunter-gatherers. As he notes, these people have sometimes been described in the literature as being essentially secular or nonreligious. Drawing on his reconstruction of the traditional Punan Vuhang world view, he argues that this conceptual world can only be described as “nonreligious” if one adopts an exceedingly narrow definition of what constitutes “religion.”

In the next Research Note, Mika Okushima follows up on a paper that appeared two years ago in the *BRB*, presenting here the concluding part of a two-part essay describing the historical migrations and cultural contacts of Kayanic-speaking peoples in central and northeastern Borneo. Her concern here is primarily with Kayanic movements from north to northeastern Borneo and the subsequent involvement of Kayanic groups, from the seventeenth century onward, with the coastal states of what is now East Kalimantan and, by extension, to the Sulu Archipelago and beyond. Okushima notes that in the past, regional groups identified themselves by means of shared genealogies, mytho-historical narratives or epics, and, in some instances, by claims to places of common origin. Using this material, much of it preserved as oral tradition, as well as ritual chant texts, she reconstructs the past movements of a number of these groups. Some, as she shows, later returned from East Kalimantan to the Baram-Balui region from which they had originally migrated generations earlier, while others, continuing onward, eventually reached the lower rivers of the east coast of Kalimantan. Here she connects their arrival and later turbulent history with the genealogies of the local Kutai and Bulungan sultanates.

Dr. George N. Appell, in the essay that follows, takes as his starting point an observation made by G.C. Woolley in a brief account of Timogun adat published originally in the 1930s, that the Timogun village holds rights to land such that only village members may open hill rice farms in “the watershed of their own village stream.” Curiously, as Appell notes, Woolley, in all of his other compilations of indigenous adat in Sabah, makes no further reference to village land rights. The question, Appell asks, is why should this be so?

Drawing on his own work and that of others, Dr. Appell argues that the village holds residual rights over land in all of the indigenous societies of Borneo for which there is adequate information. Exactly how land rights are defined varies, of course, over time and from one ethnic group to another, as does the precise nature of these residual village rights. Woolley, however, with the exception of the Timogun, is otherwise completely
silent with regard to village land rights. Drawing on Professor Wong’s Research Note that opens this volume, Appell observes that Woolley was directly involved in the Papar Land Case of 1910. He would therefore have had to be familiar enough with Dusun land tenure to be aware, at the very least, of village grazing land and community cemeteries, categories of land that were among those at issue in the dispute. The question, then, is why he chose to otherwise ignore these rights in his compilations of native adat? Dr. Appell suggests a number of possible explanations, among them ideological blinders and a possible conflict of interest with his role as Commissioner of Lands and drafter of Company land ordinances.

In the final Research Note in this issue, “Matrix to Mosaic: Habitat Fragmentation from 1982-1999 in Sabah, Malaysian Borneo,” Dawn Tanner and Ryan Kirk report on the rapid loss and fragmentation of tropical forest cover in Borneo. They open their essay with a cogent discussion of the effects on biodiversity caused by habitat loss, forest conversion, and fragmentation. As they note, the tropical forests of Southeast Asia, including Borneo, are major biodiversity “hotspots,” that is to say, world regions of greatest biological diversity. However, the current rate of forest loss is higher in Southeast Asia than anywhere else in the world, and in Borneo the rate is twice the Southeast Asian average and three times the world average. In Sabah, 48 percent of the state is gazetted as permanent forest reserves, state or federal parks, yet forest cover continues to be lost at twice the Southeast Asian average. To quantify the process of land-cover change, the authors analyze satellite imagery for the period 1982 to 1999, focusing on a specific area of Sabah that includes the Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve near Sandakan Bay on the east coast. Their data show that forest cover decreased 30 percent during this period. From this, the authors persuasively conclude: “The conservation status of the forests of Sabah is at a critical juncture.”

Our Brief Communications open, as they have since 2003, with a “Letter from Lundu,” written by our resident classicist and Borneo man of letters, Otto Steinmayer. In this letter, Otto muses on the history, art, and rationale of grass cutting in Borneo. This is likely to be Otto’s last letter to come to us directly from Sarawak. Otto returns to the United States in February 2009. His wife, Nusi, and their family will, however, retain their connection to Lundu and their house in Stunggang. For the record, Otto’s new address is 362 Farmholme Road, Stonington, CN 06378, and, for his many friends, he may still be reached at: otto@tm.net.my.

As mentioned earlier in these Notes, the late Reed Wadley, shortly before his death, presented copies of his unpublished notes and other research materials to several libraries, and in the Brief Communication that follows your Editor reports on those he presented to the Tun Jugah Foundation archives in Kuching. Next, Dr. Chur-Hansen similarly reports on the late Robert Barrett’s unpublished materials that have been deposited in the University of Adelaide Library.

In 2007, the University of the Philippines held its annual Anthropology Field School for the first time outside the Republic of the Philippines, in the Kota Belud District of Sabah. During the 2008 BRC Biennial Conference in Kota Kinabalu, Professor Castro of the Department of Anthropology presented a report describing the work undertaken
by the students and faculty of the UP field research team. Professor Castro has kindly allowed us to publish here a short summary of this report. A notable feature of the project is that several of the ethnic groups studied by the team are also present in the Philippines and that the Field School was followed by a public exhibition in the Philippines attended by guests from Sabah.

In the next Brief Communication, Cristina Eghenter and Jayl Langub describe a recently established trans-border forum, FORMADAT, created in connection with the Heart of Borneo Project and involving related highland communities in Sabah, Sarawak, and Kalimantan. Finally, in our last Brief Communication, Matthew Minarchek describes an Iban community on the periphery of the Danau Sentarum National Park, in West Kalimantan, and the small-scale, community hydro-electric project in which he was involved.

A Bit of History and Some Editorial Changes in the BRB

As I observed in my Notes from the Editor last year (BRB, 2007, 38: 1-2), the year just past, 2008, marks the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the Borneo Research Council.

The first issue of the Borneo Research Bulletin (Vol. 1, no. 1) appeared the following year, in March 1969. It took the form of a slender 5-page mimeographed newsletter. Since then, the BRB has grown considerably, and today, as the annual journal of the Borneo Research Council, it serves a much larger and more diverse audience. Most of us who took part in the original founding of the Council happened to be anthropologists by training. However, the intent of the founders was, from the beginning, that the Bulletin should serve as a forum for the dissemination of information concerning research in all areas of study pertaining to Borneo, not only anthropology, but also history, prehistory, languages, politics, the social sciences generally, medicine, and the physical and biological sciences. Some of these areas, of course, have been better served than others. Nonetheless, the intent of the BRB remains the same.

Today, of course, the volume of research is so immense that no single person can possibly hope to keep abreast of more than a small fraction of it. Indeed, even within one’s own discipline, keeping up is an ever-increasing challenge. Therefore to assist your Editor, a decision was made to create a series of sub-editorships, each covering a major topical area of research. As a beginning, two sub-editorships have been created, one in history, the other in ecology and environmental studies. Our history editor is Dr. Bob Reece, Professor in History at Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia. Bob is also a member of the Borneo Research Council’s editorial board and is well-known to many of you as a frequent contributor to the BRB. Our editor for ecology and environmental studies is Dr. Amity Doolittle of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. Both have agreed to assist your Editor by soliciting and reviewing papers and, from time to time, of preparing, possibly with others, review essays summarizing current developments in their general area of interest.

Again, as I have stressed in past Notes, your suggestions and comments are greatly welcomed. The BRB was founded, and continues to operate, without outside institutional support, and all of us who work to produce each issue do so as unpaid
volunteers. The breadth and quality of the Bulletin depend entirely upon the participation of its individual contributors and, in that connection, I would urge all of you to contact me with suggestions, news items, reviews, or essays.

The Tenth Biennial International Conference of the Borneo Research Council, Curtin University of Technology Campus, Miri, Sarawak, Malaysia, 19-21 July 2010

The Tenth Biennial International Conference of the Borneo Research Council will be held in Miri, Sarawak, under the sponsorship of the Curtin University of Technology Sarawak. The venue will be the Curtin University campus. The program, at we go to press, is still in the early stages of planning, but a formal announcement, program and registration details, as well as an official call for papers, will appear in the next issue of the BRB. The conference theme is “Borneo: Continuity, Change, and Preservation.” Bibi Aminah binti Abdul Ghani, Senior Lecturer, School of Foundation and Continuing Studies, Curtin University of Technology Sarawak, CDT 250, 98009 Miri, is coordinating arrangements and may be contacted by mail or at: bibi.aminah@curtin.edu.my. See also the announcement section in this issue.

Email Discussion List and Online Bibliography of Borneo Dissertations

Once again, I would like to remind readers that there is an active email discussion list that anyone with an interest in Borneo is welcome to join (see Notes from the Editor, Vol. 36, 2005). The list is managed by Dr. Otto Steinmayer and anyone may become a member by going to “Borneo List”borneo-l@ikanlundu.com or by writing to Otto directly at <otto@tm.net.my>.

There is also a BRC online bibliography of dissertations relating to Borneo (see Notes from the Editor, 2002, Vol. 33: 7). The bibliography website is maintained and updated by Professor Robert Winzeler and is hosted by the University of Nevada, Reno. The website address is: http://www.knowledgecenter.unr.edu/dataworks/borneo/borneoedit.aspx. At the time of writing, 561 dissertation titles and abstracts were listed. In some cases it is possible to access the dissertations themselves online. Where this is possible, web addresses have been noted.

Anyone with suggestions or titles to add to the bibliography is encouraged to write directly to Professor Winzeler at winzeler@unr.edu. We take this occasion to thank Bob, once again, for providing and keeping current this valuable service.

Thanks and Acknowledgements

Finally, I take this opportunity to thank all of those who assisted me during the year with article reviews, editorial or technical assistance, or who contributed news items, announcements, comments, suggestions, or bibliographic items. The list is a long one, but here I would like to thank in particular Jenny Alexander, George Appell, Ann Appleton, Martin Baier, Dee Baer, Anna Chur-Hansen, Carol Colfer, Traude Gavin, Mike Heppell, A.V.M. Horton, Roger Kershaw, Jayl Langub, Datuk Amar Leonard Linggi Jugah, Matthew Minarchek, Mika Okushima, Vic Porritt, Jacqueline Pugh-Kitingan, Bob Reece, Bernard Sellato, Kenneth Sillander, Andrew Smith, Otto Steinmayer, Vinson
Sutlive, Dawn Tanner, and the late Reed Wadley. I am grateful too to Mr. Alan Morse for the work he did in preparing the present volume for publication and to the other members of the BRC staff in Phillips, Maine, for overseeing its printing, distribution, and mailing. Alan also provided invaluable help with layout and the reproduction of photographs, maps, and tables. In his role as Book Review Editor and compiler of our annual abstracts and bibliography sections, I am especially indebted to A.V.M. Horton. As always, Dr. Horton has also been a regular correspondent and a frequent source of news items, references, memorials, and information about recent publications. Finally, a special thanks goes, once again, to my wife, Louise Klemperer Sather, who, as our Assistant Editor, carefully read through all of the papers, reviews, announcements, and brief communications that appear in this volume. Her editorial skills, patience, and close attention to detail have been an invaluable help to me and to us all.

Member Support

Here we wish to express our thanks to the following individuals for their contribution over the last year to the BRC endowment and general funds.

ENDOWMENT FUND: Dr. Jennifer Alexander, Dr. Clare Boulanger, Dr. Carol J.P. Colfer, Dr. Jay B. Crain, Dr. Michael R. Dove, Professor Virginia Hooker, Professor H. Arlo Nimmo, Professor Robert Reece, Professor F. Andrew Smith, Dr. and Mrs. Otto Steinmayer, Dr. and H.L. Whittier, Dr. W. D. Wilder, and Dr. Robert L. Winzeler.

GENERAL FUND: Dr. Laura P. Appell-Warren, Dr. Adela Baer, Dr. Martin Baier, Dr. Clare Boulanger, Dr. Carol J.P. Colfer, Dr. Jay B. Crain, Professor Ian Douglas, Dr. & Mrs. Allen Drake, Ms. Katherine Edwards, Dr. Richard Fidler, Ms. Judith Heimann, Mr. John W. McCarthy, Dr. Peter Metcalf, Mr. John D. Pearson, Dato Seri John Pike, Dr. Robert Pringle, Dr. & Mrs. Clifford Sather, Dr. and Mrs. Otto Steinmayer, Dr. Jack Stuster, Mr. Nathaniel Tarn, FR Brian Taylor, Dr. Phillip Thomas, Dr. and Dr. H.L. Whittier, Mr. James Wickes, Dr. W. D. Wilder, Mr. William Wilkinson, Dr. Robert L. Winzeler, and Dr. Leigh Wright.

We thank each of these individuals for their generous support.
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Ryan Kirk recently received his Ph.D. in Natural Resources Science and Management from the University of Minnesota. He is an Assistant Professor in the Department of History and Geography Environmental Studies Program at Elon University in North Carolina. His dissertation research focused on the study of land use change and carbon cycling in North Carolina from the antebellum period to the present using satellite imagery, aerial photography, historic maps, and spatial models. He was awarded the Cartography and Geographic
Information Science Award by the University Consortium for Geographic Information Science. His continuing research focuses on exurban and suburban development, changes in forest area and structure, and agricultural history.

Jayl Langub is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of East Asian Studies, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS). A retired civil servant, Jayl Langub did a BA in anthropology at McGill University and a MA in Community Development at the University of Alberta. He has published numerous papers on the Penan and Orang Ulu, including entries in The Encyclopedia of Malaysia, “Penan community and traditions,” “Adat and longhouse community,” “Kajang and other Orang Ulu groups” (Peoples and Traditions, vol. 12). Recently he co-edited with James Chin Reminiscences: Recollections of Sarawak Administrative Services Officers (Pelanduk Publications, 2007). He is also a frequent contributor to the BRB, his most recent publication being (with Jérôme Rousseau) “Ten Kenyah paintings given to the Sarawak Museum” (Vol. 37). He is currently preparing a study of the Seping, a small minority group comprising a single longhouse on the Belaga River.


Bob Reece is Professor in History at Murdoch University in Western Australia. His major publications in Borneo history are The Name of Brooke: The End of White Rajah Rule in Sarawak (Kuala Lumpur: OUP, 1982), Datu Bandar, Abang Hj. Mustapha of Sarawak: Some reflections of his life and times (Kuching: Sarawak Literary Society, 1991), Masa Jepun: Sarawak under the Japanese 1941-1945 (Kuching: Sarawak Literary Society, 1998) and, most recently, The White Rajahs of Sarawak: A Borneo Dynasty (Singapore: Archipelago Press, 2004). He also wrote introductions for the Oxford University Press reprints of Low (1848), Keppel (1846), Brooke (1866), McDougall (1882), and St. John (1879) and was a major contributor to The Encyclopaedia of Iban Studies (2001) and the Encyclopedia of Malaysia (2001; 2006). Professor Reece’s most recent contributions to the BRB include “Some Sarawak Curiosities in the British Library,” “Joseph Burn and Raffles’s Plan for a British Borneo” (with F. Andrew Smith), both of which appeared in Volume 37 (2006), and “The Kitingan Case, the Borneo states, and the Malaysian constitution,” Volume 38 (2007). His current project is a biography of Charles Brooke, which is the basis of his most recent article, “‘My Dear Treasurer’: Rajah Charles Brooke’s Correspondence with F.H. Dallas, 1902-1917,” Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. 81, Pt. 2 (2008), pp. 37-62.

F. Andrew Smith, Ph.D., is Professor Emeritus, the University of Adelaide, South Australia. Originally trained as a plant biologist, his research interests since the mid-1990s have centered significantly on the history and ecology of Borneo, especially
of West Kalimantan. He is a Fellow of the Borneo Research Council and a frequent contributor to the *Borneo Research Bulletin*. His most recent *BRB* publication was “An “Arch-Villain” to be Rehabilitated? Mixed Perceptions of Pangeran Anom of Sambas in the early Nineteenth Century” which appeared last year in Volume 38 (2007).

**Dawn Tanner** is a Ph.D. candidate in conservation biology at the University of Minnesota. She has published work on island-ecosystem management and population impacts on island species in the *Journal of Environmental Management* and the *Bulletin of the Chicago Herpetological Society*. Her global review of crossing structures to ensure safe wildlife road-crossings was published in *Natural Resources: Economics, Management and Policy*. She received a FLAS fellowship to study Indonesian. She is particularly interested in issues of habitat loss, landscape fragmentation, and effects on endemic species, with long-term interests in Borneo.

**Danny Wong Tze Ken**, Ph.D. (Malaya) is currently Associate Professor at the History Department, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Malaya. He specializes in Vietnamese history and the history of Sabah. He is the author of *The Transformation of an Immigrant Society: A Study of the Chinese of Sabah* (London: Asean Academic Press, 1998) and *Historical Sabah: Community and Society* (Kota Kinabalu: Natural History Publications, 2004).
Reed Wadley, Associate Professor at the University of Missouri (Columbia) died June 28 after a courageous two-year long battle with Ewing’s sarcoma. Dr. Wadley’s cremated remains were divided between his family in Idaho and his Iban family in Borneo. He is survived by his wife, Dr. Oona Paredes, also a cultural anthropologist, and by their 10-year old son, Lucas.

He was an energetic and dedicated field worker, having spent three years in West Kalimantan with Iban communities; many members of these communities remained his close friend and sent him Iban medicines for this illness. Dr. Wadley’s research interests while focused on Borneo ethnography, were wide. His major research was on human-environmental interactions with a focus on the historical and modern trajectories of natural resource use and management in the tropical forest, and the impacts of these on local-level socioeconomic organization and forest-based agriculture. His many publications (some of which are still in press) make major contributions to anthropology, including the understanding of swidden cultivation, local ecological knowledge, and ritual. His most significant publication is his edited volume *Histories of the Borneo Environment: Economic, Political and Social Dimensions of Change and Continuity* (KITLV Press), which arose from his three-year study of the Dutch archives at Leiden University where he focused on the ethnohistory of the Iban on the border between West Kalimantan and Sarawak.

Dr. Wadley worked collaboratively on various projects with the Center for International Forestry Research. He was one of the original signatories for the Dana
Declaration on Mobile Peoples and Conservation. Dr. Wadley served on the Board of Directors of the Borneo Research Council and Board of Sponsors of the Anthropologists’ Fund for Urgent Anthropological Research. His research materials from the Dutch archives are to be housed at the Tun Jugah Foundation, Kuching, Sarawak (see Brief Communications), and copies of his unpublished field notes, records, and manuscripts at the Firebird Foundation for Anthropological Research, Phillips, Maine.

The Reed Wadley Memorial Fund has been established by the Borneo Research Council to honor his life and work. The fund will provide supplemental grants to graduate students in cultural anthropology planning to do research in Borneo. Dr. Wadley’s wife, Oona Paredes Ph.D., has been asked to be one of the advisors to the fund. Gifts to honor Dr. Wadley’s memory should be sent to the Borneo Research Council, P.O. Box A, Phillips, Maine, 04966, USA.

(Dr. G.N. Appell, President, Borneo Research Council, Phillips, Maine)
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**Field Manuals**


Sometime before June 1992, I had heard about a brief study by a doctoral student, Reed Wadley, on the impact of roads in the area of Danau Sentarum Wildlife Reserve. My husband, 10-year old son, and I were headed up the Kapuas River to work in that area of West Kalimantan, Indonesia, and I had a clear plan to be on the lookout for Reed. After hours and hours of travel in an over-burdened speedboat, zooming around the Danau Sentarum Wildlife Reserve, in search of the perfect spot for a field center, our group of conservation folks arrived at the edge of the village of Lanjak, on the northern edge of the Reserve. In the process of reporting to the local camat (sub-district head), we encountered Reed—who was also excited to run into us.

He and I immediately hit it off and began discussing our respective plans for ethnographic (and other) research in the area, and how we might collaborate—as we sat side by side on the camat’s couch. My most vivid memory of that meeting was when, for some reason, I unthinkingly mentioned how “tall” we westerners were in comparison to Indonesians. I remember the perplexed look on his face, as his 5’5” height (the same as mine) gradually dawned on me. He wasn’t used to thinking of himself as “tall,” and I—long resident in Indonesia—hadn’t noticed that he would be considered short in America.

That brief meeting was the beginning of a close and enduring friendship. We immediately realized our shared concerns about both people and forests; and quickly divided up the ethnographic tasks, with him focusing on the Iban and me on the Melayu; him on the periphery and me in the center of the nature reserve (now Danau Sentarum National Park). However, he understood my special interest in Dayak life, based on my long experience with the Uma’ Jalan Kenyah in East Kalimantan; and he was generous enough to help me also gain some understanding of the Iban. We planned and implemented a whole series of comparative studies of both groups, from time allocation to use of non-timber forest products, to agricultural land use, to hunting; and we brainstormed about how best to involve both ethnic groups in more effective conservation efforts. After about a year, my husband and I despaired of getting the kind of support from our employers we needed to do a good job of collaborative management with local communities; and we moved on. Reed stayed on in the area, finishing his dissertation and cementing familial ties with the members of “his” longhouse in Sungai Sedik (including blood brotherhood with Umping, a colorful and intelligent Iban politician and businessman). He also came home with a back totally covered with wonderful Iban tattoos--something that impressed my own son so much he followed Reed’s example!

I went to work for the Bogor-based Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) in 1994, and he headed back to the U.S., first to finish his dissertation at Arizona State University in Tempe, then to investigate Dutch historical materials on the Iban in Leiden, the Netherlands. He finally settled at the University of Missouri, where he continued his focus on the Iban, and taught until his death in June 2008. In the meantime, he married an anthropologist, Oona Paredes, and had a lovely son, Lucas.
We maintained contact, analyzing our research results and publishing various papers together; and in 1996, I asked Reed to join me on a 6 week return visit to Danau Sentarum. I was working on a project to “test” methods for assessing social criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management. Basically, we had 12 PRA methods we wanted to test in both Iban and Melayu communities, and he took the responsibility for the Iban “test.” This experience strengthened our shared interests, and we continued to publish together. Later, not long after Soeharto’s 1998 fall in Indonesia, Reed returned to CIFOR and to Danau Sentarum to study illegal logging and its effects.

In 2006, he came to Bogor for what would prove to be his last visit. When he arrived at my house in February, he was already limping. He thought he’d sprained his hip or pulled something. He was in pain, but didn’t take it too seriously, and he went to our remote field site (at least a full day of travel from the West Kalimantan capital, Pontianak), as planned. He wanted to study indigenous ideas related to climatic predictions and their links with climate change. When he returned a month later, he was in agony, and could hardly walk. He wasn’t sleeping either. He knew he had to get to the bottom of this problem and that it was probably much more serious than he’d originally thought.

The next news—from Missouri—was of his cancer, followed by a year and a half of debilitating cancer treatments. He was hopeful and productive to the end. Throughout his treatments, we corresponded by email. He had an idea to write about the important role of personal connections in successful (and unsuccessful) conservation efforts. He wanted to use our experience in Danau Sentarum (with Julia Aglionby, Rona Dennis, and Emily Harwell) as an example of a comparatively positive effort, maintained by the ongoing commitment and interest of those who had worked together and maintained bonds of friendship and shared interests over the years. And he wanted to publish our work in Conservation Biology or another conservation-oriented journal, to broaden the horizons of biophysical scientists who tended to ignore such human considerations.

I only knew Reed in this kind of professional context, but I have rarely worked with anyone whom I enjoyed as much as Reed. He was considerate, thoughtful, patient, open-minded, and intelligent. He was an ideal collaborator, sharing his ideas freely and open to the ideas of others. He loved learning and was passionately committed to improving the planet and doing whatever he could for the Iban from whom he’d learned so much. He was also a responsible and careful editor, and he typically responded to requests or inquiries immediately. I always knew I could count on Reed to do what he said he’d do.

His death is a huge loss to the scientific and conservation communities. I know that those involved in the Borneo Research Council had high hopes for his even more active involvement in BRC affairs in the years to come. He was involved in his students’ research proposals and I am absolutely certain he was an excellent teacher and mentor—his students will surely miss him too. I know that I will always cherish his friendship and intellectual contributions to my own thinking. He will be much missed!

(Dr. Carol Colfer, CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia)
Remembering Reed Wadley—“. . .And you will.”

In my mind today, I can hear those three short words just as I did during my Ph.D. qualifying exam. The goal that day was for a committee to identify my weaknesses—a necessary, but unpleasant rite of passage—and we had been at it for several hours. A professor posed a question to me, prefaced with, “When you do your research in Kalimantan. . . .”, and Reed leaned over and spoke those three words, quietly but with confidence and great conviction. At that time, he had been diagnosed with cancer, and although I was the eternal optimist throughout his illness, part of me was gripped by fear and uncertainty. I did not expect to see him that day, knowing that he was in significant pain and undergoing treatment, but he came. He must have understood my apprehensions on a day that he knew would be difficult for me (he knew me to be a perfectionist). His presence and his few words meant more to me than I think he knew and more than I was ever able to express to him.

As a mentor, Reed was always more likely to pose a challenge, ask questions, and present alternative perspectives than he was to offer easy praise. There were always ways to improve, new skills to acquire, new possibilities and directions. Exceeding his expectations and pushing these limits became my mission (and I think he knew this). I relished his keen intellect and thought processes, while he cultivated, refined, and fortified my own.

As our professional relationship grew, our personal relationship became stronger. I watched Reed moving through the crisis of the past few years, and as I tried to offer help and hope, I was often touched by his own strength as well as his vulnerability. Throughout this time, I came to know him as a loving husband to Oona and a loving father to Lucas, as a strong and tender man, and as a cherished friend.

Simply put, Reed Wadley changed my life. He was a wonderful mentor, both academically and in learning to cope with life’s indignities. Today, I continue with the plans that we laid out at the beginning of this journey. Within the next year, I will carry out my dissertation fieldwork in West Kalimantan. This is a bittersweet moment, and I am ever aware of my mentor’s gift to me. His is a voice to heed and to remember.

“. . .And I will, Reed. I will. . .”

(Christina Pomianek, Department of Anthropology, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri)
A Passionate Love: The Contributions of the Late Professor Robert John Barrett

Professor Robert John Barrett died suddenly, after a long and difficult illness, on January 12th, 2007. At the time of his death, at the age of 57, he was Head of the Discipline of Psychiatry at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, University of Adelaide. His passing was mourned by countless individuals in Australia and internationally. The celebration of his life, held in the University of Adelaide’s Bonython Hall, from which generations of scholars have received their parchments upon graduation, was an emotive ritual of which Rob would have both approved and enjoyed immensely. The Hall was filled to capacity, with over 1,300 people listening to a collection of his favorite music and tributes delivered by eight of his friends and family members. Dignitaries in full academic regalia, including the Vice-Chancellor, the immediate past and current Deans of Medicine, and the Head of School oversaw proceedings from an elevated position in the Hall, the symbolic meaning of which would have caused Rob to smile wryly. A reflection of his life in pictures, at the conclusion of the ceremony, before the pall-bearers carried his coffin to the hearse, evoked yet more tears and grief at the tragic and untimely loss of this man: an outstanding intellectual, wise mentor, gifted teacher, caring doctor, and true and loyal friend.

A passionate love

In the application Rob prepared in 1998 for the position of Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Adelaide he wrote:

The most important personal quality that I offer is my enthusiasm—
passionate love for research, teaching and the stimulating collegial relationships that are part of academic life.

This paper is a tribute to that passion. It describes some of the many of his contributions to research, particularly research in ethics and in medical anthropology, to teaching, and to his clinical profession of psychiatry.

Précis of his curriculum vitae (based upon his own writings)

In 1973 Rob graduated from the University of Adelaide in medicine with distinction. After completing his internship he gained two year’s experience in general practice, during which time he also pursued undergraduate studies in social anthropology. His post-graduate training in psychiatry under Professor Issy Pilowsky had a strong general hospital focus, his base being at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Rob qualified in 1979 with the award of the Medallion of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists. At Hillcrest Hospital (a now defunct psychiatric hospital in the northern suburbs of Adelaide) he chiefly gained experience in the treatment of schizophrenia and the management of people with intellectual disabilities. His doctoral dissertation, an anthropological study of the culture of a psychiatric hospital and its relation to psychiatric practice, was undertaken through the Department of Anthropology at the University of Adelaide. This study was published as a book by Cambridge University Press (Barrett, 1996) and, later released in a French language edition (Barrett, 1998). Being fully trained as a psychiatrist and a social anthropologist (at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels), Rob was uniquely qualified within Australia. He was awarded a prestigious Neil Hamilton Fairley Fellowship by the NH&MRC (National Health and Medical Research Council) to pursue further studies in medical anthropology at Harvard Medical School, under Professor Arthur Kleinman and Professor Byron Good. There he was appointed a Visiting Fellow and a Member of Faculty.

He subsequently conducted a series of NH&MRC supported comparative studies of schizophrenia that combined anthropological and clinical research techniques, the research sites being located in Borneo and in Adelaide. In his position as an academic member of staff in Psychiatry at the University of Adelaide, Rob was deeply involved in undergraduate and postgraduate education, leading a number of initiatives in this area. He also enjoyed weighty clinical and administrative responsibilities at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

At the time of his death Rob had been working on an ambitious project for which he had received NH&MRC funding with Associate Professor Bryan Mowry, from the University of Queensland. In this research he hoped to disentangle the genetic contributions to schizophrenia. This project consisted of rigorous ethnographic and clinical case examination, including collection of blood samples for DNA analysis, again from the Iban people of Sarawak. In addition to this work, at the time of his death he was also deeply involved in research into cultural and historical models of language and thought, in an attempt to better understand the origins and biases of clinical writings on thought disorders in schizophrenia.

While I have divided Rob’s contributions under the subheadings of “research,” “teaching,” and “clinical practice,” these are somewhat artificial partitions. Each area
spills over into the others: Rob’s ethos of holistic approaches to mental health care is mirrored in his body of work overall.

Research

Rob produced a substantive body of work. It can be categorized as falling under the broad domains of anthropological studies of schizophrenia, the role of language in health care, cross-cultural explanatory models of mental illness, anthropological studies of ethical principles in research, and medical education. Rob’s ethnographic contributions to the literature represent part of an international lineage that began in the late nineteenth century with W.H.R. Rivers, a psychiatrist and ethnographer, through to the Clyde Kluckhohn/Dorothea Leighton collaboration in the mid-twentieth century, and on to the great work conducted over the last thirty years by Arthur Kleinman, Byron Good, Mary-Jo Del Vecchio Good, Janis Jenkins, Ellen Corin and through to Rob Barrett himself (Parker, 2007).

Rob’s concern for human rights is apparent throughout all of his writings. Rob had strong beliefs about the absolute necessity for respect and the humane treatment of everyone. This passion won him many admirers, and inevitably, some staunch enemies. Rob was never afraid to cross swords with those whom he felt were supporting injustice and discrimination.

In 2001 the South Australian Mental Health Service Reform led to mentally ill people being shackled in hospital emergency departments (Galletly et al., 2007). Rob went to the media, incredulous that mentally ill people should be treated in this way, with the shackling entailing both physical restraint using leather bands to tie all four limbs to the bedside and chemical restraint using pharmacological agents. Interviewed by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (Barker, 2001), the empathy that Rob had for people with mental illness, which resonates throughout his research writings, is clear: “People are injured, and I think they’re injured physically, and even more worrying perhaps, they’re injured psychologically. If I were to tie you down for 24 to 48 hours I think you would be injured too, psychologically.”

A member of Amnesty International, Rob was acutely concerned for people who become the victims of politics. He wrote about these issues (Barrett, 2000a) and also made practical attempts to bring about change. I recall his outrage over refugees being placed in detention, and I remember his road trip to Baxter to see conditions for himself.

Homeless people were another group for whom Rob felt empathy and concern. He wanted to know what conditions were like for the homeless, so he went out into the parklands at night with the Mobile Assistance Patrol, and spoke to individuals living on the streets (Allison, 2007). He supervised a doctoral dissertation, written by Andrew Morley, who conducted an ethnography of homelessness in Adelaide, to explore the association between mental health and homelessness, and possible avenues for helping these people.

Rob was very interested in language and the way we speak about mental health and illness and how we talk and write about the provision of services. Never one to accept intellectual knowledge at face value, Rob would assiduously and critically pursue basic
concepts – including single words – to their historical origins (Good and Delvecchio-Good, 2007). This interest in linguistic matters is obvious in his early work on the ways in which health care professionals write in case notes (see for example Barrett, 1988), and continues throughout to his most recent publications. In 2006 he published two papers in collaboration with his colleague, Damon Parker, on the meaning of the term “community” (Barrett and Parker, 2006; Parker and Barrett, 2006). The primary purpose of these two papers was to determine what health professionals mean when they refer to a psychiatric service as a “community service,” and how the use of the word “community” can both advantage and disadvantage patients and service providers.

In 2005 Rob co-authored a report on a preliminary ethnographic study of a research ethics committee (Parker, James and Barrett, 2005). Adopting an approach suggested by Bourdieu, the paper concludes that rather than being guided by the ethical principles of autonomy, beneficence and justice, the committee could be understood as functioning under an overriding principle of “agape,” or brotherly love, which encompassed not only these three ethical principles, but also confidentiality, integrity, dignity and respect. Associate Professor Michael James has told me that working with Rob and Damon was one of the most enjoyable experiences he has ever had in research: he enjoyed not only the intellectual stimulation but also Rob’s energy, good humor and sense of fun.

Rob’s interest in ethics spanned a number of areas, but included the role of the pharmaceutical company in ethical decision-making at committee level (Parker, James and Barrett, 2005). Rob was also interested in the process of attaining informed consent. He considered and examined the meaning of “informed consent” across cultures as well as from the perspective of the individual giving consent, through to consent granted by a group of people (Barrett and Parker, 2003). He was interested, too, in the meaning of the term “risk” according to whether one is considering what risk might mean for the individual or for a group of people, such as the Iban for instance, when consenting to participate in medical research (Parker and Barrett, 2003).

One of the events that gave Rob an enormous amount of pleasure and sense of achievement was the 35th Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists Congress, held in Adelaide, in April 2000, which he convened. As with everything Rob did that he believed to be important, he devoted himself wholeheartedly into the organizing of the event, and worked extremely hard on its preparation. Rob and his Committee decided upon the theme of “Looking Outward: Culture, Creativity and Psychiatry.” On the aims of the Congress, he wrote: “We sought to explore systematically the relationship between psychiatry and the society in which it is practiced—between our profession, our clinical work, and the cultural milieu of which it is a part.” (Barrett, 2000b: 276). Rob’s program combined presentations on culture, the arts and the humanities with scientific contributions. As an anthropologist Rob was keen to incorporate ritual into the Congress, and thus he included an opening ceremony by members of the Kaurna Nation, performances by the string orchestra that Rob formed especially for the Congress and composed entirely of psychiatrists and trainees, named Musicii Collegium Doctorum Animorum (Cum Amicis), along with a consumer band Finelines, to decrease the stigma and educate the psychiatric community “about the talents and positive contributions of
people who have experienced mental illness” (Barrett, 2000b, p. 279). The Congress was a resounding success and seven years later is still discussed with admiration by those who attended, or wished they had.

**Teaching**

Rob drew upon his research in the delivery of his teaching to medical students and to trainee psychiatrists, and anthropology and psychology students, whom he taught by invitation. His teaching was mesmerizing – students were enthralled and captivated, not only by his novel material, but also by his quirky sense of humor, his dynamic delivery, and his passion for his disciplines of medicine, psychiatry and anthropology. His students’ world views were often permanently changed by his teaching (Frewin and Chur-Hansen, 2007). Should this sound an exaggeration, of the myriad examples I could cite, let me recount but one.

Last year I attended a workshop on the ethics of conducting research with refugees, and was approached by a young woman, Mel Baak, who had been in a class of Rob’s in 2000, when she was a first-year medical student. In her words, Professor Barrett’s lectures had been inspirational: after two years of studying medicine she made the decision to leave the course and Australia, to pursue work as a teacher for people of the Sudan. This major change of direction she attributes in no small part to Rob’s influence. Since leaving medicine she has completed three years of a four-year degree in primary education (from which she graduated at the end of 2008), built a school in the Sudan, is Director of a charity to collect funds for the school and the community in which it is located, and made a movie about her experiences. In 2008 she presented her work to students in the University of Adelaide Medical School. In 2009 she is commencing her doctoral (Ph.D.) studies in Education, focusing on the role of primary education (in Sudan) in promoting well-being for Sudanese people. If Rob could know this, he would be so proud: he took much pleasure in nurturing the careers of his students and seeing them do well.

Rob’s anthropological background, married with his medical and psychiatric training, gave him interdisciplinary perspectives on human behavior, and he was a great supporter of interdisciplinary approaches to teaching and learning. One of the fruits of his interdisciplinary bent was the introduction of two undergraduate courses for medical, psychology and health sciences students: “Person, Culture and Medicine” and “Emotion, Culture and Medicine.” These courses were designed in collaboration with me (a psychologist) and Professor M. Henneberg (a biological anthropologist) (see Rühli, Henneberg, Barrett and Chur-Hansen, 2002; Chur-Hansen, Parker, Henneberg and Barrett, 2006). The courses continue today, are popular with students, and have been cited as examples of exemplary teaching practice by the Carrick Institute of Australia. The Rob Barrett Memorial Prize is now awarded to the students with the most outstanding results in each of these courses.

Rob’s postgraduate teaching was similarly influential. From the perspective of one of the trainee psychiatrists he has taught:

“Prof was a passionate teacher of psychiatry: both its theoretical basis and clinical application. His interviewing skills were something
to behold. He inspired many medical students and junior doctors to pursue a career in psychiatry. The trainee psychiatrists of South Australia, both past and present, will be forever in his debt.” (Shirripa, 2007).

The colleagues who taught in postgraduate programs with Rob were equally impressed by his contributions. Indeed, it has been noted that his keen interest in medical education and his participation in the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists Examination Committee resulted in the production of a world-class assessment process that incorporates summative and formative feedback to candidates – an extraordinary achievement (Handrinos and Gill, 2007).

Clinical practice

Rob’s father, the late Professor Murray Barrett, was a biological anthropologist and the Dean of Dentistry at the University of Adelaide. Rob’s research interests and his clinical practice were influenced to some extent by his father’s work with Indigenous Australians. Rob accompanied his father on many field trips as a boy. At the time of Rob’s death he was supervising an undergraduate research project on Indigenous students’ transitions into university life. The Indigenous student undertaking the project, Paul Herbert, on first meeting Rob, excitedly told him that Rob was his Grandfather. That is, Rob grew up with Warlpiri boys, who are today important community Elders. From his father Murray, who was an initiate, Rob was given the skin name Japaljari, and thus, he was this student’s kin. A traditional smoking ceremony was performed for Rob shortly after his death, as a mark of respect for his Indigenous heritage and his relationship to his student, Paul.

Rob’s affiliation with Indigenous Australians was reflected in his clinical work at Nunkuwarrin Yunti, a community-controlled center in Adelaide that provides health care and community support services to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and his position as an advocate on several Government Committees related to Indigenous mental health. He met with community leaders, and listened to what they had to say, seeking collaboration and ways to best help people in need (Allison, 2007).

His research was reflected in his clinical practice in many ways. For example, Rob took a leadership role in developing models of clinical services that are sensitive to the special needs of patients from different ethnic backgrounds, and he published a number of papers in this area (see for example Barrett, 1997).

Rob’s extensive research into schizophrenia and our cultural understandings of the illness, his thousands of hours listening to people with mental illness as a clinician and as a researcher, and his deep intellect, which enabled him to step back and really listen to what was being said, gave him “an empathic ability beyond normal comprehension” and an “ability to walk alongside a person and understand their perspective” (Allison, 2007). He was, quite simply, a remarkable clinician.

Conclusion

While those of us who loved Rob and admired his work are left bereft at his loss, we can take solace in the fact that his influence lives on. He remains with us through
the important impact he has had on countless students and others whom he mentored and guided through their careers. He lives on through his beautiful daughter Githie, and his remarkable wife Mitra, the two people in his life for whom his love and passion were greatest. And his work lives on, not only through his published materials, which will be accessed by and influence generations to come, but also his collected data, unpublished lectures and other writings, which have been archived in the University of Adelaide Barr Smith Library, so that present and future scholars can benefit from the wealth of materials that he collected, but sadly, did not have time to finish.

(Associate Professor Anna Chur-Hansen, Discipline of Psychiatry at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, University of Adelaide, South Australia, 5005. anna.churhansen@adelaide.edu.au)
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NEGARA BRUNEI DARUSSALAM: OBITUARY 2008

A.V.M. Horton

Introduction

The most remarkable Bruneian who died during 2008 was Yang Amat Mulia Pengiran Dipa Negara Laila Diraja Pengiran Haji Abdul Momin bin Pengiran Haji Ismail, a cetera who served as a Menteri Besar (Chief Minister) from 1970 until 1982. Dato Abdul Wahab bin Mohammad was a headmaster involved in the dakwah movement. Haji Butir bin Serudin was an actor, whilst Haji Sawal bin Rajab was a prize-winning writer. The local Chinese community mourned the loss, in particular, of YD Pehin Bendahari Cina Kornia Diraja Awang Ng Teck Hock (1928-2008). Among women, mention might be made of Datin Kamaliah Suhaimi, widow of the first State Mufti of Brunei/NBD.

Further afield, several notable Southeast Asians with NBD connections were lost to the world in 2007-8, notably ex-President Haji Mohamed Suharto of Indonesia and his foreign minister, Bapak Ali Alatas.

The history profession suffered the loss of Professor Mary Turnbull (1927-2008), and Lady Peel, wife of a former British Resident in Brunei, died during 2008.

The usual platoon of British military personnel departed the scene. From the Revolt/Confrontation Era, one might spotlight here Colonel William George, “Charlie” McHardy (1920-2008) and Lieutenant-Colonel Digby-Jeremie Willoughby (1934-2007). From an earlier era Lieutenant-Commander Ian Edward Fraser (1920-2008) was awarded the Victoria Cross for a submarine raid on Japanese-occupied Singapore in July-August 1945 from his base at Labuan.

Two prominent sporting figures were lost: Thomas Richard Butcher was “Mr Tennis” in the sultanate for half a century while Mr Lakshman de Alwis, who died in a bomb blast in his Sri Lankan homeland, was a successful athletics coach.

The highly distinguished Australian lawyer, Athol Moffitt, was a last-minute entry.

The remainder of this paper comprises obituary notices in alphabetical order. The entries are in most cases a starting point for further research rather than a substitute for it. A list of abbreviations is provided towards the end of the article along with a short bibliography of source material.

Alphabetical Listing

ABDUL MOMIN bin Pengiran Haji Ismail, Yang Amat Mulia Pengiran Dipa Negara Laila Diraja [cr 1970] Pengiran Haji (d 2008). Brunei/NBD nobleman, civil servant, diplomat and legislative councillor; returned to the mercy of Allah on Saturday 17 May 2008, aged eighty; survived by a widow, a son, and three daughters; buried in Telanai Muslim cemetery; in the afternoon of the same day HM Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah
visited the family residence in order to convey His Majesty’s “deepest condolences” in person (BTO Su.18.5.2008).

Nominated member of the revived Legislative from Monday 6 September 2004 (21 Rejab 1425) until his death (GBOW ON F.10.9.2004; BBO Th.1.9.2005; PB 15.3.3006:2; PBKK 22.3.2006:5*; BBO M.12.3.2007; BTO Su.18.5.2008).


Sub-ceteria awards as at 1975: DK DSNB MVO PHBS POAS PJK (BAR 1975:448).


Alternative usage: “Momin” (instead of “Abdul Momin”).


Tokoh agama (Anugerah Bakti Hijrah 1421/2000); aged eighty-seven at the time. The prize comprised B$10,000 in cash, plus a certificate, a souvenir (cenderamata), and lifetime free medical treatment in a first-class ward at any government hospital in the sultanate (PBA 19.4.2001:1*). Hari Guru Special Award, 2002 (BBO Tu.24.9.2002; h14.htm).


Born at Kampong Panchor Papan; educated at Tutong Malay School (from 1924). Teacher, 1930-68, serving at his alma mater in the ulu Belait; and in Brunei-Muara District. Retired in January 1968 as a headmaster. Also held adult Islamic religious education classes at his own home, 1958-68; and, at his own expense, erected a balai ibadat in 1970 for the teaching of the Quran and dikir.
ADAMS, Rear-Admiral John Harold (1918-2008). Rear-Admiral Adams was a British officer who served in the Royal Navy from 1936 until 1968 (MVO nd, CB 1968). For our present purposes he is most notable as the Commander of HMS *Albion* between May 1964 and January 1966, i.e. the core of the Confrontation Era.1

Born on 19 December 1918; died on 3 November 2008; “a highly successful captain of a commando carrier during the Indonesian confrontation in the 1960s, which confirmed him to be on course for the highest rank; but he was then sacked for maintaining that the Navy should not scrap aircraft carriers; his conviction, based on his own experience, was later proved correct” (*DT* M.10.11.2008:28).

“*Albion* arrived in the Far East Fleet during the throes of *konfrontasi*. He sent two flights of Wessexes [helicopters] to bases in Sarawak and Borneo [sic] to support marine and army patrols on the Indonesian borders. Adams’s *Albion* had the knack of being wherever there was a crisis. The demand for her services and the wide range of her operations over thousands of miles of ocean had convinced him of the versatility of such ships by the time he was relieved of his command by Captain Godfrey Place VC. Adams was appointed the service’s youngest rear-admiral” (*DT* M.10.11.2008:28, telescoped).

Educated at Glenalmond College, Perthshire. Ended his career as Assistant Chief of Naval Staff (Policy), Ministry of Defence, UK; dismissed by Admiral of the Fleet Sir Varyl Begg, 1968. Twice married; 1s (deceased) + 2s 2d (*DT* M.10.11.2008:28).

ALI ALATAS, Bapak (1932-2008). Bapak Ali Alatas, who died in Singapore on 11 December 2008, served as Indonesia’s foreign minister from 1988 until 1999; survived the fall of President Suharto in May 1998, but not that of President Habibie in October 1999. He was also a UN envoy and had worked as an advisor to the Indonesian President since 2003 (*BBSO* 14.12.2008).

Visitor to NBD, April 1988 (Abu Bakar Hamzah 1989:103); granted an Audience of HM Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah, INI, 7 April 1988 (*BDS* 1988:144); re-visited BSB, July 1989, for the twenty-second meeting of ASEAN foreign ministers; chaired the Non-Aligned Meeting, Bandung, April 1995 (marking the fortieth anniversary of the original conference there); signed an MOU re the establishment of a Joint Commission for Bilateral Cooperation with NBD, 27 September 1999, in New York (*PB* 28.7.1999:3).


Member of the Eminent Persons Group that framed the ASEAN Charter; a minute of silence in his memory was held at the signing ceremony, Jakarta, 15 December 2008 (*BBO* Tu.16.12.2008).

On 13 December Pehin Lim Jock Seng, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade II, NBD, signed a condolence book on behalf of the NBD Government at the Indonesian

---

1 *HMS Albion* (1947-73), aircraft carrier, 22,000 tons, 650 x 90 ft., thirty guns, fifty aircraft; launched by Swan Hunter, 6 May 1947; converted into a commando carrier, August 1962.
ALWIS, Lakshman de (d 2008). Sri Lankan coach of the NBD athletics squad, 1995-2001; killed in a bomb blast at Wellweriya in his homeland, Sunday 6 April 2008. Under his guidance, NBD national records were broken in the 100m, 200m, 400m, and 4 x 100m. The sultanate’s athletes also achieved notable feats in the South-East Asian Games, particularly a silver medal in the 4x400m in 1995 and a bronze in the high jump in 1999. Sri Lanka’s own national coach when he died, Mr. Alwis seems to have been genuinely popular in NBD. Some of the tributes to him: a “good mentor”; a “very kind and helpful person”; “a man of great passion in athletics and with a big heart”; “motivated many athletes to further their studies”; “many local coaches were the product of his regime” (BBO W.9.4.2008).

BEGBIE, Colonel Robert Martin (1920-2008). “AC Far East Land Forces and CO of 656 Squadron, with the task of introducing Scout and Sioux helicopters to the theatre. The Azahari-led rebellion in Brunei and the Confrontation with Indonesia found the squadron deployed across Borneo [sic; Sabah presumably], Sarawak, and Malaya. In 1965 Begbie returned to England on his appointment as GSO1 (Army Aviation)” (DT W.20.8.2008:23*).

BROTHERS, Air Commodore Peter Malam (1917-2008). Brothers was Director of Operations Overseas, Royal Air Force, 1962-5 (CBE 1964); also DSO 1944, DFC 1940 (*1943). Born on 30 September 1917 (WW 1994:243); died on 18 December 2008. He was a “wartime fighter pilot who destroyed at least sixteen enemy aircraft” (obituary, DT M.22.12.2008:27*).


BUDRIAH binti Al-Marhum Tengku Ismail, Duli Yang Maha Mulia Tengku (d 2008) DK DMN SMN SPMK. Her Majesty was the Consort (Raja Perempuan) to the Raja of Perlis Indera Kayangan (DYMM Tuanku Syed Putra, r 1945-2000); m (1941), 5s 5d; Raja Permaisuri Agong of Malaya, 1960-3; of Malaysia, 1963-5; visitor to BSB, October 1992, for the Silver Jubilee celebrations of HM Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah’s accession to the throne (PB 7.10.1992:15). Died, aged eighty-four, at the Kuala Lumpur Hospital, Friday 28 November 2008; funeral same day; buried at the Royal Mausoleum, Arau (BBO Sa.29.11.2008).

BUTCHER, Thomas Richard (d 2008). Mr Butcher, who died an octogenarian on Tuesday 6 May 2008, was the Father of Modern Tennis in Brunei/NBD, a title bestowed upon him in 2006.

405). Also received (no date) a “service award” from the International Tennis Federation for his contribution to the sport in the sultanate.

Manager, National Tennis Centre (under the aegis of the NBD Department of Youth and Sports), 1991-9; remained as an advisor to the NBD Tennis Association after September 1999. On Monday 8 November 2004 the Association donated a new wheelchair to him at his home in Kota Batu (BBO Tu.9.11.2004:s1.htm).

A long-serving Secretary-General of the NBD Tennis Association, he resigned some time after the twentieth South-East Asian Games were held in NBD in 1999 (BB F.24.12.1999:47), when the sultanate achieved its first medal (a bronze) for tennis (BBO Tu.13.5.2008).

Arrived in Brunei, March 1957; Secretary, Brunei Tennis Club, 1959; President, Brunei Lawn Tennis Association, 1968-79 (the first holder of the post) [from 1965, according to BBO Tu.13.5.2008]. Helped Brunei Juniors become members of the club by paying their subscription fees; responsible for staging the first NBD Junior International Tennis Tournament, 1985; member (representing NBD) of the Asian Tennis Federation, no date. The NBD Tennis Association also became involved with the ITF through his efforts (BBO Tu.9.11.2004:s1.htm).

Butcher “would always take a personal approach to tennis,” Chua Peng-Wuie, the current Vice-President of the Association, remembers. “I always got a stack of Wimbledon tickets for centre court for two weeks for local players who were staying in London which was all paid for. He said ‘that is on the association’. However, this year I found out that the tickets were not free. It was paid for by Mr. Butcher himself” (BBO Tu.13.5.2008).

One “Tom Butcher” was author of “Architecture in Brunei Darussalam,” in Muhibah (Royal Brunei Airlines, Volume 3, Number 6, 1984); cited in Francis 1993:34, No 226.

BUTIR bin Serudin, Haji (1941-2007). Haji Butir, an actor resident at Kampong Masin, died of cancer on Saturday 5 May 2007 at RIPAS Hospital; aged sixty-six; buried at the cemetery in Jalan Tutong, Damuan; survived by widow and five children.

Born on 14 March 1941; began his career in the theatre, 1956; acted in more than twenty-two “drama titles,” including several serials produced by RTB and private production houses.

His eldest son, Zulkifli[e], is a singer (BBO M.7.5.2007).


FRASER, Lieutenant-Commander Ian Edward, VC 1945 (1920-2008). Fraser was awarded the Victoria Cross in 1945 as captain of the midget submarine XE3 in Operation “Struggle,” an attack on the Japanese cruiser Takao in the Johore Straits, off Singapore Dockyard. Labuan was the base for the mission, which took place between 26 July and 4 August 1945. Born on 18 December 1920, he was taken as an infant to Kuala Lumpur, where his father was working as a marine engineer. He joined the Blue Funnel Line in 1938. Died on Monday 1 September 2008 (DT W.2.9.2008: 27*).

GLASS, William Ian (d 2007). On 15 May 2008 the Daily Telegraph (London) reported that one William Ian Glass, of Lymington, Hampshire, who died in December 2007, left estate valued at £2,117,330 net. Bequests were made to the Royal United Kingdom Beneficent Association, National Benevolent Institution, Elizabeth Finn Trust, and the Society for the Assistance of Ladies in Reduced Circumstances (DT Th.15.5.2008:24d #8).

HEELIS, Brigadier John Eric (d 2008). Commander, 99th Gurkha Brigade; satisfied with the performance of the Royal Brunei Malay Regiment [1965-83] in training, September 1969 (Harfield 1977:86); died on 1 September 2008, aged eighty-seven. OBE nd. Late of 1st and 7th Gurkha Rifles; widower of Joy; father, grandfather; donations for St Cuthbert’s Church (Milburn) and Gurkha Welfare Trust, c/o Glyn Jones, 12 Battlebarrow, Appelby, CA16 6XS (DT M.8.9.2008:28f #5).

JAFAFAR ibni Al-Marhum Tuanku Abdul Rahman, DYMM Tuanku (1922-2008). On 29 December 2008 HM Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah and HRH the Perdana Wazir attended the funeral of Tuanku Jaafar Tuanku Abdul Rahman, who had died at the age of eighty-six.

Eighth (not tenth) Yang Di-Pertuan Agung of Malaysia, 1994-9; State Visit to NBD, 10-12 September 1996 (PB 11.9.1996:1); hosted a return State Visit to Malaysia by members of the NBD royal family, August 1997 (PB 27.8.1997:1; PB 3.9.1997:1); hosted a goodwill visit to the Istana Negara by HM the Sultan and other leading members of the NBD royal family, 8 May 1998 (PB 13.5.1998:1).


Yang Di-Pertuan Besar (Head of State) of Negeri Sembilan Darul Khusus, for more than forty years from 8 April 1968 until his death in December 1998 (SYB 1981-82: 821); visitor to BSB for the Silver Jubilee celebrations, 5 October 1992 (PB 7.10.1992: 15).


A “keen follower” of cricket (Wisden 1971:978).

Alternative usage: “Ja’afar.”

KAMALIAH SUHAIMI binti Haji Mohammad Fadzullah Suaimi, Ustazah Datin Hajjah (d 2008). Datin Kamaliah Suaimi was a teacher; widow of Pehin Ismail Umar Abdul Aziz (State Mufti, Brunei/NBD, 1962-93) (PB 10.2.1993:14); died at her home aged eighty-one at 0800h local time on Friday 12 September 2008 or 11 Ramadan 1429 (GBOW ON Sa.13.9.2008). HM Sultan offered condolences and attended prayers at her residence in Jalan Tutong (BBO Sa.13.9.2008).


Alternative usage: “Fadhullullah.”


LANGLEY, Major-General Sir Henry Desmond Allen (1930-2008). “After Army Staff College and a spell in BAOR, he was posted to HQ Far East Land Forces,
Singapore, as GSO2 (Operations) during the Confrontation with Indonesia. In 1965 he became Brigade Major Household Brigade, the first Household cavalry officer to fill this appointment. Two years in Malaya in command of a squadron was followed by command of the Life Guards at Windsor” (*DT* Tu.1.4.2008:23*).


SNB (*BGG* 21.12.1963:292, here ranking as “Lieutenant-Colonel”). “He commanded a company of 1SH [SH = “Seaforth Highlanders”] in Malaya in 1950 and 1951 before commanding the Guard at Balmoral and then the regimental depot at Fort George. The Seaforth Highlanders were amalgamated with the Queen’s Own Cameron Highlanders in 1961 to form the Queen’s Own Highlanders and, the following, year, he took command of the regular battalion of his regiment. The battalion played a notable part in operations in Brunei, North Borneo, and Sarawak in 1962-3; McHardy was mentioned in dispatches. After a further appointment at Staff College, in 1965 he resigned his commission” (*DT* Tu.9.9.2008:31**).

Resident Factor, Balmoral, 1965-79.

Born on 20 July 1920; died on the eighty-eighth anniversary of his birth; m, 1s 2d; educated at Dulwich; Sword of Honour, Sandhurst, no date; commissioned into SH, October 1939; served in Tunisia (MC), Sicily, Normandy (severely wounded); his service for the next twenty-one years alternated between staff and regimental appointments (*DT* Tu.9.9.2008:31**). At his request, private cremation and no memorial service (*DT* Th.24.7.2008: 24g #3).

See further: Harun Abdul Majid 2007:115, which uses “Machardy” (*sic*).


**MOFFITT, Athol (b 1914).** Australian lawyer (CMG QC BA LLB). Chief prosecutor at the Brunei and Labuan war crimes trials, 1945-6. Author of *Project Kingfisher* (1989) about the Sandakan-Ranau death marches and an abortive rescue plan.


[ Died in Australia in 2007, *according to Wikipedia*, accessed on Sa.17.1.2009: 1117h GMT; based, it says, on an obituary in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 May 2007].
MOHD YASSIN bin Haji Metassim, Dato Paduka Awang Haji. On 29 October 2008 Pelita Brunei (page 21) carried an application for probate (ref. LA/152/2008) by Hajjah Salamah binti DP Haji Md Yassin in respect of her father, DP Haji Mohd Yassin bin Haji Metassim, who had died in NBD, no date.3

MD ZUHAIMI bin Abu Bakar, 17651 Sld (d 2007). Soldier, Royal Brunei Land Forces; died in November 2007 aged twenty-three following an accident near Kampong Sungai involving a military vehicle; six others were injured in the tragedy (BBO M.26.11.2007).

MOMIN bin Pengiran Tajuddin, Mejar (Bersara) Pengiran (1942-2008). In 1961 Pengiran Momin became one of the first intake of the Brunei Malay Regiment (which has subsequently expanded into the Royal Brunei Armed Forces). He took the oath of loyalty at the Lapau on 27 May 1961 and was one of the original sixty recruits to set off for Malaya on 31 May for training at Port Dickson. Born in 1942 at Kampong Kianggeh, he rose to the rank of Major before retiring. He died at RIPAS Hospital at 0100h local time on 22 December 2008 to be survived by two widows and fourteen children. He was buried the same morning at Kampong Tanjong Nangka (BBO Sa.27.12.2008).

NG TECK HOCK, YD Pehin Bendahari Cina Kornia Diraja [cr 1996] Awang (1928-2008). One of several “well respected” leaders of the Chinese community in NBD; died “recently” at the SSB Hospital at the age of eighty; funeral due to be held on 26 November 2008 at the family residence, No 17 Jalan Pretty, Kuala Belait (BBO M.24.11.2008).

Born in the Sultanate of Brunei on 11 October 1928; lived all his life in Belait

3 One DP AH Mohd Yassin bin Haji Metassim was declared a Tokoh Guru Tua on Teachers’ Day in 1994; aged around seventy years old at the time (PB 28.9.1994:3). As a teacher he stressed the importance of the 3Ms (membaca, menulis, dan mengira or reading, writing, and arithmetic). He also saw the necessity for his pupils to be trained as fully-rounded human beings, equally adept in intellect, spirituality, physical fitness, and aesthetics. His involvement in the PGGMB was highly valued. During the masa Jepun he was appointed Japanese Language Visiting Teacher, not only in Brunei, but also in Labuan and neighboring areas of Sarawak (Lawas, Limbang, Miri). Guru Besar II (Headmaster, Grade II) at Ahmad Tajuddin Primary School, Kuala Belait, 1963; also active in seni tenunan kain (weaving). Writes: right-handed (PB 25.10.2000:11*). Named after him (wef 14 October 2000): Dato Mohd Yassin Primary School, Pengkalan Sibabau, Mentiri; situated fifteen miles from the capital; built under the fifth National Development Plan on a seventeen-acre site at a cost of B$4 million; construction completed on 24 October 1998; more than six hundred pupils, ranging in age from kindergarten to Year VI, taught by a staff of thirty-eight assisted by eleven other employees; with PH Iskandar as Head Teacher (PB 25.10.2000:11). ‘DP AH Md Yassin bin Haji Metassim’ is mentioned as Supervisor/Instructor, Training Section, Department of Museums, NBD (TD 97:192b; BBO Th.5.4.2001:h2.htm). Likewise “DP AH Md Yassin bin Haji Metassim” was Inspector of Malay Schools, Brunei I (PB 14.2.2001:10, referring to 1967, and possibly giving his 2001 style rather than that of 1967); trained as a teacher, 1939; connection with the Sultan Muhammad Jamalul Alam Malay School, Pusar Ulak, established in 1967; mentions that he also taught at the Sultan Ahmad Tajuddin School in Kuala Belait (PB 14.2.2001:10).
District, where he was a member of various schools, associations, and organisations; created YD Pehin Bendahari Cina Kornia Diraja, 11 May 1996; previously styled ‘Awang’ (PB 15.5.1996:16; BBO M.29.7.2002:s3.htm).


Applicant for probate in respect of his wife, Lai Fung Yin, who had died in NBD, no date (ref. T/LA/No 15/2008 in PB 20.9.2008:21a).

PEEL, Lady (d 2008). Rosemary Mia Minka, Lady Peel; widow (née Redhead) of Sir John Peel (British Resident in Brunei, 1946-8, then plain “Mr W.J. Peel”), whom she married in 1936; “much-loved mother of Joanna, Alethea, Lynda, and Quentin”; died on 10 July 2008, aged ninety-eight; private funeral; thanksgiving service at Hambledon Church (DT F.18.7.2008:25a #5).

POCOCK, Air Vice-Marshal Donald (1920-2008). Obituary, “Commandant-General of the RAF Regiment who cut his teeth in action in the Western Desert, Italy, and Aden” (DT M.11.8.2008:23*). Extract: “On his return from overseas Pocock served at HQ Transport Command identifying methods to make RAF Regiment units ‘air portable.’ He attended RAF Staff College before a succession of staff and command appointments in British and NATO HQs at home and overseas, including Cyprus, and, during the Confrontation in Indonesia, in HQ Far East Air Force, Singapore.”

RUEGG, Robert Arthur, “Bob” (d 2008). Died on 21 April 2008 at St Anselm’s Care Home, Walmer; served with the Royal Navy during World War II and subsequently in Malaya, Borneo, and Australia. Published writings about warships and naval matters. Funeral took place at Barham Crematorium, Thursday 8 May 2008 (DT Sa.3.5.2008:30e #penult.).


NBD writer; winner, “South-East Asia Write [sic] Award,” 2006; living at Kampong Jangkasak (as of 2007); died on Thursday 29 March 2007 at the RIPAS Hospital; survived by widow and three children (BBO Sa.31.3.2007).

Born on 1 May 1950; educated at OKSB Malay School, Kilanas, 1958-63; at Bendahara Sakam Malay School, Bunut, 1964-5; at SMJA Malay School, Brunei Town, 1965-6; at Malay Middle School I (Sekolah Menengah Melayu Pertama [thus]), 1966-9; and at Paduka Seri Begawan Malay College, Jalan Muara, 1970, which became a Sixth Form Centre at that time. Subsequently went to Kuala Lumpur for a course at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Malaya, 1982-3 (Mas Osman 1987:111).

Began his career with the Police Force in 1970, transferring in the same year to the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (Language and Literary Bureau). Served in the Library Division (undertook a course at the National Library of Singapore for six months in 1972). Assistant Editor, 1974; Editor, 1979; Senior Editor, 1 November 1984. Served on the editorial board of Dupa, Karya, Mekar, and Bahana (Mas Osman 1987:110).

Currently (1986) holds office as a Senior Editor at the DBP, NBD. A writer

Head of the “Literature Book Section,” DBP (TD 97:105b).

Retired Senior Language Officer at the DBP” (BBO W.4.10.2006:h7.htm).

Used various pen-names, notably Nurulqamar, but also Arwal Bajsha, AS Rahayu, Shaw Rajah, and Mas SR Bidang; produced no fewer that 380 sajak, 116 cerpen, and forty-five reviews by the mid-1980s (Mas Osman 1987:112).

Member of ASTERAWANI (1967-), Brunei Nature Society (1978-), the Royal Asiatic Society (1982-), and of several other professional bodies; attended various courses in journalism, creative writing, management, and administration.

Spouse: Dayang Hajjah Aisah binti OKML Haji Md Yusof; two children (Mas Osman 1987:112).

Alternative usage: “Shawal.”

Footnote: A gathering was held at the DBP in Berakas on Saturday 26 January 2008 at which writers discussed his contribution to Malay Literature. Speakers included Dr Haji Morsidi bin Haji Muhamad, a senior lecturer at UBD (BBO M.28.1.2008).

SLATER, Lieutenant-Colonel Geoffrey J (d 2008). British soldier. “RE” [would usually refer to the “Royal Engineers,” UK]; MBE; RBMR (awarded “Star of Brunei,” no date); died on 24 April 2008 aged eighty; father, grandfather, family stalwart, and friend of many; funeral at Margate Crematorium, 16.5.2008:1520h BST; donations to RNLI (DT Tu.13.5.2008:15a #8).

SUHAIMI bin Haji Amin, Datuk Inche (d 2006). State Information Officer, Brunei, 18 September 1954 until the end of 1956 (BGG 30.10.1954; CO 985/2, BGG 28.2.1957, then still styled “Inche”); on secondment from Malaya.

Malaysian. Director, Broadcasting Department, Sabah, October 1964 to July 1977. Previously served in Singapore and Brunei (BBO W.27.9.2006:b2.htm).

Died aged eighty-four on Monday 25 September 2006 at his residence in Luyang; buried at Kampung Likas Lama on the next day (BBO W.27.9.2006:b2.htm).

Son-in-law: Hashim Mohd Kassim.

SUHARTO, General Haji Mohamed (1921-2008). On 27 January 2008 HM Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah sent a message to President Yudhoyono expressing “great sadness” upon learning of the death earlier that day of the former Indonesian leader and praying to Allah “that the soul of Bapak Suharto be received amongst the blessed ones” (BBO M.28.1.2008).

Suharto’s remains were to be flown to Solo for burial at the Astana Giribangun, the family mausoleum (BBO M.28.1.2008). HRH Prince Mohamed Bolkiah, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, NBD, and HRH PAI PAH Zariah represented His Majesty at the funeral in Solo, 28 January 2008 (BBO Tu.29.1,2008).
President of Indonesia, March 1968 to May 1998 (acting President, 1967-8; Prime Minister, 1967); Hon GCB 1974 (WW 1995). A founding father of ASEAN. Attended NBD’s independence celebrations, 23 February 1984 (BB 3.3.1984; Siddique 1985:100); further visit to the sultanate, August 1989, in order to attend the berkhatan of HRH Prince Al-Muhtadee Billah; back in BSB on 5 October 1992 for the Silver Jubilee celebrations (see also DYMM Tengku Budriah). Hosted a State Visit to Indonesia by HM Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah, October 1984 (Chalfont 1989:[165]). Hosted a visit to Indonesia by His Majesty, late February 1998 (PB 4.3.1998:1).

Following his resignation, received a message of goodwill from HM Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah (21 May 1998) expressing highest appreciation for the former Indonesian President’s contribution towards strengthening bilateral Indonesian-NBD relations (PB 27.5.1998:1).

Born on 20 February 1921 (Kemusu, Yogyakarta); son of Kertosudiro and Sukirah (WW 1995). Devout Muslim family; impoverished childhood; educated at a local high school; worked as a bank clerk; joined the Dutch colonial army and entered the military academy at Gombong. Member of the Japanese-sponsored home defense army; qualified for an officer-training course; duly commissioned; served at Sireibu and Yogyakarta. An anti-Dutch officer during the war of independence; progressed rapidly in Sukarno’s post-independence army; commanded both land and air forces; created a mobile commando team, 1963; marked for death when the Communists attempted a coup in 1965; “presided over purges that eliminated hundreds of thousands of communists” (“absolute nonsense,” Tun Dr Mahathir, BBO M.28.1.2008); hundreds of thousands murdered in East Timor following the Indonesian invasion of 7 December 1975 (DT M.28.1.2008:23).


Suffered stroke, 1999 (DTM.28.1.2008:23); placed under house arrest (BBC R4 News, M.29.5.2000:1300h BST); “now seriously ill” (DT M.17.12.2001:11); reported to have been suffering from brain damage (DT M.28.1.2008:23).

Photographed: Chalfont 1989:[164].


‘Suharto’: su = more, harto = wealth (according to Keay 1995:141)

TAN CHI CHUNG, Elvin (d 2007). A sub-editor at the Borneo Bulletin; died aged thirty-four in a car accident on Saturday 11 August 2007. Previously worked as a Commercial Sales Executive with Brunei Press (publisher of the newspaper) before leaving to pursue a degree in Business Administration at UBD, including a period of study in Australia. A “warm, friendly, and affable person, well-liked and loved by those around him”; survived by parents, an older sister, and a younger brother (BBSO 12.8.2007).

Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs, UK, 1967-8; visitor to Brunei, April 1968 (Eusoff Agaki 1991:140, then merely “Mr. George Thomson”). “Gaitskellite”; a “diplomat rather than an ideologue”; “showed particular skill explaining defence cuts east of Suez after devaluation of the pound to hostile governments in Malaysia, Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand, and trying to avert anarchy in Aden, where Britain [sic] intended to withdraw without guaranteeing the defence of the former protectorate” (DT M.6.10.2008:31).

Born on 16 January 1921; died on 3 October 2008; survived by widow and 2d. Educated at Grove Academy, Dundee; reporter (also editor of the Dandy and the Rover); served with RAF, 1940-6; MP (Labour), Dundee East, 1952-73; appointed colonial affairs spokesman by Gaitskell. Minister of State, FO, 1964; “Minister for Europe” and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, 1966.

Minister Without Portfolio, October 1968 (following the incorporation of the Commonwealth Office within the new FCO); Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (second term) and Minister for Europe, October 1969 to June 1970.


A memorial service was held at St Martin-in-the-Fields (London) on 13 January 2009 (DT W.14.1.2009:28).


Honorary Research Fellow, Centre for Asian Studies, University of Hong Kong (*FEA* 2002:xiii; *FEA* 2007:xi). The *History of Singapore* has been reprinted several times. Professor Turnbull has also published *The Straits Settlements, 1826-1867* (1972) and *Dateline Singapore: 150 Years’ of the Straits Times* (1995).


During the Brunei Revolt of 1962 Willoughby, with a small party of Gurkhas, “rescued the sultan [Haji Sir Omar Ali Saifuddin III] from his beleaguered palace and brought him to the sanctuary of battalion headquarters within the one remaining police station in the state still in government hands, thus earning the sultan’s long-lasting gratitude. Willoughby was mentioned in dispatches” (DT W.7.3.2007:25).

Death notice (DT W.7.3.2007:25c #penult) and obituary, “Soldier who became gallant guardian of the Cresta Run” (DT W.7.3.2007:25*); “the epitome of an almost Wodehousian English gentleman.”

Born in India on 4 May 1934, son of an officer of the Bombay Grenadiers and Indian Political Service; died suddenly in San Moritz on 27 February 2007, aged seventy-two; twice married, twice divorced; survived by second wife, and their son and two daughters.

In Sabah and Sarawak “the level of incursions by Indonesian forces was increasing as President Sukarno attempted to confront and break up the newly-created Malaysia. General Walter Walker, the director of Borneo operations, received political approval to carry the campaign to the enemy by secretly crossing areas of the thousand-mile border to launch offensives against the Indonesian bases. In 1964 Willoughby, by then a major in command of ‘A’ company, was instructed to mount one such operation. On 4 September he and his company were lifted by helicopter to the Sabah-Kalimantan border and, the next day, guided by a village headman, they set off. Reconnaissance had shown that there was a strong garrison of regular Indonesian soldiers with machine-gun posts on the high ground and mined approaches to the village. On 6 September the company set off at 3:15 pm and, after a hazardous five-hour march, was in place above and behind the enemy. Surprise was lost when the Indonesians spotted some movement and opened up with machine-gun and small arms fire. The Gurkhas, retaliating with rocket launchers, carried the four enemy positions one after the other with minimal casualties and then beat off a counter-attack. Outflanked, after fighting tenaciously the Indonesians withdrew with considerable losses in men and equipment. Willoughby called in a helicopter and his wounded were airlifted to safety. He was awarded an immediate MC” (DT W.7.3.2007:25, abbreviated).

Educated at Blundells and RMA Sandhurst; commissioned into the 2nd KEO Goorkha Rifles and joined the first battalion in Malaya, 1955. Member of a two-man bobsleigh team that broke the world record in 1961; secretary and chief executive of the
St Moritz Tobogganing Club for twenty-four years from 1978.
Named after him: Willoughby Cup (at St Moritz).

**Abbreviations**

* article with a monochrome illustration (but see also DFC*).
** article with polychrome photography.
28g #5 page 28, column 7, paragraph 5
AAC Army Air Corps (UK).
ABDB Angkatan Bersenjata Diraja Brunei / Royal Brunei Armed Forces (1984-).
AH Awang Haji
ASEANAPOL ASEAN Nations’ Police Federation.
ASTERAWANI Angkatan Sasterawan dan Sasterawani / Brunei Writers’ Association (f. 1982)
BAOR British Army of the Rhine.
BAR Brunei Annual Report.
BBO Borneo Bulletin, online.
BBSO Borneo Bulletin, Sunday edition, online.
BDS Brunei Darussalam (yearbook).
BGG Brunei Government Gazette.
BRB Borneo Research Bulletin.
BSB Bandar Seri Begawan.
BST British Summer Time.
BTO Brunei Times, online.
CB Commander of the Order of the Bath.
CBE Commander of the Order of the British Empire.
cerpen cerita pendek / short story.
CVO Commander of the Royal Victorian Order.
DBP Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka / Language and Literature Bureau.
DFC Distinguished Flying Cross (* and bar).
DK Darjah Yang Utama Kerabat Diraja / Royal Family Order.
DMN Darjah Utama Seri Mahkota Negara (Malaysian award).
DO District Officer.
DP Dato Paduka.
DPMB Darjah Seri Paduka Mahkota Brunei Yang Amat Mulia, Darjah Kedua / Crown of Brunei Order, second class (carrying the style Dato Paduka).
DSLJ Dato Seri Laila Jasa / Dato (second class) of the Seri Laila Jasa Order (instituted 1965).
DSO Companion of the Distinguished Service Order (UK).
DT Daily Telegraph (London).
DYMM Duli Yang Maha Mulia / His/Her Majesty.
EUROSEAS European Association for South-East Asian Studies.
FCO Foreign and Commonwealth Office.
FEA The Far East and Australasia (annual).
FO  Foreign Office.
GCB  Knight Grand Cross, Order of the Bath.
GBE  Knight Grand Cross, Order of the British Empire.
GBOW ON Government of Brunei Darussalam Official Website: Online News.
GSO  General Staff Officer.
HMS  Her Majesty’s Ship.
INI  (at the) Istana Nurul Iman.
ISEAS Institute of South-East Asian Studies (Singapore).
ITF  International Tennis Federation.
IWW  International Who’s Who (annual).
JMBRAS Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
KBE  Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire.
KCVO  Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order.
KEO GR King Edward’s Own Goorkha Rifles.
KT  Knight of the Thistle (Scotland).
m  married.
MAS Malayan Administrative Service.
MBE  Member of the Order of the British Empire.
MC  Military Cross.
MOU Memorandum of Understanding.
MVO  Member of the Royal Victorian Order.
NBD Negara Brunei Darussalam (1984-).
OBE  Officer of the Order of the British Empire.
PA  Pengiran Anak.
PAH Pengiran Anak Hajjah.
PAI  Pengiran Anak Isteri.
PANB  The Most Faithful Order of Perwira Brunei, first class.
PB  Pelita Brunei (Bandar Seri Begawan).
PBA Pelita Brunei, Aneka section.
PBI  Pelita Brunei, Iklan section.
PBKK Pelita Brunei, Keluaran Khas (special supplement).
PGAT Panglima Gagah Angkatan Tentera (Malaysia).
PGGMB Persekutuan Guru-Guru Melayu Brunei / Brunei Malay Teachers’ Association.
PH Pengiran Haji.
PHBS Pingat Hassanal Bolkiah Sultan / Coronation Medal (1968).
PIKB Pingat Indah Kerja Baik / Meritorious Service Medal.
PJK Pingat Jasa Kebaktian / Loyal Service Medal.
RBMR Royal Brunei Malay Regiment.
RIPAD (HH) Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Damit (second wife, d 1979, of SOAS III).
RIPAS (HM) Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Saleha (wife of HM Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah).
Sdn Bhd Sendirian Berhad (limited liability company).
RMA Royal Military Academy.
RNLI Royal National Lifeboat Institution.
RTB  Radio-Televisyen Brunei.
SEAA Southeast Asian Affairs (ISEAS, Singapore, annually).
Sld  Soldadu / Private (soldier).
SLJ  Order of Seri Laila Jasa (Brunei/NBD), third class.
SMB Darjah Seri Paduka Mahkota Brunei Yang Amat Mulia, darjah ketiga / Crown of Brunei Order, third class.
SMJA Sultan Muhammad Jamalul Alam (r 1906-24).
SMN Seri Maharaja Mangku Negara (Malaysian Order, first class).
SNB Darjah Setia Negara Brunei Yang Amat Bahagia, darjah ketiga / Setia Negara Brunei Order, third class.
SPMB Darjah Seri Paduka Mahkota Brunei Yang Amat Mulia, darjah pertama / Crown of Brunei Order, first class.
SPMK Seri Paduka Mahkota Kedah.
SRU Scottish Rugby Union.
SSB Seri Suri Begawan.
SYB Statesman’s Year-Book.
TD Panduan Telefon NBD / The Telephone Directory of Brunei Darussalam (Jabatan Telekom Brunei, 1997).
TYT Tuan Yang Terutama / His Excellency.
UBD Universiti Brunei Darussalam.
UKM Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia / National University of Malaysia.
wef with effect from.
WKNB Warta Kerajaan Negeri Brunei / State of Brunei Government Gazette.
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In 1910, the Dusun of Papar engaged the services of an English lawyer to summon the North Borneo (Chartered) Company administration to answer to charges that the Company had erred in selling land owned by members of the community to the railway and to plantation estates, thus violating the rights of the people. The community also alleged that the estates which had sprung up in the area had violated the customs and traditions of the people by destroying the graveyards of the community and scattering the remains of the dead. The action to sue the Company Government was the culmination of almost three years of unceasing and untiring efforts by Dusun leaders to champion the community’s rights. The outcome of the lawsuit, however, was rather mixed. The Judicial Commissioner ruled that the government and the estates had erred in encroaching into some of the Dusun-owned lands, and they were asked to compensate those who had suffered losses. However, in its entirety, the ruling did not favor the community, as the Government and the estates were asked to compensate the Dusun according to the price that a Dusun would sell to another Dusun; they were not asked to return the land they had taken. Not happy with the ruling, the Dusun and their English lawyer intended to appeal, but were prevented from doing so by a series of measures introduced by the government aimed at discouraging the appeal. The matter dragged on for another ten years before a Parliamentary Paper in 1920 more or less absolved the Government from responsibility except for several matters deemed to be related to the case. However, by 1920, interests in the case had waned and many of the Dusuns who had fought for their rights were

1 This paper is a revised version of a paper presented at the Borneo Research Council 9th Biennial International Conference, Kota Kinabalu, 29-31 July 2008.
2 The term “Dusun” is used in this text to reflect the usage of the term in Colonial Office official documents. However, the Dusun people of Papar, particularly those from around the Limbahau-Kopimpinan-Kinuta area, referred to themselves as “Kadazan” even as early as the late 19th century.
already of advanced age and the matter was allowed to slowly fade away, so much so that little could be recalled by the community with regard to the case. In a sense, the case was totally forgotten by the community.

Throughout the entire episode of championing the rights of the Dusun in Papar, many were involved. Among the local Dusun, one leader’s name stood out – Simon, who was simply introduced in most documents as a headman of Kampung Kapinpinan4 in Papar. From the official documents it is apparent that this Simon was known to Company officials right from the beginning. It was Simon who was deputized by his community to go to Labuan to present the petition to the High Commissioner seeking a redress of the land problem. It was also Simon’s name which appeared in the final document concerning the case in the Parliamentary Paper of 1920. Who was Simon? How much is known of him locally? Obviously this name is now long forgotten. A more prominent name from Papar would be the Dahm family of Limbahau, particularly Bernard Dahm, who was awarded a Papal Medal. Bernard Dahm was a younger contemporary of Simon, yet the name of Simon just simply faded away.5

This paper is not an attempt to rescue someone from obscurity, as much has been mentioned of the man in official documents, yet so little is known of him. This paper will look at the character of Simon through three perspectives, each based on a particular genre of historical sources. Thus far, the portrayal of Simon and his colleagues who fought for their rights has been based solely on perspectives provided through official documents. Given the nature of his anti-government activities, these views on Simon were entirely negative. This paper takes a slightly different approach by turning to non-official or alternative sources. What emerged from this exercise is the possibility of having two new perspectives of the man, namely, one which is quasi-official, but with some sympathetic feelings, and one that is rather personal. The emergence of these two new if not alternative perspectives suggests the possibility of reconstructing historical figures or personalities (in this case, Simon) which could be different from existing perspectives offered by official narratives. More importantly, this paper, though entailing nothing more than an exercise in interrogating historical documents, argues for the greater use of non-official documents in reconstructing the past.

This paper is divided into three parts. The first part will provide the setting of the land issue and how that led to Simon and his community organizing petitions against the government. The second part aims at providing glimpses into the life of Simon through the official perspective – Simon as a leader in fighting for the rights of his people, and someone who achieved some level of notoriety in the eyes of the government officials

---

4 Today, the village’s name is spelled as Kopimpinan (Kampung Kopimpinan).
5 A field trip taken in 2005 had initially drawn a blank. It was not until the church record was consulted that a great-granddaughter of Simon was located. Mrs. Helen Atang was the daughter of Michael Atang, who was married to Zita, a daughter of Joseph Raphael, who was the son of Simon. Mrs. Helen, who used to work for the church, knew of the existence of her great-grandfather, Simon, whose grave she was also able to point out to this writer. However, she knew nothing of Simon’s crusade to champion the rights of his people.
against whom his actions were aimed. The third part will give an alternative view of Simon from the perspective of non-official sources: diaries, church records and personal letters. It will investigate and interrogate non-conventional sources relating to Simon, and demonstrate the importance of non-conventional sources in reconstructing various aspects of local history.

It is hoped that this exercise will help to answer the main questions of: Who was Simon? What propelled him to be the leader of his community? What were the underlying reasons for his involvement? How did he fade away? More importantly, this paper will attempt to examine the role of individuals in defending community rights in early North Borneo.

**Papar in 1910**

The district of Papar is one of the oldest human settlements in Sabah. It was certainly one of the three earliest settlements where the Chartered Company first established its rule; the others were Sandakan and Tempassuk. The Company Residency was set up by the Papar River. The district was populated by two main ethnic groups, the Bajau and the Dusun. The former were distributed in villages along the coast, particularly on the western side of the Papar River. Two major Bajau villages were Pengalat Besar and Pengalat Kecil. Most of the Bajau, who were Muslims, were either fishermen or engaged in small-scale planting activities. Numerous Dusun villages were situated on the Papar plains on the southern side of the Papar River; others were on both sides of the Papar River in the interior section of the river. The Dusun were originally pagan or animistic. However, with the introduction of the Roman Catholic mission in that area in the last two decades of the 19th century, many of the Dusun converted to Christianity (Catholicism). The Dusun were basically farmers, and well-known padi planters. Their skills in rice cultivation had resulted in Papar being known as the “rice bowl” of the territory. It also reflected the close association of the Dusun with their lands. As the district stretches to the south, one would encounter some Kedayan and Bisayas or even Brunei Malay, but their numbers remained small within the Papar district. The Chinese made up the third major group of the local population. Arriving en masse in the last decade of the 19th century, the Chinese were divided into three main groups. First, shopkeepers who had followed the Company flag to establish themselves in Papar township. The second group were settlers, immigrants who were brought into the state and given land for planting purposes. The last group were those brought in to work on the railway and, later, the rubber estates that sprang up in the area.

The opening of the area for the planting of cash crops such as rubber was directly associated with the advent of the North Borneo Company (also known as the Chartered Company) administration. It was mainly the opening of the rubber estates and the construction of the railway that brought the Dusun face-to-face with the question of encroachment and violation of their rights, especially pertaining to land and customary culture. The rubber estates and the railways were two major developments that significantly altered the administrative and economic landscape of the state. It is difficult to say which came first, for they were intertwined. The idea of railway construction was championed by a number of the major shareholders of the Chartered Company in London. Led by
William Clarke Cowie, its Managing Director, the group believed that the introduction of the railway would help to open up the west coast to British plantations and, at the same time, serve as an economic impetus for that part of the state. The idea was to construct a railway to eventually link the west and east coasts. This however, failed to materialize. The railway started from Brunei Bay, at a small village later known as Weston, down to Beaufort, before linking up with Papar and, finally, Jesselton in the north as the terminus. The project began in 1896 and was not completed until 1906.

Rubber seeds were introduced into the state during the 1890s. Among those responsible for helping to ensure that the crop would flourish was Henry Ridley, the very botanist who was known for his passion for rubber planting, earning him the title of “Mad Ridley.” The crop was first introduced at the experimental agricultural station at Silam, and later at Tenom. It came at a very crucial time when tobacco, once the mainstay of North Borneo’s economy, was suffering from a massive drop in demand as a result of protective tariffs introduced by several countries, including the United States. By the time the trees were growing at the stations, it was apparent that this was the crop that could perhaps save the plantation economy of the state. As a result of its successful introduction, rubber became the main crop planted. The Government began by offering land at a generous premium and low quit-rent. As a result, many rubber companies began to take up land on the west coast, stretching from the Kudat Peninsula (Langkon Estate), to Bukit Padang Estate that eventually emerged after the establishment of Jesselton, to Putatan and Lok Kawi estates, Papar Estate, Membakut Estate, to Mawao Estate in the south. From there, the railway turned towards Tenom and Melalap where huge estates such as the Manchester Rubber Estates, Melalap Estate and Sapong Estate had been established.

Most of the estates south of Jesselton were established along the railway line. Hence, when the Dusun people of Papar began to feel that their land rights were being violated, they were, in many instances, facing the double menace of the rubber estates – whose owners constantly refused to listen to their appeals and reasoning – and the railway. They had no clue as to where to complain about the railway. But it was obvious that the Dusun of Papar felt that some of their lands had been forcefully taken away from them, either by the government or the estates. Those lands nearer the railway track were taken by the Government and given to the railway. The estates had been granted land concessions that, in many cases, also included lands previously owned or used by the community, particularly for communal purposes, such as graveyards, grazing lands and for gathering. Others had had their land, usually planted with fruit trees, taken for failing to register their land and have it surveyed as required by the 1903 Land Proclamation (Law), a law which many simply did not understand.

**The Land Laws and the Dusun**

Among the first things that the Chartered Company did during the initial stage of its administration was to introduce a series of laws and regulations relating to land issues. Until 1913, all the land laws were issued as Land Proclamations, each with the effect and ingredients of a proper land law. In promulgating these land laws and their subsequent amendments, the Company adhered as best it could to the various articles
of the Royal Charter granted to the Company by the British Government in November 1881, particularly on issues pertaining to the welfare and rights of the natives. In general, the statutory law introduced by the Company recognized the position of native customs and native rights to communal lands. Among the first laws introduced by the Chartered Company were the Land Proclamations of 1881 and 1889. These, especially the 1889 edition, emphasized the protection of native rights to lands; it stipulated that “before any title-deed to land could be issued to a European the chiefs had to be informed of the area under consideration and the headmen or chiefs had to be shown the surveying marks erected for their information. The District Officer was not to leave it to the chiefs to bring forward any claims; he himself was to make careful inquiries aimed at protecting native rights” (Tregonning 1965: 120). These rights covered all lands under cultivation, fruit trees, grazing land, burial grounds, graves, native tracks, and shrines. In the event of disputes, the rights were to be settled by either a reservation of land or payment of monetary compensation. The natives were granted the right to appeal to the Governor for compensation before the issue of the title deeds would be authorized.

While the 1889 Proclamation looked favorable to the natives, the same could not be said of the attitude of the planting community who had, since the turn of the century, begun to become increasingly influential, if not powerful. In fact, the planters gathered to form the North Borneo Planters’ Association which was given a place in the State Legislative Council. To the planters, while it was very noble on the part of the North Borneo Company administration to safeguard the natives’ rights to land based on customary rights, the actual enforcement had caused many problems for the estates that were beginning to spring up in large numbers, particularly on the west coast. Many of the companies found the old native rights unacceptable under Western law, hence there was a tendency to ignore these rights. This form of action by the companies so worried the government, especially in the face of the rising number of planting companies wanting to open up estates, that the government decided to act further to provide some safeguard of native rights. In 1903, Governor E. P. Gueritz introduced the Land Proclamation of 1903 which aimed at providing protection for native rights to lands by the issuance of written titles. European firms were forbidden to deal with natives for land. Governor Gueritz also authorized the voluntary acceptance of a written title by any native holding land under customary tenure. Thus began the task of a land settlement scheme aimed at surveying the native lands and preparing for title deeds to be issued to the natives. The plan, however, did not receive enthusiastic response from the natives. When the first settlement scheme had completed its task in the surveying and issuance of title deeds for the Putatan (inclusive of Penampang) area, 3,000 individual title deeds were prepared. Most of these were left unclaimed in the District Office (Tregonning 1965: 120). This situation persisted for around two years before the natives began to take them seriously and began to claim the titles.

This situation began to change when more planting companies began to apply to take up land on the west coast. Suddenly, the natives began to see the importance of having written title deeds as a safeguard to their lands. They were also slowly becoming more amenable to the idea of paying quit-rent, something which was rather alien to them. This change of attitude also saw a rise in demand among the natives to have their lands
surveyed, to the extent that by 1909 the survey teams were struggling to keep up with their assignments (Tregonning 1965: 121).

The alienation of land for rubber planting and other uses had started after the introduction of the 1903 Land Proclamation. Under this ordinance, the natives were encouraged to take out individual titles for their land. However, the ordinance did not cover communal and grazing land. This was the underlying problem that received a strong reaction from the Dusun of Papar in 1910. A severe staff shortage in the Chartered Company administration had resulted in a delay in the issuing of land titles. When visiting the west coast to investigate the problem, Henry Walker, the Land Commissioner, reported:

I went to Jesselton per S.S. Marudu on the 14th January and visited Beaufort and Tenom. Inspected the books at each station. The indexes at Jesselton were not written up and with that exception, the books are in order. I consider the clerical assistance at Jesselton to be quite inadequate to cope with the class or mass of work. The Putatan Native Titles are still unissued. This remark applies also to Papar.... I note I did not ask for the shop rents at Papar but I discussed the matter of issuing the native titles at Putatan and Papar with the Resident who proposes to send his Malay clerk with the Demarcator Maksud Ali to issue the native titles at those two places.6

The delay in issuing the land titles, coupled with reluctance by the Dusun to pay for the process of land alienation, resulted in plots remaining unmarked and later being sold to the rubber estates. A few weeks before the Dusun submitted their petition, G. C. Woolley,7 then Acting Land Commissioner, visited Papar to hear a land case. According to him: “Land office affairs here (Papar) seem to be in rather a chaos.”8

It was under such circumstances that many of the Dusun who lived along the railway line found themselves suffering from loss of land and their precious fruit trees. They also claimed to have suffered the loss of grazing lands and burial grounds. Negative feelings were mounting to the extent that they sought remedial action from the government. At the initial stage, they went to seek the help of the District Officer, who was not of much help.9 When they complained to the Resident, E. H. Barraut, he

7 G. C. Woolley joined the Chartered Company as a cadet in 1901 and rose through the ranks to become the Land Commissioner in 1911. See “Service Record of G. C. Woolley,” CO 874/201. G. C. Woolley was the elder brother of Sir Leonard Woolley, the famous archaeologist who discovered the City of Ur. He retired from the service in 1932 but returned to spend the remaining years of his life in Sabah. During the war, Woolley was interned and he died in 1947. A keen observer of native customs, Woolley is the author of several works on Native customs, including Dusun Adat: Some Customs of the Dusuns of Tambunan and Ranau, West Coast Residency, 1939; Kwijau Adat: Customs Regulating Inheritance amongst the Kwijau Tribe of the Interior, 1939; Murut Adat: Customs Regulating Inheritance amongst the Native Tribe of Keningau and the Timogun of Tenom, 1939.
9 Owen Rutter was a cadet Assistant District Officer serving in Papar at that time. He was accused by the natives of shirking his responsibilities and duties by not taking action on their complaints.
also seems to have refused them. In fact, it led to a stand-off between the Dusun and the Resident, whom they accused of being drunk when dealing with them.\textsuperscript{10} Even though the Chartered Company had dispatched its land officers to take a look at the situation, to the extent of preparing funds to pay out compensation for fruit trees or other losses, the Dusun were generally unhappy with the compensation meted out by the Government. Many felt it was too meagre and, in most cases, their complaints and pleas were not entertained. This caused the Dusun in Papar to unite and act by engaging an English lawyer, R. B. Turner, to act on their behalf to seek redress for their plight.

