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NOTES FROM THE EDITOR

In This Volume

There are few, if any, issues of greater concern to the indigenous peoples of Borneo at the moment than land rights. Questions of land and land tenure have been repeatedly raised in the pages of the Borneo Research Bulletin since this publication’s inception, but never, I think, with quite the urgency that they have now assumed. It is therefore fitting that the first two papers in this issue deal with land and with the relationships that indigenous communities have developed with the land they inhabit and with the complex, culturally meaningful landscapes that they have fashioned for themselves in consequence of these relationships.

The first Research Note in this volume, a major paper by Ramy Bulan entitled “Boundaries, Territorial Domains, and Kelabit Customary Practices: Discovering the Hidden Landscape,” examines in some detail the ways in which the Kelabit people of northern Sarawak have transformed the physical landscape of the Kelabit Highlands through their varied uses of the land and its resources and by means of cultural practices, understandings, shared knowledge, oral traditions and history. An Associate Professor of Law at the University of Malaya, and at present a Ph.D. student of Professor Barry Hooker at The Australian National University (himself a past contributor to the BRB on the subject of native land rights), the author is particularly concerned with documenting individual and community links to the land, cultural mechanisms used to define and allocate land rights, practices relating to the management of these rights, and indigenous concepts of territoriality, boundaries and boundary demarcation. She also writes on how a distinctively Kelabit “cultural landscape” was created in the past by the construction of megalithic monuments, the cutting of ridgetop clearings, the digging of ditches, or re-channeling of streams. These man-made modifications registered in the physical environment have produced enduring memorials, still visible today in the Kelabit Highlands, with remembered histories, that encapsulate claims to family status, honor, or stories of past accomplishments. They also constitute, as she notes, physical evidence of Kelabit occupation of the land.

Today, as Ramy Bulan points out, indigenous notions of place and land management are coming into increasing conflict with statutory law and with powerful political and economic interests. As she notes, one strategy today for making legally “visible” indigenous land relations is by community mapping. Here, however, in Sarawak, the State Government has taken the unprecedented action of making such map-making illegal and those who carry it out liable, in effect, to criminal prosecution. In this connection, the author clearly spells out the implication of state monopolization of map-making authority.

Tragically, as this volume goes to press, despite a High Court judgment (Nor anak Nyawai & Others vs Borneo Pulp Plantation Sdn Bhd & Anor) that apparently upholds native customary land rights in Sarawak, outside logging operations have begun in the Kelabit Highlands, taking community members by surprise. Government-granted logging concessions appear to encompass even existing villages within their boundaries, including that of the Kelabit anthropologist, Poline Bala. Relatedly, although occurring at the opposite corner of Sarawak, MalaysiaKini, in a news report of 12 November 2004 filed by Tony Tien, describes the felling of community engkabong forests belonging to four
Bidayuh villages between Bau and Lundu by a logging company, the “Malay Star," under terms of a concession similarly granted by the Sarawak State Government. The *MalaysiaKini* report quotes a senior legal officer from the state’s Attorney-General’s office as saying that by passing amendments to the Sarawak Land Code in 2000, the Sarawak Legislative Assembly provided for the annulment of native customary land rights, although he conceded, when questioned, that these amendments have not yet been officially gazetted and so are unenforceable. It would seem to many that the current Sarawak State Government now appears intent upon extinguishing native customary land rights, by whatever means possible, setting the stage for further court battles. Whatever the outcome, sadly, it will come too late for many, who will, by then, be alienated from their ancestral lands.

In the paper that follows, Professor Dimbab Ngidang, the current Dayak Chair, and your Editor’s successor at the Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, in an extremely timely essay, traces the evolving history, from the Brooke era onward, of native customary land rights in Sarawak, insightfully analyzing the consequences for native land-use practices of the original Sarawak Land Code, earlier land laws, and of the Land Code Amendment Bill of 2000, mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Although Professor Dimbab is writing primarily about the Iban, the greater part of his argument applies equally to other indigenous groups in Sarawak, including the Bidayuh and Kelabit. In addition, he examines past and present land development policies and clearly spells out their implications for indigenous land tenure and the socio-economic well-being of those affected.

In the next paper, the historian Bob Reece, a familiar and most welcomed contributor to the *BRB*, looks at the Second Rajah of Sarawak, Charles Brooke, as the subject of a developing biographical project. He opens by posing the question of why the Second Rajah “continues to languish,” as he puts it, “as a subject of biographical interest,” despite the fact that his long reign covered no less than 49 of the Brooke Raj’s 100-year history, including, with little question, the most transformative of these years. He answers in terms of currents in Sarawak historiography as well as Charles’s own character. The author raises the interesting question of why Charles was so successful as a ruler, surveys existing primary sources relating to his personality and methods of rule, and draws attention to the existence of a previously untapped collection of semi-official correspondence between Charles Brooke and the Sarawak Treasurer, K. M. Dallas, covering part of the last decade of Charles’s rule, from 1902 to 1917. This correspondence, he tells, covers not only many of the details of government and diplomacy during this period but also shared confidences of a more personal nature.

The next three papers deal with the interrelated topics of health, nutrition, food resources, and the use of medicinal plants. The first of these papers, by Dee Baer, “Health in the Borneo Highlands,” nicely complements Ramy Bulan’s opening essay. It focuses on the Kelabit population of the Bario valley and provides a valuable overview of general conditions of health, nutrition, and the availability of health care facilities. Considering what was said earlier in these Notes, it remains to be seen how much longer the Bario valley will remain relatively sequestered from outside pressures.

In the second paper, Alison Hoare looks at a people who are closely related to the Kelabit, the Lundayeh of southwestern Sabah, and, for two communities in the Ulu Padas area, Long Pasia and Long Mio, she provides important data on food resources and diet, using dietary surveys and household food logs, supplemented with botanical collecting
expeditions. The author then compares these data with the findings of similar research in other central Bornean societies, noting, among other conclusions, that the Lundayeh appear to utilize a smaller number of fruit and vegetable species than do Iban and Kelabit living in areas more accessible to forest resources. As the author notes, the Ulu Padas highlands were the location, until recently, of one of the largest areas of old-growth forest remaining in Sabah. Today, however, the region is being logged, and, in her paper Dr. Hoare describes the ways in which the Lundayeh have tried to accommodate to the resulting loss of resources, which, ultimately, seems certain to doom their current forest-based lifestyle. In conclusion, she makes a cogent case for maintaining at least some measure of the region’s surviving cultural and biological diversity through the establishment of protected areas and the development of community forests and agroforestry.

The third paper, “Traditional Medicinal Plants used by the Dusun Tobilung of Kampuug Toburon, Kudat, Sabah,” is presented by three Malaysian researchers, Mashitah Mohd Yusoff, Goroh Pasok and Berhaman Ahmad, all attached to the Institute for Tropical Biology and Conservation at the Universiti Malaysia Sabah. Although dealing with a more restricted topic, the paper adds valuable data on medicinal plants, their botanical identification, local names and uses to a growing body of ethnobotanical research on other ethnic groups in Sabah, including, not the least, other Dusun-speaking communities.

Finally, in this issue, Dr. Roger Kershaw initiates something that we have not previously attempted, but which we now hope, inspired by Dr. Kershaw’s example, to make a regular feature of the BRB, an extended review essay dealing with a set of thematically related publications. Volume 35 will include a review essay by Eva and Roger Kershaw surveying the life and apparent death of Bruno Manser based on a review of his writings *Voices from the Rainforest* and his newly published three-volume diaries. Tentatively, in Volume 36, we hope to include a similar review essay covering recent writings on the Brooke Rajahs.

In his essay, Dr. Kershaw, also a past contributor to the BRB and a scholar whose writings on the modern Brunei Malay monarchy will be well-known to many of you, examines four recent publications on modern Brunei history and society written by authors whose careers have been, or are, associated in one way or another with the Universiti Brunei Darussalam. His central theme concerns a pressure to accede to “political correctness” that he discerns reflected in all of these works, less, oftentimes, by what is said than by what is left unsaid. His essay is clearly intended to challenge readers and provoke debate, but the more general questions he raises about the influences that shape the content of academic writing, whether in Borneo or, for that matter, in the West, are bound, I think, to concern most of us.

Once again, I would like to thank all of those who assisted me during the year with article reviews, news items, announcements, comments, suggestions, and editorial help. The list, as always, is a long one, and includes, among others, Sander Adelaar, George Appell, Dee Baer, Martin Baier, Poline Bala, Ramy Bulan, Carol Colfer, Jim Collins, A.V.M. Horton, Terry King, Jani Sri Kuhnt-Saptodewo, Jayl Langub, Heidi Munan, Mika Okushima, Ooi Keat Gin, Vernon Porrit, Bob Reece, Graham Saunders, Bernard Sellato, Andrew Smith, Vinson Sutlive, Tan Chee-Beng, and Reed Wadley. To all of you, my thanks.

The present volume has been long delayed in appearing. Your editor very much
regrets this delay, but is pleased to report that, as this volume goes to press, Volume 35 is in the process of being made ready for the printers. We hope that it will appear early in 2005, within a month or two of the present issue.

Some Changes in the Borneo Research Bulletin

I am pleased to announce that Dr. A. V. M. Horton has agreed to take on the job of Book Review Editor and compiler of our annual Bibliography section of the BRB, beginning with the present volume. As readers will note, Dr. Horton has made a number of useful innovations, among them the addition of book reviews to the Bibliography section.

In this connection, I would urge all of you with interest or information to contact Dr. Horton about contributing book reviews, or with bibliographic information, reprints, or abstracts. Providing reviews of current publications and other timely bibliographic information is a major function of the Borneo Research Bulletin, and one which, insofar as this information relates specifically to Borneo, no other publication currently performs. Dr. Horton may be contacted directly either by mail or by e-mail:

Dr. A.V.M. Horton
180 Hither Green Lane
Bordesley
Worcestershire B98 9AZ
ENGLAND
Email: avmhorton@hotmail.com

Each year the Council receives from publishers a number of books for review. Three of these books are reviewed in the present volume and several others are now being reviewed for Volume 35. If you would like to review books for the BRB, please contact Dr. Horton, indicating your specific areas of interest. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank our present and past book reviewers. A number of you, on your own, have contributed unsolicited reviews, in many cases of books that might have otherwise escaped our notice. These reviews are always welcomed. In addition, we are happy to be able to reprint reviews that appear in other publications, provided, of course, that we are able to obtain permission. In the past, I am happy to say, we have had little difficulty doing so.