R. B. Turner was probably the first man to practice law privately in North Borneo. He had first joined the North Borneo Company as Judicial Commissioner in 1908. A graduate of Worcester College in Oxford, Turner was called to the English bar in 1906. While serving in North Borneo, he was alleged to have problems in adjudicating some cases which involved certain plantations. In 1910, on a matter of principle over the alleged intervention of certain parties in a judicial case presided over by him, Turner resigned from the service and went into private practice. At that time, he was the only lawyer in private practice. In that same year, he was approached by a delegation of Dusun from Papar, led by someone by the name of Simon, asking him to represent the Dusun in fighting for the return of their lands. From then, until the case was finally decided by the issuance of a Parliamentary Paper in 1920, Turner was closely associated with the Dusun of Papar, especially through their alleged leader, Simon. Who was this Simon? Why did Tregonning describe him as “a notorious trouble-maker”? (Tregonning 1965: 122). The next section will take a look at Simon through the eyes of the Chartered Company officials who had to deal with him.

**Simon in Official Accounts**

Simon’s name first came to the government’s notice after he put his name as the main petitioner on the petition sent to Sir John Anderson, High Commissioner for British Borneo, representing the Dusun of Papar.\textsuperscript{11} He was introduced in the petition as “One of the principal headman of Dusun inhabitants of Papar, British North Borneo, has been deputed by his fellow countrymen of several villages in the said district to come to Labuan” to present the petition. In addition, Simon also claimed that “your petitioners’ ancestors have from time immemorial settled down, owned and held possession of the lands at present in their occupation, and have in the past cultivated …”. In very simple words, with the help of R. B. Turner, the English lawyer, he laid down the background and identity of himself and his people and their association with the land.

The petition addressed six main points:

---

\textsuperscript{10} The alleged drunkenness of Barraut was one of the accusations raised by the lawyer engaged by the Dusun in the subsequent trial. However, the accusation was not accepted by the Judicial Commissioner who had presided over the court.

\textsuperscript{11} Petition from the Dusun Inhabitants of Papar to Sir John Anderson, 20 July 1910, CO531/2/33213.
1. The Dusun community claimed to have been settled in the area since time immemorial and they understood their position as regards the transfer of sovereignty of the State from the Brunei Sultanate to the Chartered Company.

2. The rubber estate had acquired land in the area from the Chartered Company without the Dusun community’s knowledge.

3. The rubber company had cut down fruit trees on their lands but failed to pay compensation. In cases where compensation had been made, the amounts were not commensurate with the actual value.

4. The rubber company had violated their customary rights by encroaching upon and clearing lands that were graveyards and, in the process, had damaged many burial jars.

5. The Chartered Company had unjustly allowed its policemen to abuse their power by deliberately encouraging native livestock to wander into the fenced areas of the rubber estates or public land, hence often resulting in the animals being impounded and heavy fines imposed upon the owners of the livestock for their release, while the policemen received a cut from the proceedings.

6. The Chartered Company, in failing to address the problems, had failed to protect the Dusuns’ rights.\(^\text{12}\)

The petition did manage to evince sympathy from the High Commissioner, who asked the Chartered Company to provide explanations and answers to the many issues raised in the petition. This eventually led to the Company being directed to allow the Dusun to take the case to a court in North Borneo for adjudication by the judicial commissioner\(^\text{13}\) – hence the so-called Notorious Papar Land Case.

When directed by the Court of Directors to furnish information and replies to the issues raised in the petition, Governor E. P. Gueritz directed G. C. Woolley, who was Acting Commissioner of Lands, to carry out an investigation. In his report to Sir John, Gueritz said that he would not accept Simon as representative of the Dusun, as claimed by the latter. Gueritz was of the opinion that Simon “really represents the local Roman Catholic Mission from whom this emanates and by whom it is fostered.”\(^\text{14}\) In other words, Gueritz did not think too highly of Simon. Instead, he viewed Simon as nothing more than a messenger or stooge used or exploited by the Roman Catholic Mission, particularly the priest-in-charge at Papar, Father Aloysius Goossens.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{12}\) Ibid.

\(^{13}\) Sir John Anderson, High Commissioner to Simon, Kampong Kapinpinan, Papar, 29 September 1910, CO531/2/33213.

\(^{14}\) Governor Gueritz to Sir John Anderson, 13 September 1910, CO531/2/33213.

\(^{15}\) Father Aloysius Goossens, d. 1935, was a Dutchman who was for a time professor of science and mathematics at St. Joseph’s College (Mill Hill). He arrived in Sarawak in 1881, and was recalled to teach at St. Joseph’s in 1883. After returning to Borneo in 1888, he served primarily with the Dusun at Papar-Limbawang, and was instrumental in compiling an extensive grammar and dictionary of the Limbahau Dusun language which was published in *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1924. He was also known to be constantly in disagreement with the officials of the North Borneo Company, particularly over the issue of the Company’s
against the Roman Catholic Church was maintained by the Company throughout the case. It would take the Catholic Church more than 50 years to lay this matter to rest. Father John Rooney, a priest who conducted research on the history of the Catholic Church in Sabah, came to the conclusion that the Roman Catholic Mission was not involved in the case. However, a re-examination of the Catholic Church Archives shows that the church could very well have been involved in the case, at least personally through Father Goossens. In a letter from Turner, the lawyer to Goossens, Turner cried out to Goossens, “How is it that I cannot hear from you? Important matters are now in hand and I feel quite isolated, without a word from you or from our Dusun friends for whom I have gone through so much.”

Judging from the tone of Turner’s writing, it is likely that Father Goossens was involved.

K. G. Tregonning suggests that the Catholic Church had a hand in influencing the Dusun to act against the Government. According to him, “On the coast too the native land policy brought trouble. At Papar a notorious trouble maker, strongly influenced by the long established Roman Catholic mission there, found for the Christian Dusun imaginary faults in the change from traditional tenure. Their land claims were taken to court in 1911” (Tregonning 1965: 60). This claim was refuted by John Rooney, who said he had gone through the missionary’s report which denied that the church had been implicated in inciting the Dusun to protest against the Government.

According to Rooney (1982: 184),

The Tregonning insinuation is that Father Goossens was the grey eminence in this case. The only reference to the case in the mission archives is a letter to Bishop Dunn from Mr. G. de la Mothe, requesting mission support to protest against the Chartered Company. Bishop Dunn’s hand note to the letter states simply that he had ordered the Fathers not to become involved. Tregonning’s justification for this insinuation is an extract from a Governor’s dispatch of 1921. A perusal of the British Parliamentary papers on the case shows that the Catholic Mission is not once mentioned in the proceedings. The Governor’s accusation can hardly be regarded as evidence and, while some may doubt that Father Goossens would have been deterred by orders from Kuching, his involvement may be discounted. The burden of the Governor’s complaint in 1921 is that wherever Catholic missions had been established the natives tended to become politically conscious of their rights and that missionary influence should be controlled so that such a result might be avoided. The dispatch illustrates the bad feeling that existed between the government and the Catholic missions of the interior.

Rooney’s misgivings about Tregonning’s assertion, however, were based solely on the Mill Hill Missionary Society’s reports and the parliamentary paper, which seem to absolve the Catholic Church from the accusations. An investigation into the mood of policy in appointing Muslim headmen to administer places like Putatan, Bundu and Papar. See John Rooney, *Khabar Gembira*, pp. 27–28, 140, 144 & 177–178.

16 ibid.
17 “Turner to Goossens,” 24 June 1914, C4.2 Box C, Kota Kinabalu Archdiocese Archives.
the Chartered Company officials during the period of the protest between 1910 and 1911, however, makes it difficult not to allude to the Catholic Church being a party to inciting the Dusun to protest.

In the petition, Simon also states that apart from the six main issues, “there are many other grievances too lengthy to enumerate here not only in your petitioners’ district but in nearly every place or village in British North Borneo – not trivial or fancied but real bona fide hardships and injustice which the natives suffer and are afraid to complain of not knowing where to go for assistance and also for fear of the consequences of trying to represent matters elsewhere.” The petition further called for the establishment of a Royal Commission to enquire “not only in your petitioners’ particular case at Papar but of the whole existing condition of affairs generally in British North Borneo when much of the injustice, high handed proceedings and other mis-administration of government by the Chartered Company or their officials will be exposed and necessitate remedial …”. It is apparent that Simon would have no idea of what a Royal Commission is, and that the entire statement could be purely at the instigation of Turner, the lawyer. However, Turner was definitely a man who had an axe to grind as he felt that he had been forced to resign from the government service as a judicial commissioner on a matter of principle after witnessing some transactions which he felt were unfair. But for Simon, the statement in the petition, regardless of whether it was his opinion or not, actually highlighted the plight of the Dusun people in general, and was not confined to the district of Papar. In this way, it had inevitably resulted in Simon being perceived by government officials as a leader of many Dusun.

At the conclusion of the Papar Land Case, Simon and his friends were unhappy over the result and were advised by Turner to put forward an appeal. Reporting the matter to the Company Secretary, Acting Governor A. C. Pearson felt that Simon’s document was “couched in vague terms and was largely made up of alleged grievances of unnamed persons in various districts, after the manner of the former petition.”\(^\text{19}\) In trying to assist Simon to draft a new petition, Pearson had Simon brought to Jesselton, where he was interviewed. Pearson’s impression of Simon was quite negative: “In due course Simon came to Jesselton and was interviewed by Messrs. Sawrey-Cookson (Judicial Commissioner) and G. C. Woolley (Commissioner of Lands) who, I am confident, did their best to frame some definite issues for trials but without success, as the man (a very small land owner) appeared to have nothing to say for himself, but a great deal to say on behalf of other people.”\(^\text{20}\)

Speaking up on behalf of other people seemed to be Simon’s trademark. It further reinforced the image of him being a leader of the Dusun beyond the confines of

---

\(^{\text{19}}\) Acting Governor A.C. Pearson to Company Secretary Forbes, 6 February 1911.

\(^{\text{20}}\) ibid.

---
Papar. Pearson added, “During January, I learnt that Simon with two or three others of similar kind, was visiting the villages along the railway, and collecting subscriptions to brief Mr. Turner on their behalf. This petition is divided into three parts, and purports to be the complaint of the inhabitants of Papar, Kimanis and Membakut.” The latest petition was decided to contain at least some concrete instances of alleged grievances…”21 By the time the judgment was made on the Papar case, the feeling of discontent had spread beyond the Papar-Kimanis-Membakut area. In fact it spread over almost the entire stretch of the coastal region from Kimanis through Membakut, Benoni, Papar, Putatan to Tuaran. Immaterial of whether Simon was really the man behind the spreading of this sentiment, the Chartered Company liked to believe so. The new petition, also drafted by Turner, also saw the emergence of new Dusun individuals coming forward to fight for the rights of their people.

The new petition from the Dusun at Papar, Bongawan, and Membakut was respectively dated 19 July 1911, and signed by Batindam, Yangar and Sogara of Bongawan, 5 August by Bokupas, Gombang and Massu of Membakut and Maratam and Tagap of Papar, and finally, 8 August by Simon of Kapinpinan, Papar.22 The Colonial Office was certainly not happy with the Company’s stand on the issue, and strongly sympathized with the plight of the Dusun. Writing to the Chartered Company in London, Lewis Harcourt, the Under Secretary of State, remarked: “I do not like this at all. I cannot think it is consistent with public policy to dispossess natives of their fruit gardens and even of their graveyards to make room for a rubber plantation, and I should tell the C.O. (Colonial Office) so straight.”23 After some debate with the Chartered Company, the Colonial Office asked the Company to instruct its officers in Sabah to take utmost care not to allow the alienation of land on which native graves were known or believed to exist.24

Though this episode ended in 1912, other similar petitions were submitted to seek the British Government’s intervention, including one from six locations on the west coast of Sabah in 1913. Sir Arthur Young, the Secretary of State, expressed surprise at the latest development as the petitions also involved Dusun from Putatan, Kinarut and Kimanis.25 The petition from Putatan was signed by Mamidal, Kinarut by Masagal, Madkar and Majarit, and Kimanis by Pambahan and Bangon. Thus far, it had been confined to the Papar–Bongawan–Membakut area.

The seriousness of the protest, however, varied from place to place. While the Dusun along the railway line were more vocal and daring by challenging the Chartered Company’s position, it was not the case for the Dusun from Tuaran. According to Rutter,

---
21 ibid.
22 See “Various Petitions by Dusun Inhabitants to the Colonial Office,” 19 July 1911, CO 531/4/39938.
23 “Sir John Anderson, Minutes,” 9 November 1912, CO 531/4/34569. See also “Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office to Secretary, North Borneo Company,” 12 December 1912, CO 531/4/39938.
24 “Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office to Secretary, North Borneo Company,” 12 December 1912, CO 531/4/39938.
“At one time the agitator movement threatened to spread to Tuaran, but the good people of the district did not appreciate squandering in legal charges the comfortable sum they had extracted from Tuaran Rubber Estate for their fruit trees and the Papar envoys went home empty handed” (Rutter 1922: 60). The fact that a delegation was sent from Papar to Tuaran suggests close affinity among the people who identified themselves as Dusun, though from different districts. It also suggests the existence of identity consciousness of the people in the need of a cohesive response against what they believed to be injustices committed against them. In this sense, Simon could very well be one of the earliest defenders of Dusun rights, albeit having drawn this conclusion from the negative comments by Chartered Company officials.

From the many portrayals on the part of the Government, Simon was definitely not seen too positively. He was portrayed as a notorious instigator, perhaps used by “unscrupulous” quarters. The official records also seem to suggest that Simon was behind the ill will and feelings of discontent by Dusun from other districts towards the government. This official view of Simon (through his third-person nomenclature of “notorious instigator”) has been the view adopted in subsequent writings on the event. However, when probing further and looking through other sources, this was hardly the sole image of the man, Simon. In the next section, Simon will be viewed through the eyes of G. C. Woolley, the very Commissioner of Lands (cum Collector of Land Revenue) whose position was being named as the principal defendant in the land case.

Simon as Recalled by Woolley

Much of what we can obtain that Woolley wrote about Simon came from his meticulously kept diary. Woolley’s first encounter with Simon was around September 1910. In his diary entry for 14 September 1910, Woolley records that “Simon’s complaints have gone on to the High Commissioner, who has asked for a report.”

Based on Woolley’s account, it is most likely that Simon was truly the leader of the Dusun of Papar in so far as the land case is concerned. Woolley, who was the Commissioner of Lands, was tasked with the responsibility of adjudicating the various claims put forward by the Dusun in Papar. In the case brought by the Dusun petitioning for the return of their lands, the Commissioner of Lands (Woolley) was named as first respondent. To his annoyance, he found that many of the Dusun refused to appear to discuss their claims “unless Simon was present.” In fact, during the trial, Woolley confessed that in most of the visits he made to Papar to determine cases of land encroachments and to give out compensation, he was assisted by Simon and Banjar.

More information on Simon was found in Woolley’s diaries. These entries were

26 I am grateful to the late Mrs. Janet Gordon nee Combe, who was responsible for transcribing Woolley’s diary when she was working in the State Secretariat, for providing me with a photocopy of the diary transcripts.
29 Judgement of Civil Suit 7/11: Simon, Si Banjar and Others vs Collector of Land Revenue and the British North Borneo Government, 8 June 1911.
Woolley’s recollection of the Papar Land Case trial. First, Simon was reported to have gone around collecting money, and also having gotten some of the locals to do it. In his diary entry for 25 July 1911, Woolley recalls that the last witness for the respondent in the trial, Dulahim, was a shock to Turner, and he could not break him down: Dulahim told the court that Simon had told him to collect money from his people and to threaten them if they would not pay. Both Simon and Banjar, recalled by permission, denied the story *in toto*, but coming out from the trial, Sawrey-Cookson, the Judicial Commissioner, told Woolley that he believed Dulahim.\(^{30}\) Cookson’s action in confiding in Woolley was clearly a breach of judicial procedure, and a likely act of perjury, considering that Woolley was the first respondent in the case! However, North Borneo society was very small and contact between members of the European society was hardly avoidable. The bottom line of the matter was that Dulahim’s statement was very damaging to Simon’s reputation, especially when it helped to confirm the Company’s view that Simon and his friends were up to no good and that Simon was the chief instigator in getting the Dusun to rise against the government.

Second, the entry for 22 July 1911 shows that some quarters in the government were under the impression that Simon was in the process of instigating the Dusun people to rise up against the Government over the loss of their lands.\(^{31}\) During the court proceedings, Turner, the lawyer engaged by the Dusun, “urged that the story of Simon’s intended rising was all a myth, and started from a conversation of his (Turner’s) own with Simon, he saying that to start the case without preparation and papers was like a man going to battle without his spear and *parang* – this was overheard and exaggerated into a threatened rising.” The explanation, however, was not accepted by many government officials, especially Barraut, who was directly implicated in the case. Father Aloysius Goossens, the Catholic Priest in charge of the Limbahau mission who was considered the advisor and main supporter to Simon and his friends, was also being asked to be a witness. When asked about the “rising,” Goossens denied that he had ever instigated the people at all, and his explanation of the matter was similar to Turner’s explanation mentioned earlier.\(^{32}\) Regardless of the truth behind this allegation and despite the denials of Turner and Father Goossens, it is clear that Simon had by then acquired a certain level of notoriety in the eyes of the Chartered Company officials. Along with several of his colleagues, including Banjar, they had been portrayed as nuisances, notorious and perhaps, even dangerous. The idea of an uprising also reinforced the notion that Simon was indeed a leader of the Dusun who was championing his people’s rights.

In his diary entry for 18 August 1911, Woolley records that a telegram had arrived in his office to say that the Government had won the Papar case. Five days later, Woolley wrote that Banjar had been sentenced to one month’s rigorous imprisonment for perjury for his accusation against Barraut.\(^{33}\) However, when the written judgement of the case finally reached him on 26 August, Woolley was of the opinion that “all legal points

---

against Gov’t and not at all clear as to what Gov’t has to pay for.” The victory that was claimed by the government was not complete. The case was too complex, and too many issues were at stake. Woolley’s admission in his diary shows that despite the government’s claim of victory, people like Woolley expressed doubt. These doubts inevitably show that Simon’s effort was perhaps a just one, but it was just that the government was not willing to accept it, and went on to deny people like Simon the justice they demanded. In the end, even though the Dusun had won on all legal points, no appropriate redress was ever carried out. In fact, it was upon this point that the Dusun continued to harp until 1920. However, by then, Simon was already fading from the scene.

Woolley’s recollection of Simon shows some consistency with the official views expressed in official documents as demonstrated in the previous section. The two sources agree to some extent that Simon was indeed a main character and leader in instigating the Papar Dusun to act against the government; and that he was suspected to have been instigated or used by others, possibly the Catholic Mission at Papar, to express grievances against the government. However, Woolley’s diary, being more personal in nature, also shows a human side of Simon, which could even be forceful, as in the case of asking others to collect subscriptions. The diary also shows views that are very different from that of the official one, as demonstrated by Woolley’s personal reading of the written judgement, which differs from the government’s claim of victory. In the next section, Simon is viewed through yet another type of source, church records.

Sindurang Became Simon

While Simon’s existence and his efforts in championing the land rights of the Kadazan people of Papar are known to us through the official correspondence and reports, our knowledge of the more personal history of Simon comes from a rather different source – the Roman Catholic Church. Simon’s association with the Roman Catholic Church was well-known to the Chartered Company officials. In his petition and correspondence, Simon normally gave his address as care of (C/O) the Roman Catholic Mission in Jesselton or Papar (Limbahau). In searching for Simon, two sets of Roman Catholic Church archival materials were consulted. The first is the personal correspondence of Father Bernard Kurz, the first Roman Catholic missionary who was in Papar from 1889 to 1895. The second source was the records of the churches at Limbahau and St. Joseph Church in Papar town.

Father Bernard Kurz was a Tyrolese who belonged to the St. Joseph’s Mission in Mill Hill, London. When he was first sent to work among the Dusun of Papar in 1889, Father Kurz chose his mission site at the little village of Limbahau. It was on this
site that the church of St. Mary’s (later renamed Holy Rosary) was established. Father Kurz was a very keen letter writer. It was his habit to write frequently to his superior, Monsignor Westernond, at the mission’s headquarters in London. One of Kurz’s letters reveals some information on Simon. Writing with a tone of exasperation over the slow progress achieved in his new parish, Kurz describes a man whom he called his first convert:

Among the catechismen [sic], I had in the very beginning, one came from three English miles distance walking much in water and mud under pretext for instructions. His intention of coming was to get some money out from me, whence of he told one many lies. His manners were mild and so that I don’t expect him to become a Christian. But once, I spoke (again) about justice and the last judgement of God, he seemed to be in great earnestness and weeping he cried out: Ja (ya), Tuan sakarang sahya perchaia (Sir, I do believe now)… still others were quiet….. A few days after he called in the night on me begging for the baptism of one of his children who fell dangerously ill, this (child) I baptised in his house on Secregisma Sunday. But on Easter Sunday I baptised his father together with three other boys (living in my house) in my chapel….Their names are as follows: Joseph, Simon …before their baptism they were called Banaik, Sendolang, …

From Kurz’s letter, it was known that Simon was originally known as Sendolang (or Sindurang, as written in all subsequent church information). Both Simon and his son Banaik (or Benaik and later, Joseph) were formally baptised on 24 April 1889. In the baptismal of Holy Rosary Church, Banaik (Joseph) was listed as the first convert, followed by Simon, who was Sindurang. Joseph was five at that time, while Simon was 29. From the church records, it is also learned that at the time he became a Christian Simon was a widower who already had several children.

It is quite obvious that after his own baptism, Simon slowly gained the confidence of Father Kurz. He was the first native to have sponsored someone for baptism (Jacobus Berangun on 1 November 1889). As Kurz’s assistant, Simon was responsible for carrying out some religious duties such as death-bed baptism for those who wished to convert to Christianity before their deaths. Many of these people were either terminally ill or elderly folks who were on their death bed. There were also records of young children who were baptised prior to their deaths. The church baptismal registry of St. Joseph in Papar town and that of the Holy Rosary Church in Limbahau (the two churches are only about two miles apart) contain many entries showing instances where Simon was responsible in baptising a large number. It was from the same records that we learned that Simon was not alone after 1891; he was assisted by one Agnes Ampok, who was his new wife.

The Marriage Registry of the Holy Rosary Church shows that Simon was remarried on 16 September 1891. He was the second person to be married there. Simon’s occupation was given as farmer, and that he was then 31 years old, and a widower. From on 2 February 1887. He arrived in Borneo (Labuan) and was sent initially to work in St. Mary’s Church in Sandakan. In 1888 he was sent to work among the Kadazan of Penampang; from there he was planning to move on to Papar. He died of illness on 1 September 1895. See PER-1887-File 77 Book No. 1: Father Bernard Kurz (St. Joseph Mission Archives).

37 Kurz to Westernond, 15 June 1889.
Joseph’s marriage entry in 1902 (when Joseph was 20), his mother’s name (Simon’s first wife) is given as Moita. The date of Moita’s death is not known.

Agnes, who was 25 at the time she married Simon, was the daughter of Law and Barong from Tomui Village. Very little is known of her earlier life, but the husband and wife team of Simon and Agnes made an outstanding couple in carrying out some of the church responsibilities entrusted to them. Apart from carrying out baptisms, the couple also occasionally acted as witnesses to marriages conducted in the church. While there is no further record of Simon in Kurz’s letters, the church records – both baptism and marriage registries – show that the couple were very committed and probably acted as the de facto local church leaders of the community. It may be interesting to ask how much time he was able to devote to his lands. It is likely that Simon’s land-holdings were sizeable, and that he employed farmhands, hence freeing himself from most of the farmwork and making him able to concentrate on his church work. In other words, Simon was probably a well-to-do Kadazan.

Father Bernard Kurz passed away in 1895 after being taken ill. In his place came Father Aloysius Goossens, who was the man the Chartered Company believed to be the main instigator behind the Papar land case, with Simon acting at his behest. As mentioned earlier, it is impossible to determine the truth behind this. However, as the two men were indeed very close, it is very difficult to completely absolve the church from involvement in the Dusun land case.

From the church records and also from Father Kurz’ personal letters, a very human perspective of Simon emerges. The record shows that Simon was one of the earliest converts to Catholicism in Papar and eventually became closely associated with the church as a lay church leader and at times, performed the function of a catechist. It is very likely that this close link with the church, especially through his link with Father Goossens, brought him into contact with issues such as fighting for the rights of the community through the very ways acceptable by the Europeans, namely, through petition and legal means. However, it was also due to such links that he was viewed as a tool allegedly used by the Catholic Church against the government.

Simon continued his efforts to champion the rights of his people until around 1915. After that, his name was rarely mentioned in official documents. However, Simon lived a full life and passed away in Papar in 1937 at the age of 77.

Conclusion

This paper set out to look into the person of Simon Sindurang Bulakang, an early Dusun (Kadazan) leader of his community who was instrumental in fighting for the rights of the community over land issues. This paper essentially focuses on the issue of the reading of historical sources by focusing on three genres of them, namely, official, a diary and non-official documents (in this case, church records and personal letters). By focusing on how the character of Simon was portrayed through each of these sources, this paper is able to demonstrate that at least three perspectives may be arrived at by drawing

38 Entry No. 2 and Entry No. 19 of the Marriage Registry of Holy Rosary Church, Limbahau, Papar.
39 According to Mrs. Helen Atang, Simon used to own 21 acres of land.
on information from alternative sources. With the emergence of these new perspectives, it is clear that a review of some of the earlier narratives of Simon which were essentially drawn from official views will need to be re-examined. This paper also shows that a closer reading of official documents, in this case, Chartered Company documents, no matter how negative the expressed views, can still provide glimpses of characteristics that may not necessarily be consistent with the expressed official views. In the case of Simon, the Company’s efforts to paint him as a notorious leader of the Dusun people beyond the confines of Papar district shows that the man was rather influential and was a pioneer Dusun leader championing the rights and interests of the community. The description by Acting Governor A.C. Pearson of Simon seems to suggest that Simon was hardly a selfish person, as he was more able to express the problems faced by the communities than his own personal problems.

The entries from the diaries of G.C. Woolley confirm Simon’s role as the leader of the Dusuns in Papar, at least in as far as the case was concerned. It also shows that the man was indeed influential, to the extent of being able to mobilize others to take up the cause. Woolley’s diary entries also show that Simon could be very single-minded in pursuing his goal, as an element of intimidation seems to have existed in getting other Dusuns to contribute to the cause. The diary entries also show how the government’s claims on certain issues, including victory in the land case, may not necessarily be shared by government officials like Woolley.

Historical personalities were normally judged by their public performance, in Simon’s case, his involvement as a leader in championing the land rights of his people. However, it is also important for any study to probe the human side of a personality so as to establish, wherever possible, the various factors that could have shaped the character of the person in question. In this study, the use of church records and personal letters provide some glimpses of Simon as an ordinary person who went through the usual vicissitudes of life like any other person. In the case of Simon, it may not be too much to suggest that many of his actions were influenced by his exposure to the Catholic Church. His role as a lay leader of the church could have allowed him to view the problem of land ownership that was faced by the community through a wider perspective – hence the ability to garner and mobilize Dusun communities in other localities to join forces in fighting for their rights.

Finally, what this paper does is simply to look at the character of Simon who was instrumental in the 1910 Papar Land Case from different sources thus far neglected by, or unknown to, historians (as in the case of earlier practitioners such as Rutter, Tregonning, Black and Ranjit). It shows that in approaching the history of Sabah or Borneo, there is a need to cast the net wider to investigate and interrogate non-conventional sources relating to the subject with a goal of obtaining a more accurate and complete perspective. This is especially true in the writing of local history where official sources are hardly adequate, let alone, available.
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Introduction: The “country trade” and Borneo in the early nineteenth century

After the occupation of Prince of Wales Island (Penang) in 1786 by the East India Company (EIC), there soon arose a small community of merchants and traders whose activities complemented those of the EIC. Their “country vessels” – not licensed to carry cargoes to Britain without special EIC permission – carried through the region commodities that included opium, textiles, iron, steel, arms and gunpowder, along with a range of luxury items such as cutlery, mirrors and watches. Elmore’s sailing directory for British mariners in the East Indies, published in 1802 but based on the author’s voyages in the period 1783-96, gave sailing directions for voyages around Borneo, with emphasis on the sale of opium (Elmore 1802:311). More details are given in Milburn’s Oriental Commerce (1811), and recent sources include Lee (1978) and Nordin Hussin (2007). From 1793, when war began with France, British shipping in the region was subject to attacks by French naval vessels and privateers, but these greatly diminished after L’Ile de France (Mauritius) fell to the British in December 1810. The conquest of Java in August 1811 stabilized the political situation, but naval threats re-emerged in the war of 1812-1815 with the Americans. Country vessels also had to be on the lookout for piratical attacks by local native inhabitants, including those with whom they (or their competitors) traded. Such attacks were rare compared with those on smaller native vessels, and were sometimes provoked by dishonest trading practices. This was the case with the capture of the Calcutta in 1803 that established in British eyes the piratical reputation of the Sultanate of Sambas in West Borneo. The Calcutta affair prompted R.T. Farquhar, Lieutenant-Governor of Penang from 1804 to 1805, to consider making commercial treaties with the main native rulers in the East Indies that would help regulate trade and allow supervision by the EIC (Wright 1961:269-277). His attempt came to nothing, but after the conquest of Java Raffles resurrected the idea and sought to confine country trade in the region to selected ports – including some in Borneo – where EIC representatives could be based (Bastin 1954; Wright 1961:179-184, 298-326). Raffles

1 This is a revised and extended version of a paper that was presented at the 5th International Convention of Asia Scholars, Kuala Lumpur (ICAS5), August 2007.
2 European names are used here for colonial settlements.
commented later that the traders supplied arms to pirate chiefs and did not wish piracy to be suppressed, because it reduced competition (Java Factory Records 61, Letters from Java, 11 Feb. 1814). The attempts to regulate trade were strenuously opposed by the Penang merchants and their backers and allies in Calcutta. Likewise, the EIC officials in Penang were no supporters of Raffles, and maintained generally a laissez-faire attitude to unrestricted country trade through Penang or Malacca.

Nordin Hussin (2007:xvii) has recently emphasized that studies of colonial society should extend from “palace or state politics and the elite” to the “the common people”: in other words, there is a need for more “history from below.” The country traders were certainly not common people, but they were not among the elite either, and their activities are hard to track down for reasons of their uncertain social status and mobility.3 This article attempts to help fill this gap by focusing on the experiences of a Penang-based country ship’s captain, Daniel Smith, over a period (1808-1815) for which unusually extensive material is available. It shows how the regional events and issues summarized above influenced Smith’s life at this time and also describes his associations with some of the Penang merchants, other country traders and especially the shrewd Sultan of Pontianak in West Borneo, a region that he visited frequently. Most of Smith’s voyages can be traced in outline from departures and arrivals that were recorded (though not always comprehensively) in the shipping news in the Calcutta Gazette, Prince of Wales Island Government Gazette (established early in 1806) and, from 1811, the Java Government Gazette.4 In addition, and rather unusually, Smith’s experiences can be unravelled from other sources that include private correspondence, official documents and a nineteenth-century naval memoir. The voyages are summarized in Table 1 where, to avoid cluttering the text that follows, I give full references. A short Appendix gives information about James Tait and Samuel Stewart, also ships’ captains who lived in Penang, whose careers overlapped with that of Smith and who also had experiences at this time that demonstrate the hazards of the country trade.

**Conflict with the French: Captain Smith on the Margaret and Mary**

Late in August 1808 the Prince of Wales Island Government Gazette reported that the country ship Margaret, commanded by “Capt. R. Smith,” arrived in Penang from “the eastward,” the term used to include destinations such as Borneo, Java, and beyond (see Table 1). The Margaret had earlier been captured by the Courier, a French privateer from Mauritius, off the east coast of the Malay Peninsula. Some time later the French prize crew ran the ship alongside another British trading ship, the Ganges, off Sumatra, “fired two broadsides, and boarded her.” Captain Smith was lucky: the Margaret was handed back to him, presumably because the ship and cargo were less valuable than the Ganges, and the prize crew was not large enough to take over two ships.5 Captain

---

3 An exception is Capt. Joseph Burn, who was based in Penang for some time before his departure in disgrace to live in Pontianak (Smith 2004; Reece and Smith 2006).
4 These weekly semi-official publications are cited in references as CG, PG and JG respectively. Volume numbers for PG in 1810 were inconsistent; they included Vols. 4, 5, 6 and again 5.
5 The Ganges was almost immediately recaptured by the British Royal Navy and returned to Penang (PG 3/132: 3 Sept 1808).
Smith (no initial given in PG) soon departed from Penang with the Margaret for the eastward. The return was not reported but the ship departed again to the eastward two months later, commanded by “D. Smyth.” There is no other reference to a country trader called R. Smith at this time, and there can be very little doubt that there was only one Captain Smith in command of the Margaret, especially given the vagaries of proof-reading of the Gazette, or possibly the editor’s poor handwriting when writing notes for publication. These voyages of the Margaret provide the first clues so far uncovered about Daniel Smith’s association with Penang, and identification becomes certain from later references to Capt. “D. Smith,” “D’l Smith” and, of course, “Daniel Smith.”

The Gazette reported arrivals and departures of more than one vessel called Margaret at the end of 1808 and in 1809, but none was commanded by Capt. Smith, who had by then moved on. A “Captain Smyth” – probably Daniel – was a passenger on the Clyde, which arrived in Penang from Malacca at the end of March 1809.

Daniel Smith’s next command was the Mary (Table 1). As with the Margaret, there was more than one Mary in the region and Smith may have commanded this vessel earlier than in the period covered here, because on 12 November 1807 the Calcutta Gazette (CG 48/1237, Supplement: 12 Nov 1807) listed “Capt. Smyth of the Mary, belonging to Calcutta” as one of those who had not collected letters that had been in the Calcutta General Office since 1 January 1807. This possibility aside, the Mary that Smith commanded after the Margaret must have been the vessel based at Penang that, commanded by Capt. A. Robertson, had made several voyages to the eastward and one to Calcutta in 1807-8. Soon after returning to Penang in December 1808, the Mary was advertised for sale (several references in PG) but went on to Calcutta, still for sale (CG 50/1299: 21 Jan 1809). Robertson and Smith occupied two houses in Penang that in July 1809 were advertised to let by Carnegy & Co, an important Penang merchant and ship-owning house (PG 4/175: 1 Jul 1809, and some subsequent issues). Robertson does not reappear in the Prince of Wales Island Government Gazette, but Daniel Smith departed with the Mary for India and, following the cessation of hostilities between Britain and Spain, went to Manila. Afterwards, the Mary was missing, and it was learned in Penang early in 1810 that during the return voyage in November 1809 she had been captured by a French privateer at the entrance of the Straits of Malacca. Shortly after the Mary was captured the privateer captured a Portuguese-owned trading vessel, the Ovidor Pereira, also en route from Manila and carrying 400,000 Spanish dollars. The vessels were dispatched to Mauritius and the officers and crews were put ashore at their request on Dutch-controlled Madura in December 1809. They remained there or on the mainland of Java on parole for six months, well treated by the Dutch. Marshal Daendels, Governor-General of Java, then gave them permission to leave, so they chartered an “Arab ketch”

6 Daniel Smith is not included in lists of European residents in issues of the East-Indies Register & Directory that were issued in London twice yearly on behalf of the EIC. These lists were quite comprehensive, though information about Penang was initially very limited.

7 Nevertheless, he remained in the Indies. The Straits Settlements Factory Records for 1812 contain several exasperated letters to him from the EIC officials in Penang, complaining about delays in the departure from the harbor of a ship he commanded, the EIC’s Surat Castle, which was bound for China.
and returned to Malacca, from where Daniel Smith returned to Penang on an EIC brig, the *Mary Anne*. Smith had in his possession a letter from Daendels to Rear-Admiral Drury, the British naval commander in the East Indies (*Straits Settlement Factory Records*, letter from Farquhar in Malacca to Clubley in Penang, 9 July 1810). Despite his detention, Captain Smith was again lucky not to join the many British personnel who were held on Mauritius. Its capture by the British in December 1810 removed the French naval threats, and “restored to the service of their country 2000 seamen and soldiers, confined in the enemy’s prisons” (Milburn 1811, Vol. 2:567).

**Trade with Sambas and Pontianak: Captain Smith on the Tweed**

Daniel Smith very soon went back to sea. In August 1810 he took over command of the brig *Tweed*, which belonged to Carnegy & Co and had shuttled between Penang and various ports to the eastward for at least four years (many records in *PG*). This pattern continued under Smith’s command (Table 1). The *Tweed* left Penang in mid-August, returning via Malacca two months later. The next two departures were not reported, but the *Tweed* again returned from the eastward in January 1811, and “from Sambas and other trading ports to the eastward” in May. Sultan Kassim of Pontianak told Raffles (who was then in Malacca) in a letter dated 22 March 1811 that “Captain Smith” could provide information about an alliance between Sambas and the Illanun pirates of northern Borneo, because Smith had just come from “the country of Sambas.” Sultan Kassim sent Raffles two orangutans with Smith (Ahmat bin Adam 1971).\(^8\) Ahmat bin Adam identified this Smith as Lieut. Smith of the *Arethusa*, a cutter of the British Royal Navy, giving no reason. Daniel Smith seems far more likely, especially as Sultan Kassim also referred to Smith’s “shipmate,” according to Ahmat bin Adam’s translation, probably the ship’s mate, not a term used for a naval officer.\(^9\) Despite this uncertainty, it must have been at about this time that Smith, along with other country traders, was consulted by Raffles as to the suitability of a controversial route via the coast of West Borneo for the British fleet that was assembling at Malacca for the invasion of Java. The others named by Raffles read like a “Who’s Who” in the local country trade; they were Captains James Carnegy, Robert Scott, Samuel Stewart, James Tait and William Greig (*Raffles Collection*, Eur MSS C34, Raffles to Lord Minto, 22 May 1811). The problem was that the prevailing winds at the time of the planned invasion blew from the southeast, thus precluding the route along the east coast of Sumatra via Bangka. The Royal Navy had strong doubts about the route via West Borneo, which would depend on irregular land breezes and the vagaries of the sea currents near the coast. Greig (sometimes called Greigh) was sent on the EIC’s chartered schooner *Minto* (sometimes called *Lord Minto*) to survey the route, and this was selected by Lord Minto when he arrived in Malacca. Greig was assisted by Joseph Burn, who resided at Pontianak and had provided Raffles with a large amount of information about West Borneo, including recent piratical

---

8 Ahmat bin Adam (1971) translated several letters sent to Raffles by rulers of states in the Archipelago. The original letters were discovered in 1970 and are in the *Raffles Collection*, MSS Eur C35, London: British Library.

9 A mission by the *Arethusa* to Pontianak at this time would surely have been mentioned in Raffles’s extensive correspondence with Lord Minto that related to the proposed invasion route to Java.
activities thought to involve Sambas (Smith 2004; Reece and Smith 2007). The Sultan’s half-brother, Pangeran Anom, was the power behind the throne and had been the prime mover in the capture of the Calcutta in 1803. One of the prahu from Sambas mounted a determined attack on the Minto during the survey of the Borneo coast (JG 1/35: 24 Oct 1812; Countess of Minto 1888:279). Nevertheless, Daniel Smith and his employers Carnegy & Co continued to trade with Sambas and the coastal areas under its control, as well as with Pontianak. Both Sambas and Pontianak were suppliers of gold dust that was obtained from mines operated both by Dayaks and, increasingly, by the Chinese settlers. Although nominally under the control of the Malay Sultanates, the Chinese were gaining increasing autonomy and control over the Dayaks in the gold-mining areas (Jackson 1970; Yuan 2000; Heidhues 2003). Much of the gold passed through Sambas or Pontianak in exchange for cargoes that included opium, textiles and arms. Some of the opium was then smuggled into Java, avoiding the trade restrictions imposed by the Dutch and subsequently the British.

The Tweed was not among the 50 or so transport vessels that formed part of the British fleet for the invasion of Java. Still commanded by “Dan’l Smith,” she returned to Penang at the end of July from another voyage to Malacca and the eastward. The Penang EIC authorities asked Smith for information about the arrival of several French frigates in Surabaya, a matter of concern with respect to the British invasion of Java, which was then under way (SSR Miscellaneous Letters Out, 29 July 1811). Very shortly afterwards he sailed for Pedir in Sumatra. There were then some gaps in the shipping news in the Gazette, and the next reference to the Tweed was another return from the east in November; the master was then “N.T. Namo” (PG 6/299: 9 Nov 1811).

Dispute with Raffles and the aftermath of the Coromandel affair: Captain Smith on the Tay

Late in 1811, Smith took command of the Tay (Table 1). This was another of Carnegy’s vessels, and had not been mentioned earlier in the Prince of Wales Island Government Gazette. He returned to Penang on 20 December from a voyage to Borneo and Lingga, and departed two days later for Calcutta. There the Tay loaded 250 chests of opium that had been bought for Carnegy & Co at the EIC sales by their agents Fairlie, Fergusson & Co (Java Factory Records 18, Public Consultations, Supreme Government to Raffles, 15 Dec 1812) and returned to Penang on 1 March 1812. Smith and the Tay, with part of the opium still on board, left Penang on 17 March and after putting in at

10 It was the Pangeran who according to the extravagant language of John Hunt (1812) “out-heroded Herod.” He took part in aggressive expeditions off the coasts of Borneo, but probably not just with the aim of plundering cargoes and acquiring slaves. I have suggested that his aim in attacking European trading vessels was to set up a naval force that would be of value in the ongoing warfare between Sambas and Pontianak (Smith 2007).

11 The invasion fleet anchored off Batavia on 4 August 1811. The frigates (in fact, two of them) escaped the British blockade and returned to France, bearing the news of the defeat of Janssens (who had replaced Daendels in April 1811) and his forces (Thorn 1815:90).

12 PG 6/299: 9 Nov 1811. Capt “Namo” is elsewhere called “Riano” or “N.F. Reano” – hence the earlier comment about proofreading or handwriting. He commanded the Tweed during voyages from Penang to Batavia in 1812 and 1813 (JG 1812, 1/1: 25 Feb 1812; 2/95: 18 Dec 1813).
## Vessel & voyage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel &amp; voyage</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Destinations &amp; notes</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Margaret</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: 21 Nov</td>
<td>Penang to E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PG 3/144: 26 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clyde</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809: c.1 Apr</td>
<td>Arrived Penang from E. via Malacca; Smith passenger.</td>
<td>PG 4/162: 1 Apr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary Anne</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tweed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812: 1 Mar</td>
<td>Penang to &amp; from Calcutta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gloucester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Feb</td>
<td>Penang to Malacca &amp; E, incl. Pontianak, Java, Pontianak, Java, and return to Penang.</td>
<td>PG 7/364: 20 Feb; see text; JG 2/64: 15 May; 2/66: 29 May.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: c.7 Aug – 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1  Summary of the voyages of Captain Smith (1808-1815), as collated from the shipping news in the Prince of Wales Island Gazette (PG) and Java Government Gazette (JG), and from other sources. A query (?) indicates where there is no information. Issues of PG that were missing from the set consulted were Vol. 3/111-118. and Vol. 8/414-445.

several ports reached Muntok on Bangka, which had been taken over by the British following the conquest of Java. Here Smith had intended to follow the established practice of bartering opium for tin, but was prevented even from landing by an order that originated from Raffles, who had created a Java Government monopoly for tin, and also wanted to restrict the sale of opium (Wright 1961:179-184, 298-326). Smith then went to Borneo (the port not named) to sell the opium, but the merchants and dealers would not buy it for resale because of the restrictions imposed by Raffles. Accordingly, Smith went back to Bangka, where he again tried to sell the opium to the local inhabitants. Although this was now allowed, he was still prevented from bartering it for tin. After unsuccessfully trying to persuade the EIC officials to buy the opium, Smith returned to Penang on 19 June. The next day Smith and James Carnegy wrote a deposition before John Dunbar, a Penang merchant and acting notary, and sent it to Fairlie, Fergusson & Co in Calcutta, who in turn complained to the EIC Supreme Government there (Java 18, Supreme Government to Raffles, 15 Dec 1812). The basis of the complaint was that when the opium had been purchased no trade restrictions had been made known, so no problems had been foreseen in disposing of it in the East Indies. This complaint mirrored a petition a little earlier against the restrictions imposed by Raffles by all the Penang merchant houses, including, of course, Carnegy & Co. The petition was first sent...
to the Penang Government and then to the Supreme Government in Calcutta (Lee 1978). The latter reassured the Penang merchants that Raffles would be required to loosen his restrictions and referred to him the matters raised by Smith and Carnegy (Java 18, Supreme Government to Raffles, 15 Dec 1812; see also Lee 1978). Raffles’s response to the complaint was not reported to the Java Government Council, but, while paying lip-service to EIC policy, he continued his policy of regulating opium imports to the areas under his control (Wright 1961:182-186). Almost immediately after the complaint was written, Smith and the Tay departed for Batavia, to dispose of the opium as profitably as possible. A report to the Java Government in October 1812 lists import of opium by Capt. Smith in August 1812, but on the Tweed. This mistake probably resulted from earlier voyages by the Tweed “to the eastward” that included Java (Java 18, Government Council, Return of Opium Received into HC Warehouse, Batavia, 10 Oct 1812).13

According to the Prince of Wales Island Government Gazette, the Tay returned to Penang on 1 November “from Malacca and the eastward but does not bring us anything new or interesting from there.” This comment does not reflect well on the editor’s interest in local newsworthy items, because there had recently been an incident that was to influence political events in West Borneo, and particularly in Sambas. On 7 August the Coromandel, a trading vessel that had sailed from Calcutta via Penang, became stranded in the Karimata Islands off West Borneo. The cargo, including opium, was subsequently looted by a strong flotilla from Sambas under the command of Pangeran Anom. Captain Dickie and passengers, who included John Palmer, the famous “Prince of Merchants” from Calcutta, escaped in the ship’s boats to Pontianak, where they were hospitably received by Sultan Kassim. He sent prahu to rescue the remaining officers and crew, though some of the latter had been persuaded to join the flotilla from Sambas. After the British authorities in Bangka had been alerted, the cruizer (corvette) Aurora, commanded by Capt. David Macdonald, sailed to investigate and came across two small trading vessels that had picked up the Coromandel’s officers, crew and passengers from Pontianak. John Palmer transferred to the Aurora, which unsuccessfully pursued Pangeran Anom to the mouth of the Sambas River.14 Palmer was eventually delivered to Penang and left for Calcutta on the Tay in mid-November. Soon after his return to Calcutta on 26 December, Palmer – whose literary style was often very acerbic and sarcastic – complained to his friend W. Phillips, formerly Governor of Penang, about the voyage in “Carnegie’s well equip’d [sic] and well found vessel... Captain Smith could [not] make her fly. The Tay is a scandalous tub” (Palmer, Private Letterbooks c81, 4 Jan. 1812 [sic, actually 1813]: 31). Despite the inadequacies of the Tay, Palmer got on well with Daniel Smith, as he also did with Macdonald. He later told Macdonald of his attempts to persuade Smith to stop trading with Sambas. “Smith is an active ardent good humour’d Fellow! A little corrupted by bad precept and worse example. That he had doubts of the criminality of an intercourse with the Sambas pirate is not strange when his Principal [i.e. Carnegy] would justify it.” Macdonald was convinced that Smith had sold arms to the Chinese at Selekau,

13 The report also listed import in January 1812 of opium in the Tweed that belonged to Alexander Hare, a Malacca-based merchant who was later Raffles’s Resident in Banjarmasin.

14 This episode was comprehensively reported in the Java Government Gazette (JG 1/35: 24 Oct 1812, 1/36: 31 Oct 1812); see also Smith (2002).
Conflicts with Sambas: Captain Smith on the Gloucester

John Palmer’s advice against trading with Sambas was effective, and after arriving in Calcutta in December 1812, Smith transferred to the brig Gloucester, owned by Forbes & Brown (formerly Forbes & Scott) of Penang (Table 1). Palmer became Sultan Kassim’s commercial agent in Bengal, and gave Smith letters to be delivered on the Gloucester to the Sultan, as shown by marginal notes in the copies of these letters. Palmer said that Smith could give the Sultan details of Palmer’s health (Palmer, Letterbooks c81, 6 Jan. 1812 [i.e. 1813]: 47). Very soon afterwards Palmer wrote to his commercial agent Mahumud (also called Mohamud, etc) in Pontianak, saying that he was sending “by your friend Capt. Smith,” a “rifle gun” and yellow shawl – but his “foolish People” had packed the latter with gifts for the Sultan. Palmer told Mahumud to ask the Sultan to give it to him (Palmer, Letterbooks c81, 9 Jan. 1812[1813]:64). In another letter to the Sultan, Palmer hoped that he and Smith would become friends and that he and Carnegy would no longer trade with Pangeran Anom of Sambas but instead “prefer the honest men of Borneo. Smith and Scott are very sensible men” (Palmer, Letterbooks c81, 9 Jan. 1812 [1813]: 65).

Meanwhile, the Royal Navy had mounted an attack on Sambas in October 1812. This was prompted by the news that Pangeran Anom had plundered the Coromandel and doubtless the realization that Sambas was attempting to gather a formidable naval fleet that might be used not only against Pontianak but also against British merchantmen. The attack was unsuccessful and caused great embarrassment in Java; it was, in effect, covered up in official reports (Smith 2004). Preparations for a second attack were immediately set in motion by Raffles and General Gillespie, the military commander in Java, with a much stronger force that involved the Royal Navy, the EIC’s Bombay Marine, numerous support ships, and about 1000 army personnel. Under Macdonald’s command, the Aurora departed from Batavia on 11 January 1813 with the first contingent of troops on board, and took a fast passage to Pontianak (JG 1/47: 16 Jan 1813; Macdonald c.1840:215). According to Macdonald, the next contingent of troops followed on a “Malay trader” captained by Smith (Macdonald c.1840:215), but this seems to be wrong. The first edition of Macdonald’s memoirs was printed in about 1830, by which time his memory about Smith’s early involvement in troop-carrying may have been faulty. The Gloucester departed from Bengal on 19 January, arrived at Penang on 12 February 1813, and departed soon afterwards for “Malacca and the eastward.” There is no record of a visit by the Gloucester to Batavia at this time.16 However, Macdonald commented in a

---

15 Whether Palmer made much profit is doubtful. Like his father, Sultan Kassim of Pontianak was prone to building up debts in his commercial ventures (Heidhues 1998). The “Scott” referred to by Palmer might have been William or Robert; both were based in Penang (many references in PG).
16 According to the Java Government Gazette, the second contingent of troops departed from Batavia on 20 January 1813, on the Mary, commanded by Capt. Mathews, and the main body of
letter to Java on 20 March: “Shortly after my arrival on this coast [West Borneo], I had the honour to forward by the brig *Gloucester*, copies of letters to the Java government” (Macdonald c1840:365). It seems likely that Smith had gone from Malacca straight to Pontianak to deliver Palmer’s letters and gifts, and it is of course possible that he took supplies for the blockade of Sambas. The *Gloucester* certainly arrived in Batavia from Pontianak in May and soon returned to Pontianak, perhaps carrying supplies and more troops for Sambas (*JG* 2/64: 15 May 1813, 2/66: 29 May 1813). The second attack on Sambas occurred from 26–29 June and was successful. Unlike its predecessor it was comprehensively reported when the news arrived in Batavia in July (*JG* 2/73: 17 Jul 1813, 2/74: 24 Jul 1813).

Smith was now prospering sufficiently for him to write to John Palmer in May 1813, suggesting that they go into business together. The idea was apparently to bypass the Penang merchant houses and also to focus on Pontianak. Palmer replied at the end of August, addressing the letter to Penang. He politely refused to be involved, saying that he did not speculate. Palmer advised Smith not to leave his present “connexion”; “I should be heartily sorry if you relinquished a real for a hypothetical advantage.” He said that if Smith were to go to Pontianak he should renew Palmer’s friendship with the Sultan and Palmer’s local agent. “I shall be happy that Sultan Cassim renders you service.”

After leaving Pontianak Smith returned to Penang and in July went to Pedir, returning with a cargo of betel nuts. The *Gloucester* next left Penang early in August and sailed via Pontianak to Batavia, arriving on 10 September, and returning to Penang via Malacca at the end of October. Smith gave up command of the *Gloucester* soon afterwards, either before or after a voyage to Calcutta. Command of the *Gloucester* was taken over by Capt. P.C. Foster, or sometimes “Forster” (*JG* 3/117: 21 May 1814), who had already followed Smith as captain of the *Tweed* and then the *Tay* (*PG* 7/339: 29 Aug 1812; *JG* 2/69: 19 Jun 1813).

**Conflict with the Americans: Captain Smith on the Adele**

Daniel Smith returned to Penang from Bengal early in January 1814 in command of the *Adele* (Table 1). John Palmer sent a letter to his friend William Petrie in Penang with Smith, and referred to him. “Capt Smith will let you share with his flock” (of sheep: Palmer planned to send more sheep to Petrie on another ship, the *Fleetwood*) (Palmer, *Letterbooks* c83, 16 Dec 1813: 230). Smith went on in the *Adele* from Penang to Batavia, arriving there at the end of February. Possibly he again traveled via Pontianak; he certainly departed from Batavia in the *Adele* for Pontianak in mid-March. In May he had a brush with another of Britain’s enemies of the period. In Pontianak roads he saw a ship that was initially thought to be the *Eugenia*, en route from Bengal, but was in troops followed in April on the *Matilda* (*JG* 1/48: 23 Jan 1813; 2/60: 17 Apr 1813).

17 Palmer suspected that the Sultan had cheated Mahamud of the yellow shawl sent earlier. He had been unable to procure the rifle that had been promised— or so he said (Palmer, *Letterbooks* c83, 29 Aug. 1813:60).
18 The vessel was sometimes named as *Adely* or *L’Adele*, the latter suggesting that she had been captured from the French.
19 There is a gap from February to mid-September in the set of *PG* that was examined.
fact an American ship, the *Jacob Jones*. This was a well-armed “letter-of-marque” ship, i.e. she was licensed to attack enemy vessels, and belonged to merchants in Boston. She had escaped the British blockade there along with two smaller vessels, and they were all bound for Canton both to buy Chinese goods and to warn American merchant vessels to remain there until the war ended. The capture of the *Adele* was certainly a bonus, and the *Jacob Jones* took cargo that included 40 chests of opium. However, Smith was again lucky. His ship was returned to him on condition that he remained at anchor for 48 hours, and the *Jacob Jones* departed towards Manila en route for Canton, where its arrival along with the other two American vessels caused great alarm among the British (Morse 1926, Vol. 3:218). Smith went on to Batavia, where he reported that Capt. John Robbarts of the *Jacob Jones* had said that the war was unpopular in America (*JG* 3/119: 4 Jun 1814).

Much more information about Smith’s encounter at Pontianak and the aftermath is given in EIC records. Smith stated that after the loss of the opium he asked Sultan Kassim to lend him 10000–12000 Spanish dollars on interest to buy another cargo of opium to sell in Java, from where he intended to return to Pontianak in 25-30 days. The profits were to be shared between the Sultan and the ship-owners. The Sultan declined because “interest was contrary to his religion,” but gave Smith gold dust to buy 10 chests of opium and English iron to sell in Java, the profits to be divided. When Smith arrived at Batavia at the beginning of June he had to sell the opium on credit, because there was a shortage of Spanish dollars, which was the only currency that the Sultan would accept. Smith had no money to repay the Sultan, so he returned to Penang for a fresh cargo of opium. He then intended to go back to Batavia via Pontianak. However, the agents for the underwriters, Forbes & Brown, insisted that he go straight to Java, where Smith sold the opium in Semarang and Batavia, but again on credit because of the lack of Spanish dollars. Smith departed from Batavia for Penang on 14 August after receiving one-third of the money in currency that was not useable outside Java. The *Adele* left in company with the *Tay*, which was commanded by Capt. James Carnegy (*JG* 3/130: 20 Aug 1814). On arrival in Penang, Smith found that Dunbar & Scott had engaged the ship to go to Sumatra, where the ship grounded and the bottom was damaged. Smith and the *Adele* were back in Penang on 13 September (*PG*, 9/446). According to Smith, it was too late in the season to go back to the east (*Bengal*, 7 Oct. 1815, letter from Smith, 25 Feb. 1815).

20 The *Jacob Jones* returned to Boston after a very profitable voyage but the valuable opium from the *Adele* was not sold in Canton, in order to avoid possible lawsuits in US courts. The opium was taken to Boston, and determined to be legitimate prize cargo, so it was then returned to Canton in a second voyage and then sold (Stelle 1940). Captain John Robbarts eventually settled in Pennsylvania, where he was believed to have been born in England, and to have served as an officer of the Royal Navy before deserting to join the American service. “John Robbarts” was thought not to be his real name (Davis et al. 1905:373).
21 Details are in *Bengal Civil Colonial Consultations* 61, 7 Oct. 1815, letters from D. Smith to W. Bloem, 25 Feb. and 24 Mar. 1815, and from Bloem to Java, 27 Feb. 1815. This information is summarized also by Wright (1961:287-288), though without naming Smith as the captain involved.
22 *JG* 3/127: 30 Jul 1814, says that Smith had departed from Batavia for Pontianak on 8 June, but he got no further than Semarang, and returned to Batavia on 13 Aug (*JG* 3/130: 20 Aug 1814). The dates of arrival in Penang were not found in *PG* because of the gap in the set consulted.
Dispute with the Sultan of Pontianak: Captain Smith on the *Eugenia*

Early in October 1814 Smith left Penang in command of the ship *Eugenia* for Calcutta (Table 1). There he encountered John Palmer, who showed him a letter from the Sultan of Pontianak that said that Smith should pay Palmer 5000 Spanish dollars that he (the Sultan) owed Palmer for purchase of opium. Palmer had reminded the Sultan of this debt in a letter written at the end of 1813 (Palmer, *Letterbooks* c83, 19 Dec. 1813: 249). Smith said that it was improper of him to pay Palmer because the Sultan had not authorized him to do so, but did when Palmer offered to refund the money if the Sultan would not reimburse Smith. Smith sailed from Bengal with his new cargo at the beginning of January 1815, arriving in Penang after a very fast passage of only nine or ten days. He was presented with the translation of a letter from the Sultan of Pontianak to the EIC authorities in Penang, in which he complained about Smith. They asked him to address the matter as soon as possible (SSR; Miscellaneous Letters Out; letter to Smith, 10 Jan 1815). He left almost immediately for Pontianak (PG 9/463: 14 Jan 1815, 9/464: 21 Jan 1815; *Bengal*, 7 Oct. 1815; letter from Smith, 25 Feb. 1815). According to Smith, the Sultan appeared satisfied with his explanations of what had transpired. At the Sultan’s request, Smith delivered to Capt. James Carnegy of the *Tay*, which was there at the time, goods worth 8950 Spanish dollars and four chests of opium worth 6000 Spanish dollars. The Sultan also said that he had sold some of Smith’s cargo to the Bugis traders at Pontianak for 20000 Spanish dollars, and asked Smith to deliver the goods; again Smith obliged. However, when Smith asked for payment for these transactions the Sultan held back the gold dust which the Bugis had provided. He “pretended all at once to be in a great rage and told me my statement was false,” alleging that Smith had received cash payment for the cargo sold in Java the previous year, and therefore had been using the Sultan’s money profitably in the subsequent mercantile activities in Penang and Bengal. Smith denied this and suggested that the Sultan’s agent in Batavia, Said Hussein, should be asked to check his explanation. The Sultan refused, as he did an offer of 3000 Spanish dollars and the interest from when the goods were sold in Java, even though Smith’s bankers in Bengal had yet to receive money for those goods. The Sultan also refused to refund the money Smith had paid Palmer and claimed that Smith owed him nearly 9000 Spanish dollars in addition to the merchandise that Smith had given him as payment for the profits. Smith was no doubt thoroughly alarmed, because in addition to his own financial woes the Sultan was detaining property of Dunbar & Scott worth 14000 Spanish dollars, so he asked Mr. Bloem, Raffles’s Deputy Resident at Pontianak, to resolve the problem. Failing that, he asked Bloem to lay the matter before the Government in Java (Bengal, 7 Oct. 1815; letter from Smith: 25 Feb. 1815). Bloem had been present during Smith’s encounters with the Sultan, but would not intervene. He explained in his letter to Java (27 Feb. 1815) that he was uncertain of his official status. Alexander Hare, the Resident at Banjarmasin, had told him not to hoist the British flag in Pontianak or exercise any authority as Resident. However, Bloem confirmed Smith’s account. He pointed out that a Bill of Exchange given to Smith for the opium sold in Java had not been accepted for payment when presented in Calcutta, but that Smith had brought merchandise which he had given to the Sultan. Smith had offered to guarantee that the Sultan would not be at risk if the Bill of Exchange was again not accepted.
However, the Sultan was indeed angry because Smith had not returned within the 25-30 days as expected, nor sent a letter of explanation, and the Sultan believed that Smith must have made use of his money.

The matter unresolved, Smith arrived in Batavia from Pontianak via Bangka on 16 March. He delivered Bloem’s letter, with his own as an enclosure, and asked that Raffles order Said Hussein to inspect the accounts kept by Smith’s agent, Mr. W. Graham. If Raffles would not intervene, Smith asked for the correspondence to be passed on to the Supreme EIC Government in Calcutta (Bengal, 7 Oct. 1815; letter from Smith to Assey, 24 Mar. 1815). Charles Assey, the Java Government Secretary, replied quickly, saying that “Raffles was desirous of avoiding all interference” and that the letters would be passed on to Bengal. Assey pointed out that Captain J. Portbury, also the Sultan’s agent in Batavia, could communicate with the Sultan as necessary (Bengal, 7 Oct. 1815; letter from Assey to Smith, 27 Mar. 1815). Smith and the Eugenia were based in Java for over two months, during which they went to Surabaya and Semarang, and then back to Batavia before departing on 20 May for Bangka with a cargo of rice. Captain Portbury was a passenger (JG 4/170: 27 May 1815). The correspondence was forwarded to the EIC Supreme Government in Calcutta, which in October 1815 decided not to get involved in the matter: it was of a “commercial nature” and “must of course be settled by the parties in the best manner practicable” (Bengal, 7 Oct. 1815).

The decision in Calcutta meant nothing to Daniel Smith, because he had died in June. The Eugenia had gone to Pontianak, where Smith had “felt the first symptoms of the Batavia fever and after 8 days died at Malacca.” The news would have been brought by the Eugenia, which, with William Skitter now in command, had departed from Malacca on 26 June and had run aground off Penang (PG New Series 1/7: 1 Jul 1816). The ship was refloated and later in 1815 went to Canton. After returning to Penang at the end of January 1816 the Eugenia was advertised for sale by order of Dunbar & Scott and Mr. A. Duff (Registrar), who were the “Executors of the late Capt. D. Smith” (PG New Series 1/38: 3 Feb 1816). Apparently, Smith had been sufficiently prosperous to have a strong financial interest in the ship.

**Conclusion**

The country traders in the East Indies were subject to hardships that included disease, warfare, shipwreck, changes in government policy as it applied to trade restrictions and commodity prices, dealings with their unscrupulous competitors and local indigenous rulers, and piratical attack. If the grounding of the Adele off Sumatra in September 1814 is counted as minor shipwreck, the only hardship on the list that Daniel Smith did not encounter at this time was piracy. In fact before the blockade on Sambas at the end of 1812 Carnegy & Co in Penang, one of Daniel Smith’s “principals,” maintained trade with Sambas, the state in West Borneo that was regarded by the EIC in the Indies as notorious for piracy. Pangeran Anom’s bad reputation was doubtless deserved, though he was rehabilitated (perhaps reluctantly) by the British in 1814 and very soon afterwards became Sultan of Sambas (Irwin 1955:31; Smith 2002, 2007).

Raffles’s unsympathetic responses to Smith’s trading predicaments first at Bangka in 1812 and then at Pontianak in 1814, are not unexpected, given Raffles’s wish
to regulate trade and strengthen the EIC’s interests against those of the unruly country traders. His decision not to intervene in Smith’s dispute with the Sultan of Pontianak should also be considered in the light of pressure from the EIC Supreme Government in Calcutta from the beginning of 1814 to cease his attempts to exert British control over West Borneo. Thus, Bloem was recalled from Pontianak in April 1815 (Irwin 1955:30-32).

As a frequent visitor to Pontianak, Daniel Smith was clearly on good terms with Sultan Kassim for several years, and why they eventually quarreled is not at all clear. There is no reason to disbelieve Smith’s account of the problems he experienced in getting solid currency (Spanish dollars) for the cargo that had been obtained in Pontianak after the encounter with the Jacob Jones. There was a major currency crisis in Java at the time (Wurtzburg 1954:297, 301), and had Smith sent a letter from Batavia in June 1814 explaining the problem, all might have been well when he returned to Pontianak eight months later. Also, the Sultan’s agent in Batavia could easily have checked Smith’s claim that the cargo had necessarily been sold on credit. Perhaps Sultan Kassim had become greedy, or had a financial crisis of his own, or perhaps someone had poisoned his mind against Smith. If this last possibility is the case, the obvious candidate is James Carnegy, who was at Pontianak with the Tay when Smith returned, and was certainly then a competitor of Smith and his associates Dunbar & Scott in Penang.23

The information gathered here illustrates the extensive nature of voyages in the country trade by Daniel Smith in the seven years until his death (see Table 1). Periods spent ashore in Penang, where these can be ascertained with confidence, ranged from only a few days to about six weeks. His longest period ashore was the six months or so under detention in Java. It is interesting too that the Prince of Wales Island Government Gazette, which usually paid little attention to the country traders, apart from recording arrivals, departures and catastrophes (e.g. shipwreck, attacks or capture), devoted a few lines to reporting Smith’s death. Not surprisingly, the sources examined here tell nothing about Smith’s private life, but when he died he left behind a son, Daniel, who was baptized in Penang nearly ten years later (Prince of Wales Island Baptisms, 20 Mar 1825). His date of birth was not recorded, nor was his mother’s name, presumably because she was non-European.

Appendix

The information that follows was picked up mainly while researching Daniel Smith and aspects of the history of West Borneo in the early 19th century. The aim is first to show the close working relationships within the small mercantile community in Penang at the time covered here, and second (and not surprisingly) that the hardships experienced by Smith were not unusual.

Captain Tait

Like Daniel Smith, Tait was a frequent visitor to West Borneo. He is the “James

23 Irrespective of this possibility, Carnegy and Co also had problems with the Sultan. They asked the EIC authorities in Penang to contact the Sultan with respect to a debt to them and received in return a letter from the Sultan via the EIC (SSR, Miscellaneous Letters Out; letter to Carnegy & Co, 24 April, 1815).
Tate,” later “James Tait” named in issues of the *East-India Register and Directory* from 1803 until 1815 as a European (non EIC) mariner resident first in Calcutta and then in Penang. Tait bore some responsibility for the attack on the Calcutta, a ship from Calcutta, off Selakau in July 1803. Sailing on the Clyde, Tait had arranged to sell opium to Pangeran Anom. Instead he sold it to Capt. Drysdale of the Calcutta, when they arrived together off Selakau, to the south of Sambas, where the opium was to be transferred. The Clyde quickly departed, and Drysdale sought a higher price for the opium. According to the Sultan of Sambas, this breach of the agreement was the cause of the attack on the Calcutta and the death of Capt. Drysdale and most of the crew. Wright (1961:272-273) summarizes the episode from EIC sources but without naming Tait. His identity is given in the original sources that include testimony by John Burgh, the only surviving officer of the Calcutta, who was detained at Selakau until January 1804 (*Bengal Secret and Political Consultations* 146/164: 6 Sept. 1804). Much more detail is given in a rare book based on Burgh’s account (Richardson, not dated but probably 1805).

Tait went on to command the Marianne (sometimes called Marian), first owned by Lambert, Scott & Co of Calcutta and then by himself (entries in *East-India Registry and Directory*). In May 1805 he arrived in Calcutta after returning via Penang from a voyage to the east (CG 43/1109: 30 May 1805). In 1806 he voyaged to China and again passed through Penang on his way to Calcutta, where he arrived early in January 1807 (PG 1/42: 13 Dec 1806; PG 1/43: 20 Jan 1807; CG 45/1194 Supplement: 5 Jan 1807). He returned from Calcutta to Penang in February 1807 as a passenger on the Swallow, owned by Forbes & Scott and then commanded by Capt. Robert Scott (PG 1/52: 21 Feb 1807). Tait based himself in Penang and took over command of the Swallow, which he handed over to Capt. Samuel Stewart. In the first half of 1809, he again commanded the Clyde (several references in PG). In July 1809 the Clyde and two American vessels, the Augustus and Glory, were captured in Tulu roads, East Sumatra, by a French privateer. The French kept the Clyde but sold the American vessels to the Sultan of Aceh. They were purchased in an arrangement made by Stewart, who was either traveling with Tait or already in Sumatra. Tait returned to Penang on the Augustus and Stewart on the Glory (PG 4/178 “Extraordinary”: 24 Jul 1809). The American vessels were quickly sold in Penang on the account of the (unnamed) underwriters, because it was impossible “from various circumstances” for the ships to proceed with the original voyage (PG 4/182: 19 Aug 1809). The Augustus did not reappear in the Gazette, and may have been renamed. Tait commanded the Glory on a short voyage to the eastward, returning from Malacca in mid-September (PG 4/186: 16 Sept 1809). Thereafter the Glory also disappeared from the shipping news in the Gazette. Tait took command of the Thainstone, not previously mentioned in the Gazette and hence possibly the renamed Augustus or Glory.24 He first voyaged to the east and then at the end of the year once more to Calcutta. When returning to Penang in January-February 1810 he was chased by a privateer but escaped (PG 4/207: 17 Feb 1810). Whilst at Bangka in June 1810 he was attacked by pirates, and the ship’s boat was captured and although retaken, its ten-man crew was killed (PG 6[sic]/227: 30 Jun 1810; see also Sophia Raffles 1830:79). During this voyage Tait called

---

24 Thainstone in Aberdeenshire, Scotland, lies in traditional Forbes family lands.
at Pontianak, and reported to Penang that trade there was depressed due to the arrival of the *Ceres*, a large ship from Calcutta that occasionally passed through Penang (*PG* 6/227 and other references in *PG*). Tait and the *Thainstone* traveled to the eastward again in September-November 1810 and the ship was struck by lightning in the Pontianak river (*PG* 5/248: 24 Nov 1810). At the end of the year Tait and the *Thainstone* went to Calcutta for opium, carrying correspondence from Raffles in Malacca to Lord Minto (*Raffles Collection* C35/1).

After returning to Penang in January 1811, Tait visited Pontianak again in February. He took back to Malacca letters to Raffles from the Sultans of Sambas and Pontianak, who were vying for British support, and from Joseph Burn.25 After more voyages to Malacca, Bangka and the eastward, Tait returned to Penang early in September (*PG* 6/265: 23 Mar 1811, 6/266: 30 Mar 1811, 6/272: 11 May 1811, 6/289: 7 Sept 1811). Thereafter, command of the *Thainstone* was taken over by William Scott of Penang (several references in *PG* 1811-1813). “Mr Tait” (presumably James) departed from Penang bound for Europe at the end of December 1811, as was reported “with a degree of concern” (*PG* 6/304: 28 Dec 1811).26

**Captain Stewart**

Raffles told Lord Minto that Stewart and Robert Scott were “two of the best informed and most respectable of our Eastern traders in the Malay seas” (Raffles to Minto, 22 May 1811; cited by Wurtzburg 1954:141). Samuel Stewart was named as a resident mariner in Penang in issues of the *East-India Registry and Directory* from 1805 to 1812, and later as a settler. He was possibly involved in the aftermath of the *Calcutta* affair in 1803. Some of the survivors swam ashore and local Chinese took them to Pontianak, where they were picked up by the *Pomona*, commanded by “Capt. Stewart” (*Bengal* 146/165). However, this may not have been Samuel Stewart, as there were other captains called Stewart in the East Indies at the time. He was not mentioned in the *Prince of Wales Island Government Gazette* until September 1808. By that time he had taken over command of Forbes & Scott’s *Swallow* from Tait, and returned to Penang from a voyage to Pedir, Sumatra (*PG* 3/132: 3 Sept 1808). The ship, with the Penang merchant John Dunbar on board, was captured on another voyage by the French privateer *Revenant* (also named as *Ravenant*) in October-November 1808 and taken to Mauritius (*PG* 3/145: 3 Dec 1808). The release of Stewart and Dunbar was not reported in the *Gazette*, but Stewart arrived in Penang from Calcutta as captain of the *Clyde* at the end of January 1809, with Dunbar as a passenger. Stewart handed command over to Tait (*PG* 3/153: 28 Jan 1809).27 Later in 1809 Stewart took over command of the *Olivia*, a newcomer to the shipping news in the *Gazette*, presumably named after Olivia Raffles, and another candidate for a renamed *Augustus* or *Gloria*. Stewart took the *Olivia* from Penang via Malacca to Macao, where he was threatened by pirates (“Ladrones”) (*PG* 4/196: 25 Nov 1809; 4/198: 16 Dec 1809; 5/212: 17 Mar 1810). Stewart seems then to

---

25 Extensive extracts from Burn’s letters from Pontianak are given by Reece and Smith (2006).
26 Tait returned to his birthplace in the Scottish border country, and died near Kelso in 1847. Scott settled in Java, where he died in 1846.
27 The *Swallow* was recaptured by the British (*PG* 1809, 4(179)).
have retired from seafaring, judging by his absence from the shipping news from both Penang and Java, and he died in 1821. His sons Frederick and Connolly were baptized on the same day that Daniel Smith’s son was baptized; again, no mother was named (Prince of Wales Island Baptisms, 20 Mar 1825).
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I first met Zaini Ahmad in Kuala Lumpur in 1985 when he was in charge of the hostel for Sabah students in Jalan Ampang while working for PERKIM, the Muslim Welfare Association of Malaysia. As executive secretary of Partai Ra’ayat Brunei (PRB), he had been in Manila en route to New York to present a joint memorandum to the United Nations on behalf of the three Borneo territories’ major political parties when the Brunei Rebellion erupted on 8 December 1962. The memorandum suggested that in place of the Malaysia proposal there should be a Borneo Federation with Sultan Sir Omar Ali Saifuddin as its Head of State, but all this was overtaken by events. Detained by the British authorities in Hong Kong, where he had sought asylum, he was returned to Brunei in early 1963 and subsequently spent more than ten years at Jerudong prison camp. Efforts by the Commonwealth Relations Office in London, Amnesty International and the United Nations Committee on Human Rights to have him released were made in vain. He was subsequently reported in 1966 to have offered to renounce his Brunei citizenship if he was allowed to go into exile and to have been offered political asylum in Malaysia in 1968, but the Brunei authorities did not respond.

On 12 July 1973 (which happened to be Sultan Sir Omar Ali Saifuddin’s birthday), Zaini, Secretary-General Jasin Affandy and six other senior PRB detainees escaped by sea to nearby Limbang in Sarawak in an operation orchestrated by PRB leader A.M. Azahari’s brother, Sheikh Saleh Sheikh Mahmud, and his nephew. Reportedly, the “springing” had covert support from the Malaysian government in the person of Tan Sri Ghazali Shafie who was then Minister for Foreign Affairs. At this point the Malaysian government, still irked by the Sultan’s refusal to join the new Federation in 1963 and by the treatment of some of its senior civil servants who had been seconded to Brunei, was committed to supporting free elections in Brunei. The freeing of Zaini and the others was probably intended as a warning to the Sultan to be more liberal or bear the consequences.

Safely established in Kuala Lumpur, Zaini was by no means content with his status in Malaysia. As a political refugee, he could not obtain a Malaysian passport and was consequently unable to travel freely outside the country. However, he played an active part together with Azahari in the re-grouping of the PRB in exile in Kuala Lumpur in May 1974 and its subsequent efforts (vigorously assisted by the Malaysian government) to mount sufficient international pressure through Commonwealth and Middle Eastern leaders as well as the United Nations to force elections in Brunei. Indeed,
in 1975 the Malaysian government went so far as to sponsor a PRB delegation to present
the case for Brunei’s independence to the UN Committee on Decolonization. In addition
to his diplomatic efforts, Zaini published a number of books, including a collection of
documents on the history of the PRB, to publicize its cause. He also completed an M.A.
thesis on nationalism in Brunei at Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia which was published

Relations between Kuala Lumpur and Brunei deteriorated rapidly as a result
of this pressure, with Sir Omar Ali (who had abdicated in his eldest son’s favor in 1967
but was still highly influential) expressing renewed interest in regaining control of the
Limbang territory which had been ceded to Rajah Charles Brooke of Sarawak in 1890.
Sarawak’s Chief Minister, Datuk Abdul Rahman bin Ya’akub, subsequently led anti-
Brunei demonstrations. In the tit-for-tat exchange, Brunei withdrew all its students
from Malaysian educational institutions and banned Sarawak government vehicles from
passing through its territory. While the subsequent revival of the PRB in Limbang was
countenanced by the Malaysian authorities, there were also petitions and demonstrations
there which favored the return of Brunei rule.

When the revived PRB’s campaign had come to nothing after ten years of
effort, and relations between Kuala Lumpur and Brunei had warmed, particularly after
it achieved independence in 1984 and joined ASEAN, Zaini decided to return to Brunei
where he believed he had something to offer. He wanted an official assurance that he
would not once again be placed in detention, but his letters to the Brunei authorities
expressing his desire to return were never answered. In the meantime, he was anxious to
complete a higher degree in international relations in Australia or the United Kingdom
and I endeavored to assist him in this through my contacts at the Australian National
University and the London School of Economics (LSE), where Dr. Michael Leifer
arranged a six-month unpaid fellowship (which was not taken up). It was no doubt
Zaini’s intention to obtain a further qualification as a means of obtaining a senior post in
Brunei’s newly-created Ministry of Foreign Affairs, where his long political experience
and intellectual sophistication could have been put to extremely good use. However, as
long as the former sultan, Sir Omar Ali Saifuddin, was alive, there was little chance of
that happening. Sir Omar (better known as the Seri Begawan), as can be seen from the
interview below, seems never to have forgiven Zaini for his political involvement which
he saw as a personal betrayal as well as a threat to the security of the kingdom. When
Sir Omar died in September 1986, Zaini no doubt believed that the main obstacle to his
return had been removed.

Thwarted in his ambition to complete a doctoral degree overseas, Zaini enrolled
instead in 1988 at the University of Malaya where he was supervised by Professor Khoo
Kay Kim for a dissertation on the history of the PRB. On 1 April 1993, when it seemed
that there would never be any assurance from the authorities that he would not be further
punished, Zaini took a big chance and returned to Brunei. He was promptly placed in
detention once again - this time for more than two years. Released on 19 July 1995 after
being pardoned by Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah, he suffered a stroke in December 1997
which caused him to lose the use of his left side for some time. After his recovery, he
was given employment in the Pusat Sejarah, the History Centre established and run by
Pehin Dr. Jamil, Brunei’s official historian, in order to prepare his doctoral thesis for publication. He now lives in quiet retirement in Bandar Seri Begawan with his eldest son and family, receiving physiotherapy for his ailment and attending to his responsibilities as a devout Muslim. When I last saw him in July 2008 he was physically frail but in good spirits and had lost none of the remarkable mental acuteness that I remembered so well. He presented me with a copy of his revised doctoral thesis which he had published in Brunei in 2003, *Brunei Merdeka: sejarah dan budaya politik*. This had apparently been approved by Brunei’s Special Branch, which continues to pay him a modest pension.

If we can think “counter-factually” for a moment and consider what might have happened if the December 1962 Brunei rebellion had been successful and PRB had become the dominant political force in Brunei, there is no doubt that Zaini would have played a major part in shaping the destiny not just of Brunei but of Sabah and Sarawak. The intriguing question is whether he and his supporters would have been able to counter the strongly pro-Indonesia stance adopted by Azahari and his followers. Zaini’s British-educated and democratic-constitutionalist background contrasted starkly with Azahari’s pro-Indonesian and militant revolutionary approach. One of the great ironies of British policy in the post-war period is that the idea of a Borneo Federation, so vigorously promoted by Britain’s Special Commissioner to Southeast Asia, Malcolm MacDonald, took root within the three Borneo territories’ emerging elite and caused many of them to resist the more ambitious concept of Malaysia as something entirely premature. They wanted independence in their own right before considering any broader arrangement. When incorporation in Malaysia was presented to them as the condition of British protection against Sukarno’s (real or imagined) expansionism, they were thrown into turmoil. Another irony is that Brunei, which was the first of the Borneo territories to experience a political awakening from the mid-1940s in the form of the Barisan Pemuda Brunei and the PRB, has subsequently experienced an extended period of political stultification. It is difficult to imagine the hundred or more rebels killed in December 1962 ever being accorded hero status. Although they did not succeed in winning independence for Brunei, they did help prevent its incorporation into Malaysia and, after all, this was something that had been strongly opposed by most Brunei Malays.

Interviewed more recently by Greg Poulgrain (1998) and Harun Abdul Majid (2002), Zaini’s account of the origins of PRB and his relations with Azahari have been dealt with (although by no means thoroughly) in their published works. His own most recent book has also documented the story. In the process, however, his early life and experience, together with the major influences on his thinking, have been largely ignored. Through his education in Brunei, Sarawak, Malaya and Singapore, and subsequently his work with the Partai Ra’yat, he met and knew an astonishing number of people who were to become significant political figures in both Malaya and Borneo.

Edited only to remove repetition and without altering the occasionally fractured chronology, the following account constitutes a unique narrative of the family background, political awakening and early political career of one of northern Borneo’s first Malay nationalist political leaders of the post-WWII era. There is a dearth of political biography and autobiography for both Malaysian Borneo and Brunei, and Zaini’s personal testimony is a valuable building block in our understanding of the origins of formal political life.
in the region. More specifically, it provides some useful insights into the origins of the Brunei Rebellion. At the same time, like any other piece of oral testimony, it needs to be read critically and with an eye to what has already been documented for the period in question.

Q. Do you have any early memories of what it meant to be a Brunei Malay? Was there a special sense of Brunei identity?

A. In fact, in my earliest years of involvement in politics I never thought of myself as a Brunei Malay. I always thought of myself as a Malay nationalist. I never identified myself with Brunei. I always looked [on myself] in a broader sense as a Malay nationalist. For me, all the political boundaries of Sarawak, Sabah do not exist. I mean, there are boundaries imposed on us by the colonial power. This is what I thought myself and still [do] today. Of course I am proud to be called a Brunei Malay because I was born there, especially now because for us the Brunei Malays would never think of federating again with Sarawak and Sabah. So we have only to look for our own interests as Brunei Malays, that territory of Brunei. Every one of us I think is quite proud to be identified with this new political entity. I must emphasize here before the formation of Malaysia every one of us thought in terms of somebody from that part of the world – north Borneo. We never thought [of ourselves] as Sarawakians, Bruneians, Sabahans. But once the issue of Malaysia . . . What we have to be concerned with ourselves from now on is to be only interested in Brunei politics and Brunei’s future and to identify ourselves with that new concept of national identity. And I think that everybody should be proud of this new identity, this Brunei identity.

Q. There was a Borneo identity before Malaysia?

A. There was a very strong one, actually. But when everybody realized that Malaysia was already a fait accompli, nothing could be done about it. Nobody dares to challenge that now, especially as Malaysia has been in existence for twenty-two years.

Q. What were the values instilled in you in your early upbringing?

A. I was born to a Muslim family and of course my mother was quite religious although my father [Hj. Ahmad bin Daud] was not very [religious] until his late age. So I was in between those two individuals, but very much influenced by my mother. But the values of Islam were not really put into practice in our society then, so I was very much detached from Islam itself. I don’t mind admitting that I was not very religious at my early stage. My mother always wanted me to become a good Muslim but because of the society then I was very detached from Islam. I can give you one or two examples. I never said my daily prayers before I was eighteen. So from the age of ten until I was eighteen I rarely said my prayers. I hardly fasted during Ramadan and of course I never performed the Haj. And also I was very much involved in the young life – going to all those places, drinking and so on. But after I was detained things changed. I really detached myself from all these evil things. In fact at one stage one member of my family went to see my mother – this was during the detention period – and asked her to see the Sultan and ask
for my pardon on my behalf. She really refused to go to the Palace and she never set foot in the Palace except once when my father took her to Mecca, just to pay respect to the Sultan. That was the first and the last time she ever went to the Palace. In fact, she said she was very happy that I was detained because that had changed my life. She was very grateful to God for having punished me. This was related to me by a sister of my mother, actually. Of course she never told me. So in my early life I had very little knowledge of moral values, about Islamic values. I never read the Koran until I was detained. So my upbringing as a Suni Muslim in my early stages was very disappointing. I think that I agree with my mother. I didn’t regret that I was detained because that changed my life from a very wild individual to something which I am proud of now. I was influenced to a certain extent by Malay culture and I was very active in the promotion of Malay culture in Brunei. I was involved with the Barisan Pemuda Brunei. Before the formation of the Partai Ra’ayat I used to write in a Malay newspaper published in Singapore, *Malaya Raya*, edited by Harun Amin Al-Rashid who is very old now. This newspaper was supposed to represent the Malay nationalist movement. I was very much encouraged by Harun Amin Al-Rashid to write on whatever I wished, including how we see Malay culture as a unifying factor in the wider nationalist movement in Brunei. As for other values – I value a sense of individualism, freedom. I was very much an individualist myself. I was never really under the control either of my father or my mother. I was very much a rebel in the family. But I was the only child in the family. I had no brothers and no sisters. And so both my father and my mother loved me very much. And because I realized that both of them loved me very much, I became rebellious, kept demanding – I think this is very typical of a Malay society. If there is only one in the family, both mother and father look upon that son or daughter as something they have to value. In other words, I can say that both of them spoiled me in my early life.

Q. Did you have a closely-knit family?

A. My mother came from a family which was from the ruling class of Brunei even during the pre-colonial time: a family of *pehin*, commoners who have been appointed by the sultan to be something like lords in England. I am very proud of this conservative status of my mother. But my father’s grandfather was an Indian Muslim who came over here from India to settle down in north Borneo – Labuan. He came to Borneo as a trader and my father was born in Brunei, so was my grandfather. Because my mother came from the aristocracy in Brunei, I understand that my father was treated at some time, in the early stages, as an outcast, somebody who came from outside. It was not normal for a lady from this aristocratic group to marry someone from outside the aristocratic class in Brunei. Somehow or other my father managed to get along with her family, joined the civil service, and became accepted as one of them. I remember my mother used to tell me that I should be proud of her blood rather than my father’s because her family came from very high society in Brunei. My father was the Shahbandar – one of the first four *pehin* in the hierarchy of Malay society in Brunei. At the top you have the Sultan, then you have the four *wazir*, and then you have the *ceteriah*. But these are only reserved for the royal family or people with royal blood. Immediately after that you have the *pehin*, the first four *pehin*, then the eight, then the sixteen, then the thirty-two. My father was right at
the top, one of the four. These are the Pehin Orang Kaya Di-Gadong, Pehin Orang Kaya Laksamana, Pehin Jawatan Dalam and then my father. So whenever there was a royal event he was always at the Palace. In fact, he was one of the traditional advisers who went with the Sultan to England and had constitutional talks with the British government. My father was very close with the old Sultan, Sir Omar Ali. Even up to his death he was never really regarded as someone who had committed something against the state. The Begawan was quite straightforward with me and said whatever I did had nothing to do with my father. But of course my father felt very badly to find his only son on the other side of the border. But I believe he died a peaceful man.

Q. Do you think that in your childhood you were brought up with the idea that Brunei traditionally controlled the coast of northern Borneo? Was there a very strong established feeling that this was Brunei’s area of influence?

A. My mother used to say this. My grandfather, that is my mother’s father, was always in trading circles. There were three brothers. One of them went to Sambas, Banjarmasin and got married there – his name is Daud. Another went to Sabah. And my grandfather remained in Brunei. So I remember my mother used to say [that] these places at one time belonged to Brunei. And that’s why I find my grandfather’s [brothers], one in Sabah, one in Banjarmasin married to a Banjarese woman where they had two children, one boy and one girl. One is still living, my uncle. And one went to Sabah and settled down and married a local Dusun [woman]. In fact, I have second cousins in Sabah and second cousins in Banjarmasin also. My mother always felt proud of this social background that she had and wanted to see that I inherited that feeling. She always said that I belonged to the awangan and that I should be proud of that. And at one time I was really influenced by her. I remember when my father was conferred with the title of Pehin Orang Kaya Shahbandar I felt very inflated about it. Because of that my relationship with Begawan was very close. I would say that Sir Omar Ali Saifuddin always thought I was one of those who was going to inherit something from his father, to be one of his supporters, to be one of his men in the Palace. I remember when I went to England in 1959 I went to see him at the Palace and he asked me what I wanted to be. I said I would like to take up law. He said “That’s good. I want you to come back and serve me.” And then he gave me $2,000. Then suddenly I realized that this man, the Sultan, really liked me very much. And when I went to the UK he asked me to stay at his palace in Kingsford Manor. And I stayed there with the ex-Resident, Mr. [Eric] Pretty, who didn’t really welcome me because he thought that it was his castle. And then you find here a Brunei Malay, although the son of somebody, but then a Brunei Malay, staying with an English family. And there was some sort of confrontation going on between me and Mrs. Pretty. Eric Pretty was a little bit fussy, but I stayed there and really felt like a big shot with all the Portuguese amahs. We had about six [servants], two drivers, and here was an ex-British Resident staying with me under the same roof. That really changed my life a little bit. I lived like a lord. I bought a car. I was the first Brunei student to own a car in London – a small Ford Anglia. And the Sultan gave me £100 to purchase that car. The car was about £400 but he gave me £100. And whenever he visited England in those days, of course with my father, he used to call me, give me some extra money. I really felt that up to the
Brunei revolt he was very much putting a hope in me to come back and serve with the government. I think also this could be one of the personal reasons why he felt very bad about my involvement with the Brunei rebellion. And so much so [that] he really wanted me to repent, like some sort of father punishing a son who was doing a lot of evil things in the family.

Q. In a sense it was a special punishment that he gave you.

A. That’s right. That’s what I feel. Because I don’t see any reason why he should be having this attitude towards me up to this moment, apart from this personal thing. I mean, [as] for security reasons, I was very much for Brunei always. Even the former head of Special Branch, Peter [Pehin G.E.] Coster, told me. He had cleared me very honestly and recommended my release not only one [sic] but several times. And I believe that because even after Peter left Brunei I checked with his successor, Dato [Paduka Awang Hj.] Ismail. He knew my case very well. He feels I should be allowed to go back to Brunei.

Q. But you believe it was the Seri Begawan who kept you there in spite of these clearances?

A. Yes, exactly. Actually, what he wants me to do is to write him a letter (this is what I feel) and ask for forgiveness, not pardon, forgiveness for my involvement. And I think if I do that, I believe he will … I mean, he’s very old now and I think he wants to see me back in Brunei. But as a son coming back to the family, discredited as a politician. You see, he really didn’t want me to take up politics from the earliest stages. He always objected to that. I remember when I left the service, when I first got back from England, [after] my study at the London School of Economics, he straight away called me to the Palace and asked me to take a job, any head of department. I still remember he was asking if I wanted to become head of the Welfare Dept., whether I would like to work in the Secretariat - or any department. I didn’t have to go [for] an interview, the normal thing to do. So when I told my father, he suggested I should ask for the State Welfare Officer. He said it was a good job, handling poor people, and very easy to have access to the Sultan because the Sultan really wanted to do something for the people, for the poor people. When I decided to take up the job in the Labour Dept. my father was shocked. He said “that’s a place you shouldn’t go, a trouble spot, you know.” And then when I decided to resign to take up politics back in 1956 I still remember the Sultan was having his dental check-up here in Kuala Lumpur. And he went to Singapore and I met him at Francis Garnier Hotel, Orchard Road. I said to him: “Well, Your Highness, I’m quitting. I’m giving 24 hours and I want to take up politics.” He was shocked: “Is that your final decision?” I said: “I’m afraid so.” “Well,” he said, “you can go.” After that I seldom saw him but there were occasions when he sent his ADC, his nephew, Brigadier [Pengiran Muda Hj.] Ismail, to come to the house and ask me to go to the Palace and play chess with him. And he used to tell me about his hobbies, hoarding krises. He used to call me in also when I was with Partai Ra’ayat but never talked politics. I think that what he wanted was maybe to ask me to resign from politics and come back to his fold.
Q. Tell me about your early education.

A. In the early stages I went to a Catholic school in Brunei Town. That was in 1947. First, of course, I went to Malay school in Temburong where my father was District Officer. Then when he was transferred back to Brunei in early 1947 and became Superintendent of Customs, I joined the English school. There was no government school in Brunei until 1951, so I joined the R.C. school. My mother objected to this because [she believed] I could easily become a Christian, but my father said: “No, don’t be foolish about it. Although it is a mission school, they don’t teach catechism to Muslims.” Which was true. I was allowed to stay in that school until 1948, then my father was transferred to Kuala Belait and became District Officer there. Then I went to another R.C. school in Kuala Belait until 1959, then my father sent me to study in Penang with three sons of the wazir – Pn. Kamshuddin, Pn. Ja’afar, Pn. Hassim. These three were brothers, sons of Orang Kaya Pemancha, the second wazir, and another three sons of the private secretary to the Sultan, Datu Ibrahim Ja’afar, Pehin Isa (General Adviser now to the Sultan), his elder brother Annuar and another elder brother, Idin, and also the son of the Orang Kaya di-Gadong, Awang Hussain, who is now Pehin Hussain, Director-General of the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports in Brunei. Of course all these people are at the top now. I am the only one still at the bottom. I don’t know whether I am going up or down. I am not complaining about that. Somehow this first group of students, [were] all of us from the aristocracy, the wazir and the pehin, because our parents could afford to send us to Penang to study. There was no English in Brunei so we went to this school, the Stafford School, and I studied there up to 1950. Every year, towards the end of the year, we came back to Brunei. You remember the Emergency was declared in June 1948 and I went there in 1949, so it was at the height of the Emergency. It was quite dangerous for young people to travel by train from Penang to Kuala Lumpur right up to Singapore. And then from Singapore we used to take a slow boat to Brunei. We stopped in Miri or Labuan. While we were on our way home in December 1950 we stopped in Singapore and suddenly there was this [Maria] Hertogh riot and I physically witnessed this event. I think that this was the beginning of a new era in my life because that was the first time I saw political confrontation between the colonial people and the colonial power. I didn’t take part but I followed the events because there was a curfew. This was the first time I saw real [political] positions in practice.

Q. Did you see it as a Malay nationalist phenomenon?

A. Yes. It created an impression in my mind. Why do people go to the extent of killing each other just for a cause, for something? Of course the issue was religion, but it had some impact on me also. Although I saw Islam very lightly, but when I saw how this thing came up and flared into something violent, it created an impression on me as a Malayan nationalist and also as a Muslim later on. Then after the curfew we were allowed to come back. And then of course when January came my mother protested that I should not be sent back to Penang because of this happening in Singapore and also because of the Communist uprising. It became so violent that my mother said: “No, because Zaini is our only son. I don’t want him to go.” So my father decided to send me to St. Joseph’s School in Kuching. So I studied there and at the end of 1951 I went back
to Singapore and stayed there. So I spent just only one year in Kuching. That’s when I made acquaintances with Tun [Abdul] Rahman [bin Ya’kub], Abang Ahmad Urai and all these leaders now. In fact, Ahmad Urai was my schoolmate: we were in the same class. When I went to Singapore I went to Beatty Secondary School, a government school, and stayed there up to my [Senior] Cambridge in 1954. I came back to Brunei in 1955 and I decided to work. The first time I worked with the government as a clerk. In those days they had two types of clerk. One is Malay, one is English. So I was an English clerk. I worked with the Immigration Dept. which was still under the Police Dept. So I was directly under the Immigration Officer who was also the head of the Special Branch, Mr. Baker. He was trying to recruit me to become his informer, actually. He liked me very much. I worked there as a clerk and I was attached to the Immigration Dept., handling passports, issuing British passports and so on. Then it was in that year, 1955, while I was still a clerk, when Azahari approached me. He approached me as to whether I would like to join forces with him and form a political party. Before that I used to attend his meetings. As soon as he came back to Brunei in 1951 he used to have discussions with people in his house. There was a crowd of people going to his house every night. He was something like the new messiah, [a] prophet. I remember [when] I was still a student, I used to go to the house and listen to the talks he used to give. All the while he was telling us about his bitter experience in the Indonesian revolution, his involvement with the TNE, fighting against the Dutch. He was very proud of it. Azahari, as you know, is an orator, he could convince you, easily, sway you to his way of thinking. And I thought at that moment he was really someone who would do something for Brunei and I was very much attracted by that. And most probably he noticed that during these talks, maybe he noticed that I was interested. So he approached me. We wanted to form the first political party in Brunei – January 1955. But then the colonial authorities heard rumors about this. Suddenly they ransacked his house. We met and decided to form one and we asked Azahari to draft the constitution. Azahari is a genius, you know. He really can do things very fast. Within two weeks he came with a constitution. We hadn’t decided on a name but there was a draft of the constitution of the proposed party. But in between the police took action. They went to his house, ransacked the whole house, and they found the constitution of the party and took it. So when they took it a few of us decided that we should wait for awhile because we didn’t want to be arrested for nothing. So Azahari was not very happy about it. Anyway, because the majority of us decided not to proceed with it he stayed alone for awhile and then about October he went to Singapore and Malaya and attended a Malay congress sponsored by Dato Onn bin Ja’afar, Baharuddin, Ahmad Boestamam, those people. He attended the conference at Kampong Bahru, in the Selamat Club. After that he also attended UMNO’s general assembly and then when he came back he called us and said he had already made an arrangement with people from Malaya – Ishak Hj. Mohd, Boestamam – [that] we should form a branch of the People’s Party in Brunei. That was about November 1955. So we agreed. After all, we had always wanted to form a party. And we held a meeting in early January in H.M. Saleh’s [Saleh bin Masri’s] house … and there we decided we should form this party and we submitted for registration. But this was objected to by the police; they said we would not be able to affiliate with any organization outside Brunei. So there was a tug of war between us and
the police and the British Resident. But finally we met again as and decided: “Alright, if
the police will not allow us to form a branch of the Partai Ra’ayat, we would be happy
to have a Partai Ra’ayat with branches in Sarawak and Sabah and in Brunei.” Even that
was not agreed upon. Somehow D.C. White (he was the British Resident), came into
the picture and suggested: “Why not just register for Brunei, forget about Sabah and
Sarawak?” The registration was approved eight months later, that was August.

Coming back to education, after Beatty Secondary School I came back and
worked in the Immigration Dept. Then when we decided to form the party, I was still a
civil servant. I remember my boss, Mr. Baker, after attending the first meeting in January
1955 he called the next morning when I reported for duty and said: “Where did you go last
night?” I said: “I went to Brunei.” He said: “Where else? I know you attended a meeting
somewhere.” You see, they always had their people. He was trying to get information
from me and at the same time threatening me with dismissal and so on. Most probably
he got something from me [about] what took place. I told him we had this meeting and
decided to form the party. When the party appointed me as the first political organizing
secretary, I resigned from the civil service and took up politics seriously. That’s when I
saw the Sultan in Singapore. Between late 1955 and 1957 I was very much involved in the
position of [organizing secretary of] the Partai Ra’ayat, forming branches, representing
the party abroad, attending conferences, organizing the party within the country, going
to Sabah and Sarawak to try to get support, especially after the concept of Malaysia was
announced. After we sent our Merdeka delegation to London [in September 1957], I
came back to Brunei and then I decided that I had to equip myself with higher education
and legal education. I wrote back to our legal adviser, Walter Raeburn, Q.C., who drafted
our memorandum. Through his influence I managed to enroll myself as a law student at
the Middle Temple in 1958.

Q. How were you supporting yourself in those days?

A. My father and also, as I said, the Sultan. He allowed me to stay in the Manor. So I
went back to London and enrolled as a student. But somehow I couldn’t get politics out
of my mind. I was very active with the Malay Society at Malaya Hall, as with the Malay
Forum which was the most extreme group among the Malayan students there. I think
the President was Mr. Lee San . . . , Lee Kuan Yew’s brother, a doctor. So I was involved
with these two organizations. One was a Malay group, the Malaya Society, and the other
was the Malaya Forum. And there was another group who were more extreme - that is
Wan Hamid, John Eber, these are the people who were involved with the Malayan Union
before, Democratic Union. I mixed with these people most of the time. Then I met that
character Wan Hamid. He was Deputy State Secretary in Johore. He went to LSE and
when he was a student there on [a] state scholarship he went to attend a youth congress
organized by the Youth Democratic Union, which was a Moscow-organized group. So
because he went right up to Peking, when he came back to London his scholarship was
cancelled. He was very much a frustrated young man. And I was very much associated
with Wan Hamid and from him I learnt Left politics. So he told me: “Why do you take up
law? Even Gandhi, he became a lawyer and finally they sent him to jail.” So I was very
much influenced by Wan Hamid and also John Eber and Ian Page who was an Executive
Committee member of the Labour Party (married to Gladys Lim). My involvement with the Malaya Society was just as a member, with the Malaya Forum as a friend of Lee, but I was very taken with these people who were associated with the colonial freedom movement – Lord Fenner Brockway. That is why I became close to Fenner. That’s why today I am still in communication with him and he is really helping us in Parliament. I didn’t give up law, but Hamid said: “You’d better go to LSE, that’s your place.” But it was quite hard to get into LSE, so I enrolled for a diploma in trade union studies. That gave me some background because I was involved in the labor movement in Brunei. I was under Professor Ben Roberts and while a student I was mixing with these Latin American people and somehow or other I was asked to become President of the Labour Society of the LSE. That’s the time when I really did both jobs – study and involvement in politics. So whenever the Colonial Freedom Group organized demonstrations in London … I was involved, especially in Hyde Park politics. After that I came back to Brunei and joined the civil service again – that was the time when I was asked by the Sultan to pick any department I wished because I was the first Brunei Malay student to have gone to England and got something. Even my cousin, Pehin Isa, who is now the General Secretary, was in his final year doing law at Southampton College. I was attached first to the Secretariat with the Deputy Mentri Besar and the Economic Planning Unit. Later on they put me into the Labour Dept. So within the year I worked in three departments and while I was in the Secretariat I was asked to be a member of the Brunei delegation attending the 17th conference of ECAFE. I was supposed to be secretary to the head of the delegation and also his interpreter because the Mentri Besar … didn’t speak English. So that was the first time I found experience in attending international conferences. In fact I really dominated the delegation because whenever he told me to translate, I put in some of my ideas … . This exposure created something in my mind. I thought that we had to do something about Brunei. We had to fight for our independence seriously. We couldn’t always remain under the tutelage of Great Britain. So I worked for only one year in the government and then the election was to be held – August 1961. But that election was never held – it was delayed for another year to August 1962. And during that one year I was involved in the formation of the party again, representing the party abroad, much more mature in my political approach. In fact I was no longer a yes-man to Azahari. I began to show myself, not only disagreeing with what he said but representing a dissenting group in the Parti Ra’ayat. I remember during a meeting of the Executive Party Committee about what we were going to put in our memorandum to the Colonial Office, especially about languages. Now Azahari wanted to have multilingualism introduced into Brunei, with Malay, English and Chinese. I objected very strongly. I said: “Why should we? We are Malay, and Malay should be the official and also the national language.” Then we came to loggerheads. Azahari is a very tactful man. He became so submissive and said: “Yes, OK.” But there was another member of the Executive Committee who was very pro-Azahari and he came to the front [of the meeting] and confronted me. During this confrontation in the party the feeling was more or less there for Malay language only. And then somehow Azahari put the thing to the vote and I won. And then Azahari suspended that man from the party for being too critical on this issue, suspended him from the Executive Committee of the party rather than me. So
that was the time I realized Azahari respected my view. And all along, up to the revolt, I became more and more independent and began to cause a worry in Azahari’s mind. But he couldn’t just get rid of me - he needed me because of my social background. I was supposed to represent the aristocracy and he needed someone from this class to be in the party. The other person was Awang Hapidz Laksamana. He came from the same group of people. Secondly, because of my education. I had a little education with some English background and of course whenever there was anything to be done in English, I did it – translation, press releases, etc. That was not my job but Azahari always referred the matter to me. In fact, during our talks with Alan Lennox Boyd, most of the time he referred things to me. The memorandum which we submitted to the British government, to the United Nations later on – I was the man who drafted it. Of course he gave me the ideas and I just did it. Azahari could not get rid of me; at the same time, he could not just ignore my existence in the party. That was the beginning of our rift, not so much because of ideology but because of personality. He thought he could no longer consult me and when he organized the underground movement he never consulted me. He thought that I would never agree to that. He knew it from the very beginning. He did it all by himself, together with the Secretary-General of the party, Jasin Affandy. Affandy was Azahari’s man, even right up to this very moment he is very much Azahari’s man. They have some blood relationship – Azahari’s father married Affandy’s sister. Again, Affandy is a very submissive type of man. I never heard him objecting to Azahari on any issue.

Q. There weren’t any substantial ideological differences between you and Azahari in 1961-62?

A. No. We were always for independence for the Federation of British Borneo. We were on the same track of thinking, except [for] his pro-Indonesia thing which I didn’t like. Azahari very much looked towards Indonesia. I don’t blame him because he was brought up there from 1943 to 1951. Anything he did was Indonesian, even in his speech. He was very much an Indonesian type of orator …
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The Lahanan of the Batang Balui were the focus of research I started as a Queen Elizabeth II Research Fellow at Macquarie University in Sydney. My original plan was to carry out a demographic and socio-economic study of Levu Lahanan, Long Pangai on the mid-Balui. Two five-month periods of intensive fieldwork were carried out in 1987 and 1988 and subsequently for much shorter periods in the 1990s. In the new century I paid three brief visits (2001, 2002 and 2006) to the longhouse community at Sungai Asap to catch up with events since my last visit shortly after resettlement and the funeral of Pemancha Nyipa Pasu in 1999 (Alexander 1999a).

This paper provides a background to the Lahanan from the time of Sarawak’s independence in 1963 to the present and focuses on the socio-economic processes which have transformed their society. The most crucial feature of their recent history is resettlement. In 1987, when I started fieldwork the Lahanan community of Long Pangai was one of fifteen longhouse communities which had been selected for relocation because of the plan to construct a dam downriver at the Bakun rapids (Rousseau 1994; 1995; Tan 1994). Although this project had been mooted since the early 1980s, it took nearly two decades for the resettlement to come to fruition. Other crucial features of recent change include religious conversion from Adat Bungan to Roman Catholicism and the introduction of educational and health services progressively updated since their introduction in the early 1950s. The Agricultural Department has assisted the community with agricultural development and the introduction of cash crops such as rubber, coffee, cocoa and pepper (see Alexander 1987: 75–77; Alexander & Alexander 1993; Guerreiro 1988a; 1988b).

The Lahanan, who belong to the so-called Kajang group (Alexander 1989a; 1989b 1990a; 1990b; Guerreiro 1987; Leach 1950; de Martinoir 1974:267; Nicolaisen 1997: 239; Rousseau 1974: 18; 1990), are one of the smallest ethnic groups in Sarawak. Their total population of around 1,000 people are allied with two longhouse communities of Belaga District in the Kapit Residency. The larger group, the focus of this paper, are the Lahanan Long Pangai. When Sarawak joined the Federation of Malaysia on September 16, 1963 this community lived on the upper Balui River, but by the end

1 The first draft of this paper was prepared for a volume to be published in honor of the Orang Ulu of Sarawak, intending to trace the constituent groups’ development from 1963 to the present. Unfortunately the volume never came to fruition and, keen for my intended contribution to be produced in some form, I approached the editor of the Borneo Research Bulletin who graciously agreed to publish it.
The century had moved to the Bakun Resettlement Scheme (BRS) at Sungai Asap. A splinter group, the Lahanan Belepeh, live in the lower Balui at Long Semuang and number around 200 individuals. Although the two groups share a common ancestry, over the 150 years since they split over a leadership dispute, the Lahanan Long Pangai have become steadily Kayanized because of their close proximity to, and intermarriage with, nearby Kayan communities. The Lahanan Belepeh, however, living close to other longhouse villages loosely labelled Kajang, have, in some respects, retained a stronger sense of being different from the Kayan.

The incorporation of Sarawak in the relatively young state of Malaysia in 1963 was marred by conflict with Indonesia. Early in that year the Indonesian government announced a policy of confrontation and within a few months launched a series of attacks on Sarawak border towns. Shortly after Sarawak joined the Federation, the Indonesian Army engaged in a skirmish with British Gurkha troops at Long Jawe on the upper Balui

2 The Bakun Resettlement Scheme is located on the Asap and Koyan Rivers in the northeast area of Belaga District, although the general term for the area is Sungai Asap. In the original plan for resettlement, Sungai Penyuan had been chosen for settlement rather than Sungai Asap. Prior to the establishment of the BRS this area was largely uninhabited except for isolated groups of Penan and the Sambup who were closely linked to the Kenyah.
While the loss of life was confined to the Gurkhas, many elderly Lahanan recalled the anxiety they felt about the threat of “Communists” and other “strangers” at the time. They did report, however, that they and other upriver people (Orang Ulu) had good relationships with the Gurkha troops who used them as guides and traders. August 1966 marked the end of the conflict with Indonesia and genuine independence from the former colonial power, Britain.

In the post-colonial era, life in the upriver communities was altered by a state committed to particular policies of modernization and development. Local communities were incorporated into the political system and encouraged to convert to a major religion. The medical facilities which were built along the river radically improved health, especially infant and maternal mortality, and all children were given access to primary and secondary education. New technology and transport also helped to raise living standards, as well as making longhouse villagers more dependent on cash. Not surprisingly, many younger people left to seek employment elsewhere (Alexander & Alexander 1993).

In the post-independence period, former indigenous leaders, such as penghulu and temonggong, lost some of their powers as indigenous politicians associated with various political parties emerged. The local representative of Partai Pesaka aligned with the Roman Catholic Church and remained in power until the end of the sixties and was influential in establishing a Catholic mission in Belaga. A SUPP representative won the 1970 election and encouraged the missionary activities of the Borneo Evangelical Mission, later to become known as the Sidang Injil Borneo. While the latter became more widespread throughout the area, the first of the Lahanan to convert to Christianity
in 1986 chose Roman Catholicism. Adat Bungan, a syncretic religion introduced into the region in the 1950s has steadily lost ground to Roman Catholicism in the subsequent decades (Alexander 1987: 18-23; 1990:207-9).

The Lahanan of the Balui River regard themselves as among the original inhabitants of the area. Often loosely defined as Kajang, along with other similar small groups, the Lahanan have no difficulty in enumerating the cultural differences which distinguish them from major ethnic groups, such as the Kayan and Kenyah, living in Central Borneo. The most important of these included secondary burial of the dead, the cult of the sacred stones, and the erection of kelerieng, massive funerary poles for the elite (Alexander & Alexander 1999:71; de Martinoir 1974:268; Low 1882:64; Nicolaisen 1997:249-51; Rousseau 1974:18.). While these customs have long since been abandoned, and many of the features which once distinguished the Lahanan from other local groups have been submerged in common cultural practices, the Lahanan are still keen to promote their differences. A glimmer of what it means to be a Lahanan in the post-colonial era is illustrated by this brief quotation from their oral history:

We Lahanan are amongst the oldest inhabitants of the Batang Balui. Our ancestors, as with all those people originating from the Apau Kayan, the high plateau in the centre of Borneo, trace our source to a forest giant. One by one as each person emerged from this giant tree they were assigned to a particular community with its own language. Except for we Lahanan, who did not have a language, as we were the last to emerge from the tree. Our founding ancestor Laké Galo consulted those who had emerged before him. “What are we Lahanan going to do about a language? We want one of our own.” After much
discussion we Lahanan were permitted to borrow language terms from the various other communities to make up our own language. That is the reason why Lahanan is so mixed up - we have borrowed words from many different peoples.

This story, revived as the Lahanan people of Long Pangai were faced with planned resettlement, illustrates the centrality of language for Lahanan identity (Alexander 1999b).

The Lahanan do acknowledge similarities with other Orang Ulu. They share a material culture with each other in that they are hill rice cultivators living in longhouses on the banks of a river. In terms of social structure, the most significant similarity is that they all belong to stratified communities. In the Lahanan case the four ranks, in descending order, were the linau laja, the laja ki, panyin and lipen. The first three remain essentially intact, but the fourth, the lipen or ‘slaves,’ had been absorbed into the panyin by the 1960s. The laja are those who belong to the ruling family’s apartment or tilung. Laja ki have kinship relations to the laja. Both commonly marry outside the community to women of similar rank, and wives usually reside with their husband’s family. The reverse is the case for the panyin or ordinary folk (see below). The panyin used to make regular “gifts” of cooked and uncooked foodstuffs, including wild boar and fish, to the headman’s tilung. By the mid-1980s panyin were more reluctant to pay tribute in this form. Even more significantly, panyin used to perform labor (mahap) for the headman in exchange for his services. The increasing autonomy of the panyin gradually eroded this practice, and by 1985 the headman agreed that mahap labor within the longhouse could be replaced by each tilung making a contribution of paddy or RM 10. Despite the erosion of this and other practices honoring the elite, the Lahanan have always taken

Plate 3: Jau Sivap conducting household headhunting ritual on men’s day (lau savie) of the Adat Bungan festival, Long Pangai, 11 April, 1988.
some pride in the genealogy of their laja (headman). They regard themselves as the center of a genealogical network which links all Kajang and Kayan communities on the Batang Balui. This genealogy spans at least thirteen generations from the founding ancestor Laké Galo to Laké Pasu Beloluk, to his son Laké Nyipa Pasu, and to the present headman, his adoptive son and nephew Lajang Nyipa (Alexander 1992:19; Guerreiro 1987).

In 1963 the group defined as the Lahanan Long Pangai were living, to use the oft-cited words of many elders of the community “in a grand, two-storey longhouse with a roof of belian shingles.” This 25-room longhouse (levu or levu larun) on the left bank of the Batang Balui had a population of a little over 200 individuals who were primarily
swidden agriculturalists earning a little cash from the trade of jungle produce and a limited amount of wage labor in downriver timber camps. The Lahanan built this structure circa 1961 and by 1965 the government had set up a primary school nearby, which opened up access to education for nearby longhouses. Part of the reason for stressing the quality of this longhouse is that it was burnt to the ground in June 1968. On this occasion many residents had locked up their apartments (tilung) and were staying in their farmhouses cultivating hill rice. Even the headman, Laké Nyipa Pasu, and his wife were absent. Many residents chose to stay in their farmhouses while the remaining took refuge on the school grounds while they built a temporary longhouse (luvung) near the school. The government provided assistance in the form of food and clothing. Some three years later another luvung was established across the river behind the permanent structure which people started moving into in 1974. In the years between 1975 and 1999 the number of doors expanded from 28 to 67, the resident population from approximately 250 to 470, and the number of longhouses from one to four.

In the four and a half decades since independence education has expanded at a rapid rate. In the 1950s education was largely restricted to the elite who attended primary schools downriver at Long Linau or Belaga. By the early 1960s approximately a third of the relevant age group took advantage of the boarding facilities at Long Linau. School attendance doubled once the Sekolah Rakyat Kerajaan Long Pangai was established in 1965, and by 1985 primary education was almost universal. At this time slightly less than half of those who graduated from primary school went on to attend junior high school for three years. By 1995, however, attendance at junior high school was the norm. Senior high school education has always been relatively restricted because schools were located a long way downriver at Song and Kapit, few had the appropriate qualifications and, even more importantly, the finances required. By the mid-1980s a third of the relevant age group were attending senior high school and by the 1990s most of those who succeeded in gaining the junior high school certificate went on to senior high school. Kemas introduced a kindergarten in 1982 and has maintained a teacher, usually a girl resident in the longhouse, to conduct classes. Attendance has always fluctuated widely from day to day, but most children in the appropriate age group (3-7) are registered as pupils.

As in other Borneo societies, the tilung, commonly glossed as the ‘apartment’ or ‘door,’ is the main reference point in Lahanan social structure. Ownership of the dwelling, its contents, and the land farmed by it are vested in the tilung which is usually ‘headed’ by the senior woman (kebaken tilung). Lahanan society has strong matrifocal elements: for example, post-marital residence is usually in the wife’s apartment, women have full rights to children or property after the frequent divorces, and agriculture is mainly organized by women. Except for men from the elite, there is a very strong preference for longhouse endogamy; very few women move outside the longhouse and in-marrying men are often handicapped by their inability to speak Lahanan. Each apartment contains a nuclear, a stem, or extended family, although it is prestigious to maintain as large a household as possible. However, limitations of space and the splitting off of domestic groups create cyclic fluctuations in tilung size. Most apartments contain a single household – the consumption and production unit – but those which have already split
into two households with separate economic units (karong buyun legua i.e. ‘two cooking pots’) normally establish a new apartment when circumstances permit. The most common form of household organization is the stem family with parents, unmarried children, a married daughter, her husband and their children. Extended households usually contain two married daughters, but this is always a transitory form as the expectation is that all but one married daughter will eventually establish their own apartments (Alexander 1990a; 1990b; 1992; 1993).

The tilung – in a wider sense– is also a kinship unit; consisting of all those who were born into it even though they may now live elsewhere. This kinship unit owns heirlooms which are shared by all members of the descending generations irrespective of where they live. The tilung is a continuing entity as at least one child always remains with the natal apartment, even though the physical building may have been replaced or relocated. To ensure the continuity of the tilung, childless couples arrange for the adoption of children, commonly the children of siblings.

The Lahanan kinship system is bilateral and encompasses all of an individual’s consanguineal kin. The term panak is applied to all persons for whom a kinship tie is known to exist, whether the exact genealogical link is known or not. The Lahanan distinguish between close and distant kin, with all those who have a great-grandparent in common regarding themselves as close kin (panak lekin). Even in the 1980s marriage within the longhouse was the norm and the Lahanan, like other Kajang groups, continue to have a strong preference for uxorilocal residence after marriage. It is compulsory for the initial post-marital period and is the common residence pattern for a very high proportion of marriages. The Lahanan’s strong preference for uxorilocal residence after marriage has important consequences for gender relations, which are, as a rule, characterized by a strong egalitarian ethic. Lahanan women have prominent economic and even political roles. They carry out a larger part of agricultural activities and tilung continuity is normally achieved through female lines. Ties between siblings, particularly female siblings, are very close and quite frequently reinforced by the adoption of children within the sibling group (Alexander 1990a).

The Lahanan have long been swidden cultivators, growing one crop of hill rice a year and cultivating the crop on the basis of exchange labor (pelado). Pelado is calculated in terms of the exchange of work days. Membership in a work team is usually based on the proximity of swiddens or gardens, but workers are also recruited on the basis of friendship, kinship and/or residential proximity. Each individual, or, if he/she is unavailable, another member of the household provides one day’s labor for each team member who works on their land. Along the upper Balui exchange labor was used in both hill and wet paddy cultivation, as well as in the cultivation of cash crops. It was particularly important in hill paddy cultivation and was used for nearly all activities associated with the cycle. The biggest work teams (10-30 persons) participated in slashing, felling, sowing, hand-weeding, harvesting, and transport. Very little of this work was done on an individual basis (nyadui karep). Other activities such as chemical weeding, fertilizing, pest and disease control and threshing, winnowing and storing, were performed by work teams consisting of only two to ten members, and much of this work was also done by individuals. Nyadui gaji, or ‘working for wages,’ was fairly rare within the longhouse economy during the
1980s, but became increasing common during the 1990s when a significant number of young people left the longhouse temporarily to seek work outside. Young women commonly sought wage labor as maids for wealthy families in urban centers and domestic work as cooks in timber camps, while young men took on both unskilled and skilled labor in timber camps (Alexander 1990a).

Rice cultivation is now regarded as part of the Lahanan cultural identity, even though they traditionally ate sago rather than rice. They grow some vegetables inter-planted amongst the rice but also have separate plots of vegetables and tobacco. All these crops are largely subsistence but the Lahanan economy was traditionally supplemented by hunting, fishing and gathering. The gathering of rattan and various other products of the forest enabled the Lahanan to acquire a cash income from either the raw product or from mats and basketware produced from rattan. In some cases the Lahanan acted as intermediaries between the hunter-gathering Penan and Chinese traders located in the bazaar town of Belaga. The Penan, renown for their weaving skills and smithy work, provided the Lahanan with rattan baskets and mats as well as bushknives in exchange for clothing, biscuits, sugar, and tobacco (Alexander 1992: 215; 2008; Alexander & Alexander 1994; Alexander 2008).

The first cash crop to be planted by the Lahanan in the 1970s was rubber. In 1987 the Lahanan had 84 acres of rubber, but production largely ceased in the early eighties because of the fall in rubber prices. Coffee was also an early cash crop but was, within a relatively short period, replaced by cocoa. An innovative farmer first introduced cocoa to the Lahanan in 1980 and persuaded fourteen more households to establish holdings nearby. Within two years the Agricultural Department introduced their initial
scheme and by the end of the nineties most households were acquiring cash income from cocoa. The agricultural department also sponsored pepper cultivation with some degree of success, even though the returns were a little more uncertain because of the frequent destruction of the vines by pests. During the eighties and early nineties the acreage under cash crops increased as it was becoming increasingly clear that people would acquire compensation for any investment they made in cash crops (Alexander 1987: 75-7; Guerreiro 1988a; 1988b).

One of the most profound changes in the final decades of the twentieth century was the rapid expansion and improvement in river travel. The initial introduction of outboard motors made access to Belaga Bazaar and distant swiddens much easier. Express services between Belaga, Kapit and Sibu introduced in the 1970s, and expanded by local entrepreneurs to Long Linau and Long Pangai in the late 1980s, had a marked impact on the local Balui economy. Upriver people took advantage of the new services to travel further downriver to shop for more expensive commodities and also to sell cash crops.

New innovations such as chain saws, herbicides, and fertilizers, from the 1970s onward, had a strong influence on local farming patterns, improving yields and enabling swidden cultivators to diversify their crops. The quality of life for the longhouse people was also improved by the introduction of a gravity-fed water system, latrines, and raised fireplaces. The Agricultural and Health Departments played a very prominent role in instituting these changes. Socio-economic changes in the 1970s and 1980s transformed the Lahanan subsistence economy to one highly dependent on the modern market. By the 1990s they were actively participating in a modern market economy because of escalating demands for cash to pay for services, particularly education, and commodities (Alexander 1987; Alexander & Alexander 1993; 1995).

The relatively swift change to a modern market economy was heavily influenced by the Lahanan and other Orang Ulu attempts to deal with government proposals to build a dam at the Bakun rapids. When it became certain that the dam would go ahead and teams of officials began to enumerate *tilung* possessions, there was a remarkable upsurge in economic activity in the area surrounding the longhouse. The motive for this activity seemed fairly straightforward; *tilung* wanted to be able to provide material evidence of their possessions to sceptical enumerators. But other actions were not so easy to interpret by a simple utilitarian calculus. For example, the most striking Lahanan response to the prospect of the dam was to sharply increase the size of their community. In 1989 the accepted population was 302 distributed among 44 *tilung*, five years later it had grown to 514 distributed among 67 *tilung*. While some of this growth rate of 12 percent per annum was a natural increase resulting from better medical services, most of it was an artifact of the construction of new longhouses (Alexander & Alexander 2002).

**Resettlement**

For the Orang Ulu of the upper Balui, the last two decades of the twentieth century were clouded by the threat of government-sponsored development requiring their forced resettlement. Both the Federal and State governments were opposed to small communities living in isolated areas outside the effective limits of central control. Some
of the opposition was motivated by humanitarian concerns; it is difficult to provide education, health care or community development to remote communities. There were also security concerns that some of the longhouses might be stepping stones for illegal migrants. And there were also suspicions that the State government wanted to clear the land of people to facilitate logging. The catalyst for resettlement was the proposal to dam the Balui River at the Bakun rapids and create a 700 square kilometer lake. Although the 15 longhouse communities in the catchment area could have re-established themselves on higher ground near their previous sites, the government decided to remove all 15 villages from the Balui, paying compensation for their lost resources, and resettling them in a previously uninhabited area (Alexander & Alexander 1999; 2002; see also Rousseau 1994; 1995; Tan 1994).

In 1999 the Lahanan community had just moved under the Bakun Resettlement Scheme (BRS) to a new area, some five hours travel by boat and timber roads north from Long Pangai. The Lahanan’s mass evacuation from the Balui took place in mid-June after several days of ceremony (bulak) incorporating both Bungan and Christian rituals in their former longhouse village. Lahanan views of the mass departure from their old longhouse to the new were rosy, if tinged with sorrow. They had planned and executed a great ritual performance at the old longhouse and invited numerous people to participate. One of their elite had recorded the events on video and these were on frequent show during the early days in the new settlement and during the funeral of Laké Nyipa Pasu, their former headman and pemanca, held within weeks of their arrival. The excitement associated with their mass emigration was short-lived. Feelings of dislocation,

Plate 5: Adat Bungan ritual on river bank prior to migration to new settlement (pelah melek uma), Uma Belor, Long Sah A, 17 November, 1998.
disorientation, malaise and even dismay took over once they had settled into their new quarters. They had felt intense grief on the imminent departure from their ancestral lands and this was once again revived when they had finally completed the move.

During the period when the Lahanan were consulted about the style of housing they wanted in the new settlement, a few, mainly younger people, expressed a desire for individual houses, although the majority were firmly of the view that they wanted to retain a longhouse lifestyle. For most the intense sociality of longhouse living was seen as highly desirable and was heavily focused on the communal verandah (Alexander 1993; cf. Helliwell 1992; 2001). On the whole, they felt their accommodation and landholdings compared very unfavorably with those on the Balui. Their greatest regrets concerned the new, exceptionally narrow verandahs which inhibited their use as a place for convivial activity, the lack of a river big enough for transport and fishing, and the distance of the allotted three acre plot from the longhouse. This was in some cases “several hours” walking distance from the longhouse. While this may have been exaggerated, it was clear people were not used to walking any distance, particularly in the heat of the day. Used to paddling their longboats, or using an outboard motor to more distant landholdings and then walking a few minutes through the forest, they found walking on bare exposed roads totally exhausting. There was no cheap public transport and people were reluctant to pay high prices for private transport and thus deplete their savings.

My initial impressions of the BRS, formed less than a month after the Lahanan had resettled, were not altogether critical. From a Western perspective, the new longhouses
were neat and architecturally rather pleasing, with lattice work on the verandahs and windows giving a vaguely Japanese appearance. The buildings were superficially attractive with dark-colored wood and professionally constructed by contractors, though even to my eye construction was flimsy and obviously lacked durability. But in the eyes of the Lahanan, the buildings were far from adequate. The longhouses were largely constructed of treated softwoods, not hardwoods, and numerous cases were reported of the new buildings already showing signs of rot – one report mentioned a large hole in a section of the verandah, for example, and another household was disrupted by the damage caused by a tree falling and destroying most of their roof. With a strong do-it-yourself tradition, they were of the view they had been deprived of the labor and pleasure of constructing their own longhouses.

The new longhouses are constructed in blocks of ten to fifteen tilung in the interests of preventing fire, but have a long continuous verandah. Each longhouse village was an exact replica of the next, with the only distinguishing features being the actual location and the number of apartments and longhouses in each community. At the time of settlement in 1999, every community had its own church and its own kindergarten as well as a bus shelter, but as yet no buses. The orientation of longhouses is no longer towards the river: in the Lahanan case the two rows of three longhouse blocks face each other and the rear of each apartment is accessible by road. In their new cultural setting it is not appropriate, for the river is not used for transport. Roads link the various longhouse communities to each other and the wider world, and because of the way the longhouses are constructed, residents enter from the rear rather than the front.

Before settling in, the new residents had already paid deposits for water and electricity. While they had temporary access to a free supply of water for the first two days of residence in order to hose down their incredibly dusty living quarters, they now face regular monthly bills for both services. Both charges have caused considerable resentment. On the Balui, water was a free resource with each household supplied with a single tap. People appreciate the availability of electricity for the access it provides to amenities of modern living - lighting, fans, freezers, washing machines and rice cookers. But as they had to make a considerable sacrifice for the sake of development of the Bakun hydro-electric scheme, they do not see that they should bear the burden of paying for electricity. Those with experience of modern life in the towns and cities are more accepting of these costs but were almost universally of the view that they should have been given a few months’ grace to adapt to life in the new settlement before being burdened with the charges.

Within the first month at the new settlement people had already become intensely anxious about the lack of income. Although all had compensation funds stored in bank accounts, they resented the fact that they would continually have to dip into these accounts for living expenses well into the future, and that these funds might be totally depleted before they could establish a regular income. One young mother reported that “Ata lingget. Tanah elau sukup, buna tanah anti.” “We have no money. The land (allotted) is insufficient, there is plenty of land available back there (Long Pangai): the land, three acres per tilung is inadequate for our needs.” People used to collecting their own supplies of food from the river and jungle were now forced to buy everything: rice, fish, meat,
fruit and vegetables. Women from longer established longhouses who had had sufficient
time to plant and harvest a crop or two, regularly engaged in peripatetic trade selling
vegetables and snacks, but meat and fish were much more difficult and more expensive
to obtain. The river, Sungai Asap, is too small a waterway to be useful for either transport
or fishing although some people made what use they could of its resources.

Peoples’ stories about compensation for housing and land were confused,
expressing their bewilderment about the whole process. Prior to departure from Long
Pangai they had received 30% of the compensation due on their lands and crops, the
remaining 70% finalized not long after resettlement, but this was paid over in a rather
piecemeal fashion. About three weeks after their arrival in the settlement each household
received a check to finalize the payment for their cocoa garden sums, ranging from a
couple of hundred to about three thousand ringgit. A government valuation was placed
on each apartment in the old settlement and this was offset against the RM 50,000 being
charged for the apartments at the new settlement. Many considered the charge outrageous
when compared with the value of low-cost housing in Kuching, even more so when
compared with low-cost housing in Peninsular Malaysia. One couple reported obtaining
a valuation of RM 40,000 for their old apartment and had only a further RM 10,000 to
pay on their new one. Other valuations ranged from RM 20,000 to over RM 100,000.
One tilung valued at RM 80,000 had been occupied by three families who each had new
accommodations in the settlement, or apartments worth a total of RM 156,000. The
remainder was scheduled for payment in installments starting in 2005. By 2006 it was
clear that no one had in fact paid any installments. All Lahanan had built a new
tilung in the last few years in anticipation of the resettlement and to maximize their chances of a
higher valuation and consequent compensation. People did receive some money for their
land, burial sites, field huts and crops before resettlement and this supplied them with the
cash they needed until able to earn an income.

By 2002 compensation for communal land held under Native Customary Rights
had not yet been paid out to individuals. The sum has been held in trust but a system has
been devised to split up the amount by a special Lahanan committee. Each longhouse
establishes its own system. The Lahanan one has been worked out in various ways,
according to residential unit, marital links, and per individual—those with large families
gaining a larger share. All those with tilung in the new settlement, including those who
are non-resident, are entitled to the same shares as residents.

The duties of the headman have changed considerably since the move to the
new settlement. The work now involves an increasing number of meetings to discuss
issues of concern to the entire settlement, and the headman has to delegate work to
others in the community to a much greater degree than in the past. Fortunately there are
a number of ex-teachers and civil servants with the education and skills to assist in this
regard and there were a number of social institutions organized by local government
already in place. The present headman’s sister has taken over the role of entertaining
guests on behalf of the longhouse, and representing the longhouse elite at events outside
the longhouse, leaving her brother, deputy headman and various committees to deal with
the day-to-day running of the longhouse.

The majority of Orang Ulu form hierarchical societies but in these democratic
times the apartments belonging to the elite were exact replicas of those belonging to the commoners. In most cases, however, elite families were able to afford more apartments and nuclear families almost invariably had a separate apartment of their own. This is in marked contrast to the past where elite families favored a multi-layered, but spacious apartment, as indeed did most commoners. The idea of independent nuclear families is one which has rapidly found favor particularly among the young. In the new settlement, provided they had sufficient money to purchase more than one apartment, families are located alongside other family members so that they have the best of both worlds: some independence and close proximity to other family members. Many young married couples feel very positive about having accommodations separate from their parents, and are free to decorate them according to their own taste and budget, and their parents are pleased to at least be living in adjacent quarters, something which had not always been possible at their old longhouse village.

Although each household started life in the new settlement with an apartment that was a mirror image of its neighbor, a new hierarchy of wealth has quickly emerged with apartments ranging from bare walls and floors with no furniture to elaborate melamine lined walls with fancy lighting, ornate cornices and leather lounge suites, a clear indication of the increasing disparity between those who have and those who don’t. Some families, particularly those from the elite, had been able to accumulate some wealth by negotiating more favorable compensation payments, but the major avenue of wealth has been outside work, and children married to spouses with wages. Those fortunate enough to have family members working and residing in the larger towns have borrowed money to finance transport businesses. Absentee owners allow kin to cultivate their land in return for a share of the proceeds. But in general the possibilities of acquiring wealth through diligence and knowledge of farming have drastically declined because of the lack of land and the lack of guidance in how best to exploit that land.

There was very little future planning about how the settlers could make a living once they had been moved. Filling niche markets and wage labor on palm oil plantations were two general proposals made, but neither was well thought out and little consultation had been made with the new settlers. The idea that they might become modern commercial farmers with only three acres was also given a hearing, but no practical plans were made for execution. The settlers were expected to acquire a cash income from crops such as cocoa and pepper as they had previously, but with much reduced landholdings on relatively infertile soil. The idea of supplying niche markets was focused on vegetable growing for urban centers, or the production of soy bean curd, noodles and other small producer commodities. The first, aimed at supplying high-quality vegetables in the Bintulu market, failed because the vegetables were not of consistently high enough standard for Chinese traders to set up permanent relationships. The second never got off the ground because the goods were not only designed for a local market but also because the raw materials were not freely available at a reasonable price. The interests of resident and non-resident landholders are frequently in conflict: residents in general want to retain their three-acre lots for commercial crops such as pepper and vegetables and also grow a little hill rice for household consumption. Non-resident family members are usually reluctant to permit resident family members to deplete the quality of their land
by growing hill rice, even if they help to eat the proceeds, and resident family members are generally reluctant to get involved in the heavy labor requirements involved in establishing and maintaining a pepper garden for a family member.

With such a shortage of land, the longhouse people are gradually encroaching on what has been formally designated as State land. They make no payment for it, treating it in much the same way as their land formerly designated communal land. The primary forest in the hills behind the second longhouse block belongs to the government and they are not supposed to farm it. The State land to the rear of the first longhouse block, called tanah payung, lies between the longhouse and the household lots. Some longhouse apartments have established pepper gardens on this land and others are keen to plant hill rice. The government appears to have made little attempt to restrict the planting of commercial crops but strongly disapproves of growing subsistence crops.

There are few jobs available in the community and the recompense for some is totally inadequate. A kindergarten teacher, for example, initially earned only MR 100 a month. Higher rewards are available to those with some experience and the freedom to work outside the community. For example, one single mother has a job as cook in a timber camp where she earns MR 700 a month plus free board and lodging. Another, a widow, works at the new Sibu airport as executive cook, leaving her adopted child to be cared for by her married daughter. Employment for males is generally better recompensed and more freely available. But the men have to leave the longhouse and set up living quarters in the towns or timber camps where employment is available.

Women have been left behind in the development process. Men earlier took control over many technological innovations such as chainsaws, outboard motors, and herbicides. Women have, however, learnt to operate generators, gas stoves and household electrical equipment, and before too long a few women will undoubtedly learn to drive. Formerly women played a prominent role in their subsistence economy; in cultivation, collecting foodstuffs, and numerous handicraft activities as well as playing a very prominent role in social and ritual activities. Women are now totally dependent on men for transport: none of them drive vehicles, men are generally designated as the head of the household, they no longer have access to the materials for handicrafts and those mixed gender communal exchange activities which underpinned their economy in the Balui have now, where they still exist, largely been replaced by single gender activities. Women work where they can, but the opportunities are limited and the economic rewards seldom worth the effort.

In the early days of the settlement, transport to and from Bintulu, the major town in the region, was by express boat and hired landcruiser at a minimum cost of RM 50. After the Bintulu-Bakun highway was upgraded in 2000, the cost of long-distance travel declined to RM 30. In 2001 a bus service with a fare costing RM 25 was instituted, but consumers felt that the slightly reduced cost did not compensate for the inconvenience. In the interim, with increased competition from numerous hire vehicles, costs have further declined and the bus service is even less attractive. By 2002, transport within the BRS was still problematic, with no public transport and people reliant on local entrepreneurs to supply the need. At the time, five Lahanan households operated hire vehicles, but generally agreed that it is a difficult way to make a living. Within the
settlement, roads are very bad and the fares are too low to make a comfortable living. Vehicle owners also feel obliged to make a lot of neighborly trips for which they receive no monetary compensation. Shared transport from the Lahanan longhouse to the clinic in the BRS headquarters costs RM 1 per person. A standard fare to Belaga costs RM 25, RM 20 from Tubau to Sungei Asap, RM 30 to Long Murum. They expect the fares to be a lot cheaper once the roads are improved. People seldom stay overnight at other longhouses now as land transport can bring them home, unlike the longboats of the past which didn’t travel at night except in emergencies.

The new longhouses are still very vulnerable to fire although firebreaks between sections have worked to Lahanan advantage. In January 2001 a fifteen tilung longhouse section of the Lahanan community was destroyed by fire. A temporary luvung was set up very rapidly within a day or two of the conflagration. The government supplied building materials and the victims and people from the longhouse quickly put together the structure. The housing was rather slum-like, but quite adequate for temporary accommodations with a pipe for water and access to electricity. Three of the fifteen households chose to take up residence in field accommodations or buildings erected for other purposes. Reconstruction of the block began in June 2001 and a largely Indonesian labor force completed it within a year.

At the time of the fire most adults were working in the fields but even those at home, in the confusion, fled, managing to rescue nothing apart from their children. One man lamented the video camera and tapes destroyed in the fire, others all their worldly goods. Generous donations from the government and family members residing in towns enabled many to replace goods, including gold jewelry and clothing. This, the second fire in the new settlement, damaged RM 850,000 worth of property and made 87 people homeless. Residents consequently complained about the long delay in setting up a fire station in the BRS, the inadequacy of water supplies to some of the longhouse villages, particularly Levu Lahanan, and the lack of any training to contain outbreaks of fire. Residents realized that, failing government intervention to set up a fire station on the allotted site, they would have to set up a voluntary fire service themselves. Under the circumstances, this was a very difficult task as the only public telephone available at the time was located in the community service center for the BRS. By 2005 public call-boxes had been installed in each longhouse community, but by April 2006 the public call-box at Levu Lahanan was out of order and had been so for some time.

At the time of resettlement, the Lahanan population of more or less permanent residents numbered 469 living in 89 separate tilung. The higher figure of 530 included part-time residents, some of whom only maintained a standing in the community by returning once a year. Other part-time residents worked in camps or settlements nearby and returned on a more regular basis. By 2006 the “resident” population in the new settlement had increased, but there was also a very high frequency of people moving in and out in response to employment opportunities beyond the community.

As far as most families are concerned, the primary benefit of living in the new settlement is improved access to clinics and hospitals. All parents of young children pay regular visits to clinics and hospitals at any sign of illness, even a common cold. Those seeking private or hospital treatment travel to Bintulu, only a two-and-a-half-
hour journey away. Views about the changes in diet since the move are mixed. Children, thanks to the education provided by the Health Clinics interested in inhibiting cavities, no longer consume many sweets. Sweets, however, have been replaced by savory and fat-laden snacks, and some children are showing signs of the obesity which plagues the West. People frequently lament the lack of fresh fish and game, particularly wild boar, and easy access to jungle products such as rattan. Nevertheless, the plentiful supply of vegetables means they have sufficient food for side-dishes even if they are regarded as a poor substitute for more desirable foods.

By the time the Lahanan people left Long Pangai there were less than twenty practitioners of the Bungan cult. Numbers had declined even further within two years of settlement with even the dayong abandoning many rituals in face of the overwhelming conversion to Catholicism. With the erection of a large church in each settlement, Christianity plays a much more dominant role in the settlement longhouses than it did in the past. In 2002 a Roman Catholic catechist (gembala) was conducting religious classes for children during their school holidays. Parents in general were somewhat ambivalent about this particular aspect of their much higher exposure to religion. But in other settings a sizeable proportion of the community feels very positive about the greater part Christianity now plays in their lives. In the early years of the settlement, attendance at the Sunday service was usually high and the Roman Catholic Church service had taken on many aspects of evangelical or charismatic Christianity, with a loud band accompanying the hymns, fervent affirmation of beliefs, and the shaking of hands at the completion of the service. But by 2006 attendance had declined and the services lacked their former vitality.

In the decade prior to resettlement significant changes in marriage patterns emerged and this trend has

continued. Local Orang Ulu are increasingly marrying spouses of ethnic groups well outside the range of earlier times, with some marriages contracted with people of different religions (mainly nominal Muslims), different states (Sabah) and even different countries (the Philippines and Indonesia). In the ten year period prior to the move, many young women and men worked in timber camps and contracted what turned out to be temporary marriages with either Indonesians or Filipinos who either had wives back home or could not extend their work permits. But many then went on to contract marriages within the Sarawak community. Young women have become increasingly concerned about only marrying a man with paid employment. Many young men are keen to marry, but know they cannot afford the expense or responsibility. A significant number of families consist of an unmarried or divorced woman with a number of children struggling to make a living with the support of male siblings, while young idle bachelors are a frequent sight in most communities.

Traditional practices such as adoption are still frequent but almost universally now have formal sanction under State regulations and many are being adopted from outside the longhouse community. With the increase in the number of *tilung*, young couples have increased privacy and although most still share sleeping space with their young children, the greater privacy, approaching that experienced in the field huts, will undoubtedly affect the frequency of sexual relations and consequently fertility.

“We are all Orang Ulu now, ’though once we were different. Now we are all of one voice.” This sentiment, frequently expressed by urban-based Orang Ulu, encapsulates the current pressures the longhouse communities within the BRS feel to conform to state ideologies to become part of a larger identity. As part of reinforcing a single identity there were moves, later abandoned, to formalize the use of one language to replace Malay as a medium of instruction in schools. As new settlers, all BRS communities face similar problems and a feeling of unity between communities is promoted by the presence of close relatives in nearby settlements. The increase in inter-community marriages also encourages allegiance to a wider social grouping.

But bigger is not necessarily better. While each individual longhouse has its own kindergarten, or at least the building to house one in the future, the two new larger primary schools which replace the numerous primary schools on the Balui are a source of considerable alienation for young children. Following a pattern established on the Balui, the children are weekly boarders, returning home to their families on the weekend. Many children find the larger schools of the settlement alienating, the conditions less comfortable than most of their homes, the lack of parental support on a daily basis distressing, and the responsibility of maintaining their boarding quarters burdensome. From the point of view of teaching staff, homework can be monitored and children are not left unsupervised by parents at work in the fields and elsewhere.

After the early days of bewilderment in the new settlement and a profound sense of displacement, disorientation and lack of control, the Lahanan gradually re-learnt to exert some control over their own lives. One of the things all the longhouse communities on the Balui valued was their independence as small-scale communities to a large degree autonomous and in control of their own lives. In a move towards exerting independence and individualization, people are making fairly extensive renovations to
their new longhouses. In the Lahanan case, in the first three years at Sungai Asap they erected a passageway linking the two rows of longhouse blocks, widened the verandahs, and erected new balustrades for each individual block. People have lined the bare wooden walls of the tilung, some have added fancy cornices and others have broken down the partition between tilung to make a more spacious room for the extended family. Many people have also erected partitions (in the upstairs area assigned for sleeping) between siluk for privacy. Of course, there are yet others who have made no alterations at all. One household, for example, lives in a tilung which is as yet not painted and it looks as though the upper storey remains unused, the entire family preferring to sleep in the tilung proper. Some tilung have already removed the joint wall between tilung and are operating as one, more or less on the same principle as the jahan of the old longhouse. The fence between tilung in the common passageway between two tilung has in some cases been removed or lowered. One of the most substantial tilung, three made into one, consisted of melamine-covered walls, linoleum flooring with a wooden parquet pattern, elaborate ceilings with cornices and roses, and the fly-screen windows replaced with vented glass. People are relatively rapidly making their own mark on their dwellings, and even more so on the landscape. Both communal and individual labor have been devoted to making the formerly desolate area between the two rows of longhouses into a garden incorporating playing fields and an array of tropical flowers and shrubs.

But even three years after their resettlement, residents’ complaints continued to echo those of their initial impressions. One young, recently divorced mother eloquently expressed the major grievance with the new settlement. “Pegieng melai, ata lingget, ata kayau melai minyak ges, elau murip. An nayu buna tanah anti” ‘We are always buying goods/have to buy everything, don’t have any cash, there is no firewood so we have to buy gas, we can’t make a living. Upriver (i.e. the old settlement) we had lots of land there.’ Admittedly, vegetable foods are much more plentiful as land and labor formerly used for cash crops have been diverted to growing their own foodstuffs. The short-term requirements of obtaining cash to pay for water and electricity, rice, meat, and fish have women as well as men busy with cultivating vegetables and preparing snacks for sale. Lahanan women were selling fruits and vegetables in their own longhouse and to other more recently settled longhouses who had not yet had the opportunity to set up their own gardens. Such employment is inevitably short-term.

People have used compensation money to buy expensive commodities such as automatic washing machines. The somewhat unreliable water supply often means that the machines are used only to spin the washing dry to speed up the drying process, rather than for a full machine cycle. One young mother does not have a washing machine to cope with an endless demand of underpants and has used disposable nappies since birth, a huge dent in household income as they are purchased at the local Chinese supermarket, the Melegai. Food preparation still takes a long time despite the use of two-burner gas stoves and electric rice cookers. The lack of employment and the security of compensation money in savings accounts means that shopping has become “retail therapy” and, unlike the shopping expedition to the Belaga bazaar of the past in which time constraints limited purchases to essentials with the odd indulgence, the shopping expedition to the local Chinese store in the new settlement involves aimless wandering.
round buying up goods of minimal value including snack foods and sweets and anything the children may desire. In the past they recognized that goods became cheaper the further one went downriver, and they are rapidly coming to the realization that the same applies in their new circumstances. Goods in Bintulu, Miri and Kuching sell for a lot less than they do in the settlement.

By 2006 Lahanan complaints about the standards of the dwellings were muted, as were their complaints about the size of their farm lands and the distance from the longhouse. Grievances voiced to local politicians had been consistently subdued by suggestions that if they created a fuss they would antagonize the State leader who would stubbornly refuse to do anything to remedy the situation. The elderly continue to have strong feelings of nostalgia for the old life on the Balui. The complaints of mature women and men at the peak of their powers have declined as they strive to earn a living at the new settlement and concentrate on nurturing their new environment. Children quickly forget all that made life attractive in the “ulu” and focus on contemporary attractions. Bitterness about the enforced move is largely submerged, but the occasional outburst occurs over specific issues: the lack of land, lack of employment and lack of cash. There are a number of individuals of both panyin and laja rank who are vociferous internal critics of the political process involved in resettlement, but increasingly they are confined to the older members of the community and they curb their animosity towards the BRS in more public contexts. Although the communities face an uncertain future, the children, their parents and the mature couples at the peak of their powers are dealing with their new circumstances as best they can.

By 2006 many members of the community were more sanguine about their socio-economic future. Material signs of wealth included 23 private telephones, a number had ASTRO TV, washing machines, electric rice cookers and other modern conveniences. The number of vehicles has skyrocketed. The community had drawn on its reputation as one with a strong ethic of group work and community leaders, supported by the agricultural department, had become heavily involved in the production of a wide variety of vegetables for the Bakun market. Sales are organized by one household with an outstanding reputation for hard work. This family sorts and packs the vegetables and transports them to Bakun twice a week. Those which are not sold at the Bakun market are sold by the bundle in the shops near the school and clinic on an individual basis.

The Agricultural Department has sponsored a ginger (halia) scheme in the Bakun Resettlement Scheme and Levu Lahanan was one of the sites selected because of the Lahanan’s good track record in agricultural activities and energetic team work, compared with other longhouse communities in the new settlement. The work involved a lot of time and effort in terracing the relatively steep slopes in the vicinity of the longhouse. In contrast to the vegetable sales which have been conducted by individuals on behalf of the community, FAMA will purchase all the ginger for sale and distribution. At the time of writing, those involved in the scheme are preparing to harvest their first crop.

In October 2006 three Lahanan living in urban centers made a move to register their own Lahanan association with the Register of Societies. They, and others in the community, were keen to re-assert their unique cultural identity. In contrast to the Kayan
and Kenyah which are large enough ethnic groups to retain an identity without effort, the Lahanan, in an era which encourages the all-encompassing Orang Ulu identity, want to maintain a separate ethnic and, even more importantly, community identity. Numerous individuals stress their unique cultural values, such as their willingness to work together for mutual benefits, specific cultural artifacts such as dances and games, and wish to retain their own language even though they recognize that it continues to be influenced by other languages around them. They, like many communities before them, wish to promote difference. Their application succeeded and despite what is commonly viewed as the “hybridizing imperative that all ‘communities’ (that is, ethnic groups) in Sarawak must strive to take their place in the mainstream of Malaysian society” (Brosius 2006: 286), there is a counter discourse which encourages difference.
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**Introduction**

A number of people live adjacent to the Pulong Tau National Park (PTNP): the Lun Bawang to the north, the Kelabit to the east and south, the Sa’ben to the southeast, and the Penan to the west and south. This paper is a general description of the seven groups of Penan, four settled and three semi-settled, found around the Park and looks at Penan historical links to the general Park area and their contemporary way of life. It takes account of their social structure, livelihood, daily activities, and dependence on the forest and its resources. It looks at migration history, contact with outsiders, and relationships with non-Penan neighbors. Penan interactions with, and perceptions of their surroundings as well as their views of the Park are also described. An earlier and slightly different version of this paper was prepared for the International Tropical Timber Organization in Kuching as a source of socio-economic data on the people living adjacent to the Park.

The four settled Penan groups are located at Long Sabai on the Tutoh River and at Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A,” and Ba’ Tik “B,” on the Nyela, a tributary of the Kubaan which, in turn, is a tributary of the Tutoh. The three semi-settled groups are located at Long Anying\(^1\) on the Tutoh and at Long Taha and Ba’ Ba’ Medamut on the Kubaan. Information on the seven groups was obtained through interviews in the settlements I visited. I visited Long Sabai on March 28-31, 2007, Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A,” and Ba’ Tik “B” on April 28-May 2, 2007, and the semi-settled group at Long Anying on July 3-6, 2007. I also visited the same semi-settled group twice in 2008, on April 15-17 and June14-17 at their new location of Long Taha, not far downriver from Long Anying. I was not able to visit Long Taha and Ba’ Medamut, but information concerning these two communities was obtained through interviews with Penan at Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A,” and Ba’ Tik “B.”

**Early Accounts**

Banks (1937:435) mentioned that there used to be Penan on the eastward side of the Tama Abu Range, but that there are none living there today. Another early record that relates to the Penan around the Pulong Tau National Park is found in a short article

---

\(^1\) The Penan of Long Anying have moved to a new location called Long Taha, about 1 kilometer downriver on the Tutoh.
by Tom Harrisson (1949) published in the *Sarawak Museum Journal*. In it, he described in some detail the “spiritual and social culture as well as material life” of groups of Penan he called “the Magoh Punans” (1949:134-146). They occupied, at that time, the area between the Kuba’an, an upriver tributary of the Tutoh; and the Malinau, a downriver tributary of the Tutoh (Harrisson 1949:135). Penan elders in the four settlements recognized the names Tama Laje and Agut mentioned in Harrisson’s article. According to them, Tama Laje was a well-known Penan leader with the rank of *Penghulu*, residing on the Malinau River, and Agut was a leader of a nomadic band that foraged along the Tepen River. Agut was perhaps the father of Tabaran Agut, currently the headman of a band of nomadic Penan foraging on the Tepen River. The two named Penan leaders were part of a larger group of Penan roaming the Tutoh and Magoh, whose descendants include the semi-nomadic groups currently residing at Long Anying, Long Tah, and Ba’ Medamut. The Penan of Long Sabai, Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A” and “B” said that they might be the descendants of the groups described by Harrisson.

In 1990, I did a head count of the nomadic Penan in the Magoh area (Langub 1990). With the help of Tabaran Agut of Ba’ Tepen and Ubong Magih (f), a former resident of the Kuba’an, who married Galang Ayu of Long Kidah in the Magoh, I recorded the names of members of two groups of Penan in the Kuba’an area. Some of these people still reside there and are listed in this report. For example, Melai Naa was mentioned in 1990 as the headman of the settled Penan of Ba’ Tik. He is now the headman of Ba’ Tik “A.”

In 1992, Peter Brosius conducted three months of research among four groups of nomadic and semi-nomadic Penan east of the Pulong Tau National Park. His observations were first summarized in an interim report submitted to the State Planning Unit in December 1992 and were later published in various academic writings (Brosius 1992c, 1995, 1997, 2006, 2007). His main observation was that the Penan were extremely worried about being surrounded by logging activities which resulted in the destruction of wild sago (the staple food of the nomadic Penan), rattan (their main source of cash income), the disappearance of game (their main source of protein), and the pollution of rivers and streams. Brosius also observed the tendency of groups to fission into smaller groups due to the inability of the surrounding area to provide larger groups with enough food resources (Brosius 1992: 6-7).

In her thesis on hunting patterns and wildlife densities in the upper Baram, Cynthia Chin (2002) has provided some basic information on the community of Long Sabai, such as number of households, population, occupations, and daily activities.

Most of the information contained in this report was obtained from interviews with the headmen of the four settlements and from informal conversations with people, both men and women of different age groups during my visits.

**Brief Ethnographic Background on the Penan in Sarawak**

There are slightly more than 13,000 Penan in Sarawak.² Their population may

---

² From 2002 district population records kept at the District Offices, Baram, Belaga, Limbang, Miri, and Bintulu.
be divided into Eastern and Western Penan (cf. Needham 1972). The Eastern Penan comprise all of those groups living roughly to the east of the Baram River, that is, along the true right bank of the Baram and in the Limbang Division, while the Western Penan are located around the watershed of the Rejang and along the Silat River (a true left bank tributary of the Baram). There are also Western Penan settlements along the Tinjar River in the Baram District, along the Jelalong River and coastal areas of the Bintulu District, and in the Suai-Niah area of the Miri District. Historically and in terms of dialect, these latter groups are Western Penan.

Although the two groups recognize each other as one people, there are differences between them in terms of dialect, family and group size, and other socio-cultural matters (Brosius 1988b:11):

First, the Eastern Penan live in small groups with a range of 20 to 40 members, while the Western Penan live in large groups of 60 to 200 members. Average household size for Eastern Penan is 4 persons while that of Western Penan is 7. Extended families rarely occur among the Eastern Penan, but are more frequent among the Western Penan. Second, the Eastern Penan tend to build their camps on ridge tops, generally at some distance from sources of water, while Western Penan build their camps adjacent to rivers and streams. The Eastern Penan camps are of short duration, occupied from 1 to 3 weeks, but the Western Penan have a two-tiered settlement system with large, central base camps inhabited for up to 1 year, and dispersed short-duration sago camps. Third, the Eastern Penan have smaller foraging areas with frequent overlap of areas used by different bands. The Western Penan have large foraging areas with little overlap of areas used by different groups. Fourth, the Eastern rely primarily on blowpipes to hunt a wide range of game species while the Western Penan use dogs and spears, with wild boars being the primary game. Blowpipe hunting is of secondary importance to the Western Penan. Fifth, institutions of leadership are less developed among the Eastern Penan while they are strong, with recognition of aristocratic status for some individuals, among the Western Penan. Sixth, the Eastern Penan have a shallow knowledge of genealogies, whereas the Western Penan have extensive genealogical knowledge, extending to more than seven generations.

The settled groups, by contrast, grow hill rice; they also plant fruit trees and other crops such as tapioca and sugar cane. In the Upper Baram area, a few settled Penan communities have even adopted the irrigated rice farming technology of their Kelabit neighbors, while in the coastal area of Bintulu and Suai-Niah some Penan communities, living in single Malay-style houses, cultivate cash crops such as rubber, pepper, and cocoa. In fact, the Penan of Jambatan Suai have participated in large-scale oil palm plantations. Among all settled Penan, rice has replaced the traditional sago as their staple food.

The Penan are well documented, their principal ethnographers thus far being

---

3 Although these terms have now become established in the ethnographic literature, by geographic location, the two groups might more accurately be labelled, respectively, the “Northern” and “Southern” Penan.

4 The settled Eastern Penan of Long Sabai adopted hunting with dogs and spears after they settled down.

Both during the colonial era and following the incorporation of Sarawak into the Malaysian Federation, various civil servants have written about the Penan. During the colonial period, these included Tom Harrisson (1949), who wrote rather generally about Penan living in Sarawak, Brunei, and Kalimantan; and Ian Urquhart (1951, 1957, 1959a, 1959b), who wrote on general aspects of Penan life and language. Among the more recent civil servants writing on the Penan are Peter Kedit (1978), who undertook a survey of Penan cultural ecology among the Penan around the Mulu National Park, and myself (Langub 1974, 1975, 1984, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1993, 1995, 1996a, 1996b, 2001, 2004). My own work has focused on general aspects of Penan life, as well as ecological adaptations and development.

There is also a serious literature on the Penan by amateur ethnographers. Notable among these is Guy Arnold, a member of the 1955 Oxford University Expedition to Borneo, who collected useful information on the Penan Geng, who at that time were still nomadic and lived in the Usun Apau Plateau area (Arnold 1958, 1959). Another publication worthy of note is that of Bruno Manser (1996), a Swiss artist and environmentalist, and an ardent campaigner for the indigenous rights of the Penan against intruding logging companies. Manser lived for six years during the mid-1980s with groups of nomadic Penan in the Tutoh and Limbang watersheds. The books of two local journalists, James Ritchie (1994) and Khaider Ahmad (1994) also deal with the consequences of logging among the nomadic Penan of Tutoh and Limbang.

Social Organization

Two levels of social organization of the groups under discussion are examined: the household and the community.

The Family Unit. The household (lamin) is the basic unit of production, consumption, procreation, and education. It is a corporate group that owns, for instance, its own tabau and ja’an, baskets and mats used in the production of sago flour; plots of land for the cultivation of rice (among semi-settled groups); and is responsible (together with other members of the community) for bringing up children. The average family size of the four settled groups is 3.94 members and of the three semi-settled groups, 3.93 members. The largest household size in both the settled and semi-settled groups is eight members. Eastern Penan couples tend to form separate households after the birth of their first child.

The Community. The village or settlement is the primary unit of social and political
identity. Each village or settlement has its own headman. Basically, the duties of the headman include maintaining social relationships among village members, resolving conflicts, and acting as an intermediary between the local population and the outside world, especially the government. The village or settlement is essentially a kin-based group mainly made up of closely related individuals. The degree of relatedness is a function of group size and in smaller groups individuals are closely related. It is here that Eastern and Western Penan differ. Eastern Penan communities are smaller and less stable, with families and individuals moving from one group to another quite frequently. This is reflected in the Penan settlements around the Pulong Tau National Park. For instance, in my headcounts of the semi-nomadic Penan, a few individual names appear in more than one settlement.

There are two Penan regional chiefs in Baram District with the rank of Penghulu. One of them resides at Long Latei on the Apoh, the other at Long Beruang in the Upper Baram. The Penan around the Pulong Tau National Park are not sure which Penghulu has jurisdiction over them. Neither Penghulu has visited their settlements. According to the District Office population data, there are over 9,000 Penan in Baram District, spread over a wide area of the interior. The Penan told me that they deserve more than two Penghulu as the Kelabit, with a population of 5,000, have one Pemanca and three Penghulu.

Each community is proud of its existence and exerts its individuality. One of the more critical aspects of Penan community structure is the nature of relations among community members, between communities, as well as between them and their non-Penan neighbors, particularly timber companies. Few Penan have a positive opinion of timber companies. Despite this, some settlements have established workable relationships with the companies in order to obtain favors such as building materials, or even of getting the company to build them a longhouse. The nature of relationships between particular groups of Penan with timber companies also has implications for relationships between different Penan communities. There are cases of strained relationships between villages that have cordial relationships with timber companies and those that do not.

**Perceptions of their surroundings and the National Park**

The Penan look at their surroundings as the source of livelihood, a home, and a place within which they organize activities. One remark that constantly came up in my conversations with them was: *hun akeu’ na’at tong tana’, akeu’ na’at urip; murong kening ki’,* “when I look at the forest, I see life; it makes me happy.” In fact, the forest was considered by the Penan to be a “big store,” “bank,” or “supermarket.”

For both the settled and semi-settled groups, the immediate surroundings are converted into farms where they cultivate hill rice, cassava, fruit trees etc. Beyond the immediate surroundings are areas where they harvest wild sago when they run short of rice or cassava. These are also areas where they hunt and collect forest products such as rattan and gaharu (incense wood). They are also connected to various places in the landscape through the migrations of their ancestors, old camp sites, and burial sites. These sites, although not physically visible due to regrowth of vegetation, exist in memories, and information concerning them is passed down through the generations. The present generation may not know the exact locations of old camps or the burial sites of
long-dead ancestors, but they know the watersheds within which these sites are located. Sites such as these not only link the present generation historically to these places but serve to establish rights to exploit resources in the area. It is within the particular area of their surroundings that a band or group of Penan exercises stewardship. Such an area comprises the group’s tana’ pengurip (foraging area). As mentioned earlier, in the Eastern Penan region, tana’ pengurip of one group may overlap with another, and groups involved in such overlaps have mutual understandings on the use of the area.

In their exploitation of resources, the Penan employ an ecologically sound harvesting strategy of sustained yield management known as molong. The idea of molong is to mark and preserve resources for future use. Molong serves two purposes: it acts as a monitoring device to track the quantity of resources over a tract of forest where the Penan exercise stewardship; and as a check to prevent over-exploitation of these resources.

In their exploitation of the tana’ pengurip they rotate their harvest of resources from one location to another to allow for regeneration of the harvested area to which they will return sometime in the future when resources there have regenerated to maturity. When they harvest food resources, for instance, they harvest only the amount they need, leaving the rest for the future. When they do this, they are said to minut the resource, or use it wisely. An old man explained minut as kon dawai-dawai or ‘to eat slowly,’ with the idea that the resource lasts for a long time. However, when someone in the process of harvesting the resource harvests more than he needs, and leaves what he cannot use or eat to waste, he is said to ngeburah (waste) the resource. Although there is no legal sanction against those who ngeburah resources, in pre-Christian times, it was believed that the offender would incur supernatural wrath, which frightened the Penan. In addition, the offender might lose the respect of community members, be’ seva’, which, given the face-to-face nature of their society, a Penan could ill-afford. Another way of dealing with the situation would be for the headman to nebara’ (advise) the offender not to repeat the same mistake in the future. The whole idea was to leave the forest in as good a condition as the present generation inherited it from their ancestors, conscious of the fact that their descendants will someday want to walk in their footsteps.

Of concern to the Penan today is the destruction of much of the forest by logging activities, and in some places, by oil palm plantations. Destruction of the forest means the destruction of many of the resources that the Penan depend upon for their livelihood. When the land is destroyed, life becomes harder to live (tusa pita urip). When nothing is done to prevent further destruction, there is a feeling of hopelessness (be’ pu’un pengalan); people set up blockades on the logging roads to express their frustrations and to draw the attention of the authorities. A cynical individual suggested that timber blockades are “invitation cards” to come to a negotiation table, apat inah bari’ tebukeu’ tebai irah pepane. At all the five settlements that I visited, some individuals openly admitted to having taken part in logging blockades.

In all the settlements I visited, the Penan said that they welcome the idea of the Pulong Tau National Park largely because they hate what logging has done to their surroundings. It has caused ugly scars of soil erosion, pollution of rivers and streams, and destruction of forest resources that are food, trade items, and medicines to the Penan.
Plate 1: Kuya Akeh (left), headman of Long Lobang with fellow villagers.

Plate 2: Kuba’an bridge found midway along the footpath between Bario and Ba’Tik.
Plate 3: Semi-nomadic Penan boy at Long Anying.

Plate 4: Semi-nomadic Penan elder at Long Anying.
As they live adjacent to the Park, they are given rights of access to it, and to harvest resources therein on a sustained yield basis. They also see opportunities of employment as guides and porters for research scientists and tourists in the future. What the Penan would like to see is for the park management to document local knowledge of their surroundings as well as their resource management strategy for future generations. A step in this direction has recently been undertaken under the ITTO project (Tipot, Henry, and Paul Chai 2008).

Daily Activities

The main activities of the four settled Penan groups are cultivating hill rice by the swidden method, hunting, fishing, and gathering. They also plant cassava to supplement rice. The three groups of semi-settled Penan plant cassava. I was told that during the past few years some families have cultivated small plots of hill rice; however, as semi-settled groups, they still spend a lot of time hunting and gathering.

Rice cultivation. The four groups of settled Penan started cultivating rice around the time of the Brunei Rebellion. Although rice has replaced wild sago as the staple, the latter is still eaten. In fact, most people above the age of 50 still prefer sago to rice. Cassava is planted as a readily available replacement for rice when there is a shortage, which I was told did occur in the past. I was told by the people of Long Sabai, Long Lobang, and Ba’ Tik “A” that during the past three years, they have always had enough rice to last from one harvest to another, whereas the people of Ba’ Tik “B” said they experienced a sufficient rice harvest some years and shortages in others. However, a rice shortage is not a major concern as they also rely on cassava and wild sago. Overall, the four settlements always have enough food to eat. Besides rice, cassava or sago, game, fish, and other food resources are still easily available in the nearby forest.

When I visited Long Anying in July 2007, the semi-settled Penan there were facing a shortage of sago. The shortage was attributed to the fact that quite a number of people had been sick the previous month, leaving not enough people to go to the forest to harvest sago. During that visit a number of young people had gone to Batu Lulau on the opposite bank of the Tutuh to extract sago flour. With regard to the two other semi-settled Penan groups of Long Tah and Ba’ Medamut, I was told that when they face a food shortage they come over to visit Long Lobang and Ba’ Tik “A” to share the food of the settled groups, sharing being an important Penan value.

Hunting. Hunting and fishing are important activities that provide much-needed protein. In the four settled communities, three types of hunting are practiced: with dogs and spears, blowpipes, and shotguns. At Long Sabai, hunting with dogs and spears is popular, while in the other three settlements blowpipes are mostly used. Hunting with shotguns is the most effective method, but the communities have only a few shotguns. Besides, it is difficult to obtain a regular supply of cartridges in the interior. Among the semi-nomadic groups, blowpipes are the main hunting equipment used.

Fishing. Three types of equipment are used to fish: cast nets (jala), hang nets (pukat), and hook and line (lesai). The most popular method is fishing with cast nets. At the four settled settlements fishing is a productive activity with each trip bringing in a sufficient
catch of fish for the family’s meal. However, this is not the case with the semi-settled Penan of Long Anying. They complain that timber workers in the nearby Shin Yang Timber Camp at Long Kubaan have depleted the fish population in the area. During my four-day stay at Long Anying, the Penan did not catch a single fish from the few fishing trips they organized.

Gathering. Gathering was an important activity during the nomadic days. Foods such as wild sago, shoots, mushrooms and ferns, as well as medicinal plants, were gathered from the forest. They also gathered jungle produce such as camphor, jelutong (a wild latex-producing tree of the species Dyera costulata), damar (resins from species of dipterocarp trees), gaharu (incense wood from species of Aquilaria), bezoar stones (gallstones to which the Chinese attribute medicinal properties), and rattan for making mats and baskets. These were brought to the barter trade centers (tamu) located in various parts of the Baram District, and barter traded with their settled neighbors: the Kenyah, Kayan, and Berawan. Barter trade activities were supervised by the government to prevent the Penan from being taken advantage of by the local traders. Government-supervised tamu are no longer organized; the last one was held in 1976 (Langub 1984). Moreover, most of these jungle products have been largely depleted, and the animals that are likely to have bezoar stones are now protected under the Wildlife Protection Ordinance 1998. A few individuals still go deep into the forest to collect gaharu which, according to them, is quite difficult to locate due to over-harvesting. Many still spend a lot of time going into the forest to process wild sago, collect other food items, medicinal plants, and rattan to weave mats and baskets.

Penan Groups Adjacent to PTNP

The Settled Penan. As mentioned earlier, the four settled Penan communities near the Pulong Tau National Park are Long Sabai, Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A,” and Ba’ Tik “B.” Long Sabai is located on the southern side of the Pulong Tau at the confluence of Tutoh and Sabai. It takes one or two days of hard walking through rugged terrain to reach Long Sabai from Long Lobang, the nearest of the three settlements on the western side of the National Park. Long Lobang and Ba’ Tik “A” are located at the Nyela; Long Lobang at the confluence of the Nyela and Lobang; and Ba’ Tik “A” at the confluence of the Nyela and Tik, a one and a half hour walk downriver from Long Lobang. Ba’ Tik “B” is located on the Tik River, about an hour’s walk from Ba’ Tik “A.”

The four settlements comprise 142 households, and a population of 218 people: 111 males and 107 females. Figure 1 shows the population distribution of these settlements.

The settled and semi-settled groups consider the land areas they currently occupy as their place of origin (okoo bu’un), or ancestral land (tana’ pohoo). They point to numerous burial sites, and sites of old camps used by their ancestors as evidence to support their claim.

Long Sabai

Location. As mentioned earlier, Long Sabai is located on the southern tip of the Pulong Tau National Park, at the confluence of the Tutoh and Sabai rivers. The settlement is
about 3 kilometers from the Park. It is the furthest settlement on the Tutoh. To reach it, one takes an hour’s flight in a small plane from Miri to Long Lellang, a 4-hour walk from Long Lellang to Aro Kangan, and an hour’s outboard ride from Aro Kangan to Long Sabai.

**Population.** Long Sabai comprises 22 families, and a population of 100 people: 55 males and 45 females. Seven families comprising 20 individuals were previously living at Ba Keramu, and a family comprising 7 individuals at Long Belusu, located downriver from Long Sabai. These families agreed to move to Long Sabai. The population census also reveals that 13 individuals from neighboring Penan settlements are residing in Long Sabai, following marriages or are staying with relatives: 4 females and 1 male from Ba’ Lai; 2 females from Long Sait; 1 male from Ba Berang; 3 males from Long Kepang, 1 male from Long Main, and 1 male from Long Belok, in the Apoh. There are also two non-Penan individuals, both male, residing in Long Sabai: a Sa’ben from Long Banga, and a Lun Dayeh from Long Midang, Kecamatan Krayan, East Kalimantan. They are married to Penan women of the village.

The age distribution of Long Sabai is shown in Figure 2 below.
Education. Despite the remoteness of Long Sabai, a respectable number of individuals have some form of formal education. Of the 36 individuals between the age of 5 and 19, 22 are attending school: 13 at the primary school, Long Lellang, and 7 at junior secondary school, Bario. The other 14 either did not go to school or dropped out. The reason given for dropping out was financial.

The village census indicates that there are 41 persons between the age of 20 and 49. Of these 41 individuals, 18 attended school: 12 at primary level (did not continue to the secondary level due to financial constraints), 4 at junior secondary, and 2 at senior secondary. It is interesting to note that 9 people between the ages of 40 and 70 are able to read printed words in Penan. They attended adult education classes organized for church elders by the Borneo Evangelical Mission (BEM). The Sidang Injil Borneo (SIB) continued the program in parts of interior Northern Sarawak. The main purpose

5 Sidang Injil Borneo or Evangelical Congregation of Borneo is an indigenous church established in 1963 by the Borneo Evangelical Mission comprising Christian missionaries from Australia and Great Britain. The Borneo Evangelical Mission came to Sarawak in the 1930s and by 1963, the year Sarawak, Sabah and the Malay Peninsula formed Malaysia, church administration and activities were handed over to the Sidang Injil Borneo. Sidang Injil Borneo is a self-administered independent church which trains its own pastors to look after its congregations.

Figure 2 Age distribution of the population of Long Sabai
of this adult education program was to teach church elders to read the Bible in their own language. Three of the 9 individuals mentioned, two females and one male, went for further training in reading and writing at Long Bedian and Lawas. They were later appointed as pastors. One of them, in his 70s, has now retired. Some of these retired pastors are active in local church activities.

Table 1 shows the number of people still attending school, those who have finished their schooling, and those who attended the adult education classes organized by the Borneo Evangelical Mission.

**History.** The upper Tutoh used to be inhabited by several bands of nomadic Penan. Over the years some bands have moved out of the area to other parts of the Baram and Limbang districts, specifically to the Selungo, Akah, and Magoh in the Baram, and the Madihit and Adang in the Limbang. Three groups remained in the upper Tutoh: one group at Long Sabai, another at Ba Keramu, and a family at Long Belusu. All except one family from the Ba Keramu group and the family at Long Belusu have moved to Long Sabai; members of that remaining family have indicated their intention to move to Long Sabai at some point in the near future.

Despite the isolation and difficult access to the outside world, the Penan of Long Sabai have said that they prefer to stay where they are. The reasons are as follows:

- They consider the upper Tutoh as their *okoo bu’un*, place of origin. They have historical and emotional attachments to the area through burial grounds of long-dead ancestors and sites of old camps. They know the river system, where the sago and rattan are and the location of salt licks and pig wallows.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1  Educational attainment of the Penan of Long Sabai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Left School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They claim that the upper Tutoh is rich in food: wild sago, vegetables, fruit, game and fish. It also has a rich diversity of medicinal plants.

They also claim that the land is quite fertile, proven by the good harvests they have had.

The absence of other groups competing for land and resources.

The headman, Pusa Luding, said that he is the eighth generation of his family to live in the Upper Tutoh. His genealogy is shown in Figure 3.6

During their nomadic days, the Penan generally traveled great distances, from one river system to another. However, the group at Long Sabai did not. They moved mainly within the area of the upper Tutoh and its tributaries, between the Labid and Kerurai, a tributary of the Sabai. Their foraging area, tana’ pengurip, includes the Selunok and Sabai including its tributaries, the Lawan and Kerurai. These rivers are now part of the Pulong Tau National Park and are known to the Penan by different names, Labid River as Kalit, Selunok as Dat, Lawan as Pedereng, Sabai as Kuren, and Kerurai as Kelure. The group made their living in these river systems, moving from one resource area to another, in a circle, returning to previous harvested areas that had regenerated. They also followed pig migrations during fruit seasons.

Contact with Outsiders. Since time immemorial the Penan of Long Sabai have been in contact with their neighbors, the Kelabit and Kenyah, through social visits and also through barter trade meetings (tamu). A few marriages have taken place between the
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Figure 3 The genealogy of Pusa Luding, the headman of Long Sabai

6 Normally Eastern Penan have shallow genealogical knowledge. The depth of Pusa Luding’s genealogy is unusual for Eastern Penan.
Penan and their Kelabit and Kenyah neighbors. Village elders say that it was through *tamu* organized by the government that the Penan had the opportunity to meet government officials during the Brooke and Colonial periods. Five places were designated as *tamu* centers for the Penan of the upper Baram, Selungo and Tutoh: Lio Matu on the Baram, Long Sait and Long Sele on the Selungo, and Sungai Layun and Long Melinau on the Tutoh. The presence of government officials was to ensure that trade was conducted fairly. The District Officer normally brought along one of his Sarawak Administrative Officers, a Hospital Assistant to dispense medicine, and other relevant officers.

The headman, Pusa Luding, as a young man, remembers meeting Ian Urquhart, a well-liked Colonial District Officer in Baram, during a *tamu* at Lio Matu. It was at that *tamu* that Urquhart suggested to the Penan that they consider moving to Long Mau on the Baram, below Lio Matu. The main reason for Urquhart’s proposal was to get the Penan close to the school and clinic at Lio Matu. It also meant that government officers would be able to visit them more regularly. However, none of the Penan agreed to the proposal. The headman also mentions having met another Colonial Baram District Officer, Malcolm McSporran at Long Akah. He also asked them to move downriver, near Long Lellang. Again, the Penan did not agree to leave the upper Tutoh.

When the Long Lellang Airstrip was under construction in the early 1970s, the Baram District Officer suggested that the Penan move near Long Lellang in order to justify the construction of the airstrip that would serve a larger population. Once again, the Penan refused. They told each District Officer that the upper Tutoh was their ancestral homeland where they have historical and socio-cultural ties to the landscape.

*Christianity.* Christianity was introduced to the Penan in the late 1950s through their Kelabit, Kenyah, and Kayan neighbors. They remember three Australian missionaries of the Borneo Evangelical Mission who had worked with the Penan: Ken Nightingale, Phyllis Webster, and Majorie Britza. Although they did not visit Long Sabai, the Penan often met them at the Kenyah village of Lio Matu and Kelabit village of Long Dati (which later moved to Long Lellang). A number of Penan attended the adult education classes organized by the Borneo Evangelical Mission at Lio Matu and at the Kayan village of Long Bedian on the Apoh, and met these missionaries there. A few young Penan also attended the BEM Bible School in Lawas. The Penan of Long Sabai built a chapel and a house for a pastor in the settlement. As they have no resident pastor presently; the task of organizing church services every Sunday is undertaken by the church elders. Penan in all the settlements interviewed consider conversion to Christianity important in one social aspect: it enhanced social interaction between them and their neighbors.

*Settlement.* The Penan of Long Sabai first settled down either in the mid or late 1960s. When they made this decision, they told the Baram District Officer that they would settle in the upper Tutoh, in the area where their ancestors had lived as nomads. They did not wish to settle in areas suggested earlier by various District Officers. Aban Lenyau Jau, brother of the Temenggong Oyong Lawai Jau, who was present at the Penan meeting with the District Officer, said that it was a fair suggestion and supported the move. According to the Long Sabai headman, Pusa Luding, the two Kelabit headmen of Long Lellang “A” and Long Lellang “B,” Lun Raja and Sena’an Bala did not object to the Penan settling in
the upper Tutoh. In fact, they were happy with the move.

The Penan first settled at Long Penakoh, on the Tutoh, about an hour upriver by outboard motor from Long Sabai. In the 1970s they moved downriver and built their houses on the true left bank of the Tutoh, opposite the mouth of the Sabai. It was from here that the village got its name, Long Sabai. In the mid 1980s they moved again, to the present site, on the true right bank of the Tutoh, just below the mouth of the Sabai.

**Farming.** When the Penan first settled in the 1960s, they cultivated cassava, and a year or two later, hill rice. Cassava, sugar cane, and various kinds of vegetables were intercropped with rice. Some of their farms were on the *temuda* left by the Kelabit who now reside at Long Lellang. Those who farmed on Kelabit *temuda* obtained permission from the owners. According to the Penan, the four individual Kelabits who used to farm in Long Sabai at the time they made the decision to settle down were: Raja Bala, Ngelawan Tepun, Tuked Rini, and Maren Bala. At that time the Kelabit were living at Long Dati, about an hour’s outboard journey and two hours walk on foot from Long Sabai. According to the Penan, since the Kelabit moved to Long Lellang, none of the owners have come back to farm their *temuda*. At Long Lellang, the Kelabit gave me a list of people having *temuda* at the Long Sabai area. The list contains names slightly different from those given to me by the Penan. The names of *temuda* owners and their heirs are in Table 2.

The Penan also opened new areas of land between Long Sabai and Long Penakoh for their farms. They did this so that they would have their own *temuda* to fall back on, should the former owners decide to claim them back. At the moment there is no dispute over *temuda* land between the Penan and Kelabit. Should this become an issue in the future, the appropriate authority to deal with this is the district administration and the Native Court. The villagers express interest in adopting wet rice cultivation. Some

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bil</th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Temuda Sites</th>
<th>Descendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lawai Adun</td>
<td>Lg Biung Lg Sabai</td>
<td>George Phusu (Son of Lawai Adun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bilung Adun</td>
<td>Lg Biung Lg Sabai</td>
<td>Peterus Raja (son of Bilung Adun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Baru Aran</td>
<td>Lg Biung Lg Sabai</td>
<td>Robin Aran (son of Baru Aran)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Balang Menu</td>
<td>Lg Biung Lg Sabai</td>
<td>Dayang Menu (daughter of Balang Menu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tabaran Raja</td>
<td>Lg Biung Lg Sabai</td>
<td>Paul Raja (son of Tabaran Raja)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Jalong Nabun</td>
<td>Lg Biung Lg Sabai</td>
<td>William Bala (son of Jalong Nabun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Temu Aran</td>
<td>Lg Biung Lg Sabai Arur Kangan</td>
<td>Freddile Abun (son of Temu Aran)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Bala Paran</td>
<td>Lg Sabai</td>
<td>Rini Tuked (son of Bala Paran)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Ngelewem Tepun</td>
<td>Lg Sabai</td>
<td>Padan Raja (son of Ngelewem Tepun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Bala Riwat</td>
<td>Aro Kangan</td>
<td>Anderias Riwat (son of Bala Riwat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Nadun Riwat</td>
<td>Aro Kangan</td>
<td>Anderia Riwat (son of Bala Riwat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kapung Aran</td>
<td>Aro Kangan</td>
<td>Singir Kapung (son of Kapung Aran)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of them have visited Bario and Ba Kelalan and are impressed with the irrigation system of the Kelabit and Lun Bawang. There is adequate flat land at Long Sabai that could be converted into wet rice fields.

Livelihood. The Penan are self-sufficient in rice and have adopted it as their staple food. Despite this, they still go to the forest to process sago. The Penan of Long Sabai rotate their consumption between rice, cassava, and sago. They do this to avoid the monotony of sticking to just one particular staple. The people of Long Sabai raise chickens mainly for domestic consumption. Some are also sold to the Kelabit at Long Lellang.

Game and fish are still plentiful in Long Sabai. This is so because the place is isolated, difficult to get to, and so hunting pressure from the outside is minimal. In her study on hunting patterns and wildlife densities, Chin (2002:102) says that of the three sites she studied, the hunting success in Long Sabai was the highest, at 82.4% compared with Long Main 56.8%, and Ba Buboi 19%. Long Sabai is also rich in jungle vegetables, shoots, and fruit.

The Penan of Long Sabai are poor, however, in terms of cash. Shortage of money is pressingly felt when children go to school, especially to secondary schools in Bario or Marudi. Of the 36 persons between the ages of 5 and 19, 14 did not go to school or have dropped out mainly due to financial constraints.

Income and Employment. In the past Penan collected various forest products to trade with their neighbors at barter trade (tamu) centers in the Baram District. Most of these resources have been depleted. Ten to 20 years ago, gaharu was a big income earner for some families. In the mid 1980s and early 1990s, the headman of Long Sabai made several trips to Brunei, Labuan, and Kuala Lumpur with some Kelabit friends to sell gaharu. Today, it is extremely difficult to locate gaharu in the forest. Rattan is still plentiful in the Long Sabai area and is collected and woven into mats and baskets for local use. In the past, such products were brought by the Penan to tamu to barter trade with their neighbors. Since tamu were discontinued in 1976, there has been no market for these items. The odd travelers passing through Long Sabai might buy one or two rattan baskets, but such travelers rarely exceed ten a year. In the past ten years, a number of researchers have come to Long Sabai to conduct research on wildlife and resource inventories and have employed local people, both men and women, as informants, guides, and porters. This provided cash income to some families.

During the off-farming season, a few Penan go to Long Lellang to look for odd jobs with Kelabit families after making prior arrangements with them. They are paid between RM15 and RM20 per day depending on the type of work. There are three young Penan families staying at Long Lellang while looking after children attending school. They are also employed by the Kelabit to do odd jobs. They normally go back to Long Sabai during the farming season, leaving one of the parents to look after the children.

Penan can be good guides for jungle trekkers. A German tourist was extremely happy with his two Penan guides (one in his 30s, and the other 16) who guided him trekking from Long Lellang to Bario for seven days, despite the fact that the two men are not certified tourist guides. The tourist was very impressed by his guides’ knowledge of the landscape, plants and animals, and the speed at which they could build shelters.
for them to sleep in the jungle. The same tourist went trekking in the jungle of Sabah with certified tourist guides, but they were not as knowledgeable and competent as his two Penan guides. The two Penan guides told me that they were each paid RM100 per day. Young Penan say they like to guide tourists as it brings good pay; but the number of tourists trekking between Bario and Long Lellang is small and far between. Two brothers, one 30 years old, the other 27, with Form 5 education, are employed by medium sized companies in Miri, with monthly salaries. Both are married with young children. As the nature of their employment is not permanent, the likelihood is that they will eventually return to Long Sabai.

**Houses.** The families live in single houses built on stilts. The houses are made of timber with zinc roofs supplied by a timber company, and built by the Penan. There are three persons in the village with some basic carpentry skills: Balang Weng, Romeo Pusa, and Matius Robin. Presently there are 14 family houses. Seven of the Penan families still live in Ba’ Keramu, and one at Long Belusu. It is learnt that they will move to Long Sabai when the community decides to build a new longhouse.

**Views on Timber Blockades.** Long Sabai has not been affected by logging, but individuals from the village have taken part in blockade activities at various locations, such as the Magoh, Layun, Akah, and Upper Limbang. They did this to declare their sympathy with those whose way of life has been disrupted and to show solidarity with the Penan community. They do not see anything wrong with setting up blockades as this is done to exercise their rights to protect resources important for their livelihood. Blockades, according to them, are an expression of frustration and helplessness meant to draw public attention when authorities do not listen to the problems caused by logging.

**Views on the National Park.** Based on information given to them by officials of the Forest Department and ITTO, the Penan do not think that the National Park would in any way affect their livelihood. They believe that the Park is good for them as they are given rights of access to harvest resources within it on a sustained yield basis. They also see the National Park as a source of employment, as informants on indigenous knowledge and as guides and porters for visiting researchers and scientists.

**Views on One Settlement.** The Penan of the four settlements were asked what their views were if there is a proposal for them to settle in one big settlement so that basic amenities such as a school, clinic, and so forth could be built for them. The Penan of Long Sabai feel that the idea of one settlement for the Penan around Pulong Tau National Park is not feasible. They feel firmly attached to Long Sabai, an area rich in food resources. They would not like to move out from the area to either Long Lobang or Ba’ Tik “A,” and live in one big settlement. They also feel that the Penan of Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A” and Ba’ Tik “B” would not like to move to Long Sabai, either.

**Long Lobang**

**Location.** Long Lobang is located on the western side of the Pulong Tau National Park, at the confluence of the Nyala and Lobang Rivers, about 0.5 kilometer from the National Park. Long Lobang is accessible from Bario by walking through the National Park, a
tough two-day walk. It can also be reached from Miri by a logging road in one day; however, it is necessary to walk from the end of the logging road for about one and half hours to reach the village.

Population. Long Lobang is a small settlement comprising 13 families and a population of 52 persons. They live in two blocks of a newly-built longhouse provided by Shin Yang Timber Company. They moved into the two-block longhouse in September, 2004. There are seven individuals, all Penan from other areas, who, with one exception, came following marriages with the people of the village. Of the seven individuals, six are females and one male. Three of the females were originally from Long Kerong on the Selungo; and one each from Long Napir in Limbang District, Long Beruang in the upper Baram, and Ba’ Pengaran in the Akah. The male is from Ba’ Tik “A.” The age structure of the village is shown below.