My wife Louise has been a major editorial help, proofreading, often repeatedly, every manuscript that crosses my desk, in some instances through multiple revisions. It seems only fair therefore to acknowledge her role, and with permission of the executive committee, I am delighted to formally declare her Assistant Editor.

This year we are initiating a new production process for the computer formatting and layout of the Borneo Research Bulletin. When fully implemented, this process should allow us to make articles and other materials that appear here available online as well as in printed form. To this end, we are now linking the technical production of the BRB to the general publications operations of the Borneo Research Council.

Over the years the Borneo Research Bulletin has grown greatly in size. In addition, with the increased use by our contributors of computer graphics — photographs, maps, and similar materials — the work of processing manuscripts for publication has become ever more complex and time-demanding. Our volunteer Production Editor, Dr. Phillip
Thomas, has coped heroically through it all. However, your Editor has become increasingly aware that it is far too much of a burden for a single person to undertake alone. For Phillip, I know, it has been a labor of love, but it is a major labor nonetheless, and one that has grown prodigiously over the years.

Phillip, in addition to his expertise as a Malay language and literature scholar, is also, of course, an experienced computer programmer. He first began doing the production formatting of the BRB during the last years that Professor Vinson Sutlive, my predecessor, edited the BRB, through, he tells me, by his own recollection, at least one or two annual publication cycles. During my tenure, I can truthfully say that the BRB could not have appeared without Phillip’s presence, skillfully coaxing it through the often trying formatting and production process. Phillip and your Editor have been friends and colleagues ever since our youthful days in Penang, Malaysia, more years ago than either of us now cares to admit to, but over 30, by my reckoning, and it is a continuing source of satisfaction to work with Phillip and to benefit from his advice and technical know-how. The present stylistic form and layout of the BRB owe much to Phillip’s technical guidance and suggestions. Still, over the last few years, the sheer volume of work has become an unreasonable burden, particularly in light of Phillip’s own demanding professional career with the U.S. National Library of Medicine. Fortunately for the BRB, Mrs. Joan Bubier, the Borneo Research Council’s Administrative Assistant, who currently oversees the production side of the Council’s publications (i.e., the monograph series, proceedings volumes, etc.) has agreed to assume charge of the computer formatting and processing of the BRB, beginning with the present issue. I am deeply grateful to Mrs. Bubier, and others in the BRC office, for their willingness to take on this demanding job. As I indicated, our hope is that by consolidating operations in this way, we may additionally be able to add an online service, thereby increasing the accessibility of the BRB to a larger academic audience.

Of course, Phillip will go on advising us on computer matters as well as on general Borneo affairs. Indeed, I have already had occasion to seek his advice several times this year in regard to the present issue and he remains the BRB’s Malay manuscript specialist. We hope, in addition, that Phillip will also indulge his special affinity for Sarawak and report to us soon on developments in Sarawak Malay literature, including his beloved pantun.

Finally, in the present issue of the BRB, from Sarawak, our resident man of letters and historian of the local scene, Dr. Otto Steinmayer, writes in “A Letter from Lundu” about parish history and its significance to the members of a small Iban congregation to which he and his family belong. We hope, with Otto’s consent, to make “A Letter from Lundu” a continuing feature of future BRBs.

Membership Database

Those of you who received the Borneo Research Council mailing and membership invoice of 9 August 2004 will know that the Council tries on a regular basis to keep its current membership database up-to-date. Therefore, included in the mailing was an address form and a request for email addresses from those of you who would be willing to receive occasional BRC notices electronically.

If you are a new member, have changed your address, or for some reason failed to receive the mailing, we would like to hear from you. Please contact the Council secretary either by mail (Borneo Research Council, P.O. Box A, Phillips, Maine 04966, USA) or
by email (brc@borneoresearchcouncil.org). Also, as a reminder, the Council maintains a website with information on the BRC, its goals, and current activities at www.borneoresearchcouncil.org. Again, if you have suggestions or further information that you would like to see included on the website, we would like to hear from you.

Borneo Research Council Medal, 2004—awarded to Dr. Bernard Sellato

We are pleased to announce that the Borneo Research Council medal for excellence in the pursuit of knowledge in the social, medical, or biological sciences in regard to Borneo was awarded this year (2004) by the Council’s executive committee to Dr. Bernard Sellato. Dr. Sellato is the seventh recipient of the award.

For the past 30 years, Dr. Sellato has distinguished himself by his many and extensive contributions to the study of Borneo societies and cultures. Dr. Sellato first arrived in Kalimantan as a uranium geologist in 1973. Here, he soon developed an interest in the tribal peoples of the remote Müller Range, where he was engaged at the time in geological mapping. For two years, he lived among the Aoheng, a community of forest farmers. Partly as a consequence, he shifted his field of professional interest and returned to France to take up graduate studies in anthropology, earning his doctorate from the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris, in 1987. Today, Dr. Sellato is the undisputed authority on the smaller Dayak groups of the central Borneo interior, including not only farming communities like the Aoheng, but also, notably, rainforest hunter-gatherers.

Dr. Sellato has been extraordinarily productive in contributing to the field of Borneo studies both as a scholar and as an administrator. He was a member of the Board of Directors of the Borneo Research Council from 1985 to 1997 and Director of the Indonesia Office of the BRC in Jakarta from 1991-1996. During this time he was responsible for administering Ford Foundation grants to the Council which enabled more than three dozen Indonesian scholars to attend the BRC Biennial Meetings in Sabah (1992), Pontianak (1994), and Brunei Darussalam (1996). A member of CNRS, the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, since 1992, Dr. Sellato was Director of the Institute for Research on Southeast Asia (IRSEA), CNRS and the Université de Provence, from 1999 through 2003, having served in other administrative positions earlier. Between 1991-95, he headed an interdisciplinary social science program, “Culture and Conservation,” focused on past and present interactions of people and rainforests in East Kalimantan. Dr. Sellato is currently a member of the Université de Provence faculty, and since 1999, has served as founding editor of the international Southeast Asian studies journal, Moussons.

In the realm of Borneo scholarship, Dr. Sellato is the author of four volumes and the editor of six other works. These books cover a wealth of topics, ranging from art and material culture, through kinship and social organization, to issues of ecology, conservation and ethnography. A review of his most recent volume, a collection of essays (Innermost Borneo: Studies in Dayak Culture) appears in the Book Review section of this volume.

In recognition of these many contributions, the Board of Directors, on behalf of the Borneo Research Council, is pleased to present the BRC medal to Dr. Bernard Sellato.

A Brief History of the BRC Medal

The BRC instituted the Borneo Research Council Medal in 1990. The first award was
made that year to Datuk Amar Dr. Leonard Linggi Jugah, Chairman and founder of the Tun Jugah Foundation, in recognition of his tireless efforts on behalf of cultural heritage preservation and for his many philanthropic contributions to the cause of Borneo studies and to the advancement of the Dayak community of Sarawak. The second award was made in 1993 to Dr. H. Stephen Morris for his long-term commitment to the study of the social organization, economy, and religion of the Melanau people and for his now classic publications on Melanau society and religion. Two awards were made in 1994. The first was presented posthumously to Professor William R. Geddes in recognition of his pioneering studies of Bidayuh (or Land Dayak) society and culture. His beautifully translated Bidayuh epic, published as Nine Dayak Nights, remains to this day an enduring anthropological masterpiece. Professor Geddes was also a pioneer ethnographic filmmaker. The second award was to Professor J. Derek Freeman, who, together with Stephen Morris and William Geddes was part of the post-World War II Colonial Office Social Science Research Council Project that figured crucially in the development of modern social anthropology of Borneo, for his landmark studies of Iban agriculture and social organization and for his many other seminal contributions to anthropological theory based upon his Iban research. In 1996 the BRC medal was awarded to P. M. Dato Shariffuddin in recognition of his contributions to Borneo scholarship and for his role in developing the Brunei Museum. Also in 1996, the sixth BRC medal was awarded to Anthony John Noel (A.J.N.) Richards in recognition of his significant contributions to the study of Dayak adat law, Iban culture and to Borneo lexicography, the latter through his encyclopedic Iban-English Dictionary.

A Request for Information, Sabah

From time to time, the Borneo Research Council receives requests for information of various kinds. The following request seemed to your Editor to be one that might warrant the attention of at least a few of our readers. The author of this request, Mr. Robert F. McGechan, writes that he is trying to trace his family tree. "The McGechan side of the family," he writes, "appears to have had a substantial history with Borneo, but I have very little to work on. The few facts I have are as follows: Father Robert James Baillie, born Jesselton, N. Borneo 27/4/1921. Grandfather or great grandfather went out with Captain Cowie to put up the British Flag in Borneo — date and name unknown — but believed to be Robert McGechan. I also understand this [ancestor] started a company called British Borneo Dyes. I would be grateful for any help you are able to give me in my endeavour," signed Robert F. McGechan at <r.mceghan@virgin.net>.

Member Support

Here we wish to express our thanks to the following individuals for their contribution over the last year and a half to the BRC Endowment and General Funds.

Endowment Fund:

Ms. E. Kim Adams, Dr. Matthew Amster, Antiquarian Booksellers 'Gemilang’, Dr. and Mrs. G. N. Appell, Laura P. Appell Warren, Mr. Ralph Arbus, Dr. Clare Boulanger, Dorothy Chin, Dr. Amity Doolittle, Dr. Michael Dove, Ms. V. K. Gorlinski, Professor Virginia Matheson Hooker, Dr. Allen R. Maxwell, Professor H. Arlo Nimmo, Ms. Vicki Pearson-Rounds, Dr. Phillip Thomas, Dr. & Dr. H. L. Whittier, Dr. W. D. Wilder, Dr.
Robert L. Winzeler, and Mr. Herwig Zahorka.

General Fund:

Ms. E. Kim Adams, Dr. Matthew Amster, Dr. G. N. Appell, Mrs. Laura P. Appell Warren, Mr. Ralph Arbus, Dr. Adela Baer, Dr. Martin Baier, Dr. Clare Boulanger, Dr. Donald Brown, Mr. Chew Lun Chan, Dr. Jay B. Crain, Dr. Otto Doering, Professor Ian Douglas, Dr. Michael R. Dove, Dr. Richard Fidler, Ms. V. K. Gorlinski, Ms. Judith Heimann, Professor Virginia Matheson Hooker, Dr. A. V. M. Horton, Dr. & Mrs. Alfred Hudson, Dr. Allen R. Maxwell, Dr. Peter Metcalf, Dr. Rodney Needham, Dr. & Mrs. Clifford Sather, Dr. Graham Saunders, Dr. Anne Schiller, Dr. Rolf Schlömer, Dr. Bernard Sellato, Professor F. Andrew Smith, Dr. & Mrs. Otto Steinmayer, Dr. Jack Stuster, Fr. Brian Taylor, Ms. Pushpa Thambipillai, Dr. Reed Wadley, Mr. Jim Welsh, Dr. & Dr. H. L. Whittier, James Wickes, Dr. W. D. Wilder, William Wilkinson, Dr. Robert L. Winzeler, Dr. Leigh Wright, and Mr. Herwig Zahorka.

Once again, our thanks to all these individuals for their support.
FORMATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL BOARD OF EDITORS

The Executive Committee of the Borneo Research Council is pleased to announce the formation of an International Board of Editors to provide advice for its publications and activities:

The BRC publications include the *Borneo Research Bulletin*, the Monograph Series, the Proceedings Series, and the Occasional Paper series.

The Board's functions may include:

- advising the current editors of the Council's various series in choosing new manuscripts to publish;

- recommending new manuscripts to be considered for the BRC's various series;

- providing advice on the general status of the BRC's publications and how to improve them;

- suggesting scholars who would be willing to write reviews of the status of research and publication in various disciplines, such as botany, medicine, history, ecology, biology, sociology, indigenous literature, etc.; and

- providing advice on occasion as to whether particular manuscripts are suitable for publishing.

One of the new developments in our publication program will be to publish reviews of the status of research in Borneo from those disciplines whose topics of research are seldom covered in our current publications. We believe that these reviews will be of considerable importance in helping scholars to keep up to date in disciplines other than those they are familiar with; to help determine what research from other disciplines might be relevant to one's own research; and to provide the necessary information to advise students on their research plans.

Members include:

Sander Adelaar, Ph.D. (The University of Melbourne)
Adela S. Baer, Ph.D. (Oregon State University)
Bjorn F. Dahlen (University of North Dakota)
Amity A. Doolittle, Ph.D. (Yale University)
Michael R. Dove, Ph.D. (Yale University)
Christine Egenter, Ph.D. (Trento, Italy)
Jayl Langub, (Sarawak)
Peter Metcalf, Ph.D. (University of Virginia)
Arlo H. Nimmo, Ph.D. (San Francisco, California)
Leslie M. Potter, Ph.D. (University of Adelaide)
Rajindra K. Puri, Ph.D. (University of Kent at Canterbury)
Bob Reece, Ph.D. (Murdoch University)
Clifford Sather, Ph.D. (University of Helsinki)
Bernard Sellato, Ph.D. (CNRS-IRSEA)
Vinson H. Sutlive, Ph.D. (College of William and Mary)
Nicolas Tarling, Ph.D. (University of Auckland)
Motoimitsu Uchibori, Ph.D. (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies)
Andrew P. Vayda, Ph.D. (Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey)
Reed L. Wadley, Ph.D. (University of Missouri)

If there are additional scholars who would like to participate, please let us know.

We would also appreciate receiving nominations for research topics to be reviewed and a reviewer for these.

George N. Appell, Ph.D.
MEMORIALS

THE RIGHT REVEREND PETER HENRY HERBERT HOWES

1911-2003

Bishop Peter Howes died peacefully at his home in York on 12th April, age 92. His had been a long and full life, the main part of it spent in Sarawak as an Anglican priest and missionary from 1937 to 1981, during which time he spent only three leaves in England. His Sarawak service was during a period of turmoil and change in Sarawak history in which he played a significant part.

Howes was born in the village of Edgmond in Shropshire, where his father was Director of the National Institute of Poultry Husbandry. After a relatively unhappy primary and preparatory school education, he attended Adams Grammar School in Newport and then, from 1929 to 1934 trained for ordination at Kelham Theological College, Newark. He was ordained deacon in 1934 and priest in 1935, and served as curate at St. Michael and All Angels Church at Norton, Stockton-on-Tees until his departure for Sarawak in May 1937. On 12 July 1937 he was licensed as Assistant Priest at St. Augustine’s School, Betong, under Fr. Jack Sparrow, with pastoral responsibility for Stambak Ulu, Stambak Ili in the Saribas and houses in the Paku. In January 1939 he was sent as temporary Headmaster to St. Michael’s School, Sandakan, in British North
Borneo. On the arrival of the new Headmaster, he was transferred in November 1939 to Quop as priest in charge of the Bidayuh district, with responsibility also for the Iban houses in the Merdang and Entingan area.

As a missionary priest, Peter Howes worked to further the Christian faith, but he always respected the beliefs, customs and traditions of those he served, transforming rather than destroying their cultures. Thus, he devised prayers and rituals for various events in the Bidayuh and Iban calendars and for social and religious occasions. He was suspicious of the self-righteous, seeking beneath the surface for a person’s true worth and in his heart had a soft spot for the rogue and sinner. About one, who had tricked him out of ten dollars, but who could be relied on in a crisis when others demurred, he remarked that he, “like so many rogues, had a character and gifts which, along with those of the harlots, would gain him entry into heaven before some of us more respectable people” (Howes 1994:109-110). He recognized that Christianity was seen by many good, upright, honest and responsible people in Sarawak as a threat to their societies and their traditions, and respected those who stood out against the new teaching in order to preserve their communities. He expressed this view in his article, “Why Some of the Best People aren’t Christian,” for the Sarawak Museum Journal (Howes 1960). His confidence in his own faith was not threatened. He could find humor, as he did often, in the human condition, demonstrated in these words from his report to the Borneo Mission Association for 1940, recording a sudden and violent tropical storm which rocked the wooden structure of the church at Mambong, near Quop, during evensong. “Part of the roof was torn off, the windows burst open, and the whole building shook and bent under the force of the wind, so that the main posts began to lift out of the ground. Women shrieked, and one person shouted out something to the effect that they had been backing the wrong gods, and the spirits were taking vengeance upon them” (Borneo Mission Association Annual Report for 1940, pp. 16-17). Many in the Bidayuh area who had been born Christians had forgotten the crisis of faith new converts faced. Howes understood it. One of his assistants, named Saden, had been brought up a pagan. Howes found him invaluable on his missionary visits to non-Christian houses, possessing “an understanding and sympathy which second and third generation Christians lacked” (Howes 1994:116). This empathy with the people among whom he worked remained throughout his life and is perhaps symbolized by his love of local delicacies, which many Europeans shunned. He was still receiving gifts from Sarawak of fried sago worms up to the time of his death.

During the Japanese Occupation he was interned in the Batu Lintang Camp where, using the Greek New Testament and Gore’s Commentary, he occupied himself by revising the Biatah Gospels and translating the Epistles. For paper he washed and bleached old treasury records, which entered the camp wrapped around rations, and the backs of labels from tins. Japanese searches were frustrated by rolling the papers into small, pencil-size cylinders and concealing them in bottles closed with a wooden stopper and sealed with latex, which were buried underneath the hut. These survived to be published some 18 years later.

At the end of the war, the internees were sent to Labuan. Howes successfully resisted immediate repatriation to England by the Australian military authorities and received permission to return to Quop. Rajah Vyner Brooke was negotiating the transfer of Sarawak to the British Crown. With many of the Brooke regime’s administrative officers out of the country, Howes was appointed to the Council Negri to take part in the debate on the issue. Refusing to vote for cession, he expressed his doubts in the whole process,
arguing that the people should have been properly informed and consulted. He then returned to England on leave. His stand earned him respect and affection from those whose interests he strove to represent and whose reservations he voiced.

On his return in February 1950, he was sent to Tase in the Bukit Sadong area where he remained until September 1952, when he was appointed the first Warden of the House of Epiphany Theological College in Kuching, preparing candidates for the priesthood. This required the duplication of all lectures into Iban and Biatak. He was still responsible for the Bidayuh villages (other than Quop) where he spent all his weekends. In 1952, his collection of Bidayuh folktales, *Shun Nyanba Nang* and *Surat Basa. A Land Dayak Primer* were published by Macmillan. The latter began with the alphabet and concluded with a simple homily on cleanliness.

Howes had argued for many years for a development scheme at Padawan, near the border with Indonesia, to improve education, health and agriculture in the villages there. The scheme was approved in 1958 and Howes was seconded to the Government as Officer-in-Charge. He threw himself wholeheartedly into the task and looked back on the following three years as the highlight of his life. “The beauty and wildness of the surroundings, the physical demands which the work imposed, the perception that we were all pagan and Christian alike God’s people living in community, all this made the experience exceptional and sustained us in an ecstasy of energy” (Howes 1994:315).

He was appointed Archdeacon of Sarawak and Brunei in 1961 and in the same year received the OBE. Based now in Kuching, he was responsible for training lay-readers and catechists, both Bidayuh and Iban, and was Chaplain to Secondary Schools. In 1962 he was appointed Archdeacon of Kuching, having declined to take over the See upon the resignation of Bishop Cornwall in favor of Basil Temenggong, who became the first local Bishop. Sarawak became independent within Malaysia in 1963. Howes’ contribution to the state was recognized by the new State Government when he was made an honorary Officer of the Order of the Star of Sarawak (PBS) in 1964. In 1965 he was appointed Archdeacon of Brunei and North Sarawak, based in Miri and then Mamut. He was an active missionary, opening the Tatau and Mamut areas and establishing two new parishes, one covering the Niah and Subis District and the other in Bintulu. In 1970 he was recalled to Kuching to re-open the theological college and to instruct new catechists. In 1976 he was stationed in Limbang to establish St. Mark’s as a parish. He was recalled to Kuching in August 1976 as Assistant Bishop, an honor he greatly appreciated because it signified acceptance of him as being virtually a Sarawakian himself. This post he held until his retirement to the UK in June 1981.