Education. Of the population of 52 persons, 24 have some formal education: 10 males and 14 females. In terms of levels, 20 have primary, while 4 have secondary education. Of the 20 with primary education, four did not reach Primary Six, but dropped out because of financial reasons. Of the 21 persons between the ages of 5 and 19, only six are in school. Of the remaining 15, 6 left school after completing Primary Six or dropped out, two could not attend school because they did not have birth certificates, one is physically handicapped, while the other six did not go to school because of financial difficulties. Three village elders, one male and two females, have attended the BEM adult education classes, specifically to enable them to read the Bible in Penan. Table 3 shows the number...
of persons who have obtained the different levels of education.

**History.** The Penan of Long Lobang say that they have always lived on the Kuba’an and its tributaries. Like most nomadic groups, they did travel outside the Kuba’an area into the Tutoh, Akah, Selungo, and Magoh, but returned to the Kuba’an, the area they consider to be the home of their ancestors.

During the Brooke and Colonial periods, if a *tamu* was held on the Malinau, they moved to the Magoh and stayed in the area for a few weeks or a month to look for food before they continued their journey, carrying their jungle trade items to Long Melinau, below the present Mulu National Park HQ. If the *tamu* was to be held in Layun, they moved to the Upper Tutoh; or if it was in the Selungo, they moved to the Upper Akah, and so on. On their journey from their home to the *tamu* meeting place, groups were bound to meet at some points along the way. Such meetings provided opportunities to exchange news and information, and renew friendship between groups. During such meetings single people would look for future spouses. After weeks or perhaps months of traveling, they would return to the Kuba’an and its tributaries, the Nyela, Lobang, Laleh, and Rakidah.

Their immediate settled neighbors in the Kuba’an were the Kelabit of Pa’ Tik’, located exactly on the same site where the Penan village of Ba’ Tik “A” is now. They visited the Kelabit at Pa’ Tik mainly to exchange jungle produce for essential items such

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left School</th>
<th>Still in School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3  Educational attainment of the Penan of Long Lobang

7 Pa’ Tik in Kelabit means ‘Tik River,’ *pa’* =river, and Tik, the name of the river; similarly Ba’ Tik in Penan also means ‘Tik River,’ *ba’* =river, and Tik the name of the river. Pa’ Tik is used with reference to the Kelabit, and Ba’ Tik with the Penan. The Kelabit migrated to Bario in the early 1960s, around the konfrontasi period (Indonesian confrontation with Malaysia, 1962-1966), to establish a new village at Arur Dalan.
as Kelabit salt, utensils, and bush knives. After years of friendship, the Kelabit extended an invitation to the Penan to settle down nearby. Colonial District Officers had also encouraged them to settle down.

They eventually settled around the time of the Brunei Rebellion, establishing a village on the true left bank of the Nyela, opposite the Kelabit village of Pa’ Tik. They grew cassava and hill rice on small plots of land. However, they did not stay long in the village to look after the rice fields and cassava gardens. After planting, they left for the forest to process sago, hunt, or collect rattan and other jungle produce, remaining in the forest for weeks and even months. They would return to the village for a short time to inspect their rice fields and gardens, and went back to the forest. It was only at harvest time that they stayed in the village for a longer period. While having their houses at Ba’ Tik, they also established farms and gardens at Long Lobang, building temporary huts there. Sometime in the early or mid 1990s, they began to stay more permanently at Long Lobang. By 2001 they decided to stay permanently at Long Lobang after a timber company built them a longhouse.

Contact with Outsiders. The Kelabit of Pa’ Tik were the first outsiders the Penan had contact with. As mentioned earlier, their visits were mainly to trade. The Penan also made trips to the distant Kenyah village of Lio Matu, the Kayan village of Long Bedian, and also met with the Berawan people at the tamu on the Malinau River, in what is now the Mulu National Park. These trips were made when they came to attend the barter trade meetings. A few individuals made specific trips to Lio Matu and Long Bedian to attend adult education classes for church elders organized by the Borneo Evangelical Mission. The Penan look back at barter trade meetings as important events. The meetings provided opportunities to meet government officials and discuss matters affecting them. They also got medical treatment from the traveling dressers accompanying the District Officers.

Christianity. They probably converted to Christianity in the mid 1950s, while visiting the Kelabit village of Pa’ Tik where they attended church services. They took their conversion seriously after church elders attended the adult education classes.

Settlement. As mentioned earlier, they settled around the time of the Brunei Rebellion together with the group under Melai Na’ of Ba’ Tik. In the mid 1990s, they split from Melai’s group to establish the present settlement of Long Lobang.

Farming. As mentioned earlier, they started farming when they first settled down in the early 1960s, but did not take the activity seriously. After planting they left for the forest, leaving what they had planted to grow on its own. They became more serious about farming after they moved to Long Lobang and began intercropping cassava and vegetables with hill rice.

Last year’s harvest was good and virtually all families had enough rice to last them until the next harvest. Whether they have enough rice is not of great concern to them, as they can always rely on cassava and wild sago. In terms of a general food supply, it is not a problem. Nevertheless, they have expressed interest in wet rice cultivation. Some of them have visited Bario, Ba’ Kelalan, and the Lutut valley in the Kerayan in East Kalimantan, and are impressed by the wet rice irrigation system of the Kelabit, Lun Bawang, and Lun Dayeh. The Penan of Long Lobang are thinking
seriously about adopting wet rice cultivation and feel that this is a development project that the Agriculture Department should introduce to them. There is adequate flat land in Long Lobang that can be converted into wet rice fields. Many families raise chickens mainly for domestic consumption, but some are sold to timber workers or to visitors passing through the village. Some of the older Penan do not eat chicken as, traditionally, they consider it inappropriate to eat anything that is raised or domesticated.

*Income and Employment.* The Long Lobang residents consider themselves as full-time subsistence farmers. However, they still devote a considerable amount of time to hunting and gathering, especially during the off-farming season. In the past, they used to spend a lot of time collecting jungle produce for barter trade, but this activity has been drastically reduced as there are no longer government-supervised barter trade meetings. A Kayan from Long Bedian runs his own trade meetings with nomadic Penan living in areas between the Mulu National Park and the Pulong Tau National Park once a month, and the Penan of Long Lobang sometimes participate in this event, bartering rattan mats and baskets for essential items such as salt, sugar, coffee, cooking utensils, and sundries.

Some of the young men earn money as informants or as guide-cum-porters for scientific expeditions, or for the occasional tourists passing through the area. During the off-farming season, they may go to Bario and look for employment with the Kelabit. Timber companies in the area are willing to employ Penan, but so far none has accepted the offer.

*Houses.* Shin Yang Timber Company built a two-block longhouse for the settlers. It is a sturdy, clean, and well-ventilated longhouse. The Penan moved into the two blocks in September 2004. No Penan was involved in the construction of the longhouse. The work was contracted to the Kayan of Long Bedian, and the Penan were told that their involvement was not required. This is a pity as Penan involvement would have been a useful learning experience for them. It would also have created a sense of achievement and ownership. A group of Christian professionals from Singapore and Miri donated a 12 hp. electric generator to the village in 2004. They get their supply of fuel from the Shin Yang timber camp located at the confluence of the Kuba’an and Tutoh Rivers.

*Views on Timber Blockades.* The Penan of Long Lobang said they have taken part in a number of blockades in the Layun, Magoh, and Tutoh. According to them, blockades are erected when timber companies and the government ignore the hardships of the people caused by the destruction of food resources, game, and economic activities due to logging. They erect blockades as a last resort to draw public attention to their plight. As we were discussing the topic of blockades, a young woman remarked that “a blockade is an invitation to talk.” Their view is that, as legitimate occupants of the area, they have the right to defend their way of life and livelihood.

*Views on the National Park.* They welcome the idea of a National Park and foresee that it will not adversely affect their livelihood. As they live close to the Park, they see it as a source of employment for local people, as informants, guides and porters, and perhaps as permanent employees in the future.
Plate 5: Beautiful scenery in the upper Tutoh, below Long Sabai.

Plate 6: Penan women at Long Sabai pounding rice.
Plate 7: Mother and child sitting beside their hearth.

Plate 8: Semi-settled Penan children on the bank of the Tutoh.
View on One Big Settlement. The idea of one big settlement for the Penan around the Park is good, but they are sceptical that it is achievable. They have just had a new longhouse built, and they do not like the idea of moving to another place to live in one big settlement. If the site for the big settlement is Long Lobang, they doubt that other settlements would join them.

Ba’ Tik “A”

Location. Ba’ Tik “A” is located west of the Pulong Tau National Park, slightly above the confluence of the Nyela and Tik. It is about two kilometers away from the Park. The village is nestled on a large padang (open field) used as a helicopter landing pad as well as a soccer field for British soldiers during Konfrontasi. A perfect spot, its surroundings are picturesque. The settlement is within the area of the former Kelabit village of Pa’ Tik.

Population. Ba’ Tik “A” is a small settlement comprising 8 households and a population of 35 people. Out of this population, four are Penan from other villages: 2 from Long Kerong, one each from Long Kawi and Ba’ Ajeng. They came to Ba’ Tik “A” following marriages with the local people. When they first established a settlement here, the group comprised four bands of former nomads, each group made up of members closely related by blood or marriage. Over the years, three groups left the settlement, reverting to nomadic life. The remaining group under the present headman, Melai Na’, also split into three groups, leaving the present population of a mere 35 individuals. Figure 5 shows the age structure of the Penan settlement of Ba’ Tik “A.”

Education. Eight of the children are currently attending school in Bario, four in the primary school and four in the secondary school. Six of the adults in their 30s and 40s have had primary education. Two individuals in their 20s and 30s attended the adult education classes organized by the Sidang Injil Borneo Church. This is a continuation of the adult education program introduced by the Borneo Evangelical Mission. Table 4 shows the number of persons who have obtained the different levels of education.

History. The Penan of Ba’ Tik “A” claim that they have always lived in the Kuba’an and its tributaries, the Rekidah, Nyela, Lobang, and Laleh. But they also moved into the Magoh, Tutoh, Selungo, and Akah. They even crossed the Baram River into the Silat, Selio, and as far as the Usun Apau in Western Penan territory. The headman talked fondly of meeting Western Penan with whom Eastern Penan seldom meet. Even though they traveled far, they would return to the place they call their ancestral land, tana’ pohoo.

Around the time of the Brunei Rebellion in December 1962, they were invited by the Kelabit headman of Pa’ Tik, Lupong Bala, to settle near the Kelabit longhouse. The Penan built their huts on the true left bank of the Nyela, opposite the Kelabit longhouse. At the time the Kelabit were on the verge of moving to Bario. The majority of the Pa’ Tik Kelabit are now settled at Arur Dalan, Bario. The Penan headman recalls that there were only two resident Kelabit families when they built their huts.

When they first settled at Ba’ Tik, they comprised four nomadic bands. Leaders of these bands were Wee Salau, Kurau Kusin, Pelisi Agan Jeluan, and Melai Na’. Except for the band under Melai Na’, the other bands were all from the Magoh. After a few years
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of living in the Ba’t Tik area, Wee Salau, Kurau Kusin, and Pelisi Agan Jeluan led their bands back to the Magoh. They said that they had to go back to their own place, their ancestral land, tana’ pohoo. Pelisi Agan Jeluan took his group back to the Upper Magoh, Wee Salau and Kurau Kusin brought their own groups back to the Lower Magoh, close to the Mulu National Park. Sometime in the early or mid 1990s, a splinter group led by Kuya Akeh moved up the Nyela to farm around the Long Lobang area. At that time they moved back and forth between Ba’t Tik “A” and Long Lobang, but by 2001 the group spent more time at Long Lobang than Ba’t Tik “A.” In 2004 a new longhouse was built for them, and this made their stay in Long Lobang permanent.

In 2001, Melai’s son, Samuel, moved up the Tik River to establish another settlement called Ba’t Tik “B” following a disagreement between them over the marriage of the latter to a nomadic Penan girl. Today, Ba’t Tik “A” comprises only eight families with a population of 35 people.

Contact with Outsiders. The Penan of Ba’t Tik “A” had a good relationship with the Kelabit of Pa’t Tik. They traded with the Kelabit and were often guests. They also traded with the Kenyah, Kayan, and Berawan whom they met at trade meetings in the Selungo, Layun, and Malinau. It was during these trade meetings that they also had contacts with

Figure 5  Age structure of the population of Ba’ Tik “A”
various colonial officers. Melai’s group is perhaps the only Eastern Penan from the Tutoh area to have lived with the Western Penan.

Christianity. As regular guests of the Kelabit of Pa’ Tik, the Penan followed the Kelabit to attend church services in the village. Over the years they realized that they have become Christians unconsciously, conducting their own prayer meetings. The Penan take Christianity seriously and use it as a guiding principle in their lives.

Settlement. Ba’ Tik “A” is a perfect site for a village. It is unfortunate that not many Penan live here. The headman extended an invitation to the semi-nomadic Penan of Long Tah to join him, but their reply has always been: “give us time to think about it.” He is also not happy that his own son left the village to form a small settlement up the Tik River at Ba’ Tik “B.” He is hoping that he will return one day to Ba’ Tik “A” with the people of Ba’ Tik “B”, as the place they occupy is located in a narrow valley without room for village expansion.

Farming. They have been planting hill rice and cassava since the early 1960s and claim they have enough rice to last them from one harvest to the next. Like the other settled Penan in the area, they rotate their food around rice, cassava, and sago. The forest is still important to the Penan, and they go there every other day to hunt, process sago, and collect rattan, fruit, and vegetables.

Income and Employment. There is no cash employment in the area. Although there are a few nearby logging companies, they are not interested in working with them. During the gaharu boom, they made quite a lot of money, but this resource is now difficult to locate. To earn a bit of cash, the few young people in the settlement go to Bario to look for work with Kelabit families.

Houses. Most of the families live in single houses built by the British Army during
Konfrontasi. The headman's house is still in good condition. On the hill slope leading to the padang where the main village is located are several empty houses left by the Penan who now reside at Long Lobang. They are thinking of building new houses.

Views on Timber Blockades. The Penan of Ba’ Tik “A” say that putting up a blockade is a waste of time, but if they don’t do anything they have nobody to blame other than themselves for not standing up for their rights. They say that when the loggers come in they normally tell them the “sensitive” areas to avoid. When this is not adhered to they go to see the company manager or lodge a complaint at the District Office, Marudi. If no action is taken, they go to Shabat Alam Malaysia (SAM) to get help to write a letter of complaint to the highest State authorities. When all fails, they have no other choice but to erect a blockade or a series of blockades along the timber road.

Views on the National Park. The villagers say that the Pulong Tau National Park is a good idea. They look at the Park as a way to prevent loggers from destroying the environment. It protects the land, conserves flora and fauna, and prevents landslides and pollution of rivers and streams. The Penan say that they will exercise the right of access to the Park with care. They have been living in the forest since time immemorial and know how to look after it.

Views on One Big Settlement. The headman says that the idea of one big settlement for the Penan around Pulong Tau National Park is good, but doubts whether it is achievable. If there is a serious move to regroup all the Penan around the Park, Ba’ Tik “A” would be a good location. He, however, doubts that the people of Long Lobang would want to come back to Ba’ Tik “A,” much less those of Long Sabai. What he proposes instead is for the group at Ba’ Tik “B” to join Ba’ Tik “A” to form a sizable community.

Ba’ Tik “B”

Location. Ba’ Tik “B” is located on the true left bank of the Tik River, one and a half hours’ walk from Ba’ Tik “A” and about one kilometer from the National Park.

Population. Ba’ Tik “B” comprises nine households and a population of 31 people. Except for the headman, Samuel Melai, and a Berau Dayak from East Kalimantan, the remaining group members were recently nomadic. During my visit to the settlement there were five people at home: the headman, his wife, their niece, the Berau Dayak, and another fellow villager, Pase Tingang. The rest of the villagers were in the forest processing sago or collecting rattan. Of the nine households, six are offshoots of one family, that of Padeng Sega and his wife Runan Tingang. Padeng and Runan have five children with their own nuclear families. An Indonesian Dayak from Berau is married to one of their daughters. Their son, Dawat Padeng, is married to a Penan from Ba’ Adang in the Limbang District. Another Penan from the Adang is married to the granddaughter of Padeng and Runan. In fact, everyone in the nine households is closely related by blood or marriage. The age distribution of the settlement is shown in Figure 6.

Education. Of the 11 people between the ages of 5 and 19, 5 are attending school. All the 5 pupils are enrolled in the government primary school at Bario: 2 in Primary Two, 1 in Primary Four, 1 in Primary Five, and 1 in Primary Six. Four individuals, 2 males
and 2 females, between the ages of 30 and 44 have formal education at the primary level. Two individuals, both female, attended the Sidang Injil Borneo Adult Education classes and are able to read the Bible in Penan. Only two adults have formal education up to the secondary level: the headman, Samuel Melai, and the Berau Dayak from East Kalimantan.

Figure 6  Age structure of the population of Ba’ Tik ‘B’

History. The people of Ba’ Tik “B” are from the family of Padeng Sega and his wife Runan Tingang. In the head count I did for nomadic Penan in 1990, I found Padeng’s family among the group of nomadic Penan, under the leadership of Bala Tingang, then foraging in the general area of Kuba’an. About twelve years ago, the headman, Samuel Melai, then living in Ba’ Tik “A,” married one of Padeng’s daughters, Ganit Padeng. Samuel persuaded his father-in-law and his children to settle down. In 2001, they established a settlement on the Tik River, with Samuel as its headman. They grew cassava and planted hill rice on temuda left by the Kelabits who had moved to Bario in the early 1960s.

Contact with the Outsiders. The settlers of Ba’ Tik “B” are a part of groups of Penan that occupied the Kuba’an since time immemorial. The story of their contact with neighbors...
and the outside world is similar to the other groups mentioned earlier. Members of the group have traveled widely in the upper Tutoh, Akah, and Selungo, but consider the Kuba’an their ancestral land.

Christianity. They became Christians through contact with the Kelabits who used to live at Pa’ Tik.

Settlement. The settlement is located in a narrow valley surrounded by steep hills. On the opposite bank from the settlement is a very steep hill, where the footpath to Bario snakes its way along the ridge.

Farming. The villagers grow both cassava and hill rice, but sago is still preferred by the older folks. The headman says that when they take good care of their farms they normally get a good harvest. But when the villagers spend more time in the forest hunting, looking for rattan, or processing sago, neglecting their farms, then they don’t get a good harvest. He says that this is not of great concern to the villagers or him as there is plenty of wild sago, and also cassava to fall back on in times of rice shortage. They raise chickens, but the majority of the people in the settlement do not eat them. Some of the chickens are sold to the timber camp at the mouth of Kuba’an River.

Income and Employment. There is no cash employment. Gaharu was the main source of cash income, but this resource is now difficult to locate. There is no market for rattan mats and baskets. If they want to earn some money, they go to Bario to look for work with Kelabit families. During the past four years, a few people have been employed by researchers as guides, informants, and porters.

Houses. During my visit, I saw four houses. Some families are sharing houses. All the houses were built by the Penan themselves. The houses look solid, but are poorly maintained.

Table 5 - Educational attainment of the Penan of Ba’ Tik “B”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Left School</th>
<th></th>
<th>Still in School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F1-3</td>
<td>F4-5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 -14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 – Above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Views on Timber Blockades.** Speaking on behalf of his community, the headman, who I found to be an amiable person, cordial and knowledgeable on local matters, said that the Penan of Ba’ Tik “B” have taken an active part in timber blockades in the Baram and Limbang Districts. Logging, as mentioned earlier and elsewhere (see also Brosius 1991, 1993, 1997, 2006, 2007), destroys food resources such as sago, the staple food of most Penan, rattan and other essential items; causes stream and river pollution; and felled tree branches obstruct pathways in the forest, making it difficult to walk and locate resources. It is for these reasons that the Penan have put up blockades against logging operations in various parts of the Baram and Limbang Districts. For putting up these blockades, the Penan have been labelled “trouble-makers,” “anti-development,” etc. The headman said that the Penan do not deserve these labels; they are not opposed to logging per se, and recognize the rights of timber companies to harvest timber. He insisted that, by the same token, the authorities and timber companies should recognize the rights of the Penan to subsist on the forest. When the loggers bulldoze their way onto people’s land as if nobody lives off the area, the Penan consider this not only insensitive to the rights of others, but mean and inconsiderate.

The Penan of Ba’ Tik “B,” like other Penan in the upper Baram area take the view that blockades are an expression of frustration and helplessness. They also express their determination to defend their way of life. As long as their rights are not recognized, they intend to continue to press for their recognition.

**Views on the National Park.** The headman said that as far as the people of his village are concerned, they are happy with the idea of turning the area into a national park. They view this as a positive way to prevent logging operations in the area. Although he and the villagers may not understand the detailed concept of a national park and what conservation means, from what they had heard, the idea is generally consistent with how the Penan people relate to the forest.

**Views on One Big Settlement.** The headman felt that one big settlement for the Penan around the Park is not practical. He personally felt that the three settlements, Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A,” Ba’ Tik “B,” should remain where they are. After all, these settlements are not far apart, with only a one-hour walk between them. He said that the priority should be to encourage the three semi-settled groups to settle down with the existing settled Penan, the Ba’ Medamut group to settle at Ba’ Tik “B,” the Long Tah group at Ba’ Tik “A,” and the Long Anying group at Long Lobang.

**The Semi-Settled Penan**

There are three groups of semi-settled Penan in the Kuba’an River area. They have established three base camps along the Tutoh and Kuba’an: Long Anying on the Tutoh, just below the confluence of the Tutoh and Kubaan; and Long Tah and Ba’ Medamut on the Kuba’an. The population and number of households (Table 6) should be viewed as estimates as they were obtained from the Penan settlements of Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A,” and Ba’ Tik “B,” not directly from the bands concerned. These three groups of semi-settled Penan are among a number of bands of nomadic Penan foraging the Tutoh, Magoh, and Kuba’an. They are descendants of the bands of nomadic Penan described by Harrisson in his 1949 article. Some names of individuals in the three semi-

The three semi-settled groups have been living in the Tutoh-Kuba’an area side by side with the settled groups of Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A” and Ba’ Tik “B” for as long as they can remember, sharing resources. A number of families were originally from the Magoh, being pushed further inland into the Kuba’an because of logging activities. Based on information obtained from the settled groups at Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A,” and Ba’ Tik “B”, the three semi-settled groups cultivate cassava, with the group from Ba’ Medamut also planting rice on a communal rather than household basis. Being semi-settled, they still spend a lot of time foraging in the forest. While the able-bodied members of the group are out in the forest, the older folks and small children remain in the base camp. The base camp is occupied all year round.

During my visit to Long Anying only a few people, mainly old people and young children, were at home. The others were out in the forest processing sago, hunting, or collecting rattan. A few young people were in Long Bedian either looking for wage work or visiting the rural clinic. The semi-settled Penan of Long Anying visit the settled Penan of Long Lobang quite frequently, while those at Long Tah visit Ba’ Tik “A,” and those at Ba’ Medamut visit Ba’ Tik “B.” Periodically, the Penan of Ba’ Medamut get reciprocal visits from the settled Penan of Ba’ Tik “B.” This is because several individuals in Ba’ Medamut have siblings in Ba’ Tik “B.”

Table 6  Household number and population of semi-settled Penan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group name</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Anying</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Tah</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba’ Medamut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of Long Lobang quite frequently, while those at Long Tah visit Ba’ Tik “A,” and those at Ba’ Medamut visit Ba’ Tik “B.” Periodically, the Penan of Ba’ Medamut get reciprocal visits from the settled Penan of Ba’ Tik “B.” This is because several individuals in Ba’ Medamut have siblings in Ba’ Tik “B.”

The frequent visits made by the semi-nomadic groups to the settled groups have been interpreted as an indication of interest on the part of the semi-settled groups to move and settle with the settled groups. However, this is not the case with the Penan of Long Anying. Although they visit Long Lobang quite frequently, they have no desire to settle there. They prefer to stay at Long Anying which is just across river from Batu Lulau, a hillock with abundant sago and fruit trees. I did not visit the groups residing at Long Tah and Ba’ Medamut, nor meet anyone from there, so we do no know if their frequent visits to Ba’ Tik “A” and Ba’ Tik “B” mean that they will eventually move to these two settlements.

During my visit to Long Anying there was a shortage of food at the camp. This was the reason for the absence of young people, as they were out in the forest processing sago, hunting and gathering. When asked if food shortages were a frequent occurrence, the response was that food resources are still available in the forest, but that logging
activities have made it difficult to locate them. The Penan of Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A,” and Ba’ Tik “B” felt that since the three groups at Long Anying, Long Tah, and Ba’ Medamut occupy the area adjacent to the Pulong Tau National Park, they too should be given rights of access to it.

Summary and Conclusion

There are four settled Penan groups with a total of 52 households and 218 persons located west and south of the Pulong Tau National Park: Long Sabai, Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A”, and Ba’ Tik “B.” Three semi-settled groups comprising 36 households and a population of 145 people have established base camps outside the western boundary of the Park: Long Anying (which later moved to Long Taha), Long Tah and Ba’ Medamut.

The settled groups plant hill rice and cassava as their main food crops besides various kinds of fruit trees, sugar cane, and vegetables for side dishes. They go to the forest quite frequently to gather food items such as shoots, mushrooms, and other wild vegetables, medicinal plants and other forest produce such as rattan, gaharu and ketepe (wild rubber). Occasionally they go to the forest to process sago for the old folks who still prefer sago to rice or cassava. They hunt and fish frequently, still depending on the forest for many of their domestic needs. The semi-settled groups plant cassava and occasionally hill rice, either on a communal basis or by household. They go to the forest frequently to process sago, hunt, fish, and collect forest items, including medicinal plants. They occasionally visit their settled relatives at Long Lobang, Ba’ Tik “A” and Ba’ Tik “B,” staying for days or weeks at a time.

Of the 218 settled Penan around the PTNP, 53 persons have primary education, 24 have secondary education, and 14 in their late 50s upward are able to read printed materials in Penan owing to the Borneo Evangelical Mission adult education program. This means that 42% of the settled Penan are literate. A small number of the semi-settled Penan children attend primary school at Bario.

During the Brooke and Colonial periods, the Penan moved, often over wide areas in the Upper Tutoh River and its tributaries, the Magoh, Kuba’an, and Sabai, looking for food, hunting, and gathering trade items to bring to trading centers located in various parts of interior Baram. Although they traveled widely, they eventually returned to home bases referred to as okoo’ bu’un or tana’ pohoo. They are historically linked to where they are today through old camp sites and ancestral burial grounds.

Eastern Penan groupings are smaller than those of the Western Penan. The four settled groups have an average of 54 persons per settlement and the semi-settled groups of 49 per group. Settlements are basically kin-based with most individuals closely related. Composition of groups is fluid, with constant movement of individuals and households between groups. This poses difficulties for any proposal to resettle them in one large settlement. Given the emotional attachment of each group to the area it currently occupies, the idea of resettling the Penan around PTNP seems impractical.

The Penan consider their surroundings as a source of survival. They refer to their surroundings as a “bank” or “supermarket” that provides all their needs. Their relationship is one of stewardship, harvesting resources on a sustained yield basis, and conscious of the fact that they need to hand over these surroundings in good shape to
succeeding generations. The Penan look at logging as a major obstacle to handing-over their surroundings in good condition to the coming generations. It is precisely for this reason that the Penan put up timber blockades to remind loggers not to cause unnecessary damages to the environment and to respect the rights of local people to continue their way of life on their own land.

The Penan in the surrounding area support the idea of a national park, particularly if they are given rights of access to it. They also see the park as a way to prevent logging activities in the area, and a source of possible future employment.
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Introduction

In 1994, decades after the Punan Vuhang and spirits of their cosmos had ceased contact with each other due to the Punan Vuhang’s conversion to Christianity, two dwarf-like otu dokgek spirits appeared to the people to appeal for help. One night, during a long period of drought and food scarcity, two female spirits appeared in a dream to a former shaman, asking for food. The following morning, three of the shaman’s nephews and members of a related household each obtained a fat wild boar. That evening, the former shaman offered a little of the meat to the dwarf spirits and requested that the Christian God show sympathy toward the spirits. This event demonstrated that although they are now Christians, the Punan Vuhang still believe in spirits.

This paper presents an account of the belief system of the Punan Vuhang before their conversion to Christianity in the late 1960s. Punan Vuhang cosmological beliefs contained four main elements that were related to their socio-economic activities. First, they believed that the realm inhabited by human beings encompassed several spirit realms, some inhabited by benevolent, and others by malevolent spirits. Second, aided by shamans, people were able to cultivate close relationships with the benevolent spirits by celebrating nyangen rituals. These spirits, in turn, assisted them in nullifying the threat of malevolent spirits to which they were exposed in nalau rituals. Third, belief in the harmful effects of the malevolent souls of the dead caused the community to flee from sites of death where these souls were said to linger. Fourth, their augural system influenced their socio-economic life in that the appearances of auguries regulated many of their daily activities.

The paper in this volume will present the first and second elements of the Punan Vuhang former belief system, while the third and fourth elements will appear in a later volume. As the community no longer fully embraces these beliefs, my account is based solely on information provided by informants. Nyinyang Enang, the only former shaman still alive during my fieldwork, was my primary informant and the former shaman that appears in the story above. Nyinyang’s narration was difficult to follow and I have relied on Naro Pua and Uji Lating to clarify and order the information. While arranging the material which I present here, I kept in mind an issue mentioned by Endicott (1979:29-30):

But I think it is fair to say that everything I have recorded is present in the Batek cultural tradition, even though it probably does not
correspond exactly to what is known by any particular individual. Another difference between Batek knowledge and my description is in the order I have imposed on the material. I have arranged the exposition in a way that I hope will be easily comprehended by the reader. But this does not actually violate Batek conceptions because there is no ‘correct’ order for describing the Batek world-view.

I also took note of Shanti Thambiah’s concern “not to create an impression of coherence in a situation filled with uncertainty and contradictions” (1995:157).

**The Punan Vuhang**

When I conducted fieldwork in 1993-95, the Punan Vuhang lived in a single longhouse settlement called Long Lidem, at the estuary of the Lidem, a small tributary of the Kajang River, in the Malaysian State of Sarawak (See Maps 1 and 3). Their population then was 70 persons, comprising 47 males and 23 females. They settled down in 1968 and briefly adopted the Adat Bungan religion. In 1970, they converted to Christianity. Before they settled down, they had moved about in a wide area, encompassing some 1500 square miles that covered the headwaters of the Balui River (the name given to the upper part of the Rejang River, the longest waterway in Malaysia), and its tributaries of the Danum, Linau, Kajang, Bahau and the Kihan, tributary of the Iwan River of Indonesia (see Map 2). Rapids and waterfalls along the upper parts of these rivers inhibited traveling and discouraged shifting cultivators from living here, and in the past, only hunter-gatherers occupied this region. Until recently when logging intruded, the area was covered with pristine rainforest vegetation. It was in this isolated region that the Punan Vuhang had lived from time immemorial.

**Cosmology**

The Punan Vuhang believed that the cosmos consisted of five main realms, with the human realm at its center. Above the human realm was the heavenly realm, or sky, termed *lau*. Below the human realm was the realm beneath the land. On the same level with the human realm were the upriver and downriver realms. The realms of the heavens and those beneath the land were beyond the reach of ordinary human beings. The upriver and the downriver realms, on the other hand, had no clearly demarcated boundary and overlapped with the human realm. Consequently, ordinary human beings could interact with the spirit beings residing there. In contrast, only shamans could communicate with spirits residing in the realms above and below the earth.

The following depiction of the Punan Vuhang cosmos will provide a background for understanding their belief system. The characteristics of the different realms relate to the beings that reside in them and also to the interactions with beings of other realms. I use the term “realm” to describe the five domains that different categories of spirits inhabited. The Punan Vuhang themselves did not talk of “realms,” but accorded specific names for the distinctive domains inhabited by different spirits.

**The Heavenly Realm**

Figure 1 shows that the heavenly realm consisted of five distinct regions: *Kak lolau* (beyond the sky) was the highest. The second highest was the *likun avun* and the
Map 1: Sarawak and the Adjacent Territory of Kalimantan

Map 3: Sedentary Punan Vuhang Regular Exploitation Grounds: The Kajang Basin

Figure 1: Punan Vuhang Cosmology
level below that was the nuan sok lau (a place in the sky). All these regions were beyond the reach of ordinary human beings. Only the soul of the shaman could visit these places, and it went regularly to the likun avun to perform nyangen rituals with participating otu tulik spirits.

**Kak Lolau**—The kak lolau, or region ‘beyond the sky’ formed the highest part of the heavens. Its sole inhabitants were the lorong spirits. The only other spirits that were able to travel there were the otu tulik, spirits who inhabited the likun avun region. Besides residing in a region beyond the reach of other spirits (with the exception of the otu tulik), the lorong were also invisible to all other spirits. Their unattainable environs and invisibility made the lorong the most powerful spirits in the Punan Vuhang cosmos. Because of their power, the otu tulik spirits sought the lorong for protection and requested that individual lorong become their protector-spirits. In order to commit a lorong to provide protection, the otu tulik made pacts with them in which they became protector-spirits. After forming a pact with an otu tulik spirit, the lorong protector-spirit then became visible to its otu tulik protégé. Other than this, the Punan Vuhang did not know much about kak lolau as it was considered a mysterious place too high even for the soul of a shaman to reach.

**Likun Avun**—The next region below kak lolau was the likun avun, the best-known realm in the Punan Vuhang cosmology. It was the realm that the otu tulik inhabited, where they performed nyangen rituals comprising musical and singing activities and competitive games (puyat), renowned throughout the cosmos. Because of nyangen, likun avun was a place frequently visited by spirits of other realms, including the souls of shamans who helped otu tulik perform the nyangen rituals.

According to Nyinyang, the only surviving former shaman whose soul is acknowledged to have gone to likun avun, the most striking feature of the region was its brightness (talabangat / talajantan). Everything was sparkling and bright. The other unusual feature was that the houses could fly. Using a helicopter as an analogy, a house could fly and land wherever its inhabitants, the otu tulik, liked. Despite the brightness of likun avun, the houses were even brighter, like fireflies shining in the darkness of the night. Some of these houses became the site for performances of nyangen rituals. As otu tulik in the likun avun performed various activities, otu tulik from other regions or realms came to participate or to watch as spectators.

Features of likun avun were quite similar to those of the human world. Its rivers were big, with pebbles shining like sparkling beads. The water level always stayed the same and the current flowed gently. Trees were all of a similar height, with leaves like stars, sparkling on clear moonless nights.

**Nuan Sok Lau**—The region of the nuan sok lau (a place in the sky) or jik lau tek kakop (a region in the lower sky) was where souls of the dead congregated. The Punan Vuhang believed the souls of the dead (buruan dok kavoh) existed in a very happy state, always laughing, playing and splashing water (petitik). The Punan Vuhang were forbidden to mention a soul’s name, not even in a whisper, for the spirits would know of it and then
cause rain or even rainstorms. For this reason, the Punan Vuhang were not told the names of their ancestors by their elderly kinsmen. A household was only told an ancestor’s name during the naming of a child that took on the name of the ancestor. Then the elders in the community announced the relationship between the newborn child and the dead ancestor. The ancestor was usually of the third or fourth generation, chosen from among the siblings of the individuals’ grandparents or great-grandparents whose names only the surviving elders knew.

The soul of the dead, or buruan dok kavoh, traveled to the place of the dead by way of a land bridge called Batang Tebilong, which linked the earth and the place of the dead through the moon (langa’ne). A dead person’s soul traveled up the Batang Tebilong, going through the moon to reach the sok lau. The Punan Vuhang heard long ago that a man by the name of Lake’ Tungum (of Punan Aput origin) was sleeping on a mountain ridge near the Kapuas River in Indonesian Kalimantan. It was said that through the night, he saw people of all colors and languages passing by him on the ridge. Most of the people were groaning in different languages, some understood by Lake’ Tungum, but most unintelligible to him. As he observed further, he saw that the land bridge led to the moon and then beyond.

This story supported the Punan Vuhang belief that the souls of the dead went up to the heavens during the appearance of a new moon (a description of death-related beliefs will be discussed in Part Two of this paper), and it explained how the moon functioned as a bridge between the earth and the sky for the dead spirits to go to their place in the nuan sok lau.

The Realm beneath the Earth

The realm beneath the earth was believed by the Punan Vuhang to be a huge space with its own sky and a ground terrain very similar to that where human beings resided. It consisted of two regions, the belahut and the kunyuling, with the names of the inhabitants being the same as that of the region in which they dwelled.

**Belahut** — The belahut was the region below the earthly realm that was closest to the surface of the earth. It was a place in which all vegetation was similar in height and as tall as a Punan Vuhang—about 5 feet 2 inches. The plants were small and looked very luxuriant and beautiful.

The otu belahut emerged from the earth’s surface to fish, although their main food was a type of tuber called luan. They lived in wooden longhouses that they did not build, but instantaneously created.

**Kunyuling**—Kunyuling was the region far beneath the earth. It was too far for the soul of a shaman to enter directly from the ground. Instead, he had to go up to likun avun, and then dive down to it. In kunyuling, all things were red, and even the sunlight was reddish.

The otu kunyuling residing there were extremely powerful and no other type of spirit could defeat them. They could take on the form of the wind, or turn into a body with a human likeness. The spirits had huge red bodies with tattoos on their skin.
realm was so far beneath the earth and beyond the reach of other spirits, they intermarried among themselves. They stayed in longhouses, had families, but did not propagate through sexual intercourse, rather, their children simply emerged out of nowhere. Their food consisted only of the tanguh fish (*Tor douronensis*), a single fish being sufficient for a whole longhouse community of *otu kunyuling*.

The *otu kunyuling* were on very good terms with humans. Some *otu kunyuling* would approach the Punan Vuhang to become patron-spirits of shamans. As the role of being a patron-spirit was mainly taken by the *otu tulik*, only a few *otu kunyuling* became patron-spirits. Those who did, however, did not relinquish their positions. When their shaman died, they approached the shaman’s children and eventually become a patron-spirit of one of the shaman’s descendants. This was unlike the *otu tulik*, who returned to their place of origin upon the death of their shamans.

**The Upriver Realm**

The upriver realm was the domain that ordinary Punan Vuhang could experience, as two of its three regions were not distinctively separated from the human realm. Spirits in these regions frequently mingled with human beings, occasionally with positive consequences, but more often resulting in conflict and injuries to humans.

*Muxit Matan Lau*—Within the upriver realm, the region farthest upriver, *muxit matan lau*, was the only region that ordinary Punan Vuhang could not reach. *Muxit matan lau*, literally translated as ‘where the sun appears,’ was the place of the rising sun and thus it was extremely hot. Not much was known about that area since only the most powerful of shamans could withstand its heat. Nonetheless, Lengerik, the head of *otu muxit matan lau* and three other spirits, Boyong, Jilen, and Jinikon, became the patron-spirits of some shamans. The spirits that resided there were *otu tulik* and were called *otu tulik muxit matan lau*. Unlike the *otu tulik* of *likun avun*, most of these spirits did not want to become patron-spirits.

*Bulukuk*—This mountainous region with peaks and steep cliffs, huge rocks, and rivers with high waterfalls and rapids, was the domain of various types of spirits, some benevolent and others malevolent. These spirits had frequent contacts with humans. Good spirits assisted the Punan Vuhang whenever requested to do so. The bad ones harmed the human community upon being disturbed, and the malevolent spirits killed humans whenever an opportunity arose.

*Otu Tulik Bulukuk*—The most important spirits found in the mountains were the *otu tulik bulukuk*, spirits similar to those in *likun avun*. These spirits resided inside the rocky formations of the mountains. Their houses were, like those of the *likun avun*, bright and beautiful. The leaders of the mountain *otu tulik* did not welcome visitors. This was especially so in regard to the shamans or their patron-spirits who requested them to participate in *nyangen* rituals in *likun avun*. They refused to join these *nyangen* rituals because they did not want to be absent from their homes, fearing that marauding spirits would come to raid their communities.
These *otu tulik* had families, spouses and children. Their children emerged out of nowhere and became adults within the same day. They exited and entered the mountains with ease, penetrating through the rock as if diving through water. Although these spirits were similar to those of *likun avun*, the terrain inside the mountains where they lived was different from *likun avun*. For example, rivers and trees were not found inside these mountains.

These mountain *otu tulik* went to *likun avun* for *nyangen* rituals and some of them became patron-spirits to Punan Vuhang shamans. While most were good-natured, some had a marauding nature and raided stores of *busui* in *likun avun* for the highly desired *busui* (musical instruments played during *nyangen* rituals). These warlike *otu tulik* were also archenemies of another type of fierce spirits, the *otu laput lanum*, originating from the realm of the rivermouth. When either party went on an offensive against the other, innumerable warriors, like a swarm of bees, would take part. There was not much reason for war, except fighting for pride and supremacy. A battle ensued when one party boasted of its greatness and that its king or leader was the most powerful king. This insulted the other spirits, causing them to wage war against the boasters. When an enemy attacked a group of spirits, all the spirits of the same kind united to defend their honor. In an offensive war, however, only those *otu tulik* with the same warlike attitude participated. From time immemorial, neither the *otu tulik* nor the *otu laput lanum* had ever achieved a decisive victory over the other. Consequently, the two archenemies were frequently at war with each other.

The *otu tulik* related to the shamans, especially as patron-spirits, were never involved in these wars. The patron-spirits had immense loyalty to their shamans and only acted under their orders. Moreover, the patron-spirits had no need to be involved in these wars because their leadership in the *nyangen* rituals provided them fame and status achievable by no other means. In addition, some of their enemies, the *otu laput lanum*, participated as audiences in the *nyangen* rituals in *likun avun*. This contact resulted in familiarity between the two types of spirits, and consequently, an *otu tulik* patron-spirit found it unsuitable to fight against the other spirits with whom it had relationships.

*Otu Tanok*—The *otu tanok* were spirits who lived inside big rocks or boulders found in the mountains. They were dwarf spirits about one and a half feet tall and resembled human beings. They looked like little children, and wore clothes and used tools similar to those of the Punan Vuhang. However, they did not marry and always traveled with a companion of the same sex.

While the *otu tanok* were essentially harmless, they were bad tempered and easily irritated when humans became too noisy. When disturbed by noise, the eyes of an *otu tanok* turned red with anger and then it attempted to kill the offender. For that reason, the Punan Vuhang did not become noisy unnecessarily, or misbehave, out of respect or fear of the *otu tanok*. During festive seasons, however, the *otu tanok* were not offended, as they seemed to understand the need for people to be joyful and merry. This was especially so if the activities involved a shaman. The *otu tanok* had great respect for shamans because many *otu tanok* were assistant spirits to various shamans.
Otú Dogkek—The otú dogkek were spirits that resided in conditions similar to those of the otú tanok. They were also dwarf spirits that looked like little children. While they wore clothes and used weapons, they differed from the otú tanok in that they had little hair and had yellowish skin. While usually only shamans could see them, occasionally ordinary human beings also saw the otú dogkek. They lived in communities with leaders called tokek lapo. In the mountains they resided mainly along riverbanks, with their shelters in boulders.

The otú dogkek searched for food in pairs, usually at sunrise and sunset, the only times when they were awake. The only food that the otú dogkek ate was the very small finger-sized seluan fish, which they caught by using lines and hooks. They made the lines from long strands of the female spirits’ hair and the fish hooks from tekurang bones. These spirits cooked their food over a fire of blue flames that did not produce any heat. The otú dogkek did not excrete their food. After eating, they simply rubbed their stomachs with a leaf to ease their digestion.

Otú Pahkavoh—The otú pahkavoh were the spirits most hostile toward mankind, always seeking opportunities to kill and eat a human. For that, they were called the otú pahkavoh, simply translated, ‘killing spirits.’ The ability to kill a human elevated their status, and the human heart was a much-craved food. They resided inside big rocks found mainly in flat rivers with hard beds located immediately above big and high waterfalls. The Punan Vuhang called this kind of place natong, which they believed to be the nesting grounds where dragons gave birth to their young.

The otú pahkavoh were big, white-haired beings and extremely powerful. They produced a foul stench so toxic that a human being who smelled it even from faraway would have a headache and stomachache and vomit. Despite their strength, they armed themselves with knives, spears and blowpipes.

Although the otú pahkavoh were very powerful, like all spirits, they could not withstand the heat produced by fire. Even wounds caused by weapons forged with fire resulted in their death. Two stories mention Punan Vuhang killing otú pahkavoh. In the first story, a hunter used a spear to kill the hostile spirit. In the second story, a poisoned dart shot by a blowpipe caused the spirit’s death as the poison smeared on the dart had been made with heat from a fire. Otú pahkavoh traveled in small groups of twos or threes, or, more frequently, alone, in order to prevent shamans from sighting them. Traveling in bigger groups exposed them more easily to the shamans. They feared that a shaman would see and kill them before they had reached an area inhabited by humans.

Tanok, the Region of the Land—The region of tanok, or ‘land,’ was located within the same realm as where human beings lived. The difference was that tanok was a spirit realm invisible to the human eye, while the human realm was the natural domain inhabited by life on earth.

The main spirit beings, both the otú tanok and the otú dogkek, inhabited big rocks and boulders, with the otú dogkek residing closer to the river banks. As their shelters were also within the territory inhabited by the Punan Vuhang, these two types of spirits were closely related to the human community. By virtue of their proximity, they were
more intimate with the humans than spirits of the same type residing in mountainous regions.

_Otu Tanok_—_Otu tanok_ had a very close relationship with the human community and some occasionally informed the Punan Vuhang of the arrival of the seasonal wild boar migration. This usually occurred after a long period of several months without wild boars. The spirit would one day suddenly appear at daybreak walking around the settlement site, looking like a little boy wearing a loincloth and a bottom protector (tabin), and carrying a knife and spear. This indicated that the _otu tanok_ was asking the Punan Vuhang to go hunting. Informants maintained that heeding this sign always resulted in a successful hunt.

_Otu Dogkek_—When a hunter repeatedly failed to obtain game, he could approach an _otu dogkek_ for help. One could invoke their help by chanting, “Kek, kan angkun pok. Oh no’ok kan yut kum,” loosely translated, ‘Grandfather (or granduncle), give me some food. Afterwards I will give you your share.’ Shortly afterwards, the hunter would be successful. In appreciation for the spirit’s help, the hunter would immediately give the _otu dogkek_ its share by leaving a little meat or blood on a leaf. The share had to be small, the size of a small twig. The _otu dogkek_ would turn the small portion of meat into a quantity sufficient for all its community’s needs.

While the humans could ask the _otu dogkek_ for help, at times, these spirits also asked the Punan Vuhang for assistance. When the _otu dogkek_ was in distress, especially during a period of extreme scarcity of food, one would approach a hunter for help by appearing in his dreams. The next day, the hunter would go out to hunt and successfully obtain game, and then give a little of it to the _otu dogkek_. The spirits mentioned in the introduction of the paper were _otu dogkek_. According to Nyinyang, the _otu dogkek_ had not previously appeared to them after the community’s conversion to Christianity, and seeing them now was indicative of a time of very great distress for them. This difficulty could have been related to the drought in 1994 that had extended into the expected rainy season. It was also a time when there were very few wild boar. Food was scarce during the long drought, and most wild boar became very thin. Frequently, the animals were so thin that the hunters had to abandon the carcasses in the forest because even their hunting dogs found the meat unfit. It was an exceptionally long drought which had not been experienced by the Punan Vuhang for a very long time. Therefore, it was not surprising that the situation had even affected the _otu dogkek_ so badly that they had appealed for help from a former shaman no longer in contact with them. Although now Christians, the Punan Vuhang still believe in spirits.

The Downriver Realm

The downriver realm, as the upriver realm, was categorized as a spirit domain distinctively different from the natural human realm.

_Kali, Region of the Dead_—The first region downriver from the human realm was _kali_, or ‘region of the dead,’ which was actually the abandoned campsites where people had
died. These sites were located within the territory inhabited by the Punan Vuhang. A death site was not necessarily only to be found downriver. It could also have been upriver from a present settlement, when the community over the years had moved downriver from the earlier abandoned site. However, based on the Punan Vuhang’s rule to immediately flee a death site, a move was always in the upriver direction, or a direction toward the hinterlands away from the river bank. The *kali*, therefore, in relative terms, was always the downriver region.

When a person died, one of his or her two souls remained at the death site, while the other went up to the heavens (*nuan sok lau*). According to shamans who frequently saw them, the souls remaining at the death sites were in extremely bad condition, disfigured and hungry. Upon seeing a shaman, they would wave to the shaman for help, but unfortunately, these souls were condemned to their fate and nothing could be done to help them.

**The Region of the Suket**—The region farther downriver, the region of the *suket*, was the beginning of the area that ordinary human beings could not reach. It was a place farther downriver than all the areas inhabited by human communities. The Punan Vuhang had no specific name for this domain of the *suket*. Like human beings, the *suket* depended on food for survival. They ate ferns, fished and hunted, and processed sago. After eating, they did not pass any excretion, but merely massaged their stomachs with *anui* and *jalik*, two types of sweet-smelling leaves. Only two *suket*, Lirang and Belavan, were known to have practiced cultivation, and their crops took only one week to mature. When sick, the *suket* performed healing rituals to heal themselves.

The *suket* were similar to human beings, being proud and boastful of their abilities. They could jump across the sky from one place to another, and were powerful and warlike by nature. Probably for this reason, the *otu laput lanum* residing in the region farther downriver always attacked the *suket*. The equally warlike *otu laput lanum* were probably envious of the *suket*, as Punan Vuhang’s stories—with the same name—*suket*, frequently told about their adventurous quests. In this connection, apparently a renowned *suket* named Lirang was the first spirit to lead a war party to attack the *otu laput lanum*. The *suket* lost. However, they did not give up and afterwards these two types of spirits were always at war. Whenever they fought, the *suket* were usually defeated.

**Laput Lanum**—The region of the rivermouth, *laput lanum*, was a land-based region located farthest downriver. The environment was quite similar to that of *likun avun*, except that instead of its light being white, the light in *laput lanum* was yellowish. Probably, the perception of the light as yellowish was due to the color of the sky during sunset, as the *laput lanum* was west of the Punan Vuhang territory. (The Punan Vuhang do not have a word for the color orange. They call orange, as well as yellow, *nyahang*.)

The *otu laput lanum*, the sole type of spirit inhabiting the rivermouth region, densely populated the area of *laput lanum*. These spirits looked like the *otu tulik* and spoke a similar language. They lived in longhouses with innumerable members led by two paramount chiefs of similar authority called Lay Bovong Avun and Barang Longokbat. *Otu laput lanum* did visit *likun avun* for the *nyangen* rituals, but no other
“spirit outsiders” could visit them except shamans who had *otu laput lanum* as their patron-spirits. Even so, shamans were also forbidden to enter the inner sanctum, and, should they encroach, would be killed. The prohibition for all other beings to enter *laput lanum* could be related to the *otu laput lanum*’s bellicosity. As they were warring spirits always on the offensive, it was natural that they had many enemies. In order to avoid certain enemies who might have been disguised as friendly visitors planning a surprise attack, they simply attacked all visitors except for shamans for whom one of them was a patron.

The *otu laput lanum* were always at war with other spirit beings, especially the *suket* and the *otu tulik* residing in the mountainous regions. In battles against the *suket*, they usually won. However, against the *otu tulik*, they had not achieved any decisive victory; therefore, perpetual war still existed between them. They were also hostile toward humans. However, the famous Punan Vuhang shaman, Rigai, made a pact with the *otu laput lanum*. Consequently, when a Punan Vuhang intoned a chant mentioning that he was a descendant of Rigai, his life would be spared. According to legend, two Punan Vuhang brothers by the names of Kalong Jot and Tipijot, in running away from their father eventually reached the realm of the *otu laput lanum*. They married spirits, and their descendants, upon hearing a person speak the Punan Vuhang language, would spare his life. Also, for that matter, the *otu laput lanum* would never attack a Punan Vuhang settlement.

The *otu laput lanum* were hostile toward migrating wild boars and sought opportunities to kill them. The Punan Vuhang had a myth that the migrating wild boars were actually spirits, who turned into wild boar during the major fruiting season. When the wild boars were in their spirit form, they always defeated the *otu laput lanum*. Therefore, the *otu laput lanum* would only attack these spirits when they were in their defenseless form as wild boars. During the peak of the wild boar migration season, the Punan Vuhang believed that the *otu laput lanum* killed many juvenile wild boars. When the Punan Vuhang would find and cut open a carcass, a small wound was usually found on the heart, and the Punan Vuhang believed that it had been caused by an *otu laput lanum* spear. They also believed that wild boars killed by the *otu laput lanum*, although still fresh, produced a terrible stench, and hunters would ignore such carcasses. At one period of great wild boar spirit “massacres,” not a single wild boar reached the headwaters for decades, with the exception of one big one.

The spirits of wild boars resided in a longhouse community on an island in a huge lake. The Punan Vuhang believed the island was located in the rivermouth region. When these spirits traveled in the form of wild boars, they were always accompanied by a spirit called Man Babui (wild boar’s father). Man Babui would protect the wild boar from attack by their enemies, especially the *otu laput lanum*. Fortunately for Punan Vuhang hunters, the protector spirit of the wild boars, for reasons unknown, always left a trail of clay on the trees along its path. On seeing this clay, the Punan Vuhang did not go hunting, in order to avoid clashes with Man Babui. Also, a shaman could see it traveling from afar and would then warn the community of the protector-spirit’s impending arrival.
**Lengunang**—The realm of the sea was the most dangerous of all, and was inhabited by the most powerful and violent spirits. It was a mysterious place, and only the most powerful shamans, those powerful enough even to enter the hot sun, could go to the dangerous sea realm. However, informants did not know of any story of a shaman going there since the shamans had no reason to go there. No spirits from other spheres dared to go to *lengunang* as they would have been killed by the spirits found there.

The two types of spirits inhabiting *lengunang* were *Ivit* and *yiang*. *Ivit* was the brother of Akikato, the creator of the world. But *Ivit* was very wicked and was driven away by Akikato to *lengunang*. Because *Ivit* had no contact with human beings, informants did not know much about him.

The *yiang* were malevolent spirits that journeyed from the sea into the rivers of the human realm. The *yiang* were solitary, traveling alone. They were usually seen in the shape of an animal such as a buffalo, deer or barking deer in the large, deep river-bays (*liang*). Although *yiang* were malevolent, Punan Vuhang knew few cases of *yiang* attacking human beings. However, when that happened, it was usually fatal, as it was difficult to rescue a drowning victim that had been dragged into a deep bay.

**Lanum**—Within the downriver realm was an area of the river inhabited by the malevolent *yiang* and *tun lanum* spirits. As mentioned above, the *yiang* traveled from the sea into upriver regions to prey on victims in huge deep bays. The *tun lanum*, on the other hand, did not originate from the sea, and their domain was solely in the rivers. A *tun lanum* never rose to the surface of the water nor laid on the river bed. Instead, it always swam in the middle depth of the river. The shape of the *tun lanum* was exactly like that of a human being except that it had very long hair. When it was angry, it would cause a boat to capsize, and when it was very hungry, it would eat a human’s soul. Once the soul was bitten, the human died, as the *nalau* healing ritual could not rescue it.

The Danum River (called Lanum) where the Punan Vuhang occasionally ventured was known to be inhabited by the *tun lanum* and the *yiang*. Perhaps this is why the Punan Vuhang seldom went there unless it was absolutely necessary. The spirits only resided in the remote headwater regions of the Danum that had few rapids. Living even further upriver, the Punan Vuhang seldom went downriver where there were many dangerous rapids separated by huge deep river bays. It was likely that due to this downriver location of the *tun lanum* and the *yiang*, the Punan Vuhang thought of the malevolent beings as spirits of the downriver realm.

The orientation of these spirit and human realms in the Punan Vuhang cosmos is similar to that of the Batek (Endicott 1979:50). The Punan Vuhang’s heavenly realm and realm beneath the land correspond to the Batek’s up/down axis, while the Punan Vuhang’s sunrise: upriver / sunset: downriver orientation is based on the daily movement of the sun, as is the Batek’s east/west orientation. The Punan Vuhang and the Batek also share similar concepts of time. Endicott (1979:51) states that for the Batek, “time is also ordered by the passage of the sun. Many of the terms for different times of day refer directly to the position of the sun in the sky” (Endicott 1979:51). So, following the term *lau* for sun in Punan Vuhang, daybreak is *gang lau* (emerging sun), noon is *o’un lau* (middle sun) and afternoon is *tesing lau* (evening sun).
The Nyangen and Nalau Rituals

The beings in this cosmos were connected to the Punan Vuhang through two ritual activities: nyangen and nalau. In nyangen humans were related to the good spirits, and in nalau to the bad spirits. The human community cemented its relationships with the good spirits in joyous nyangen rituals and used the nalau healing rituals to defeat the bad spirits.

Nyangen

During nyangen, the soul (buruan) of the shaman went up to likun avun to sing and play a musical instrument called a busui (musical bow) with the otu tulik spirits. After the musical performance, the spirits played different types of competitive games. As the shaman’s soul observed the events, the shaman reported these activities to the human audience. The reports took the form of a singsong narration conducted in the otu tulik language. Community members who knew this spirit language then translated the songs for the rest of the community. Everyone very much enjoyed these performances. Thambiah’s transcription of a musui, a singing poem that tells of the work of the uboh busui spirit among the Bhuket gives us some idea of the nyangen (1995: 165-166). Some of the Bhuket, unlike the Punan Vuhang, despite being Christians continue to practice such rituals.

The shaman began the nyangen ritual by shaking a kayuk busui musical bow, once the community had gathered. The shaking of the kayuk busui produced a flute-like sound heard in the heavenly realm of the likun avun. Instantly all otu tulik spirits related to the shaman gathered at the house of the shaman’s patron-spirit, the pun busui, whose house served as a place of congregation (tiring busui). The patron-spirit took out busui from a stronghold (tilong) and distributed the musical instruments to other otu tulik. The distribution took place according to the rank or seniority of the patron-spirit, each one taking an instrument first for himself and then for his spouse. Then, his companion or assistant and the spouse of the assistant were given busui. After that, the patron-spirit presented instruments to other otu tulik, with the numbers distributed determined by the number of busui available.

The otu tulik then played the busui, producing a beautiful sound heard throughout the spirit realm. This attracted other otu tulik to form a large audience. Among them were otu tulik related to other shamans. Also, otu tulik not related to any shaman but eager to participate in the performance attended, hoping to join the group in future performances.

The sound produced by the busui provided background music to the singing. Although other participating otu tulik also sang, the main singer was the patron-spirit. While the soul of the shaman went to the heavens to observe the events, in the human realm, the shaman sang songs to community members, following the exact wording, intonation and style used by the otu tulik.

Each time the shaman conducted a nyangen ritual, a new busui was added in likun avun. However, in the human world, the shaman used his same kayuk busui until a member of the community died and a new one was made after the end of mourning. Both the human community and the spirits eagerly looked forward to a nyangen ceremony.
because it provided great entertainment. Further, the ritual offered an avenue for the *otu tulik* spirits to gain status, as those playing in the musical performance achieved fame. An *otu tulik* who possessed and played a *busui* had his name mentioned and praised in the shaman’s narrative. Not only the human community, but also all beings in the spirit realm heard the narration.

Additionally, *otu tulik* wanted to participate in the ritual because, in doing so, they would become very strong, resulting from a close relationship with the shaman. The closeness enabled them to receive heat from the shaman, who, as a human being, could handle fire. Heat produced from fire would give exceptional strength to the spirits who would then become very much stronger in comparison to ordinary spirits, who could not withstand heat. And so it followed that in any form of competition or fight, ordinary spirits lost to spirits related to a shaman.

After the singing and musical performance, the *otu tulik* spirits proceeded to play competitive games. The shaman continued his narration of these activities. An informant used the analogy of a live-broadcast of a football game on radio to describe the shaman’s narration. Although the listeners did not see the game being played, they could visualize it from the “broadcasted” commentary. Similarly, the human community could not see the *otu tulik* spirits, but their familiarity with the *otu tulik* spirits and the types of games they played allowed them to imagine in their minds the spirits playing. Since the narration was also heard throughout the spirit realm, *otu tulik* involved in the games became very famous.

**Nalau, Healing Ritual**

Contact between human beings and bad spirits, in particular the *otu dogkek* and *otu pahkavoh*, resulted in humans becoming sick. The *otu dogkek* would hurt the offender only when disturbed. Otherwise, they did not harm human beings. In contrast, *otu pahkavoh*, or ‘killing spirits,’ used any opportunity to kill a human being and then eat his heart. *Otu pahkavoh* wished to kill human beings because being able to do so was a great achievement that gave the killing spirit tremendous fame.

Illnesses caused by the bad spirits ranged from mild to serious, requiring different types of healing methods. Also, shamans differed in the methods they used. While some employed parts of their own bodies, such as strands of hair or drops of blood, others depended on healing aids given to them by their *pun busui* patron-spirits. The healing aids, called *batu tulik*, were in fact, containers for keeping healing potions. The patron-spirit sometimes gave the *batu tulik* to the shaman through the *otu tanok*, or assistant-spirits. At other times, the soul of the shaman went to *likun avun* to get the healing aids. After they were consumed in a healing ritual, the patron-spirit himself would refill the *batu tulik* container with potion.

The shaman conducted healing rituals at the sick person’s shelter. Household members of the patient prepared a special compartment to avoid contact with dogs, as the *tulik* spirits assisting in healing disliked dogs. The most common method for healing involved the use of *kumulang* leaves, a type of plant much feared by evil spirits. The shaman rubbed the leaves on the affected parts of the patient and simultaneously chanted. This was done for common illnesses such as the *seliat*, headaches (*paroh utok*)
and vomiting (nutak) caused by the *otu dogkek*, or by the stench of the *otu pahkavoh*. If *kumulang* leaves were ineffective, the shaman then turned to a healing agent given by his patron-spirit which he put on the injured part of the patient’s body. The aid, by itself, would adhere to the injured part and suck out the cause of the injury. Once the healing agent had cured the injury, it would drop off. Other shamans used a few strands of their hair or a few droplets of their blood to rub onto the affected parts of the patient’s body. If these methods proved ineffective, the shaman’s soul would go to *likun avun* to obtain other healing aids from his patron-spirit or to receive instructions on the proper healing method. Alternately, the patron-spirit himself would give another healing agent through the *otu tanok*.

Chest pain, serious stomachache and waist pain were indications of severe wounds inflicted by the *otu pahkavoh*. These kinds of illnesses required a more intense healing ritual. This was crucial, because the life of the shaman was in grave danger, as the killing spirit would try to obstruct the shaman from healing the victim, even to the extent of killing the shaman. The patron-spirit and his protector-spirit *lorong* then would come to protect the shaman and ward off the aggressor. The spirits used a wrestling method (*perpitak*) to keep the aggressor from coming near the shaman. Eventually, the *otu pahkavoh* would give up, thus allowing the ritual to be completed within a short time.

Not all the *otu pahkavoh* killing spirits, however, gave up so easily. A hostile spirit that was inherently powerful, or aided by other *otu pahkavoh*, would continue to challenge the patron-spirit and his protector spirit. When the situation worsened, and the life of the shaman became increasingly endangered, the shaman would conduct a *nalau* ritual involving *nyangen*. The shaman summoned all his related *otu tulik* by hitting a knife across an axe hung on a string. This emergency summons (*bukak*) resulted in the *otu tulik* reacting instantly “as fast as lightning” to rescue the shaman. Once they had arrived, the *otu tulik* and their *lorong* protector-spirits formed a defensive circle around the shaman. Within this circle, the patron-spirit and his *lorong* made an inner circle to protect the shaman. As the *otu tulik* fought with the enemy, a battle developed. To enhance the ability of his *otu tulik* to fight, the shaman conducted a *nyangen* and narrated the battle. The fight would go on for up to five days. Occasionally, the *otu pahkavoh* would temporarily win and the patient become worse. Eventually, however, the *otu tulik* won by virtue of their superior strength over the hostile spirits. During the battle, a rainstorm or a very strong wind might come to indicate a victory over the *otu pahkavoh*.

The shaman’s spirits had won the battle when all the *lorong* protector-spirits of the *otu tulik* succeeded in grabbing and holding the *otu pahkavoh*. The *lorong* then carried the captured enemies for imprisonment in a place called *luvang malam*, where, the Punan Vuhang believed, the sun sets. Here, they would throw the *otu pahkavoh* into a deep hole and cover it with a big rock. The *luvang malam* was a prison from which no *otu pahkavoh* ever escaped.

During the imprisoning of the defeated *otu pahkavoh*, the shaman’s spirits took great precautions to prevent other hostile spirits from coming near the shaman. These aggressive spirits might have taken advantage of the absence of the *lorong* to attack the shaman. Therefore, the patron-spirit and his *lorong* and all the *otu tulik* remained behind
to protect the shaman. When the healing was completed, and all possible harm was
nullified, the *otu tulik* then returned to *likun avun*.

During all forms of *nalau* healing rituals, the community complied with
following several prohibitions. One prohibited children from coming near the sick person
to avoid the ill-effects of exposure to the *lorong*, the protector-spirit of the patron-spirit,
whose power the children could not endure. Also, the shaman and the patient had to eat
their meals together, and avoid eating wild boar. They could only consume fish and small
birds which the patient’s household would provide. As mentioned above, the community
kept their dogs away from the special compartment as the *otu tulik* spirits involved in the
healing disliked dogs.

**Conclusion**

To conclude our description of Punan Vuhang cosmology and beliefs, it is
useful to consider Sellato’s view of “the Punan band as a ‘secular’ society, pragmatic
and little given to religious belief or behavior” (1994:162). Sellato’s characterization of
the Punan as being non-religious is based on the fact that: “The Punan have few or no
prohibitions, omens or auguries, curing or purification ceremonies for the sick, or rituals
related to the extraction of sago, hunting, or gathering... When they do have them, they
seem to be traits that have been borrowed and considerably simplified” (1994:161). After
becoming sedentary, “the Punan in general took up rice farming divested of its rituals....
and showed] no special interest in adopting the farmers’ body of beliefs” (1994:206).

Their evident reluctance to grant a sacred character to a material object
like a house or to an economic activity like rice farming (two spheres
closely linked and highly ritualized among the settled peoples but
secular among the Punan), along with an absence of any inclination
towards their neighbors’ cosmogonic beliefs and theories, the notable
minimalism of the ritual and religious sphere in the Punan traditional
culture, and their lack of enthusiasm for borrowed rituals, all lead to
the conclusion that Punan societies are fundamentally nonreligious

Sellato’s description of the Punan as nonreligious follows Turnbull (1961:198)
who sees the BaMbuti pygmies as not a “ritualistically minded people.” To Sellato, “This
phrase seems completely adequate as a characterization of the Punan: although it cannot
be said that they have no religion, it seems evident that they are not a religiously minded
people” (1994:207).

However, the question of Punan religiosity can usefully be considered in terms
of Endicott’s description of Batek religion:

The few rituals the Bateks do have, such as the blood sacrifice and
the singing and trancing sessions, do not follow rigidly fixed patterns.
They contain a small core of standardized acts surrounded by a great
mass of options and alternatives.... They have no general term for
ritual, and they normally designate particular rituals by ordinary terms
describing the actions engaged in. For example, the blood sacrifice
is simply called ‘throwing blood’. But it is possible to distinguish
categories of Batek behaviour according to the orientations of the activities. *I think it is justifiable to regard as religious ritual all those actions that are directed toward the superhuman beings, even though they may show few of the outward signs of behavioural patterning that are usually the mark of religious rites* (1979:23) [emphasis mine].

To me, Endicott’s way of identifying religious behavior is preferable, as it is more objective. For it is not for us to impose externally defined patterns of behavior, as Sellato does in using sedentary people’s categories to define the Punan. Instead, if we apply Endicott’s description of Batek religion (1979:25) as “an all-encompassing framework of ideas and actions that makes the world intelligible and gives meaning and value to the whole of Batek life,” we may say that the Punan Vuhang’s beliefs were complete and that they saw no need to incorporate other people’s rituals or beliefs. This was evidenced by their initial reluctance to accept Adet Bungan when they were persuaded to adopt agriculture. Even after adopting this new religion, they retained their practice of singing and healing rituals.

If we adopt Endicott’s notion and accept as religious ritual all actions directed toward superhuman beings, we can say the Punan Vuhang were undoubtedly religious. Their cosmology described spirits and the spirit realms, with humans living in their midst, and in both the *nyangen* singing ritual and the *nalau* healing ritual, it was believed that spirits interacted with humans or human souls. Their death-related beliefs also assumed potential human/spirit interactions as I shall describe in a subsequent paper.

**Note:** This paper is adapted from a chapter on cosmology, ritual, and religious belief in Chan 2007. My appreciation goes to Clifford Sather and Louise Klemperer Sather for their earlier comments and for editing the present paper.
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Datu Mancang came up the Kayan River searching for local inhabitants. He found a village on the island of Busa:ng Aru:, near the mouth of the Pengian tributary (on the lower Kayan). There lived the Hopan, descendants of a female chief, Lahay “Bara:,” and Datu Mancang made a marriage alliance with this village... His daughter Kanawai Lumu married a Sulu (Tausug) chief, Abdurrasid, with the title “Raja Laut,” and settled in the Suluk (a tributary of the Kayan river mouth). Abdurassid was one of three sons of an Arab, Sech Abdurrahman Al-Magribi, who had once lived in the Johor kingdom. He had run away to the Sulu islands because of the Portuguese occupation of Johor. Later, he fled to Bulungan because of quarrels about religion in Sulu.

Oral History of the Bulungan Malay and Tarakan Tidung

Introduction

In a previous paper (Okushima 2006), I described the sociocultural background of the Kayanic peoples, who originated in northwestern Borneo, chiefly in the Baram basin. In this paper I describe their expansion into areas of northeastern Borneo based on an analysis of various oral sources. The genealogies of chiefs and nobles (hapoy/hipuy/paren) are the most important of these sources, particularly for evidence of time depth and interethnic relations. The longest Kayanic genealogies I have collected extend back 40 generations from present-day descendants (“egos” in Tables 1-14), who are now in
their 60-80s, hence, about one thousand years, if we roughly calculate one generation as 25 years. Some chiefs from more recent times are referred to in the colonial records and other written sources, as we will indicate in the Tables (the names which are framed).

The Kayanic peoples, or Segai/Segei/Segai-i, are commonly known in the history of northeastern Borneo as aggressive headhunters who burst onto the scene at the end of the eighteenth century, pushing the area into a state of terror. However, from chronological reconstructions, we find that some early Kayanic migrants like the Hopan and Hwang Siraw had already settled in the area and allied themselves with coastal groups in Bulungan and the eastern Mahakam by at least the seventeenth century. Also, some later migrants, such as the Kayan Meka:m (Mahakam Kayan) and Long Glat, started to open the headwaters of the Mahakam some 14 generations, or ±350 years ago. Earlier settlers in the Kayan and Berau prevented these latecomers from entering the upper Kayan, especially under the leadership of the Long Way chief, Baeng Wuang “Ngo:k,” who similarly dates to 14 generations ago. Later, the Long Way and their allies moved gradually to the Kelai and the eastern Mahakam tributaries, while later migrants were blocked by the former and so shifted to the western Mahakam. Finally, from the late eighteenth century to the first half of the nineteenth century, or 9 to 6 generations ago, Kayanic peoples migrated downriver in large numbers, after having established footholds in these new upriver territories.

The great Kayanic migration and Segai disturbance in northeast Borneo probably corresponded to the power shift between the neighboring sultanates, especially from the Johor to the Sulu Sultanate. Since Johor as well as its ally Brunei were occupied by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century, many Malay rulers and Arab traders fled intermittently to Sulu and elsewhere, including northeast Borneo as a political buffer area, as seen in the oral history above (see also Section 5). Then, some time later they joined the Buginese from Johor-Singapore-Riau, as well as Buginese directly from Sulawesi, and also other Malays and Arabs from Java, Sumatra, Banjarmasin, and so on. Those runaways made intermarriage alliances with the natives, the Kayanic inlanders as well as the coastal Muruts/Tidung, and they developed the local sultanates of Kutai, Pasir and Berau. They even established a new one, the Bulungan.

For as long as local oral histories record, Brunei and Johor continued to influence the Kayanic migrants to northeast Borneo and also other inhabitants, as we saw in the preceding paper (Okushima 2006). Brunei never became a significant trading center like Johor or Malacca according to colonial records. But, this doesn’t mean that its trading activities or communication with Johor ceased (cf., Dr. Bassett’s suggestion in Horton 2006: 176-177). There are two hypothetical reasons to explain this: First, the trading activities of Johor and Brunei were not centralized, but rather scattered between several centers, and these centers were often moved in response to migrations, wars, or enviromental changes. For example, Nicholl suggests (1980) that the location of the ancient Brunei port seems not to be that of the present Brunei port, but rather on the mouth of the Lawas River (at the north end of Sarawak). The oral histories of the Kayanic peoples, the Tidung, and Bisaya also mention some old centers in the lower Baram, Sipitang (near Labuan Island), in the Pulau Tiga islands. They even remember

5 On the term Segai, see Okushima 2006: 86, Note 2.
that the Malay and Arab migrants came from Johor by way of Singapore and Batam before the nineteenth century. A recent archaeological survey bears this out, showing that Singapore has been a trading center since the fourteenth century (Miksik and Low Mei Gek 2005). Batam was also a main port after the Bugis married into the Johor royal family and established a foothold in the Riau islands.

Secondly, some of the main trading centers of Brunei were formed in inland regions and so were hidden from foreigners. By the eighteen century, the Kayanic peoples opened the broad hinterlands of Brunei and came out to the northeast coasts of the island. So, there must have existed satellite towns, like present-dady Marudi and Long Lama along the Baram. In fact, the early Long Glat living in the Baram had contact with the inhabitants of the ‘town’ (*akowng piyûn*) downriver, and also with Malay traders wearing Batavian-styled hats (Okushima 2006: 111-112). Those inland centers were much more easily moved or abandoned on the occasion of migrations or wars than coastal centers.

In the following discussion, we will start with several oral histories that are shared by regional alliance groups, consisting of villages or subgroups that live, or used to live, together, under the control of a powerful village/subgroup and its paramount chief (“a supralocal organization” in Rousseau’s terms (1990: 255-262)). Such groups often share ancestors or an old settlement as their common point of origin, although some members may not share these commonalities, but, instead, look to the dominant group for protection and status. Or, in some cases, the dominant group may adopt the ancestors or homeland of its subjects as a strategy to conciliate them.

In the following four sections, we shall examine the process of Kayanic expansion by noting various regional alliance groups as they formed or absorbed one another. The pioneers of the Kayan basin, mainly the Mengga’ay and their allies the Wehèa, settled in the middle and lower regions, and from there they easily expanded to the Berau, including Kong Kemul (*kong, kowng* = a conic mountain <G>) at the Kelai headwaters (Section 2-1). These early migrants gradually advanced to the upper Kayan, having been supplanted by the Long Way during the reign of the chief Baeng Wuang “Ngo:k.” This chief conquered the Kayan basin by driving out its former inhabitants, the *Menung* / Ot Danum, as well as latecomers, like the Long Glat and their allies (2-2). In fact, these early settlers defended the upper Kayan by, in some cases, specializing in patroling and self-defense. Such bands later became “Punan” hunter-gatherers and followed their relatives as they migrated (see 2-3).

Being blocked by these defenders, later Kayanic migrants changed direction and moved to the western Mahakam (see Section 3). The Kayan Meka:m and Long Glat arrived first with their allies. They spent, perhaps, a century driving out or assimilating the older inhabitants, such as the Ot Danum, *Ping* / Penihing and the *Benua’/ Tunjung-Benua’. Later they moved to the middle-lower Mahakam and established inland hegemony under the Long Glat (3-1, 3-2). Their relatives, namely, the Hwang Siraw and related Bahau subgroups, had settled in the area even earlier and intermarried with Kutai nobles beginning in the seventeenth century (3-3).

Meanwhile, as discussed in Section 4, some later migrants returned to Sarawak or moved to West Kalimantan. The Uma:’ Juman under the famous chief “Laké’ Dia: n” / Dia:n Kula:n led his allies back to the Baluy because of rivalry with the Long Glat and
Uma:' Laran (4-1). The final battle between the paramount chiefs Ngaw Wa:n Luhung of the Uma:' Laran and “Lejiw Aya”/ Lejiw Do:m Ba:ng Lawing of the Long Glat is still remembered by the Kenyah, as it establishes the legitimacy of their land claims to the Kayan basin (4-2).

In the final stage, the Kayanic peoples/Segai expanded even to the lower and coastal regions of northeast Borneo, where they allied and mixed with the migrants and runaways from Johor, Sulu, and Sulawesi (5-1). In fact it is these Malays and Arabs that ruled the local Borneans. They strategically emphasized the names of their Kayanic allies in their origin myths, chronicles and royal genealogies, not only because of the Kayan’s power to control other inlanders and to protect trade in forest products, but also because their “nativeness” legitimized supremacy over rivals. The most typical was the case of the early Bahau and Ga’ay settlers in the lower Kayan, Hopan/ Uma’ Apan and Seloy/Ga’ay Gong Kiya:n, who were mixed with Tidung, Sulu, Malays, and Arabs, and finally established a new sultanate, Bulungan, independent of Sulu.

Another considerable Bahau subgroup, the Merap, who migrated to the Malinau basin on the middle Sesayap, also allied with local Tidung chiefs and monopolized forest products, especially bird’s nests, in rivalry with the Kayanic alliance group under the Uma’ Laran and Ga’ay Long Ba’un, as well as the older settlers, the Burusu and Tenggalan (5-2). The other Segai did as the Merap, everywhere from Kutai to the southeast coast of Sabah, very rebelliously at first, but later often under the direction of local sultans. Peace was established throughout northeastern Borneo only in the end of the nineteenth century (5-3).

1. Ancestors and Homelands Shared by Regional Alliance Groups

The oral myths and stories shared by Kayanic villages or subgroups, particularly those about ancestors and homelands, are a key to understanding the makeup of regional alliance groups. Within these groups, subjects have often adopted the oral myths and genealogies of the hegemonic group or its paramount chief.

Let us look at some examples. Table 1 shows the genealogy of the Long Way nobles, some of whom are described in traditional epics (takna’). Epics 1-3 constitute a series known as the Takna’ Po’ (‘Stories of Our Ancestors’), while epics 4-6 belong to a series, Takna’ Hejowng Kejin (‘Stories of the Kayan Basin Era’). The Takna’ Po’ is widely shared among other Ga’ay subgroups, especially the Mengga’ay of Berau. The early nobles, including the famous chiefs Jiw “Ngèan,” Dèa “Puen” (ngèan, nga:n, puen, ‘big, elder’), and Teguen Baeng Dlay, the main characters of Epics 1, 2, and 5, are also known as the “descendants of Doh Boang” (doh boang, a kind of bird, as the incarnation of Hoang Ben Wèan Wowng, 35 generations before present-day informants). On the other hand, the Takna’ Hejowng Kejin are known among the Long Way and other Ga’ay in the Kutai (Mélèan, Long Nah, Long Glat, and Ga’ay-ized Wehèa). The Mengga’ay actually recite Epic 6 (Takna’ Baeng Wuang Ngo:k) in the Long Way dialect.

The relation between the two series of epics suggests a shift in hegemony

---

6 His story is also mentioned in Dewall 1848-49 (22-27 October).
7 Also, Tepgun Béang Dlay <W>, Tinga:ng Ba:ng Blaré’ <K>.
Table 1: Ga’ay Ancestors, or the “Descendants of Doh Boang”

### Epic 1

- Ben Wèan Wowng  \(\triangleleft\) Heliang Éan
- Teguen Séng Kung Melaeng  \(\triangleleft\) Hoang Ben Wèan Wowng = \(\triangleleft\) Luy Jèan / Doh Boang
- Hoang Déa  \(\triangleleft\) Héy’ Luy Jèan
- Diang Héy’ Luy Jèan  \(\triangleleft\) Tung Beyèan
- Lowng Hoang Déa  \(\triangleleft\) Jiw Diang Héy’ Luy Jèan / Jiw “Ngèan”
- Déa Jiw Ngèan  \(\triangleleft\) Jiw Lewi:ng
- Yaeng Déa Jiw Ngèan  \(\triangleleft\) Ding Nyekum

### Epic 2

- Dèa “Puen”  \(\triangleleft\) Bit Yaeng Déa
- Jiang Béy Déa Puen  \(\triangleleft\) Doh Déa Laeng Boang
- Ñyedéyn Déa Puen
- Jiw Baeng Dlay  \(\triangleleft\) Laeng Boang
- Doh Déa
- Déa Nyehèah
- \(\triangleleft\) Jiwng Jiaj Lua’ Keléa
- Laeng Jiaj  \(\triangleleft\) Keléa Win
- Lowng Keléa Win

*Series of “Takna’ Po’”*
- Yea’ Jew  \(\triangleleft\) Liah Lowng Weluen

*Series of “Takna’ Hejowng Kejin”*

### Epic 5

- Ngèa Ngeléa  \(\triangleleft\) Déa Ping Bit
- Déa Yea’ Jew
- Hoang Déa Ping Bit  \(\triangleleft\) Dlay Déa’
- Haw

### Epic 4

- \(\triangleleft\) Lung Liah Wéa
- Lowng Gé:ng  \(\triangleleft\) Baeng Dlay
- Lowng Yaeng Ping Bit Léy’
- Gueng Déa
- Oam Haeng Yaeng Ping Bit Léy’
- Kung Baeng  \(\triangleleft\) Teguen Baeng Dlay
- Soang Suwong Ding Lejiw
- Boang Deho:ng Teguen

*see his genealogy, Okushima 1999: 83*

### Epic 6

- \(\triangleleft\) Wang Bit Petowng
- Baeng Wang Bit Petowng / Baeng Wang “Ngo:k”
from the Mengga’ay to the Long Way, chiefly during the reign of the conquerer of the Kayan basin, Baeng Wang Bit Petowng, alias Baeng Wang “Ngo:k” (ngo:k, ‘neck’), in Epic 6. Baeng was descended from the legendary early settlers, the “descendants of Doh Boang,” but only through his grandmother, Boang Deho:ng (Table 1). On the other hand, his paternal descent line (see Djeng 1969; Guerreiro 1983a: 55-57; also, partially in Okushima 1999: 83, Table 1) consisted of the original Long Way ancestors, although the Long Way themselves acknowledge that they remained nameless until Éng Kan Yaw (5 generations before Baeng) settled near the Awun/Avon rapids on the middle Kayan. Beginning at that time, the Long Way gradually promoted marriage alliances with their Kayanic neighbors. Finally, during the reign of Baeng, they seized hegemony over the Kayan basin by defeating two dominant groups in the headwaters region, namely, the Menung/Ot Danum and related hunter-gatherers, and the most powerful Ga’ay village under Ding Boang (seemingly Long Glat or a related subgroup), as we will see in Section 2-2.

By contrast, the descendants of the early migrants, such as the “descendants of Doh Boang,” declined. Some of them were absorbed by the Long Way or other powerful subgroups, while others migrated to the headwaters of the Berau (Segah and Kelai) and eastern Mahakam (Belayan and Telen), especially around Kong Kemul at the Kelai headwaters. Those who concentrated at Kong Kemul were largely the Mengga’ay and Wehèa. These people preserved an old myth about the birth of the first humans, “Kiwi Kit” and “Kiwi Kw;” from a tooth of the Thunder God (kiw, ‘tooth’ <G>). Reference to this myth occurs in the genealogy of another famous Mengga’ay chief, Baeng Hèat Tung “Puen,” who married his son to the daughter of Baeng Wang Ngo:k (see Table 2). After living for a long time at Kong Kemul, they seem to have altered the myth, so that the descendants of Kiwi Kit are now said to have lived at Kong Kemul. They emphasized this new version in contrast to the old version still held by the Long Way and their allies, to differentiate themselves from the latter. Later, the chiefs of the Long Bléh (part of the Long Way in the Belayan) also began to emphasize their descent from this “Kong Kemul group,” because of their rivalry with other Long Way who moved to the Kelinjau (see 2-2). The regional alliance group under the Ga’ay Long Ba’un in the lower Kayan shares this same myth, though their allies, like the Uma:’Laran, Ngorèk, and Pua’, probably never lived at Kong Kemul or anywhere else in the Berau.

Similar cases occurred among later Kayanic migrants to the Kayan basin. Among them were the Long Glat, who for a long time lived together with Busa:ng/Kayan subgroups in the Baram basin. Although they had their own original epic series, Takna’ Po’Jenayng (‘Stories of the war-chief Jenayng /Jening’; see Okushima 2006: 111-112), they adopted another series from their allies, namely, the Takna’ Inay Aya’ (‘Stories of the Mother Ancestor’ <K>), and its sequels, Takna’ (H)Unay and Takna’ Uma:’Away (‘Stories of Inay Aya’s descendant Hunay’ and ‘Stories of the Uma:’Away village’) (see Table 3), all of which are recited in Kayan dialects. The Long Glat adopted these takna’ probably after settling in Apo Sio: and Apo Gera:ng on the upper Baram, where they came to ally themselves with the Busa:ng under a descendant of Inay Aya’,”

8 Also, Béang Wo:ng Beyt Petowng <LG>, Béang Wang Bit Petung <W>.
9 Also, Béang Hi:t Tung <LG>, Ba:ng Luhat Tung <K, B> etc.
Long Luhung /Long Tekhin Lejiw\textsuperscript{10} (see Okushima 1999: 84, Table 2), and also with the Uma:\textsuperscript{`} Tu\textsuperscript{`}an, who had the title “Uma:\textsuperscript{`} Away.”

Unfortunately, the Uma:\textsuperscript{`} Tu\textsuperscript{`}an and other Busa:\textsuperscript{ng} have forgotten their genealogies dating back to Inay Aya\textsuperscript{`} because of their assimilation by the dominant Long Glat. Though the Takna \textquoteleft Inay Aya\textquoteright\ and its sequels have become mythologized and partially eroded,\textsuperscript{11} they seem to have originally constituted a long chronicle of the proto-Kayan nobles. According to these texts, Inay Aya\textsuperscript{`}, a female chief (hipuy) living in Tana:\textsuperscript{`} Leda:\textsuperscript{ng}, envied the prosperity of her sister, Buring Bangaw (Table 3), who reigned over Apo Laga:\textsuperscript{n} (the most famous homeland among the Kayan and Bahau) and was a skillful priestess of rice farming, house-building, and so on. Buring moved to Apo Sio: in despair after Inay Aya\textsuperscript{`} had swallowed her two daughters, (H)Avuy Ipuy and (H)Avuy Pa:r. As a result, Inay\textsuperscript{`} Aya\textsuperscript{`} became the master of Apo Laga:\textsuperscript{n}, as recited in many Kayanic oral histories, chants, and prayers. Later, the great-granddaughter of Inay Aya\textsuperscript{`}, (H)Unay, married the chief of the first human village on earth, Uma:\textsuperscript{`} Away (away, \textquoteleft salient\textquoteright\ <K>).

As the last example of shared ancestors and homelands, the Long Glat and Long Way share a belief in a world after death (Tela:ng Jula:n)\textsuperscript{12} toward which their souls pursue an invisible path starting from the Kasau (Mahakam headwaters) and leading to “Mahanday <G, K>?” (Mandai), and then to “Pang Kong Pelowing <G> / Tukung Pilung <K>?” (Batu Tepilung) on the upper Kapuas in West Kalimantan (see the photos in Sellato 1989: 91).\textsuperscript{13} In fact, this belief came from their old allies, hunter-gatherers like the Ot Danum and Penihing, who originated from West and Central Kalimantan. The Ot Danum were driven out from the Kayan headwaters by the Long Way, while the Penihing and other related groups were sedentarized by the Long Glat (see 2-2, 3-1). Thus, the two Ga\textsuperscript{`}ay subgroups came eventually to share myths of the same afterworld located in an area where they themselves had never lived.

2. Exploration of the Kayan Basin: Early Ga\textsuperscript{`}ay and Bahau Migrants

2-1. Early Migrants, the “Kong Kemul” Group: Mengga\textsuperscript{`}ay and Wehèa

We Meda:\textsuperscript{ng} <LN>/ Medaeng <LW> (the Modang, or Ga\textsuperscript{`}ay in the Kutai) are the descendants of the Ga\textsuperscript{`}ay coming from the Malaysian side… In the early days of settlement in the Kayan basin, the Modang occupied the lower regions, while the Ken\’yah/Ken\’yeah (=Wehèa and other non-Ga\textsuperscript{`}ay subgroups) settled more upriver. In the headwaters

\textsuperscript{10} According to Long Glat funeral chants, she is the 10th generation from Inay Aya\textsuperscript{`} through maternal descent (Lo:ng Luhung Unya:ng Da:ng Bua:\textsuperscript{`} Luga:n Luhung Hiping Bawé: Inay\textsuperscript{`} Aya\textsuperscript{`} <K> / Lo:ng Leho:ng Yéang Deyng Buwé:\textsuperscript{`} Legien Leho:ng Hapayn Buway Hanay Aya\textsuperscript{`} <LG>).

\textsuperscript{11} Many characters are described as animal spirits, for example, Doh Ham (\textit{ham}, an anteater), Tinga:\textsuperscript{ng} Kungwat (\textit{kungwat}, a kind of owl), and Lalang To\textsuperscript{`} Wak (\textit{to\textquoteright wak}, spirit of night hawk) (Table 3).

\textsuperscript{12} This heaven, a river name in Kayan as well as in some Bahau dialects, could also have been adopted from their old allies, the Long Glat, who had once lived in \textit{Jelien} (Julan River), a tributary of the upper Baram (see Okushima 2006: 111).

\textsuperscript{13} Tromp mentions (1888: 65) that the same belief was told during the death of the Hwang Tri:\textsuperscript{ng} (Muyut) chief, Ba:\textsuperscript{ng} Lawing (probably “Ba:\textsuperscript{ng} Ago:\textsuperscript{ng}” in Table 7).
Table 2: Alliances between the Mengga’ay and LongWay-Long Bléh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>△Jiw Diang Héy’ Luy Jèan (Epic 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Jiw Déa Haw Maeng</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Lung Lengét</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Éng Lung Lengét</td>
<td>O Lowng Miw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Miet Éng</td>
<td>O Keléang Lowng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suen Miet Éng △ = O Diang Keléang

O Doam Diang Keléang

△Peno’ Doam Diang Téthèan Naek Geah△ = O Deho:ng’Teguen

△Tung Peno’ O Boang Deho:ng △ Lung Téthèan

△Hèat Tung Peno’ △ Wuang Blé Petowng △ Geah Lung Téthèan

△Baeng Héat Tung “Puen” (Epic 6) △ Baeng Wuang Ngo:k △ Hèat Bea’ Boang

Lowng Baeng Héat Tung △ = △ Jiw Baeng Wuang △ Liah Lowng Baeng

Boang Liah Lowng Baeng △ = △

△Lewi:ng Boang

△ Baeng Lewi:ng

[Belayan (Long Bléh) ←] [→ Kelinjau (Long Way)]

O Ping Baeng Lewi:ng △ Hejaeng Baeng Lewi:ng

△ Liah Ping Baeng Lewi:ng △ Ding Hejaeng

△ Geah Liah △ Hèat △ Baw △ Suvong △ Yo:k

[→ Long Tesak]

O Doam Geah Liah △ Baw Hèat △ Haeng Baw

△ Lung Hela’ Haeng

△ Ding Liah Baw / “Temanggong Sri Gembira” △ Hejaeng Baw

△ Liah Hejaeng Baw

Lengét / △ = O Diang But / “Raja Adinda” Tana:’ Yo:n
Table 3: Kayan Chronicle from Inay Aya’ to the Uma:’ Away

Epic 1: Takna’ Inay Aya’

[Apo Laga:n → Apo Sio:]  [Tana’: Ledą:ng → Apo Laga:n]

○ Buring Bangaw  Inay Aya’/ Daya’ Ipuy ○ = △ Uva:ng Wa:n = ○ Doh Ham
/ Huku: Asung Luhung  Kuhaw

○ Avuy ○ Avuy  ○ Lala:ng ○ Kerigit  △ Lebuy  △ Tekwan  △ = ○ Ketubung
Ipuy  Pa:r  Kuawah  Lenaw Doh Ham

Epic 2: Takna’ Unay

△ Tinga:ng Kungwat  ○ Unay Ketubung Lenaw
/ Unay “Aya””

△ Hinga:n Ja:n  ○ Unya:ng Luwa:n Unay

△ Belawing  Unay ○ ≠ △ Julura:n = ○ Lala:ng To’ Wak  ○ Avuy
[uma:’ Away]

Tawa:ng ○ = △ Tima:ng  Unya:ng ○ = △ Kulèh Mida:ng = ○ Unya:ng  △ Terang
Busa:ng  Bué’ Hibaw  Ajay

△ Meba:ng  ○ Uva:ng △ Ujung  △ Pena’  Bato’ △ = ○ Bula:n  ○ Ubung Bayung
Wa:n  Galaw  Ledaw  Kawai:  Temaya:n  Unya:ng

Ketubung Lala:ng ○ = △ Aja:ng Langyo:
Sul Usa:n

Jeliva:n Aja:ng △ = ○ Pejul
Langyo:  [Apo Jelunga:n]
△ Sung Nula:n

Epic 3: Takna’ Uma:’ Away (Hwang Tri:ng etc.)
were also the Menung/Menowng (Ot Danum and related hunter-gatherers), who consisted of two subgroups living in caves and forests. In the beginning the Modang had good relations with the Menung, until this alliance was broken during the reign of Béang Wang Ngo: k/ Baeng Wang Ngo:k (see 2-2). The Menung were gradually pushed out by the Long Way and their Mélan (Melan) allies … The Menung finally decided to migrate away from the Kayan, rather than to choose do-or-die resistance.

Oral History of the Long Nah and Long Way, Kelinjau

Today, only the Ga’ay subgroups of the Berau and Bulungan still preserve their old name, “Ga’ay/Mengga’ay,” probably because these regions were their earliest settlement sites in northeastern Borneo. By contrast, the later Ga’ay preferred to differentiate themselves from the others by using village names, such as “Long Way” and “Long Glat.” The Ga’ay pioneers first opened the middle and lower Kayan. From there they easily spread to the Berau by passing through the Pengian tributary, which runs from the Segah basin. Takna’Hejowng Kejin lists the village locations of these early Ga’ay and their Ken’yeah/Lembueh allies (Bahau and Ga’ay-ized Wehèa), such as “Long Melinjé:/Melinji:” (Long Telanjau), “Long Bela’” (Long Bala’/Mara), and “Hengoy Mesea’/Hengoy Bela:’” (Telang Bala). Among these groups were the “descendants of Doh Boang” under their famous chief, Teguen Baeng Dlay.

As the number of Kayanic migrants increased, these early settlers gradually expanded into the upper Kayan, including the Kayan Iut and Kong Kemul tributaries (Map 1). Some new powers appeared, for example, the Long Way, who came from the middle Kayan to the Kayan Iut, and the Mélan/Melèan, who settled along the upper Kayan. Also, the Long Glat migrated from the Baram to the Kayan headwaters, leading their numerous Ken’yeah allies.

As a result of the increasing population, the Kayanic peoples began to war with each other as well as with the older inhabitants of the Kayan, like the Menung/Ot Danum, who were finally defeated by the Long Way (see 2-2). The first settlers tried to prevent the later migrants from entering their lands. For example, the chief of the Ga’ay Long Ba’un, Anyé’ Luhung “Aya’,”15 defended the upper Kayan regions against the Ken’yeah from the Baluy. Some of the early settlers even specialized in scouting and patrolling by wandering in the forests and living like hunter-gatherers (2-3).

Finally, however, the early Kayanic settlers delivered the Kayan to the later migrants, including the Kenyah, and scattered into the Berau and eastern Mahakam (Belayan, Telen, etc.). Settlers of the Berau intensified their raids, not only internally but also in alliance with the local sultanate to protect forest products against rivals like the Sulu, Bugis, and others. The Long Way and their Ga’ay allies settled in the Belayan and Kelinjau and fought against the Wehèa, who were concentrated in the Telen and Wahau, until the Kutai sultan arranged a truce through the intermarriage of the Long

14 Some informants state that the term Mélan/Méla:n probably corresponds to the Aran tributary on the Bahau.
15 His name is not mentioned in their genealogy, but seemingly he ruled sometime before or after Bit Ivung (see Table 9). Anyé’ Luhung in Table 9 is called “the third Anyé’ Luhung” from this Anyé’ Luhung “Aya’.”
Way paramount chief, “Raja Dinda” (Adinda), with Wehèa and Long Tesak nobles (see Table 2 and 14).

The Mengga’ay and Wehèa have lost most of their oral history relating to past times in the Kayan because of the rise of the Long Way and Long Glat, and also because of incessant wars after their dispersal from the Kayan. However, they still share an origin myth from Kong Kemul, where the Mengga’ay, Wehèa, and also local inhabitants (“Lebo’” or Lebu/ Basap) once lived together (see Okushima 2006: 95). From there, the Mengga’ay moved to the tributaries of the Segah and Kelai, while the Ga’ay Long Ba’un returned to the upper Kayan and continued to fight against later migrants in alliance with the Uma’ Laran (see Section 4). The Wehèa of Long Batloh (upper Kayan), who moved to Kong Kemul under Lejiw Kepbung, as recited in their traditional poem (ken ‘iah) Siw Ma ’Do:m, joined the other Wehèa in the Telen.

Among the Kong Kemul group mentioned earlier, there existed also some subgroups that did not originate in Kong Kemul and thus did not share the same origin myth. For example, a small faction of the Long Way under Éng Bit Haw came from the Kayan Iut to the upper Kelai (now in Long Lesan) apart from others who migrated to the Belayan, as recited in the Ken'iah Wong Waih Wong. The allies of the Ga’ay Long Ba’un, who had never lived around Kong Kemul, such as the Uma:’ Laran, Ngoréak, and Pua’, insist their origin myths were adopted from the Ga’ay Long Ba’un. On the other hand, part of the Wehèa prefer to identify themselves with other regions of the upper Kayan, like E’an and Laham, probably because of their alliance with the Long Way and Long Glat. For instance, the villagers of Benhes (Bénhès) state that one of their past chiefs, Wang Dang Kan Jung in Long Penyinga’ on the upper Kayan, was allied with the Long Way chief Baeng Wuang Ngo:k, mentioned above.

Subgroups of the Kong Kemul group also share some socio-cultural features, many of which seem to be of Bahau or Bahau-Murut origin. For example, both the Mengga’ay and Wehèa tend to form small, fragmented villages, some of them led not by nobles but by a chief’s right-hand man or a commoner. The use of stone tools is another important feature that is often mentioned in their oral histories (see Arifin and Sellato 2003). Their origin myth states, for example, that the people of Kong Kemul felled a giant tree, Kia ’Yo’ (‘tree of omen birds’), bearing a nest of man-eating hawks (Okushima 2006: 95) by using stone axes. Also, Sengguk Wuk, one of the Mengga’ay chiefs who migrated to the upper Segah, had a special stone axe, aséy Ngèan Lengét (Axe ‘the Great Arch of the Sky’), as an heirloom, which he used to quarry a stone boat from a riverside bluff in order to unite with the Divine. However, he was later defeated by another Mengga’ay chief, his rival Senwin Ding Lengét, and forced to concede his axe.

The Mengga’ay and Wehèa also shared a unique system of personal naming. In general, the Kayanic peoples choose the names of their children from those of their ancestors. To this name they add one of the parents’ names, for instance, Lo:ng Luhung or “Lo:ng, daughter of her mother Luhung,” or Baeng Wuang Bit Petowng or “Baeng, son of his father Wuang Bit Petowng (son of Bit, son of Petowng…).” In contrast, the

16 The descendants have scattered among the present-day Wehèa villages, Dia Lai (Dia’ Lay), Dabek (Déa Bek), and Jak Luay (Dia’ Luway).
17 Also, Wuang Diang Kan Jo:ng <LW>.
Kong Kemul group and related subgroups (Long Tesak and others) name their children not from their direct ancestors, but at random, and they do not add the parents’ name (see Tables 13 and 14). This system makes it difficult for descendants to memorize their genealogies, as well as to retain details of other memories of the past. Some informants explain that this peculiar system resulted from the extinction of high-status nobles (*hepoy puen, hepuy ngan*) due to incessant wars and headhunting. In fact, the Long Way also adopted this system from their allies the Wehèa for similar reasons during the reign of “Raja Dinda.”

2-2. Conquerors of the Kayan: the Long Way and their Allies

The name Belayan (tributary of the Mahakam) was derived from the Kutai words *bala Kayan*, or ‘lines of Kayan people,’ because of the many Kayanic migrants who arrived in the Kutai kingdom walking in file from the headwaters of the Kayan River. They also replaced the

---

18 Indeed, the Mengga’ay chief acknowledged that his tribe was war-captives of their enemies, the Mengga’ay or Long Way (Spaan 1901: 12).
19 Raja Dinda /Lengèt Lung Hela’ is said to have been a noble of low status (*hepoy so’*), although he was descended from famous chiefs like Baeng Wuang Ngo:k and Teguen Baeng Dlay in Table 2. He eventually became the paramount chief of the eastern Mahakam by succeeding to the position through one of his wives’ father, Jaw Bawng (Long Jengèan chief; also mentioned in Dewall 1846-47: 28 April), because almost all of the other Ga’ay chiefs were already dead.
original name of the main stream, *Kutai*, with *Mahakam*, the name used today.

Oral History of the Kutai Malays

The successors to the early Kayanic migrants, the Long Way and their Ga’ay allies, were actually of low status until the reign of Baeng Wuang Ngo:k. The Long Way split into four subgroups during their migration from the Kayan to the Mahakam, namely, the Long Lesa:n on the upper Kelai (2-1), the Long Bléh (also, Bleah <LW>/ Bilah <K>) on the middle Belayan, the “Long Way Pén”/ Long Way on the middle Kelinjau, and the “Long Way Lung”/Long Tesak formerly of the Pari, a tributary of the middle Mahakam. Today, the Long Way Pén have the largest village, Long Bentuk (Long Bung Taw’), where there still exists a rich storehouse of oral histories, not only of their own, but also of their neighbors, such as the Long Tesak, Mélèan, and Long Nah.

The ancestors of the Long Way migrated to the Kayan under Éng Kan Yaw as described above. They settled first near the Hewon/Avun rapids (Map 1). Then, they gradually moved upriver and entered the Kayan Iut. In the reign of the Éng’s grandson, Petowng, they settled at the mouth of a tributary, Way Pén. Here they intermarried with some powerful subgroups, including early Mengga’ay settlers under Teguen Baeng Dlay. Thus, they became known as the “Long Way.”

One product of this intermarriage was Wuang Bit Petowng and his son Baeng Wuang Ngo:k. As stated in many oral histories, Baeng was very ill-behaved and violent. He disobeyed the elders and did not follow his people’s religious practices, the most serious crime in the old Kayanic culture. At one point, Baeng’s followers ran away and his family was forced to rely on the Wehèa chief, Wang Dang Kan Jung (2-1). He eventually recovered his honor by defeating two dominant groups in the Kayan headwaters, the *Menung*/*Ot Danum* and the Long Glat or the related Ga’ay under Ding Boang Wuang Déa Lejiw. According to the *Takna’ Hejowng Kejin*, the Long Way moved to the upper Kayan, Long Baeng Mew’, to seek Ding Boang’s protection from the Menung, because they were worried about a revenge attack by Baeng’s right-hand men and their Menung allies. However, Ding Boang’s half-brothers made trouble with Baeng’s father and killed him. Hence, the two villages began to fight, which turned later into an all-out war throughout the Kayan basin. Ding Boang and all of his family died in this war, except for Ding’s youngest sister Heyea’ (Anya:’ <K,B>) who ran away with some villagers to the “Wehèa Bap,” or the Merap of today (see 5-1).

The victory of the Long Way resulted in the Kayanic peoples occupying the

---

20 His village, Suen Buet Bew’ Lem Weluen, was located near the *Pen’ian*, or Pengian on Kayan headwaters in Map 1 (not the Pengian on the lower Kayan).
21 His epic (Epic 6 in Table 1) describes that two right-hand men of Baeng, Ledaeng and Teguen, ran away from the village because of his behavior and sought protection from the Menung.
22 Baeng won the other Kayanic peoples to his side by setting special prizes, namely, his two beautiful sisters, Soang Bum and Déa Léy’, on Ding Boang’s family heirloom jars (*tajaw*), Sentuk and Ké:ng Downg. Competition for these prizes is the highlight of *Takna’ Hejowng Kejin*.
23 It is said that these Ga’ay-ized Bahau were linguistically and culturally very close to the Ga’ay. Some Long Way state that they lived in an area of the highlands of Bahau which was often covered with fog (*bap*), and the word *Bap* seems to be a dialect variant of Berap/Merap.
whole basin. However, they gradually moved to the Berau and eastern Mahakam as they were pushed there by later migrants like the Long Glat and Busa:ng, as seen in 2-1. In comparison with the Mengga’ay and part of the Wehèa, who were concentrated around Kong Kemul, the Long Way and their allies gathered further south, especially around three rocky mountains (hanga’) between the headwaters of the Kayan Iut, Belayan, and Telen (Map 1). Some of the Long Way temporarily moved to the upper Kayan, such as the Laham tributary. It is likely that in this period some of the Long Way split from the main group and became known as “Long Way Lung,” or later as “Long Tesak” after their migration to the Pari:/Pari on the Mahakam. If we examine genealogies of the Long Tesak, we see that they had adopted the naming system of the Kong Kemul group (2-1), beginning before their migration to the Kelinjau and re-assimilation by the other Long Way. Also, another party under Êng Bit Haw settled at the Kelai.

The rest of the Long Way arrived in the Tewaeng/Tava:ng/Tabang on the Belayan, see Map 2) during the reign of Baeng Lewi:ng, five generations after Baeng Wang Ngo:k, together with their allies the Long Nah, the Long Jengèan (a faction of the Mélèan), the Wehèa, and some other Bahau subgroups like the Hwang Muyut (see 3-3). The Belayan was the main gateway to the Mahakam basin for these early Kayanic migrants, which resulted in it being named “Belayan/Bala Kayan” by the Kutai inhabitants, as mentioned at the beginning of this section. The Ga’ay, from the time of Baeng Wang Ngo:k, continued to attack the earlier inhabitants of the Mahakam such as the Tunjung-Benua’ who then still lived on the upper Telen and Kelinjau.

During the age of Baeng Lewing’s grandson, Liah Ping Baeng Lewi:ng, and his first cousin, Ding Hejaeng (Table 2), the Long Way split into several subgroups and moved to the Kelinjau, except for one subgroup, the Long Bléh under Liah. In this period, the Long Way formed several farming groups along the Bengen, a tributary of the upper Belayan (Map 2). These groups, however, secretly fled to the Senyur and Atan, tributaries of the Kelinjau, to support other nobles. The Long Bléh then attacked the rest of the Long Way as well as all other Kayanic peoples on the Mahakam, until Liah’s great-grandson, Ding Liah Baw, was defeated by a Kutai force and converted to Islam in the middle of the nineteenth century (see also Dewall 1848-49: 22-27 October).

Settlements on the Senyur and Atan consisted of three main villages, Long Genwah (upper Atan) under Ding Hajaeng in alliance with the Long Nah, Long Suwi’ (middle Kelinjau) under La’ Soang Hoang, and Long Menwéa (Muara Ancalong) under Baeng Hèat Tung “So’” (Map 2). These villages continued to fight with the Long Bléh and Wehèa, and also with the Hwang Sa’ of the middle Mahakam, and later, they were finally reunified in the Long Tekowing (near Long Bentuk of today), also absorbing the Long Jengèan. The other Ga’ay, such as the Long Nah, We’ Hela’ (another

24 These mountains are Hanga’ Léy’ Soang Seloyng (name of the chief who had once settled there), Hanga’ Downg Tung, in the middle (downg tung, ‘burn from lightning’), and Hanga’ Mendéa, with no vegetation on the top (mendéa, ‘reflecting the sun’).
25 Some informants state that the subgroup was named after their chief, Lung. The term “Long Way Lung” was still in use at the end of the 19th century (see Tromp 1889: 287).
26 This name was originally the Kayanic name for the Belayan basin.
27 He was also known as “Liah Ha:ng Lawing” (see Knappert 1905: 594).
Mélèan faction), and Long Tesak, also joined one another in the middle Kelinjau.\footnote{28}

This reunification was promoted by the Kutai sultans who sought to regain hegemony from the Kayanic migrants. One of the sultan’s right-hand men, Pengeran Mangku, appointed the Long Way chief Lengét Lung Hela’ Haeng (Table 2) as paramount chief of the eastern Mahakam, and Lengét arranged a truce throughout the Mahakam basin by means of intermarriage alliances between the Long Way, Long Tesak, and Wehèa. Lengét was given the Malay title “Raja Dinda/Adinda” (‘Sultan’s Brother’) and married noble women of these groups, including Diang But or “Tana:’ Yo:ng” of the Long Tesak (see also Bock 1881; Spaan 1901; Knappert 1905). As a result, the Long Way ceded part of their land to the Long Tesak and the latter sent a party under Tana:’ Yo:ng to govern this new territory, including her followers selected from their subjects, the Hwang Sa’ (H. Tri:ng, H. Anah, H. Dali:’, and H. Siraw) and Laham in the middle Mahakam. Later, the whole Long Tesak group moved to the Kelinjau and became assimilated with the Bahau, as well as with their neighbors, the Tunjung-Benua’.


In the Kayan, there were not only hunter-gatherers who fought and allied themselves with Kayanic peoples, like the Lebbo’/Lebu and Menung/Ot Danum, but also some Kayanic peoples who specialized in scouting and patrolling and who later became “Punan,” as we shall see from the oral history of the Long Nah.

As I wrote previously (Okushima 1999, 2006), the Kayanic peoples succeeded in maximizing mobility and corporateness by means of various social institutions, like stratification, house groups, and kinship. They developed an efficient division of labor for farming, hunting, trading, and war-making. Sometimes this involved cooperation with neighboring hunter-gatherers, whom they later called “Punan.” The Kayanic term “Punan/ Penan/ Penèan,” originally meant ‘someone who brings rice souls from deep forest’ or ‘forest spirits,’ though later the term came to refer to hunter-gatherers. Hence, this title was given to old allies who brought them practical benefits, for example, game and other forest products, or information about distant places and their inhabitants.

Kayanic migrants used to rely on their relatives or allies among the Punan to guide them to new settlements in northeast Borneo. They distinguished these Punan from other hunter-gatherers who were the older inhabitants of the area, such as the Lebu, Ot Danum and Penihing, because the latter were, potentially at least, enemies. The Kayanic peoples sometimes stationed the Punan according to their convenience, in order to protect their territory or sources of forest products. This was the case, for example, with the Merap and the Punan and Beketan on the Malinau (see 5-2), and with the the Uma:’ Laran and Ga’ay Long Ba’un and the Punan Menyaung/ Benyaung, P. Belahun/ Berun and P. Lejuh on the lower Kayan.

\footnote{28 The Long Nah, seemingly a faction of the Mengga’ay from the Kayan Iut (see 2-3), once lived in the Wahau, in alliance with the Wehèa. On the other hand, the We’ Hela’ moved from Long Nawang (Kayan headwaters) to the upper Mahakam in alliance with the Long Glat (see 3-1), but they later split off and migrated to the lower Mahakam, and then to the Kedang Kepala (Map 2).}
A similar relationship developed among the regional alliance groups under the Long Way, but with Punanized Ga’ay. The Long Nah, who were originally related to the Kong Kemul group, allied later with the Long Way and followed them to the eastern Mahakam. They formerly lived in Long Sétjaw’ (or, Sékjaw’/Sékji’/Tekéja’ etc.), a tributary of the Kayan Iut, where there was a saline spring (nah <LN> / noah <LW>). There they split into two factions. The Long Nah chief at that time, Beyt Ba:w Dam Taw’ (Bit Baw Doam Tew’ <LW>), had a younger sister, Ye’ Ba:w Dam Taw’, who loved farming and cattle breeding. One day, however, it happened that one of her domestic pigs ran away and ruined the farm of Bit. He became so angry that he prohibited Ye’ from farming or staying in the village. Therefore, Ye’ led a small party from the Kayan to Long Gueh, and they became “Punan Long Way,” namely, hunter-gatherers who follow after the Long Way and Long Nah. Later, they mixed with other hunter-gatherers and divided into several Punan subgroups, such as the Punan Kelay (Kelai), P. Leséy’, P. Abang, and P. Lepdéan.

In fact, those Punan subgroups were probably divided according to the convenience of the Long Way alliance group to guard the headwaters of the Kelai and Belayan against later Kayanic migrants. As we shall see in Section 4, these later migrants, like the Long Glat, Long Huvung, and Uma’ Juman, suffered from the furious attacks of the Punan Kelay and therefore were forced to migrate to the western headwaters of the Mahakam. They called the Punan Kelay not “Punan,” but rather “Li’ Kelay” (li’, lih, ‘a group of’ <G>), or simply “Ken’yah/ Kenyah” in their oral histories. Guerreiro also suggests (1985: 108, 115-116) that the Punan Kelay, or Mnan as is their autonym, are physically and linguistically very close to the Ga’ay, especially the Wehèa and the Mengga’ay of the Kelai.

Such “Punanization” or creation of “secondary hunter-gatherers” (Hoffman 1986) among Kayanic peoples seems to have sometimes occurred in the past. Also, according to Kutai oral history, the Lebu are descended from Chinese forest-product traders (Adham 1979, vol.1: 49). Other possible factors such as quarrels, social sanctions, religious segregation, tyranny, and desertion from wars could also have motivated some Kayanic peoples to escape into the forest and become forest wanderers (see Okushima 2006: 120-121).

3. Discovery of the “Big Mahakam”: Long Glat, Kayan Meka:m, and Hwang Sa’

The broad, fertile basin of the Mahakam was very attractive for many Kayanic migrants from the Kayan. They replaced its old name “Kutai” with Mekiam Puen/Meka:m Aya’, or ‘Big Mahakam, Ocean,’ to distinguish it from their older settlement, Mekiam/Mahkam on the upper Segah.

After the defeat of the Menung/Øt Danum on the upper Kayan, Kayanic peoples gained easier access to the Mahakam, not only from the Belayan and Telen, but also via western tributaries like the Boh, Ogah, and Tepai, all of which flow from the Kayan headwaters (Map 1). Most later Kayanic migrants passed these western tributaries in 29 It is uncertain whether this river corresponds to the Long Gueh of the Kelai or of the Kelinjau.
30 There are two Leséy’ rivers on the upper Kelinjau and Telen. The other locations are obscure.
order to avoid the attacks of the Long Way and their allies, including the Punan Kelay. Among these migrants were three main alliance groups. On the upper Mahakam (above the Riam rapids), the pioneer Kayan Meka:m and some other Bahau and Murut subgroups lived scattered along the uppermost part of the river (see 3-2), while the Long Glat and their Busa:ng allies spread from the upper to the middle Mahakam (3-1), and the “Hwang Sa’” and other Bahau, who were largely controlled by the Long Glat and its small faction the Keliway, concentrated along the middle Mahakam (3-3). In addition, some Ga’ay, like the Long Huvung/Hubung, part of the Méléan (We’ Hela’ above), and the Long Tesak, also migrated to the Mahakam.

Examining genealogies reveals that some Kayanic peoples, including the Kayan Meka:m and Long Glat, arrived at the headwaters of the Mahakam during the reign of the Long Glat chief Luhat Ba:ng, 14 generations before present-day informants, or ±350 years ago (see Table 4). Some of the Hwang Sa’, such as the H. Siraw and H. Anah, who migrated from the Belayan and Telen, may have come to the Mahakam a bit earlier, if we consider the evidence of intermarriage alliances with the coastal Kutai (see 3-3). From this it would seem that the Kayanic migrants spent more than a century, 5 to 6 generations, opening the forest and driving out the local inhabitants, not only the Ot Danum but also the “Ping”/Penihing, “Tera:n”/Pira Toran, and “Benua”/Tunjung-Benua,’ until they were able to settle safely along the main river. Later, they allied and became assimilated with these local groups, creating the Hwang Boh, H. Temha:, H. Meka:m/Mahakam,31 Uma:’ Pala:’, and U. Tepay/Tepé:. In contrast, others like the Kayan Meka:m were linguistically changed by the influence of their Penihing subjects as well as their Busa:ng neighbors. After securing a foothold along the upper Mahakam, Kayanic peoples spread to the middle Mahakam in the late eighteenth century, 6 to 7 generations ago, triggering disturbances throughout the Kutai sultanate, until a final peace-making was concluded during the reign of Raja Dinda, as described earlier.

3-1. The Long Glat and Busa:ng, or the “Descendants of Inay Aya’”

When our ancestors (later Long Glat migrants under Ding “Tung”) still lived in Long Jemahang (see Map 1), some of them went fishing in the Kayan Iut and saw a shining silver sengala:ng tree32 drifting from the Danum Nyivung tributary. They picked it up and made a long drum (tuvung) from it, which they named “Teloy Lengayt <LG>/ Tuluy Langit <K,B>” (‘Flood in the Sky,’ a poetic expression for a thunderbolt). Because the sengala:ng was in fact the sacred tree for the funeral rituals of the Ot Danum (adat Turay), one of them, Lambang, who was descended from “Tambun Bungay,”33 later came to get the drum back from the Long Glat, who by this time had migrated to

31 The Hwang “Jinaway,” who also existed in the 19th century, were either extinct or, they might have changed their name to “H. Meka:m” (compare Dewall 1846-47 and Tromp 1889).
32 A kind of rambutan tree with a white trunk <K>.
33 These famous war-chiefs of Central Kalimantan, Tambun and his cousin Bungay (Bungai), came from the Kapuas headwaters and are generally said to be the ancestors of the Ot Danum as well as other Kapuas inhabitants (Lambang himself was from the Bungan). The Indonesian National Army (KODAM) of Central Kalimantan was named after them.
Table 4: The Long Glat (in Busa:ng Dialect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Baram → Apo Sio:]</td>
<td>*see his genealogy in Okushima 1999: 84, Table 2 (also his mother’s, in Note 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(*seven generations below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[→ Apo Kayan]</td>
<td>&lt;Early migrants to the Mahakam&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[→ Boh → Ogah]</td>
<td>[Long Jemaha:ng]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[→ Long Deho’]</td>
<td>[Long Keputus]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[→ Liw Mulang]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[→ Liu Mulang]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Kulé]</td>
<td>[→ Lulo: Liya:ng]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[→ Long Muroh]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram:

- [Baram → Apo Sio:] *see his genealogy in Okushima 1999: 84, Table 2 (also his mother’s, in Note 9)
- (*seven generations below)
- [→ Apo Kayan] <Early migrants to the Mahakam>
- [→ Boh → Ogah] [Long Jemaha:ng]
- [→ Long Deho’] [Long Keputus]
- [→ Liw Mulang]
Long Puti:’ (at Riam). But, he could not find the village because of the supernatural power of Tuluy Langit. Years later, the Long Glat under Lejiw Lie’ and Ibo: Lie’ (see Table 4) experienced a sudden attack of the Long Huvung, who came with their allies the Long Tesak and Hwang Tri:ng (Muyut). Thus, the Long Huvung took away Tuluy Langit as well as other heirlooms.\footnote{Functioning also as an ensign of a village, the \textit{tuvung} often became the target of enemies in the past.}

Oral History of the Long Glat, upper Mahakam

Originating in the Baram, the first Long Glat chief, Ba:ng <K, B> / Béang <LG>, 25 generations before his present-day descendants (see Okushima 1999: 84, Table 2), settled at Napo’Bem Biha:’ Tela:ng (an area of rapids with a waterfall) next to the Busa:ng tributary, in the Apo Sio: highland. His great-grandson, Lejiw Lie’ (Lejaw Li:’ <K, B>), married Lo:ng Tekhin Lejiw / Lo:ng Luhung and gave birth to Ibo: (also (H)Ibaw <K, B> / Ba:, Baw <G>). From his reign, the Long Glat started to differentiate themselves from the others, with the subgroup name \textit{Puhu: Ibo: Lo:ng Luhung} <K> / \textit{Su:n Ba: Lowng Leho:ng} <LG> (puhu:, meso:n, su:n, ‘a grandchild, descendant(s)’). Remember that the name Apo Sio: appears also in the old Kayan epics and chants, including the \textit{Takna’ Inay’ Aya’} above, as the homeland of the sister of Inay’ Aya’/ Iné: Aya’, Buring Bangaw (Table 3). In fact, the genealogy of Ibo:’s mother dates back to this legendary noble (see footnote 9). Hence, we can see that the birth of Ibo: was symbolic of the alliance between the Long Glat and some powerful proto-Kayan subgroup.

The Long Glat began at this time to rule over these proto-Kayans, who differentiated themselves from other \textit{Ken’yeah} by their use of the name “Busa:ng.” Their power grew during the period of Ibo: Lo:ng Luhung’s great-grandson, Ba:ng Lejiw, and his son, Ding Ba:ng, alias Ding “Tung.” Ba:ng once dreamed of a fire in his village and so moved his village to Apo Gera:ng and became known as “Bo’ Tung” (tung, ‘burnt out’). There they encountered another large Busa:ng population, the Uma:’ Tua:n, who were allegedly also descendants of Inay Aya’ and the “U.Away/Awé:.” The chief Kwé:ng Belawa:n married his daughter-in-law, Usun Ut, to Ding “Tung.” Thereafter, the Uma:’ Tua:n became important allies, always following the Long Glat and were given the title, “Our Favorite (like the central bead of a necklace)” (beluwa: \textit{ting kelbé:} <K>). There were also Uma:’ Sam, who came to Apo Gera:ng seeking protection. By the time they migrated to the Kayan, the other original Busa:ng, the Uma:’ Lekwé:, U. Mehak, and U. Wak, also came under the control of the Long Glat.

The Long Glat arrived in Apo Kayan\footnote{In this paper I use the term “Apo Kayan” to indicate the regions of the upper Kayan, just as it is today, although it originally referred to the highlands between the upper Kayan and the Iwan tributary (see Map 1).} during the reign of Ding’s great-grandson, Luhat Ba:ng (Hi:t Béang <LG>), 14 generations before present-day descendants (see Table 4). This seems to have occurred during almost the same period as that of the famous Long Way chief, Baneg Wuang Ngo:k, who also lived 14 generations ago. The son of Luhat Ba:ng, Ding Luhat decided to migrate to the Boh, hearing that Singa Melu:n, chief of the Kayan Meka:m, had just moved to the Mahakam. This migration
may also have been the result of battles between Baeng and Ding Boang (2-2), although the name of the latter is not mentioned in the Long Glat genealogies I collected. Some of the Long Glat soon left for the Mahakam, while the rest stayed in the Kayan headwaters, such as the Long Jemahang and Long Danum (Map 1). The two later rejoined in the upper Mahakam, during the reign of Lej iw Aja:ng or “Kerta” in the nineteenth century.

Having moved from the Boh to its tributary, the Ogah, Ding Luhat’s son, Ba:ng Ding searched a long time for a good place to settle along the main river and finally settled at Long Deho’ (near Batu Kelau) on the Riam rapids. There, the Long Glat were fully occupied with expeditions to the upper and middle Mahakam for several generations. Ba:ng’s great-granddaughter, Do’ Ding, alias Do’ “Langit,” married “Sultan Kutai,” or some Kutai noble at least, who visited the upper Mahakam to make allies with the Kayanic newcomers. Although he himself could not stand a “Dayak” life style and later returned to the lower Mahakam (Long Keputus), the Long Glat obtained their first inroad into controlling the Mahakam basin by means of this marriage. The hegemony of the Long Glat was almost established by the time of Do’s grandson, Aja:ng Lej iw, or “Po’ Hejieng <LG> / Bo’ (H)Aja:ng <K>” (see Dewall 1846-47: 9 and 14 June, “Bokk-Djing,” “Bohha-Djang” etc.).

Colonial records relating to the Long Glat seem quite confused, written as if only one chief, whose name was “Lej iw,” performed all of these deeds, such as arranging a marriage alliance with the Kutai sultan, conquering the Mahakam basin, and sending expeditions to West Kalimantan. In fact, however, there were at least four different “Lejiws” between the late eighteenth and middle of the nineteenth century.

The earliest “Lej iw” was one of Aja:ng Lej iw’s sons, Lej iw Aja:ng, who was also known as “Lej iw Bela’: /Lejaw Bela:’” (bela: ’<K, B> “turning red in anger”), or by his Malay title “Kerta” given to him by the Kutai sultan (see Table 4, and also Table 7). In this Lej iw’s time, the Long Glat attacked the inhabitants of the Mahakam one after another in alliance with other Kayanic migrants. They also fought against the Long Way and Wehèa in the eastern tributaries. Aja:ng once migrated for a time to the Tabang (Belayan), seemingly to take temporary refuge from some conflict with the We’ Hela’ or other Ga’ay. Lej iw Aja:ng later became a Kutai officer, while his younger brother Ibo: Aja:ng was mainly engaged in suppressing the peoples of the upper Mahakam, including the Uma:’ Tepay, U. Pala:’ and U. Suling (see also 4-1).

Some time later, the late-arriving Long Glat came to the upper Mahakam, under the direction of three children of another Ibo: Lo:ng Luhung, Do’, Lie’ and Aja:ng (Table 4). Do’ married another Lej iw, Lej iw Do:m Ba:ng Lawing (a Long Way, or Mélèan, noble), who fought against the Uma:’ Juman and U. Laran in Apo Kayan, together with his son Ding, another Ding “Tung,” as we will see in 4-2. This aggressive chief Ding “Tung” often quarreled with neighboring people. For example, he once tried to abduct Do’ Langit, the beautiful daughter of the Long Huvung chief Langit Ding, and the

36 He could not be purely Malay but rather was a descendant of the Hwang Siraw or Tunjung Linggang under the chief Puncan Karna, who had assimilated with the Kutai nobles (see 3-3).
37 His mother is said to have been a Long Way noble, Soang Jiw Belowng.
38 Nieuwenhuis also mentions (1904: 279) Ding’s quarrel with the Long Huvung (“Long Howong”), but he mistakenly describes Lej iw and Ibo: (“Ibau und Lèdju”) as Ding’s sons.
Long Huvung soon left Batu Kelaw and moved downriver to avoid war with Ding. Before or after this period, the Long Glat drove other neighbors to the middle Mahakam, such as the Hwang Meka:m, Uma:’ Luhat or “Tunjug Linggang” (Kayanized Penihing), and other Tunjug-Benua’. The Mélèan and Uma:’ Mehak also migrated to the middle Mahakam, probably seeking protection from Lejiw Aja:ng or Kerta, who had married another Long Huvung noble, Hipuy Lawing Ding, and moved down to Long Meroh by this time.

Two first cousins of Ding “Tung,” Lejiw Lie’ and Ibo: Lie’ (Table 4), who were still young at the time of the migration from the Kayan to the Mahakam, later had to reap the harvest of Ding’s aggressive behavior when the Long Huvung returned from Kota Bangun (Map 2) and counterattacked the Long Glat in the upper Mahakam, reinforced by the Long Tesak and Hwang Muyut. The Long Glat were forced to flee to the headwaters of the Seratah. After these hardships, Lejiw and Ibo: devoted themselves to restoring their power by attacking and annexing their neighbors for better defense, such as the Bang Kelaw and Uma:’ Suling between the Seratah and Meraseh, the Penihing and other hunter-gatherers in the Mahakam headwaters region, and even the Tiuri:/Maloh (Taman) of West Kalimantan (see also Nieuwenhuis 1904: 279; Ngo 1988: 52-53; Sellato 1986: 304-305, 317-318).

Some of the children of Lejiw and Ibo: split from the group and moved to the middle Mahakam under the hegemony of the Kutai sultans, taking with them some of their Busa:ng, Uma:’ Pala’, and U. Tepay allies. The rest of the Long Glat maintained their independence along the upper Mahakam under Kerta’s brother’s son, Kuléh Ibo:.

Among them was the nephew of Ding “Tung,” another Lejiw Lie’, who took several wives from among the hunter-gatherers of the Seriku, Sekeh, Tibang, and Kasau (see Table 5). This younger Lejiw Lie’ settled these allies along the main stream and taught them to cultivate rice. Other hunter-gatherers preferred to migrate further upriver, or to West and Central Kalimantan. Lejiw also married one of his daughters, Bula:n Lejiw of Penihing origin, to the Kutai Sultan, Muhammad Salehudin, in the 1820s (Table 4 and 6, see also Dalton 1837; Dewall 1846-47). However, because the sultan had many wives, Bula:n begged him to allow her to return to the upper Mahakam. She had repeated secret abortions, until she finally came home and married again, this time to a Penihing chief, Blaré’.

Intermarriage alliances were frequently promoted. The son of the elder Lejiw Lie’, Ba:ng Lejiw, married the granddaughter of Kerta, who gave birth to Lejaw Ba:ng, or “Raden Temanggung” in Hwang Anah’s village (see 3-3). Lejiw Lie’s first-cousin, Do’ Ibo:, sister of the chief Kuléh Ibo: mentioned above, married a Kayan Meka:m noble, Uvat Tuko: (Table 5). Uvat’s daughter Unya:ng married the son of Lejiw’s second cousin, Ibo: Aja:ng. The brother of Bula:n Lejiw, Dalung Lejiw, was also asked to...

---

39 According to Dewall (1846-47: 14 June), there was also Kuléh’s brother, Tekhéan <LG>/Tekhin <K> (“Tékhoean”), who is absent from local genealogies. Tromp writes (1889) that the Long Glat split in two after the death of “Lidok Langit,” that is, Ding Tung’s brother, Lie’ Do’ (Table 4). 40 “Ledjieoew-Ngooi” in Dewall’s report (1846-47: 14 June) seems to correspond to this youngest Lejiw, but the details are obscure (ngo:y <G> ‘an arm’; or, hango:y, ‘river, water’?). 41 Knappert (1905) seems to confuse him with his father, Md. Muslihudin.
marry his daughter to the sultan. Thus, political networks were established in this period throughout the Mahakam.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, the Long Glat of the upper Mahakam were further split into several villages. Ibo: Lie’s grandson, Liah Lo:ng (Table 4), led his party to Lirung Ba’an, then to Long Tepay, together with his wife’s village, Uma: ‘Lekwé:’ (see also Nieuwenhuis 1904: 281). They finally settled in Long Tuyo’ at the beginning of the twentieth century. On the other hand, the great-grandson of Lejiw Lie’ (Ibo:’s brother), Ibo: Aja:ng, split from the village of his second cousin, Ba:ng Juk, and moved to Long Meroh, then to Long Melaham, until his group rejoined the latter in Ujoh Bilang in the 1960s because of depopulation. Ba:ng Juk seized hegemony as the paramount chief over the middle and upper Mahakam at the end of the nineteenth century, but he and his siblings had no heir to succeed them. After the death of Ba:ng Juk in the 1930s (see Vossen 1936), his first cousin Ha:ng Lejaw or “Mat Saleh,” son of Raden Temanggung (see Table 7), became the Kutai official until the Japanese occupation. During this time, Long Glat influence in the middle Mahakam region gradually decreased.

3-2. The Kayan Meka:m and the Related Murutic Group

…The Ping Sekay, Ping Uvo:ng, Ping Kenyo:ng, Ping Bahva:ng, Ping Talun, nobles of the Hwang Kaya:n, nobles of the Tera:n,42 and the female chief Unya:ng Lalaw,43 all who have long possessed the Pahangai basin, until today, and who live in the sacred land in the sky, from where this basin originated. We order them to wake up and hear our voices call for them. We order them to come and take up our souls, we, the inhabitants of this basin.

Land purifying prayer of the Uma:’ Suling, upper Mahakam

Among the Kayanic migrants to northeastern Borneo, there were many “in-between” subgroups, that is, people who were already allied with some of the Kayanic peoples but not so strongly as to become assimilated. These miscellaneous in-between peoples were Muruts, hunter-gatherers, Malays, and any other local peoples, all whom were the Ken’yeah/Kenyah in the original sense of the term (see Okushima 2006). Some migrated to the upper Mahakam and became known as the Kayan Meka:m, Bang Kelaw, Lutan, and Laham. Thus, they were labeled by their neighbors, the Long Glat, Busa:ng, and Hwang Sa’, as being “like the Kenyah.”

Over the generations, however, these Ken’yeah or in-between groups were assimilated into the Busa:ng and Long Glat, while those of the middle Mahakam were Bahau-ized by the Hwang Sa’. The dialect of the Kayan Meka:m is a very interesting example of this assimilation. They are said to have formerly spoken a dialect close to Hwang Sa’ before assimilation with their Penihing subjects as well as their Busa:ng neighbors. However, their language also shows some Murutic remnants, derived, perhaps,

42 The term Ping corresponds to the Penihing (e.g., Sekay, Seké:= ‘Sekeh River at the headwaters’), Hwang Kaya:n to the Kayan Meka:m, and Tera:n to the Pira Toran now living in West Kalimantan (pira= bilah <K>, ‘a coffin with four pillars’).
43 It is unclear whether she was an Uma:’ Suling noble or a sister of the first Kaya:n Meka:m chief, Kwé:ng Ira:ng.
Table 5: The Kayan Meka:m and Penihing in the 18-19C (in Busa:ng dialect)
from the language of the people living today along the Kerayan and northern Baram, where the early Ga’ay and Bahau had contacts (Okushima 2006: 103-105).

As seen in Long Glat oral history as well as from the prayer of the Uma:’ Suling, the Kayan Meka:m are generally known as the first Kayanic migrants to the upper Mahakam, under the leadership of chief Kwé:ng Ira:ng, alias “Singa Melu:n.” Tromp mentions (1888: 62-63) their oral history which includes a typical, widely-shared Kayanic legend of a falling bridge (butat ja’it <K>). The Kayan Meka:m came to be split in two during their migration from the Kayan to the Boh because some of them cut down a rattan bridge that crossed a ravine after mishearing a cry of payaw (a deer) as ayaw (enemies). Because of this, the followers of Kwé:ng’s sister (“Oeboeng Lirang”) could not reach the Boh and were obliged to return to Brunei, while the others headed towards Danum Paray/Paré: on the upper Mahakam.

Unfortunately, the oral historical details were lost by the early twentieth century, as the Kayan Meka:m themselves acknowledge. According to Nieuwenhuis’s genealogy (1904: 283), Kwé:ng Ira:ng/“Singa Melu:n” corresponds to 8 generations before present-day informants, which is close to the reign of the Long Glat chief, Aja:ng Lejiw/Po’ Hejieng (see Table 5). However, if we follow Long Glat oral history, as seen in section 3-1, the first “Singa Melu:n” should have been alive during the reign of Ding Luhat, 6 generations before Aja:ng Lejiw. Hence, we can speculate that there were several descendants of the first “Singa Melu:n” with the name Kwé:ng, and that all of them were given the alias “Kwé:ng Ira:ng” or “Singa Melu:n”, just as in the cases of “Lejiw Bela:” and Ding “Tung” described above. Moreover, these descendants originated not from the first “Singa Melu:n” but from his brother, Unya:ng, very likely the Unya:ng Lalaw referred to in the Uma:’ Suling prayer quoted above.

Arriving in the upper Mahakam region, the Kayan Meka:m joined other Kayanic migrants to attack the old inhabitants and enlarge their new territory. Because they were the pioneers of the region and also because they had numerous subjects like the Penihing, even their rivals, the Long Glat, dared not to attack them directly. The Kayan Meka:m were still considered in general as the ruling group of the upper Mahakam in the 1890s, during the reign of Kwé:ng Uvat, alias “Kwé:ng Ira:ng” (see Table 5), although his first-cousin’s son, the Long Glat chief Ding Ngo:, insisted on his own hegemony by stressing his descent from Ibo: Aja:ng (brother of “Kerta” above) (see Nieuwenhuis 1904: 282). Nevertheless, because of their preference for staying in the uplands, just as their Murutic ancestors had done, the Kayan Meka:m were gradually left behind, in contrast to the Long Glat, who were eager to organize regional alliances and political networks.

Two related groups of Kayan Meka:m, the Uma:’ Pala:’ and U. Tepê:/ Tepay, share linguistic and cultural features. The Uma:’ Urut and Bang Kelaw may also have had relations with them, because the U. Urut came from the Mount Murut/Murud area of Sarawak together with the Bang Kelaw. According to their oral histories, the Uma:’ Urut once fought with the Bang Kelaw during their migration to the Mahakam, but later

44 It is obscure how he got such a Malay-styled title. Tromp translates (1888: 63) this honorific title as ‘Big Tiger’ (groote tiiger). (Or, “Melu:n”= mela:n, maran, mara:n, ‘sacred, noble’?)
45 Also, payo: and ayo: <Busa:ng>, penyiw and enyiw <G>.
46 It is said that they once lived together with some Hwang Sa’, like the H. Tri:ng.
allied with them. The Bang Kelaw themselves consisted originally of several different subgroups, like the “Uma:’ Bawa:ng” (Kenyah U. Tela:ng now living in the Tabang and Baluy), 47 “U. Sabben” (the Saban?), and “U. Dia:n.”

These various in-between subgroups were caught and annexed by the Long Glat. When the Long Glat attacked the Uma:’ Pala:’ (pala:’, ‘to be taken, conquered’ <K>), they lived on the rocky mountain Bato’ Uko:t (uko:t, utiong <K>, ‘a domestic pig’). 48 The U. Tepay once lived in Data: Talun around Bang Bro’/Brok, 49 before moving to the Tepai basin. There, according to local legends, they prospered as rice farmers in cooperation with several “Ping”/Penihing subgroups. However, the Penihing eventually became extinct because the U. Tepay chief harrassed them. The U. Urut settled in the southern region, ranging to Central Kalimantan. Here the Sihang and other local groups often came to attack them. They finally sought protection from the Long Glat when they lived on the Belso’, a tributary of the Pahangai. 50

Only the Bang Kelaw remember some details of their past migrations. They migrated from Batu Maga:ng between the Kayan and Boh, then settled near lake Mesa’ay on the Ogah. All subgroups such as the U. Bawa:ng and U. Sabben migrated together but built separate longhouses. Then, the Bang Kelaw gradually migrated westwards, from the upper Tepai to the Lunok. In this period, they became well-known for their invincible villages protected by various devices, 51 as expressed in the local saying: Tiah ta’ uli:’ men Bang Kelaw (‘We obtained nothing, just like our expeditions to the village of the Bang Kelaw’ <K>). The Long Glat were barely able to defeat them when the Bang Kelaw lived on Mount Hapa:ng Palok (between the Meraseh and Seratah), seemingly sometime after the counterattacks of the Long Huvung described above. Thus, the Long Glat gave them the title of ‘Sharp Swords’ (mala:t nyiét /nya’at <K>).

3-3. Alliance and Assimilation with the Coastal Malay: The Hwang Sa’

Ngaw Wa:n Luhung (chief of the Uma:’ Laran; see Section 4) attacked the Kaya:n (here, the Long Glat) and Kenyah (non-Ga’ay peoples, here, the Hwang Sa’) in Apo Kayan. Many dead bodies turned the lake red, so that it came to be called Bawa:ng Baluy (near Long Ampung, Map 1). The rest of the Kaya:n and Kenyah then moved to the Mahakam; the Kenyah in fact consisted of two subgroups, the “Hwang Tri:ng” and the “Hwang Tembaw.”

In contrast with the in-between subgroups of the upper Mahakam, the “Hwang Sa’” were strongly Kayanized from their time in the Baram, and so they were more

47 Their old words indeed show some similarity with those of the Kenyah; e.g., hu’è:’ (I, me), kelian (water), tango’ (side dish), and du:’ (to drink).
48 The location is obscure. Some informants wonder if Batu Uting of the Tabang (Belayan) was also one of their old territories.
49 This seems to refer to the Mount Batu Brok at the river’s headwaters. In addition, the term Bang Bro’ originally referred to the most fertile land for rice farming in Kayan myths.
50 It is obscure whether the name Belso’ is related to Burusu’ (“Belso’/Beluso’” in Kayan) of the lower Kayan and the Malinau (see 5-1).
51 Their most famous device was a trap of falling logs (bata:ng bavé:).
Table 6: Kutai Royal Genealogy (from Adham 1979)

[Mouth of Mahakam]

<Hulu Dusun>
Dewa △= ○Putri Junjun Buih (Banjarmasin)

<Jaitan Layar>
① Aji Barata Agung △= ○Putri Karang Melenu
     Aji Putri ○=△ Aji Barata Agung
     Paduka Suri (Bengalon)
     Paduka Nira ②

△Maharaja Maharaja=○Paduka Dayang=○Puncan △Jeliban △Sualas
Sakti Sultan③ | Suri Putri | Karna Bena Guna | [→Sirau]

△Mandarsyah ④ △Seru Gambira
○=△ Pengeran Tumenggung=○ Raja Puteri △Permata Alam
(Pasir) Bayabaya ⑤

△Tumenggung ⑥ Raja Makota△=○Ratu Agung
     Aji Raden Wijaya △=○
     Kuing Tuan ○=△Aji di Langgar =○Tuan Rangga Tua○ =△Wadu Aji
     Katak ⑦ | Rimah
     △Δ Ki Dipati Jayapura ○Tuan Kucang

[*Conquest of Martapura]
⑨ △Pengeran Dipati Agung Ing Martapura / Aji Keranda

[→ Jembayangan]
⑪ ○Aji Ragi / Ratu Agung ⑫ △Pengeran Dipati Tua Ing Martapura

<Bone Kingdom (Bugis)>
△Petta △Petta Tu Rawe
Risenggang Petta Tu △=○Andin Ajang (Pasir)
Sebengareng (Pasir)

△Pengeran Petta Putri Andin Duyah ○=△ Aji Mohammad Idris △Raja Pantun
Aji ○=△Raja Alam (Sambaliung) Aji ○=△Aji Imbut / Sultan Aji Muhammad Muslihudin ⑬ (died in 1816)
Aji Nantu ⑬

[→ Tenggarong]
Aji Kujar / Sultan Muhammad Salehadin △=○Bulan Lejiw
⑭ (died in 1845) (*see Table 4)
subservient to the Ga’ay and Kayan chiefs. They consisted of the Hwang Anah, H. Dali:/ Dalih, H. Siraw, and H. Tri:ng/Tering, including their faction, the H. Muyut/Muyub, as well as Bahau-ized local groups, H. Boh, H. Temha:, and H. Meka:m, all of whom had once been under the rule of the Long Glat and Keliway in the middle Mahakam. The Hwang Patak (mixed with the H. Muyut) and H. Huray are considered not to belong to the original Hwang Sa’ group, seemingly because they were allied with the Long Way.

The identity of the Hwang Sa’ or ‘original Bahau’ (sa’ = “sah” in Malay, ‘real, correct’) seemingly developed in rivalry with the Ga’ay-ized Wehèa along the eastern tributaries. Also, they may have been proud that they were the first Kayanic group along the Mahakam to form alliances with Kutai nobles. In fact, some Bahau seem to have been settled in the Mahakam before the arrival of the Kayan Meka:m and Long Glat, according to Kutai oral histories. Thus, in the Kutai royal chronicle, Salasilah Kutai (Adham 1979, vol. 1: 122, 126, 156-157, 182, see also Tromp 1888; Mees 1935; Kern 1936), Aji Barata Agung Paduka Nira (the second Kutai king in Table 6) is said to have arranged a marriage between his youngest daughter and Puncan Karna, a Tunjung chief from the Linggang region on the middle Mahakam (see Map 2). As the Dutch controllers heard (Dewall 1846-47; Veth 1870; Tromp 1888), Puncan’s family was actually known to be descended from the Bahau. Indeed, his parents, Aji Tulur Jangkat and Muk Bandar Bulan, are memorialized with the typical symbol of Bahau nobles, namely, being born with an offering of eggs in their hands (tulur= telor <Malay>, ‘egg’) (Okushima 2006: 116). Furthermore, one of Puncan’s brothers, Jeliva:n Benah (“Jeliban Bena”), became the chief of the Hwang Siraw (“Sirau”).

Cross-checking the Kutai and Ga’ay genealogies, we find that both Aji Barata Agung Paduka Nira and Puncan’s parents lived 17 generations ago, which means that they lived almost at the same time as, or a little bit earlier than, the reign of Ding Luhat, the first Long Glat chief of the Mahakam. Hence, Puncan’s family was probably descended from the Hwang Siraw, just as the oral history above notes, and possibly also from the H. Patak and H. Muyut, all of whom came to the middle Mahakam after passing the Belayan and Wahau. These Bahau themselves remember that they migrated very early to the mouths of these tributaries and partially mixed with the coastal Malay. In fact, the early Wehèa migrants found Bahau-ized inhabitants who had already settled on the upper Wahau, such as the Long Tung Nang (see the descendants in Table 14 later). There were also Kayanized Penihing, the Uma:’ Luhat, who came from the upper Mahakam to the Linggang because of attacks by the Long Glat (see Knappert 1905: 592-593). These

52 The Hwang Anah and H.Siraw might have descended from, or at least be related to, the Long Nah and the Seloy/Ga’ay Gung Kiya:n, as suggested by their subgroup names in Ga’ay dialects, Noah /Nah and Seloa /Seloy.

53 Another possibility is that the term Sa’ came from the river island Busa:ng Sa’ and Lep’un Sa’ (an old village near the island) in the upper Kayan (lower side of Data Dian).

54 Not only Jeliva:n Benah but also his ancestors in Table 6 seem to have had Kayanic names, such as “Hirong” (Hirung / Hirus:ng), “Gah” (Gah / Géh), and “Beran” (Bera:n).

55 There were also some Ga’ay and Wehèa. According to Takna’ Hejowng Kejin, Baeng Wang Ngo:k (of the same generation as Ding Luhat) had relatives who had already settled in the headwaters of the Wahau and Atan (Kelinjau) by this time.
“Tunjung Linggang” were thus assimilated into the earlier Tunjung of the Linggang, very likely because they knew about these earlier relatives.

Veth also heard (1870: 456-457) that “Aji di Mendirsa,” the first king to convert to Islam, was a Bahau. If he meant Raja Mandarsyah, the fourth Kutai king in Table 6, a nephew of Puncan’s wife, this king may have been related to some early Kayanic migrants to the Wahau and Kelingau basins, like the Hwang Siraw described above, because he was allied with the old kingdom of Martapura at Muara Kaman (Map 2), near the mouths of these tributaries. In addition, Dewall notes (1846-47: 14 June) that the Kutai nobles were also descended from the Hwang Anah. This seems to refer to “Kerta” or the Long Glat chief Lejiw Aja:ng’s intermarriage alliances with the Tunjung-Benua’ and Malay neighbors.

In the late nineteenth century, opponents of the Kutai sultans called together their Kayanic relatives in order to spark a revolt. Indeed, there were many discontented men who had gathered in the lower Mahakam over the previous two centuries. The Martapura kingdom in Muara Kaman, for example, was conquered by the eighth Kutai king, Ki Dipati Jayapura, around the seventeenth century. Kota Bangun was also a place where criminals were exiled. And, in the late eighteenth century, an opponent faction against Sultan Muhammad Muslihudin (Salehudin’s father, Table 6), who had been supported by Buginese allies, put forward the sultan’s first cousin, Aji Kado, as the legitimate sultan. Among these opponents were Aji Mas and his cousin, Aji Raden, and some Kutai nobles or local chiefs, who led a force of Ga’ay, Bahau, and Malays to attack the palace as well as Kota Bangun in the 1780s or 1790s (Dewall 1846-47: 9 June). When Westerners arrived in the first half of the nineteenth century, Kutai was still in a state of all-out war, but the sultan had already formed alliances with some of the powerful Kayanic chiefs, like Lejiw Aja:ng and Lejiw Lie’ (3-1).

The Hwang Sa’ lost a large part of their oral history. Only the Hwang Tri:ng, including the H. Muyut faction, still remember well their past migrations and genealogies, probably because of their large population and late arrival along the Mahakam. In the Baram, they lived in the Apaw Tri:ng Aya’/Apaw Aya’ highland, under their first legendary chief Dalé:’ Bahuma:n, as recited in the old chant, Latal Pedah (see Tukau 1984), 21 generations before the late regional chief (kepala adat daerah), Ding Tukau (Table 7). Sometime later, the Hwang Tri:ng migrated to another highland in the upper Bahau, Apaw Tri:ng (near Long Pujungan), under the direction of two chiefs, (H)Ayé:’ Wang Lalaw Lalah ((H)Anyé’<K>), and his cousin, Ibaw Ya:ng. They seem to have had influence on their neighbors in the Bahau region, because people like the Uma’: Laran, Pua’, and Merap who live today in lower Kayan and Malinau still remember the name Hwang Tri:ng in their oral histories.

56 Adham writes (1979: 35-37) that not Mandarsyah, but his grandson Raja Makota (6th king in Table 6), converted officially to Islam.
57 According to them, at the time the Hwang Tri:ng and H. Muyut moved to the middle Mahakam, the Hwang Anah, H. Siraw, Uma’: Luhat, and another H. Muyut party had already settled there.
58 While Hayé:’s aunt married a Long Way noble, as shown in Table 7, Ibaw Ya:ng married his daughters to the chiefs of the Mataliva’/ Uma’: Lekan and Kayan (=Kayan Meka:m?), Huluy Naga’ Mering and Tinga:ng Aju:ng (see also Devung 1978).
Table 7: The Hwang Tri:ng (Tering, Muyub and Tukul Villages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Apaw Tri:ng Aya’] (Baram)</th>
<th>△Dalé:’ Bahuma:n</th>
<th></th>
<th><em>(seven generations below)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silaw Bato:’ Puti:’ ○ = △ Hjung Liré:’</td>
<td>Lalaw Lalah / Hmék○=△Lalaw Ha’ć:’</td>
<td>△Ibaw Ya:ng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Lejaw Hilé:”△=○Tukaw (Long Way)</td>
<td>△Hayé:’ Wang Lalaw Lalah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*descends to Tana:’ Yo:ng, Table 2)</td>
<td>△Hju:ng Liré:’</td>
<td>△Paran Tinga:ng (son-in-law?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>△Huva:ng Ayé:’</td>
<td>△Dalé:’ Ayay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○Hinu:’ Uva:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○Hmék Inu:’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>△Kwé:ng Méh (son-in-law?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Bahau → Data Dian]</td>
<td>△Lejaw Ara:n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>△Paran Ju:ng / Paran Tinga:ng “Uk”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[→Ayeh →Boh → Mahakam]</td>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>△Lejaw “Bela:’” /“Kerta”(L.Glat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Tering&lt;</td>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▽Hwaw</td>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hwa:ng</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Lalaw Silaw</td>
<td>△Lejaw “Lawing”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Lalaw Silaw</td>
<td>△Lejaw Talaw (Long Way)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Lalaw Silaw</td>
<td>△Paran Lawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Dalé:’ △=○Hmék Laha:t △=○Aré:’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hwaw</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Aji Kidat”</td>
<td>“Aji Kidat”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Raden Te:mggung”</td>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Raden Te:mggung”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Juk</td>
<td>△Juk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Kerta Mas”</td>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Kerta Mas”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Huvat (H. Anah)</td>
<td>△Huvat (H. Anah)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hwaw</td>
<td>△Hwaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Mada:ng / “Mas Welmono”</td>
<td>△Mada:ng / “Mas Welmono”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Tukaw</td>
<td>△Tukaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Raden Te:mggung”</td>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Raden Te:mggung”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Juk</td>
<td>△Juk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Kerta Mas”</td>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Kerta Mas”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hwaw</td>
<td>△Hwaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Aji Kidat”</td>
<td>“Aji Kidat”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Raden Te:mggung”</td>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Raden Te:mggung”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Juk</td>
<td>△Juk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Kerta Mas”</td>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Kerta Mas”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hwaw</td>
<td>△Hwaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Aji Kidat”</td>
<td>“Aji Kidat”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Raden Te:mggung”</td>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Raden Te:mggung”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Juk</td>
<td>△Juk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Kerta Mas”</td>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Kerta Mas”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hwaw</td>
<td>△Hwaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td>△Haj:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td>△Hiru:ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Mada:ng / Tukaw</td>
<td>“Mas Welmono”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Aji Kidat”</td>
<td>“Aji Kidat”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Raden Te:mggung”</td>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Raden Te:mggung”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td>△Lejung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Juk</td>
<td>△Juk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Kerta Mas”</td>
<td>△Ba:ng / “Kerta Mas”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The Hwang Tri:ng (Tering, Muyub and Tukul Villages)
After an intermarriage alliance with a Long Way chief with the title “Lejaw Hilé:’” (Table 7), part of the Hwang Tri:ng split from the main group and followed the Long Way from the upper Kayan to the Belayan. This party, who later came to be called “Hwang Muyut,” assimilated with the H. Patak in the Belayan area and split further to the Belayan, Pari, Wahau, and the main Mahakam. The rest of the Hwang Tri:ng placed themselves under the protection of the Long Glat (late migrants under Lejiw Do:m Ba:ng Lawing and his son, Ding “Tung” in 3-1) and moved to the Boh, together with some other Bahau. When the Uma:’ Laran chief Ngaw Wa:n Luhung attacked the Long Glat and Kenyah in Apo Kayan, as described in their oral text quoted above, the latter were recognized only as the “H. Tri:ng” and “H. Tembaw” (Tembaw= Ita:m Baw, ‘we Bahau,’ still in use in the Bulungan and Malinau regions). This suggests that these Hwang Tembaw could be the present-day H. Boh, H. Temha:, and H. Meka:m, or possibly some of the in-between groups discussed in 3-2.

The Hwang Tri:ng and some of the H. Muyut arrived along the upper Mahakam during the reign of the two chiefs Lejaw “Ara:n” and his cousin, Paran Ju:ng/“Paran Tinga:ng Uk,” listed in Table 7,\(^{59}\) and for a time they settled along the Boh.\(^{60}\) Then, the Hwang Muyut of the Belayan, under chief Hilaw Ura:, joined their relatives at Batu Kelaw (at the Riam rapids); in fact, they split from the H. Patak chief, Tiling Abing Liway, who led his followers to Muara Muntai (the mouth of the Belayan). Those who continued to migrate down the Belayan also came up later to the middle Mahakam, except for those who stayed in the coastal regions and mixed with the local Malays. The other H. Patak followed the H. Siraw who migrated to the Wahau and then moved down to Muara Kaman and Selerong, and finally rejoined the others along the middle Mahakam.

In the middle Mahakam, the Hwang Tri:ng and Muyut were subject to successive raids by the Long Way, especially the former rulers of the H. Muyut, the Long Bléh. They migrated further downriver to seek protection from the Keliway in Ujoh Benteng (\textit{benteng}, ‘fort’), near their village location of today. They once made peace with the Long Bléh through a marriage between Lalaw Tinga:ng and Ho:ng Ding Liah Ha:ng Lawing,\(^{61}\) granddaughter of the warlike chief, Liah Ping Baeng Lewing/Liah Ha:ng Lawing (Table 2). But later, they were again attacked by Liah’s great-grandson, Ding Liah Baw. The struggle was finally ended by means of a single combat between Ding and the Muyut chief, Kwé:ng Lahay Bata:ng,\(^{62}\) arranged by the Kutai sultan to promote peace-making in the Mahakam.

In this period, the Hwang Tri:ng and H. Muyut formed marriage alliances with their neighbors, like the Long Glat, Hwang Anah, and Mataliva’, and also within their

---

59 Lejaw “Ara:n” could be the son-in-law of Kwé:ng Méh (“Ara:n”= Bahau dialect of \textit{aran, aren} ‘sacred, noble’ <K>?).
60 According to the Hwang Boh (mixed with the Long Huvung), the Hwang Tri:ng once lived together with the other Hwang Sa’ in Data:’ Lingay (on the Boh), where they were unified under the H. Boh chief, Huvang Liré:’.
61 Also known as Ho:ng Ding Ho:ng Aja:ng among the H. Muyut.
62 He was the son of Hilaw Ura:, mentioned above. Kwé:ng’s son Murib married a Muyut noble, Hwaw Lalaw, who gave birth to Tayung Murib, as shown in Table 7.
own two groups (see Table 7). One of the Paran Ju:ng’s descendants in the H. Muyut village, Tukaw Laha:t, married two famous Ga’ay chiefs, first Ba:ng Ago:ng, or probably Ba:ng Lawing, who died around 1885 (Tromp 1889; see also “Bang-Lawin” in Dewall 1846-47, “Obang Lawing” in Knappert 1905), and later the great-grandson of “Kerta,” Lejaw Ba:ng or “Raden Temanggung,” mentioned earlier. On the other hand, the Hwang Tri:ng living in Ujoh Tepoh were ruled for a while by a Mataliva’ noble, Ding Luhung (see also Dewall 1846-47: 9 June), who was married to Tukaw’s cousin, Meba:ng Lirung. Being childless, Ding and Meba:ng adopted Hibaw Dalé’: /Hibaw Meba:ng, who became a Hwang Tri:ng chief in the late nineteenth century (“Bau Mobang” in Tromp 1889).

In the twentieth century, the Dutch controllers determined the subdistrict border of Long Iram, the inland center of Kutai, and thus the Hwang Muyut who had previously divided themselves into several farming groups (laléh <B>) in the border area began to live separately in the villages of Muyub and Tukul.

4. Return to Sarawak and entry of the Kenyah into Apo Kayan: Uma:’ Juman, U. Laran, U. Suling, Long Huvung, etc.

After defeating Ngaw Wa:n Luhung (Uma:’ Laran chief), Lejiw “Aya’” (Long Glat chief) and his Kenyah allies held a feast in the upper Danum (Kayan headwaters). Lejiw “Aya’” built a big pillar of ironwood, onto which was affixed a hornbill sculpture. Then he spoke to the Kenyah: “This is the symbol of our everlasting alliance and brotherhood. We Ga’ay are leaving for the Mahakam. From this moment, you Kenyah may visit everywhere, as far as you hear hornbills calling, and we will always welcome you.” The Kenyah were thus permitted to settle in Apo Kayan. This is the reason why we Kenyah have been making sculptures of hornbills for marriage ceremonies and other rituals since that time, as a symbol of peace and hospitality.

Oral History of the Kenyah Uma:’ Tukung, middle Mahakam

In contrast to the Kayan Meka:m and Long Glat who thrust into the upper Mahakam region, there were other subgroups who preferred to return to the Baluy and Baram, mainly the late-arriving Kayan and Kayanized Bahau. Many Kenyah of today still remember the final stage of this Kayanic dispersal from the Kayan basin, as it gives proof of their land rights, since they were ceded land from one of the paramount chiefs (see Whittier 1973: 24; Kaboy 1974: 287; Sandin 1980: 1; Jessup cited in Rousseau 1990: 331). Some of their oral histories include the names of these paramount chiefs, such as “Dia:n Lulaw” (also, Dia:n Lulo: Kasok, Laké’ Dia:n), “Ngaw Wa:n Luhung” (Ngo: Wa:n, Laké’ Langat), and “Lejiw” (Lejaw Aya’) (Nyipa 1956; Harrisson 1961; Kaboy 1974; Uyo 1980; Sandin 1980; Devung et al. 1985: 24; Lawai 2003: 187).

By cross-checking with Kayanic oral histories collected in East Kalimantan, I am able to verify that the chiefs mentioned were the Uma:’ Juman chief, Dia:n Kula:n (Table 8), the U. Laran chief, Ngaw Wa:n Luhung, together with some siblings, including Pay Wa:n Luhung (Pay Luhung “Aya’,” see 5-1), and the Long Glat chief, Lejiw Do:m Ba:ng Lawing, and his son, Ding “Tung” (Table 4). In the following section, we will examine

---

63 He died in 1890 and was succeeded by his son Ding (brother of Ha:ng or “Mat Saleh” in Table 7) (Koloniaal Verslag 1895: 23).
the struggle between these Kayan and Ga’ay subgroups, and also their suffering at the hands of the aggressive Punan of the Kelai and Belayan on the basis of data presented by Tom Harrisson (1961) and of the oral histories of the Long Huvung/Hubung and Uma:’ Suling who were once allied with Dia:n Kula:n.

The Uma:’ Laran are said to have consisted of two old Kayan subgroups, the U. Layo: and U. Away, which indicates the possibility of their relation with the Busa:ng like the U. Tua:n in the past. After the wars in Apo Kayan intensified, however, they moved to the Laran on the Bahau and assimilated with the Ga’ay Long Ba’un. Referring to the genealogy of the Ga’ay Long Ba’un (Table 9), Ngaw Wa:n Luhung seems to belong to the same generation as Ping Wa:n Ding Wa:n Luhung, great-granddaughter of the first chief Bit Ivung, because Ping’s son, Jiw Luhung, is said to have married Ngaw’s daughter, Luhung Ngaw. If this is correct, Ngaw dates back 6 generations from present-day informants, which almost coincides with the generation of Ding “Tung.” On the other hand, Dia:n Kula:n lived 8 or 10 generations before Tom Harrisson’s informants around 1960. Hence, it is likely that Lejiw and Ngaw fought not directly with Dia:n Kula:n, but rather with his children or other descendants. In fact, the Long Huvung chief Liah married Dian Kula:n’s daughter, and Liah’s cousin’s great-granddaughter was claimed by Ding “Tung” as we shall see in 4-1.

4-1. Alliance Group under the Uma:’ Juman: Long Huvung and U. Suling

To summarize first the oral history collected in the Baluy by Harrisson (1961, Vol. 2, retyped by J. Rousseau), the daughter of the Thunder God, Blaré’ Ubung Daw (“Aki Belarik Ubong Do’”), Paya’ Blaré’ (“Payak Belarik”), married a human hunter on earth, Saran Gahay (“Saran Gahai,” or Haran?), and gave birth to a baby boy (see Table 8). Her father put the baby in a durian fruit (dia:n <K>) and threw it into the river to carry it back to the earthly world. Drifting to Long Matan on the upper Kayan, the baby was picked up by an Uma:’ Juman man, Saluy (“Bok Saloi”), who adopted the child and named him Dia:n (“Dian Lulo Kasok”).

Dia:n grew up and became a powerful warrior, which triggered jealousy on the part of the Uma:’ Juman chief, Ding Lejiw (“Ding Leju”). At that time, the Kayanic peoples of Apo Kayan were divided into two alliance groups, one under Ding Lejiw and the other his rival, Ngaw Wa:n Luhung (“Ngo Wan Luhong”). These two paramount chiefs had a common enemy, the Punan chief of the upper Tabang (Belayan), Haju:ng Palo’ (“Hajong Palok,” or Haja:ng/ Hajaeng?). Ding ordered Dia:n to fight with this chief. After Dia:n defeated him, he gained numerous supporters and finally revolted against Ding and Ngaw. The allies of Ding, 24 villages that consisted of Kayanic subgroups and their neighbors (Penihing, Maloh, etc.), ran away to the Mahakam, while those of Ngaw, 23 villages, including those of the Tenggalan and Burusu’, fled to coastal Bulungan. Dia:n captured all 23 of those villages and led them to Long Itam, at the headwaters of the Baluy.

64 Sandin (1980: 37-38) records another genealogy of Dia:n’s descendants, which also dates back 8 generations from Tajang La’ing, who was appointed as a Sarawak officer in 1965.
65 Here, I try to transliterate the names in the Busa:ng dialect, which is quite close to the Uma:’ Juman.
Table 8: Descendants of “Laké’ Dia:n” or the Uma:’ Juman and the Allies
(T. Harrisson 1961 Belaga Book; Spellings are modified by the author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Apo Kayan]</th>
<th>△Blaré’ Ubung Daw (‘Thunder God’)</th>
<th>△Paya’ Blaré ○=△Saran Gahay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>△Dia:n “Lulaw Kasuk” (Dia:n Kula:n)</td>
<td>△Saluy △Ding Lejiw (*adopted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[→Long Itam] (upper Baluy)</th>
<th>△Bawing △Laway △Juk △Garing Dia:n △Dia:n Mering △=○ (U.Away)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[→Long Bahau]</td>
<td>△Avun △Kuléh (U.Tapo’ chief) △Bula:n △Ipuy (m.o. to U.Away) △Usun (m.o. to U.Away) △Kula:n (m.o. to U.Lesung) △Bato’ △ (U.Aging chief)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bula:n ○=△Kuléh Lalang △Nyipa’ (fought against Brooke in N.Pila) △Dia:n △Luhat △Bato’ △Baling (Punan Bah chief) △Mering △=○ Haw △Avun △Baling (U.Aging chief) △Bula:n △Libaw ○Tining △Lasah (Kejaman chief) △Penghulu Matu (Sekapan chief)

*Abbreviation
U. = Uma:’
m.o.= married out to
Table 9: The Ga’ay Long Ba’un (including the Uma:’ Laran)

[But Kong Kemul]

[→Keléa Mang Jung] (Kayan Iut) △Bit Ivung <K> / Bit Ivung <G>

△Ivung Wa:n Luhung <K> / Ivung Wa:n Leho:ng <G> △Ding Wa:n Luhung

○Lo:ng □Do:m □Mang □Wa:n

[→Telen] [→Kelai] [→Segah] [→Kayan (Long Héban →Long Ba’un)]

Luhat Jiw Li': △= ○ Ping Wa:n Ding Wa:n Luhung / Ping Wa:n Luhung / Ping Luhung etc.

[→Petah →Bahau →upper Pengian →Long Beluah →Kaberau Kecil]

Ping ○=△Anyé’ Luhung Jiw Luhung△=○Luhung Ngaw (U.Laran) △Liah Luhung

*L=△Daughter of Ngaw Wa:n Luhung?*

Unya:ng ○=△Wa:n ○=△Usun △Bit Jiw Luhung △Jiw Luhung △Do:m △Jiw Luhung

Anyé’ Luhung △=○Jaw Luhung (U.Laran) △Jiw Luhung

Luhung | Luhung | Y:ng (Kelai)

Gah Bo:ng△=○Uray Tad:n (Hopan in Mara)*

*see Table 13

△Pay La:’ing△= ○Pay △Jaw Luhung (U.Laran) △Jiw Luhung △Do:m△=○Jiw Luhung

Luhung | Luhung | Luhung | Luhung | Luhung | Luhung | Luhung | Luhung

[→Haji Duri →Jelarai →Mara →Long Pengian] △=○Long Pengian

△Liah Pay Wa:n△=○Njung Jaw (Ngorèk in Long Balau) △Ho:ng Pay △Luhung Pay△=○Luhung Pay

△Bit Jiw Luhung “Datuk Bandar” *4

Jalung△=○Ipuy (Kenyah Loy in Long / Datuk U.Alim) △Luhat Pay △Luhat Luhung

△Luhat Wong Loy “Datuk Layap”

[→Long Lembu’]

△Laran Layap

▲(Ego 1) ▲(Ego 2) ▲(Ego 3) ▲(Ego 4) ●(Ego 5)
Later, Dia:n’s great-grandson, Dia:n Juk (“Dian Jok”), migrated to Long Bahau and attacked the old inhabitants of the area, the Kejaman, Sekapan, and Punan Bah. His sons Avun (“Abun”) and Bato’ (“Batok”) separately led their followers and settled along the upper Baluy.

The text suggests that the first Dia:n, or Dia:n Kula:n, was not the original Uma’ Juman chief, although he belonged to the noble stratum on his mother’s side. According to the Kayan Penghulu, Ha:ng Nyipa’ (Nyipa 1956), Dia:n was adopted by the Uma’ Juman chief and married Bula:n Lejiw (“Bulan Lejiu”), who was possibly the sister of Ding Lejiw. Ding himself might have been of Ga’ay origin, because the villages of Ding’s faction described above contained the Long Way (“Wai” and “Belah”), Long Glat (“Gelat”), and Busa:ng (e.g., “Tuhun”= Uma’: Tua:n <K> / Mé’ Tuhûyn <LG>). In fact, the Uma’: Laran under his rival, Ngaw Wa:n Luhung, were also mixed with the Ga’ay Long Ba’un. If my supposition is correct, it would have been remarkable that a Kayan chief won his independence from the Ga’ay paramount chiefs. Thus, as Rousseau suggests (1990: 165), most of the Kayan returning to the Baluy came to stress their descent from Dia:n Kula:n.

There are some sequels to the story of Dia:n Kula:n after his migration to the Baluy headwaters. The Long Huvung/Hubung made a marriage alliance with him, while the Uma’: Suling failed to do so because of troubles described below. The Long Huvung, who had once lived near the mouth of the Kayan Iut during the reign of chief Lejiw and his son, Liah Lejiw, alias Liah “Telap” (‘Liah the swordman,’ telap, ‘lightning’ <B>, migrated to Long Nawang. By then, the Kenyah migrants had already arrived at the Iwan and Bahau, but they were prevented from entering Apo Kayan by the aggressive Punan Kelay and other hunter-gatherers. The Punan Kelay attacked the Uma’: Héban and drove them away to the lower Bulungan. Liah “Telap” permitted the Kenyah to join the Kayan against them, and so he faced single combat with the Punan Kelay chief, Ba:ng Anak Lung/Ba:ng Lung, at Bato’ Mespap (also, Bato’ Jepak/ Sepap /Nyepap etc.) in Long Ampung (Map 1).

Instead of respecting Liah’s victory, the Punan Kelay continued to attack the people of Apo Kayan. Finally, the Long Huvung decided to migrate to the Baluy, following Liah’s wife’s father, Dia:n Kula:n, and to the Mahakam under the direction

66 Hugh Low (1882: 54, 62) met Dia:n Bato’ and his father Bato’ Dia:n. He heard that Dia:n’s great-grandfather was Dia:n Kula:n, conqueror of the Rejang. However, according to Harrisson’s data, Dia:n Bato’s real great-grandfather was Dia:n Juk (or, his mother’s name was Kula:n?) as in Table 8. In addition, Low also met Dia:n Bato’s brothers-in-law, Mering Baling (Punan Bah chief) and Avun Matu (Sekapan chief) (compare with Harrisson 1961: 33).

67 The descendants from this legendary Paya’ Blaré’ also exist among the Busa:ng of the upper Mahakam (such as the Uma’: Lekwê’). Dia:n might also have been related to other legendary ancestors, Dia:n Lulaw and his wife Dia:n Ugu, who founded the family Mesu:n Dia:n (‘descendants of Dia:n’ <K>) (see also Nyipa 1956).

68 The oral text was told in Bahau (which is quite similar to Kayan), for the Long Huvung have assimilated with their neighbors, the Hwang Sa’.

69 Another version suggests (H)Ibaw Anak Lung (Baw Nèak Lung <G>).

70 Dia:n said he would allow Liah to marry his daughter, if Liah could defeat the chief of the Uma’: Daro’, who had refused to obey the U. Juman.
of Liah’s siblings, Luhat Lung Yé’ and Dayung Sambung (dayung, ‘a priest’ <K, B>, Sambung= Hembowng <G>). Intermarriage between the Long Huvung and Uma:’ Juman seems also to have been memorized by the Baluy Kayan, for Dia:n’s daughter, Buring, is said to have married the “Dragon King” (see Table 8). In fact, Liah “Telap” had the title Lejaw Ba:’ Long Kayan Uk (‘Dragon at the mouth of Kayan Iut’<B>), since he had once fought a river spirit (lejaw hida:’ hungay, ‘river tiger, dragon’) and nearly drowned in his youth.

On the other hand, the followers of Luhat Lung Yé’and Dayung Sambung migrated from the Barang (Kayan headwaters) to Long Puti:’ (near Long Deho’) on the upper Mahakam, where they allied themselves with the Long Glat under Ding “Tung.” However, the Long Huvung eventually began to antagonize them, because Ding wanted to bring the great-granddaughter of Luhat, Do’ Langit Ding Luhat, to live with his people (3-1). Because Do’ was the only descendant from the original Long Huvung noble family, the Long Huvung refused Ding and ran away to the lower Mahakam, to Kota Bangun, where they called for allied forces to seek revenge against the Long Glat. Thus, the Long Glat under Lejiw Lie’ and Ibo: Lie’ fled to the headwaters of the Mahakam and met with another subgroup of Dia:n’s allies, namely, the Uma:’ Suling then living on Bato’ Masa:n.

The Uma:’ Suling were not of Busa:ng origin, but rather they had long lived on the upper Bahau together with the Uma:’ Lekan/U. Lasa:n, and apparently also with the U. Laran. When Dia:n Kula:n left the Kayan, the Uma:’ Suling followed him to the Baluy. It happened that Dia:n visited them to propose to a Uma:’ Suling noble woman, Silaw. However, in the middle of Dia:n’s speech, as he was sitting on the platform in the noble apartment (amin aya’<K>), many U. Suling villagers saw Dia:n’s testicles (abi: k, abé:k <K>) slightly hanging out of his loincloth, and they could not stop giggling. At last, Dia:n became angry and cancelled the marriage.

After that event, the Uma:’ Suling left Baluy to avoid the attack of Dia:n. While passing through Long Mangiyung/Mayivung (the Baleh River), they split into groups going to the Mahakam and to Kapuas (West Kalimantan). The party journeying to the Mahakam had to fight against the early Long Glat migrants under Lejiw Aja:ng/ “Kerta” and Ibo: Aja:ng (3-1). The Uma:’ Suling war-chief, Lejaw Baya:n, defeated Ibo, and the Uma:’ Suling hid up on Bato’ Masa:n. Sometime later, other Long Glat chiefs, Lejiw Lie’ and Ibo: Lie’, described above, came to ask them to help in defending against the Long Huvung. Thus, the Uma:’ Suling came to migrate down to Nyangan (the Meraseh River) some 6 to 8 generations ago (see Okushima 1999: 85, Table 3).

4-2. Final Battle and Entry of the Kenyah: Uma:’ Laran and Long Glat

Of all the material I collected from the Kenyah of East Kalimantan, the oral text of the Uma:’ Tukung of the middle Mahakam describes in greatest detail the last phase of the Kayanic dispersal from Apo Kayan (partially mentioned also in Devung et al. 1985: 24). They remember it as the story of the “Kayan Ga’ay” or “the origin of our hornbill sculpture,” as described above.

At the time, the Apo Kayan region was divided between two paramount chiefs, Ngaw Wa:n (Ngaw Wa:n Luhung above, Uma:’ Laran) in Long Kejanan, and
Lejiw “Aya’” (Lejiw Do:m Ba:ng Lawing in Table 4) and his son Ding “Tung” at the headwaters of the Jemahang and Danum rivers (see Map 1). The paramount chiefs determined their territorial border to be the Ubung Aja:ng river. One day, Ngaw sent his subjects Bit Bua:’ and Jangto’ 71 to borrow a long drum for the rice harvest ritual (jatung bunut <Kenyah> / tuvung, ketubung lenaw <K>) from Kulêh Lalang Awa:ng, chief of the village of Long Pengian. Because Bit and Jangto’ bore an old grudge against Ngaw, they conspired to make trouble. They returned to Ngaw’s village without bringing the drum and pretended to have been attacked by Kulêh. Ngaw became angry and attacked Kulêh and his followers, who were then occupied with farming in Apo Kejo’ (pekejo’, ‘to be occupied with’).

After the death of Kulêh, his brother, Lejiw “Aya’,” in Long Jemahang declared he would seek revenge against Ngaw Wa:n. He sent a message to Ding “Tung,” who was then living in the village of Long Danum, to tell him to come back so that they could fight together. The son, however, disobeyed his father, because he had married Ngaw’s daughter. 72 However, Ngaw sent his followers at night to secretly bring back his daughter, and she chose to go home with her child. The forces of Lejiw and Ngaw clashed at Bato’ Nyepak on the Long Ampung (same as Bato’ Mespap in 4-1). Because it looked like Lejiw’s forces were losing, he temporarily retreated.

Meanwhile, numerous Kenyah subgroups advanced from the Iwan to Apo Kayan (Map 1). On the way, they allied themselves with the Punan Aput to get information about the Apo Kayan. Among them was the chief of the Kenyah Uma’: Tukung, Bilung Apuy, 73 who then visited Lejiw “Aya’” to ask his permission to settle in the Apo Kayan. Hearing about the war against Ngaw Wa:n, Bilung offered to help Lejiw with his Kenyah forces. While Lejiw was still reluctant, Bilung proposed: “Let us first seek a good omen, and we will certainly win.” After wandering for eight days in Apo Kayan, Bilung saw in the Bem Uro’ rapids a large belut fish jump through his bracelet. The Kenyah became excited and confident about their victory.

The allied forces of Lejiw “Aya’” and the Kenyah finally defeated Ngaw Wa:n. Then, Lejiw tied Bit Bua:’ and Jangto’ to the grave of Kulêh and killed them as the sacrifices to purify the bloodshed, and he ordered the people to bury all the swords there. After that, Lejiw decided to join his relatives (the early Long Glat migrants) on the Mahakam, and he held a feast for peace-making with the Kenyah in the upper Danum, at which he built a pillar with a hornbill sculpture. Thus, the Kenyah came to occupy the Apo Kayan. Later, some of them migrated to the middle Mahakam, where they were governed by their long-time allies, the Long Glat.

The survivors of the Uma’: Laran fled to the Bahau and then to the lower Kayan, where they assimilated with the neighboring Ga’ay Long Ba’un and Uma’: Héban, as we will see in the next section.

---

71 Bit Bua:’ is said to have been from the Kenyah Uma’: Kulit (see Rousseau 1990: 331). The name Jangto’/Gangto’ might have been a Punan name.
72 Some state that her name is Buring, or Jela:n.
73 He is 8 generations before my informant (see Devung et al. 1985: 24-25).
5. Destruction and Reorganization in Northeast Borneo: Bulungan, Merap, and Other Segai

Raja Muda Kaharudin (third Bulungan sultan) was a clever strategist. He called for the Dayak Kayan, namely, Ma’ Alim and Ma’ Kulit (the Kenyah Uma:’ Alim and U. Kulit) from the upper Kayan, as his guardsmen. Then, he also called for his uncle living in the Berau, through whom he recruited the Dayak Kayan Segai (Mengga’ay)… Thus his power got stronger and stronger, but he was still uncertain of his ability to defeat his half-brother (Sultan Aji Achmad Maulana). Hence, he tried to attack other regions, first the Sebuku basin, passing secretly through desolate hinterlands. Thus his power got stronger and stronger, but he was still uncertain of his ability to defeat his half-brother (Sultan Aji Achmad Maulana).

74 Sudden attack is a typical Segai tactic. For details about these wars in the Sebuku region, see Okushima 2002.

5-1. The Bulungan: Malay-Arab Power, Kayanic Identity

The Kayanic peoples, who had migrated separately to northeast Borneo, Sarawak, and West Kalimantan as described in Section 1-4, made incessant, destructive raids, especially from the second half of the 18th century to the end of the 19th century. However, their operations became more premeditated and intensified after coming under the direction of coastal rulers or of their rivals, for example, the Kutai sultans who allied with the Hwang Sirau and Long Glat, and the Bulungan who were mixed with the Hopan and other early Bahau and Ga’ay migrants. There were also uncontrollable subgroups, especially between the Kelai basin and eastern Kutai, where some of the Long Way (L. Bléh), Mengga’ay and Wehèa preferred forming small, closed villages to settling around communicable riverbanks in touch with the Muslims.

There was also an intermittent flow of Malays and Arabs from neighboring sultanates. When the Portuguese occupied Johor and Brunei, many local rulers, chiefs, and traders fled to Sulu, Java, and elsewhere including northeast Borneo. In the eighteenth century, the Sulu sultanate advanced into the area and made chiefs and Bajau (Sama) subjects collectors of tribute. The Buginese-Makassarese diaspora occurred at the same time. It was these Islamic migrants who established or enlarged the power of the petty kingdoms of northeast Borneo. The Bornean inhabitants relied on these strangers, because they generally lacked maritime technology, except for coastal groups like the Brunei, Bisaya, and Tidung.

The most successful case is perhaps that of Bulungan. Early Bulungan was a colony of the Tidung kingdom on Tarakan Island, and the migrants were mixed with the Kayanic peoples and other local inhabitants. Then, the Bulungan nobles allied with Sulu, Johor, and Sulawesi, as well as with Pasir, Banjarmasin, and Berau, and finally began to fight against Tarakan for their independence. From the second half of the eighteenth century to the first half of the nineteenth century, furious Segai raids continued under the direction of the first to third Bulungan sultans, who sought independence not only from Tarakan but also from Sulu (see Okushima 2002, 2003a, 2003b). From the 1830s to the

75 The Mengga’ay of Kelai seem to have increased antagonism against the Sambaliung after the penetration of the Buginese under Raja Alam (Table 6) into the palace.
80s, the former trading centers of Sulu chiefs along the northeast Borneo coast became almost depopulated (Warren 1985: 92).

In fact, the Bulungan achieved state-formation in association with the Malay-Arab runaways as described above. For example, the first Bulungan sultan, Wira Amir/Sultan Amiril Mukmin⁷⁶ (see Table 10), had a powerful tactician, “Kumbayat”/Cambay (Gujarat) Arab merchant prince Muhammad Al-Musyarafah, who married the sultan’s sister, Dayang Sempurajaya (see also Okushima 2003b).⁷⁷ Muhammad’s son Zainal Abidin seems to have seized actual control over local economics and politics (see Hageman 1855: 81), because the sultan himself often left the palace for expeditions. Also, the third sultan, Kaharudin (1)/ Raja Muda mentioned in the oral history above, married one of his sisters to a Johor prince, Datu Haji Raja Laut, who came leading his Bugis fleet. He is said to have been the eldest son of the Johor-Singapore sultan and had run away from a struggle for the throne with his younger brother who was of higher status (gahara).⁷⁸ There were also many other influential migrants who came during this period, as shown in Table 10.

Nevertheless, the actual rulers of northeast Borneo continued to emphasize their descent from the Kayanic peoples in their origin myths and genealogies as in the cases of the Kutai and Bulungan, not only in order to overawe enemies with the name Segai, but also as part of the following strategy. First, they protected forest products and monopolized inland trading by using Kayanic forces. In fact, the local sultanates moved the political centers from the coast or coastal islands to inland regions. Then, the rulers legitimatized their right over the hinterlands by means of their “nativeness,” namely, their relationships to these local inhabitants who had been collecting forest products for a long time. This diplomatic identity had once been with the older inhabitants, the Tidung, at least in Bulungan and Berau, whereas the name Tidung came to be erased and switched to “Kayan/Segai” after the Sulu conquest of northeastern Borneo.

In a similar way, another Segai subgroup took over the Malinau basin (tributary of the Sesayap). They fought against the other Kayanic subgroups living along the middle-lower Kayan, especially the alliance group under the Uma:’ Laran and Ga’ay Long Ba’un above, and finally they allied with the local Tidung chiefs who were the

⁷⁶ He was the first cousin of the Tarakan king, Maharaja Lela (see Table 12 later, and also Okushima 2002: 154, Genealogy 2). Wira Amir defeated the Sulu-Bajau fleet advancing on Salim Batu with the help of another Arab tactician, Sayyid Abdul Rahman bin Abdullah Bilfaggih from the Demak, in Hijrah Nabi 1211 (1709-10). The date appears to be correct: According to the buku nasab (certifications of the Hadhramaut sayyid issued by the Al-Rabita al-‘Alawiyya in Jakarta) of Abdul Rahman’s descendants (7 generations after him), this tactician was the 6th generation from the first Bilfaggih/Bal Faqih, Sayyid Abdul Rahman bin Muhammad, who died in Tarīm (Yemen) in 1545.

⁷⁷ The details of his profile are obscure, but he likely originated from Johor or its surroundings.

⁷⁸ According to his descendants living in Borneo, he was Tengku Abdul Jalil, the eldest son of Sultan Hussein Shah who died in 1835. His younger brother, Tengku Ali, was appointed as the successor, because of his higher status from the mother. Tengku Abdul Jalil disappeared from historical records after his father’s funeral, but he left his wife and children in the domain of his father-in-law in Muar (near Johor) (see CO 273/416; Hj Buyong Adil 1980: 210-211 etc.). I haven’t checked this oral history with his descendants in Muar (if any).
Table 10: Malay and Arab Allies in the Bulungan Royal Family

(Pi: Pengian, Sd: Sayyid, Sf: Syarifah, Md: Muhammad, Pg= Pengeran)

△Sech Abdur-Rahman Al-Magribi (Johor-Sulu Arab)

△Pengeran Amir Dipati

△Wira Amir / Sultan Amiril Mukminin

△Sultan Alimuadin

△Sultan Kaharudin (I)

△Sultan Jalaludin (I)

△Datu Alun (fled to Sebatik before 1895)

△Datu Mancang (Brunei-Tidung-Kayan)

*Also known as “Abu Mansyur Indra Jaya” in Pasir

Putri Petung = △Imam Muhammad / Sukma Dewi di Giri (Demak) (Pasir noble)

△Wira Kelana = ○Aji Dayang Minta

△Wira Digadung

Kidung Bulan = △Syah Alam (Johor prince)

△Sultan Pi Bijaksana ○= △Zainal Abidin = ○Siti Zubaidah (Tarakan noble)

△Ahmad Maulana

△Datu Haji Raja Laut (Johor-Singapore prince)

△Sd Md Al-Idrus Pg Hamzah Al-Marzak

△Sd Md

△Sd

△SdTaha

△SdAisyah

△Sd Yaki Nimbas

△Sd Sahab 

△Datu Kana (Brunei noble)
subjects of the Bulungan (see 5-2). Then we will look at some additional data on other Segai in 5-3.

5-2. Invasion and Monopolization of Forest Products: Merap and Murutic Allies

In the Bulungan, there were three main regional alliance groups struggling with each other. The oldest settlers were the Hopan and their rulers, the Seloy/Ga’ay Gung Kiya:n on the lower Kayan. Their rivals were the latecomers, the Ga’ay Long Ba’un and U. Laran, part of the Kong Kemul group, who returned to the Kayan and attached themselves to the Ngorèak, Pua’, and other groups. The last to come were the Merap, who remained independent of these other alliance groups, and migrated to the Malinau on the middle Sesayap.

As Kaskija (1992, 1995) and Sellato with the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) survey team (Sellato 1995, 2001) report, perhaps for the first time, the Merap (also, Berap/Beraw/Melaw) are currently living in six villages on the middle-lower Malinau, and partially also in resettlement villages (RESPEN) around the river mouth. These strongly Ga’ay-ized Bahau have a notable feature in their dialects, namely, nasal vowels that are rarely found in Bornean languages. Today, besides the Merap, only the Long Glat of the Mahakam and the Long Kiput of the Baram are known to share this feature (see Guerreiro 1995 and Blust 2002), as well as diphthongs and triphthongs. This suggests that these three subgroups probably lived together somewhere on the Baram, or that some of their neighbors had nasal vowels but that these were later lost in the process of migration and assimilation with other groups. Remember that in the reign of the Long Way chief, Baeng Wuang Ngo:k, the Merap had already appeared in the upper Bahau and were called “Wehèa Bap” (2-2). It seems reasonable to conclude that Ding Boang’s villagers fled to the Wehèa Bap to seek protection.