In 1958, while at Padawan, he took up philately as a hobby. It became an abiding interest. He decided to make a philatelic survey of Sarawak, and over the years formed a major collection of Sarawak stamps. He had, also, an inordinate fondness for cats, in particular for SiPuss, his constant companion for almost 17 years from 1961 to 1977, whose grave in the garden of the House of the Epiphany carries the letters P.I.P. – Purr in Peace. Howes advised anti-feline readers to pass over the chapter in his autobiography which records his recollections of SiPuss, but he wrote that she had given him more affection than he had ever received from any other creature (Howes 1994:322). A revealing remark. Many who visited him at Padawan and in other isolated areas found him hungry for companionship. He also had a fondness for small luxuries, particularly foods, and at one time at Padawan would produce for visitors a very mature Stilton cheese he retained for such occasions.
Howes had a very keen, if sardonic and even scatological, sense of humor. Of a rare interview with Joanna Lumley he remarked to Heidi Munan, "Now you know what the Bishop said to the actress": a reference to the slightly risqué joke. He had a matter-of-fact attitude to basic human functions, which raised some eyebrows among those who read his autobiography. He also had no illusions about the Anglican Church as an institution, had little patience with those who made a show of religiosity, and categorized the three streams of Anglicanism as the "High and Crazy, Broad and Hazy and Low and Lazy." His was a practical Christianity and his mission began from where the people were. At the House of the Epiphany, in the words of Bishop Made, he molded the students "into men of God in the same frugal condition." In instructing the catechists, he seated them informally around him as on a longhouse verandah, explaining that, if they were ever to reach out to the peoples in the villages, kampons and longhouses, they would have to behave like them, conducting a dialogue in the simple plain language of the Gospel rather than that of theology. Underneath it all was a very sensitive man, perhaps a bit defensive, with a strong religious belief and self-discipline. He could be a charming companion, loved his garden and classical music, appreciated the fine things of life, and in retirement lived comfortably but simply. He also loved Sarawak and its people. He once half-jokingly confessed he should perhaps have married a Bidayuh and retired to Quop; but such matters were not so easy in his day. He could have retired there, but felt that he would become a burden, and he had family in England.

In retirement he maintained his close connection with Sarawak, receiving a constant stream of visitors who brought him delicacies and news. In the front window of his house in York flourished a bunga raja and his table was covered with correspondence. He made several journeys to Sarawak until age and lameness, the latter the effect of long arduous journeys by foot over many years, restrained him. In his last years he acquired a battery driven cart on which he traveled around the center of York, a distinctive figure in his jauntily-worn beret. Despite a heart operation and bouts of illness, he retained his independence until the end, living in the shadow of York Minster, a far cry from the little wooden church at Quop, receiving visits from Sarawak friends. Obituaries have appeared in The Times and The Church Times, but for a real appreciation of the impact of his life and work upon those among whom he served, see the entries in the Borneo Chronicle, the magazine of the Borneo Mission Association.

Bishop Bolly Lapak traveled from Sarawak to attend the funeral service held at York Minster. On Bishop Howes’ strict instructions no eulogy was read, though this prohibition was skillfully evaded in a manner he would have appreciated. He was cremated and his ashes returned to Sarawak where they now lie by the high altar in St Thomas’s Cathedral, Kuching, a place of honor he would not have chosen, but bestowed by those whom he had befriended, trained and taught.


Acknowledgment: The writer would like to thank those many friends of Bishop Howes whose reminiscences have contributed to this memorial of his life. Especially, he thanks Sidi and Heidi Munan, Datuk Robert Jacob Ridu and Bishops Bolly Lapak and Made for sharing their personal anecdotes.

(Graham Saunders, Dam End Farm, Kelfield Road, Riccall, York YO19 6PQ, UK)

ORANG KAYA PEMANCIA KALONG ANAK JEMAT

1910-2003

With the passing of Orang Kaya Pemancha Kalong ak Jemat of Lundu, an era has come to a close. The last descendant of a hereditary line of local headmen, OKP Kalong passed away at his residence in Kpg. Sungai Lundu on the 30th May 2003, aged 93 years.

Orang Kaya Pemancha Kalong (Photo provided by family).

OKP Kalong’s ancestry can be traced to the Danau Melayu or Lake District on the upper Kapuas, in Kalimantan Barat. From there, succeeding waves of migrants moved over the watershed into the headwaters of the Batang Lepar, downriver to Undup, and later to Lingga, Sebuyau and Sebangan.

In the eighteenth century, one of Kalong’s ancestors, Nyambong, led a migration from Sebuyau into the lower Sarawak, remaining for some time at the mouth of Padungan Creek in Kuching, and then to Sg. Lundu on the Batang Kayan. The community settled and spread up and down along the main river, meeting opposition at times. Nyambong’s son (or possibly grandson; current genealogical opinion is divided on this point) Jugah built the first longhouse at Stunggang, but later moved to Belungei and finally settled at Kedaong. The family’s heirloom cannon, “Bujang Betutu” (a proportionately short fat fish), is first mentioned as the property of Jugah; “a well-wrought piece of ordnance that didn’t vibrate when it was fired.” It is said to have been used by Jugah and his followers to defend Belungei against Saribas attackers.
Nyambong was the first member of this family to be invested with the title Orang Kaya, reportedly by the Sultan of Brunei. The office was bestowed on the trusted headman of this staging point for the cross-border trade with Sambas, most likely by the hand of the Brunei Viceroy, Rajah Muda Hashim, who was stationed in Kuching in the early nineteenth century.

An Orang Kaya’s duties were similar to those of a penghulu. He was responsible for the smooth functioning of his district’s administration, called upon to settle disputes beyond the scope of individual longhouse elders, and instrumental in collecting government dues and taxes.

OK Temenggong Jugah, Nyamlong’s successor, was the chief at “Loondoo” sometimes mentioned in travellers’ tales. He figures in these books as a staunch friend of James Brooke; visitors were taken to his hospitable house, which was something of a tourist attraction in the rough-and-ready days of early Brooke rule. The Rajahs and government officers frequently took visitors or family members on “longhouse tours” to this accessible, peaceful area. The Orang Kaya’s family was among the first to convert to Christianity when the SPG Mission set up work in Lundu in the 1850s; the Church Records that record their conversion, and subsequent baptisms, marriages, and funerals have survived raids, floods, fire and two world wars, and are still carefully preserved.

According to tradition, Lundu could muster as many as 400 fighting men to join the Bala Rajah in cases of emergency such as the gold miners’ rebellion in 1857. Two of Jugah’s own sons were lost in such “peacekeeping operations,” while his younger son Kalong (often spelled Callon or Calloong) succeeded as Orang Kaya.

OK Kalong ak OK Jugah was succeeded by his brother OK Langi, who was in turn succeeded by OK Baja, and then OK Jemat.

Two Orang Kaya of Lundu were appointed to the Council Negri: OK Langi in 1889, and OK Baja in 1906.

Kalong ak OK Jemat was born in 1910 at Kampong Sungai Lundu. He attended the mission school at Kpg. Stunggang, a couple of miles upriver from Lundu. Rajah Charles Vyner, on one of his visits to Lundu, was impressed with the lad’s confidence and abilities. He advised OK Jemat to send his son to St.Thomas’ school in Kuching, but the fond parents were too distressed to let their only boy go so far away!

Young Kalong completed his primary education, and worked in the Land and Surveys department as a chain-man from 1930-1932. He became a rubber checker (1933-1934), and spent the war years farming on his parents’ land. In 1945 he was recruited by the Australian Military Administration as a Special Police Constable. After the demise of his first wife, Puli Goh, he married Ngingit ak Apok.

After the demise of his father, Kalong’s traditional succession as Orang Kaya was ratified by the government; he was promoted to Orang Kaya Pemanca (OKP) in 1956. At the same time he was a councilor of the Lundu District Council and a member of the Divisional Advisory Council from 1952-1954.

OKP Kalong received several honors from the government, including the Malaysia commemorative medal, the Sijil Kerhormatan Negeri and the Long Service Medal.

OK Kalong was a conscientious, humble man; everybody in town and the surrounding kamponds knew and respected their aged leader. He used to cycle to town every morning; when people greeted him as ‘Orang Kaya’ (i.e., rich man) he would retort: ‘Orang Yang Kaya!’ (somebody else is rich!) The family was not by any means poor, but neither were they rich in the modern meaning of the term.
A long line of mourners, the late Orang Kaya Kalong's relatives and friends, attended a Church service on Gawai Eve at St Francis Church, Lundu.

OKP Kalong ak Jemat leaves his widow Ngingit anak Apok and daughter Mermaid, son-in-law Philip Banyan Tingang and two grandchildren, Ezra Arkin and Brenda Jelia to mourn his loss.

(Sidi and Heidi Munan, 301 Golden Farm, 6th Mile, 93250 Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia)
RESEARCH NOTES

Boundaries, Territorial Domains, and Kelabit Customary Practices: Discovering the Hidden Landscape

Ramy Bulan
Faculty of Law
University of Malaya

Introduction
The landscape of a place is a historical record of the activities of past generations, “woven like a tapestry from the lives of its inhabitants” (Ingold 2000:15). Historical landmarks are often permanently carved into the physical landscape, evidenced by planted fruit trees, shelters that were built and rebuilt, established burial places, or by the erection of permanent monuments and artifacts. Long after footprints have ceased to be visible to the human eye, hidden histories and landscapes are indelibly etched in the memories of those who held ceremonies, participated in tribal expeditions and those who lived and toiled on the land. That knowledge is handed down to the descendants through stories and oral traditions, providing them not only with a link to the past but also a consciousness of their identity in relation to the land.

In this paper I look at the physical landscape of the area called the Kelabit Highlands and the influences that have shaped it. Landscape is used as “evidence for origins” and

* The issues addressed in this article are the subject of a Ph.D. thesis being undertaken by the writer under the supervision of Professor Barry Hooker at the Faculty of Law, The Australian National University. The thesis is due for completion in 2005. A draft of this paper was presented at the Global Alliance for Justice Education Regional Conference (GAJE) held at the University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia on 8-11 November 2002. This paper is a much extended version. I gratefully acknowledge Professor Barry Hooker for his guidance and constant encouragement, Professor Cliff Sather and Louise Klemperer Sather for reading and providing valuable suggestions on the present and earlier drafts, the Earl of Cranbrook and Gerawat Gala for reading through the paper and offering their comments, and Lucy Labang who provided invaluable help in checking the data. The views expressed here are nevertheless my own, as is responsibility for any errors or omissions. The materials included here were obtained from fieldwork conducted in Bario, mainly in 2002 and early 2003, made possible partly by funding from Vote F, University of Malaya. The Australian National University Faculty of Law covered part of the airfares between Canberra and Kuala Lumpur and I am grateful to both institutions. What I had been able to do in the field in the short time was only possible because Lucy and David Labang not only set up meetings for me, but also participated in many of my discussions with community leaders. Kelabit leaders and individuals I talked to opened their hearts to me. David took me by boat to visit some of the sites, my uncles Bala Pelaba and Tama Raman trekked with me into the jungle. To each of these who shared stories of their land and landscapes that I have tried to put on paper, I am grateful.