On the other hand, the Merap themselves preserve no memory of their early days on the Baram or Kayan. They only emphasize their identity as a Bahau subgroup, as can be seen by their endonym, “Baw/Mbaw.” They claim to share the same origin as other Bahau of the lower Kayan, the “Hopa:n Mayewn” (early Hopan on the river island of Busa:ng Mayun, see Map 3; mayewn/mayun/mayul etc., “to drift”) and the Ngorèak.79 The first Merap chief mentioned in their oral histories was Ngıham Caw, 9 generations before present-day descendants (Table 11), about one century after the reign of Baeng Wuang Ngo:k, described above. He was the son of legendary parents with Malay poetic titles, Encaw Tincung Bukun Jangaw (or, Ncaw Tencung/ Kincung etc.; Encaw/Ncaw = Lejiw, Lejaw <G, K, B>/ Lenjaw <Kenyah>) and Dayang Ankung Telor Jelaw,80 who were born from eggs given by the Thunder God (Blaléy’) to Lua’ Ay and Lua’ Yo: (lua’ = teknonym after the death of the father), just like the case of the early Bahau in the Kutai.

79 Furthermore, they suggest that the Kayan subgroups of West Kalimantan (Uma:’ Aging, U.Suling, and U.Pagong, see Ngo 1988) also belonged to the Ngorèak. In fact, those Kayan are linguistically related to the Bahau. Some of them, like the Uma:’ Pagong, may be Kayanized Bahau.

80 Bukun = buku, tembuku <Malay>, ‘a gnarl (of tree)’; telor, ‘egg.’ These expressions suggest that the names of these early Merap nobles were once recited as a Malay poem, seemingly after an alliance with their old sovereign, Brunei. Similar cases are seen among the Tidung.
Encaw Tincung is said to have led the Merap from the Iwan to the Bahau, then further to the Malinau. This chief was possibly not Ngiham’s real father, but rather some older ancestor whose name was also Encaw.

During their time along the Bahau, the Merap lived in the uppermost area, while another Merap group, the Uma:’ Liya:ng Kalu:ng, lived in the middle area, and the Kayan Uma:’ Laran and U. Héban lived in the lower area. Later, the Merap moved to Batu Kucéh, below Batu Lalaw (Map 3) in the Malinau headwaters. Conflict broke out during the reign of Ngiham Caw’s grandson, Encaw Ala:ng, because the chief of the Uma:’ Liya:ng Kalu:ng, Encaw Ubang Kuwot (in the Ngaran/Aran on Bahau), brought gossip to his father-in-law, the U. Laran chief Pay Luhung (probably Pay Luhung “Aya”/Pay Wa:n Luhung, a sibling of Ngaw Wa:n Luhung, described in Section 4). Attacked by Pay Luhung and the Uma:’ Héban chief, Bit Do:m, the Merap fled to the Tubu (a tributary of the Mentarang, on the upper Sesayap). There, they allied themselves with the Lun Dayeh chiefs living on the Semamu and Tamalang (tributaries of the Mentarang) and counterattacked Pay and Bit.

The Merap stayed on the Kerayan for several years, annually paying a slave as tribute to the Lun Dayeh. During this time, the Tembaw of the Tubu made trouble with the Merap, so the Merap moved from Pa’ Upan back to the Kalun (a tributary of the Tubu), where they allied themselves with the local Punan hunter-gatherers, whom they posted at sites around the Malinau basin, such as the Sidi, Sengayan, and Tubu rivers, to block other Kayanic peoples. The bird’s nest caves in the Malinau were divided among three ethnic groups, namely, the Seturan under the Merap, the Gong Solok under the Burusu’, and the Bengalun under the Tidung and others on the lower Sesayap. Therefore, many Segai attacked the area, coming not only from the Kayan but also from the Berau. To better control these forest resources, the Merap spent several generations advancing downriver and driving out the old inhabitants, the “Hwing Diaw” (Hwang Daut)/Burusu’, as well as other rivals, such as the Tenggalan, Tembaw, and Bajau.

The hegemony of the Merap over the Malinau was established during the reign of Encaw Ala:ng’s son, Ala:ng Caw, and his first cousin, Ala:ng Émpang (Table 11). The two spent most of their lives at war. They defeated the Uma:’ Laran and U. Héban and killed Encaw Ubang Kuwot. His wife, the daughter of Pay Luhung, was taken back to the U. Laran, while the rest of the U. Liya:ng Kalu:ng fled to the lower Malinau where they mixed with other Merap and local groups. Then, Ala:ng Caw married Lahay Ibung, a sister of the local Burusu’ chief, Kumboy Ibung. After the death of Ala:ng Caw, Ala:ng Émpang became custodian of his cousin’s son, Lungu Ala:ng, by marrying Lungu’s sister, Uncung. Lungu’s brother, Ara:n Ala:ng, disapproved of this marriage of convenience and his faction split from the village and migrated to the Luwe tributary.

In spite of these difficulties and separations, the Merap continued to attack neighboring groups, including the “Baw”/Ngorèak, Tembaw, Burusu’, and Tenggalan. Ala:ng Émpang sent Bekatan/Bakatan hunter-gatherers to spy on the Burusu’ of the

81 According to Sellato (1995: 39), the Merap once inhabited two villages on the lower Lurah of the Bahau (Map 3), on the Kedayan and Belaka tributaries.
82 The descendants of these people are said to live in the village of Gong Solok.
83 Kaskija writes (1992) that her name was Ura.
Table 11: Malay and Arab Allies in the Bulungan Royal Family
(Pi: Pengian, Sd: Sayyid, Sf: Syarifah, Md: Muhammad, Pg= Pengeran)

△Blaléy’ Layé: Tenkoue <M> /
Blaléy’ Layang Tenggong <Malay>

Lua’ Ay △ = ○ Lua’ Yo:

Encaw Tincung Bukun Jangaw △ = ○ Dayang Ankung Telor Jelaw

[→ Iwan → Bahau →
Merap (upper Malinau)]

△Ngiham Caw

[→ Batu Lalaw → Batu Kucéh]

△Ala:ng Iham

[→ Tubu → Kerayan
→ Mount. Epa:]

△Encaw Ala:ng ○ Uncung ○ Uding

△Kumboy Ibung Lahay Ibung ○ = △Ala:ng Caw △ Unjat Caw ○ = △Ala:ng Êmpang

[→ Mount. Nyurat (Malinau)]

△Lungu Buring Wat Usat ○ = △Ara:n △ Ibung ○ Uncung △ Êmpang Ala:ng

[→ Long Ran
→ Kelawit]

[→ Luwe] [→ Long Ran]

△La’ing Lungu
/ La’ing Ngo:

△Kelit La’ing

△Èmpang Ala:ng

△Èmpang Ala:ng ○ Uray

△(Ego 1) △(Ego 2) △ △
Sekatak, who had once killed, during the reign of Ala:ng Caw, many Merap refugees from the attacks of Pay Luhung and Bit Do:m. In alliance with the Bekatan and other Segai, he finally succeeded in wreaking revenge on the Burusu’. On the other hand, Ala:ng Êmpang’s son, Êmpang Ala:ng, was poisoned by the Tembaw chief of Long Mabung (Tubu), Ivung Segar/ Ibung Sigar. Also, one of the Ngorèak chiefs of Long Kemuat (upper Bahau, Map 3), Bilung Wat Laue (= Bilung Uvat Laway <K>?), came to ask for a marriage alliance with the Merap, and his sister, Buring Wat Usat, married Ara:n Ala:ng. Another Ngorèak chief, Bilung La’ing, later joined the Malinau.

During the reign of Ala:ng Caw’s children, the Merap renewed trade with the coastal polities. Ala:ng Êmpang and Lungu Ala:ng had met and formed alliances with the chief of the Malinau Tidung, Penambah Raja Besar. Years later, Lungu’s brother and son, Ibung Ala:ng and La’ing Lungu, who often patroled around the mouths of the Sesayap and Sembakung against the Bajau, met a relative of Penambah Raja Besar, named Penambah Raja Tua (Table 12). Thus, the Merap and Tidung started to trade forest products and other commodities, and as a consequence, they gradually moved their villages towards the river mouth for convenience. The Malinau Tidung also sometimes asked the Merap to send reinforcements to fight their enemies, the Tenggalan and Burusu’.

This reconstruction of trading networks seems to have started in the second half of the nineteenth century, as in the neighboring Sebuku and Sembakung basins. Trading in the Malinau was taken over by the sons of La’ing and Penambah Raja Tua, Kelit La’ing and Penambah Raja Pendeta, alias “Salpu Jangat” (‘Sweeper of the World’). Having settled in Langap and at the mouth of the Malinau by this time, the two chiefs cooperated in defense against the other Segai. Finally, the Dutch controllers came to arrest the Penambah, because he encouraged Kelit and his followers to continue headhunting. According to governmental reports (Koloniaal Verslag 1896, 1897, 1901, “Si Sapoe” and “Si Kelit”), the Penambah was exiled to Central Java in 1896, and he died there in 1900. His grandson, Penambah Sayyid Abdurrahman (Table 12), succeeded him.

5-3: Peace-Making with Other Segai

Finally, we will take a brief look at the Segai of other regions.

In the nineteenth century, to suppress the all-out wars of the Kayanic peoples, the sultans of northeastern Borneo promoted intermarriage alliances between themselves and the chiefs, and also between the chiefs or nobles of other Kayanic subgroups. Then, they led those who obeyed them in wars against their enemies, namely, neighboring sultanates, including Sulu and Banjarmasin. In Kutai, the sultans used the early Kayanic migrants, like the Hwang Siraw and Long Glat, as we saw in Section 3, to contain the Long

---

84 It is obscure whether he was one of the Malinau Tidung chiefs or a Bengawong chief of the lower Sesayap, Pengeran Besar (see Table 12). In addition, the Malinau Tidung still lived around Sebawang (lower Sesayap) at that time.

85 For example, the Tidung Sumbol chiefs, Pengeran Anum and Aji Raden (Table 12), returned to the Sebuku in 1849-50 (see Okushima 2002).
Table 12: Tidung Chiefs in Northeast Borneo (Malinau, Tarakan etc.)

(Pn.= Penambahan  Pg.= Pengeran)

*See Table 10, and also Okushima 2002: 151, 154

KENAWAI: Abdurrasid

△Raja Rambat / Lambat

△Amas Mangku

△Aji Ratu ≠ Aji Ratu

△Pn. Raja Aji

△Aji Kar / Adipati

△Pg. Dipati

△Pg. Ahmad

△Pg. Anum

△Pg.Bhakti

△Pg. Sukma

△Abdul Karim (died ca.1941)

△Tua Aji

△Pn. Kaharudin

△Maharaja Lela (1)

△Pn. Alimudin Hasan / Pengasakan

△Pn. Mangku Bumi

△Pg. Amir Dipati

△Abdurrasid (2)

/ Singa Laut

△Pn. Kaharudin

△Pengeran Jalaludin

△Pengeran Mansyah

△Ismail

△Pg. Amurhamad

△Pg. Kuning

△Pg. Tua Aji

△Pg. Kuning

△Pg. Aji

△Pg. Belyan

△Pg. Dipati

△Pg. Adipati

△Pg. Aji Kar

△Pg. Ranik

△Pg. Sayid Abdurrahman

△Pg. Hamzah

△Pg. Asaludin

△Jambadara

△Pg. Asalah
Bléh, Long Tesak, and others. Later, the sultans sent Kayanic peoples to Banjarmasin to struggle for forest products in the border regions (see Vossen 1936: 263). The Bulungan also had old allies, such as the Hopan and Seloy, through whom they could call for help from other Kayanic peoples, as described in Tarakan Tidung oral history. Some of these warriors even joined the Bulungan-Tidung fleet against the Sulu (Okushima 2006: 86).

It is in the Kelai and Wahau that Segai violence continued the longest. In Berau, intensified conflicts and Islamization may have also kindled the hostility of the Kayanic peoples, especially in the Kelai, under the rule of the Sambaliung and their Buginese allies. The Mengga’ay of the Kelai came under the hegemony of the Long Way descendants of Long Lesan (see 2-2) around the mid nineteenth century. Those of the Segah came to be controlled by the Ga’ay Long Ba’un chiefs, Anyé’ Luhung and his nephew, Liah Pay <K>/ Lih Pay <G> (Table 9), who took the place of older groups like the Hopan. The Ga’ay Long Ba’un nobles married into many neighboring villages, including Gah Bo:ng Nyuk So:ng as the chief of the Hopan in Long Bala’/ Mara, and Wa:n Pay as the Ngorèk chief in Long Balau. Liah also controlled the Segah through his sister Ho:ng Pay, who married Ket Miw Ba’ Lo:ng (Table 13). After the death of Ket in 1894, his relative, Leho:ng Lih Jiw Bao:ng or “Aji Intan,” succeeded him as chief until 1905. She was succeeded by another Ga’ay Long Ba’un, Bit Jiw Luhung/ “Datuk Bandar,” the adopted son of the Bulungan sultan. The other Mengga’ay village in the Segah was ruled by Ket’s cousin, Ping Hela’ or “Aji Tua,” who was also married temporarily to Bit Do:m Êng Ya:ng. Their daughter, Mang Jung/“Aji Kesuma,” succeeded her mother around 1899 (see Koloniaal Verslag 1895: 24; Spa:n 1902: 526-528, 974, 966; Walchren 1907: 759).

The Wehèa used to attack the Kelai and Kelinjau frequently. One of the powerful chiefs of the village of Long Mesa’ Ting (at the mouth of the Wahau), Jiang Héang Lé’, alias “Jot,” had been obedient to the Kutai since the first half of the nineteenth century (see Dewall 1846-47: 6 Mei 1847) (Table 14). On the other hand, the village Béa Ling under Lung Jéa, who originally migrated from Mount Kulat in the Kelai headwaters, continuously fought with the other Wehèa and Long Way. Finally, in the reign of “Raja Dinda”/ Lengét, described above, the Kutai sultan succeeded in arranging intermarriages between the daughters of Lung and the other chiefs of the eastern Mahakam, including Jot’s son, Bit Lua’/“Raja Alam.” In addition, the daughters of “Raja Dinda” and his Long Tesak wife, Tana:’ Yo:ng, married the Long Nah chief, Béang Nyuk So:ng or “Mas Wongso Tua” (see Okushima 1999: 83, Table 1), who became the customary chief of the Mélèan. Thus, peace-making was established throughout the Mahakam region by the end of the nineteenth century.

86 This is also mentioned in Knappert (1905: 594): Liah Haeng Lewi:ng (“Leah Heng Loeing”) was the Long Bléh chief, while Ngéo Pegeah and Lung Tethèan (“Ngio Pagit” and “Long Tekhin”) were the Long Tesak chiefs.
87 Wung Bà’ Là’ and her daughter, Ping Hong, in Guerreiro’s genealogy (1985: 119) seem to correspond to the Long Lesa:n chiefs, “Hong-boulah /Adjji-Bini” and “Ping,” both of whom met with Dewall in 1848 (Dewall 1855: 449, 453).
88 Liah was appointed as the officer of the Onderdistrict Segai by the Dutch.
Table 13: The Mengga’ay in the Segah Basin

[Diagram with relationships and dates, including (died in 1897), (died in 1894), (died ca. 1905), (died ca. 1932), and (died in 1897).]

---

Table 9: See also
Table 14: Intermarriage Alliances between the Wehèa and Long Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;Long Way&gt;</th>
<th>&lt;Béa Ling&gt;</th>
<th>&lt;Long Mesa’ Ting&gt;</th>
<th>&lt;Long Tung Nang&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Bentuk</td>
<td>Diak Lay</td>
<td>Selabing &amp; Long Wahau</td>
<td>Jak Luway, Diak Lay etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*see Table 2

Diagram:

- **Tana’ Yo:ng** ○ = ○ Win / Haji Win
- **Béang Nyuk** △ = ○ Win / Haji Win
- **Béang Nyuk** △ = ○ Win / Haji Win
- **Yea’** ○ = ○ Siang Liah / “Raden Temanggung Muda”
- **Ding Bo:ng** “Long Menéh” / Ding Bit Lua’
- **Jiang Héang Lé’/ “Jot”**
- **Jiw Ban / “Temanggung Jiw Ban”**
- **Hat Beliw / “Temanggung Gah Beliw”**
- **Kung Jiw Tien** ○

(Ego 1) (Ego 2) (Ego 3) (Ego 4) (Ego 5)
Concluding Remarks

By cross-checking the genealogies reported in oral and written sources, we find that early Kayanic migrants arrived in northeastern Borneo and began to mix with coastal peoples between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As their population increased, they advanced from the middle-lower Kayan and Berau to the upper Kayan, then further to the Mahakam, or partially back to the Baluy and Baram, driving out or assimilating earlier inhabitants like the Ot Danum, Lebu, Penihing, Tunjung-Benua’, Maloh, and various Punan and Murutic groups. Through intermarriage alliances with Kayanic peoples, both dissidents and sultans in northeast Borneo came to use Kayanic newcomers for wars, defense, and the collection of forest products, which contributed to their dramatic expansion throughout the area from the late eighteenth to the end of the nineteenth century.

The experiences of the Kayanic peoples seem to have been quite similar to those of the Iban of Sarawak in their response to increasing colonial pressures. However, the situation was much more conservative and hierarchical, because the broad hinterland of northeast Borneo consisted of a kind of political buffer area, or a sanctuary, for the refugees from the drastic changes of colonial times. The Kayanic peoples themselves also had some crucial disadvantages in trying to adapt, such as a strong sense of ethnocentrism and exclusiveness based on their hereditary chieftainship, a preference for inland life, and a lack of maritime technology. Thus, instead of realizing actual rule over coastal centers, except in the case of the Bulungan sultanate, most Kayanic peoples remained upriver where they came to be looked upon as primitive headhunters by their Islamized relatives on the coast, who came under the influence of the Malay and Arab migrants/ runaways from Johor and Sulu. Those men of power strategically stressed their identity as Kayan/Segai in order to legitimize their rights to land and forest products. In contrast, the name of the older dominant group of this area, Tidung/ Tirun/ Berayu, came to be omitted from the oral histories and noble genealogies.

In future writings, I plan to share more details of Kayanic oral history, including excerpts from the takna’, describing in particular early life on the Baram and the Kayan.
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**Corrections to Part 1 (BRB Vol. 37, 2006)**

P. 90, L. 8: “D Bek” → Déa Bek, “Bala (no. 54)” → Bala’ (no. 53)
P. 97, L. 41: “Tepé” → Tepé:
P. 97, L. 43, and P. 98, Footnote 10: “Lekwé” → Lekwé:
P. 98, L.22: “ul:” → ulé:
P. 100, L. 16: “pa’:” → pa:
P. 102, L. 8: “mixed with” → including
P. 108, Footnote 16: “the term ina-” → the term kina-
P. 111, 34: “Juan River” → Julan River
P. 114, L. 38: “keluna:n aya’ lun puen” → keluna:n aya’, lun puen, “lun lun kéhèa” → lun kéhèa
I consider it a mistake to allow any body of men, who have monetary interests, to have absolute control over a territory; for as long as human nature is what it is there must always be a temptation for the directors and shareholders in such a company to sanction.... revenue-producing schemes which may be exceedingly damaging to the native peoples entrusted to their care. In fact there must be a possibility of those who are largely interested in the company caring little from what sources and what manner dividends are procured.

Evans 1922:43

Introduction

G.C. Woolley prepared a series of Native Affairs Bulletins in the late 1930s for the North Borneo Chartered Company. These detailed the customary law or adat of various peoples in then North Borneo as he understood them. He wrote in Bulletin No. 1 on the adat of the Timogun, a Northern Murutic speaking group, the following, which appears in Chapter XI: Agricultural Customs:

Each kampong had its own flat agricultural land, and no one else could come and occupy any of it without leave from the Headman, who would usually only give it if the applicant had a wife or relatives in the village: for the shifting cultivation of hill clearings (ladang) all were supposed to keep to the watershed of their own village stream (1962:28).

This piqued my interest as evidence for the argument I have made in a number of papers that the village among most, if not all, the swidden agriculturalists of Borneo held residual rights to land.

Woolley’s Native Affairs Bulletins

Woolley prepared and/or compiled six Native Affairs Bulletins for the British North Borneo Chartered Company. These I have listed in the table below along with
their publishing dates listed as far as I have been able to ascertain. With the exception of No. 1, as noted above, Woolley does not include information on the rights held by the village over its domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date Reprinted</th>
<th>Dedication Date</th>
<th>Wong’s Dates*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Timoguns: A Murut Tribe of the Interior, North Borneo</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>June 1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tuaran Adat: Some Customs of the Dusuns of Tuaran, West Coast Residency, North Borneo</td>
<td>January 1953</td>
<td>June 1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Murut Adat: Customs Regulating Inheritance amongst the Nabai of Keningau, and the Timogun Tribe of Tenom</td>
<td>January 1953</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dusun Adat: Customs Regulating Inheritance among the Dusun Tribes in the Coastal plains of Putatan and Papar</td>
<td>January 1953</td>
<td>December 1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dusun Adat: Some Customs of the Dusuns of Tambunan and Ranau, West Coast Residency, North Borneo</td>
<td>January 1953</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kwijau Adat: Customs Regulating Inheritance amongst the Kwijau of the Interior</td>
<td>January 1953</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wong (2006). Woolley translated the work of Pangeran Osman bin O.K.K. Pangeran Haji Omar, who was Deputy Assistant District Officer of the Putatan District at the time. For further information see Wong 2006.

These bulletins are curious bits of amateur ethnography at a remove from the field. They are the products of interviews of native chiefs and sometimes headmen. They do not have the depth of understanding that Rutter (orig. 1929; 1985) displays in his summary of the ethnography of North Borneo. In reading these, it is like looking through an imperfect lens full of bubbles so that ethnographic reality is distorted. Every now and then a bit of very interesting ethnographic information slips by the distortion of the lens. But the implications are lost as the context does not come through.
Woolley’s Distorting Analytical Lens

This ethnographic distortion is the result of Woolley’s use of Malay concepts and categories to describe the indigenous categories. With the exception of No. 1, his studies are focused on moveable property classes, classes of heirs, marriage, adoption, and, in one or two instances, illicit sexual conduct. While they all start on property, there is no systematic inquiry of ethnographic materials. For instance, only one deals with a cemetery.

All the bulletins, with the exception of No.1, divide property into pesaka, ‘inherited property,’ penchurian sendiri, ‘acquisitions as a bachelor or spinster,’ penchurian laki-bini, ‘acquisitions during marriage,’ and brian, ‘bride-price.’ The economic activities that provision these societies are generally ignored with only a superficial nod to swiddens or wet rice fields. Land tenure is restricted to occasional remarks on the inheritance of individual interests in land.

The distortion of a Malay lens is clearly shown in the category of property called penchurian laki-bini, ‘property of the husband and wife.’ All of the agricultural societies in Borneo that I am aware of treat property accumulated by a married couple and their children as property of the domestic family, a jurally corporate unit. For example, among the Rungus property accumulated by the family is called indopu’an do nonbkob, ‘durable goods (or property) belonging to the domestic family.’ There is no property belonging to the husband and wife as a unit. This is also the case among the Iban (see Freeman 1955, 1958, 1970). Freeman describes the Iban bilek, or domestic family as a jurally corporate group in terms of accumulating property.

But Woolley’s distortions in describing property interests by the use of a foreign lens is an issue for another paper. Here we want to focus on the omission of information on the village as a jural unit holding rights of various types over land in the village domain.

The Distortion of Woolley’s Lens: Was Woolley Right or Wrong About Village Rights?

Specifically, while Woolley details the rights held by the Timogun village over land in Bulletin No.1, in the other bulletins he does not mention village rights to land. It is pertinent to question whether Woolley was right that there were no rights to land held by the village in other ethnic groups in Sabah. Or was he wrong? If he was wrong, as I shall demonstrate, the question must be posed “why?” Is there a problem of political correctness as happened in Sarawak, which we shall shortly discuss? Or does this represent the usual willful ignorance of the peoples of North Borneo and their customary law by the officers of the Chartered Company? This willful ignorance has continued through the colonial period following World War II, and continued on into the period of independence in which North Borneo became the state of Sabah in the nation of Malaysia (see Appell 1991 ).

1 Rutter (orig. 1929, 1985:11) wrote: “The late Dr. W. H. R. Rivers believed implicitly in the importance of a knowledge of anthropology if native races were to be governed wisely. In Papua and the mandated territory of New Guinea this has been recognized and an anthropological department has been created to assist in native administration, with conspicuous success. If at some
Dates when the Native Affairs Bulletins were written

One might argue that Bulletin No.1 was the last one written and by then Woolley had discovered village rights. Therefore, an important question is the date when these bulletins were prepared. Bulletin No. 1, along with Bulletin No. 2, appear to be the earliest from Woolley’s dating of his preface. But this is not a solid surmise. For in Bulletin No.3 there is preliminary data on the adat of the Timogun which is then treated in fuller detail in No. 1 (see Table), which suggests it was prepared before No. 1. But there is no dating of the preface.

The second bulletin, which is on Tuaran adat, was prepared at roughly the same time as the Timogun adat bulletin (No.1). But there is no reference to village rights to territory that only residents could use for agriculture. However, there is a reference to the fact that each of the Tuaran villages had its own burial grounds, access to which lay with the headman. This aspect of village jural personality does not appear in the other bulletins.

Unfortunately inquiry into the dates when these Native Affairs Bulletins were prepared does not provide an answer to the question as to why Woolley ignored village rights in bulletins other than No.1. What were the reasons for his silence? Does recent ethnographic research have any light to throw on the problem of omission of village rights?

Village Rights in Dutch Ethnography and British Ethnography

Before we turn to the evidence from ethnographic research in the areas covered by Woolley’s bulletins, let me briefly review the work I have done on village rights. This will set the stage for explaining the failure of other ethnographers and civil servants in British Borneo to report on village residual rights to land. This may have relevance to Woolley’s silence.

In preparation for beginning my ethnographic field work in North Borneo among the Rungus in 1959, I had studied Ter Haar’s excellent summary of adat law in Indonesia (Haar 1948). He drew attention to the fact that villages held rights (“rights of disposal”) over their territory or domain and that the nature of these rights varied between ethnic groups. But the early British ethnographers of Sarawak appear not to have been aware of the work of the Dutch school of adat law that began in the early 1900s (see Burns 2004, Holleman 1981). Why was this so? I attempt to answer this failure in British ethnography in a forthcoming monograph, The Discovery of Law in...
Stateless Societies. Briefly, British anthropologists followed the position of Radcliffe-Brown (1933) that indigenous societies were stateless and therefore did not have law. They had customs. There were no codes, courts, or constabulary, so they could not have law. This ignored the growing work in America on law among stateless societies. And it ignored the functioning of the village moot which has served as a court throughout much of Insular Southeast Asia.²

Alerted to the issues in Haar (1948), I found in my research that the Rungus village had rights over its domain. And I first drew attention to this jural characteristic of the village in Borneo in local publications in Sabah in 1963, 1986a, 1992; in Malaysia in 1968; to the anthropological community in publications in 1966, 1976, 1978, 2001 as well as many subsequent publications to be discussed later; and to a community of both anthropologists and local Borneo scholars in 1971a and 1971b. Also in 1971 (1971b) I began circulating among those doing research in Borneo a manuscript that provided observational procedures for determining land tenure.

In 1997 I published a summary of the history of the study of land tenure in Borneo and showed that in addition to the Rungus, there was sufficient evidence to conclude that in other ethnic groups the village held residual rights over land which only their residents could cultivate, including the Bulusu’, the Iban, Bidayuh, and the Mualang. The nature of these residual rights varies with the ethnic group (see below). But the general rule is that only residents in the village may have usufruct rights in the village domain without permission of the headman.

How valid are these conclusions? Are there societies in Borneo in which the village did not hold residual rights? First, not every ethnographer in Borneo has been concerned with this issue, and so there may be societies in which the evidence is incomplete. Also, there have been some disputes over my conclusions. Some of these arise from confusing the domain of choice with the jural order. But some of these arise from the very nature of the development of property relations. Property relations are emergent and respond to scarcity (see below).

Whatever the case, those who claim otherwise, that there are no village rights over land of some sort or another, have to establish this claim by using the tests that I have developed in Appell (1971b) in their research design.

Rights to Land Held by Village Residents

Once a family, or individual, has been granted acceptance to reside in a village, they gain the right to cultivate swiddens in the village domain. This right I have termed a “derived right.”

I have also argued that in some ethnic groups, the usufruct held by families is what I have termed “circulating usufruct.” That is, after the last of the crops of the

² Gluckman (1965) continued the argument that the law of acephalous societies was of a different order than societies with formal “forensic” institutions. Epstein (1967) decried this dualistic approach. His position took an American turn. He argued that if anthropology was ever to be a comparative discipline, it must look for universals in the study of law. The American approach was not to worry over definitional issues, but to bash ahead and do ethnographic research on social control. See Hoebel 1941, 1941-42, 1942.
family are removed from a swidden and the area returns to secondary forest, any other member of the community may cultivate there. Use rights do not remain with the original swidden cultivator. This system contrasts with what I have called “durable usufruct” in which permanent use rights to a plot of land are retained by the individual who originally cut the primary forest or secondary forest for which there were no holders of rights through death or permanent movement of the holder to another village.

Durable rights, in turn, are divided into two different forms. Among the Iban, rights to the land held by a domestic family (bilek) can be divided. When the domestic family splits into two units, the rights of the lands held by the original domestic family are divided up and given to the new domestic family. I have called this form “devolvable rights.” In other instances, as, for example, among the Bidayuh [Land Dayak] of Sarawak, rights are inherited by individuals in the cognatic descent group from the ancestor who created them by cutting primary forest. These I have called “devisable rights” (also see Appell 1986b, 1997).

In these cases of durable rights I have used the concept of “reversionary rights” for those held by the village. When areas of cultivation lie dormant in instances of durable usufruct, the village has the right to redistribute those lands to others.

But in all cases the village holds residual rights to the village territory. We will explore this further shortly.

The Concept of Jural Personality and Emergent Rights

At this point I must discuss the term “jural personality” in relation to the variations found in village rights. This is the term used by legal scholars to refer to the sum total of rights, duties, and powers held by a jural entity, in this case the village as a corporate unit. And the jural personality of villages in different ethnic groups varies. In some ethnic groups, the jural personality of the village may be well developed in that it holds many diverse rights. In other instances, the jural personality may be minimal, with few rights held by the village.

Furthermore, the jural personality of a village is not permanent. Village rights over land are subject to change as the environment in which the village operates changes. In 1976, 1978, and 1985a I pointed out how in the case of the Rungus village rights developed as the land came under pressure from increased population. Dove (1985), in a paper also in the same volume with Appell (Appell, ed. 1985), showed how the nature of the rights held by the village changed with external pressures both from population pressure and from changes in demands for types of agricultural or forest produce. Property rights are, in essence, emergent (Appell 1988; also see Appell 1997).

Thus, the nature of the village’s residual rights should not be considered unchanging and it should be expected that the extent of the rights held by villages in different ethnic groups would also not be identical. The erosion of the jural personality of the village is particularly common under situations of social change when the central government forces agricultural land to be divided up among individuals and registered to individuals. We should keep this in mind when we consider why Woolley did not mention land rights in his other Native Affairs Bulletins.
Customary Law in Ranau: Evidence for Village Rights

We now turn to review ethnographic evidence from the regions where Woolley wrote on the local adat. In Woolley’s treatment of the customary law in “Natives Affairs Bulletin 5: Dusun Adat: Some Customs of the Dusuns of Tambunan and Ranau, West Coast Residency, North Borneo” he ignored village rights to land. But we have ethnographic accounts for these areas. And these raise questions as to the motivations for Woolley’s silence.

Robert Harrison spent nineteen months between 1962-63 in the Ranau District of Sabah doing research for his Ph.D. dissertation. His research focus was on the swidden communities in the district.

Harrison (1976:87) writes with regard to his research in these communities:

They maintain a form of organization in which the community as a social group possesses a bounded area of land (domain) in which the members and member families reside and practice shifting rice cultivation (swidden rice).

Harrison (1976:90) continues:

Use rights to land for the planting of swidden crops and the preparation of house yard gardens depends ... upon residence in the community as a sole criterion for use. Residence is the only requirement for membership in any of the community’s component groups or activities.

Harrison claims (1976:96) that these communities are not pioneer settlements. They are, instead, established systems and that they are territorial entities whose boundaries tend to remain fixed over a long period of time. These boundaries are public knowledge and are known to all communities in the immediate vicinity of each other. The means by which boundaries and trails are marked are common knowledge throughout the districts, such as the person from another area would know when he was entering the domain of a village. Therefore, to the extent that these communities operate within fixed, known boundaries, they would not be defined as pioneer settlements, and they do not clear climax forest on a regular and frequent basis.

Harrison then addresses two of the critical questions that we have put to the data on land tenure. Is the village a jural isolate and is it a ritual isolate?

Following the tests proposed by Appell [1968] to determine the nature of social isolates, it is possible to define the Ranau swidden-farming community as both jurally and ritually a corporate entity. With respect to jural concerns, the community is the largest property-possessing social isolate in Ranau Dusun life. The territory of a community is held by the village as a whole, and rights to the use of such land are conferred upon members through residence as the sole criterion. This domain may often encompass an area of fifteen to twenty square miles (Harrison 1976:97-98).

Harrison turns to considering the community’s ritual status (1976:98): Ritualy the community is also a corporate entity; that is, a community may hold rituals to ward off the effects of acts committed against it by
its own members or members of outside communities. With respect to these rituals... they apply to all members conjointly rather than to each member separately. Other ceremonies, such as a ritual to renew all of the resources of the village, also apply to all members equally,...The community, too, as a whole is likely to suffer ritual pollution from a delict committed by one of its members. That is to say, the community is liable for the ritual behavior of its members.

Please note that any violation of the community’s ritual status has ritual sanctions that are backed up by jural sanctions. That is, violation of the ritual makes it impotent, and the violator can be sued for this. It is interesting that the Ranau village rights mirror what I found among the Rungus.

One final note on the degree of powers in the jural status of the community. Anyone who has planted fruit trees, and then leaves the village, may come back to collect the fruit even though he is no longer a resident. But he may not cut a swidden in the village in which he is not resident (Harrison 1971:270). However, it may be difficult to protect fruit trees and enjoy their fruit when resident is in another village.

Customary Law in Tambunan

For the Tambunan area, which Bulletin No. 5 also covers, we again have ethnographic information. Gausset and Mertz (2002:216) write:

The land was traditionally the communal property of the village. All members of the community could freely open up land and start cultivating it, but no member outside of the community could do it without permission.

The conclusion reached by these authors seems to be reasonably correct, although their work lacks a certain level of scholarship.\(^3\)

Unfortunately, one of the critical aspects of land tenure in Sabah that has never been addressed is that of rights to irrigated fields and how this impacts the village residual rights. There were irrigated rice fields in both Ranau and Tambunan. Neither Harrison, nor Woolley, nor Gausset and Mertz address this. This is a major lacuna in the study of land tenure.

Customary Law in Papar

When we come to Bulletin No. 4 on the customary law of the Dusunic peoples of the coastal plains of Putatan and Papar, there is again no mention of the village as a land holding unit. But here also we have additional data. This comes from the study by Danny Wong Tze Ken (2008) of the character of the leader in the “Notorious Papar Land Case,” a Simon Sindurang Bulakang. Simon was an early Kadazan leader “who was

\(^3\) I say this for several reasons. Certain items referred to in the text do not appear in the bibliography. Certain references used to illustrate the authors points are not apposite. They are apparently unaware of the large literature on land tenure, particularly my summary discussion of land tenure in Borneo. And they make statements like: “The literature on Dusun systems of land tenure is ambiguous” (2002:216). And by this they mean that the reports on land tenure for different Dusunic ethnic groups do not agree. How surprising!
instrumental in fighting for the rights of the community over land issues” (Wong 2008)

Wong writes:

In 1910, the Dusun of Papar... engaged the services of an English lawyer to summon the North Borneo (Chartered) Company administration to answer to charges that the Company had erred in selling land owned by members of the community to railway and to plantation estates, thus violating the rights of the people.

Wong argues:

The estates had been granted land concessions that, in many cases, also included lands previously owned or used by the community, particularly for communal purposes, such as graveyards, grazing lands and for gathering. Others had had their lands, usually planted with fruit trees, taken for failing to register their land and have it surveyed as required by the 1903 Land Proclamation (Law), a law which many simply did not understand.

A petition for redress was sent to the High Commission for British Borneo. This in turn asked the Chartered Company to provide explanations and answers to the issues in the petition. The Chartered Company was then “directed to allow the Dusun to take the case to a court in North Borneo for adjudication by the judicial commissioner...hence the so-called Notorious Papar Land Case (Wong 2008).

Thus Woolley, as Commissioner of Lands, was directly involved in the Papar Land Case. He was directed by the Governor to investigate the issues raised by the Dusun. And he made visits to Papar to determine cases of land encroachment and give out compensation (Wong 2008). Woolley, as Commissioner of Lands and Collector of Land Revenue, was named as principal defendant in the case.

In sum, Woolley was clearly exposed to the Dusunic concept of village rights over land. At a minimum it included village grazing lands, cemeteries, and fruit groves shared by community members, etc. So why did he not mention these rights in his Native Affairs Bulletins, with the exception of No. 1 on the Timogun Murut?

What was Woolley’s Motivation in Ignoring Village Rights?

How can we interpret the motivation for Woolley’s silence on village rights? I can think of five possible explanations: 1) ignorance of native adat; 2) ideological blinders; 3) conflict of individualism ideology with the communitarian ideology of the indigenous peoples of Sabah; 4) desire to increase land rent revenue for the Chartered Company; and 5) government orders.

1) Ignorance of native adat. This argument won’t float. Woolley was exposed to native adat in the notorious Papar Land Case in which demands were made to return

4 Woolley does not refer to cemeteries as village property in Bulletin No. 4 on the adat of Putatan and Papar, while he does in his Bulletin No.2 on the adat of Tuaran. He writes: “It is usual for Tuaran villages to have each their own common cemetery ground in which any inhabitant of the village has a right to be buried” (1953:10). This is very confusing since he was right in the middle of the Papar incident in which representatives of Papar villages were complaining that their cemeteries were being destroyed by the railroad and plantation expansions.
village lands. He also provided information on village land tenure in the Timugon case. Why not in the others? Furthermore, in 1932 Woolley translated a Malay text on native adat in Putatan in which there were references to fruit tree plantations on “kampong [village] land.”

2) Ideological blinders: One of the ideas floating around the English speaking world at the time of Woolley’s work in North Borneo was the idea of primitive communism. It started with Lewis H. Morgan in his *Ancient Society* (1877). Morgan gave ethnographic evidence, or what he thought was evidence, for what he called “primitive communism.” This was picked up by Engels in his *The Origin of Family, Private Property and the State* (1884).

Rutter (1985; orig. 1929), who had spent five years in North Borneo as a magistrate and District Officer for the British North Borneo Chartered Company just before World War I, wrote the following with regard to the “pagans” (orig. 1929; 1985: 58): “The whole village life is one of communism (in the true sense of that misused word)... The whole training of the pagan, from childhood onwards, is based on suppression of the individual interest in favour of a communal spirit.”

Was Woolley of the persuasion that this form of communism was bad for the country? We may never know. I do know that in 1959-60 when I began my field work in Sabah I was surprised by the concern expressed by some government officers over what they called “communalism,” which was perceived as a threat to their governing. This conflicted with their ideology of individualism (see below).

Now let us look at what happened in neighboring Sarawak. In 1970 I began reanalyzing the ethnographic data of Freeman for the Iban and Geddes for the [Bidayuh] Land Dayak. I found that they provided sufficient evidence to conclude that in each case the village as a jural entity was an important land holding unit. But Freeman in his ethnographic reports denied that the Iban village held anything as a unit, and Geddes denied the same for the Land Dayak. And the words they used to deny village rights were couched in such a way as to throw light on Woolley’s reluctance to recognize similar rights for the North Borneo villages.

Thus, Freeman wrote (1970: 104):

> To what extent then is the long-house community as a whole, a corporate group? This is a difficult question to answer in general terms, but it may be observed from the outset, that the degree of corporateness is low and that inasmuch as it does exist it stems from ritual concepts, rather than from collective ownership of land or property.

And also (Freeman 1970: 128):

> The long-house [community], it is important to realize, holds virtually no property in communal ownership, nor is there collective ownership of land.

Geddes (1954a: 59), in a similar, vein also wrote with regard to the Land Dayak:

> Although much of the land belonging to Dayak villages in the Sadong has many people sharing in its ownership, the system of land tenure is in no sense a communal one, for each of these persons has his or her particular rights defined in such a way that there should be no conflict with the rights of the others.
I wondered at the time of doing this analysis whether the stress put on the lack of communal property in both Geddes’s and Freeman’s reports to the Sarawak government was not in fact a reaction to concerns prevalent in government circles over the “communal” nature of nonliterate societies, that is, primitive communism.\(^5\)

It is important to note that the terms “communal ownership” and “collective ownership” are really concepts from political economy. They are too opaque and not sufficiently analytical for land tenure research. For ethnographic analysis they are meaningless and tell more about the cognitive world of the enquirer than ethnographic reality. Unfortunately the terms “communal” and “collective” are still in use in many instances. They do not distinguish two different forms of ownership of rights, but, instead, conflate them: Does the village as a legal entity own the rights to the land; or do the rights reside with the members of the village in severalty? In other words they do not identify where the rights actually lie. There is no direct evidence that Woolley had accepted the arguments of communalism or primitive communism. But one wonders.

3) Confrontation between Ideologies: Communitarianism and individualism. All the interior agricultural societies had what might be called a communitarian ideology. By this I mean morality was based largely on community values. This left large opportunities for individual choice and actions as long as these did not harm the community.

Macfarlane (1978:5), in his study of the rise of individualism in British society, describes individualism:

> It is the view that society is constituted of autonomous, equal units, namely separate individuals, and that such individuals are more important, ultimately, than any larger constituent group. It is reflected in the concept of individual private property, in the political and legal liberty of the individual, in the idea of the individual’s direct communication with God.

Morality is largely derived from the values of the marketplace. The British staff of the North Borneo Chartered Company, and its subsequent governments were carriers of the values of individualism that justified social action. And this prevented them from understanding the communitarian ideology, its value, and actions by the indigenous peoples based on this. In fact, most of the government personnel felt that the indigenous culture impeded development (Appell 2005). Is this a partial answer as to why Woolley ignored the rights of the village?

Macfarlane (1978:202) concludes with regard to the rise of individualism:

> If most contemporary countries are trying to move from ‘peasantry’ to ‘urban-industrial’ society within a generation, whereas England moved from non-industrial but largely ‘capitalist’ to ‘urban-industrial’ society over a period of at least six hundred years, it will be obvious that the trauma and difficulties will not only be very different but probably

\(^5\) In 1970 and the early 1980s I circulated a manuscript (Appell 1971b) which contained this argument on why claims were made for the absence of village communal property. Neither Geddes nor Freeman commented on my supposition about the concern by Sarawak government members over the problem of primitive communism or communal or collective property, although Freeman agreed with my reasoning that established the Iban village as a jural entity holding rights over land (private correspondence).
far more intense. Furthermore, if such countries absorb any form of western industrial technology, they are not merely incorporating a physical or economic product, but a vast set of individualistic attitudes and rights, family structure and patterns of geographical and social mobility which are very old, very durable, and highly idiosyncratic. They therefore need to consider whether the costs in terms of loneliness, insecurity and family tensions which are associated with the English structure outweigh the economic benefits.

4) The Desire to Increase Land Rents: The British North Borneo Company in 1902 started charging rent for lands registered to native people (Black 1983:193, 206). Was Woolley, by ignoring village rights, trying to ensure income for the North Borneo Chartered Company which was always short of funds (see Black 1983)?

5) Woolley drafted the land law of 1913 and most of the replacement 1930 ordinance (Horton 2002:58). Was he under government orders to de-emphasize village rights?

Woolley’s diaries may help explain to us his motivations, when they are published. At the present time, we can be sure that ignorance of native adat was not one of the reasons that Woolley did not deal with village rights to its domain.
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Introduction

As the footprint of human society expands on the earth, habitat loss and fragmentation are global problems of increasing significance. Habitat loss and fragmentation cause the natural matrix of a landscape to become a mosaic of patches. Each patch is a relatively homogenous unit such as an agricultural field, a logged forest, or an urban center of human settlement and industry. In this mosaic, patches are connected by networks of roads. These landscape changes have strong effects on the composition of biodiversity (Saunders et al. 1991; Chung et al. 2000; MEA 2005). Scattered among homogenous, anthropogenic patches are remnants of native vegetation, habitat islands in a mosaic of developed land. Patch edges in this mosaic offer a variably permeable boundary that is especially constraining for animals with large home ranges and/or those requiring a suite of different habitats within a landscape (Bach et al. 2004). Boundaries become barriers for sensitive interior species and species such as arboreal animals that require a matrix of connected, natural habitat for movement (Forman 1998; van der Ree 2006). Ecosystem effects of habitat loss and fragmentation include loss of biomass, modified and increased habitat edges, reduced core areas, divided and isolated animal populations, changed species composition, altered population sizes, reduced genetic exchange due to isolated populations, reduced likelihood of recolonization following local extinction events, altered species interactions, and increased probability that humans will access and further modify habitat (Andrews 1990; Forman & Alexander 1998; Trombulak & Frissell 2000; Bickel et al. 2006).

In the tropics, the rate of land-cover change, especially conversion through deforestation, is unprecedented, and tropical land-cover conversion is a primary driver of global environmental change (Geist & Lambin 2002). The inextricably linked processes
of habitat loss and fragmentation are reducing biodiversity, increasing risk of extinction for many organisms (Laurance 1999; Myers et al. 2000) and weakening the ability of global ecosystems to resist climate changes. The tropical forests of the world support high rates of endemism, serving as repositories of genetic information. Forty-four percent of all plant species and 35% of all vertebrate species are found in just 1.4% of the land area on Earth. These “hotspots” of biodiversity are concentrated in tropical forests and include almost all tropical islands (Myers et al. 2000). Right now, species are being lost that will never be identified.

Nowhere in the world is the crisis of tropical forest loss more immediate than in Southeast Asia (WRI 1996; Laurance 1999; Sodhi et al. 2004). The 1980s were a decade of rapid forest conversion and loss. During this decade, Asia lost 11% of its tropical forest cover, more than any other region (WRI 1996). The current rate of forest loss is higher in Southeast Asia than anywhere else in the world at 0.91% yr\(^{-1}\), nearly twice the global rate of 0.52% yr\(^{-1}\) (Langner et al. 2007). If the current rate of deforestation continues, by 2100 Southeast Asia will have lost 75% of its forest cover and 42% of its biodiversity (Sodhi et al. 2004). Lowland tropical forests are among the ecosystems undergoing most rapid change because they are easily harvested, and cleared lands are readily converted to agriculture. These lowland, high diversity forests are becoming increasingly rare and highly fragmented. In Southeast Asia, the area of land remaining in lowland forest is surpassed by the area in both secondary forest and agriculture (Slik 2005). Malaysia, including Malaysian Borneo, typifies those patterns. Malaysia is one of the top 14 deforesting countries in the world, with 250,000 ha being deforested annually (McMorrow & Talip 2001).

Sabah occupies 76,115 km\(^2\), approximately 10% of the island of Borneo (Marsh & Greer 1992). Sabah’s long history of land-cover conversion started in the late 1800s. In the 1890s, colonial governments initiated large-scale timber harvesting, which was quickly followed by introduction of agricultural crops such as tobacco and rubber (McMorrow & Talip 2001). Forest conversion and associated fragmentation accelerated greatly with the timber boom of the 1960s (Bickel et al. 2006). Oil palm (Elaeis guineensis) agriculture, introduced to Sabah in the 1980s is the most dramatic driver of landscape conversion yet seen in the area (Rajaratnam et al. 2007). The period from 1981 to 2000 was characterized by rapid expansion in oil palm cultivation, as oil palm replaced previously valuable cash crops like rubber, coconut, and cocoa (Henson 2005). During this time, selectively logged forests become progressively degraded; these forests are prone to fire and often occupy land suitable for agriculture. Harvested areas that would have previously been reforested are now being converted into oil palm, making oil palm the fastest growing industry in the state and resulting in a steady decline in forest area between 1987 and 1995 (Chung et al. 2000; Henson 2005). The loss of forest and conversion to oil palm agriculture simplifies the structure and complexity of vegetation on the landscape, accelerating the negative effects of biomass loss and reduction in carbon storage (Henson 2005). Forest loss continues today. In fact, deforestation in Borneo is 1.7% yr\(^{-1}\), double the rate of loss in Southeast Asia (Langner et al. 2007) and three times the global average.

Sabah supports a high percentage of protected areas; 48% of the state is gazetted into permanent forest reserves, state parks or national parks (Marsh & Greer
1992; Chung et al. 2000). Yet, protection often is only paper thin. Forest area continues to decline in Sabah as a consequence of the variance between state and federal policies and conflicting goals among government entities that are charged with both protecting Sabah’s forests and funding social improvements through timber sales (McMorrow & Talip 2001). Protected areas contain valuable forests, making it a common practice to degazette protected-area boundaries in order to allow timber harvest (Chung et al. 2000; McMorrow & Talip 2001). In spite of those problems, forests inside protected areas have fared better than lands not included in such areas. From 1973 to 1992, Sabah’s forest cover outside protected areas declined from 51% to 15%.

More information is needed to understand how landscape changes are impacting the species of Sabah’s forests, but some things are clear. Changes in the landscape favor some species to the detriment of others, exacerbating differences between native and oil palm areas. Habitat fragmentation due to oil palm expansion is changing social structure in wild populations of Proboscis monkeys (*Nasalis larvatus*), critically endangered Bornean endemics that are obligate inhabitants of mangroves, peat swamps and riverine forests (Murai 2004). Density and distribution of insect communities are changing as a consequence of oil palm. For example, beetle and ant species are suppressed in oil palm areas (Chung et al. 2000; Bickel et al. 2006). In oil palm fields, rodents reach high density,
which may be to the benefit of native predators such as the leopard cat (*Prionailurus bengalensis*) and the bay cat (*Catopuma badia*) (Kitchener *et al*., 2004; Rajaratnam *et al*. 2007). Sun bears (*Helarctos malayanus*) are attracted to oil palm fields to feed on the fruits (Normua *et al*. 2004). Although those factors may provide some benefit to native species, oil palm fields remain patches in a mosaic. Forest fragments in and near those oil palm fields also are necessary habitat components for endemic species (Rajaratnam *et al*. 2007). Because the forest patches that do remain in an oil-palm dominated landscape are highly isolated, “even relatively large areas may not prevent the critical loss of genetic variability and guarantee long-term survival of organisms” (Bickel *et al*. 2006).

A large percentage of Sabah still remains in tropical forest. However, there is little forest that has not been disturbed, and all of Sabah’s forests are under severe, immediate pressure (Marsh & Greer 1992; Langner *et al*. 2007). Retaining protected areas that contain the remaining healthy forest habitats is a high priority for conservation (Halpin 1997). Achieving that conservation goal requires careful decision making. Scientists and managers cannot make informed decisions without accurate, timely, precise, and actionable information. Effective conservation strategies for Sabah’s forests will require continued assessment and adaptation, but the remaining rainforests are very difficult to assess on the ground. They often are steep, inaccessible or inappropriate for agriculture,
which is usually why they remain forested. Remotely-sensed satellite images offer a means of assessing land-cover change over time and researching land-cover distribution (Green & Sussman 1990). Satellite imagery has been used previously in understanding Sabah’s forests. For example, Miettinen et al. (2007) used MODIS imagery with 250 m resolution to map the distribution of land cover and to analyze forest fires. By mapping forest fire distribution, they found that 90% of all forest burning occurred in degraded habitats. Such information can help guide scientists and mangers working on the ground to conserve fragile tropical forests. Higher resolution satellite imagery such as Landsat (60 m and 30 m) and IKONOS (1 m) offer the potential for more spatially-detailed analysis. This study uses Landsat data to quantify land-cover change in Sabah between 1982 and 1999, and IKONOS imagery to assess the accuracy of that classification.

**Study Area**

The Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve (KSFR) is located on the east coast of Sabah, at 5°45’N 117°45’E. The reserve is adjoined by Sandakan Bay to the south and the city of
Sandakan to the east. The forest reserve is 4294 hectares and has more than 450 species of trees; almost 40% of the known dipterocarps in Sabah have been recorded here (Fox 1973). Mean daily temperature in KSFR is 30ºC, annual rainfall averages 3100 mm, and daily humidity is often 90% (Chung et al. 2000). KSFR was disturbed by selective logging in the 1950s; currently, the forest reserve is regarded as regenerated (Bickel et al. 2006).

Methods and materials

We obtained Landsat images for the portion of Sabah that included KSFR, Sandakan, and the peninsula surrounding these locations. The extent of the images is 35.8 km by 36.5 km, representing a subset of the full Landsat scenes of Path 125 Row 056 (1982) and Path 117 Row 056 (1999). We obtained images from August 1982 (MSS, 60 m resolution) and September 1999 (TM, 30 m resolution) through the University of Maryland's Global Land Cover Facility (GLCF), as part of the collection of orthorectified images housed at GLCF (NASA Landsat Program 1982 and 1999). We obtained a single IKONOS image compiled from two dates (July 30 and August 10, 2002) of the immediate vicinity of KSFR for use in accuracy assessment. The orthorectified and georeferenced IKONOS image (1 m resolution) has an extent of 13.6 km by 7.5 km.

Tropical forests are characterized by high evaporation rates, and many of the Sabah images available through a variety of data sources had high cloud cover and were not useful for our purposes. For our use, we selected images that contained less than 5% cloud cover. All clouds and cloud shadows were manually digitized as polygons and excluded from all analyses. We resampled the 1999 Landsat image to 60 m resolution using a cubic convolution aggregation so that comparisons of land use from 1982 to 1999 would not be confounded by differing pixel size. All analyses were completed using ERDAS Imagine 9.0 (ERDAS 2005) and ESRI ArcGIS 9.2 (ESRI 2005) software packages.

We developed separate, multi-phase, unsupervised classifications of land cover for the 1982 and 1999 images. In addition to the standard multispectral bands of the MSS and TM, we calculated and included the first three bands of a Tasseled Cap transformation (Crist & Cicone 1984). Those three are linear combinations of the Landsat bands that highlight landscape features representing brightness, wetness, and greenness, allowing us to increase unique signatures of land cover for the Landsat images. We ran an initial, unsupervised classification with 50 classes using an ISODATA clustering algorithm. These 50 classes were manually examined and assigned to distinct or mixed land-cover classes. The areas containing mixed classes with high spectral overlap were extracted, and an additional, unsupervised classification was run on only these mixed areas. After the unsupervised classifications were complete, we used five land-cover information classes: water, forest, agriculture, developed land (including cities, roads, agricultural roads, villages, and homes), and bare soil.

Following spectral classification of the 1982 and 1999 images, we ran a 3x3 majority filter, kernel smoothing function to remove localized errors produced in generating the classifications. We used these final maps to calculate the total number of pixels in each information class and identify percent change over time for each land-
cover class. We then conducted a post-classification change detection from 1982 to 1999 and analyzed the resulting change detection matrix following Pontius et al. (2004).

The final step of our analysis was an accuracy assessment using the IKONOS imagery to determine how well the unsupervised classification process performed compared to visible land cover on the high-resolution IKONOS image. The IKONOS image is a portion of the overall study area that contains all of the land-cover classifications found in the Landsat study area. We clipped the classified 1999 image to match the extent of the IKONOS image, generated 480 stratified random points whose frequency was proportional to the classes on the 1999 classification, and visually interpreted land cover of each point on the IKONOS image. This process made it possible to create an error matrix that expresses performance of the classification for that subset of the total image.

Results

The unsupervised classification with the 3x3 majority filter resulted in land-cover maps for 1982 and 1999 (Figures 1 and 2). Our analysis suggests that 31.6% of the study area changed land use between 1982 and 1999, a rate of approximately 1.9% per year (Table 1). Total forest area decreased by 30.4% over the same period, an average loss of 1.8% per year, but agriculture increased only 0.1% per year. Thus, the major transitions in land use and land cover are more complex than a direct forest-to-agriculture conversion. While 11% of the 1982 forested area was lost to agriculture, an estimated 4% of the forest area was lost to development. Conversely, forest area increased in a few areas: approximately 1% of the 1982 agricultural landscape was reforested by 1999. Some of that was oil palm plantations initiated in 1982 that by 1999 represented mature canopy cover.

To clarify land-use-change relationships, we developed three landscape change maps (Figures 3-5). Figure 3 shows graphically the loss of forests between 1982 and 1999. The KSFR itself remained forested from 1982 to 1999, but many areas surrounding the protected area and riparian buffers were converted to agricultural land or developed into roads and villages (Figure 3). Much of the land that was agricultural in 1982 remained in agriculture over the sample period, but many patches that were forested, bare soil, or developed became agriculture fields by 1999 (Figure 4). Most of the area that was developed land in 1982 remained developed, but numerous areas that were forested or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>1982 area (ha)</th>
<th>1982 percent of study area</th>
<th>1999 area (ha)</th>
<th>1999 percent of study area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>30,716</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>25,646</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30,194</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>6,121</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10,714</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare Soil</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65,385</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65,385</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agricultural fields became developed by 1999 (Figure 5).

The accuracy assessment, the final step of our analysis, was used to estimate the quality of the classification. Relatively cloud-free images are difficult to obtain for Borneo. We used a relatively cloud free IKONOS image from 2002 to test our 1999 land classification. We used that comparison to develop an error matrix for our study area classification (Table 2).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classified Data</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Bare Soil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare Soil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The error matrix allowed calculation of Producer’s Accuracy (Errors of Commission) and User’s Accuracy (Errors of Omission) for the study area. Overall accuracy for the study area classification was 91.56%, while the Kappa adjusted statistic was 87.89% (Table 3). The Kappa statistic correction accounts for pixels that would have been correctly classified due to chance so our analysis can be viewed as having approximately 88% classification accuracy.

**Discussion**

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classified Data</th>
<th>Reference Totals</th>
<th>Classified Totals</th>
<th>Number Totals</th>
<th>Producer’s Accuracy</th>
<th>User’s Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>98.68%</td>
<td>90.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>90.99%</td>
<td>95.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>88.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare Soil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall Classification Accuracy = 91.56% | Overall Kappa Statistic = 87.89% |

Sabah is a Malaysian state where the landscape has been rapidly transformed to accommodate cash crops, especially oil palm. According to the Sandakan Coastal Profile Report (1997), Sandakan is primarily an agricultural district with approximately 190,151 hectares suitable for agricultural activities. Major crops are oil palm, fruit trees, cocoa, and others. Oil palm was introduced in the early 1980s and was quickly recognized for its economic value. It is a dominant, rapidly expanding crop that is causing accelerated forest loss and conversion to agriculture. In Sandakan, there are 102 oil palm estates with 81,802 hectares of oil palm under production. Three major oil palm processing facilities serve this important cash crop.
The images analyzed for this paper focus on an area in Sabah that experienced rapid change during the period from the early 1980s through the 1990s. As of 1999, forest remained in narrow riparian buffer strips and inside the KSFR reserve, but the areas surrounding the reserve showed high forest loss between 1982 and 1999 (Figure 3). Thirty percent of forested areas in the study area were lost between 1982 and 1999. Areas of forest that were lost were converted primarily to agriculture and development. The boundary of the KSFR has become readily identifiable; it is the place where the largest patches of recovered forest remain. Connectivity among forest fragments outside the KSFR was reduced over the study period, and the remaining forest increasingly appears as a mosaic of isolated patches, constraining choices for the plants and animals that require this habitat for survival. In 1982, 39% of the land cover in the study area was agriculture. By 1999, this had increased to 46%. In addition, 9% of the land was developed in 1982, including cities, villages, major and agricultural roads and homes. By 1999, development had increased to 16%. Areas that became agriculture by 1999 (Figure 4: Landscape Change: What Agricultural Land in 1999 was in 1982: This figure shows what areas that became agricultural land cover by 1999 were in 1982. Forest and bare soil were converted to agriculture. According to the classification, some developed land was also converted to agriculture. This is probably a result of the patchy nature of newly planted fields that tend to overlap with impervious surfaces and villages rather than actual conversion of these areas. Areas on the map that are white are areas that were not classified as part of the agricultural class in 1999.)
4) had high percentages of forest and bare soil in 1982. The analysis showed that some development also became agriculture; this may be more a reflection of the performance of the classification and change detection than a reflection of actual developed areas being lost to agriculture. Fields in early stages of production and developed areas are patchier in nature, supporting more bare soil and paved areas, both of which have high reflectance values, often overlapping in remotely-sensed images. This relationship is also evident in the accuracy assessment, where agriculture and developed lands had lower mean accuracy than the other classes. Intact forest, water, and bare soil showed higher accuracy and were characterized by more uniform reflectance in the Landsat imagery.

Development changed predictably over the study period (Figure 5). Roads often serve to increase access and human settlement over time (Tanner 2008). The developed areas of Sandakan and the major road, route 22, remained developed as would be expected. As patches of agriculture and forest were converted to developed areas and the boundaries of cities and villages expanded, additional settlement was focused around primary roads. As the forests shrink in response to growing agriculture and development, the viability of Sabah’s wildlife will continue to decline, especially for species adapted
for life in the forest canopy. These species will have little ability to cross agricultural fields to reach isolated forest patches.

However, oil palm apparently has positive benefits to wildlife in addition to the known negatives. Oil palm is eaten by several native species, and mature oil palm may provide a canopy that arboreal species can navigate, although oil palm also poses risks to these species being killed by humans in agricultural fields. Rodent densities are often exceptionally high in agricultural fields and may provide an increased resource for predators. Hypotheses about the complex relationships between oil palm and wildlife are emerging now among researchers working in Sabah, and much remains to be understood about the ecological role of oil palm for native species (Wong et al. 2005; Wong personal communication). As we noted in the introduction to this paper, the plight of the forests of Sabah is at a critical time for conservation. These forests are in need of immediate, definitive action if they are to retain their current level of ecosystem services (Sodhi et al. 2004). In addition to empowering conservation of the remaining forests in Sabah, research should be undertaken immediately to better document and understand the ecological role of oil palm and to document the ways native species respond to this land-cover type.

Conclusions

- Average deforestation rates in Borneo are 1.7% per year, double the rate of SE Asia. In our study area in Sandakan, 31.6% of the land use changed between 1982 and 1999, a rate of approximately 1.9% per year. Total forest area decreased by 30.4% over the same period, an average loss of 1.8% per year.

- Land use in the study area including the Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve was 39% agriculture and 9% developed in 1982; it was 46% agriculture and 16% developed by 1999.

- We based our conclusions on 60 m resolution remotely-sensed images, and calculated accuracy with a 1 m resolution IKONOS image. Our analyses have a classification accuracy of approximately 88%.

- The conservation status of the forests of Sabah is at a critical juncture. Only with immediate, definitive action will they retain their value as a biodiversity hotspot, home to numerous unique and critically endangered wildlife species.

- Further research is desperately needed to empower informed conservation policy, to better document and understand the ecological role of oil palm and to document ways native species respond to this rapid land-cover change.
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Many of us indulge, from time to time, the affectation of writing in the third person (“the present writer suggests”) in order to create an impression of neutrality or objectivity. The device employed by Professor Milner in his third book is rather distinct from this: a way of tempting readers on board as companions on a “first-person” journey of discovery, whereby, if we consent to the illusion, we become, as it were, accessories to the author’s conclusions. The technique is charming but will not work like a Malay charm on most social scientists, who, even if they were not teased for making their own contribution to the stereotyping of “the Malay character,” will surely query the conclusion that the Malays across the centuries have been involved in a process of induction into a “Malay civilization” or cultural system of “Malayness,” rather than “Malay ethnicity.” Their primary reservation about this could relate to the definition of ethnicity in terms of race and biological descent. We may well consent to the proposition that “the Malays” have been recruited, through cultural induction, from a wide range of racial stock, but was it not because of problems about the restrictive meaning of “race” that the more behavioral and contextual concept of “ethnicity” was first coined? If so, then “ethnicity” as understood by social scientists is precisely what Milner is talking about when he refers to “Malayness” and a closely related concept, “Malay civilization.” A couple of the clearest statements of Milner’s dichotomy occur on pages 227 and 237, but it informs the whole book in a very consistent manner, being apparently grounded in the leading perspective of his *The Invention of Politics in Colonial Malaya* (1995, marginally revised 2002) that the rise of the notion of a Malay *bangsa* in the 19th century reflected Western thinking on the biological classification of peoples at that time. Nevertheless, whilst labelling as “ethnicity” this concept that Malays are a biological race (as soon as they themselves had adopted it), he now demurs from the relevance of “Malay” (in that sense), and swims with an alternative scholarly consensus on the way forward for the historiography of the Malay world, which emerged at a conference in Leiden in 1998, itself part of an ongoing project between Leiden and Pekanbaru.

It appears that Milner attended the conference, but without contributing a paper. Nor is his work represented in the Symposium which the conference engendered in turn, in *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 2001. However, in view of the remarkable demand for that issue of the journal, Timothy P. Barnard gathered a slightly larger group
to contribute to his subsequent edition, *Contesting Malayness. Malay identity across boundaries* (2004). Anthony Milner was invited to write the concluding overview to this collection, which he did with all due conscientiousness and polish. It ought to be entirely otiose to rehearse this background, yet it may merit a mention as the author of *The Malays* has somewhat defied presentational convention by omitting from his “Preface and Acknowledgements” any reference to the Leiden conference, least of all as a possible source of stimuli for the book, notwithstanding the striking affinities between Milner’s emergent emphasis and the consensus in question. Among a handful of scholars whom Milner does single out for acknowledgement is his one-time student and now ANU colleague, the pre- and early-modern Sumatra specialist, Jane Drakard, but here too there is a puzzle, for the online publicity of none other than Wiley-Blackwell themselves, on the very eve of publication, announced her as joint author. Meanwhile, the extensive citation of other scholars within the text (by the author/date system) entirely takes the place of footnotes, making the text visually rather heavy and possibly distracting for the general reader. It is not wholly clear whether a book which attempts to pull together the wealth of not always easy to reconcile data which we find here, could have been conceived with a general readership in mind – though the division of the eight chapters into quite short, titled, sections is indeed helpful to all.

Not even the community of arch-specialists is entirely obviously the main target audience for this work of impressive aggregative sweep and philosophical application. Often one senses oneself witness to a dialogue between Professor Milner and his former self, A.C. Milner, with whose *Kerajaan. Malay political culture on the eve of colonial rule* (1982) he now disagrees on one point: its confidence in attributing subjective Malay identity to all pre-modern ancestors of “the Malays” of the present era. In my own first reaction to that book (Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science, 1987) I thought that, as ruling class ideological texts, the two chronicles studied should not have been classified as representing necessarily the “political culture” of all Malays, but it did not occur to me that it might be misguided to label all such *rakyat* of the many *kerajaan* as “Malays” in their own minds. Even now, after reading the new book, I do not think this is an important issue, but no doubt the Leiden consensus deserves attention. No doubt, also, if the defining mark of any “Malay” community were rule by a local raja, there would be a logic in denying a wider, regional identity. Still, if those groups of subjects all spoke forms of Malay, it was hardly untoward that Europeans tended to call them Malay. Be this as it may, somewhat later in academic time (East Asia, 2008) I commended the more explicit references to language as a vehicle of ideology (an ideology of *ummah* as well as *bangsa*, by the way) in *The Invention of Politics*, and now *The Malays* proves to be pleasingly replete with the concept of “ideological work” – the “Malay experience”—and changing subjective identity being seen not so much as the products of language at all (or at any rate only of Western categories, not from within the Malay linguistic treasury) but of the “top-down” endeavors of didactic rulers from Mansur Shah to Mahathir Mohamed. Where I would certainly take issue with the new book is with its tendency to regard the development of Malay nationalism out of, or on a foundation of, a previous (possibly also partly constructed) Malay ethnic identity as *sui generis* in the modern history of Southeast Asia and elsewhere. Recent work on nationalism by Anthony D. Smith is germane.

In a rather similar way one could criticize *Kerajaan*, still echoed in The
Malays, for seeing the characteristic political structure of the 18th and 19th century Malay principality as distinguishing it, even more than did Islam and the Malay language, from its regional comparers and thus being almost the key element in the “Malay experience” and definition of this people-tentatively-in-the-making. How much is the Malay polity, dubbed a “kerajaan,” seriously distinct from Thai counterparts, for instance, with their far more extensive lexicon of political terms featuring the word raja (as: Phraraachaanaaacaak, ‘a kingdom’; Phraboromaraachaaoongkarn, ‘a royal command’)? How much is the chronic Malay fear of being submerged fundamentally different from the anxieties for Siam’s future which motivated Rama VI and the Thai officer corps at the time of the First World War? As for the inclusion of bilateral kinship as a distinct and identifying mark of Malay society by earlier Western observers and Japanese anthropologists today, it is difficult to credit that the author does not deny this by invoking – and immediately – the “loose structure” paradigm that was so long prevalent in the study of Thai society, having originated in a comparison of Thai bilateral kinship with the Japanese system.

For the twentieth century, either side of political independence, the book gives pride of place to Malaysia, and this is not unnatural, for even if the concern is to present the evolution of a concept more than narrate political events, the most significant “ideological work” has indeed taken place in Malaya/Singapore and Malaysia. However, there is perhaps a consequential tendency for the Malaysian polity to come across as the modern norm. This is helped by an occasional taciturnity on any deviation from it, even within Malaysia: for instance where Milner virtually brushes aside the constitutional crises of 1984 and 1992 (pp. 210-11), and with Dr. Mahathir cast as a prime mover of confrontation with the rulers, the immensely significant “kerajaan”-type revivalism of the Sultans of Kelantan and Johor being ignored. This omission marks a missed opportunity in terms of Milner’s perception that the ancient kerajaan principle has not disappeared amidst constant pressures for adaptation. As for places beyond Malaysia, one arguable effect of the focus on the Malaysian “heartland” is that Patani, Indonesia and Brunei appear to constitute deviations from its “norm.”

The Malays of Patani are treated as if deprived of a historical birthright by the territorial thrust of Siam and later nation-building by Thailand—unlike the seemingly more “correct” experience of Malays under British and Dutch colonialism, which surrendered to nationalism, having done much to secure, and ultimately bequeath, varying degrees of continuity in the institution of the raja. Milner singles out (p. 107), as a symptom of official Thai insensitivity, what he calls “a Thai tendency” to call Malays khaek, which he understands to mean ‘visitor’ or ‘guest’ (hence ‘alien’?). It needs to be affirmed that this is a term of some longevity and dates back to the first Muslim (thus, Arab or Indian) traders who came to Siam – no more modern, or inherently offensive, I would suggest, than the term farang (literally, ‘Portuguese’) which Thais have a “tendency” to apply to me when I am in Thailand. Milner is hardly happier with the official category “Thai-Muslim” (pp. 167, 226), because it smacks of a denial of Malay ethnic birthright even while acknowledging religious identity. He seems less offended by the fact that Thai-speaking Muslims (or “Sam-Sam”) have been included as “Malays” in censuses of Kedah (p. 124) and have lately been abandoning their Thai tongue in favor of Malay (p. 181). Whether the “Sam-Sam” were in fact an ethnic group defined by religion, rather than a creole-speaking population resident astride two language zones (and comprising, as it happens, both Muslims and Buddhists), is a specialized question
which need not detain us, for it should not occasion surprise if a book of great scope which draws predominantly on secondary sources, and apparently not at all on “hands-on” research in any parts of “the field,” reveals a few anomalies.

Indonesia would test the ingenuity of any writer who attempted to include it in a history of the Malays, whether or not in a deconstructionist mold, for only the elusive Srivijaya (progenitrix of Melaka?) and, in later times the Sultanates of the east coast of Sumatra, qualify manifestly for inclusion. Deviation from a “Malaysian norm” is not merely inferrable but pretty much manifest in nearly all the relevant material. The claim of modern, nationalist Indonesia to be included in a “Malay world” discourse appears to be derived more from the vision of a handful of Peninsular Malay intellectuals such as Ibrahim Yaacob and Dr. Burhanuddin al-Helmy in the mid-twentieth century, or Professor Ismail Hussein of the *Dunia Melayu* movement in the late twentieth. I cannot speak for the first two, but Professor Ismail, in a personal communication in Brunei at one gathering of the period, was all too well aware of the vanishing prospects for “pan-Malay unity” today, as the development of modern Indonesian under the influence of Jakarta vernacular makes it less and less accessible to Malaysians. As Milner himself reminds us (p. 169), Sukarno appropriated the term *bangsa* for his “Indonesian nation,” which was chiefly a geopolitical construction, only racial in a very broad sense. Three decades later (p. 174), the Malays of east Sumatra had been reduced in official parlance to a mere *suku* or ethnic splinter within that exclusively legitimate nation-state (“civic-nationalist” in type, as some might classify it). On the other hand, the post-Suharto period has seen “a widespread revival of sultanates” (p. 177). At least, we can observe some reconvergence here – though by definition the Javanese are not more probable candidates for “Malay” membership than before!

The case of Brunei, as presented in this book, prompts the reservation that while its non-democratic, indeed absolutist, monarchy defies the would-be “Malaysian norm,” it does seem to represent a striking exemplar of the core of the “Malay essence”—a *kerajaan*—in Milner’s early writing, however reluctant he may now be to speak of “essences.” The exceptions to historical form are the fact that ceremony is now augmented by strict control of national wealth, and is complemented by the generously funded propagation of neo-traditional ideology. One could certainly argue that Brunei deserves not less than the mere two pages which Milner devotes in aggregate to modern Brunei ideologies (including the *bangsa* ideal of the Peninsular Malay, nationalist teacher Harun Rashid, exiled to Brunei in the 1930s, and the 1950s agitator and ultimate rebel, Sheikh Ahmad Azahari), but considerably more than this, starting with a more thorough and precise analysis of monarchical revival than has been provided (see p. 164 – though p. 223 offers a little more). It is less than edifying to read that B.A. Hussainmiya, in his *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III and Britain* (1995), was “astute” in pointing out that Azahari failed to emulate Tunku Abdul Rahman’s manipulation of the traditional ruling class. I rather think that the Tunku had an easier time of it because he was himself of that class. At the same time, it is quite inaccurate to suggest that Azahari did not try for an alliance. What of the attempted inducement of a Brunei monarchy of revived pan-northern Borneo scope? But it was a sticking-point for this activist Sultan that Azahari wanted the Ibans already present in the state to be granted citizenship of Brunei. It happens to be Milner’s view that the absorption of non-Muslim ethnic groups as “Malays” through conversion has been an important historical norm around the region (see especially p. 83 on the Dayaks
of Sarawak). In this light, it would have been academically more astute to explain why Sultan Omar was reluctant to “conform with history” in this respect: it simply seemed too risky until the power of monarchy had been consolidated. Of course his reluctance to contemplate northern Borneo union and the challenge of integrating a predominantly non-Muslim native population was similarly motivated. Yet this is not to say that Sultan Omar lacked long-term ambition as a leader of pan-Malay revival—however late, and under Peninsular influence, the concept of “Malayness” may have come to Brunei, and (we could add) however much it would depend for its effectiveness within Brunei on the initial assimilation of non-Muslims to the Brunei-Malay culture but also acceptance of a shared citizenship as “Bruneieans,” rationalized as reflecting membership of “the Malay race.” The international aspiration of Brunei’s neo-monarchical state does seem to have been missed in this book. The fact that the Islamic component in *Negara Melayu Islam Beraja (M.I.B)*, the state ideology, is so much stronger than its “Malay nationalism,” and to that extent seems in step with the rewriting of Malay identity in Malaysia since the 1970s (a dimension which Milner handles very convincingly for Malaysia), could also have provided grist for the author’s ideas-mill.

At the same time, one would not want to overlook the probable power of the notion of racial qualification for membership of a nation-state, let alone as a foundation of ethnic identity, even if the reality of racial descent is scientifically unprovable or disprovable. As was insinuated in the previous paragraph, Brunei potentially offers much stimulus for discussion in this connection, and its sideling in several respects is regrettable. Symptomatically or predictably, there was a complete lacuna where we might have expected to meet Robert Nicholl’s and John Carrol’s work on the dating of the monarchy’s conversion. This is no merely academic question for contemporary Brunei ideologues, who have been seeking to establish a competitively early date, not only for the purpose of the regime’s domestic legitimation but in the context of their pan-Malay leadership aspirations. It is a pity that the role of historical imagination in Malay identity-formation, which is clearly enunciated in connection with the Melaka past (cf. p. 19), is not given more salience for the modern era, especially with reference to the Abode of Peace—though Milner is ideologically “correct” in keeping silence on the reputed hatching of the father of the founder of the dynasty from a cosmic egg (p. 50).

Still, the overarching thesis that what counts in the Malay world is the continuing reformulation of identity based on shared culture or perception of a common “civilization” (now almost exclusively at the hands of “Malays” themselves, we will notice – but logically incompatible with “unchanging essence”), is well maintained and sustained up to Professor Milner’s final bow on p. 242. I have mainly depreciated the terminological anomaly – also consistently maintained - that this is not “ethnicity.” If I have made too much of this distinction, and have neglected much else of interest in this thoughtful and wide-ranging book, readers need to be urged to take it up and engage, for themselves, with its great fund of insights and panoply of conventions revisited. Insofar as post-modernist scepticism may have become conventional in some circles, readers may be reassured to hear that in this book construction is not deconstructed with the aim or effect of denying that “the Malays” do have an objective existence, in spite of the use of inverted commas at every appearance of the term.
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Heppell’s book *Iban Art* contains numerous, extensive footnotes that remark critically on my doctoral thesis *Iban Ritual Textiles*, published by KITLV in 2003. Heppell extracted these notes and with a few alterations and additions published them separately in the *BRB* as an “update” of the recent literature on Iban weaving, including some references to Linggi (2001) and Ong (n.d.), minimally amended from an earlier version published in *Moussons* in 2005. The disparaging tone of many of Heppell’s remarks is quite out of place in a scholarly debate. But more importantly, in many instances Heppell’s statements leave one wondering as to what extent he has actually read my book. Three examples should suffice to demonstrate my point.

**Freeman’s notes**

For example, Heppell writes: “The Freemans’ drawings and notes are freely accessible in the Tun Jugah Foundation in Kuching, Sarawak. Gavin accessed these notes and one of the mysteries of her book is that she barely used them” (2006a:185); and “She largely ignores the field notes of the acknowledged authority on the Iban, Freeman” (2006a:190).

Yet, in fact, at the time of writing my thesis, the Freemans’ unpublished notes and drawings were still at their home in Canberra and I traveled there in order to study them, which is clearly stated in the preface (p. viii) and acknowledgments (p. x). I refer to these notes in virtually every chapter on a wide range of topics from dreams, charms, ritual prohibitions and pattern names to individual weavers the Freemans and I had known and so on. In chapter 3 alone, there are over fifty such references. In addition, fourteen of Monica Freeman’s drawings are included in the illustrations and clearly marked as such in the list of figures. By contrast, Heppell’s chapter 5 on weaving has four references to Freeman’s notes; chapter 6 on plaitwork has seven; and the remainder of the book has
another five, sixteen in total. I rest my case.

**Rang jugah**

Furthermore Heppell’s remark regarding the *rang jugah* pattern again makes one wonder to what degree he has read my book. He writes: “Gavin’s [Baleh] informants told her that there is no praise-name for *rang jugah* or, perhaps, that they did not know it” (2006a:188); he adds in a footnote on the same page: “There is a *julok* for *rang jugah* in the Batang Ai – *rang jugah, nyawa ngempuau, bau sinang* […]”, leading one to speculate that the Baleh Iban might have taken the design with them, but not the *julok*.

Actually, in my book (p.139) I quote this very same fragment of *julok*, which was recited to Heppell and me by a Baleh weaver on 14th September 1988, on the occasion of an international weaving seminar in Kuching. I remember the incident well because Heppell and I considered it very important information as neither of us had so far recorded a praise name for the *rang jugah* pattern. The informant also happened to be my host at the Baleh longhouse where I conducted much of my field research. First, it is unfortunate that Heppell should not have remembered the occasion, or have recorded it in his field notes. Second, it is most peculiar that he should not have taken note of the quoted *julok* and discussion in my book. Again, the question is: to what extent has he actually read and properly studied it?

**Ngar**

In my book (pp. 56-64), I provide a detailed analysis of the *ngar* to show conclusively that all of us (myself included, as well as the Freemans) were mistaken in referring to the *ngar* as the ‘application of mordants’, but rather that the *ngar* is a ‘pretreatment’ that does not involve a mordant at all. It is therefore puzzling that Heppell in his “update” (2006a:183) continues to refer to the *ngar* as including a mordant. Surely it is the very purpose of an update to point out new information, especially if it challenges the established understanding of a process as important as the *ngar*, which is specifically linked to headhunting (*kayau indu*). Again, it seems that Heppell has not actually read my book, or at least not to the degree that is customary before writing an “update” that makes sweeping critical allegations.

**Heppell’s Book**

In the following remarks on Heppell’s book (2005) I want to focus on the factual evidence on which this densely illustrated publication is based. Or, to repeat Reed Wadley’s question (2006:260), are the standards that of a scholarly treatise or of a coffee-table book?

The first fact is that there is no list of plates or figures. It is only in the acknowledgments that we learn that the photographs are of “pieces in Australian collections, which comprise all the plates which are not attributed to others” (pp. 5-6). Regarding the textiles, there are only three plates attributed to others (plates 49, 50, 62), and a further three that were woven by Enyan, the co-author (plates 60, 70, 74). What this means is that the remaining 63 textiles (or roughly 91%) are part of one or several undocumented private collections, which, according to Heppell (p. 6), were “collected
after 1960” by a person or persons whose identity is not disclosed. This does not pose a problem as such, as it is not unknown for collectors to prefer to remain anonymous. However, given the collection’s apparent lack of provenance, it is surprising that many cloths are given a precise place or river of origin, such as Pantu, Krian, Skrang, Layar, Undup and so on. In order for this to be accepted as valid documentation we really need to know on whose authority it is based.

Another major concern for undocumented private collections is the reliability of pattern identifications. As I wrote in my introduction (2003:21), a reliable identification of a given pattern can only be obtained from the weaver who made it, or from her descendants or immediate family. This is perhaps the only statement of mine with which Heppell seems to agree. He writes that, “Gavin is quite right for repeating that you need to talk to the woman who conceived the design to understand it” (2006a:188). In his book he compares pattern names to the memory boards used by the bards, where each mark or sign stands for a whole segment of the ritual chants. He states that, “The only people who can interpret a particular board are those who have been joined to it through instruction,” and adds, “The same is true of cloths” (p. 69); and, “Like the design of a cloth, it requires the person who has designed it to interpret it” (p. 70).

It is therefore puzzling indeed that Heppell consistently applies praise names provided by Enyan for cloths she has not woven herself; nor were these cloths woven by members of her family, or her longhouse community in the Delok, or for that matter in longhouses elsewhere in the Batang Ai. Instead (according to Heppell’s own captions), they originate from the Baleh, and other regions that are known to have a significantly different tradition of pattern names, such as the Saribas, and more specifically the Layar, Undup, Pantu, and Lingga (Balau)¹. And yet, Heppell offers no explanation for this obvious contradiction.

To be fair, Heppell does state in his acknowledgments (p. 6) that, “Much of the information about weaving was obtained from Enyan.” In other words, here he acknowledges the fact that his information is mainly derived from one informant. However, this fact is not carried over into the main text where he routinely presents Enyan’s interpretations of other weavers’ cloth patterns as being generally valid. Heppell’s reliance on these interpretations is particularly disconcerting when they are applied to ancient sungkit patterns (plates 18, 57, 83) for which we are in dire need of reliable data (see Gavin and Barnes 1999:88). In an earlier publication (1996:73), I both repeated and questioned some of Enyan’s interpretations of sungkit motifs, but I always assumed that when Heppell eventually published his book on Iban weaving he would provide evidence that would place these interpretations firmly within a wider Batang Ai tradition. This he most emphatically has not done and Enyan’s interpretations remain those of one single informant, which certainly is not a basis on which to construct as assertive an account as Heppell has presented here.

Regarding Heppell’s main thesis of great weavers marrying great headhunters, I agree with Reed Wadley (2006:263) that this thesis falls apart due to the simple fact that young unmarried women have not yet proven themselves as great weavers because only older women dare to weave powerful patterns. Heppell’s counterargument that one does not need to have woven a powerful pattern “to demonstrate talent” (2006b:266) does
not stand up to scrutiny, as many technically accomplished weavers never advanced to weaving powerful patterns as these required dream invitations, the bestowal of charms by helping spirits and so on, especially in past headhunting days which after all is the period Heppell claims to be writing about. We all are familiar with the saying that women were not considered fit for marriage unless they had woven a *pua*, and men unless they had taken a head. But it is puzzling why Heppell would want to take this maxim to such an extreme position and what, if any, advancement this would mean for our understanding of Iban cultural practice. Heppell’s ungracious response to Wadley’s measured and well-researched review largely ignores the factual criticism brought forward, and instead counters with yet more anecdotal “evidence,” or “just-so stories,” of which, as Wadley rightly says, “we have plenty already” (2006:263).
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Endnotes

1 Details of cloths for which Enyan provided praise names:

Plates

13 Saribas *pua kumbai*; text p.32; compare plate 67;
19 Pantu *pua pilih*; text p.43, note 16; p.78, note 56;
52 Baleh *pua kumbai*; text p.66, note 28;
53 Saribas *pua kumbai*; text p.66, note 28;
54 Balau *pua pilih*; text p.66, note 28;
55 Saribas *pua kumbai*; text p.66, note 28;
56 Undup *baju buri*; text p.53, note 43;
57 Baleh *pua sungkit*; text p.43, note 18; p.71, note 36;
63 Baleh *pua sungkit*; text p.78, note 58;
67 Balau *pua pilih*; text p.80, note 61;
68 Saribas *pua kumbai*; text p.80, note 62;
71 Krian *pua kumbai*; text p.83, note 67;
83 Baleh *kelambi sungkit*; text p.81, note 65; p.87;
85 Saribas *kelambi sungkit*; text p.88, note 84;
96 Baleh *pua sungkit*; text p.94, note 7;
97 Layar *pua kumbai* (erroneously referred to as plate 98 in the text); text p.94, note 7
Letter from Lundu
10 February 2009

Otto Steinmayer
P.O. Box 13
94500 Lundu, Sarawak, Malaysia

I’m neither a former D.O. nor a missionary, yet I too am an Old Hand and one day I too shall write a memoir of life in Sarawak. Or maybe I won’t. However, I have a title, and a catchy title is nothing to waste, so here it is: A Lawn in Borneo.

Life in Borneo has been mostly about cutting grass. Apart from the laborers on the roads, I must mow more grass than anyone in Lundu. The grass in the garden (kehun) must be shorn every month year-round—no winter here—and every month I join the men of the Stunggang in the gotong-royong upkeep of the church grounds.

Our “yard” occupies an odd-cornered tongue of land rising from swamp and forest on three sides. It was surveyed and titled under Rajah Vyner, and the surveyor—one Gomes—shrewdly mapped out a two-acre plot that was not likely to flood in landas season. Scattered engkabang and rubber trees show that people have lived and gardened here off and on since the 1800s. Nusi (my wife) was deeded this land 25 years ago and she in her turn planted a few cocoa trees, durians, mangoes, and coconuts.

Nothing is truer than that to do most outdoor things in Borneo, even to get from A to B, one must chop away lots of bush. Plant-life riots here, you can feel the aggressive and almost malign urge of sprawling green to crawl over and possess everything. Conrad in his most lurid prose did only justice to the jungle.

When she and I first decided to carve a house-site from this wilderness we faced ramparts of babas, and where there wasn’t jungle, immense matted piles of lalang and densely tangled ferns, vines, and brush.

On our yearly returns from the Peninsula where I was working, we hacked at it with parangs. When we moved into our first wooden pondok we realized parangs were not going to cut it (so to speak) so in Kuching I bought a “grass engine.” These are universal. It is a small gasoline engine carried backpack-wise, with a flexible shaft that turns a cutter at the end of a pole. Don’t imagine any wimpy Weed-Whacker. This thing is serious. The blade is nearly a foot long, and we folks keep it sharp. I call it the “Whirling Blade of Death.” OSHA1 would have fits.

With my new weapon, and myself armored with hat, safety glasses, boots, long sleeves, and blue jeans (heatstroke wear), I opened the throttle full bore and plunged into the biomass, wading through heaps of green slaughter. I felt like the Grim Reaper, a Horseman of Apocalypse, and Oppenheimer’s line from the Bhagavadgita, “I am become Death, destroyer of worlds,” would not leave my head.

1 The U.S. government Occupational Safety and Health Administration.
In a few months we had a broad, clear space. The *lalang* kept trying to assert itself, but I found that frequent mowing and the creation of shade from fruit trees kills it. Shorter grasses, “cow grass” in particular, takes its place. Only the loathsome “love-grass” with its annoying seeds that stick in clothes won’t give up.

After a decade of monthly cutting, the yard is tolerably handsome, maybe not exactly a *lawn*, because it’s bumpy, full of holes, and gets shaggy quickly; but it’s pleasant to wander in. Most of the work now is done with a ordinary push-mower, powered (naturally) by a Briggs & Stratton engine.

At the church corvée I use the “Echo” backpack, and still feel like the Dark Angel. The church grounds, besides *lalang*, sprout broad patches of pretty *Caladium* and *Alocasia* with heart- or arrow-shaped leaves, with their elegant cut-outs or cheery pink spots. U.S. supermarkets sell such exotics at $9.95 a pot, and I calculate that each month I must destroy $2,000 of tropical ornamentals, which, fortunately, grow back.

While I work I think to myself, has life in Sarawak been all about cutting grass? Did I pull up roots and come all this way to drudge at the most grimly respectable chore bourgeois suburbia affords?

To chase away these blues I pondered the history of indigenous grass-cutting in Borneo, not an easy subject, for the humbler an activity is, the less it is likely to be noted and recorded. We may conjecture. Rice-culture came to Borneo some thousands of years ago, and to grow rice you have to cut down forest, and grass along with it. Dayaks performed, and still do, this work with axes and fire. Then they had to weed. The proper method for weeding is not to pull a weed out entirely, but to cut it close to the root, so it can anchor the soil.

Wet-rice likes a flat field that can be flooded and drained and reused annually. One prepares a wet-rice field for the long term, removing the stumps as well as the trees, and mowing it before each season.

Was iron introduced at the same time as wet-rice? Iron is the *sine qua non* of serious grass-cutting and huge heaps of 1,000-year-old iron slag at Santubong testify to industrial production. I see no reason to assume that iron wasn’t used long before that time throughout Borneo. Metal is surprisingly easy to work with very simple tools, and plenty of beautiful ancient war-knives forged by Orang Ulu smiths are to be seen. Blades for daily use are always being made, and discarded as they wear out or break. The specialized parang for cutting grass is something less than a meter long, swept in back in a curve to resemble a light, thin saber, and Richards calls it *duku tebas* [“weeding-knife”]. One can grab the grass with a wooden hook, *pengait*, to make a convenient sheaf. Dried *lalang* is useful for mulch and to line boxes for laying hens.

Lundu’s Dayaks, Sebuyau and Selako, often use a broader, slightly crescent blade about half a meter long. This is called *isau bengkok*, ‘crooked knife,’ and is attached to the end of a meter-long pole. One mows by swinging it over the head in circles through the grass. The men who don’t own *injin rumput* use this, and it takes 2

---

2 Native to South America. Maybe the Rev. John Zehnder (priest at Christ Church in the late 1800s) thought it would look good here. He was a keen amateur botanist. (For his letter to the *Sarawak Gazette* on native rice, go to: http://www.ikanlundu.com/junglelife/zehnder_on_rice.html)
skill to use safely.

Photos show that European-style stretches of tamed grass came with the Brookes. Smallholders kept the lalang down in their new-model rubber and coconut plantations. Churches, schools, barracks, the Istana, and each outstation kubu had a plot of grass around it (a “field of fire”?); Kuching’s Museum Gardens are an early example of a park. All the clipping and raking was done by prisoners let out from jail. The convicts seemed happy enough with the arrangement and called it makai gaya perintah, “eating government wages.” And so we reach the present, when we have football-pitches, town padangs, and golf courses, and even the roads have their borders mowed.

The biophilia-enthusiasts speculate that human beings possess a built-in preference for clear, open spaces of low vegetation inherited from the time when we first roamed the savannahs of Africa. Another Just-So story? However, Lundu people have told me that they like to keep ground-cover in frequented places short specifically so no snakes can hide at ankle-level, and it’s said that fear of snakes is another hardwired trait.

But undoubtedly utility is not the whole reason. As Sir Francis Bacon observed, “nothing is more pleasant to the eye than green grass kept finely shorn.” Clifford Sather draws my attention to the laman tengah or menalan, a square of lawn usually at the foot of the main ladder to a longhouse. Here, he says, is where guests are welcomed on ceremonial occasions, adding “a well-kept menalan was a source of pride.” My wife says that children played there, and Benedict Sandin mentions it as the place where cockfights were held. The Sabak Kenang calls the laman in the Afterworld where the soul is received nyapan, ‘smooth and flat,’ and landai, gently ‘sloping.’ A fine lawn could hardly be described better.

Human nature, like all life, has a rooted urge to alter surroundings for its comfort and pleasure. I wanted a space where I could stroll barefoot without danger of hurt, and I’ve been over every inch of ground here. We may take the modifying much further than our ancestors (I’m not sure but that modern longhouses have a car-park as their chief open space), but the essence of it is the same as theirs. I suppose that “a lawn in Borneo” is not that absurd and that I have fulfilled my nature as well as any “primitive” man.
In May 2008, shortly before his death, Dr. Reed Wadley deposited with the Tun Jugah Foundation in Kuching two large storage cartons of archival materials together with a brief inventory describing their content. This inventory is reproduced below. The materials themselves contained in the cartons consist primarily of copies of Dutch archival sources from the colonial period relating to the Iban in West Kalimantan. These date chiefly from the 1870s through to the Japanese Occupation. In addition, there are notes written by Dr. Wadley from archival sources housed in the National Archives of the Republic of Indonesia, Jakarta. These pertain to events in West Kalimantan during both the colonial period and post-independence era. In addition, there are also notes, commentaries, and brief translations made by Dr. Wadley from the Dutch colonial sources, plus notes on James Brooke’s private letters relating to Dutch Kalimantan-Sarawak border issues (frequently involving the Iban), and a timeline of events in the Emperan, the Iban term (meaning ‘flat land’ or ‘plains’) used to refer to the area of principal Iban settlement in West Kalimantan. All of this material was scanned under Reed’s supervision during the last months of his life and is now deposited in Kuching in both duplicate hardcopy form and also in duplicate e-copy on special archival CDs.

In addition to the Dutch and Indonesian archival materials, Reed also deposited in the same collection a MP3 CD recording of a timang mali umai chant which he had recorded during a performance at his West Kalimantan field site in 1992. In earlier correspondence with me, Reed wrote that he hoped that one of his graduate students at the University of Missouri might eventually transcribe, translate, and work up an analysis of this material, using data from Reed’s fieldnotes as a supplemental source of background information.

The materials described here have been placed in the humidity-controlled archives housed in the Research Section of the Tun Jugah Foundation offices, on Level 4, Tun Jugah Tower, 18 Jalan Tunku Abdul Rahman, 93100 Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia. For inquiries and further information, those interested should contact the Foundation.
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archivist, Ms. Janet Rata Noel (jrn@po.jaring.my), or the Director of the Foundation’s Research Section, Dr. Robert Menua Saleh, or consult the Tun Jugah Foundation website at: www.tunjugahfoundation.org.my.

Copies of this same collection have also been deposited with the Firebird Foundation in Phillips, Maine, USA, and with the KITLV in Leiden, the Netherlands. The latter two institutions will also receive copies of Reed Wadley’s fieldnotes, subject to a 15-year moratorium to protect the confidentiality of those persons who are still alive.

It is a testament to the scholarly conscientiousness of Reed that he made systematic provision for the preservation of this valuable material not only for future generations of researchers but also, through the auspices of the Tun Jugah Foundation, for the Iban community itself.

Below is the inventory prepared by Dr. Wadley describing this collection.

**Inventory of Dutch Colonial Archives on Iban of West Borneo**

Collected and compiled by Reed L. Wadley (1999-2001), with support from the International Institute for Asian Studies (Leiden, Netherlands) and sponsored in Indonesia by the Center for International Forestry Research (Bogor, Indonesia).

Materials from the Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, Netherlands are designated by NA.

A. Mailrapporten NA (short and long reports on local/regional conditions)
   a. Mailrapport 1891 No 369 NA
   b. Mailrapporten 1870s NA
   c. Mailrapporten 1880s NA
   d. Mailrapporten 1890s NA
   e. Mailrapporten 1900s NA
   f. Mailrapporten Catalogue NA
   g. Politieke Verslagen en Berichten NA (extracts from early 20th century Mailrapporten)

B. Memorie van Overgave NA (succession overviews for incoming officials)
   a. Inventory MvO West Borneo NA
   b. MvO Burgemeestre 1934 (KIT 999) NA (lots of details on Iban pacification efforts and relations with Sarawak in an appendix)
   c. MvO Militaire 1928 (KIT 994) + 1931 (KIT 996) + 1933 (KIT 998) NA
   d. MvO Residentie West Borneo (MMK 260-265) NA
   e. MvO Sheuer 1932 (KIT 997) + Adat Iban + MvO Kuik 1936 (KIT 1000)
      (Appendix on Iban farming adat by Burgemeestre)
   f. MvO Werkman 1930 (KIT 995) NA

C. Miscellaneous Archives
   a. Early 19th Century Documents on West Borneo from NA & KITLV
   b. Kapucijnenarcief (Notes from the archives of the Capuchin Catholic mission)
   c. KIT Photographs West Borneo (short list of photos at the Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam)
d. Maps at the Nationaal Archief (short list of West Borneo maps)
e. Rapportage Indonesia 1945-1950 NA
f. Rough Notes on Museum Nusantara Collection (commissioned cultural artifacts from Nanga Badau area, West Borneo)

D. Notes on Published Material
a. Kapuas Hulu Statistics 1980s
b. Notes & Translations on Dutch Publications (rough)
c. Notes on James Brooke’s Private Letters (as related to relations with West Borneo)
d. Partial Dutch Vocabulary (rough)
e. Preliminary Timeline of Events in the Emperan
f. Regerings-Almanak voor West Borneo (list of officials and their postings by year)
g. Request van C. Kater 1885 (long-serving resident of West Borneo)
h. Staatsblad van Nederlands-Indie (as related to events in West Borneo)

E. ANRI Notes (Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, Jakarta – notes are all handwritten from original documents, collected in 2000)
a. ANRI notes 2000 pp 01-20
b. ANRI notes 2000 pp 21-40
c. ANRI notes 2000 pp 41-60
d. ANRI notes 2000 pp 61-79

F. Verbalen NA (long reports, both public [openbare] and classified [geheime])
a. Geheime Kabinetsverbalen NA
b. Geheime Verbalen NA
c. Openbare Verbalen NA
When Professor Barrett passed away he left behind a substantial amount of unfinished work. He also left meticulous field notes from his completed work, along with hundreds of photographs and recordings. His work represents a remarkable devotion to his work and to the disciplines of psychiatry, medicine, and anthropology. These data were far too valuable to be lost: most of the materials have been catalogued and stored in the University of Adelaide Barr Smith Library, so that current scholars and future generations can draw upon them if they so wish.

If you are interested in examining these materials, in the first instance you should contact me, A/Professor Anna Chur-Hansen, at anna.churhansen@adelaide.edu.au. Ethics approval must be secured by the interested researcher(s) before materials can be released, and where relevant, Professor Barrett’s research collaborators will need to be consulted and their permission gained. Many of the people who participated in Professor Barrett’s research will still be living, and thus the issues of stringent ethical processes and informed consent are extremely important – the researcher(s) will need to take these factors into account when considering what they might wish to do with the data. It is also important to note that much of the material is in the Iban language, so fluency in this would be essential.

Summary of materials available

These data represent ethnographic research conducted with the Iban people from Sarawak in Borneo. Data collection began in 1986 and continued up to 2006.

The archived materials can be divided into two main waves of data collection. The first phase, encompassing the 1980s and 1990s is material for a series of National Health and Medical Research Council (NH&MRC) supported comparative studies of schizophrenia that combine anthropological and clinical research techniques. Essentially, these data are 50 case studies of Iban people suffering with what we would call “schizophrenia.” Included in the materials are Professor Barrett’s ethnographic notes, as well as his transcribed interviews and videotapes and CDs of individual patient cases. Professor Barrett completed several papers on these data.

The second wave of National Health and Medical Research Council (NH&MRC) funded research, beginning in 2002, can be viewed as a continuation of the first studies. Professor Barrett again collected case records, combining these with cases of non-psychotic spiritual experiences and blood analyses, in an attempt to determine genetic influences upon psychiatric illness. Only one paper was produced from these data: he was working on a book plan around this research when he died.

In addition to the raw data, we have archived his lecture notes and other papers as well as his published works.
PAST MEETS FUTURE: A TRANS-BORDER FORUM FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR THE HIGHLANDS OF BORNEO

Cristina Eghenter
WWF-Indonesia
and
Jayl Langub
Institute of East Asian Studies
Universiti Malaysia Sarawak

Introduction

In the heart of Borneo, the highlands at the border between Malaysia and Indonesia, the indigenous peoples of the area have come together to establish a communications forum, Forum Mesyarakat Adat Dataran Tinggi Borneo (FORMADAT), a trans-boundary, grass-roots initiative to create and maintain a network of communication and information to help steer development in the highlands in ways that are sustainable and suitable to the needs and aspirations of local people in both Malaysia and Indonesia.

The Highlands

The highlands of Borneo, comprising the subdistricts of Krayan Selatan and Krayan Utara in East Kalimantan, Indonesia; Bario, Ba’Kelalan and Long Semado in Sarawak; and Long Pasia in Sabah, Malaysia, constitute one geographic, environmental, and cultural landscape inhabited by groups of people sharing a common origin. The highlands are also home to a rich assemblage of megalithic monuments, serving as a witness to a long history of settlement in the area. The main ethnic groups–Lun Dayeh, Kelabit, Lun Bawang, and Sa’ban–inhabiting the area number around 15,000 people of whom 75 per cent are on the Indonesian side of the border. The close cultural and historical ties between the people on both sides of the international border of the highlands are one of the main reasons for the intense cross-border social and economic interactions. The highlands are located in the very “heart” of the island of Borneo, and fulfill an invaluable ecological function by protecting and maintaining a very important water catchment for the entire island.

A relatively isolated region averaging 1000 meters in elevation, the highlands are linked by logging roads to the coast on the Sarawak and Sabah sides, but only linked by air to the lowlands of East Kalimantan. Traditionally, communities have practiced wet rice agriculture in the wide valleys of the highlands, and dry rice agriculture on the hill slopes. The wet rice agricultural system, integrally linked to animal husbandry of water buffalo, has not only sustained the communities of the highlands, but resulted in the production of an agricultural surplus.

Nowadays, the communities face increasing challenges in trying to develop the local economy and secure a sustainable future. Development of infrastructure and better transportation are essential to guarantee a market for local agricultural products. At the same time, it is important to choose the kind of economic alternatives—like sustainable farming, ecotourism, and animal husbandry—most adapted to the local environmental and social conditions in order to maintain vital natural functions and characteristics of the highlands. The sustainability of economic alternatives needs to be assessed in terms of social and economic benefits as well as the preservation of the natural environment.

The People of the Kerayan-Kelabit Highlands

The Kerayan-Kelabit highlands of central northeast Borneo are settled by groups of people who speak several variants of a language which A. B. Hudson named “Apo Duat,” after the name of a mountain range between the Kerayan plateau in East Kalimantan and the Kelabit plateau in Sarawak, erroneously written on maps of Borneo as “Apo Duat.” As far as local inhabitants are concerned, no mountain range exists by such name, but there is a mountain range which local people call “Apad Wat,” *apad* ‘mountain range,’ and *wat* ‘tree roots.’

Anthropologists who have studied these groups have been fascinated by the
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similarities between them. On the basis of cultural and linguistic evidence, they are but one people. Who are these groups, and why are they known by various names despite sharing a common language and culture? To start with, let us look at the various terms they use to refer to themselves.

**Lun Dayeh.** The term *lun dayeh* literally means ‘people of the interior or upriver.’ It seems like an appropriate term of self-reference for people who live along the upper reaches of rivers. In fact, the people of Lawas and Limbang districts, and those in Brunei who call themselves Lun Bawang, sometimes refer to themselves as Lun Dayeh. According to W. M. Toynbee, the Kelabit also use the term *lun dayeh* as a self-referent. For instance, “[t]he Kelabit have lived in the interior highlands of Sarawak’s Fourth Division for a very long time. The name for their race was Lundayeh (simply ‘Hillman’), but they came to be identified with the river, Pa Labid, and this name eventually turned into the English “Kelabit.” The two groups who retained the term *lun dayeh* are the people we


know today as the Lun Dayeh of East Kalimantan and the Lundayeh of Sabah.

**Kelabit.** The term “Kelabit” was originally used by Europeans to describe a group of people inhabiting the upper reaches of the Baram, and those of the Madihit (a tributary of the Limbang River) and the Magoh (a tributary of Tutoh River). Originally spelled “Kalabit,” the term derived from the name of a river, *Pa’ Labid* (*Pa’, ‘river’ + Labid, the name of the river), which eventually became “Kelabit.” It was originally used to refer to the people who lived along the Labid River or *Pa’ Labid*, but eventually its use extended to include all the people we know today as Kelabit. Today, it is used as a self-referent by the group made famous through the writings of Tom Harrisson.6

**Lun Bawang.** The term *lun bawang* literally means ‘people of the place.’ The term is used everywhere by speakers of Apad Wat to distinguish villagers or original settlers from visitors, or *sakai*. The term is now used by people in Lawas and Limbang districts, as well as those in Brunei, who refer to themselves as Lun Bawang.

**Subgroups.** The Lun Ilu’, Lun Ilau, Lengilu’ etc. are subgroups of Lun Dayeh who reside in the upper Kerayan. They speak a variant of the Apad Wat language. They are also known as Milau or Ilau after the name of a tributary of the Kerayan.

Spencer St. John referred to the people of the Adang River in Sarawak as the

---

The Adang have migrated to the upper Trusan, where they call themselves Lun Bawang; to the Madihit, a tributary of the Limbang, and Magoh, a tributary of the Tutoh River, where they call themselves Kelabit; to the lower Limbang where they call themselves Lun Bawang; and to the Bawan valley in the Kerayan, East Kalimantan, where they call themselves Lun Dayeh. The Adang valley is now occupied by a few groups of Penan, some nomadic, others settled.

The Potok, or Putuk, reside in the lower Kerayan and are a subgroup of Lun Dayeh. The name derives from Pa’ Potok, or Potok River. The Dutch once used the term “Potok” or “Putuk” to refer to the total Lun Dayeh population in the Krayan valley.

The Kemaloh, or Kemaluh, are also a subgroup of the Lun Dayeh people. They used to reside along Pa’ Kemaluh or the Kemaluh River. Largely hill rice cultivators, they migrated to the Sipitang District of Sabah, the Lawas and Limbang Districts of Sarawak, and to Kebupaten Malinau in East Kalimantan. Those who moved to Sipitang and Kebupaten Malinau call themselves Lun Dayeh; and those that moved to Lawas and Limbang call themselves Lun Bawang. The first translation of a number of the gospels of the New Testament in the 1940s for use by the Lun Dayeh and Lun Bawang people was in the Kemaluh dialect rather than that of the Lun Dayeh or Lun Bawang.

The name of another subgroup of Lun Dayeh, the Brian, possibly came from a combination of the words *ba’* (referring to wet rice fields) and *Rian*, the name of a small stream that flows into the Lutut, a tributary of the Kerayan, where the local people established wet rice fields. The Curator of the Sarawak Museum, Eric Mjoberg, mentioned meeting a “Pah Brian man” in the Kelabit Plateau in the 1920s.8

*Sa’ban.* The Sa’ban are a small group residing at the extreme headwaters of the Baram, Sarawak, and in the past the Bahau, East Kalimantan. Noakes lists them as a subdivision of the Kelabit.9 Harrisson often makes reference to “Saban-Kelabit territory.”10 Apparently there are intermarriages and mixed villages in the north part of the Kelabit territory.11 The “southern Kelabit” dialect that Southwell mentioned may be that of the Sa’ban.12 The Sa’ban also consider themselves related to the Murik, a Kenyah subgroup, but on the basis of language, the Sa’ban are closer to the Kelabit and Lun Bawang. For instance, 75 per cent of the Sa’ban language consists of cognates with Lun Bawang, 73 per cent with Kelabit, while only 40 per cent with Kenyah.13

Related groups outside the highlands. The Tabun and Tring are linguistically related to the peoples who speak Apad Wat. Harrisson considers the Tabun a subgroup of Kelabit.14 They originally lived on the Tabun, a tributary of the Limbang, but later moved down to the Madalam on the lower Limbang. They form one longhouse at Long Madalam, populated mainly by Iban families. Other Tabun moved to the nearby Lun Bawang longhouses at Liang Datu and Lubuk Aur. The Tring are related to the Tabun. They used to live on the upper Limbang and Madihit, but moved to the Tutoh in the Baram District. When the Berawan moved to the Tutoh, they established a large longhouse with the Tring at Long Terawan. There is a group known as Hwang Triing on the lower Mahakam, but it is not certain if they are related to the Tring of Long Terawan.15

Cultural and social practices the people of the Kerayan-Kelabit Highlands share in common:

- They all speak mutually intelligible dialects, all classified as variants of Apad Wat.
- They share similar agricultural practices, especially a system of irrigated wet-rice cultivation known as *lati’ ba’*. Also, buffaloes are important for rice cultivation, transportation, meat, and for sale.
- They share a similar salt-making technology using local salt springs (*main*).

---

11 Ibid.
• In the past, they practiced secondary burial (they are part of what Peter Metcalf has called the “nulang arc”).¹⁶
• In the past, well-to-do families competed for prestige and status by sponsoring lavish feasts (irau).
• In the past, they practiced similar rituals, e.g. nawar ada’ (spirit chants at the commencement of harvest), nui ulung (raising the ritual pole), ngabang pagkung (clearing mountain ridges).
• The presence of megaliths, created in the past, extended throughout the area.
• Today, all have adopted Christianity.

Thus, the Lun Dayeh, Kelabit, Lun Bawang, and Sa’ben are one people sharing the same language, general cultural traits, and beliefs. Recognizing these common traits they have come together to form the forum, FORMADAT.

The History of FORMADAT

On 19 September 2003, a Workshop on Sustainable Agricultural Development in the Highlands of Borneo was held in Ba Kelalan, Sarawak. The workshop, organized and sponsored by the Sarawak Development Institute, brought together representatives of the highland communities of Long Pasia, Long Semado, Ba’ Kelalan, Bario, and Krayan as well as government representatives from Sarawak and East Kalimantan, and experts and researchers on issues pertaining to sustainable farming. All participants came with a similar aspiration: to search for a way to intensify economic development of the area without compromising the quality of the social and natural environment.

At this workshop, participants discussed the possibility of establishing a forum to forge stronger links among communities on both sides of the border to create common strategies beneficial to all. The idea came from the late Dr. Judson Sakai Tagal, a minister in the State government of Sarawak, and also an exceptional individual from the highlands. Foremost on his mind was what had happened in Kundasang, Sabah, where the environment had been destroyed by overdevelopment. The landscape of the highlands is fragile and development plans need to be appropriately designed to avoid damage.

The following year, in October 2004, the same group met at Long Bawan, Krayan, East Kalimantan to establish a trans-boundary organization, the Forum Mesyarakat Adat Dataran Tinggi Borneo, or FORMADAT (Forum of the People of the Highlands of Borneo). In 2005, FORMADAT met again in Long Bawan. In 2006 the group met at Bario, Sarawak and in 2007 at Long Layu, in the subdistrict of Krayan Selatan.

Vision for the Highlands: Sustainable development and protection of the environment

The need for development is a reality in the highlands. Easier access, more reliable transportation, faster communication, and market links are essential, but remain

---

a big challenge.

In November 2006, the members of FORMADAT met in Bario and drafted their vision and mission statements. The latter outlines the essence of the FORMADAT mandate to foster unity among the indigenous peoples of the highlands of Sarawak, Sabah, and Kalimantan, to create and promote sustainable development in the highlands. More specifically, the statement also mentions that support of local people for conservation initiatives would be contingent on their involvement as partners in planning, managing, and implementing such initiatives.

We, the Indigenous People of the Highlands in the Heart of Borneo who share a common heritage and a common land as the Lun Dayeh, Kelabit, Lun Bawang, and Sa’ban people, come together in the Alliance of the Indigenous People of the Highlands of Borneo (FORMADAT) to: increase awareness and understanding about the highland communities, build local capacity, and encourage sustainable development in the Heart of Borneo.

Key aspects of the FORMADAT vision of sustainable development and conservation include:

a) Social
   • Maintenance of cultural and family bonds that have made the people of the highlands one people sharing a common land; strengthen our traditions and adat ways

As one of the leaders, Pak Lewi Gala, put it:

We have no other homeland, save the patar dita’ [highland plateau] Borneo where we have lived for generations. We are of one root, one ancestor, one tradition. We are divided into two groups, a boundary drawn between us. We in the Krayan; you in Sarawak and Sabah. Even though a boundary is drawn between us, we are of one root, one ancestor, one culture, one belief.

b) Economic
   • To search for sustainable economic alternatives such as organic agriculture and value-added products; community-based ecotourism etc.
   • To initiate open access and to establish fair trading networks

c) Environment
   • To minimize negative impacts on the environment
   • To encourage conservation that involves local people in all its aspects
   • To protect water sources, cultural and historical sites, river banks and forest areas for ecotourism development

The establishment of FORMADAT not only contributes a plan for action, charting a challenging yet sound direction for sustainable development in the highlands, it also creates a new political and social entity based locally in the highlands, but also reaching out to national and regional levels through social and extended family networks. FORMADAT strengthens the collective voice of the communities of the highlands, and reinforces the notion that their future is one of common interest and rooted in a common past.
In the words of one of the leaders,

The FORMADAT that we established in 2004 is a forum in our own backyard to serve the interests of all of us who live along the border of the Borneo highlands. This is a good forum: it unites us in one fellowship, one thought, one journey, to look after our homeland, our rights. This place we call *patar dita* Borneo is the only homeland we the Lundayeh, Kelabit, Lun Bawang and Sa’ban have. Before, we went our separate way: we in the Krayan kept to ourselves; you in Sarawak kept to yourself; those in Sabah kept to themselves. We did not have an association to bring us together in one thought, one strength to defend our land, our environment, our culture, our economic interest.

The forum is also important for trying to build and strengthen a common vision internally to the Forum itself, the communities of the highlands, as well as those of their kin who have moved down to the towns and cities in the coast. Only a strong vision can provide the basis for coordinated and effective action for a sustainable future in the highlands.

A young man in Ba’ Kelalan taking his buffalo to the grazing ground. In the background are the wet rice fields. (Photo: Jayl Langub)
NOTES ON AN IBAN COMMUNITY IN
DANAU SENTARUM NATIONAL PARK
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Between 15 August and 25 August 2008, I visited the Iban community of Sungai Pelaik located on the periphery of Danau Sentarum National Park in West Kalimantan. This was a preliminary field survey for thesis research on rural electrification and development in Indonesia. What follows is a brief sketch of the community.

I traveled from the coastal city of Pontianak via overnight bus to Sintang, about twelve hours up the Kapuas River. In Sintang, I stopped by the Danau Sentarum National Park headquarters to gain entry permits for the park and discuss the research with park staff. The following morning I took a local minibus (opelat) for seven hours to Semitau located near Danau Sentarum National Park. From Semitau, I entered the park by speedboat, passing through numerous Melayu villages and eventually arrived at the Sungai Pelaik longhouse.

The Iban longhouse is located on the Pelaik River just upstream from the lakes region, about two hours by speedboat from the Melayu village of Laboyan, depending on water levels. Sungai Pelaik is a 9-door longhouse with 43 residents, and one family of four lives in a neighboring house. The longhouse was constructed at the current location in 2002 and is situated just a few kilometers from the old site. The residents use Iban adat and the annual gawai is still practiced every July. Most commonly the men of Sungai Pelaik leave the village upon marriage and join the household of the wife and the opposite is true of the women, but one of the male residents had stayed after marrying and his wife moved to Pelaik. At the time of my visit, ten residents were working wage labor jobs in Malaysia and a few of the children were in Lanjak for school. It is common in this community for whole families to travel to Sarawak for work and oftentimes families will move there for up to ten months.

I arrived during the dry season and fishing was the main activity for the residents throughout my stay. Villagers wove fishing traps (bubu ikan), fishing nets (nyala ikan), baskets for carrying the fish, and carved pronged fishing spears (jerpak ikan). Throughout the days, both men and women traveled downstream to the lake to check the fish traps or take dugout canoes out for net fishing, and then returned back to the longhouse to clean their catch for drying or to prepare for dinner. To take advantage of the low waters during the dry season, the community partnered with the Melayu village of Nanga Telatap for jakat. Jakat may be described as the following activity. In the early morning, the villagers of Pelaik loaded fishing nets, food, and drinks into their dugouts and paddled out into the lake to meet the residents of Nanga Telatap. All the canoes then
moved into a circle formation around a large pole sticking 15 feet out of the water. After the dugouts were in place and the signal had been given, cheers quickly erupted and everyone paddled their canoe as quickly as possible towards the center pole and then cast their nets into the water. The movement of the watercrafts and pounding of the paddles into the lake caused the fish to flood toward the pole in the middle and all the fisher folks’ nets emerged out of the water full of fish. After a few more casts, the nets were emptied into the hull of the dugouts and then the boats slowly dispersed. The Pelaik longhouse residents made their way back to the longhouse and the freshly caught fish were sorted by species and then cleaned for drying and cooking. Delicious fish was then grilled over a small fire in celebration of the catch and eaten with rice and a homemade sambal.

Craftwork was another of the main activities within the longhouse and women wove traditional textiles such as pua’ and tanun, fabrics used in ceremonies or for clothing. Plant material was collected from the surrounding forest to make dyes for the cotton string that would soon be woven on the wooden loom. Rattan was also harvested and used to make floor mats and baskets for use in the longhouse. Some of the floor mats, weavings, and baskets were being sold to buyers in West Kalimantan and Java for supplemental income.

Due to the remote location of the Sungai Pelaik longhouse, electricity from a central grid network is inaccessible. Two of the apartments own diesel generators and produce electricity in the evenings for a few hours when fuel is available. In 2007, a micro-hydro electricity scheme was built on the Pelaik River just upstream from the longhouse. The project produced electricity for all the apartments of the longhouse for nearly a year. However, at the time of this study, the small-scale hydro project had encountered a few problems and the two operators were working to get the system running again. The operators were two residents of the longhouse who were trained to maintain the system throughout the development process. The project was facilitated by the Center for International Forestry Research and Riak Bumi, a Pontianak-based nongovernmental organization. CIFOR initiated an adaptive collaborative management approach and both organizations continue to work with the local people to repair the project. The alternative energy system provided a renewable electricity source for the community and allowed every apartment within the longhouse access to electricity. At the time of writing the micro-hydro system is producing electricity for the longhouse again and it appears the dry season and the low water levels may have affected the project.

Note: This preliminary survey was funded by a Luce Grant from the Center for International Studies at Ohio University.
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The 2007 University of the Philippines Anthropology Field School was undertaken in Kota Belud, Sabah, Malaysia from April 23 to May 20. The field research team consisted of three anthropology professors and 17 undergraduate anthropology students from the University of the Philippines.

Various anthropological research methods were employed during the Field School, including key informant interviews, key word listing, kinship charting, material culture inventory, and participant observation. Researches were undertaken in two general areas, namely: social anthropology and ethnoarchaeology.

This paper discusses the initial findings of the anthropological research conducted in Kota Belud. Eight research papers in social anthropology and seven papers in ethnoarchaeology were generated by the Field School. The topics covered by these research papers included cultural heritage, customary law, death rituals, emotions, fishing technology, gender politics, gong music, heirloom items, the market system, marriage customs, and weaving, among others. Aside from these research papers, several essays and articles on various topics were also produced by the students in the areas of anthropological linguistics, ethnohistory, folklore, informant biography, and material culture studies.

The UP Anthropology Field School

The U.P. Anthropology Field School (UPAFS) is an annual undertaking of the Department of Anthropology of the University of the Philippines. The UPAFS aims to train senior Bachelor of Arts students in Anthropology on field techniques in archaeology, social anthropology, and physical anthropology. The first UPAFS was undertaken in 1970 in the Tabon Caves of Palawan, Philippines. Since then, the UPAFS has been conducted in several parts of the Philippines, including the Batanes Islands, Benguet, Bohol Island, Cagayan Valley, Capul Island, Cavite Province, Davao, Kalinga, Nueva Ecija, Pangasinan, Rizal, Sorsogon, and Metro Manila.

1 This Brief Communication summarizes a longer paper presented at the Ninth Biennial BRC Conference in Kota Kinabalu, July, 2008.
Research Area

In 2007, the UPAFS was, for the first time, held outside of the Philippines. Three communities in Kota Belud were selected to represent three distinct ethnolinguistic groups found in the District, namely the:

- Bajau of Kampung Taun Gusi;
- Dusun Tobilung of Kampung Dudar Laut; and
- Iranun of Kampung Pantai Emas.

The three communities were selected based on the recommendations of the Mahkamah Anak Negeri, the Native Court of Kota Belud, which acted as host institution. The Native Chiefs of the three villages acted as the principal contacts of the researchers. It must be noted that the Bajau and the Iranun may also be found in the Philippines, most specifically on Mindanao Island and in the Sulu Archipelago.

Research Team

The field research team consisted of three professors and seventeen students. Prof. Nestor Castro, Ph.D. was designated by UP as the Field School Coordinator. He was supported by Prof. Soledad Natalia Dalisay, Ph.D., a nutritional anthropologist, and Prof. Carlos Tatel, M.A., a historical archaeologist.

The students were all in their senior year in the B.A. Anthropology program of UP Diliman. They were enrolled in two courses offered during the Summer Semester of Academic Year 2006-07, namely Anthropology 195 (Field Methods in Archaeology) and Anthropology 196 (Field Methods in Social Anthropology). Of the 17 students, 13 are female while four are male. The four male students were assigned to Kampung Pantai Emas while the female students were further divided into two groups – one for Kampung Dudar Laut and one for Kampung Taun Gusi.

Research Funding

Partial funding for the UP Anthropology Field School was acquired from the Southeast Asian Gender and Sexuality Research Project of The Ford Foundation and from the University of the Philippines Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Development. The funds solicited from these agencies covered the board and lodging expenses incurred by the faculty and students during the entire Field School. Other expenses, such as plane fare, were shouldered by the students themselves or their individual sponsors.

Research Methodology

The principal methods of research employed during the field school were:

1. Key informant interviews; and
2. Participant observation of family and village life.

The key informants came from various sectors of the three kampungs, including the Ketua Anak Negeri (native chiefs), school teachers, religious leaders, health practitioners, farmers, fishermen, market vendors, musicians, craft specialists (e.g. weavers, knife makers), Filipino migrants, and women and youth leaders.
Whenever possible, the students, especially those assigned to Kampung Dudar Laut and Kampung Taun Gusi, stayed with their host families in order to experience kampung life. They also participated in community activities, such as weddings, burial rituals, kenduri (thanksgiving) feasts, fishing activities, native court hearings, the tamu sabtu (weekend market), the pesta kaamatan (harvest festival), and a host of other occasions.

**Preparatory Activities**

Prior to going to the field, faculty and students reviewed the available literature on Sabah, in general, and on the Bajau, Dusun, and Iranun, in particular. They also took a crash course in Bahasa Melayu under the auspices of Prof. Emilita Cruz of the UP Department of Linguistics.

A pre-field visit to Kota Kinabalu and Kota Belud was conducted in the middle of February 2007 by Prof. Nestor Castro and one of the students, Mr. Jessie Varquez. They made courtesy visits to the Muzium Sabah, the Roman Catholic Diocese of Kota Kinabalu, the Institut Linguistik SIL, the Mahkamah Anak Negeri of Sabah, and the School of Social Sciences of Universiti Malaysia Sabah.

The entire research team arrived in Kota Kinabalu, Sabah on April 23, 2007 and stayed in the Stella Maris Parish Church in Tanjung Aru for a few days before proceeding to Kota Belud. The group visited the Muzium Sabah to look into its ethnographic, archaeological, and historical collections. In Kota Belud, the researchers set up their quarters at the SIU Motel in Kuala Abai. They were welcomed there by the Ketua Daerah (district chief) of the Tempasuk area of Kota Belud and the Ketua Anak Negeri (native chiefs) covering the three research areas. They gave the UPAFS delegation a briefing about the research areas. After the briefing session, the students divided themselves into three groups and immediately planned their research schedule together with the native chiefs.

**Field Exercises**

As a field methods class, the students were exposed to various exercises aimed at improving their research skills. These exercises were as follows:

A. In Social Anthropology:
   1. Life story writing
   2. Kinship charting
   3. Key word listing
   4. Linguistic domain analysis

B. In Ethnoarchaeology:
   1. Ethnohistorical research
   2. Heirloom biography
   3. Material culture inventory
   4. Craft standardization analysis

The outputs of the students’ exercises were short essays and mini-researches on the following topics:
A. **Life Stories**

1. *Bitiara a Uyag-uyag*: A Story of Love of an Iranun Woman (by Denzil Buenaventura);
2. Life Story: Faizal bin Sagindek, Kampung Dudar (by Ma. Carmela Protacio);
3. Life Story: Francis bin Sungkin (by Marian Rica Lodripas);
4. Life Story: Hardi Sagindek, Kampung Dudar (by Ma. Gabriela Aparentado);
5. Malaysian Iranun Cikgu: Story of Ha-Fizah (by Rodelio Gagwis);
6. Seeking Refuge: Life Story of Incik Kahar bin Sinalindo (by Alvin Tengonciang);
7. Tearful Past, Joyful Present: The Life of a Filipino Migrant in Kota Belud, Sabah, Malaysia (by Jessie Varquez); and

B. **Research Papers on Bahasa Melayu Gender and Sexuality Keywords:**

1. A Preliminary Study on Gender and Gender Categories: Sabah, Malaysia (by Louielyn Joy Morada and Frances Keith Cortes);
2. Appeal and Attraction in Sabah, Malaysia (by Irene Justine Agbayani and Sachi Maio Panganiban);
3. Bahasa Melayu Keywords on Courtship and Sexual Strategies (by Fatima Gay Molina and Kimmy Rose Roan);
4. *Kebiasaan* (by Alvin Tengonciang and Rodelio Gagwis);
5. Keywords: Sex Organs and Genitalia in Sabah, Malaysia (by Diana Josefa San Jose and Cyril Santos);
6. Lust and Desire Domain (by Jessie Varquez and Denzil Buenaventura);
7. Melayu Keywords Related to Sexuality (by Marian Rica Lodripas and Ma. Carmela Aparentado); and
8. Sexuality Keywords in Partnering and Relationships (by Maria Gabriela Aparentado, Abigail Faith Luistro, and Roxanne Gale Villaflor).

C. **Linguistic Domain Analyses**

1. Domain Analysis: Emotions (by Fatima Gay Molina and Kimmy Rose Roan);
2. Domain Analysis: Market (by Marian Rica Lodripas and Frances Keith Cortes); and

D. **Essays on Ethnohistory**

1. Ethnohistory of Sungai Dudar (by Marian Rica Lodripas and Frances Keith Cortes);
2. Ethnohistory: The Pulutan River (by Maria Carmela Aparentado, Abigail Faith Luistro, and Roxanne Gale Villaflor);
3. Ethnohistory: The Story Behind the Betel Nut (by Fatima Gay Molina and
Kimmy Rose Roan);
4. Gold and Sand (by Alvin Tengonciang and Rodelio Gagwis); and
5. Shared Culture, Defined Boundaries: The Ethnohistory of Kampung Kota Peladok (by Jessie Varquez and Denzil Buenaventura).

E. Essays on Material Culture Studies
2. A Survey of Material Culture: Kampung Pantai Emas, An Iranun Village (by Alvin Tengonciang, Rodelio Gagwis, Jessie Varquez, and Denzil Buenaventura);

F. Essays on Heirloom Biography
1. A Mother’s Memento (by Abigail Faith Luistro);
2. Family Treasures: Heirloom Biography of a Celapa and Kili (by Cyril Santos);
3. Gong (by Alvin Tengonciang);
4. Moligun: The Basin of Our Fathers (by Maria Gabriela Aparentado);
5. Pusaka (by Rodelio Gagwis);
6. Pusaka: Sumbul and Gadur (by Roxanne Gale Villaflor);
7. Tana’ Near the Sungai: The Pemasoko of Dingga Binti Tangoh of Kg. Sembirai (by Jessie Varquez);
8. Tempayan, Talak at Kasarian: Isang Pagsilip sa Papel ng Kababaihan sa Lipunang Dusun [Tempayan, Talak and Gender: A Glimpse on the Role of Women in Dusun Society] (by Marian Rica Lodripas);
9. Tinukol: Unraveling the Journey Around the Seas of Southeast Asia (by Fatima Gay Molina); and
10. The Tandas (by Kimmy Rose Roan).

All of the outputs of these exercises served as inputs into the final research papers that were expected from the students by the end of the summer class.

Final Research Outputs
The final research outputs were eight research papers in social anthropology and seven papers in ethnoarchaeology. The titles of these papers are as follows:

A. Research Papers in Social Anthropology
1. Bajau Marriage Customs: Kota Belud, Sabah (by Frances Keith Cortes and
Louielyn Joy Morada);
2. Death Beliefs, Rituals, and Practices Among the Bajaus of Kota Belud, Sabah (by Diana Josefa San Jose and Cyril Santos);
3. Mahkamah Anak Negeri and Adat: The Use of Native Court and Customary Laws in Conflict Resolution (by Jessie Varquez and Denzil Buenaventura);
4. Notes on the Female as a Primary Icon in the Dusun Tobilung Agricultural Society of Kampung Dudar Laut (by Maria Gabriela Aparentado, Abigail Faith Luistro, and Roxanne Gale Villaflor);
5. Panginseda’: Beyond the Iranun Sea Hunter’s Line (by Alvin Tengonciang and Rodelio Gagwis);
6. The Bajau Beat: Bertitik (by Irene Justine Agbayani and Sachi Maio Panganiban);
7. The Gender Politics of Dusun Tebilung Traditional Marriage Ceremony (by Fatima Gay Molina and Kimmy Rose Roan); and

B. Research Papers in Ethnoarchaeology

1. Notes on the Gongs of Sabah (by Maria Gabriela Aparentado, Abigail Faith Luistro, and Roxanne Gale Villaflor);
2. The Bajau Bertitik Instruments as Heirlooms (by Irene Justine Agbayani and Sachi Maio Panganiban);
3. The Saging and the Barait: An Ethnoarchaeological Study of the Dusun-Tobilong Handicrafts (by Marian Rica Lodripas and Ma. Carmela Protacio);
4. Threads and Ethnicity (by Alvin Tengonciang and Rodelio Gagwis);
5. One Bajau Graveyard: Identification of a Bajau Burial Site (by Diana Josefa San Jose and Cyril Santos);
6. The Craft of Parang Making in Kota Belud, Sabah (by Louielyn Joy Morada and Frances Keith Cortes); and

Museum Exhibit

The results of the Sabah field school were shared with the academic community through a museum exhibit at the U.P. Anthropology Museum entitled “Fieldwork across the Border: The Sabah Experience.” The exhibit formally opened in November 9, 2007 and is still on public display at the U.P. Anthropology Museum in Palma Hall of U.P. Diliman. The exhibit is a project of the Museology students of U.P. Diliman under the auspices of Prof. Maria Mangahas. Among the exhibits on display in the museum are the maps and photographs of Kota Belud, a showcase on the kenduri, the tamu (market), a Bajau wedding, Iranun handicrafts, and field materials actually used by the students
while in Sabah.

Last July 4, 2008, OKK Tuan Haji Masrin Haji Hassin, the Ketua Daerah of Tempasuk, together with 14 native chiefs and staff members of the Mahkamah Anak Negeri of Kota Belud visited the U.P. Anthropology Museum to view the exhibit on Sabah. During that visit, they presented the U.P. Anthropology Department a token of their gratitude for undertaking the Anthropology Field School in Kota Belud.

**Plans for Future Studies**

The U.P. Department of Anthropology plans to pursue in the future more in-depth studies of the cultures of Kota Belud. It is hoped that these future research endeavors will be implemented in collaboration with local research institutions in Sabah, such as the Universiti Malaysia Sabah, the Institut Linguistik SIL, and the Muzium Sabah. Cross-cultural research on the Philippines and Sabah should also be undertaken, such as ethnological studies comparing the Iranun of Mindanao with those of Sabah.
“UMS rocks!” was how Professor Vinson Sutlive Jr., Executive Director of the Borneo Research Council, summed up his feelings in his concluding remarks at the Closing Ceremony of the recent Borneo Research Council 9th Biennial International Conference that was jointly organized by the Kadazandusun Chair and the School of Social Sciences of Universiti Malaysia Sabah.

The Conference ran from 29 to 31 July 2008 and attracted around 250 participants including researchers, academicians, civil servants, students, members of NGOs and the general public. International participants came from as far as Australia, New Zealand, USA, Finland, France, South Africa, Japan, the Philippines, Singapore, Indonesia, as well as from Brunei and throughout Malaysia.

The Opening Ceremony was officiated by Datuk Raymond Tan Shu Kiah, Deputy Chief Minister of Sabah and Minister for Social Development and Consumer Affairs. Professor Dr. Rosnah Ismail, newly appointed Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research and Innovation) delivered a speech on behalf of the UMS Vice Chancellor, Prof. Datuk Dr. Kamaruzaman Hj. Ampon, while the Keynote Address was delivered by Professor Dr. Vinson Sutlive Jr., Executive Director of BRC. The Conference consisted of 32 parallel sessions and 8 Special Panel Sessions on a variety of research topics concerning Borneo under the theme of Borneo on the Move: Continuity and Change.

A series of special events reflecting the Conference theme was also held in conjunction with the Conference.

The first Special Public Lecture of the Kadazandusun Chair was presented by Associate Professor Dr. Jacqueline Pugh-Kitingan on 23 July. Dr. Jacqueline is the holder of the Chair and was the Chairman of the Main Organizing Committee for BRC 2008. A Photographic Competition and Exhibition was held from 28 July to 1 August. Organized by Mr. Suhaimi Salleh of the Communications Program in the School of Social Sciences, it attracted local, regional and international entries. This is the first time that such an event has been held in conjunction with a BRC conference.

Another first for this conference was the exhibition of the exceptional Kinabalu Series by world renowned Sabahan artist Miss Yee I-Lann. This trilogy of works that coincidentally aptly reflects the theme Borneo on the Move: Continuity and Change, has been exhibited in Melbourne, Amsterdam, Bangkok, New York and other world art centers, but was shown in Sabah for the first time at BRC 2008. The trilogy can still be viewed in the UMS Library.

After the Conference, interested participants were taken on a trip to the Sabah Museum complex. They were escorted by Miss Pauline Yong, Secretary for BRC 2008 Main Organizing Committee, who is completing her Masters degree in the Sociology of Tourism.

Participants thoroughly enjoyed the conference and their stay in Sabah, and are eagerly looking forward to the 2010 Borneo Research Council Conference that will be organized by Curtin University in Miri, Sarawak.

(Associate Professor Dr. Jacqueline Pugh-Kitigan, School of Social Sciences, UMS)
Supplemental Grants for the Collection of Oral Literature

The unique oral literatures of indigenous peoples are rapidly being lost through the death of the traditional practitioners and through the formal schooling of the next generation. The Program for Oral Literature of the Firebird Foundation has initiated a project to fund the collection of this body of rapidly disappearing literature.

This literature may consist of ritual texts, curative chants, epic poems, musical genres, folk tales, songs, myths, legends, historical accounts, life history narratives, word games, and so on.

Supplemental funds are available to anthropologists and linguists going into the field to support a collection of oral literature.

Grants of up to $10,000 will be made to applicants for purchasing recording equipment and covering the expenses of collecting this material. Applicants are encouraged, where possible, to foster the development of local teams of collectors to continue the work of recording these materials. Transcriptions of the recordings are encouraged.

Applicants should submit a letter of not more than three pages describing the importance of collecting oral literature among the society in which they will be working, the methods to be used, the goals to be achieved, the urgency of the project, and include a budget.

Copies of the recordings, transcriptions, and other documents are to be deposited and archived at the Program for Oral Literature along with a final report including a list of expenses incurred.

Applications should be sent to: Firebird Foundation for Anthropological Research at the following email address - Firebird@tdstelme.net

Conference: South and Southeast Asian Association for the study of culture and religion, 3-6 June 2009

“Water in South and Southeast Asia: interaction of culture and religion,” at Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia – Sponsored by the International Association for the History of Religions, with Institut Seni Indonesia and Universitas Hindu Indonesia – Some suggested themes for papers (condensed here): Rivers; Ports & people; Religion; Water & symbolism; Culture & religions along rivers; Religious trends & patterns of life; Maritime routes & religious links; Indonesian waters and the Malay world…syncretism & society; Islam, trade & traditions; Hinduism & Buddhism; Christianity; Art & religion; Religious languages; Pilgrimage; Diaspora; Culture & religion in the region – Also special symposia related to religion & science, the role of women in religions.

See www.sseasr.org, secretariat@sseasr.org & thirdSSEASR@hotmail.com
Social Sciences in Asia Monograph Series, Brill

Contributions are invited to the interdisciplinary Social Sciences in Asia Monograph Series. The Series publishes original materials and the revised editions of special issues of the *Asian Journal of Social Sciences*. The Series welcomes submissions from specialists on any facet of Asia, including sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, economists, geographers, and historians.

The Social Sciences in Asia Monograph Series was the initiative of the editorial team of the *Asian Journal of Social Sciences* at the Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore. It was initially the Asian Social Science Series, with Brill and the Times Academic Press co-publishing the first three volumes between 2001 and 2002. In 2003, the Series became Social Sciences in Asia and henceforth carries only the Brill imprint.

For all queries, please contact Kiat-Jin Lee, the Editorial Assistant, at soclkj@nus.edu.sg. For inquiries about the aptness of your virtually completed manuscript, please send a book proposal and a 150-word abstract.

The Tenth Biennial International Conference of the Borneo Research Council

Curtin University of Technology Campus
Miri, Sarawak, Malaysia  19-21 July 2010

The Tenth Biennial International Conference of the Borneo Research Council will be held 19-21 July, 2010, in Miri, Sarawak, under the sponsorship of Curtin University of Technology Sarawak. The conference theme is “Borneo: Continuity, Change, and Preservation” and the venue will be the Curtin University campus in Miri. A formal announcement, program and registration information, as well as a call for papers and panel sessions, will appear shortly. For updated information please contact Bibi Aminah, the conference coordinator:

Bibi Aminah binti Abdul Ghani
Senior Lecturer, School of Foundation and Continuing Studies
Curtin University of Technology Sarawak
CDT 250, 98009 Miri
Tel: 085-443939  Mobile: +6016-8716676
email : bibi.aminah@curtin.edu.my or bibi.aminah@gmail.com.

For further information or to purchase copies of the book please write to Dr. Georg Martin Baier, W.-Fr.-Laurweg 6, 72379 Hechingen/Germany, or contact him by email <mh.baier@t-online.de>
BRUNEI NEWS

Dr. Annabel Teh Gallop (British Library) presented a paper entitled “The art of the Qur’an in Brunei” at a Seminar Sejarah Brunei (Brunei History Seminar) organized by the Brunei History Centre, BSB, on 3-5 December 2007 (ASEASUK News, No 43, Spring 2008:5).

In 2004 A.N. Muellner and C.M. Pannell conducted botanical fieldwork in Brunei, mainly collecting species of Aglaia. Their work was part of a two-year EU project which was undertaken in collaboration with the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, and involved collaboration with the Forestry Department of the Ministry of Industry and Primary Resources in Brunei, the University of Brunei Darussalam, and the Kuala Belalong Field Studies Centre. Although the number of endemic species in most parts of the total range of Aglaia is comparatively low, they found that Borneo harbors a comparatively high proportion: 10% (6/60) are endemic (Flora Malesiana Bulletin, 14(3), p. 139, 2008).

The Kuala Belalong Field Studies Centre (KBRSC). The forests of Brunei are among the richest in the world and represent the greatest living natural resource of the country. About 80% of Brunei is under forest cover, the majority of which is undisturbed primary forest. Although the forest cover is, by percentage, the highest among Southeast Asian countries, the small area of Brunei makes it necessary to maintain a great proportion of these conserved forests within its borders to ensure continuing ecological benefits for its population. This has resulted in a broad interest of local researchers and decision makers in rainforest ecology, but also in a range of national and international research programs carried out in Brunei since the 1960s.

The Kuala Belalong Field Studies Centre is located in the largest national forest reserve (Batu Apoi Forest Reserve), which covers 38% of the easternmost district, Temburong. The KBRSC was built in 1990 and served as a logistic base for the Brunei Rainforest Project 1991-1992. This exemplary project was a collaborative effort between the University of Brunei Darussalam and the Royal Geographic Society as well as a number of associated institutions in the United Kingdom (including the Royal Society, the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, the Natural History Museum, London, and the National Environmental Research Council) and in other nations. Professionals and students of geographical and biological disciplines were brought together to describe climate, regional geology, landform processes and soils, and the complexity of tropical rainforest biodiversity and ecology (Flora Malesiana Bulletin, 14(3), p. 139, 2008).

KALIMANTAN NEWS


**SABAH NEWS**


The residence of the late Tun Mustapha Datu Harun in Kota Kinabalu was auctioned for more than one million ringgit in June 2007. Pictures of world leaders (Queen Elizabeth II, Muhammad Ali) he met before his death in January 1995 still adorn the walls of the house. The house was auctioned to settle Mustapha’s unpaid loans amounting to twenty million ringgit. The water supply to the house had been disconnected and an eviction notice was issued to Datu Kamaruddin and his family who had been staying in the house. Datu Kamaruddin is one of Tun Mustapha’s sons. The new owner, a Chinese businessman, plans to turn it into a hotel-restaurant (*Borneo Bulletin* online, M.25.6.2007).

Supt. Mohd Zain Yaacob, who joined the Sabah Police Force in 1975 and rose to become the Deputy Chief of Police in Sandakan by March 2005, died in office at the age of fifty-three following a heart attack on Monday 1 October 2007. He was survived by his widow and their son (*BBO* Tu.2.10.2007).

In August 2007 Royal Brunei Airlines sponsored two Sabahans to fly to Sydney for the Sandakan Memorial Dedication at Burwood Park in Sydney. Saumin Gadalip @ Kaingal, 82, of Kampong Koparingan, and Domina OKK Akoi, 87, of Paginatan Ranau were to be guests at the dedication for their role in saving Australian prisoners of war
during the Sandakan-Ranau death march of 1945. Kaingal and Domina would also be attending the official opening of the Borneo Exhibition on “Sandakan: The Story That Must Be Told” at the Burwood City Council Building. As a girl, Domina fed five prisoners of war; while Kaingal was among a group of Kadazan farmers who helped three of the six POWs survive after they had escaped from the Ranau camp (BBO Th.2.8.2007).

Mrs. Jean Knappett, 80, daughter of the US novelist, Agnes Keith, paid a visit to Sabah in August 2007 at the invitation of the state government. Accompanied by her daughter, Leslie Sellers, Mrs. Knappett visited the restored bungalow in Ernestina Road (now Jalan Istana) where Mrs. Keith had lived with her husband, Harry, before the Second World War. Born in Sandakan, Mrs. Knappett had lived there with her parents until she went overseas to further her studies. This was her first return trip to her birthplace since then. She was “really happy about the restoration efforts at the Kinabatangan river to enable the elephants to move easily” (BBO M.20.8.2007).

Contrary to the statement by Horton (BRB 2007:260), Wanderer in Malaysian Borneo is not “the last we are going to get in this line.” The BRB is assured by Mr. Gallop that at least one further volume is in press. A couple of other errors crept into the review during the editorial process: for “Pengemba” read “Pengembara”; and for “accommodations” read “accommodation.” That same “maverick spell-checker” detected by the Kershaws, perhaps (cf. BRB 2007:92-3)?

SARAWAK NEWS

Professor Michael Leigh, the former Director of the Institute of East Asian Studies, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS), now serves as the Director of the Aceh Research Training Institute (ARTI) in Banda Aceh, Indonesia. The Institute was established in direct response to the devastation caused by the Indian Ocean tsunami of December 2004 and focuses upon building research capacity and providing critical skills for a new generation of Acehnese. The work of the Institute is supported by four Indonesian and eight Australian universities and by grants from both the Myer Foundation and the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID). Professor Leigh is also Professor of Contemporary Asia at the University of Melbourne and President of the Asian Studies Association of Australia.

Dr. Daniel Chew was appointed to the post of Sino-Borneo Chair in the Institute of East Asian Studies, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, on October 15 2008. Dr. Chew is currently working on a study of the social identities of the Chinese in Sarawak since the end of World War Two.

In early August 2008 Professor V.T. King (University of Leeds) delivered the keynote address on the theme of “Borneo studies: perspectives from a jobbing social scientist” at the International Conference of the Malaysian Social Science Association, Kuching. He also attended a conference dinner presided over by the Chief Minister of Sarawak for an official book launching and endorsed a recent publication issued by the Association and edited by Professor Wan Zawawi Ibrahim entitled Representation, Identity, and Multiculturalism in Sarawak (ASEASUK News, No 44, Autumn 2008:7).

Dr. R. Kiew and Ms. J. Sang continue their work on limestone begonias in Sarawak. Nine new species were described, making a total of 15 begonias now known from the

**Dr. S.Y. Wong** (UNIMAS) has been collecting specimens, especially Araceae, Homalomenaceae and Schismatoglottideae, in the limestone of Southwest Sarawak, the Song-Kanowit system, the Bintulu shales, and Mulu National Park. Additionally, successful trips have been made to target specific species at the Gunung Gading N.P., Bako N.P., and the sandstone isolates in Sri Aman.

**Dr. F.S.P. Ng** as botanical advisor to the Sarawak Biodiversity Council (SBC) designed an ethnobotanic garden in Kuching to showcase plants of cultural importance to Sarawak. The garden is open to the public and will eventually contain about 500 species of plants used in food, medicine, arts, crafts, and magic.

**Alastair Morrison** is convalescing in the assisted care section of his residence, St. Andrew Village, Canberra, after having suffered a broken leg in early December. Your Editor and Alastair’s many Sarawak and Australian friends wish him a speedy recovery.

**Pulong Tau National Park** (PTNP). The Pulong Tau (which means ‘Our Forest’ in the Penan language) National Park is located between the Limbang and Marudi Districts in northeastern Sarawak. It occupies an area of 59,817 hectares of the Kelabit Highlands and was gazetted in March 2005. The PTNP-Kayan Mentarang National Park (Kalimantan) is the second Transboundary Biodiversity Conservation Project between the Malaysian (Sarawak) and Indonesian Government under the auspices of the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO). The first was the Lanjak-Entimau Wildlife Sanctuary (Sarawak)-Bentuang-Karimun National Park (Kalimantan). Between 1967 and 2005 a number of botanists have carried out botanical explorations and collections, particularly in Mt. Murud and its vicinity in the north, and the Pa Menalio and Tama Abu Range in the southeast, resulting in a collection of about 1,873 botanical specimens currently preserved at SAR and a few other herbaria.

A recent botanical expedition, jointly organized by the Tree Flora of Sabah and Sarawak Project, the Forest Department and Forestry Corporation of Sarawak, and the ITTO-FD Sarawak Project was held between May 6-20, 2007, in the Sg. Talon-Bukit Tenidan area in the west-central part of the park. Eleven botanists took part. A total of 1,109 collection numbers representing about 198 genera in 99 families of flowering plants, gymnosperms, and ferns and allies were collected. The specimens are currently being processed, curated, and identified to the species level at SAR (*Flora Malesiana Bulletin*, 14(3): 139-40, 2008).

**Dayak Bidayuh National Association (DBNA)/UNESCO Multilingual Education Pilot Project.** A multilingual education seminar was organized by the Bidayuh language development project committee on 30-31 January 2006 at the DBNA headquarters in Kuching. This seminar cum workshop discussed the importance of multilingual education and the possibilities of implementing such a program among the Bidayuh community. The presenters were Jim Smith and Karla Smith, SIL Asia area consultants for multilingual projects. The participants expressed their interest in the program. Between February and May 2006, Jim Smith contacted and communicated with the UNESCO office in Bangkok. Through these contacts Jim Smith learned that UNESCO wished to initiate a multilingual education pilot project in Malaysia and this information was conveyed to Mr. Ik Pahon ak. Joyik, the DBNA President.
Upon the advice of the President, the DBNA education subcommittee met on 16 June 2006 to discuss the offer by UNESCO to start a MLE pilot project among the Bidayuh. Jim Smith, Guillermo Ruben Vega, Marilina Vega, and Dr. Grace Tan from SIL International were present and gave a detailed explanation of the project, its objectives and activities. After lengthy deliberations, the committee decided in favor of the project. Jonas Noeb, Robert Sulis, Anna Dreba, Josak ak. Siam and the SIL officers were assigned to draft a proposal paper which was later sent to UNESCO Bangkok on 22 July 2006 for consideration and approval. Josak ak. Siam was officially appointed to be the coordinator for the project. On June 6, 2006, a faxed Activity-Financing Contract amounting to USD 10,000 was received from Mr. Sheldon Shaeffer, UNESCO Bangkok director. A briefing was held by Jim Smith on 7 July 2006 for the DBNA education subcommittee and on 30 July a special gathering of Bidayuh politicians, leaders and individuals was held at the Holiday Inn Kuching to officially launch the Bidayuh language book entitled *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*. It was during this occasion that Jim Smith, on behalf of UNESCO, announced the DBNA/UNESCO MLE Pilot Project. The contract was signed and sent back to UNESCO Bangkok on 2 August 2006.

Since then, through 2008, a number of activities have been undertaken: village playschool committees have been created; road shows have been organized and have traveled from district to district to explain the nature and benefits of mother tongue education, to plan play- and pre-schools, and to recruit parents to help at schools and other persons, particularly pensioners, to help develop and produce classroom materials. Ongoing writing, editing, and illustrating work groups have been established to prepare play- and pre-school curriculum, listening stories, songs, teaching aids, spelling guides, and primers and stories in the five main Bidayuh dialect groups. The materials prepared so far include MLE playschool booklets (Resources for Administrators and Resources for Teachers and Administrations), pre-school primers, and a Bau picture dictionary (*Buk Bang Sinda Bigambar*). For further information, contact Jonas Noeb, Persatuan Kebangsaan Dayak Bidayuh, Dayak Bidayuh National Association, Lot 964, Block 10, Jalan Kumpang, off Jalan Ong Tiang Swee, P.O. Box 614, 93712 Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia.

In June 2008 reconstruction work on a Chinese temple in Bintulu was nearing completion. The temple, built fifty years ago, was suffering from a leaking roof. The committee decided to demolish the original building. A fund of three million ringgit to reconstruct the temple was raised from businessmen and other donors (*Borneo Bulletin* online, Saturday 19 July 2008).

**Datuk Wan Othman bin Wan Hamid Al-Khatib**, the composer of *Ibu Pertiwi Ku*, which was adopted as Sarawak’s national anthem in 1988, died aged seventy-seven in hospital on 25 March 2008. He also composed other popular songs. Sometime Treasurer of Kuching Municipal Council; survived by nine children and thirty-three grandchildren (*New Straits Times* online, 26 March 2008).
BOOK REVIEWS


For many of us who were graduate students in anthropology in the 1960s, Hal Conklin was a figure of inspiration. Conklin’s study of Hanunóo agriculture and his essays on ethnobiology were, for some of us, a revelation, disclosing the unexpected riches that can come from painstaking observation, careful attention to everyday speech, and to the categories by which people relate to, and act upon, their social and material surroundings.

The last four decades have not been kind to Conklin’s legacy. None of his essays are currently in print and only Hanunóo Agriculture, published a half century ago, is still available, in a reprint edition. The editors, Joel Kuipers and Ray McDermott, both former students of Conklin, and the Yale University Southeast Asian Studies Program are therefore to be commended for republishing here a significant body of Conklin’s writing, for the time has certainly come to reintroduce graduate students to the work of this remarkable anthropologist.

*Fine Description* is arranged in eight topical sections, each containing from one to five essays, or extracts from longer works, preceded in each case by a brief editorial introduction written by a different author. In order of appearance, these are: 1) “Fieldwork” (Clifford Geertz), 2) “Ethnographic Knowledge” (Myrdene Anderson), 3) “Lexicographical Approach” (Harold Scheffler), 4) “Kinds of Color” (Charles O. Frake), 5) “The World of Plants” (Eugene Hunn), 6) “Modes of Communication” (Dell Hymes), 7) “Orientation” (Nicole Revel), and 8) “Agriculture” (Michael Dove). A ninth section, “The Early Years,” reprints from the *Annual Review of Anthropology* Conklin’s autobiographical reminiscences, “Language, culture, and environment: My early years,” and concludes with a CV and complete bibliography of Conklin’s writings.

Frake in his foreword, Kuipers and McDermott in their introduction, and most of the other contributors attempt with varying degrees of success to identify Conklin’s place in anthropology. At the outset Frake acknowledges the difficulty. Conklin was never a polemicist, his essays rarely confront theoretical debates directly, and, by and large, his ethnography, as Frake puts it, lacks “narrative style.” In the end, Frake settles on “fine description” (p. xiv) as the defining characteristic of Conklin’s work. The editors are more explicit and in their introduction they briefly sketch what they see as Conklin’s principal contributions to the eight topical areas into which the volume is divided. “Ethnographers,” they argue, “have higher responsibilities than arguing with each other,” chief among them being a responsibility “to represent ways of life with full attention to the ingenuity and complexity they demand” (p. 3). Beyond question, Conklin took this latter responsibility seriously. As a consequence, his work includes a large body of meticulous ethnography describing first the Hanunóo, with whom he began fieldwork in 1946, at the age of 20, and later, beginning in 1962, the Ifugao, since then continuing intermittent work among both groups for more than four decades. This long
duration has allowed Conklin to document long-term cultural processes in a way that is almost unique in anthropology. Michael Dove, writing later on, cites two examples. One is Conklin’s classic account of the long-term succession of vegetation among the Hanunóo that effectively demonstrates that the spread of grassland is not, by any means, a necessary outcome of swidden cultivation. The second is his study of continuity and change in Ifugao patterns of settlement and rice-field terracing, making innovative use of long-term mapping and photography.

A key to Conklin’s success as an ethnographer, the editors argue, is that he starts where those he has studied start. He begins with the things people do, the kinds of activities they engage in, the kinds of social persona they assume in the process, and the everyday speech they use while doing these things, including the words they use to describe what they do and who they are. Much of the history of anthropology is marked by a curious mistrust of what our informants say. This is attributable, perhaps, to the discipline’s early empiricist roots. However, as Dell Hymes writes in his introductory contribution, this comparative neglect of everyday speech cuts anthropologists off from an important source of understanding, as speech is clearly a major dimension of how people interact and communicate with one another and with their surroundings. Here, as he observes, Conklin has always been a notable exception. Given the importance of speech, descriptions of what people do with language, Hymes argues, should be commonplace in ethnography. Instead, their comparative neglect has led to the development in recent years of a specialized subdiscipline: the ethnography of speaking. By contrast, for Conklin, such descriptions have always occupied a major place in his ethnographic writings.

Another useful point made by Kuipers and McDermott is that much of Conklin’s writing is concerned with questions about “kinds of” things—for example, kinds of colors, kinds of plants, or kinds of kin (p. 7). It must be acknowledged that this gives Conklin’s writings at times a resemblance to early nineteenth-century natural history in its seeming preoccupation with taxonomic pigeonholing. This resemblance is strongest in section three, “Lexicographical Approach,” the one direction taken by Conklin’s work that seems to have run its course. What redeems Conklin’s writings, however, and gives them their significance, is the fact that the systematics he explores are those of his informants, not his own, and that his main concern is with the intervening variables of language and culture.

Section One, “Ethnography,” contains, for this reviewer, one of the genuine ethnographic gems of Conklin’s writings: “Maling, a Hanunóo girl from the Philippines.” Not only does this essay present us with a moving account of the experiences of a young Hanunóo girl upon the death of her younger brother, but, at the same time, it also presents a brilliant exposition describing how, in a small community, adult and childhood worlds intersect. Clearly, Conklin can, when he chooses to, write compelling narrative ethnography. The essay only makes one wish that he had chosen to do more of it. Writing more generally about the ways in which people make use of language, Conklin distinguishes between what he calls “aesthetically appealing” and “culturally valid statements.” While his anthropological writings tend to focus on the latter, some of his most insightful works concern the former, notably cultural and linguistic aesthetics,
in, for example, his essays that appear later in the volume on word play and speech disguise. Something of these interests is also reflected in his Maling essay. Thus, Maling, in characteristic Hanunóo fashion, expresses her experiences in poetic form by inventing a series of extemporaneous verses addressed to her younger bother, one of which Conklin beautifully translates into English rhyming verse, the structure of which nicely replicates that of its Hanunóo original.

Section Two, “Ethnographic Analysis,” reprints two of Conklin’s essays on ethnographic method, Section Three deals, as already noted, with Conklin’s writings on folk taxonomies, (including kinship, “Ethnogenealogical Method”), and Section Four, “Kinds of Color,” reprints Conklin’s classic essay, “Hanunóo Color Categories,” and a more general review, “Color Classification,” written in response to Berlin and Kay’s Basic Color Terms.

Conklin’s concern with color categories reflects a more general interest in questions of perceptual categorization, an interest that runs throughout much of his work. In this case, every normal human being has the ability to distinguish between virtually millions of potentially distinguishable “colors,” but the manner in which different languages classify these possibilities differs greatly. Charles Frake, in his excellent introduction, points up a number of conceptual principles which Conklin introduced that have greatly influenced later writing. First is the basic notion that terminological systems, such as those of color, have a taxonomic structure comprised of levels of contrast that must be understood before the semantic range of individual terms can be grasped. A second useful notion is that of “focal value,” which refers, in the case of color terms, to a color within the range of a category that speakers consider to be the ideal or best exemplar of that color. Another is surface texture, for example, bright, shiny, or dull. Thus, for the Hanunóo, Conklin relates these notions to cultural and aesthetic preferences. For example, in textiles, clothing, beads, and basketry, the Hanunóo favor sharpness of contrast and intensity, hence, as focal values, “black,” “red,” and “white,” whereas “green” is the dominant color of the surrounding natural world and so is avoided in the production of cultural artifacts. As Frake writes, Conklin’s essay on Hanunóo color terms remains unique even now in the way it explores the association of color classification with cultural uses of color, both technical and symbolic (p. 158).

Section Five, “The World of Plants,” is deservedly the longest in the volume, containing, as it does, two major ethnographic works, excerpts from Conklin’s 1954 Ph.D. dissertation, “The Relations of Hanunóo Culture to the Plant World,” and “Betel Chewing among the Hanunóo.” The former, as Eugene Hunn aptly observes, set the standard for all subsequent botanical ethnography and remains the “world standard” in terms of its ethnographic detail and the number of native taxa recognized by the Hanunóo: 1,625—with no less than 93% of all local plant species having some recognized utility (pp. 192-93). The Hanunóo are clearly fascinated by plants and Conklin describes them as combining the interests of both systematic and economic botanists. Conklin’s long essay on betel chewing is to many ethnographers what “Citizen Kane” is to film buffs. In it, among other things, Conklin shows how the practice of betel chewing is present at the center of virtually every social encounter and act of communication that the Hanunóo engage in with one another, whether as kin, lovers, friends, enemies, or strangers. Beyond
the human realm, no offering to the dead or to supernaturals is complete without a betel quid.

Conklin’s ethnobotanical writings contain, in a highly condensed form, a virtually complete ethnography of the Hanunóo. And, in its details, a fascinating ethnography it is. To give a personal example, Conklin in a footnote in his dissertation (here, in this volume, p. 247, fn. 15) writes: “The Hanunóo do not recognize ‘spirit intrusion’ or ‘possession’ as a possible cause of sickness.” As it happens, I did fieldwork in two communities that differ diametrically on just this point. First, for the Bajau Laut (or Sama Dilaut, as they call themselves), possession by spirits, including spirits of the dead, is seen as a regularly occurring phenomenon, and mediumship, involving communication with spirits that characteristically enter through the head and speak using as their vehicle the body of a medium, figure prominently in village curing rituals (see Sather, The Bajau Laut, 1997). By contrast, the Saribas Iban, like the Hanunóo, have no culturally constructed notion of possession or spirit intrusion (see Sather, Seeds of Play, Words of Power, 2001). Spirits, to be sure, are described as a common cause of illness, but Saribas shamans and others explicitly deny that spirits enter, or take possession of a victim’s body as a way of causing sickness. No doubt, the contrast was heightened for me by having worked first with the Bajau Laut, but Conklin’s ethnographic observation was also important. This is particularly so, as possession states and ideas of spirit intrusion loom so large in the anthropological literature. Their absence, moreover, can be easily overlooked, for, as any fieldworker knows, it is much more difficult to establish the absence of something than it is its presence.

Section Six, “Modes of Communication,” is, again fittingly, the next longest and contains five essays. Two of these, on speech disguise and linguistic play, have already been mentioned. Two more deal with Philippine systems of writing. Here, one of the attractions that drew Conklin to work with the Hanunóo in the first place was the presence in this small tribal community in upland Mindoro of an Indic script, or, more precisely, a syllabary, in which a majority of both men and women were literate. Characteristically, Conklin sought to understand Hanunóo literacy by examining how the Hanunóo themselves use it. The results, even now, challenge most commonly-held assumptions about orality and literacy, for the Hanunóo lack everything commonly associated with the latter: e.g., schools, scriptural religion, government, or markets. What they write is chiefly poetry, much of it for purposes of courtship. They acquire a facility for reading and writing with relative ease, without formal instruction, and maintain a high level of literacy in order to master, as Conklin puts it, “a repertoire of as many traditional love songs as possible” (p. 342). This, he tells us, is sufficient motivation to keep most Hanunóo actively reading and writing. While this Hanunóo syllabary has survived to the present, at the time of Spanish contact a number of related scripts were in widespread use among coastal peoples throughout the Philippines, northward to Luzon, only to disappear soon afterwards, eclipsed, beginning in the 15th century, by the spread of European- and Arabic-based writing systems. In the second essay Conklin describes the Doctrina Christiana, the earliest book published in the Philippines (1593) that was printed in both Spanish and Tagalog, the latter in an Indic script which Conklin analyzes, drawing attention to its historical and linguistic significance, pointing up as it does the
once widespread use of Indic-based writing systems far beyond Mainland Southeast Asia, Java, and Bali. Section Six concludes with another ethnographic gem, “Hanunóo Music from the Philippines.” Conklin’s program notes to an Ethnic Folkways recording of Hanunóo music. Despite their brevity, these notes not only describe musical genres and instruments, but give us one of the best accounts we have of the cultural contexts of music-making in a Southeast Asian society.

In Section Seven, Nicole Revel performs a valuable service by translating a brief address that Conklin delivered upon receiving the 1983 Fyssen Foundation Prize in Paris. This address, “Orientation, wind, and rice,” is not only a useful contribution to the growing literature on spatial orientations among Austronesian-speakers, but also an excellent object lesson in how to do ethnography, specifically, in this case, how to move from individual terms of direction, which, in themselves, may appear confusing, to the underlying logic of an orientation system. It is also a tribute, by a master ethnographer, to those “indispensable coinvestigators, our informants” (p. 399).

The final section of essays, “Agriculture,” contains two papers already mentioned, “Shifting cultivation and the succession to grassland” and “Ethnographic research in Ifugao.” To younger anthropologists, it is probably inconceivable how important studies of agricultural systems were in anthropology forty years ago, particularly for anthropologists working in Southeast Asia. Today, the topic rarely appears on the program of anthropological meetings. It was once very different, owing in no small measure to Conklin’s meticulous study of Hanunóo swidden cultivation. As Michael Dove observes in his useful editorial introduction, “Conklin’s analysis of Hanunóo rice yields—and his findings that these yields matched those from the best irrigated systems, and that rice was only a small part of the total product—ran counter to accepted wisdom in development, then as now” (p. 413). In his studies of indigenous agriculture and ecological relations, Conklin, as Dove notes, has always been “a particularist,” who “takes an interest in the same subjects that interest his informants” (p. 420). Following from this, Dove bravely seeks to link Conklin with what he describes as “anti-essentialist” trends in current anthropology. The result is far from convincing. “High-modernist thinking,” as Dove terms it, continues to prevail outside of anthropology, while within it ecological studies have now moved, if anything, in the opposite direction, away from the concerns with culture and language that are at the heart of Conklin’s work. Renato Rosaldo (in his essay, “Subjectivity in Social Analysis,” from Culture and Truth, 1993) comes closer to the mark, I think, in arguing that Conklin, by making the concerns of his informants his own, and by addressing them in the “scrupulously dispassionate” language of science, succeeds far better than most in producing a critical ethnography that attempts, in the best tradition of anthropology, “to give voice to the voiceless” (p. 186).

(Clifford Sather, Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Helsinki)
The contributions to this monograph, *State, Communities and Forests in Contemporary Borneo*, lay to rest the image of an idyllic tropical paradise, the focus of the tourist trade; and instead describe the dramatic changes to the landscape and its “ownership.” The changes to the landscape and the loss of one of the most biologically diverse jungles in the world are not only of concern to the communities within Borneo or a small number of interested individuals, but to the world at large. The November 2008 issue of *National Geographic*, “Borneo’s Moment of Truth,” brought this issue to its readers.

The voices and opinions of the communities are heard through the researchers and academicians who contributed to this monograph. Each chapter, with the exception of the introductory and concluding chapters, is written to stand alone and as a result, background information in which the writer explains how the past has led to present is repeated. This can be considered a strength or a weakness. As a strength, it allows the reader to focus selectively on a single topic of interest and still obtain the relevant background. The monograph deals with the entire island of Borneo. Each chapter, describing a diverse physical, cultural and administrative landscape, is like a snapshot telling a bit of the story.

The communities within or near the jungles have interacted with the environment and as the changing land use patterns emerge due to logging concessions, oil palm plantations, government administration, and national, state or provincial legislation, they continue to interact with and respond to changes that originate from outside their communities. Even 10 years ago the island of Borneo was considered to be the “last frontier,” but since the mid1990s the establishment of, and conversion of land to, oil palm plantations has increased dramatically; Kalimantan 1056%; Sabah 310%; Sarawak 748%. This has been expedited by the states increasing their control.

The institutions and legal framework that deal with land issues are discussed in the second part of this monograph. Fadzilah Majid Cooke in “Expanding State Spaces Using ‘Idle’ Native Customary Land in Sarawak” and Ramy Bulan in “Native Customary Land: The Trust as a Device for Land Development in Sarawak” trace the development of Sarawak’s present-day Land Code under which the local communities no longer have the legal right to create Native Customary Land according to the rules of their respective adat. The misconception, according to Majid Cooke, that unoccupied land is idle or wasted, has resulted in development legislation that supports the conversion of large tracts of land to oil palm plantations under *Konsep Baru* (‘New Concept’) as a means to bring economic development to rural communities. Bulan discusses the concept of fiduciary trust with reference to *Konsep Baru*. Under this concept indigenous landowners enter into Joint Venture Companies, with the government institutions acting as a trustee for the landowner to develop large areas into oil palm plantations. Trusts are flexible and easy to set up, but should protect the interests of the more vulnerable party, the beneficiaries (native landowners). The trustee, the government, is obligated to protect
the rights of the beneficiary and not to derive benefits from the trust. Concerns, however, have arisen about administration and development procedures, the certification of rights to the land but not landownership, and lack of transparency concerning the boundaries of NCR land.

The situation of the Kutai Barat District in East Kalimantan, Indonesia, contrasts sharply with the situation in Sarawak as resources have come under district control. Ann Casson, in “Decentralisation, forests and estate crops in Kutai Barat District, East Kalimantan,” discusses the effects in one district, Kutai Barat, of the policy of decentralization which was established in 1999. In that year the Indonesian legislature passed the new Basic Forestry Law which recognized the rights of use of land by indigenous communities. Local communities have responded to state control over land issues and the state’s limited recognition of traditional rights to the land under *adat* and to cultural and social changes. These are discussed predominantly using case studies. For example, in Indonesia many rural communities, including 130 in West Kalimantan, have used community maps to facilitate recognition of their rights (as recognized in the 1999 Basic Forestry Law) to use the land, to identify traditional areas of use and boundaries between communities, and to facilitate decision-making and conflict resolution.

National borders are clearly demarcated, but the communities living on the border may have ambiguous feeling towards their country, perhaps claiming the rights and privileges of both countries. The Iban people who live along the upper reaches of the Kapuas River near Danau Sentarum National Park at the border between Sarawak and West Kalimantan have responded to regional autonomy by harvesting the timber with permits issued at the district level. The communities, prior to reformation, had received few economic benefits from timber harvesting and with local control they now receive some.

A belief that the customary traditions and norms of indigenous communities can be used to enhance conservation of biologically important areas was part of a dramatic shift in thinking in the 1980s that included the idea that welfare of the people was inseparable from conservation issues, and Cristina Eghenter explores this in “Social, environmental and legal dimensions of *adat* as an instrument of conservation in East Kalimantan” with reference to communities residing in and around the Kayan Mentarang National Park. The Kayan Mentarang Park has a gazetted area of 1.4 million hectares and lies near the Sarawak border. The indigenous people living in and around the park are historically entwined with it. The communities, though not all of the same ethnic group, all have traditional laws that manage the forest in ways that preserve it for the future. For example, hunting species considered locally rare, such as the rhinoceros which is highly endangered, and the straw-headed bulbul (*Pycnonotus zeylanicus*) which has only recently become a trade species, is banned. The ban on harvesting trees in the headwaters is another example of how the traditional laws encourage conservation.

and Long Mio. The land traditionally claimed as *kampung* (village) land had been given as a concession to Sabah Forest Industries. The communities wanted to have secure tenure over the land they claimed and WWF-Malaysia aimed to conserve the biologically important area which is mainly composed of old-growth montane forest. The collaboration proved to be more complex than what had been originally anticipated and conflicts concerning resource ownership arose at the village level. Several reasons were responsible for this, including that the communities in the past would have been more widely dispersed and that the traditional resource management techniques were falling by the wayside as individuals wanted to get the greatest benefit for themselves rather than for the community. In fact, one individual who requested the assistance of WWF-Malaysia to help conserve ancestral land later sold the rights to harvest the timber. Collaboration requires that the objectives of all parties are clear and the objective of conserving biodiversity is balanced with the economic development of the people in the area.

As commented on in the final chapter, “Concluding remarks on the future of natural resource management in Borneo,” the majority of the writers include recommendations for future action. The monograph expresses the writers’ interpretations of the views of the rural indigenous communities and provides solutions that support the theory that resource conservation depends on the commitment of the communities. It supports the idea that communities need to be involved and that they have aspirations. I definitely do not need to be convinced that communities must have a voice in the way the land in their areas is used; but my question is, would others who, for example, support the establishment of very large oil palm plantations, be convinced, and more importantly, in my view, would this book even reach this audience?

(MM Ann Armstrong, Lodge International School, Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia)


Although published in 2004, this book remains informative and relevant today. It was commissioned by, and published in association with, the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD). With the aid of 11 authors, it manages to present specialized information on a variety of topics. Malaysia, now virtually deforested, was once the leading supplier of logs to the world. How this came about, and its relationship to the blanket of export-crop plantations in Malaysia, is the subject of this book.

The book outlines the use and abuse of the Malaysian forest from pre-colonial days up to the present. The first major attack on the forest involved rubber plantations. After Malaysian independence in 1957, government land-development schemes led the second attack, switching gradually from rubber to oil palm. Commercial logging was the necessary, and lucrative, precursor to the bulldozing step in plantation development. As forests disappeared in West Malaysia by the 1980s, the Borneo states of Sabah
and Sarawak suffered severe pressure on their forests for “schemes.” Not that all this
commercial agriculture has made Malaysia self-sufficient in food production. Rather,
commercial agriculture has largely meant the production of a dinner menu of rubber,
palm oil, pepper, and cocoa—not a healthy diet.

After a chapter introducing Malaysia to the overseas reader, the book explores
the private and governmental factors in export agriculture and in the fate of the forests.
Subsequent chapters consider the diverse situations found in West Malaysia, Sabah, and
Sarawak. The penultimate chapter takes up the business side of agriculture and logging,
often in repetitive fashion.

As is well known, most Malaysian timber has gone to Japan, with little (sawn)
timber going to Europe, “probably due to successful pressure by anti-tropical timber
logging lobbies” (p. 187). Yet Malaysian state leaders, who have almost unlimited control
over land and forests, continue, via their families and friends, to enjoy corrupt gains from
forest destruction. For example, the Sarawak Chief Minister was reported to control
about RM 10 billion worth of logging concessions by 1991. His sister was reportedly a
partner in a 800,000 hectare timber empire at the same time (p. 211). Pahang state also
has been reported to indulge in sweetheart timber deals between the sultan’s family there
and local crony. The list goes on.

The economic analysis of logging, in Malaysia and elsewhere, sketches a
complicated tangle of push-and-pull forces but offers no realistic solution to sustaining
Malaysia’s remnant rain forest. In particular, an analysis of the International Tropical
Timber Organization (ITTO), headquartered in Japan, reveals the “forked-tongue” effort
of this body that gives lip service to sustainable logging.

Conclusions are then drawn in the book about governmental impacts on
agriculture and on forests. Why, for instance, has Malaysia continued to push land-
settlement schemes when they have lost favor worldwide? Malaysian officials perhaps
were unaware of international criticisms. They have evidently assumed, quite erroneously,
that success in (a few) schemes in West Malaysia would automatically be repeated in
East Malaysia. Also, government agencies have not worked in a coordinated, let alone
fair, manner and some agencies have heard the siren call of privatizing the schemes,
especially in Sarawak. Although not a central topic of this book, it is also pertinent that
local communities have rarely if ever had an equal say in grandiose plans for land use
in Malaysia.

This land-use policy “has given little protection to the forest or…the
environment” (p. 223). Rhetoric about conservation aside, Malaysia has, in fact, run
amok on its national heritage and, even worse, cheated future generations of Malaysians
of a healthy and lasting environment. While Malaysia might learn some day that good
policies without implementation and enforcement are ludicrous, little forest land exists
in Malaysia that has not been overrun by loggers, plantations, mega-dams, golf courses,
resorts, or urban sprawl. But logging takes first prize in forest destruction and capital
accumulation by a select few. Cash-crop plantations are just the icing on the cake.

As a footnote to this review, the bibliography does not include many publications
cited in the text. I looked in vain for “Lim Teck Ghee 1976,” “Nicholas 1999,” and even
“Jomo 1997.”

(A. Baer, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-2914, USA)
This reviewer has often lamented the absence of a wider theoretical relevance in much of the scholarly literature on Borneo. *From Rebellion to Riots* is not such a book. Jamie Davidson’s study of the roots of contemporary violence in West Kalimantan skillfully interrogates recent theoretical perspectives on collective violence against a detailed presentation of the turbulent history of the province. Based on numerous interviews during fieldwork in West Kalimantan, the study of Dutch colonial records, Indonesian army internal documents and published accounts, Davidson provides a detailed historical exegesis of ethnic violence involving the Dayak, Madurese, Chinese, and Malay communities.

Davidson sets out to explain the origins of a series of ethnic riots that occurred from 1967 to 2001. He examines the particular forms of violence in each case and the changes in these over time. He situates these events within the coercive effects of state-building under Soeharto’s New Order and compares them to patterns of violence in other areas of Indonesia. In the introduction he reviews some of the competing explanations of violence in Indonesia. These fall roughly into three varieties. The first focuses on the economic and political inequities generated by the institutional makeup of the New Order regime and the attempts by marginal or excluded groups to struggle for more inclusion in the post-Soeharto state (Davidson calls this the “post-Soeharto scramble approach”). The second seeks to identify historical continuities through examining the effects of colonial rule. The third falls in-between these two and has as its focus the role of certain elements in the army. Looking at a range of violent incidents across the archipelago, he concludes that none of the above adequately explains the variation in Indonesia’s collective strife. He argues that a careful analysis of the West Kalimantan case will shed light on this. Moreover, West Kalimantan is intrinsically interesting. First, because of the scale of the violence, since the death toll from 1967-2002 approximated those of the Moslem-Hindu riots of India during a longer period (1950-1995). Second, this province is larger and more ethnically diverse than many countries which figure in the literature on communal violence. Last, and central to his argument, no other province in Indonesia has such a long history of the politicization of ethnicity.

Davidson identifies and discusses key periods in West Kalimantan history which reveal complex connections between episodes of ethnic violence amid altered political, social and institutional contexts. In so doing he provides a rich contextual and historical perspective on two forms of violence which have occurred in West Kalimantan: counterinsurgency warfare and ethnic riots. He begins with the Dutch-*konsi* warfare in the late 19th century and continues through the Japanese occupation and its aftermath, *konfrontasi*, the communist-inspired rebellion and 1967 ethnic cleansing of the Chinese, and finally the Dayak-Madurese bloodshed of 1997, the Malay-Madurese riots of 1999, and the Pontianak riots of 2000 and 2001. Central to the earlier events was the practice by the Dutch and later the Indonesian army to mobilize Dayak groups as allies. The colonial and later the Soeharto regime’s construction of Dayak as an ethnic identifier foreshadowed the identity politics which come to the fore in the turbulent competitions
which characterized the reformasi and post-reformasi periods.

This work is a remarkable example of scholarship and Davidson’s nuanced reading of these events is an invaluable contribution to our understanding of the recent history of West Kalimantan, identity politics and post-reformasi institutionalization. It is also important reading for scholars of communal violence in general. His comparisons within Indonesia and further abroad suggest many refinements in our understanding of how, where, and by whom violence is initiated and the conditions which influence its recurrence and longevity.

Further studies are suggested from what Davidson has laid out. In his discussion about “elite vs. mass” engines of riots, it is clear that local sensibilities ultimately lie at the heart of the issue, therefore continuing study of how these events are culturally historicized is essential. While works like this—by their methodology—privilege outsider models, local constructions continue to be developed (see Michael Dove, 2006, “‘New Barbarism’ or old agency among the Dayak: Reflections on post-Soeharto ethnic violence.” Social Analysis 50(1):192-202). Regarding the comparisons of violence within Indonesia, another variable that should be further explored is the role the international border played. West Kalimantan’s border with Sarawak figured prominently in the Dutch intervention in local affairs, the Indonesians’ experience with konfrontasi and the communist insurgency. Dayak communities that straddled this border (especially the Iban) were most affected by these “bordered” circumstances. In the current climate of hukum adat claims in the identity politics of the island, those peoples whose communities are found on both sides of the Indonesian-Malaysian border of the island increasingly participate in each other’s adat seminars and community forums.

Davidson has done a superb job in disentangling a complex series of events and providing a useful way of framing them. This is a valuable book and most highly recommended for scholars of Borneo, modern Indonesia and those seeking to understand the complex factors which underlie ethnic violence.

(Jay Crain, Professor of Anthropology and Asian Studies, California State University Sacramento, Sacramento, CA 95819, USA)


Pitcher plants are of particular interest to naturalists as they have evolved a complex container-like structure (pitcher) on the ends of their leaves to capture insects which they then digest to aid in their growth and reproduction. This carnivorous habit allows them to maintain a foothold in the nutrient-starved environments in which they are usually found. Clarke and Lee’s book on this fascinating plant family maintains the high standards set by Natural History Publications of Kota Kinabalu and by Charles Clarke who has published at least four other books on this topic.

Sarawak is of particular interest for fans of pitcher plants, or Nepenthes, as it holds 25 of the 85 or more currently described species. The reasons for this high diversity include the wide range of geologies and topographies found in this Malaysian state, coupled with the naturally high diversity of such tropical regions.
This small book starts with a short introduction on these unusual plants including details on their morphology, prey capture mechanisms, and distribution. Then follows a short description of the habitats in Borneo where they are found which are often more open and nutrient-poor habitats such as kerangas forest, montane forest, or forest over limestone.

The bulk of the book describes each of the 25 species found in Sarawak with wonderful color photographs (mostly by Ch’ien Lee) found liberally throughout, on almost every page. These photos are of excellent quality and focus on particular aspects of the plants’ morphology illustrating the wide variation in pitcher forms. This variation is hypothesized to be partly due to the peculiarities in the diets of some of these plants, for example Nepenthes ampullaria has squat, ground-dwelling pitchers with no lid as it is thought they actually obtain nutrients from leaf litter falling into them. In contrast, Nepenthes lowii has very broad and open upper pitchers which are thought to be helpful in catching falling bird and small mammal droppings.

The book is in a handy “pocket book” format which will assist amateurs, and indeed, interested professionals, identify pitcher plants on their visits to the natural parks and other pristine environments that remain in Borneo. Perhaps the only shortcoming is the small map of Borneo at the front which could have been improved by focusing on Sarawak only and noting areas where one might fruitfully search for Nepenthes in the state.

I highly recommend this book for all those with even a passing interest in pitcher plants as it is informative, excellently presented and costs only US$7!

(Francis Brearley, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK, <f.q.brearley@mmu.ac.uk>)


Over 20 years ago, in my first semester of graduate school, I wrote a research paper for Jim Eder’s Ecological Anthropology seminar looking at the variable success of some Southeast Asian societies to negotiate a place for themselves in the global economy (before “globalization” became one of the latest buzz words); my prime example of “success” was the Iban, and I worked in rather vague notions about their participation in the market economy as being central. I got decent marks for the paper, but never felt fully satisfied with it (and for good reason). Thankfully, Rob Cramb’s new book, Land and Longhouse, takes on the issue so much more thoroughly and insightfully, showing how the critical factors of Iban (specifically Saribas) culture, social organization, and historical circumstance come together to create the dynamic, vibrant, and resilient society that many of us have come to know, love, and respect. Cramb’s book is where important research activities come together – long-term field research, attention to often excruciating detail (e.g., rice and pepper yields: what the late Bob Netting referred to as “counting potatoes”), and a solid sense of what’s important in the big picture – to give us a valuable, reliable, and ultimately useful account of Saribas Iban livelihood.
Cramb sums up the essential variables thus: (1) “the resilience and cohesiveness of the longhouse community during the process of agrarian transformation;” (2) “distinctive social and cultural norms and attitudes … forged in the context of migration, warfare, and pioneering agriculture;” (3) “a timely redirection of energies” allowing localized economic development; and (4) the Brooke practice of indirect rule which encouraged engagement with both market and government on local terms (pp. 379-380). But this work is not merely a specific case study, as Cramb places his research within the broader context of agrarian transformation of the uplands throughout Southeast Asia. He shows that the Saribas case is part of a larger set of tensions and trends involving the increased diversification of livelihoods as households and communities have responded through different configurations of intensification, commercialization, and migration in the face of population growth, the expansion of the global market economy, and increased government involvement in local affairs. In the conclusion, he compares the strategies of other folks in Sumatra, Central Sulawesi, and southern Mindanao (the latter based on Cramb’s more recent research), highlighting these tensions among state, community, and market.

Land and Longhouse is divided up into three main parts that serve to flesh out these issues: (1) the ethnographic and historical background of the Iban generally, and the pre-colonial agrarian system of the Saribas specifically; (2) transformation of that system under Brooke rule, as the White Rajahs extended their influence over Iban political activities and livelihoods through land laws and the use of courts to settle land disputes; and (3) the rapid transformation after World War II under the transitional colonial government and post-independence Malaysia. Throughout the account, Cramb compares the variation seen in his long-term focus on two communities in the Spak area of the upper Saribas – Batu Lintang and Nanga Tapih. The contrasts that emerge in these two cases, as their residents respond to the changes facing them, provide an invaluable guide to the variation we have all too long neglected in our studies of Iban culture and society.

For this brief review, rather than provide a chapter-by-chapter summary of the book, I will make a few specific comments instead, as I can provide no higher endorsement than “Read the book!” First off, within the context of traditional swidden practices, Cramb shows convincingly the speculative nature of Freeman’s conclusions on Iban pioneering swiddening, particularly his harsh judgment of krukoh farming (i.e., farming a plot for two seasons in succession). Despite there being little to no evidence of permanent damage to forest regeneration under supposedly “prodigal” farming practices (p. 93), the label has stuck over the decades, and this on the opinion of one social anthropologist and carried forth by others, some with an outright agenda to end sustainable swiddening.

One strength (among many) of the book, alongside the explicit historization, is Cramb’s use of colonial era court records; these flesh out the general historical trends and provide concrete evidence of profound livelihood changes. This is especially important regarding Iban land rights as communities and households have sought to navigate through redefinitions of their territorial rights, the persistent issue of migration as a solution
to land shortage, and how all that has affected those rights. This in particular reveals
the overwhelming importance Iban have placed on maintaining the integrity of their
traditional *menoa*, and the relative success they have had in doing so despite continual
government and market pressures to end such supposedly “outmoded” institutions.

Cramb provides a rather disconcerting account of the expansion of the “clientist”
state that Sarawak has become through its incorporation into Malaysia, with its strong
emphasis on “economic development” as manipulated by networks of patrons, clients,
and their own clients further down the line. The high-modernist state comes to most
Iban with the face of government programs and departments such as SALCRA (Sarawak
Land Consolidation and Rehabilitation Authority); the Iban whom I study across the
border in West Kalimantan seem downright neglected (indeed they have been until
recently) compared to the government initiatives and the like aimed at their cousins in
Sarawak. Cramb spells out the incredibly profound implications these programs have
had on Saribas livelihoods – the expansion of commercial crops, participation in private
plantation schemes, titling and leasing of household land, and most fundamentally the
decline and eventual abandonment of swidden rice farming. Yet despite all this bad news,
Cramb makes sure to emphasize that the Iban have not been passive victims but rather
have remained very much their own agents, constrained, to be sure, by more powerful
interests but their own agents nonetheless. That is, of course, what we have come to
expect of the Iban.