1 Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Malaya, and currently Ph.D. student, The Australian National University.

2 I am mindful of the multiple meanings given to landscapes in different disciplines.
evidence of “material culture” (Rowntree 1996) and as a backdrop to show the process of settlement and occupation of the highlands by the Kelabits. The description of patterns of Kelabit habitation, their agricultural, social and cultural practices, and the recording of their narratives and personal stories will provide not only a link to the places, but also an interpretation of the landscape. The marks of their occupation are etched in the physical landscape as they are in their oral traditions and customary practices, but as their traditional knowledge system collides with statutory legislation, there appears to be very little formal understanding or recognition of native concepts of place and boundaries with regard to land.

I propose to look at territorial boundaries through the customary practices of the Kelabits to reveal evidence of their exclusive occupation of their ancestral territory. The concept of the territorial domain of the bawang (village), and its significance in agricultural practices, hunting and fishing, and in the management of common resources within the Kelabit community will be discussed along with two closely related concepts, the apu’ (meeting place) and the tung (dividing line) which play an important role in the conduct of inter-village as well as inter-tribal transactions. In relation to neighboring tribes, cultural evidence of Kelabit occupation of the land was characterized in the past by a unique stone megalithic culture that set the highlands apart as unmistakably inhabited by the Kelabits.

In the late 1990s, a number of agreements were signed between Kelabit leaders and their neighboring tribes. An integral part of those agreements are boundary maps drawn by the parties and later endorsed by state administrative officers. This introduces another dimension to the native claims to NCR in remote Sarawak. Living in an era when the struggle for control and access to customary resources has become increasingly difficult, the Kelabits have been compelled to translate their knowledge of the landscape through the medium of maps that can be understood by others, in an effort to make their right of place visible to the outside world, and as a means of self protection, negotiation, and empowerment. It raises the issue of the place of maps and mapmaking in a culture that not long ago knew only of mental maps. Almost, as it were, on the day of awakening to possible empowerment, they also discover that the law introduces an impediment in their path.

This paper thus examines the concept and power of maps. The question is: should “written” records be considered as an all-important “be all and end all” evidence and proof of occupation? As this paper will show, even maps have their limitations. It will be apparent that maps are neither exact nor entirely objective, for they are controlled by those who make them. Factors of history, oral traditions, cultural practices, permanent and semi-permanent marks on the physical landscape, all of which constitute records, must be taken into account in considering the question of the Kelabits’ connection to and occupation of land — in this case, the Kelabit Highlands.

The Context: The Kelabits and the Kelabit Highlands

For generations the Kelabits have lived at the headwaters of the Baram River in their “secluded homelands” in the Kelabit Highlands (Southwell 1999). The plateau lies at the northeast corner of Sarawak and the northwest corner of Kalimantan in Central Borneo.

Indeed, even within one discipline alone there are myriad ways in which landscape is conceptualized.
This upland plain, well over 1,500 feet above sea level, forms a great bowl encircled by mountains rising to almost 8,000 feet, comprising Gunung Murud, (7,950 ft.), the highest mountain in Sarawak, Batu Lawi (6,703 ft.), Batu Iran, Bukit Merigong, Gunung Murud Kecil, and Gunung Melepe (6,556 ft.) (Murang 1998:1) (See Map 1). It is bordered on the west by the Tarnabu mountain range and on the east by the Apad Uwat range. Valley areas of the highlands are approximately 1,000 meters above sea level with the mountain range crests around 2,000 meters. The plateau is the source of the upper tributaries of the great rivers like the Baram, Limbang, and Kerayan. Gorges and falls make the rivers impassable and access by road is very difficult (Southwell 1999:194).

The Kelabits have traversed the mountain ranges for centuries using established trails and footpaths between villages and it took many days to reach the nearest Kayan or Kenyah settlement at Lio Mato. In the last few years, logging tracks have provided access to some areas. It was only in the early 1960s that regular access to the highlands by air was established. Today, Malaysia Airlines Rural Air Services run daily flights by Twin Otters into Bario. There are other airstrips at Long Peluan, Long Lellang, and Long Seridan serving the different regions in the highlands.

The main center of life in the Kelabit Highlands is Bario, a settlement which consists of eight villages: Bario Asal, or Lem Baa' (meaning, in the ‘wet plain’) was the original village in the Baa’ valley. Other villages were built in the early 1960s during the Indonesian Confrontation with Malaysia, when people were relocated by government authorities to the central region for security reasons. These are Arur Dalan, Arur Layun, Ulung Palang Dita’ (Upper Ulung Palang, recently renamed Bued Mein “A”), Ulung Palang Benah, (Lower Ulung Palang or Bued Mein Baru “B”), Pa’ Ramapoh Dita (Upper Pa’ Ramapoh), Pa’ Ramapoh Benah (Lower Pa’ Ramapoh). Two new villages built in the last few years are Kampung Baru and Padang Pasir. Other Kelabit villages on the periphery of Bario include, on the northeast, the villages of Pa’ Lungan, Pa’ Umur, and

---

3 This map uses imaginary straight lines to cover an area that the Kelabits talk of as their ancestral territory. In a culture that still relies mainly on mental maps, the elders speak of their ancestral land encompassing an area described as: From Gunung Murud (eastward) to Ra’an Bulu’ to Apad Getawat to Buduk Udol to Ra’an Mekang to Ra’an Abang Bulu’ to Apad Uwat to Ra’an Liwan to Punang Dalih to Punang Di’it to Apad Bawang Ruman to Apad Riku’ to Batu Kalung to Punang Belah (Punang Balung), Long Metephe to Merigong to Pengaran, and going westward from Gunung Murud, to Sipan Pa’ Adan and Kerabangan to Perupu’ to Sipan Buduk Buyo to Ra’an Terap to Long Mutang to Ra’an Sedan. This information was gathered during separate interviews followed by a general meeting with the Kelabit community leaders in Bario, December 2003.

4 The Kelabits have always referred to this mountain range as Apad Uwat, Apad means ‘mountain range,’ and uwat, is a root, describing the “root like” top of the mountain range. Most writers have mistakenly called this range Apo Duat, and the name has become entrenched by frequent use.

5 Poline Bala (2002) in her book enumerates the various routes that could be taken in and out of the highlands.

6 The term Barea was first used by Tom Harrisson to refer to this village in the “Bah” (baa’ meaning ‘wet’) valley. It is speculated that the people could have called the valley Lem Baa’ - ariu, alluding to the gusts of wind that rush through the plains, or referring to the stream Pa’ Marariu that flows through the plains of Baa’.
Map 1: The Kelabit Highlands and Kelabit Ancestral Territory

--- Territory inhabited by Kelabits (incorporating Long Seridan and Long Napir)
--- The Kelabit Highlands as indicated in Ose Murang's map

Adapted from Ose Murang, *Sarawak Development Journal* 3(1) at p 11
Pa' Ukat and towards the south, Pa' Derung, Pa' Berang (for a time in the 1970s and 1980s settled by Penans), Pa' Mein and to the west of Bario the villages of Kubaan and Pa' Tik (with a Penan settlement). (See Map 2 for location of these Bario villages). In the south are Pa' Bengar (now not inhabited), Long Dano (also known as Pa' Mada), Pa' Dalih, Batu Patong, Ramudu, Long Peluan, Long Puak, and Long Banga. To the southwest on the upper Akah River is Long Lellang, and close to Mt. Mulu National Park are the villages of Long Seridan and Long Napir.

Map 2: Location of Major Settlements in Bario


Bario has a primary and secondary school, a number of government offices including a medical center, immigration department, agriculture department, public works (water) department, police station, civil aviation office, and a Malaysian military base. As the commercial hub, Bario also supports a number of coffee shops and lodging houses, an assortment of retail shops, and since 2002, a tele-centre was set up under the E-Bario
project.\textsuperscript{7}

When the Indonesian Confrontation with Malaysia erupted in the 1960s, it resulted in the resettlement of the Kelabit population in the central part of the highlands in what is now Bario. The resettlement coupled with a growing monetary economy presented the threat of land scarcity, with the result that land boundaries now tend to be more carefully defined than in the past, and ancestral claims more vividly remembered and guarded. There is an increasing urgency to ascertain rights to customary land by proof of occupation and connection with the land. Amug (secondary jungle, formerly cultivated land) and other cultivated lands, planted trees and pulau or ulung (communal forest reserves), traditional burial grounds and former longhouse sites serve as tangible reminders of the past, historicizing each longhouse domain.

Like many Borneo societies, the Kelabits hold their lands under customary tenure based on native customary laws. This has often been referred to as a usufructuary right by numerous writers (Appell 1997, Cram 1986, Ngidang 2000). A dictionary definition describes “usufruct” as “the right of temporary possession, use, or enjoyment of the advantages of property belonging to another, so far as may be had without causing danger or prejudice.”\textsuperscript{8} A usufructuary is one who enjoys the usufruct of a property, a mere right to use that land and its “fruit” or resources. The use of this nomenclature and approach disregards the possibility of possession acquired under common law which is a proprietary title akin to ownership. A usufructuary has often been called a mere licensee without any proprietary right to the property and this concept has been entrenched through formal land laws of the state. As the creation of native customary rights to land, or its acronym NCR, is defined and redefined in the Sarawak Land Code 1957, there is a clear clash between the Kelabit, and, for that matter, the general native notion of ownership, and ownership as it is envisaged in state legislation. This paper, however, does not purport to deal with the nature of NCR under the law nor with the question of whether that interest is a proprietary interest or not. These issues are best dealt with separately (see also Dimbab Ngidang’s paper that follows in this volume of the BRB). On the other hand, part of my concern here is with Kelabit notions of communal and proprietary interests in land.

What is certain is that for generations the Kelabit occupation of the land has been to the exclusion of other parties, under a land tenure system whose rules are ascertained according to a customary legal system. Their interests in land are not fully documented and the boundaries are not surveyed nor precisely demarcated. Nonetheless, there is a keen sense of territorial space and boundaries woven into their customary practices and oral histories by which inter- and intra-community relations have been structured for centuries.