(Reed L. Wadley, Department of Anthropology, University of Missouri-
Columbia)

Calvin R. Rensch, Carolyn M. Rensch, Jonas Noeb and Robert Sulis Ridu,
Language Development Project. Kuching (Sarawak, Malaysia): Dayak
Bidayuh National Association; xiv +449 pages, figures, tables, maps; soft

Bidayuh is spoken in a number of dialects in the Kuching and Samarahan
Divisions of West Sarawak in Malaysian Borneo. It belongs to the Land Dayak (or
Bidayuhic) language subgroup, which is part of the (West) Malayo Polynesian branch
of the Austronesian language family. Other Land Dayak languages are mainly spoken in
neighboring West Kalimantan, Indonesia. They are among the least known subgroups in
Borneo, which in turn is one of the least well-known linguistic areas in the Austronesian-
speaking world. *The Bidayuh language* is therefore a very welcome addition to the
literature on Bornean linguistics.

The book consists of three sections.

In the first section called “Language development in Bidayuh: past, present
and future,” Jonas Noeb and Robert Sulis Ridu give a general introduction detailing
information about the speech community, language classification, language development,
and the Bidayuh Language Development Project. The language classification is by
location and “cultural traits,” rather than by genetic affiliation. Until very recently, the
Bidayuh language obtained virtually no attention. In fact, during White Rajah rule and
British colonization, Dayak education in general received hardly any support and was largely in the hands of missionaries. The Borneo Literature Bureau (1959-1977) was the first organization that published Bidayuh texts other than of a liturgical nature. It also encouraged writing in Dayak languages. In 1977 it was taken over by the Sarawak branch of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (the government-sponsored literacy bureau in Malaysia), which practically meant that it ceased to exist. Other positive influences on the maintenance and development of Bidayuh have been the publication of Datuk William Nais’ dictionary (Nais 1988), native language broadcasting by Radio Sarawak, the performances of Bidayuh singers and recordings of their popular music, the Majlis Adat Istiadat (Council for Customs and Traditions, Sarawak) established in 1974, the Sarawak Gazette (1870) and Sarawak Museum Journal (1911), the Oral Traditions Project (started in 1990 by the Sarawak government and aimed at recording oral traditions from all ethnic groups in Sarawak) and church publications (Bible translations, newsletters). Bidayuh is under threat of disappearance because of urbanization, intermarriage, and formal education in languages other than Bidayuh (foremost, Malay). Add to this the indifference of some of its speakers preferring to educate their children in Malay or even English because they believe that this will enhance their future, and Bidayuh qualifies as an endangered language. Efforts to turn the tide and to develop the language have led to the formation of the Bidayuh Development Committee in 2000, with representatives from all Bidayuh-speaking regions. With the help of linguists from the Summer Institute of Linguistics, it started in 2001 the Bidayuh Language Development Project, which aims at the preservation of Bidayuh and its promotion among community members, including in the home and in schools. Its activities are language research, spelling standardization, the training of language activists, the establishment of writers’ workshops and dictionary workshops, and curriculum development. While the Project has achieved a unified spelling (in 2003), the establishment of a standardized “common dialect” remains problematic because of regionalism among the Bidayuh speakers.

The second section, “Nasality in Bidayuh phonology” by Carolyn Rensch, is a fairly comprehensive cross-dialectal overview of the basic phonology, phonotactics and morphology of Bidayuh, based on word lists representing 25 varieties of Bidayuh (as well as Rara’, see below). This section is not just about nasality, although nasality is certainly very central to it, and Carolyn Rensch’s approach to broader phonological and morphological issues is more descriptive than analytical. Nasality is manifested in three independent phenomena. (1) Nasal prefixation can be syllabic or non-syllabic. Prefixation of non-syllabic N- forms intransitive verbs: if the root begins with a consonant, it is replaced by a homorganic nasal; if the root begins with a vowel, ŋ- is prefixed to it. Prefixation of syllabic ?N:- forms transitive and causative verbs. (2) Nasal spread happens when a nasal consonant influences adjacent vowels in such a way that they also acquire a nasal pronunciation. In Bidayuh, this spread is non-phonemic. Its effects are usually progressive (that is, they affect following vowels) but regressive nasal spread also occurs (whereby a nasal consonant nasalizes a preceding vowel, as in French words). Finally, (3) nasal preplosion is a phenomenon affecting final nasal consonants whereby an unreleased homorganic (voiced or voiceless) stop is articulated before the actual nasal (e.g. Gumbang dialect jadn, ‘rain’). In Bidayuh, this preplosion is also non-contrastive.
Finally, in some Bidayuh dialects, there is a nasal release of word-final stops.

The third section is a phonological history of Bidayuh, in which Calvin Rensch uses the comparative method to reconstruct the phonologies and basic lexicons of Proto Bidayuh as well as of Proto Bakati’, Proto Bidayuh-Bakati’ and Proto Land Dayak. The basis for these reconstructions are the 25 Bidayuh and Rara’ word lists mentioned above, augmented with data from a few Land Dayak varieties spoken in West Kalimantan. This is the largest section of the book, making up more than two thirds of the text.

All three sections are very informative, richly documented, and written in a very readable style. However, a few omissions and other awkward aspects need to be pointed out.

For instance, no estimation is given of the number of speakers for any of the languages, dialects and language groups discussed. The authors also tend to be vague in their definition of “Bidayuh” as a linguistic label. They give several accounts of the main dialect divisions of Bidayuh, sometimes dividing them into three groups (that is, a western, central and eastern group), and sometimes into five groups (through the inclusion of the Rara’ dialect). It is only through careful re-reading (and a schematic representation on page 225) that we learn that, by and large, four Bidayuh dialect groups should be distinguished (an Eastern Group, Western Group, Central Group and “Sembaan” Group) and that Rara’ is definitely a dialect of Bakati’. The latter is another Land Dayak language mainly spoken in West Kalimantan, although there are some Bakati’ (Rara’) villages across the Sarawak border in the Lundu District. Part of the problem appears to be that in Sarawak, “Bidayuh” is used as an ethnic term for Land Dayak people in general. At any rate, this is the way Jonas Noeb and Robert Ridu use it. It is also the way Carolyn Rensch uses it in part II, and, while she is aware of the separate linguistic status of Rara’, she does discuss it along with other Bidayuh varieties.

Jonas Noeb and Robert Ridu’s concept of a “common Bidayuh dialect” remains vague. What would be the nature of such a dialect, and how do the authors think it should be realized? The options are limited: one could (1) use one Bidayuh dialect as a standard, (2) make one dialect the basis of a new standard dialect and then “enrich” it with terminologies from other dialects, or (3) try to create an artifact on the basis of common features (words, grammatical elements) shared by all or most existing forms of Bidayuh. Whatever one does, it is hard to see how the issue of dialect hegemony can be avoided. Either one chooses the dialect that has the most speakers and is (probably) more prestigious than other dialects, which would be linguistically more natural and feasible but would disappoint speakers of other dialects, or one creates an artifact which (hopefully) does not favor any group in particular but will be done at the cost of much effort, will appear unnatural, and will require even more of an effort to be learned from all Bidayuh speakers. Chances are that such an artifact will never be generally accepted. This is not a problem that can be solved to everyone’s equal satisfaction.

Calvin Rensch basically applies a “bottom-up” approach to his linguistic reconstructions. His work is meticulous and systematic, and he should be commended for tackling the history of a phonologically particularly complicated Austronesian subgroup. However, this mainly regards his reconstruction of Proto Bidayuh and Proto Bakati’. As far as Proto Land Dayak is concerned, he basically lacks the data to make a
representative reconstruction, given that the spread and genetic variety of Land Dayak languages in West Kalimantan is at least as wide as it is in Sarawak, and he has lexical data of only three Land Dayak varieties in West Kalimantan other than Bakati’ (namely Ribun, Kembayan and Semandang). Furthermore, there is no clear justification for the reconstruction of Proto Bidayuh-Bakati’. Proto-languages can only have significance if they are based on “exclusive shared innovations.” Calvin Rensch did not adduce such innovations for Proto Bidayuh-Bakati’, and even if he had tried to do so, it is unlikely that he would have come very far, given the lack of data regarding West Kalimantan varieties. He himself admits that Proto Bidayuh-Bakati’ “may be a statement of common phonological features rather than a description of a period of development” (p. 243). But if that is the case, why reconstruct what seems to be a random proto-language?

Somewhat less forgivable is the fact that he and the other authors refer to hardly any literature concerning Land Dayak languages in West Kalimantan, such as Cense and Uhlenbeck’s bibliography of Borneo languages (1958), the Borneo maps in Wurm and Hattori’s language atlas (1983), or any of the Indonesian and Dutch sources (for instance, Darmansyah et al. 1994). Most importantly, no reference is made to Sudarsono’s grammar of Bakati’, which appeared in (2002), nor to the research efforts of the Institut Dayakologi in Pontianak, which also publishes literature in Land Dayak languages. In the historical section, Calvin Rensch makes use of works that are only marginally relevant to the linguistic history of Bidayuh. He makes no reference to any of Robert Blust’s historical linguistic publications, although the latter has dealt repeatedly with the classification of Land Dayak (e.g. Blust 1981, 2006), and his Comparative Austronesian dictionary (Blust n.d.) and etymologies in several Oceanic Linguistics issues are standard reference works. Due to this lack of familiarity with the relevant literature, Calvin Rensch obviously missed some opportunities to fine-tune his proto-phonemes and lexical reconstructions, which sometimes remain ambiguous. For instance, he could have gone much further in making a critical distinction between inherited and borrowed vocabulary. In his phonological comparison, he somewhat hesitantly realizes that Land Dayak l is a loan phoneme, whereas from a wider comparative Austronesian perspective, its being borrowed is in fact the only sensible conclusion. He does not address the problem of variant forms with final n, which emerges in various Land Dayak languages. Although the occurrence of these final n variants is not easy to solve and may require a combination of explanations, in body-part and kinship terms it makes sense as a fossilized element suffixed to inalienable vocabulary originally ending in a vowel. The same phenomenon occurs in other Land Dayak languages (including Sungkung in West Kalimantan, cf. Adelaar 2005:25). Only part of the Land Dayak languages represent this suffix, and where they do, they do not always do so to the same extent: for instance, Bidayuh varieties have the suffix more often than Bakati’ ones, and within the Bidayuh dialect group, some varieties exhibit it more systematically than others. It is consequently unlikely that this inalienable n can be attributed to any of the Land Dayak proto-languages.

These critical remarks notwithstanding, this book is clearly a milestone in the study of Land Dayak languages, and it is of crucial importance to the study of Bornean languages. We are looking forward with great anticipation to further research publications from the Bidayuh Language Development Project.

(Alexander Adelaar, Asia Institute, The University of Melbourne)
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The author has chosen a challenging area of study, one aimed at complementing social work with indigenous realities, and she has accomplished a great deal. To my pleasant surprise, reading this book reveals how social work provides a fresh viewpoint for understanding cultural variation and change. For those of us quite innocent of social work theory and practice, the book easily manages to educate us about the discipline, especially by means of its quotations from fieldwork. As a bonus, we also increase our understanding of East-West differences and the complexity of Sarawak itself.

Among the helping professions in the West, both clinical medicine and social work have generally taken the individual-case approach, while in Sarawak both medicine
and social support systems have long been community-based. Notably, in neither situation has a major aim been so-called “social development.” Now, however, social development has become a bureaucratic goal in Malaysia, ostensibly to include both social support and improved health, but it has been more successful in “developing” the vested interests of elite groups than in helping the people at large (p. 13). While the difficulties posed by a social development agenda in Sarawak are beyond the scope of this book, it is important to note that they are relevant and deserve timely study and analysis.

The book starts with a discussion of the dissonance between modern social work theory *cum* practice (based on biology, psychology, and social situation) and the world views inherent in the cultural complexity of Sarawak. These Sarawak views include certain “values and beliefs related to the family, the concept of shame and self-control, the belief in fate and karma, [and] the belief in the healing power of ‘nature’ and the supernatural” (p. 148). To make social work more effective in Sarawak, the emphasis is put on indigenizing it, building on a consideration of culture as the key variable. Outside of natural instinct, culture gives us information “to guide our behavior and interpret experiences” (p. 35). Although this information is ever-changing, a particular cultural group knows its own shared assumptions, values, beliefs, and taboos. A culture is a shared system with shared meanings (but not necessarily having a shared origin in history, as does an ethnic group). Culture, then, is not a storehouse of traditions or customs; it is dynamic, transactional.

Both theoretical and practical aspects of culture are thoroughly examined in the book, derived from the author’s research findings of successful and appropriate ways of doing a social worker’s job. Many people with different perspectives were interviewed during this research project; the findings that emerged have allowed the author to point the way forward to a more culturally-compatible practice of social work, one that extends out from the individual to embrace the local community, the culture, and spirituality.

The book is also a rich lode of information on how *not* to do social science studies, often highlighting the gossamer nuances of culture that are most difficult to see from the outside. Such information is as valuable for an anthropologist as for a health worker, a school teacher, or a zoologist visiting a highland longhouse for the first time.

(A. Baer, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, 97331-2914 USA)


Since the establishment in Sarawak in 2000 of a sub-office of the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM), some 287 complaints have been received of which well over half relate, not surprisingly, to Native Customary Land Rights (NCLR). The present volume, written by Dr. Ramy Bulan, Professor and Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Malaya, herself a Sarawak native and a legal expert on
issues pertaining to indigenous land rights, was written in response, following a series of investigations, dialogues, and discussions focused on these complaints. The principal intent of this work is to locate native customary land rights issues, or, more broadly, as the author prefers, “native title,” in a larger legal context of existing laws and statutes, common law case precedence, international law, human rights declarations, and the Malaysian Federal Constitution.

*Legal Perspectives* is divided into ten parts. Part One provides an introduction, definitions of concepts, and a statement of purpose, while Part Two, “Executive Summary,” briefly reviews the report’s conclusions. Part Three summarizes the laws applicable to native title. As Bulan observes, Malaysia, as a multicultural society, has “a plural legal system, integrating English common law, written law, syariah law and customary laws with the Federation Constitution as the supreme law of the land” (p. 14). In particular, she looks at the role of common law, customary law, and the Constitution in defining the concept of native title. From the historical outset, she observes, past Sarawak governments have consistently recognized the rights of natives to their land and have acknowledged and respected the associated customs of land tenure from which these rights emerge. The Brookes, particularly Charles Brooke, repeatedly reaffirmed this recognition, declaring the protection of native land rights as being essential to the material livelihood and cultural survival of Sarawak’s native peoples. Moreover, Sarawak and, indeed, all of Malaysia follows a common law tradition in which, the author notes, under the doctrine of continuity, pre-existing property rights, regardless of changes of sovereignty, remain in effect unless otherwise expressly extinguished. Despite challenges from the present state government, the Malaysian federal courts in a series of important decisions have upheld this principle and affirmed that Malaysian common law respects the pre-existing rights of native communities, including land rights, as based on native laws and customs (p. 16).

In Part Four, the author argues that a recognition of the rights of indigenous people to their lands is also consistent with the development of common law in other countries, such as Canada, the U.S., and Australia, that share with Malaysia a common law tradition. The concept of “occupation” is an important one in English common law and the author shows how developments in these other common law jurisdictions have broadened the concept to encompass the rights of shifting cultivators and hunter-gatherers. While these developments are, of course, not binding in Malaysian courts of law, they nonetheless carry weight. In addition to the principle that pre-existing customary rights are recognized by common law, a second major point that the author makes is that native title is also a right protected under the Federal Constitution. Thus, Bulan notes, Article 160 (2) of the Malaysian Federal Constitution defines “law” to include “custom or usage having the force of law” (p. 16).

This recognition of custom as law, or as having the force of law, is a principle acknowledged by prior Sarawak governments and is reflected in various codifications of custom that have been compiled over the years. However, the author stresses, these codifications were never exhaustive, and some of the most important uncodified customs relate to land tenure. The importance of these customs lies, she notes, in the fact that they are central to the economic and cultural life of native communities, being, as she
writes, “inextricably linked to [their] continued existence” (p. 33). While native title is recognized under common law, its origins, in other words, are in native customs and traditions. Thus, Bulan argues, “Native title is not a creature of the common law and consequently, the interests associated with native title are not limited by common law conceptions of property” (p. 32). This, again, is something supported by recent developments in other common law jurisdictions. In Part Five, the author briefly surveys as examples of customary practice the land tenure customs of three native communities in Sarawak—the Kelabit, Iban, and Penan—and discusses various proofs of “occupancy” that courts have accepted, including oral history, traditional boundary demarcations, and cultural perceptions and modifications of the natural landscape.

Part Six, “Statutory Recognition of Native Customary Rights to Land,” deals chiefly with the Sarawak Land Code of 1958, the primary state statute relating to native title. In particular, the author draws attention to aspects of the Land Code of 1958 that in her view undermine or are inconsistent with other bodies of law, including native custom and the Malaysian Federal Constitution. The Sarawak Land Code was, in point of fact, a disaster from the outset. For the colonial government of the time it was a political time-bomb and in the long run its provisions not only disadvantaged native interests but did much to corrupt future political life in the state. The Sarawak Land Code of 1958 recognized NCR land created before 1st January 1958, but imposed on native claimants the burden of establishing their ownership of these lands. Further amendments of the Code in 1996 made these burdens even more onerous for native claimants. While ostensibly stipulating methods for creating future areas of NCLR from Interior Area Land, the Code, in actuality, effectively foreclosed this possibility.

Section 7A (2) of the Sarawak Land Code 1958 establishes a Register of Native Rights. However, as Bulan points out, down to the present time, no administrative structure to implement such a Register has ever been created. Nor has any state government ever moved in that direction. Indeed, the present state government, on the contrary, has pursued every means within its power to hinder mapping, surveying, and other techniques for documenting rights of native ownership. The consequences have been profound and, Bulan argues, on the face of it, notably discriminatory by providing documentary protection for other forms of land title, but not native title. While the Code claims to establish a Torrens system of registered title, by failing to provide a process for registering interests based on customary rights, it effectively leaves these rights unprotected, without title documents, and so subject to possible state appropriation. Some of these flaws in the Code seem to derive from the apparent hidden agendas of those who drafted the statute. Thus, Bulan notes in passing the interesting observation of the well-known Sarawak solicitor, Baru Bian, who argues that one reason the registration of NCLR was never undertaken was fear that, if it were, there would be no land left for alienation by the state (p. 55, fn 244). Possibly even more detrimental to native interests are provisions of the Code that grant the government broad authority to extinguish NCLR claims and almost unlimited power to issue provisional leases to corporate bodies, including those controlled by non-native interests, to exploit or make use of land claimed by native communities as NCR Land. While the exercise of these powers requires notification and compensation, these requirements have proved highly
problematic. Thus, a few lines published in the Sarawak Gazette have often qualified as government/native claimant “consultation.” Finally, the author argues that the Sarawak Land Code fails to recognize traditional forms of occupancy that are recognized in native customary law. Instead, “occupation” is defined by the Code in a highly restricted way, mainly in terms of settlement and cultivation that excludes, for example, recognition of community forest reserves, tree ownership, forest fallowing practices, and hunting and collecting rights. As Bulan observes, the Code is obviously biased in favor of “settled agriculture,” a bias, she observes, that, in the past historically served European colonists in countries like Australia and the U.S. to justify the expropriation of native lands on the grounds of their being “unused” or “underutilized” (p. 54). The irony here, of course, is that this same bias has come to profit a small native political elite in Sarawak at the expense of the great majority others.

But statutes are only part of the relevant legal framework that defines native title rights. In Part Seven, the author examines the role of judge-made common law in Malaysia, reviewing a number of cases heard by the Malaysian federal courts, including the 2001 High Court decision that upheld native customary rights as enforceable common law rights, pre-existent and historically protected by previous governments, and therefore still valid. In Part Eight, Bulan looks beyond Malaysia at recent developments in other common law jurisdictions and at a growing body of international human rights law. One point she makes is that both establish in general that indigenous concepts of property ownership are relevant in determining native title rights. In Part Nine, she looks in greater detail at international conventions and human rights laws, particularly at those protecting the land rights of “indigenous” or “native peoples.” Here, Bulan stresses three features of international law protecting indigenous land rights that are relevant to the status of NCLR in Sarawak: 1) the principle of equality and non-discrimination, 2) the importance of native custom in defining property rights, and 3) the rights of indigenous peoples to be consulted with regard to decisions affecting their land (p. 137). Finally, in Part Ten the author concludes by briefly describing some ways in which the Federal Constitution protects native title rights.

Professor Ramy Bulan and the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia are to be commended for producing this timely, concise, and clearly written report which makes indispensible reading for anyone concerned with justice and the legal ramifications of native land rights issues in Sarawak.

(Clifford Sather, Editor BRB and Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Helsinki, Finland)


‘Muslim Burmat’ is the pen-name used by Dato Paduka Awang Haji Muslim bin Haji Burut DPMB SMB PJK PIKB PKL, who is regarded as the greatest living writer in Negara Brunei Darussalam. Born on 15 April 1943, he was educated in both English and Malay. He began work as a clerk in the Land Office in 1964, but quickly
switched to the *Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka* (Language and Literature Bureau) as an Assistant Editor, subsequently rising swiftly to become successively an Editor, Senior Editor, and Language Officer. His in-service training included a one-year course in Malay Studies at the University of Malaya in 1968, followed in 1971-2 by a course in Writing and Book Production at the University of London’s Institute of Education in Tropical Areas. In 1998 he was appointed a Research Fellow in the Department of Malay Studies at the University of Brunei Darussalam. He married Dayang Kamsiah binti Sulaiman, with whom he had one child as at 1986-7.

A prodigious output of novels, short stories, and works for children has brought Muslim Burmat a string of prizes. The first Bruneian to claim the “South-East Asia Write [*sic*] Award” (in 1986), he is also a double winner of the MASTERA Award, first in 2001 and again in 2007. In 1999 he was presented with the *Anugerah Sastera Nusantara* in Johor Baharu and in 2002 he was recognized as a *Tokoh Sastera Brunei Darussalam* (*PBA* 8.1.2003:1). He won the Novel-Writing Competition marking the Silver Jubilee in 1992, and ended as runner-up in similar national competitions in 1980, 1982, and 1983. He has also received a *Bahana* creative award. The process culminated on 15 July 2006 when he was created DPMB, carrying the style *Dato Paduka*, by His Majesty Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah (*BBSO* Su.16.7.2006:h2.htm). A photograph of him dating from 1986 may be found on page forty-eight of the June 2004 issue of *JMBRAS*.

In ‘Man and Society’ (a copy of which was supplied to the reviewer by the author) Mr. Gallop sketches the literary background in Brunei/NBD and the wider regional context. He then traces Muslim Burmat’s development as a novelist, five major works published between 1982 and 1996 being subjected to detailed examination. Chapter two looks at two early works, *Lari Bersama Musim* (1982) and *Hadiah Sebuah Impian* (1983). Chapter three analyzes themes of migration and introspection in *Puncak Pertama* (1988). Chapter four deals with dialogues and divisions in *Terbenamnya Matahari*, published in 1996 but actually written after *Sebuah Pantai di Negeri Asing* (1995), which is discussed in chapter five. A final chapter assesses Muslim Burmat’s contribution to Malay literature. Gallop, whose original BA degree from the University of London was in English (p. 255), does not consider *Urih Pesisir* (1999), an 832-page tome with a preface by Dr. Haji Hashim bin Haji Abdul Hamid, which was launched at UBD on 5 May 1999 (*PB* 19.5.1999:11). It should be noted in passing that only three novels had been published by Brunei writers before Muslim Burmat adopted the format.

As a member of the minority Kedayan ethnic group, Dato Muslim writes from a position that is lateral to the mainstream. This enables him to adopt a more “objective” approach. He also tends to focus on people occupying the lower ranks of society; persons from the upper classes are almost never featured in his novels. He portrays a society that is less than just, for example in the unequal power relations between employer and worker (pp. 124-5); compassion for humble people is one of his characteristics. He narrates without comment and tends to eschew explicit social criticism. Historical markers are often planted in his works, although specific dates

---

are rarely mentioned; one of his motives seems to be to record for younger generations a way of life that is disappearing. More importantly, a knowledge of history is seen as a means of establishing race and identity (p. 158). Viewed by some as primarily a nationalist writer, it might be countered that, particularly in his later books, he has actually transcended chauvinism and the narrow limits of Negara Brunei Darussalam to produce texts of universal application. A melancholic quality informs much of his writing. The use of “interior monologue” is noticed. Rhetoric and elegy are adopted here and there. A tendency to didacticism is detectable on occasion (particularly in his second novel). Themes of migration, alienation, and “social character” are explored. A dissection of the individual human psyche is attempted in Puncak Pertama, which is also the first of his novels to include non-Malay characters; racial stereotyping is avoided. Terbenamnya Matahari touches on the role of women in society. Sebuah Pantai probes gently issues such as (no less) the meaning of life.

The erudition worn lightly by Gallop in the “Pengembara” series emerges in its full flower in “Man and Society.” There is something new to be learned on virtually every page of this lucid, subtle, and well-integrated study. Telling (but never gratuitous) use is made of European concepts, everyone from Fromm to Derrida, from Freud to Althusser, from Fielding to Hegel being called in aid. The richness of Muslim Burmat’s work emerges strongly. The novelist seldom presents a single or simplistic view of an issue; and he rarely leaves uncontested a position which he himself has seemed to assert (pp. 152, 154). He has an informed and liberal world view; his aim is to “provoke thought” (p. 118). He conveys dissent “by raising a question and then posing various answers in the text that will suit different persuasions of reader, including those dissatisfied with the status quo in [Negara] Brunei [Darussalam]” (p. 179). In due course dialogue becomes the novelist’s “foremost distinguishing stylistic feature”; there is a “growing reluctance” to narrate scenes of action. Muslim Burmat develops more interest in “delineation of character and an exploration of the workings of the human mind.” Islam is seen to have a place in the novels which are believed to fulfil some of the accepted criteria of “Islamic” writing. Failure is explored rather than success, allowing the author to make manifest the essential frailty of “man”. This is a “bold departure” in the context of the nation-building imperative in the sultanate (p 230). But Muslim Burmat does not introduce any new narrative techniques; and “linguistic ineptitudes and other infelicities of language” are “not hard to discern” (p. 239). There is a tendency towards “verbosity in dialogue”; his longer novels might benefit from “greater concision and excision” (p. 240). Nevertheless, the novelist’s work deals with fundamental questions (notably the relations of human beings with one another, with their environment, and with the Islamic deity); and in such a way as to amount to a “significant contribution to Malay literature” as a whole (p. 244).

Since 2000, when Gallop was writing, Muslim Burmat has published a stream of further works, including Makna Sebenar Sebuah Ladang, a novel launched on 28 December 2002 (PBA 8.1.2003:1) and Terbang Tinggi, published on Wednesday 7 May 2003 by the Malay Literature Department at UBD (BBO Th.8.5.2003:h13.htm). His latest work of fiction, Ntaidu, is reported to discuss the devastation caused by drought, food shortages, and famine in a village community that depended upon agriculture as its
main source of income. Two further books, *Permainan Ombak* and *Naskhah*, were in press in late 2007 (*BBO* Tu.27.11.2007; *BBO* F.30.11.2007).

Muslim Burmat emerges from Mr. Gallop’s scholarly analysis as a novelist of considerable skill and complexity, well deserving of the high status he enjoys in his own country and overseas. “Man and Society” itself has never been published as such, although a summary appeared in *JMBRAS* in 2004. This is unfortunate because Gallop is a literary critic of no mean ability. Scholars ordering a copy of this thesis via inter-library loan from *Universiti Sains Malaysia* would be well repaid for their time and trouble.

(AVM Horton, *Bordesley, Worcestershire, UK, Thursday 12 February 2009*)


*Historical Sabah: Community and Society* by historian Danny Wong Tze Ken consists of 25 short, but compelling, chapters, each from four to 14 pages long, all amply illustrated, many with never before published photographs that, taken together, nicely capture in their diversity the highly heterogeneous character of Sabahan society of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. All but two of these chapters first appeared in a weekly newspaper column, hence their brevity. Together, *Community and Society* comprises something still rare in Borneo historiography: a genuine work of social and popular history. Drawing not only from the colonial archives, but also from more informal sources such as, for example, diaries, local newspaper reports, petitions, municipal council rosters, civil service records, and temple dedications, the author portrays something of the personalities and institutions that shaped everyday life in Sabah during the decades immediately before and after the turn of the last century.

In his acknowledgements, Dr. Wong tells us that his intent in writing his original columns was fourfold: “First, to explore new topics of research; secondly, to encourage research into local history; thirdly, to create awareness of the community’s past…; and finally, to help popularise History as a discipline of learning” (vi). The same purposes infuse the present work as well. One of the great virtues of *Community and Society* is the author’s infectious fascination with the past and his ability to convey this fascination to his readers, thereby both making history accessible and, at the same time, enlisting his local audience in the work of historical discovery. Chapter 14, “Lessons from a Family Gathering,” offers, perhaps, the best example of how the author successfully engages his readers in the process of reflecting on history and of finding meaning in the past. He begins the chapter with a newspaper account describing a recent Hari Raya gathering of 1,200 descendants of two early Sabah settlers at Kampung Pengalat, Papar. Over the more than 130 years since the arrival of Panglima Kuning, who came to Sabah from the state of Perak, and Dayang Acheh, who arrived from Brunei, their descendants have repeatedly intermarried so that today the majority are interrelated. For those who took part, the gathering at Kampung Pengalat was far more than a simple family reunion. It was also, as the author aptly puts it, “a celebration of… historical consciousness” (p. 91), That these descendants were able to trace their origins through genealogies,
memorabilia, and by word-of-mouth tradition to two persons who had lived more than a century ago “is,” Wong writes, “a testament of the concern given to the preservation of such information...[which, as a point of departure] augurs well,” he adds, “for the development of research into local history” (p. 91). Even more, the event expressed to those involved their heritage and sense of personal and collective identity. As Wong goes on to observe, there are a number of other lessons to be learned here. For one, the story of Panglima Kuning and Dayang Acheh typifies that of many Malay families, particularly from Brunei, who established themselves shortly before the turn of the twentieth century in the towns that grew up along the railway lines of the west coast of Sabah. Several of these families later rose to positions of prominence, producing native officers who served with distinction in the Chartered Company administrative service. More broadly yet, their story provides an object lesson in larger-scale historical developments. While the early modern period is often associated with the creation of a pluralistic Malaysian society, through, in particular, the founding of so-called “overseas” communities, notably Chinese and Indian, it was also an era of extensive intra-Southeast Asian migration. Thus, the story of Panglima Kuning and Dayang Acheh also mirrors the large-scale, if less conspicuous movement of local people occurring at the same time within the Malay Archipelago itself. Another example he briefly mentions in the chapter is that of Sarawak Dayaks, some of whom settled permanently in Sabah, marrying into local Kadazan-Dusun families.

Community and Society is essential a book about the origins of modern Sabah. Hence, the development of towns and commercial life looms large. The first eight chapters, or roughly a third of the book, thus deal with the origins of Sabah’s principal townships (or ex-townships, as not all of the towns founded by the Chartered Company flourished, and one of these towns, Labuan, which was only briefly administered by the Company, is today no longer part of Sabah). These chapters include, in the order of their appearance: Chapter 1, “From Gaya to Jesselton;” 2, “Life in early Jesselton;” 3, “The Jesselton Sanitary Board;” 4, “The Railway and Beaufort Town;” 5, “From Silam to Lahad Datu;” 6, “The Towkays of Jesselton;” 7, “The early Towkays of Sandakan;” and 8, “Labuan under Chartered Company Rule, 1890-1906.” Towns form a particularly interesting subject for a social historian in that, though largely a colonial creation in Sabah, they became, early on, places where local people gained a decisive voice in managing their own affairs.

Chapter 9, “A Poignant Page from History,” tells the story of the Karayuki-san, or Japanese prostitutes, of pre-war Sandakan, who, Wong tell us, “Because [they] were foreigners and engaged in a profession that is generally regarded as shameful, they do not have a face in the history of Sabah” (p. 61). Today, several recent books and a popular Japanese film have, of course, made them famous, however fleeting and faceless their presence may have been in Sabahan history. Chapter 12 describes another largely faceless group, the mui tsai (Cantonese, ‘small girl’), girls brought to Sabah (and to other parts of Southeast Asia) as unpaid family servants, whose plight became, as Wong notes, an early social concern and whose status in many cases verged on outright slavery.

Two chapters trace the development of popular pastimes in Sabah: Chapter 10, “Early Pony Racing,” which, as practiced locally, remains a distinctively Sabahan
institution, and Chapter 18, “Football in Early Sabah.” Three chapters deal with controversial social issues of the day: Chapter 15, “Opium in Early Sabah,” 16, “Early Anti-gambling Campaigns,” and 21, “Communism or Labour Unrest?” The latter chapter includes a fascinating story of Javanese labor organizers on the Sandala Estate near Sandakan whose efforts on behalf of their fellow workers involved more than wages and working conditions, but also, it appears from their trial transcripts, elements of magic and the formation of what might best be described as a mystical brotherhood.

In addition to his work on Vietnamese-Malaysian diplomatic relations, Professor Wong is best known as an academic historian for his writings on the Chinese community of Sabah, and, not surprisingly, much of Society and Community deals with the origins and development of the local Chinese community, and particularly with the role of its early business leaders. However, the Eurasian and Indian communities are also the subject of one chapter each, while a third chapter traces “The Beginning of Malay Vernacular Education.” Three chapters deal with the lives of local government servants, namely: Chapter 17, “The Dressers,” 19, “Pony Allowances in the Early Civil Service,” and 23, “A Loyal Government Servant: Ho Yin Fook of the Constabulary.” A fourth chapter, Chapter 22, “The Scholar Administrators,” describes very briefly the scholarly work of four colonial officers who served in Sabah, G. C. Woolley, who, following his retirement, returned to Sabah to spend his final years and whose collection of local material culture formed the foundational ethnographic collection of the present-day Sabah Museum; I.H.N. Evans, Owen Rutter, and H.G. Keith.

Concluding Society and Community, the last two chapters represent something of a departure. Unlike the others, they were originally written for scholarly journals. The first describes the brief existence, from 1893-1897, of the British North Borneo Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, a group formed to promote scholarly research in northern Borneo and surrounding areas. As Wong notes, the brevity of its existence was due in part to the presence of the much older and better established Straits Branch, the precursor of the modern Malaysian Branch. The role of the North Borneo Branch was revived only in 1960 with the founding of the present-day Sabah Society. The last chapter, “Historical Sources of Sabah: Some Recent Observations,” traces the development of Sabahan historiography, bringing the story more or less up to present. Again, compellingly written, this chapter nicely addresses the author’s purposes by introducing its readers, especially those comparatively new to the subject, to the existing historical literature.
ABSTRACTS


Since the early 1990s anthropological analysis of “development” has cast a serious doubt on the feasibility and the desirability of “development” itself. Considered as a failed industry, it therefore needs to be rejected. The Kelabit experiences with Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) as a tool for rural development in the Kelabit Highlands of Sarawak, East Malaysia, however, do not fit this argument. For the Kelabit, engaging with “development” is largely about a desire for it, but within a framework of shifting economic and political terrains and changing cultural values. It is from this perspective that this dissertation highlights how the impact and effects of the introduction of Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) in the form of Internet, telephone, computer, Very Small Aperture Terminals (VSATs) in Bario have been mediated and reconfigured by webs of social relations and the intricate interplay of social, political and cultural conditions specific to the Highlands and also beyond it.

My findings are based on two different periods of research activities. The first of these involved personal experiences as a native anthropologist engaged in setting up and implementing the e-Bario project, which aimed to demonstrate the many ways in which ICTs could be used to improve the lives of “marginalized” groups in remote areas in Sarawak. The second period involved thirteen months of field research, from August 2004 to September 2005. The purpose of this was to analyze the outcomes and consequences of e-Bario in the Highlands, and the broader Kelabit community.

Drawing on insights afforded by these two different periods of engagement, this dissertation considers the ways in which the Kelabit’s own desire for, and expectations of, ‘development’ and ‘progress’ have conditioned the social and economic effects of e-Bario. It is a quest which ties in closely with two fundamental Kelabit concepts: doo-ness (goodness) as a social ideal and iyuk or movement in social status among the Kelabit. I argue that it is the images and ideals of doo-ness, and the interweaving processes between doo-ness and iyuk that have generated and sustained Kelabit modes of engagement and interaction with ideas, people, institutions and objects from the “outside world.” This includes their on-going engagement with “development” and their recent responses to participative development, the Internet, telephone and computers introduced through e-Bario [author].


An analysis is presented of psychiatric research interviews conducted among the Iban, a longhouse dwelling people of Sarawak, Malaysia. It draws on transcripts of interviews recorded in the course of carrying out research into schizophrenia in this group. The article examines three different interview spaces within the longhouse—public, family,
and private—in order to explore the interplay between ethnographic context and interview conversation. The public setting is notable for the number of relatives who join in and transform the communication from dyadic to collective interlocution; the role of repetition in recruiting them into the conversation is explored. In direct contrast is the private space, which allows for a level of confidentiality commensurate with Western psychiatric research practice. Intermediate between the two is the family space. The communicative forms that correspond to these settings influence the way symptoms of schizophrenia are experienced and expressed in Iban society. Implications for the practice of psychiatry cross-culturally are examined [author].


While tropical forests continue to be cleared at alarming rates, the debate over how best to conserve them often proceeds without a clear understanding of the trade-offs that result from different management alternatives. Because timber is the most valuable product of tropical forests, substantial effort has been directed to harmonizing timber production and other goals, especially carbon sequestration and biodiversity conservation. Unfortunately, the nature and magnitude of the trade-offs between timber production and these objectives remain unclear and depend on numerous factors. By elucidating the key biophysical factors that influence forest management trade-offs, I aimed to better inform the quest to manage tropical forests for multiple benefits. I assessed the trade-offs between timber production and fire susceptibility in a seasonally dry forest in lowland Bolivia subjected to four silvicultural treatments of increasing intensity aimed at achieving sustained timber yields (STY). By quantifying treatment effects on fuel loads, vegetative cover, dry-down rates of 10-h fuels, and fire spread, I found that the treatments had little effect on fire susceptibility; this forest is fire-prone for about 130 days per year, even in the absence of logging. Fire severity, however, would likely be greater with intensive management due to increases in 1,000-h fuels. Using a simulation model (SYMFOR) to project the effects of the silvicultural treatments on future timber yields, forest structure and composition, and biomass, I found that none of the treatments came close to achieving STY, indicating that silviculture would probably need to be intensified to secure STY. Neither forest structure nor species composition changed appreciably over two cutting cycles (60 years) in any of the treatments. By contrasting the Bolivian forest with eastern Amazon and Borneo forests, I found that the trade-offs resulting from intensive silviculture to secure STY paled in comparison to the loss of forests. If maintenance of productive forest for both timber and carbon with a full complement of biodiversity is the goal, then fire (and not silviculture) is the menace. Fire prevention must complement silvicultural treatments to achieve sustained yields if tropical forests are to serve both production and conservation goals. (Winzeler database)
Alpine vegetation worldwide constitutes the alpine ecosystem, the only terrestrial biome that is distributed across a large latitudinal gradient and reaches a global distribution. Plant groups distributed in multiple alpine systems thus present an excellent system to test biogeographic hypotheses on a global scale. In this dissertation, phylogenetics and phylogeography of Oreomyrrhis are studied to elucidate its controversial phylogenetic relationships within the family Apiaceae and the historical biogeographic mechanisms that generated its disjunct distribution in the southern portion of the Pacific Basin (Mesoamerica, Andes, southern Patagonia, Tierra del Fuego, Falklands, New Zealand, SE Australia, Tasmania, New Guinea, Borneo, and Taiwan). Analyses of nuclear ITS sequences unambiguously place Oreomyrrhis in the subtribe Scandicinae (tribe Scandiceae) and suggest its intimate relationship with the North American species of the otherwise Eurasian genus Chaerophyllum. Analyses of the combined data set composed of ITS and two chloroplast intergenic spacers (trnS-trnG and atpB-rbcL) further confirm the monophyly of Oreomyrrhis and its sister taxon relationship with the North American Chaerophyllum. This well-established phylogenetic relationship strongly supports synonymizing Oreomyrrhis taxa with Chaerophyllum. The star-like haplotype network structure in all three data sets (ITS, trnS-trnG, and atpB-rbcL) suggests a scenario of recent population range expansion, an inference consistent with the significant negative value of the Tajima’s D. The existence of two widespread interior/ancestral haplotypes in atpB-rbcL data suggests that multiple dispersal events have occurred. Coupled with results of phylogenetic analyses and molecular dating, the South Pacific disjunction of Oreomyrrhis is clearly a result of recent long-distance dispersal, most likely during the late Pliocene to the early Pleistocene. The weakly supported sister-taxon relationship between the SW Pacific clade (New Guinea and Borneo) and the rest of Oreomyrrhis suggests that this region is a possible center of origin for Oreomyrrhis, a proposition also consistent with the distribution of ancestral haplotypes in the network. However, Australia harbors the highest genetic diversity and most ancestral haplotypes, suggesting its possibility also as a center of origin. These findings corroborate many recent studies, suggesting that long-distance dispersal in recent geological time (Pliocene-Pleistocene) has been the dominant mechanism generating the disjunctions of the South Pacific alpine taxa. (Winzeler database)


In 1997-1998 an estimated eight million hectares of forest and land went up in flames and caused a haze crisis that darkened skies across the region for three months. Local, national and international stakeholders were moved to improve fire management capacity; but their visions, strategies and ability to maneuver diverged markedly. This dissertation is based on applied research carried out in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia between November
1997 and May 1999. It sought to identify the factors that influenced responses to the fire and haze crisis and to understand what led a group of university faculty and students to independently initiate local fire brigades. Perhaps more importantly, this dissertation asks why they did not succeed. Building on developments in political ecology, institutional analysis and disaster management, this dissertation argues that marginalized stakeholders leveraged opportunities created by the fire crisis to further broader agendas and mitigate non-fire related risks but that the planning process failed to recognize how other risks to personal, community, and organizational and national security influence participation in the initiative. The sustainability of fire management, like disaster management and most environmental management initiatives relies on recognition of shared risks and a commitment to identifying mutually agreeable solutions. The true challenge to institutionalizing fire management is building commitment among a broad range of organizations at local national and international levels. Navigating the diverse perceptions of risk and approaches to problem solving should be a part of the planning process.

(Dumbrell database)


Commercial, selective logging is a major cause of habitat disturbance in Southeast Asian rainforests, yet despite much research there is little consensus on the impacts of disturbance on biodiversity. I used fruit-baited traps to sample Nymphalid butterflies from primary forest and forest selectively logged 15 years previously in Danum Valley, Sabah (Malaysian Borneo) for a 10-month period between April 2003 and December 2004. I sampled 1280 individuals from 61 species from 30 traps along 2 km. linear transects and 2244 individuals from 62 species from 25 traps on [approximately] 80 ha. square grids in primary and selectively-logged forest. I found that long term (5-month) and large spatial-scale (transects ≥ 1.6 km) samples were needed in order to detect a significant decline in diversity following disturbance. I showed that sampling canopy fauna was important for producing species inventories but not for detecting changes in species conservation value between habitats. I found higher α and β diversity in primary forest compared with selectively-logged forest. Differences in α diversity between habitats were dependent on the spatial scale at which data were analyzed because a diversity increased with spatial scale at a significantly faster rate in primary forest compared with selectively-logged forest. This reflected higher vegetation heterogeneity in primary forest compared with selectively-logged forest. Measures of α diversity were spatially autocorrelated in primary forest, and β diversity between samples was distance-dependent in primary forest, but not in selectively-logged forest. These spatial patterns of α and β diversity reflected patterns of vegetation structure. Selectively-logged forest contained species with higher light tolerance and some evidence suggested wider geographical ranges and thus lower conservation value than primary forest. I conclude that as spatial patterns of diversity change following disturbance, conservationists need to be aware that the placement of their traps and the spatial scale of their study may largely predetermine their results. (Winzeler database)

Borneo occupies a central position in the Sundaland promontory of SE Asia. It has a complex Cenozoic geological history of sedimentation and deformation which began at about the same time that India is commonly suggested to have started to collide with Asia. Some tectonic reconstructions of east and SE Asia interpret a large SE Asian block with Borneo at its center which has been rotated clockwise and displaced southwards along major strike-slip faults during the Cenozoic due to the indentation of Asia by India. However, the geological history of Borneo is not consistent with the island simply forming part of a large block extruded from Asia. The large clockwise rotations and displacements predicted by the indentor model for Borneo are incompatible with palaeomagnetic evidence and there is no evidence that the major strike-slip faults of the Asian mainland reach Borneo. Seismic tomography shows there is a deep high velocity anomaly in the lower mantle beneath SE Asia interpreted as subducted lithosphere but it can be explained just as well by alternative tectonic models as by the indentor model. Very great thicknesses of Cenozoic sediments are present in Borneo and circum-Borneo basins, and large amounts of sediment were transported to the Crocker turbidite fan of north Borneo from the Eocene to the Early Miocene, but all evidence indicates that these sediments were derived from local sources and not from distant sources in Asia elevated by India-Asia collision. The Cenozoic geological history of Borneo records subduction of the proto-South China Sea and Miocene collision after this ocean lithosphere was eliminated, and a variety of effects resulting from long-term subduction beneath SE Asia. There is little to indicate that India-Asia collision has influenced the Cenozoic geological record in Borneo.


With some 7,000 islands lying adjacent to a continental shelf, a known geologic history, and high levels of endemism, the Philippine islands are of great interest to biogeography. Throughout history, the majority of the Philippines have remained isolated, so over-water colonization must explain the presence of these organisms. Researchers have proposed hypotheses of colonization and diversification processes for 80 years, yet these have not been tested in an explicitly historical manner. I sequenced mitochondrial DNA from seven species of birds that are distributed on all of the major islands of the Philippines. From these data, I constructed Bayesian phylogenies of relationships, and used these to test phylogenetic predictions for each hypothesized colonization route. My results demonstrate unique colonization and diversification patterns for each of the seven taxa. Examining existing literature on Philippine organisms as well as my own data shows some evidence for each proposed colonization route, but the greatest support is for the two routes from Borneo. Many taxa exhibit multiple colonization events, using several of these routes. As each organism colonizes a new island, gene flow halts and differentiation occurs, regardless of its Pleistocene history. These data also show that species widespread throughout the Philippines possess surprisingly high levels of genetic
differentiation among and within islands, suggesting that modern taxonomic divisions in these birds underestimate the true biodiversity of this imperiled fauna.


West Kalimantan (West Borneo) has a history of violent communal conflict. It also has extensive forests that have been looted for decades. The argument will be that these two are linked, but not by the grievances of the forest dwellers. Except in its first few days, the two main episodes of 1997 and 1999 were not driven mainly by grievances among marginal groups. Rather, explanations based on the “resource curse” carry more weight. These focus attention on the contested nature of the state, rather than on rebellious activities of marginal groups. When state institutions were thrown into disarray by the sudden resignation of President Suharto in 1998, Dayak militants already close to state power rewrote the rules of local politics by demonstratively “cleansing” certain areas of an unpopular immigrant minority. This theatrical maneuver impressed political rivals sufficiently to allow Dayaks to gain control over several timber-rich districts, which had a thriving black economy. Malays later imitated these techniques to stem the tide [author].


Rising global demand for palm oil is likely to exacerbate deforestation rates in oil palm-producing countries. This will lead to a net reduction in biodiversity unless measures can be taken to improve the value of oil palm plantations. Here, I investigate whether the biodiversity of oil palm plantations can be increased by determining how forest-dwelling butterflies and birds in these plantations are affected by vegetation characteristics at the local level (e.g. epiphyte prevalence) and by natural forest cover at the landscape level (e.g. old-growth forests surrounding oil palm estates). Across transects, vegetation variables explained 0–1.2% of the variation in butterfly species richness and 0–7% of that in bird species richness. The most important predictors of species richness across transects were percentage ground cover of weeds for butterflies; and epiphyte prevalence and presence of leguminous crops for birds. Across estates, natural forest cover explained 1.2–12.9% of the variation in butterfly species richness and 0.6–53.3% of variation in bird species richness. The most important predictors of species richness across estates were percentage cover of old-growth forests surrounding an estate for butterflies; and percentage cover of young secondary forests surrounding an estate for birds. Synthesis and applications: In order to maximize biodiversity in oil palm plantations, oil palm companies and local governments should work together to preserve as much of the remaining natural forests as possible by, for example, creating forested buffer zones around oil palm estates or protecting remnant forest patches in the landscape [author].

Within Borneo, the indigenous Iban pua kumbu cloth, historically associated with headhunting, is steeped in spirituality and mythology. The cloth, the female counterpart of headhunting, was known as women’s war (Linggi 1999). The process of mordanting yarns in preparation for tying and dyeing was seen as a way of managing the spiritual realm (Heppell, Melak, and Usen 2006). It required of the “women warriors” psychological courage equivalent to the men when decapitating enemies. Headhunting is no longer a relevant cultural practice. However, the cloth that incited headhunting continues to be invested with significance in the modern world, albeit in the absence of its association with headhunting. This thesis uses the pua kumbu as a lens through which to explore the changing dynamics of social and economic life with regard to men’s and women’s roles in society, issues of identity and nationalism, people’s relationship to their environment and the changing meanings and roles of the textiles themselves with global market forces. By addressing these issues I aim to capture the fluid expressions of new social dynamics using a pua kumbu in a very different way from previous studies.

Using the scholarship grounded in art and material culture studies, and with particular reference to theories of “articulation” (Clifford 2001), “circulation” (Graburn and Glass 2004) and “art and agency” (Gell 1998, MacClancy 1997), I analyze how the Dayak Iban use the pua kumbu textiles to renegotiate their periphery position within the nation of Malaysia (and within the bumiputera indigenous group) and to access more enabling social and economic opportunities. I also draw on the theoretical framework of “friction” and “contact zones” as outlined by Tsing (2005), Karp (2006), and Clifford (1997) to contextualize my discussion of the pua kumbu in museums. Each of these theoretical frameworks is applied to my data to situate and illustrate my arguments. Whereas in the past, it was the culture that required the object be made, now the object is made to do cultural work. The cloth, instead of revealing hidden symbols and meanings in its motifs, is now made to carry the culture, having itself become a symbol or marker for Iban people. Using an exploration of material culture to understand the complex, dynamic and flowing nature of the relationship between objects and the identities of the producers and consumers is the key contribution of this thesis. [http://hdl.handle.net/2100/637]


It has been debated whether a human dispersal originating from southern mainland Asia replaced the original, late Pleistocene modern human populations inhabiting the islands of Southeast Asia or whether observed morphological changes (and cultural changes) are attributable to in situ change. It has been suggested that this transition occurred at the Mesolithic-Neolithic boundary. The migration-replacement model predicts abrupt morphological changes in a short period of time due to the influx of a southern mainland China population. The in situ model predicts no significant abrupt
morphological changes at the Mesolithic-Neolithic boundary. It is the goal of this
dissertation to test predictions of both models with a suite of traditional cranio-dental and
geometric morphometric cranial analyses that have proven useful in studies of biological
relatedness. Analyses are performed on recent human samples from the East Asia-
Pacific region and prehistoric skeletal samples (i.e., Pre-Neolithic and Neolithic) from
an archaeological site in northwest Borneo (West Mouth, Niah Cave). The first phase
of analysis tests predictions of both models by comparing statistically the Pre-Neolithic
and Neolithic group means. If the data indicate significant morphological differences
between the temporal groups, then the in situ model is rejected. Conversely, if significant
differences are not detected, then the in situ model cannot be rejected and the migration-
replacement model remains unsupported. The second phase, statistical comparison of
the prehistoric samples with modern East Asia-Pacific human samples, determines to
which modern populations the prehistoric groups have the closest affinities. Results
of the analyses fail to falsify the in situ model. The two West Mouth samples do not
appear significantly different from each other regarding cranial and dental non-metric
or upper- and mid-face shape. The Pre-Neolithic and Neolithic samples demonstrate
affinities closer to Southeast Asians, Polynesians and Australians than to East Asians.
Both prehistoric groups also demonstrate considerable variation and overlap in
morphology. Tooth size, however, does differ significantly between the temporal
samples and is most likely a result of dental reduction over time. The cultural changes
evident at the Mesolithic-Neolithic boundary in island Southeast Asia, therefore, may
be the result of diffusion without significant genetic contribution at this particular site.
(Winzeler database)

**Martin, Peter, 2008, Educational Discourses and Literacy in Brunei Darussalam,**

Over the last century, the small Malay Islamic Sultanate of Brunei Darussalam, on the
northern coast of Borneo, has moved away from an oral tradition, to a print culture and
towards mass literacy. Discovery of oil in the early part of the 20th century transformed
the economic situation in the country, and led to major changes and developments
in the country. This paper explores one of the major transformations in Brunei,
the development of education and the rise of literacy. The introduction to the paper briefly
describes the multilingual ecology of Brunei, an ecology which is much more complex than
official discourses would suggest. The paper then provides an historical contextualization
of language and education discourses in Brunei, specifically the discourses around the
promotion of *dwibahas* (two languages) in the education system, following independence
in 1984, as well as literacy in two languages, Malay and English. The final part of the paper
focuses on microethnographic analyses of classroom literacy practices, and these practices
are linked to the broader sociopolitical and educational transformations in Brunei [author].

This dissertation is comprised of two chapters that examine labor supply and health in the developing world. The first chapter focuses on the labor supply of older people in Indonesia. In developed countries, most workers depend on public and private pension systems to smooth their consumption. In the developing world, where little formal institutional support exists, older individuals rely on their own labor income and on family support in the form of transfer payments, coresidence, and participation in family businesses. However, the dramatic gains in life expectancy and declines in family size and coresidence that accompany development suggest that these traditional forms of support may break down. In this chapter I build and estimate a structural dynamic model of labor supply for older men in Indonesia that incorporates these mechanisms. I use this model to simulate the effects of demographic change and a broad public pension reform on labor supply and welfare. The estimation results show that families and health play a key role in labor supply choices in old age. Simulations show that a unified defined-contribution pension program for government and private sector workers would provide modest welfare gains at a reasonable cost, but may not offset the potential welfare losses brought by declines in family support. These results highlight the complexities of old age labor supply and pension reform in the context of rapidly developing societies.

In the second chapter, co-authored with Elizabeth Frankenberg and Duncan Thomas, we combine data from a population-based longitudinal survey with satellite measures of aerosol levels to assess the impact on adult health of smoke from forest fires that blanketed the Indonesian islands of Kalimantan and Sumatra in late 1997. To account for unobserved differences between haze and nonhaze areas, we compare changes in the health of individual respondents. Between 1993 and 1997, individuals who were exposed to haze experienced greater increases in difficulty with activities of daily living than did their counterparts in nonhaze areas. The results for respiratory and general health, although more complicated to interpret, suggest that haze had a negative impact on these dimensions of health.


Lowland rainforests on Borneo are being degraded and lost at an alarming rate. Studies on mammals report species responding in various ways to habitat changes that occur in commercial forestry concessions. Here we draw together information on the relationship between the ecological, evolutionary, and biogeographic characteristics of selected Bornean non-volant mammals, and their response to timber harvesting and related impacts. Only a minority of species show markedly reduced densities after timber harvesting. Nonetheless there are many grounds for concern as various processes can, and often do, reduce the viability of wildlife populations. Our review of what we know, and of current understanding, helps predict mammalian dynamics and subsequent mammal-induced ecosystem changes in logged forests. We identify groups of mammal

Shifting cultivation is practiced by millions of farmers in the tropics and has been accused of causing deforestation and keeping farmers in poverty. The assumed positive relationship between fallow length and crop yields has long shaped such negative opinions on the sustainability and environmental impact of the system, as population growth is believed inevitably to lead to its collapse. Empirical evidence for this assumption is scarce, however, and a better understanding of system dynamics is needed before discarding shifting cultivation as unsustainable. With cases from Malaysia and Indonesia [all from Borneo], we show that fallow length is a weak predictor of crop yields, though interactions with fertilizer inputs may increase its importance. Other factors such as drought, flooding, and pests are more important determinants of yields. The implication is that when using natural fallow as the only means of nutrient supply, there is no need to cut old fallow vegetation. Moreover, there is no evidence of system collapse, even at short fallow periods. We conclude that shifting cultivation should be accepted as a rational land use system and that earlier calls for bringing a “Green Revolution” to shifting cultivators are still relevant to achieve intensive and sustainable production [Reed L. Wadley].


This dissertation is a description of the grammar of West Coast (WC) Bajau, a western Austronesian language spoken in Sabah, Malaysia by some 60,000 people. Drawing extensively from elicited data as well as a corpus of compiled texts, I describe the language at its various levels: phonology, morphology, phrase structure, clause structure, clause-combining operations, and discourse. In its verbal morphology, WC Bajau shows a (marked) actor-orientation vs. (unmarked) undergoer orientation with both transitive and intransitive verb roots. I show evidence for a verb phrase in WC Bajau, in one (and possibly two) voices. Investigation of the pragmatic structure of the clause shows that WC Bajau has both a topic and a focal position preverbally.

Though primarily descriptive in nature, the grammar devotes some space to theoretical issues concerned with the voice system, which has long been the subject of debate among linguists and typologists studying western Austronesian languages. I argue on primarily
syntactic grounds that WC Bajau shows little evidence for an ergative-antipassive voice system, as has been proposed for a number of other Sama-Bajaw languages. Instead, WC Bajau patterns as a symmetrical voice language with two transitive voices, as well as a “true passive” voice. In this and other respects, WC Bajau resembles Malay/Indonesian and Balinese (“Indonesian-type” languages) as opposed to the indigenous languages of Sabah and some Sama-Bajaw languages, which show greater resemblance to the “Philippine-type” languages [author].


Monogamy occurs in only 5% of mammalian species, but is significantly more common in the Euarchonta: primates, dermopterans, and treeshrews (15% spp.). However, many of these species do not breed monogamously, indicating the need to understand behavioral and genetic monogamy as separate evolutionary phenomena. I examined monogamy in the large treeshrew (Tupaia tana) in Sabah, Malaysia using radiotelemetry data from 46 individuals tracked during and after a fruit masting episode in 1990-1991, during a non-masting period from 2002-2004, and in a selectively logged forest from 2003-2004. I show that large treeshrews exhibit behavioral monogamy in all these ecological situations. However, behavioral monogamy is best characterized as dispersed pair-living, or “asocial monogamy,” in this species because male-female pairs travel, forage, and sleep alone on their joint territories. Next, I use microsatellites and mitochondrial DNA d-loop haplotypes to analyze the genetic maternity and paternity of 24 T. tana offspring. I show one of the highest rates of extra-pair paternity (EPP) ever recorded for a behaviorally monogamous mammal. Over 40% of young were sired by males that were not the behavioral partner of their mother, and three litters exhibited evidence of multiple paternity. Comparative analysis of relative testis size in treeshrews and primates indicates that sperm competition is not associated with the high rates of EPP in T. tana, and that the evolution of monogamy is associated with the evolution of smaller testes. Finally, I find genetic evidence of female-biased dispersal and gene flow in large treeshrews. The vast majority of mammals exhibit the behavioral combination of polygyny and male-biased dispersal, but female-biased dispersal may evolve in monogamous species when females compete for ecological resources. In support of the local resource competition hypothesis, I find lower population assignment probabilities and pairwise relatedness for females than males. These results indicate that female T. tana are a mixture of philopatric residents and immigrants from other areas. Coalescent-based Bayesian analyses also show that historical female migration has been three times higher than the overall migration rate between primary and logged forest populations, providing evidence of female-biased gene flow. (Winzeler database)

Asserts that many Asian nations, in their drive to industrialize, have chosen national identity and economic development over the survival of their indigenous peoples. Utilizes case studies in Malaysia, India, and China to examine the divergence between macro- and micro-interests illustrated by the egregious examples of these hydraulic projects [MJP].


Swidden farmers throughout Southeast Asia are rapidly abandoning traditional land use practices. While these changes have been quantified in numerous local areas, no reliable region-wide data have been produced. In this article we discuss three linked issues that account for at least some of this knowledge gap. First, swidden is a diverse, complex, and dynamic land use that data gatherers find difficult to see, define and measure, and therefore often relegate to a “residual category” of land use. Second, swidden is a smallholder category, and government authorities find it difficult to quantify what is happening in many dynamic and varied smallholdings. Third, national policies in all countries of Southeast Asia have tried to outlaw swidden farming and to encourage swiddeners to adopt permanent agriculture land use practices. Drawing on specific, local examples from throughout the region [including Indonesian and Malaysian Borneo] to illustrate these points, we argue that an accurate assessment of the scale and pace of changes in swidden farming on a regional level is critically important for identifying the processes that account for these shifts, as well as evaluating their consequences, locally and regionally [Reed L. Wadley].


A collection of memories – vignettes – of an experience that took place forty-two years ago – between 1963 and 1965. It is about a place, its flora, fauna and peoples – their lives and customs; and a time of political change; the shedding of its British colonial rule, the becoming of the independent State of Sabah; and a few weeks later, becoming incorporated within the Federated States of the nation of Malaysia.
Patterson, Katherine-Anne V., 2008, Patterns of Local Mobility in an Iban Community of West Kalimantan, Indonesia. MA thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Missouri-Columbia, USA.

This study examines the concept of mobility in relation to small-scale, subsistence-oriented societies, in which groups and individuals create complex resource networks in order to satisfy physical and social needs. Mobility is multi-dimensional and is defined as the capacity or ability to move over a landscape. The purpose of this study was to examine the mobility patterns of a West Kalimantan Iban community, answering the following questions: (1) Where and how often did people travel? (2) At what time during the observed year did people travel? (3) Are there differences in travel patterns, dependent upon gender and age? (4) What are the relationships between the visited and the visitor, and how do the relationships affect the frequency and purpose of travel episodes? (5) What do the social relationships determine in terms of travel for exchange? The data are derived from a local mobility study of one Iban longhouse community between April/May of 1993 and February/March of 1994.

The observations indicated that groups and individuals most often traveled in close proximity to the longhouse and more frequently during periods in which additional resources were necessary and at times of low swidden cycle labor demands during the observed year. Those who traveled were generally 16 years of age or older and most often female, and the relationships between the visited and visitor were most often close kin relationships. Due to the importance of the close kin relationships to the groups and individuals, the balance of exchange was highly important in order to maintain a cognatic network of abundant economic and social resources.

This study illustrates the importance of the interrelationship between the multi-dimensional mobility patterns of the community and its network of natural, economic, and social resources [author].


In the field of human behavioral ecology, Costly Signaling Theory (CST) is often employed to explain the existence of seemingly “wasteful” behaviors such as hunting and distributing game widely among non-kin. These behaviors are economically wasteful, but may transmit valuable and reliable information to interested signal receivers. Successful and competitive signal production may lead to an increase in reputation and prestige, and thus, an increase in ability to attract potential mates and allies. At present, however, CST assumes that individual signalers within a sample all produce the same signals. I explore the hypothesis that individuals use hunting to produce different signals within different contexts, and these signals are likely to be aimed at specific individuals. Additionally, other important subsistence activities may have a great impact on type of signal production and the effectiveness of these signals in communicating this information. Using Iban hunting, game distribution, and rice-farming data, as well
as various measures of relative prestige, the signal-type production of individual hunters and the intended direction of these signals are evaluated. Analysis of a sample of Iban hunters reveals that there are no differences in signal production among relatively low-prestige hunters and relatively high-prestige hunters. However, analyses of individual hunting, game distribution, and rice-farming activities suggest that individuals may produce signals to communicate specific qualities, such as diligence, intelligence, and altruism to targeted individuals [author].


This dissertation examines the nexus of research, policy and practice from village to global levels regarding forest management and local communities’ control over forest resources and improved local livelihoods in Indonesia. I investigate how problems and solutions are articulated; how these articulations are transformed in practice; how practice is translated into knowledge or policy; and how particular interpretations of practices become authoritative. In doing so, I examine the culture of and relationships between forestry institutions in Indonesia, highlighting the role of brokers of authority—individuals and/or organizations that skillfully translate social reality into an “order” that not only resonates with the different logics, interests, and expectations of relevant institutions, but also recruits support for their interpretation to become authoritative. The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) and the Donor Forum on Forestry in Indonesia (DFF) are the key interlocutors studied, and CIFOR’s applied research activities in Indonesian Borneo and the landscape of international aid-related forestry institutions are the contexts within which they are examined.

With respect to CIFOR, I investigate in one analytical frame (1) project plans and intentions, (2) the context within which activities take place and the relationships between the different actors, and (3) how the difference between plan and outcome is addressed to a broader public. I show that although activities do not proceed as planned, CIFOR’s reporting and publishing of unintended outcomes incorporates this unraveling into an authoritative narrative of prescriptions for CIFOR’s interpretive community. Essential to legitimizing and mobilizing support for these prescriptions and CIFOR more generally is their articulation through the vehicle of self-critical reflection.

I also examine the tension between order and disjuncture in the landscape of aid-related forestry institutions in Indonesia. I analyze how the order or narrative of reform agreeable to both donors and the Indonesian government was crafted and maintained by the DFF in its brokering role, while no actual progress was made on agreed upon commitments. Moreover, I investigate the structural dynamics that explain this lack of progress and the ineffectiveness of aid in Indonesia. In doing so, I reveal the disconnect between knowledge, policy and practice, as well as how these disjunctures are maintained (Winzeler database).

The Philippine state, as a labor broker produces, distributes and regulates Filipino migrants, as citizen-workers, globally. As a labor brokering state the Philippine government produces and distributes workers for various types of capital and their attendant flexible labor regimes, privatizing states, and nascent middle-classes making it one of the world’s top exporters of temporary labor. Yet, the state does not merely produce and distribute workers, but citizens who are endowed with protections and who are, simultaneously, also expected to fulfill national obligations as Filipinos regardless of their country of employment. The state therefore, must regulate its citizen-workers transnationally to ensure that they remit their earnings back home. At the same time, the state must also extend regulations or protections of its citizen-workers transnationally because it cannot merely export migrants as commodified bodies of labor. Indeed, the state had initially instituted a purely “labor exporting” apparatus, but that apparatus was thrown into major crisis as Philippine migrants mobilized transnationally demanding more protections from the state. The state therefore created a new “labor brokering” apparatus that has proven to be an effective means of managing migration. The Labor Brokering State is based primarily on qualitative research including ethnography and interviews conducted in the Philippines and Brunei from May 2000 to September 2001. I conducted ethnographic research of the Philippine state’s migration apparatus, what I call the “bureaucratic assembly line,” and a migrant grass-roots organization, Migrante International. In these two keys sites I also conducted interviews, both formal and informal, with state representatives and migrant workers. Through my work in The Labor Brokering State, I contribute to the globalization and transnational literature, which either reifies capital flows from “above” or in opposition to this scholarship, examines transnationalism from “below.” I argue, alternatively, that the state plays a central role linking and mediating between these two processes. (Winzeler database)


The East Java Basin has a geological life span of more than 50 Ma, with a diverse structural and stratigraphic development history. The basin originated during the Eocene on continental crust and developed northeast to southwest trending linear paleo-highs at its inception. These antiformal uplifts are cored by contractional structures, but also exhibit minor crestal extension. The parallel and convex paleo-highs are separated at a spatial wavelength of 80-100 km. The well and sediment information is recorded and evaluated herein as subsidence histories. By coupling the convex profiles from geohistory information with low heat flows recorded in well bottomhole temperatures, the evidence points to an origin of lithospheric flexure and buckling of the continental crust. The stratigraphy documented in well and outcrop samples indicates a preponderance of shelfal carbonate deposits with an influx of quartz sandstone during the Miocene. The quartzite source is north of the basin in Borneo associated with an exposed granite massif.
Only Pliocene-Recent sediments (<5 Ma) are sourced from adjacent volcanic eruptions to the south. In contrast to previous studies where rifting is proposed as the mechanism for basin initiation, the evidence uncovered in this research points to crustal buckling of continental crust as the correct mechanism. Well subsidence histories indicate folding or flexure of the continental crust caused by contraction of the lithosphere which appears to be responsible for Eocene-Miocene basin subsidence. The research evidence suggests the basin developed in four stages identified in the structure and stratigraphy captured in the geohistory profiles. The first stage of East Java Basin development, crustal buckling, originated with Middle Eocene with sediments deposited in geographic lows on folded continental crust. Stage two, the flexural deepening phase, started in the Late Oligocene with gradual subsidence until the Lower Miocene. The third phase, foreland inversion, started in the Middle Miocene and persisted until the Middle Pliocene. The last stage of basin development, arc convergence, began in the Upper Pliocene with the northward vergence of the Sunda magmatic arc. During the Pleistocene the north verging thrusts on the south side of the basin initiated a reversal of the basin symmetry. 

(Research database)


The book covers the onset of Indonesian confrontation against Malaysia in 1961 and the subsequent military reaction by the Security Forces (British Commonwealth) under the command of Far Eastern Command until 1966. Themes covered are the importance of intelligence, air and naval forces and the deployment of British and Gurkha infantry and later Australian artillery and infantry to stop insurgency war spreading to Kalimantan, Sabah and Brunei and Malaya/Singapore. The main theme covers the role of artillery (field and locating branches) in supporting infantry patrols and guarding borders with Indonesia [publisher].


Heavy stable isotope analysis of mid-late Holocene Neolithic burials from Sarawak (Malaysia) identifies groups not apparent in mortuary treatment or inferred subsistence. Isotope ratios of strontium and lead from adult tooth enamel show distinct groups at Niah Cave’s West Mouth organized by dietary catchment. Two roughly contemporary sites, Gua Sireh and Lobang Angin, are included to assess regional heterogeneity in northern Borneo. Heavy stable isotope ratios for humans differ from sampled modern plants and archaeological fauna from West Mouth, and suggest a non-local origin for some of the West Mouth human remains. Distinct heavy isotope ratios characterize all three sites and show regional differentiation broadly consistent with geological expectations. Results supplement paleodiet and morphological analyses and have implications for clarifying Niah Cave mortuary use during the mid-late Holocene. Further and more precise
Swidden cultivation with a long fallow period has long been a central component in a complex agroforestry system practiced by the Iban of Northwest Borneo. Importantly, the system has also included permanent and semi-permanent groves and tracts of forest, and gardens of rubber, fruit, and bamboo. These have not only been preserved and managed for gathering forest products and hunting, but the Iban also recognize longer-term benefits such as the protection of watersheds and regeneration of the forest after farming. This chapter proposes that the managed forest in the Iban system may have provided not only the seed necessary to reforest fallowed fields, but also the habitat needed by animals that pollinate and disperse seed. These animals may thus have helped sustain both preserved and fallow forests, which, when seen as part of the total agroforestry system, may both have been essential elements in the long fallow cultivation cycle [author].


Interactions of organic matter (OM) with soil mineral phases strongly affect the storage and dynamics of soil OM as well as other ecosystem processes. This study examined aspects of organo-mineral associations in soils at different scales. First, I assessed the potential controls of climate and parent rock type on organo-mineral associations using two sets of undisturbed tropical forest soils developed on two contrasting rocks along an altitudinal gradient in Borneo, Southeast Asia. Density fractionations showed that OM stored in surface mineral soils partitioned towards plant detritus fraction under cooler climates on both rock types. Thus climate exerted stronger control on soil OM storage and partitioning patterns than parent rock in the study area. The plant detritus associated with soil mineral grains also increased its standing stock under cooler climates, suggesting that abundance of mineral-free detritus and its comminution had stronger control than soil mineralogical factors. Second, gas sorption approaches were applied to the same sets of soils to assess OM associations with soil mineral surfaces. Surface characterization before and after OM removal revealed that, with increasing altitude and OM loading, OM appear to accumulate in globular forms that incidentally encapsulate fine mineral grains, rather than accumulating via sorption onto all mineral surfaces. Similar control of soil OM loading on the organo-mineral arrangements was found in soils of different geographic areas and soil types (n = 33), suggesting much wider generality of this relationship. Third, I examined the importance of hydrous iron oxides (FeOx), a common soil mineral phase known to have strong sorptive capacity,
for soil OM storage using a wider range of mineral soils spanning eight soil orders. With a modified selective FeOx dissolution method, I achieved the first quantification of the organic carbon (OC) that can be released from FeOx phases. Iron-bound OC accounted for only minor fractions of total soil OC (mean: 11%, range: 0-37%), indicating limited capacity of FeOx to sorptively store bulk of soil OM. The mass ratios of OC to iron (OC:Fe) of the extracts in some low pH, organic samples (e.g., spodic horizons) implied the presence of organo-iron complexes rather than adsorbed forms. (Winzeler database)

**Wells, Konstans, 2005, Impacts of rainforest logging on non-volant small mammal assemblages in Borneo. Thesis, experimental ecology (level n/a), University of Ulm.**

As logging activity increases in tropical rainforests, it is crucial to better understand the extent to which changes in species assemblages and species interactions with the environment affect the function of rainforest ecosystems. The overall objective of this study was to determine how non-volant small mammal assemblages are affected by rainforest logging in the rainforest in Borneo: Do species diversity and assemblage variability of small mammals differ in undisturbed and logged rainforests? Do logging-induced habitat differences influence habitat use and movement trajectories? What are the characteristics of movement and ranging patterns of the rat *Leopoldamys sabanus* in different forest types? Do these trajectories differ at different scales? Do parasitic helminthes assemblages differ in small mammals? Are these helminth assemblages affected by logging? The study emphasizes the importance of local ecological interactions and within-habitat dynamics in contributing to the spatial dynamics of small mammal assemblages in dipterocarp rainforests. The variability in spatio-temporal habitat use within local assemblages and the large variability in individual movement patterns tended to be greater between sites than differences induced by logging, demonstrating the difficulty in predicting the effects of logging. The high level of forest heterogeneity in both forest types may help to explain the weak effects of logging on small mammal assemblages. The reduced species richness in logged forests clearly shows that some species are vulnerable to severe population reductions or extinction by logging-induced changes. The inconsistent responses of several small mammal species to logging with regard to movement trajectories and composition of parasitic helminth assemblages prevent general predictions about the effects of logging. It became clear with this study that multiple sets of environmental and intrinsic features unique to a species determine the outcomes of logging. (Winzeler database)
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ENDNOTES

UK doctoral research on Borneo (in progress): ASEASUK News appears to have ceased publishing an annual directory (cf. BRB 2005:308 and BRB 2006:308).
The Borneo Dissertations Project (Winzeler database) had 541 items as at 1344h
GMT on 13 January 2009; but none of these was dated either 2007 or 2008.

At the time of going to press the latest available issue of the Sabah Society Journal was still that for 2004 (cf. BRB 2006:308).

Sutera 2007, published in conjunction with the sixty-first anniversary of the birth of HM Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah, was officially launched on 2 July 2007 by Pehin Adanan Mohd Yusof, Minister of Home Affairs. The book aimed to disseminate information on the royal birthday activities and celebrations at the national and district levels to enliven the atmosphere (BBO Tu.3.7.2007). Similarly, Sutera 2008 marking Hari Keputeraan 62 appeared on 1 July 2008. A website (www.sultanate.com) had been established to enable public sector employees to post congratulatory messages (BBO W.2.7.2008).

On 8 August 2007 it was reported that a group of literary figures (including Muslim Burmat) had “recently” met Pehin Mejar-Jeneral (Bersara) Mohammad bin Haji Mohd Daud, Minister of Culture, Youth, and Sports, and a senior government officer, Dato Paduka Haji Mahmud bin Haji Bakyr, to press for major works of local writers to be translated so that their books could be promoted globally. The ultimate goal was to see an NBD writer receiving the Nobel Prize for Literature within twenty years (BBO W.8.8.2007).

Thirty-six textbooks for schools of Islamic religion from Primary 1 until Primary 6 had been produced by various principals and teachers. Twelve of the books had been printed already, whilst the others were in press ready for use in 2008 (BBSO 26.8.2007).

A Brunei Book Festival with the theme ‘Books and ICT Enhancing the Nation’s Competitiveness’ was held from 27 August to 5 September at the Brunei-Muara District Office in conjunction with Hari Keputeraan 61. Supported by the Ministry of Home Affairs, the aim of the event was to “encourage and nurture the reading habit among members of the public” (BBO F.3.8.2007). At the official opening on 27 August, Pehin Mejar-Jeneral (B) Mohammad, Minister of Culture, stated that all members of the community, especially youth, “should make books their primary source of information”; they should not rely solely on the internet (BBO Tu.28.8.2007).

Brunei Reading Year 2008 would coincide the Silver Jubilee of the DBP’s Reading Competition. In working towards a reading culture and a more educated community, the DBP provided a mobile library, seminars, and a carnival. All schools were urged to create a “reading club” (BBO F.26.10.2007).

Remember, Remember .... the 8th of December (with a Foreword by HM the Sultan; Brunei Press Sdn Bhd, 2007; hbk, pbk) by HRH the Pengiran Perdana Wazir (Prince Mohamed Bolkiah) was officially launched by HRH Pengiran Anak Isteri Zariah at the Balai Penghadapan on 12 November 2007. The book comprises a study of the 1962 Brunei Revolt. Five hundred copies were sold in the first two days. A Special Edition of thirty copies, presented in a slip case and autographed by the author, was also available (BBO W.14.7.2007).

On 13 November 2007 Pehin Mohammad Haji Daud, Minister of Culture, opened the Brunei Writers’ Meeting at the DBP in Berakas. First held in 2001, the
gathering attracted more than one hundred authors from throughout the sultanate. The fourth such conference ended on 15 November with a seven-point resolution:

1. Literature experts were expected to forge their creative minds in cultural diversification, high morals, without compromising Islamic and conservative values.
2. A “National Interpretation [Translation] Bureau” was required to implement the “interpretation” of local writers’ books. A degree course in “interpretation” should be introduced at a local university.
3. A database or website that stored current information on the country’s literature needed to be activated to expand networking, discussion, and idea exchange between local and international writers.
4. The implementation of guidelines on laws or regulations in the use of electronic media and an evaluation association, with international standards for local writers.
5. The development of research on literature in the local arena.
6. A prestigious national Islamic literature award was suggested.
7. The Education Ministry was advised to emphasize literature as part of the curriculum (BBO F.16.11.2007).

On 14 November HRH the Crown Prince (Haji Al-Muhtadee Billah) launched The Report: Brunei Darussalam 2007 by the Oxford Business Group (price £105 at www.oxfordbusinessgroup.com). The book provided a comprehensive overview of Brunei’s political and macroeconomic environment targeted at foreign investors. Fifteen thousand copies were to be circulated within the sultanate and a further sixty-seven thousand were to be distributed worldwide (BBO Th.15.11.2007). On 29 May 2008 an MOU was signed between the government and the OBG to publish an updated second edition entitled The Report: Brunei Darussalam 2008 (BBO F.30.5.2008), which duly appeared before the end of the year.

On 26 November a delegation departed from NBD for Kuala Lumpur. Dayang Aminah binti Haji Momin, Deputy Director of the DBP, was due to present a paper entitled “Literature and History: Tradition and Continuity in Mahkota Berdarah” at the International Seminar on South-East Asian Literature (SAKAT) 2007. Likewise, Dr Haji Morsidi bin Haji Mohammad (Head, Malay Literature Department, UBD) delivered a paper entitled “History-Based Literature from Brunei: A Discussion on Reality and Imagination.” Two other officers from the DBP, Suip Haji Wahab (acting Secretary-General of the South-East Asia Literature Council, MASTERA) and Hajjah Shaharah binti Dato Paduka Haji Abdul Wahab were also in the delegation; they were due to attend a MASTERA secretariat meeting in addition to SAKAT 2007 (BBO Tu.27.11.2007).

On 28 November 2007 Dato Paduka Haji Muslim bin Haji Burut (“Muslim Burmat”), received the fifth Hadiah Sastera MASTERA 2007 (NBD section), comprising RM10,000 in cash, a plaque, and a certificate, for Ntaidu, his eleventh novel (BBO Tu.27.11.2007; BBO F.30.11.2007). “MASTERA” is somewhat grandly named, however, given that it covers only Indonesia, Malaysia, and NBD, with Singapore enjoying “observer” status.

Shaikh Mahmud bin Shaikh Haji Ibrahim took first prize in the Civil Service Institute’s Essay-Writing Competition (2007) for his “Analisis Keperluan Latihan
Dalam Perkhidmatan Awam Negara Brunei Darussalam,” which analyzed the training needs of the NBD Civil Service. Twenty-three essays were to be collected in a journal to be published by the IPA in due course (BBO W.28.11.2007).

The acting Director of Curriculum Development at the Ministry of Education, AH Matassan bin Haji Bungso, called on all book dealers to observe the prices fixed by the government for school textbooks and work books. Officers from the JPK [Jabatan Perkembangan Kurikulum] would be making spot-checks to ensure that the regulations were being obeyed (BBO M.10.12.2007).

From January to November 2007 the Malaysian government seized 11,159 copies of Islamic religious publications worth RM166,960.80 throughout the country for violations under the Quran Text Printing Act (1986). The worst offender was Penang, followed by Pahang, Kedah/Perlis, Putrajaya, and Sabah (BBO Sa.29.12.2007).

Dr Mataim Bakar, Director of the DBP, was present as the chief guest at the commencement of a three-day Literature Writing Workshop organized by the Tutong Writers’ Group with the cooperation of the Language and Literature Bureau. Thirty-five persons attended. Parents tended to regard Bahasa Melayu and Malay Literature as second-class subjects; writers needed to change this mindset (BBO Sa.19.1.2008).

On 19 January 2008 the Department of Economic Planning and Development at the Prime Minister’s Office announced the publication of the Brunei Darussalam Long-Term Development Plan.

A book on customer care from an Islamic perspective (Pemedulian Pelanggan: Menurut Perspektif Islam) by the State Mufti, Pehin Abdul Aziz Juned, was launched 28 January 2008 at the Brunei International Airport Departure Hall. The book was published by the State Mufti Department (BBO Tu.29.1.2008).

On 6 February 2008 the Syariah Court published Sejarah Penubuhan Mahkamah Syariah Negara Brunei Darussalam. Edited by Dato Ustaz Metussin Baki, the book carries eleven papers by judges, historians, lawyers, and academicians (BBO Th.7.2.2008).

The ten-day Brunei Book Fair 2008, organised by the DBP, ran from 27 February until 7 March 2008, with the theme “Books are the Future.” This year there were nearly 120 sections with more than sixty companies selling local and international books, compared to only ninety sections and fifty companies the previous year. Among the new books launched at the festival was The Phonotactics of Brunei Malay: An Optimality Theoretic Account, by Dr Mataim Bakar (BBO Th.28.2.2008; and cf. BRB 2007:301).

More libraries were being built in NBD to inculcate reading habits. The latest addition, at Sengkurong in Brunei-Muara District - was expected to open some time during 2008. It was the fourth after Kampong Pandan (Belait), Muara, and Kampong Lambak Kanan, which were all situated within “village areas.” The construction of the building had been completed, but the actual date of the opening was not yet known. The establishment of such facilities was in line with the government’s aspiration to create a knowledge-based society. The DBP had also set up “recently” a
reading corner at Mendaram Besar Longhouse in Labi (*BBO* Tu.8.4.2008).

**Ustazah Hajjah Fatimah Ghani**, Assistant Director of Islamic Education in NBD, stated on 10 April 2008, that there should have been more than enough new textbooks for schools of Islamic religion in the country. This was in response to a report on 3 April concerning a “shortage.” Following an investigation it was found that several greedy schools had purchased more copies than needed, which led to difficulties for other establishments. To solve the problem she urged the guilty headmasters to return the surplus books. The department would continue to upgrade their monitoring process to ensure better distribution and to prevent any recurrence of the problem (*BBO* F.11.4.2008).

**Anne Fine**, an award-winning British novelist, spoke to parents and teachers about the craft of writing when she visited Jerudong International School on 15 April 2008. Fine, who has written more than fifty novels since she took up her pen in 1971, is most famous for *Mrs Doubtfire*, which was made into a film. She maintains that writing has to be carried out “in absolute silence, in absolute secrecy.” A former “Children’s Laureate” in the United Kingdom, Fine possesses “great judgement and a beautiful voice” (*BBO* F.11.4.2008; *BBO* W.16.4.2008; *DT* Tu.2.12.2008:32).

The *Borneo Bulletin Brunei Year Book 2008*, the fifteenth edition of the annual publication, was published free-of-charge on 14 April 2008. This year’s theme was “The Heart of Borneo.” With a “user-friendly format” and up-to-date information, it was (the publisher claimed) “the ultimate guide to the A-Z of NBD” (*BBO* M.14.4.2008).

The **Strategic Plan Book of the Ministry of Communications** was issued on 28 April 2008 (*BBO* Tu.29.4.2008).

A book written by the indefatigable **State Mufti, Pehin Abdul Aziz Juned**, *Orang Sembahyang Ditangisi oleh Tempat Sujudnya* (197pp, B$8.00, 27 May 2008), aimed to heighten the commitment of Muslims to prayer (*BBO* W.28.5.2008).

An awareness-raising event on the archiving and preservation of books and local published works was held on 28 May 2008 at the Art Gallery of the Royal Customs and Excise Building in the capital. Proceedings were conducted by the Museum Department in conjunction with International Museum Day. Similar gatherings were planned for Tutong District (11-12 June), Belait (2-3 July), and Temburong (28-29 July) (*BBO* Th.29.5.2008).

In June 2008 the **DBP was negotiating with the Google search engine** to make it easier to purchase books published by the bureau. The DBP had already achieved its target of one hundred titles annually and has significantly increased the range of topics involved; the idea now was to increase readership and sales (*BTO* Tu.3.6.2008).

A **Memorandum of Understanding between the DBP and Rafiqun Information Telecommunications Services (RITS)** was signed on Thursday 10 July 2008 with the aim of disseminating DBP products to a wide public using modern techniques. The MOU aims to introduce the service using hand phones to receive a list of terminology and a Brunei Malay dictionary through the short messaging service.
DSTcom customers can the dictionary fast and easily (BBO F.11.7.2008).

**The DBP staged a “reading month” in June 2008.** Various activities were held in the four districts, aimed at instilling a habit of reading among the people. It was also hoped that the initiative would encourage the use of libraries as a source of knowledge. Parents were advised not to depend solely on teachers to do all the work. Combined efforts could create a generation with better knowledge, qualifications, and talent; this could lead to a culture that could hold its own in a competitive world (BBSO 6.7.2008).


The **ASEAN Good Agricultural Practices** Seminar was held at the Pengkalan Batu Mukim Community Hall of the Taman Mini Perayaan Kampong Parit on 11 July 2008 with a book launched as a guideline to ASEAN GAP standards covering worker health and safety, food safety, and environmental management (BBO Sa.12.7.2008).

On 5 August 2008 a prize-giving was held for various competitions staged in conjunction with the Hari Keputeraan 62 Knowledge Convention (2008). The categories comprised: story for children, short story, articles, and jawi calligraphy. In his address the energetic Dr. Mataim Bakar said that the numbers of people participating in additional competitions have been encouraging over the years. The competition saw more seasoned writers putting up a tough fight against stiff competition from fresh writers (BBO W.6.8.2008).

The **Kreatif Bahana DBP-BSP 2007** competition held its prize-giving on 16 August 2008 on 16 August 2008 at the DBP in Berakas (BBSO 17.8.2008).

Pengiran Dato Seri Setia Dr. Haji Mohammad bin Pengiran Haji Abdul Rahman, Deputy Minister of Education, was selected by the NBD Judging Committee to be the twenty-third recipient of the South-East Asia Write [sic] Award 2008 for the sultanate. A prolific poet using the pen-name Zairis MS, Pengiran Dato Mohammad was chosen on the basis of his anthology of poems entitled Rinduku (DBP, 2008). Taking inspiration from the surrounding environment, his personal thoughts, and current affairs, Rinduku comprises fifty poems, originally published in 1985 in Kuala Lumpur, but re-published by the DBP in NBD in 2008. The Deputy Minister added his voice to the pressure for the best ASEAN works to be translated into universal languages, such as English and Arabic (BBO Th.2.10.2008). He has written three other books of poems - Harga Waktu, Salam Takwa, and Madah Remaja (BBO W.27.8.2008). The Deputy Minister departed for Bangkok on 25 September (BBO F.26.9.2008) and received his prize from HRH Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn on Tuesday 30 September (BBO Th.2.10.2008).

The winner for the sultanate in 2007 was K. Manis (b 1937) and in 2006 Haji Shawal Rajab (1950-2007). On the latter, vide supra, NBD obituaries. “K. Manis” is the pen-name used by Haji Moksin bin Haji Abdul Kadir, a teacher and poet from the Tutong District who has been involved in creative writing for half a century. He received another award on Hari Guru in 2008.
It was reported on 27 August 2008 that a Chinese-language book entitled *Brunei Darussalam* (B$10.00) had been published “recently.” Edited by Mr. Sng Teck Ann, Chairman of the Chinese Writers’ Association in NBD, the collection comprised the perspectives of twenty writers from throughout the world, including Australia, the PRC, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, and the USA.

The finals of the eleventh national *syair*-recital competition for schools and colleges in conjunction with *Hari Guru* were held on 28 August 2008 at the DBP in Berakas. Fifty schools entered the event but only twelve pupils (six boys and six girls) won through to the last round. The event aimed at re-introducing traditional Brunei literature and also to encourage appreciation of the country’s heritage to the younger generation and to present a platform for the newer generation to hone their skills and interest in traditional literature (*BBO* F.29.8.2008).

On 28 August 2008 the Survey Department (Ministry of Development) in collaboration with Brunei Press Sdn Bhd launched the *Brunei Darussalam Street Directory* (B$14.90, 144pp) in a ceremony at the Ministry of Development. The Minister (Pehin Abdullah Bakar) said that HM’s Government was “aware of the importance of geospatial information as one of the main forces for the progress of a nation”; the new directory was one of the many good examples of cooperation between the government and the private sector. A similar publication had been made twelve years earlier; but the country had developed fast since then. Dr. Kazimierz Becck, a senior lecturer at UBD and a cartographer with twenty-five years of professional experience, took two years to create the maps (*BBO* F.29.8.2008).

The SME [small and medium sized enterprise] share of employment is fifty-nine per cent in NBD compared to 49.5 per cent in Canada, 43.1 per cent in Singapore, and 41.5 per cent in the USA. It appears that a *Brunei SME Business Directory* was “launched” on 30 August 2008. Ten thousand complimentary copies of the directory and CD ROMs were to be distributed to SMEs, government ministries, government departments and agencies, MNCs, large corporations, and overseas. It is not entirely clear from the report whether the book was available immediately or whether it was to be published in January 2009 forthcoming (*BBSO* 31.8.2008).

On 17 September 2008 the State Mufti’s Office launched *Other People Bank, We Also Bank: We Bank by Aqidah, Syariah, and Ibadah*, written by Pehin Abdul Aziz Juned. Ten thousand copies were printed (*BBO* W.17.9.2008). The government’s official website (*GBOW ON* Tu.30.9.2008) stated that the book was entitled *Orang Berbank Kita Juga Berbank*, or Other People Have Banks, So Do We. The book contained a wealth of useful information designed to boost Islamic banking.

The MASTERA Awards were presented on 21 September 2008 at a ceremony held at the Rizqun International Hotel in Gadong. The prize-giving took place in conjunction with the fourteenth MASTERA meeting in NBD. The winner for NBD was Professor Madya Dr. Haji Hashim bin Haji Hamid (*BBO* M.21.9.2008).

The fourteenth Conference of the Literature Council of South-East Asia (MASTERA) ended on 21 September 2008 after a three-day meeting in NBD. MASTERA was formed in 1995 to elevate the Malay literature to a higher international status. Chaired by Dr. Mataim Bakar (Director of the DBP doubling as Chairman of
the NBD section of MASTERA), heads of missions from member nations of Indonesia, Malaysia and NBD signed a number of resolutions at the final session designed to elevate the status and quality of Malay literature to world standards by carrying out various activities such as comparative literature lectures in member countries (BBO M.22.9.2008).

On 16 October the State Mufti’s Department together with Darussalam Holdings Sdn Bhd published a book entitled Haj and Umrah (294pp) at the State Council building. The book comprised more than eighty fatwas of the State Mufti of Brunei/NBD from 1964 to 2005; it would serve as a work of reference for prospective pilgrims in performing their religious duties and assist officers and administrators in solving problems faced in carrying out their duties in Mecca and Medina (BBO F.17.10.2008).

Foreign diplomats in NBD “recently” attended a Hari Raya open house hosted by the National Development Party at its headquarters located at Limbaruh Hijau, Simpang 323, of Jalan Jerudong. A book entitled Ilmu Politik dalam Islam: Orientasi NDP, written by Haji Antin Ahad, the party’s Vice-President, was launched by M Yasin Affandy, NDP President (BBO M.20.10.2008).

The Sultan Haji Hassanal Bolkiah Foundation (YSHHB) was introducing an “Award in Islamic Literature.” The prize was to be presented every three years with the first one scheduled for 5 November 2008 at the ICC. The idea was to encourage writers who had produced high quality literature based on Islam and to spread Islam among people in the region through literature (BBO Th.30.10.2008). The winner in 2008 was Pehin Siraja Khatib Yahya Ibrahim, the former Deputy Minister for Religious Affairs, for his work entitled Perjalanan Anakku Terakhir Yang Hilang. At the same time Sultan Haji Omar ‘Ali Saifuddien Sa’adul Khairi Waddien (1914-86) was recognized as the “Eminent Islamic Scholar of Brunei” while Pengiran Shahbandar Mohd Salleh ibn Pengiran Sharmayuda (d 1858) was declared to be the “Pioneer of the Modern Literature of Brunei” (BTO Th.6.11.2008). When announcing the awards, HRH the Crown highlighted the problem of non-Muslim authors who had published works on Islam without the benefit of a true understanding of the religion.

More than eighty teachers attended the launch in Berakas on 18 November 2008 of two books published by the Academy of Brunei Studies, namely Masyarakat Pribumi Cemerlang dan Masalah Sosial and the ninth edition of Pembarigaan Jurnal Janang.
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