**The Kelabit Bawang**

The basic unit of the Kelabit community is the lubang ruma’ (household). In this paper I take lubang ruma’ to mean “household” rather than “family” to indicate the social and economic unit of the community for the simple reason that the Kelabit family can refer to an extended family system, whereas the household is the nuclear unit which

\textsuperscript{7} Sponsored by the Canadian government in conjunction with the Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS).

typically consists of a husband, his wife, their children, and very often either or both of their parents and occasionally, younger unmarried siblings of either spouse. An aggregation of *lubang ruma‘* makes up the *bawang* (village) which encompasses the physical structures of the *ruma‘ kadang* or *ruma‘ rawir*¹⁹ (longhouse) and the residents, or *uwang bawang* (lit., ‘contents of the bawang’). It also encompasses the *ruma‘ maun* (old longhouse sites) and the agricultural domain of its occupants (Talla 1979:91).

The traditional *ruma‘ kadang* is divided into segments called *tetak ruma‘*¹⁰ each consisting of the *tawa‘* (common corridor), *tilung* (bedrooms), and *dalam* (kitchen). Each *tetak ruma‘* ordinarily has one *tetal*, i.e., hearth or fireplace, which is the place the family’s food is prepared and cooked. Sometimes, however, a single *tetak ruma‘* may have two *tetals*, signifying the presence of two *lubang ruma‘* in one *tetak ruma‘*.¹¹

Each *bawang* is territorially discrete from other bawangs, and has its own demarcated territory separate from that of neighboring bawangs. Each has its own *tana‘ bawang* or village land, a concept which is similar to the Iban notion of *menoa rumah* (demarcated longhouse territory) and its *pemakai menoa* (lit., ‘land to eat from’).¹²

**The *ruma‘ ma‘un* (old longhouse sites) as *tana‘ bawang***

In the past, longhouses were built and rebuilt several times in each generation, usually on a new site, close to the previous location. Rebuilding was often necessary because the wood used in construction could not withstand the tropical weather. The main posts of the longhouses were made of whole tree trunks which were embedded in the ground and were quickly affected by the tropical weather. In the olden days, the floor was made of *tasag bulu‘ betong* or split bamboo (*Gigantochloa levis*; Merr; poac). With better implements in the form of the *uwai* and *bikung* (metal adze) in the 1900s, bamboo floors were replaced by wooden planks made of *kayu rumah*. The houses were by no means flimsy, otherwise a ceremony with the accompanying stomping and dancing such as the one described by R. S. Douglas on the occasion of the peace agreement between the Kelabits and the Kerayan people would not have been possible. At least 1,800 people

---

¹⁹ *Rawir* and *kadang* are synonymous and both mean ‘long.’ The *bawang* is an aggregate of *lubang ruma‘*, and traditionally took the physical form of a *ruma‘ kadang* (longhouse). Now it more commonly refers to one or more longhouses plus adjacent individual houses.

¹⁰ *Tetak* in Kelabit refers to ‘a piece’ or ‘segment of (something),’ say, of a fish or of a long piece of meat. It is usually used in reference to something long that is divided into segments.

¹¹ My mother’s sister’s husband, who had joined the Police Force, was stationed in Marudi, the nearest town to Bario, for many years. After Confrontation, he was posted to Bario for a number of years and during that time his family lived with ours in the same *tetak ruma‘*, but maintained a separate *tetal* (fireplace, hearth) and worked their own farm. In other words, they were another *lubang ruma‘* in one *tetak ruma‘*. In normal discourse, to say that two people maintain separate *tetal* is to make a clear distinction between their separate households, usually between those of two sisters or sisters-in-law, primarily because the food production of the household is considered the role of the woman.

were reported to have been on the verandah of Penghulu Balang Maran's house at Pa'Mein in 1911 (Douglas 1912).

Sina Bulan, this writer's mother, talks of how early longhouses in Pa' Umur were dismantled about every five years or so. The planks were either carried or made into rafts for transport down or upriver to the new site. Sometimes they relocated to new farming sites but at other times, as a precaution and protection against frequent tribal raids by the Kayans from the lowlands, or the Kerayans from over the Tamabo mountain range, they relocated to safer locations. At times, plagues, epidemics or sicknesses, usually of smallpox or cholera, forced them to move.

Before they turned to Christianity in the early 1940s, bad omens, fear of spirits and curses pronounced on the longhouse, or quarrels between residents caused whole villages to move or to split. It was common for them to return to earlier spots or river valleys when the threat had ceased. According to the oral histories that I have recorded from some areas, bawangs split and merged on occasion, and marriages occurred within strict hierarchical limits, which meant that families in the highlands were relationally interconnected according to rank across village lines.

In an attempt to trace their history, stories and movement around these old longhouse sites, I compare two main settlements, Lem Baa' and Pa' Umur. The former practiced a more sedentary form of farming, while the latter engaged in shifting cultivation. Lem Baa', which literally means 'in the wet' (i.e., plains) and presently called Bario Asal ('original Bario'), has practiced wet rice agriculture since 1900, while the residents of Pa' Umur were swidden farmers, who only started to cultivate wet rice in the mid 1960s. What were the motivations for migrations and movement within the highlands? Were they tied to land use or to general life circumstances? I will refer to the people of Lem Baa' as the Lun Lem Baa' and the Pa' Umur people as the Lun Pa' Umur — in Kelabit the word Lun literally means 'people of.'

**Lem Baa' (Bario Asal)**

The Kelabits in Lem Baa' (Bario Asal) were among the first to cultivate wet padi in the highlands. As early as 1889 it was reported that the wet plains and extensive peat swamps were cultivated using an advanced irrigation system, as the inhabitants moved successively through the valleys and the plain in Lem Baa'. There are at least half a dozen valleys not inhabited within Kelabit memory that show clear evidence of previous extensive irrigation. A Kelabit writer, Lian-Saging, also reports that the Lun Lem Ba'a had for various reasons left their cultivated lands to farm afresh in new valleys, often later returning to those old sites to renew the cultivation of their farms. Since the implements for farming were a small peluwing (a basic hoe) and wooden sticks, the farms were fairly small and were not as big as the present farms where irrigation methods have been

---


improved and farming implements are far better.

Lian-Saging documented that his ancestors had lived in the Pa’ Marariu valley for at least five generations, basing his evidence on the fact that his father’s (now in his 80s) father’s father was a young man when R. S. Douglas (1912) came for the peace conference between the Kerayans (Kalimantan Muruts) and the Kelabits in 1911. He recorded the existence of 18 longhouse sites which alternated between the valleys of Pa’ Marariu and its tributaries, namely Pa’ Ramapuh, Arur Laab and Arur Dalan, before they settled at the present longhouse site of Bario Asal in 1962. Built on an old airstrip that was constructed in 1953 (now in disuse), this longhouse still stands and remains inhabited as the oldest longhouse in the Kelabit Highlands.

One of the earliest longhouse sites in living memory was on the hill at Ulung Palang. This is remembered as the site of the first Kayan raid on Lem Baa’. This was followed by other longhouse sites at Ruma’ Ma’un Nabang, Luun Puun, Ulung Palang (two longhouses were rebuilt on the same location), Ribpa’ Taka, Tana’ Rengung, Ruma’ Pun Mengiung, Batu Mik, Turud Rawir Arur Telal, Arur Tegkang, Pa’ Ramapuh Lem Ikup, Ng Taka, Lem Budud, Long Arur Lutut, Abang Nukat, Pa’ Derung, Long Arur Dalan, Long Arur Dalan (second longhouse) and Ruma’ Kadang Bario (see next page for Lian-Saging’s sketch map).

The group of people who constituted a bawang changed at various times, occasionally splitting, then sometimes reuniting, at other times merging with another bawang. The Kayan raid at Ulung Palang forced some villagers to move to Pa’ Brunut (in the Adang Valley and the Medihit River), but they returned to build another longhouse at Ribpa’ Taka. Lian-Saging recorded a split and the consequent migration by some villagers from the longhouse at Arur Dalan to Pa’ Mada, in the south, after a quarrel broke out between the villagers at Arur Dalan and Pa’ Ramapuh. The splinter group later returned and they built a longhouse called Ruma’ Pun Mengiung in Lem Baa’. The next house at Batu Mik was named after the batu, a big stone under which the longhouse amik (goats) found shade. After a series of further relocations, an epidemic forced them to move from Pa’ Ramapuh Lem Ikup to Ng Taka. Part of their group went off to join relatives living in Pa’ Mein, a village less than a day’s walk away. Their descendants returned to Bario in the course of resettlement, encouraged and supported by the Malaysian government in 1963.

The story is often told that while at the longhouse site at Lem Budud, in a drunken brawl, a young man named Lawai ran amok and killed a Murut man from Pa’ Bawan

---

16 See R. Lian-Saging, An Ethno-History of the Kelabit Tribe of Sarawak: A Brief Look at the Kelabit Tribe Before World War II and After, 1977, Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis for Bachelor of Arts, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur. Lian-Saging writes of Penghulu Tingang of Pa’ Dalih, who claimed to have traced his ancestors for at least 13 generations. He surmised that there must have been other people living in the plains of Lem Baa’ as far back as that, which may be about 350-400 years.

17 See Lian-Saging’s sketch map in Lian-Saging (1977:105).

18 Ruma’ means ‘house,’ puun means ‘mountain,’ turud is a knoll or a mountain ridge, arur is a stream, pa’ refers to a river, and long or elung is the confluence of two rivers or streams.

19 Incidentally, it was Lawai Besara who was the headman at the time of Tom Harrison’s arrival in Bario in 1945. Having been interned at Marudi (see Sarawak Gazette, Vol. XCII,
(Kerayan) called Sigar Barah. Not only was this a penal offence under colonial law, the murder was a violation of an oath made by a Kelabit leader that his people would never again attack their enemies, the Lun Kerayan of Kalimantan. By the oath of *bulung uku* 'by the tooth of a dog' concluded during a visit of R. S. Douglas in 1911, they had become blood brothers.20 This was regarded as the most serious form of treaty-making among the inland tribal groups. After agreeing to the peace-making overture by Douglas, both parties had promised never to take each other's lives again, or the violators of that treaty would be cursed by plagues and terrible diseases. The murder was a breach of that

---

20 See R. S. Douglas 1912. *Bulung uku* — 'oath by the dog' was the most serious oath taken by the people. There is an interesting paper by Roger Peranio on the use of dogs' teeth for oath-taking among the Bisaya' of Limbang and southwestern Sabah. Today, one often hears people, in mock swearing, assert the truth of their report by saying "*uku' sia' dih!*' (by) the red dog!'
treaty.

Fearing a backlash and revenge from the Lun Kerayan at Pa' Bawan, all except for six households under Balang Lipang's leadership (the brother of Lawai) fled to join relatives either at Kubaan or Pa' Umur, and others fled to Pa' Mein. The curse was said to have taken effect on the Lun Lem Baa'. One by one, the senior Kelabits of Lem Baa' died. Those who fled returned three years later to build another longhouse at Long Arur Pintumuh. Another wave of sickness resulted in at least two other relocations and they settled at Pa' Derung, and then at Long Arur Dalan. This was the location of the longhouse when Major Tom Harrisson parachuted into Bario in 1945 (Harrisson 1954). He led the "Z" Special Unit Allied Force formed to create an inland resistance against the Japanese Occupation. By then the threat of tribal enemy raids had long ceased. They found freedom from fear of bad omens and spirits with conversion to Christianity about that time. One final relocation, in 1962, took them to the present site of Bario Asal.

Pa' Umur

Pa' Umur was a major settlement that practiced swidden farming. This settlement had at some point merged with the bawangs from Pa' Terap, and included the people that are at the present village at Pa' Ukat. Some of the people from Pa' Terap formed the village at Pa' Lungan.

Until the 1960s, Lun Pa' Umur had traditionally practiced swidden farming. They farmed the plains of Pa' Debpur (also called the Libbun River by Tom Harrisson (1954) and its tributaries, Pa' Umur, Pa' Ukat, Pa' Ramein, and Arur Pa' Tenga'ang. Within the expanse of its bawang, the residents practiced a pioneer system of land use (cf. Cramb 1986:15-17) where virgin jungle was felled and cultivated, followed by a rotational fallow system. The pioneering household or its descendants had first right of claim over the amug, or secondary jungle, for later farm sites.

Each year the members of the longhouse agreed on which valley they would farm, moving successively into new areas, thereby creating a large area of cultivated land or amug (secondary forests). This meant that they had lived at a number of different longhouses and had occupied the river valleys where the longhouses were sited. Informants from Pa' Umur remember at least 19 previous longhouse sites, each named after the river system (pa' or arur) or the river confluence (lung), going back five or six generations. In chronological order, longhouses were built at Lung Kerubat, Ruma' Pa' Ramein, Ruma' Maun Lem Pipit, Arur Teng Nudun, Ruma' Ma'un Lung Arur Rupan, Ruma' Maun Lem Patar, Ruma' Ngi Arur Geriperah, Pa' Semarang, Arur Mapung, Pa' Rarupan (Long Arur Bengkuir), Arur Batang Putul, Lung Nipat, Lung Teribah, Lung Arur Perambango, Lubung Lung Persengit, Pa' Ramein (the longhouse was rebuilt twice here), Lung Ramein, and then the present site at Pa' Umur.

It is said that one of the last Kayan raids against the Kelabits occurred at Lung

---


22 Poline Bala writes about her family's farms along some of these tributaries in her book Changing Borders and Identities in the Kelabit Highlands: Anthropological Reflections on Growing Up Near an International Border (2002).

23 Tama Pasang, now headman of Pa'Umur. Personal communication, Bario, October 2002.
Kerubat at a longhouse built on a hill overlooking Pa’ Debpur. The village bridge was built at Buduk Butal. Anticipating the Kayan raid, the Kelabits cut the rattan ropes that tied the *apir* (bridge). When the Kayan warriors tried to cross the bridge, they all fell into the water with their spears and the Kelabits ambushed them. The *binatuh* (burial ground) of the village was located at nearby Buduk Butal. From this site, they moved to Pa’ Ramein at Arur Talun, near the salt spring at Mein Keramut. Evidence of their hearth stones may still be seen today. At the next house at Ruma’ Ma’un Lem Pipit, they began to make solid wood planks of *tumuh* in place of *tesag* (split bamboo). Nonetheless, the pillars which were made of tree trunks 8-9 inches in circumference suffered the usual decay and had to be replaced. New longhouses were built at four other consecutive sites, namely, Arur Teng Nudun, Long Arur Rupan, Lem Patar and Arur Geriperah.

At Arur Geriperah, a splinter group left to go to Pa’ Ukat while the remnant went to Pa’ Semerang where they built two longhouses. Up until that time, the *bawang* was comprised of Lun Pa’ Terap and Lun Pa’ Umur. Together they moved to Arur Mapung. There was an outbreak of a cholera epidemic, so the people from Pa’ Terap decided to leave to form a new *bawang* at Pa’ Lungan. A very small group went back to Pa’ Terap, but soon rejoined those at Pa’ Lungan. The remnant in Pa’ Umur moved to build another house at Lung Arur Petebpung where they farmed the land along the Lung Pa’ Tebpung and the valley of Ra’an Berua’. They then moved to Long Arur Rupan and on to Arur Batang. At the latter, four people were struck and killed by lightning forcing the others to move to Long Nipat to escape “the bad luck.”

At Long Nipat, the splinter group that had gone to Pa’ Ukat rejoined them. Together they lived and farmed along the tributaries of Pa’ Umur, namely the Lung Pa’ Teribah and Lung Arur Perambango. During the Japanese occupation, they were at Lubung Lung Perseengit before returning to Lung Ramein, at the old longhouse site. Re-establishment of residence at Lung Ramein meant they had gone one full circle. That was in the late 1940s and early 1950s. They rebuilt their longhouse twice at this site. There were reportedly at least 40 *lubang rumah* here. As a result of a misunderstanding, once again a splinter group comprising a third of the village decided to move to Pa’ Ukat to join new settlers who for security reasons had just moved from Long Rebpun to a village close to the Malaysian-Indonesian border. That was in 1962, shortly before the formation of Malaysia and the outbreak of Indonesian Confrontation with Malaysia.

---

24 See also Lian-Saging (1977).
25 Interview with Kareb Ayu, 80 yrs old, November 2002, Miri. The remnants of two *belanai buda’* and *belani madting* (ancient jars), used for burying two siblings, Dayang and Agan, (siblings of Tapan Ulun, the husband of Kareb Ayu) both of whom died of the smallpox epidemic, were said to have been removed from the site at Buduk Butal by the late Tom Harrison and taken to the Sarawak Museum.
26 This was in the 1920s.
27 When they were at Long Arur Perambango, they crossed to farm the land at Pa’ Duan in the territory of *bawang* Pa’ Mein and had to pay a *belanai* jar as *dawi* to Tekapan Raja, the Pa’ Mein headman. *Dawi* was a type of payment for “spilt blood” or an accident that had occurred on the land. In this case an enemy raid on the village had caused loss of life and on the territory which created a “mark” on the land as belonging to that village.
**Manifestation of the Territorial Domain of the Bawang**

Although the villages moved successively through the valleys in their *tana’ bawang*, they did not haphazardly move into territories which were traditionally occupied and farmed by other *bawangs*. No *bawang* encroached upon another’s territory without informing the leaders of that *bawang*. This was clearly the practice in farming and to a certain extent in fishing rights. Boundaries between the *bawangs* were observed, marked by rivers, ridge tops, or valleys.

**Farming Practices**

Sina Napong Aran tells of a particular year when people in Pa’ Umur had built their longhouse at Lung Arur Perambango in the Pa’ Umur Valley. A bad drought (*da’at laaken*) in Pa’Umur forced them to move to Pa’ Duan, a river system within the Pa’ Mein *bawang*. This was an area at Ra’an Berangad, the place traditionally acknowledged as the *erang bawang* (boundary) between Pa’ Umur and Pa’ Mein. The Pa’ Umur headman Belaan Iyu paid one *belanai ma’un* (the most expensive ancient jar) to Tekapan Raja, the Pa’ Mein headman, for the “use” of the land for one year. It was said that there had been some deaths in the territory (Pa’ Du’an Valley) as a result of an enemy raid. The *belanai* was required as a *dawi* or *pegka*, a traditional payment of restitution or propitiation for blood “spilt” on the land, marking it as Pa’ Mein territory. Lun Pa’ Umur made the payment, farmed the land, and after the harvest they carried the produce back to their own *bawang* territory.

Another example of the observance of the territorial *bawang* is related by Bala Pelaba of Pa’Umur. When one Balang Peratu, also known as Pun Mengiung, and his people passed through Pa’ Umur enroute to Lem Baa’, he asked for permission from Pun Ratu of Pa’ Umur for his people to stop and farm land in Pa’ Umur. Pun Mengiung built a *lubung* (temporary longhouse) and planted many fruit trees at Rebaruh Belaban, along Pa’ Debpur (across the river from the present site of the Pa’ Umur longhouse). When Pun Mengiung proceeded on to Lem Baa’, Pun Ratu gave him a *gumut* in exchange for the rights to the trees and the fruits. A *gumut* is the second-most expensive ancient jar after the *belanai ma’un* used by the Kelabits in trading exchanges.

**Hunting and Fishing**

**Hunting:** The Kelabits were among the most energetic and skillful jungle hunters in Borneo because they “cannot easily get abundant protein from adjacent waters, and must look to the land” (Harrisson 1950:274). In the past, their implements were only blowpipes and spears, but today hunters use shotguns. Hunting techniques, as described by Talla (1979), included *ngarunut* (to shake a tree which was the home of an animal, e.g., a

---

28 *Berangad* means ‘monkey.’ It was said this was a trail that monkeys used to cross this ridge and that people put wood across the valley to help them cross.

29 This story was corroborated by Sina Balang Imat (also known as Kareb Ayu’) and Galih Balang. Interview in Miri and Bario in October 2002.

30 Interview in Bario October 2002.

31 Lian-Saging wrote of a longhouse named Ruma’ Pun Mengiung after this ancestor. He also noted that Pun Mengiung was originally a Kelabit from the south who married a girl from Lem Baa’, but was recognized as a leader and headman by the Lem Baa’ people (Lian-Saging 1977:100).
rodent, until the animal fell to the ground from exhaustion); and *ngabant* (to hold vigil and ambush) which was usually done at a *rupan* (salt lick), or a *ranuwang* (a trail frequented by the animal), or a *taran* (a place where there were fruits which animals ate). In each case, the hunters waited for the animals to appear, being careful to be downwind, lest the wind carry the hunter's scent. Hunters also *muti ukut* (hunted with the assistance of dogs) (Talla 1979:392).

Subject to precautionary measures that hunters should warn or make their presence known to other hunters, hunting appears to have transcended village boundaries and was not restricted to the *tana bawang.*

**Fishing:** Fishing, particularly *tuba* fishing, was done respecting the territorial rights of the *bawang.* Under the Tuba Fishing Order, the Brookes allowed *tuba* fishing by the natives. It is a practice allowed to continue today, subject to a permit from the Resident. *Tuba* root fishing required the involvement of the whole *bawang.* It was often made into a celebration of sorts and was a matter of prestige and other *bawang* were always invited to join in the fish harvest. The person who initiated the *tuba* fishing was the host. He and his family provided the *tuba* roots and the food, rice, *borak* (rice wine), and perhaps slaughtered an animal as food for the whole village and their guests.

One of the last major *tuba* fishing events carried out in the Pa' Depbur was initiated by Bala Pelaba in 1957. Other villages were invited to participate in the *tuba* fishing. As was customarily required of the host, Bala Pelaba and his family provided the *tuba* roots and the rice required to feed the people. Shelters were built along the river where *tuba* roots were beaten and the sap was allowed to flow into the river. *Patun batu b* (stone walls) were built in the river to trap any fish that swam upriver to escape the effect of the lethal sap. As the *tuba* began to take effect, it was customary for the men to dive around the *patun batu b* to catch the fish. They would present the biggest fish to the host first, before proceeding to catch fish for themselves. The host would later feed the whole community with the catch.

*Tuba* fishing was primarily done in villages located along the major rivers like the Pa' Depbur, Pa' Kelapang, Pa' Mein, and Pa' Umur. Any *tuba* fishing in the smaller rivers such as the Pa' Marariu and others was done at the level of the local village. Penghulu Henry Jalla related how in a major *tuba* expedition at Pa' Kelapang in the 1940s by the villages of Pa' Dalih and Batu Patung, the fish swam upriver to Pa' Madi'it and the village of Pa' Bengar. The headman of Pa' Bengar consulted Tama Laai, the headman of Batu Patung, as to whether they could capitalize on the *nubah* and catch the fish that came up to their territory for themselves. Tama Laai replied that the fish that swam upriver to Pa' Dalih belonged to that village and those that swam further up to Pa' Bengar were rightfully theirs.

**Tree Tenure and Forest Produce**

**Trees:** The Kelabits practiced a form of tree tenure, similar to that practiced by the Iban.

---

32 In recent years a number of accidents have occurred during hunting and one reason offered is that people are crossing into another *bawang.*

33 Other forms of fishing, such as using the *keluit* (hook and line), *bubu* (bamboo traps), *mering* (weirs), *iyap* (hand nets), and *pedala* (cast nets), do not involve the whole community.
as described by Cramb (1986:17) and Sather (1990:31). Rights to planted trees belong exclusively to the planter’s household. In the wild, the first person to find a fruit tree or tree for timber may claim it by cleaning the undergrowth around its base and placing an etu (‘mark’) on the tree which establishes exclusive rights over the tree on behalf of the finder’s household. He may pass this right to his descendants by public declaration. The traditional, and still used, etu (mark) is in the form of an a’ud, a main stem with a branch put perpendicular to it. Another mark could be in the form of an epang, where two sticks are inserted in the form of a cross at the foot of the tree. Both these marks signify a claim by a person. A mark with four sticks intertwined together to form a square means that the tree is reserved for communal use. Today it is common to have villagers point out certain tumuh (timber trees) which have been marked with an epang and so “kept” for the use of a particular household. In Pa’ Lunis for instance, a certain area where many tumuh trees are growing has been fenced by the village as a reserve for the community’s use.

The use of the etu or epang to signify a claim was, and still is, taken very seriously. Lian-Saging (1977:98), for example, related an incident where Balang Rira, the father of Tepun Bawang and an ancestor of Lian, laid claim to a cluster of kenangan, or wild sago palms, on a hill at Pa’ Marariu where his longhouse stood. The leaves of the kenangan were used for roof thatch, the pith of the young palm shoots could be eaten as a vegetable, and should the rice harvest fail, the pith of a mature palm could provide sago starch or flour. When it happened that an anak katu (ordinary member of the longhouse) named Oyau Tapu’an took some of the palm shoots for a vegetable without asking permission, Tepun Bawang speared Oyau’s thigh to show his displeasure and to assert his claim.

Forest Produce: Gathering forest products like rattan, resin, and wood for house or boat construction as well as for firewood was done within the territorial domain of the bawang. In contrast to the Saribas Iban practice reported by Sather (1990) in which an individual may claim ownership of a tapang tree (koompassia excelsia) and the original finder’s descendant may inherit the right to use it, the taking of honey by the Kelabits from tapang trees is a communal venture. Among the Kelabits no individual may claim an exclusive right to a tapang tree in which is found buah tikan umun, or a collection of beehives, in one area or on one tree. A bawang has prior rights over honey found in its vicinity or within the tana’ bawang, and the honey is to be collected by the whole village. This involves the men of the village climbing and torching the trees on a moonless night, driving the bees out of the nest using smoke torches, and then collecting the honey and larvae. Another village has access only if the village with prior rights invites or gives consent for them to participate. In contrast, a buah tikan runut (a lone or single beehive)

34 Tepun Bawang was the grandfather of the present Tepun Bawang (now in his 80s), the headman of Bario Asal, who is the adopted father of Lian-Saging.
35 This sago starch is the staple food of the Penan people who roam the jungle as hunter gatherers.
may be taken by whomever finds it.

The rule appears to be founded on the necessity of cooperative labor for the task of honey collection. It is also for the preservation and protection of the bees, as much as a means of fair distribution of a common resource. In the division of the honey and edible u'at (larvae), a widow's household will be given the same share as the rest of the households, even if no member of her household participated in the collection of the honey.

Similar to Land Dayak (Bidayuh) families who may claim rights to own wild engkabang trees, a Kelabit household may have an individual claim over damar putih (agathis) trees, for the natang (resin or damar). A family who first discovered and marked the tree with the recognized etu or epang could own heritable rights to the trees. The damar was useful in the past not only as fuel and a sealant for wood, but also as a trading commodity.

**Salt Production:** The Kelabits produce their own iodine-rich salt through a process of evaporation of salt water from salt springs in the highlands. This requires the boiling of brine in cauldrons for days using a continuous wood fire. When the water has evaporated, leaving a sediment of salt-crystals in the cauldron, the semi-liquid is poured into bamboo containers (of various sizes), which are open at the top and bored at the bottom to drain away excess water. The bamboo containing the salt is then baked in the fire and when it is completely dry, the dry stick of salt is taken out, its size corresponding to that of the bamboo, and wrapped in leaves for storage. These yield fine grains of white or sometimes ash colored organic salt. This salt was one of the Kelabits’ main items of trade with the lowland Kayans and Kenyahs.

*Mein* (salt springs) that are frequently used are located at Pa’ Mein, Pa’ Umur, Pa’ Bengar, Pa’ Dalih, and in Long Peluan (Long Senibong). Each of these sources consists of multiple small springs. While these salt springs are available to any Kelabit to produce salt, a salt spring remains the common property of the community, subject to the control of the village in the vicinity within whose tanah bawang it is located. A person who intends to use the mein (salt spring) should let the headman of the host bawang know of his intention and ask for permission to take firewood from the jungle within the bawang.

In the past, the construction of a wooden “well” for the salt spring was done by influential families — as a matter of prestige. Large hollow trunks of wood were used to

---

37 Douglas (1912) described the water as “brackish” and its taste as being like “epsom salt.” Incidents of goiter, which are, or were in the past, frequent among lowland tribes, are rare in the highlands. This has been attributed to the high iodine content of this salt.


39 The Lun Bawangs, the Kerayans and the Berians also make salt using the same method. The salt obtained from the Kerayans, however, is formed of reddish brown crystals resembling coarse sugar.

40 The *tubung* (well) of the Mein Keramut salt well in Pa’Umur was first dug by the grandparents of Sina Napong Aran and was later reconstructed by her and her husband, Napong Aran, using a hollow tree trunk in honor of Sina Napong Aran’s parents in the
reach the stone base to create the well. Today, the wells at both Mein Keramut in Pa’ Umur and Mein Rayeh in Pa’ Mein have been constructed with cement and the cauldrons are of stainless steel, courtesy of Sarawak Shell Bhd.

**Inter-Bawang Boundaries: Function of the Tung and Apu’**

Two notions associated with the boundaries between different Kelabit bawangs are tung and apu’. Talla (1979:91) suggests that the tung delimits the political and economic boundaries of a bawang, equating tung with the erang tana’, or boundary lines, between villages. All economic pursuits are carried out by bawang members within the tung. Tung boundaries are often marked by or coincide with mountain ranges, ridge tops, rivers, or other natural features, such as an ulung, or ‘island,’ of virgin jungle left untouched to serve as a reserve and boundary. Closely linked to the concept of tung is that of apu’.

The apu’ (meeting point) was where exchanges or trading transactions took place. When, for instance, there was an irau (a child-naming feast ceremony) or as in pre-Christian days, a burak ate (a ceremony to commemorate the final burial rites for a deceased person), animals or other items given as contributions towards the feast were sent by a visiting bawang to the host. The villagers met at an established meeting point which was midway between the two bawang, with the recipients of the gifts meeting the donors halfway. Similarly, in an exchange of goods in trade, the carriers of the goods met to exchange the goods at the apu, ensuring that both parties would bear the task of carrying the load equally.

The importance attached to the apu is illustrated by an incident when some Lun Lem Baa’ were to have met a group from Pa’ Dalih for a transaction at the agreed apu’. When the latter arrived late at the apu’, a leading member of the waiting party from Lem Baa’ was incensed. They would not go beyond the agreed apu’ and the excessive delay on the part of the other village was seen as a breach of the understanding to meet at the halfway point. To show his displeasure, the leader of the waiting party threatened to tie up the limbs of the other party’s leader with ropes and would have done so had he not been forcefully restrained.41

In times when a village was afflicted with disease, an arch called a berara made of vines and leaves was erected at the apu as a signal to warn people of the next village not to cross into the territory of the next bawang lest they be infected with the disease. The story is told about the village of Paririman (near Pa’ Mein) where the whole village was wiped out by an epidemic sometime around 1912. To contain the disease, a number of berara were erected at the apu between Paririmans and nearby villages to warn people against visiting and contracting the disease.42

All informants are unanimous on the concept of the apu’ being the halfway point between the two bawang. In many instances it coincided with the tung, blurring the

---

41 Personal communication with Sina Napong Aran, Bario, August 2002, confirmed by Galih Ballang, personal communication in Bario September 2002.

42 Personal communication with Bala Pelaba of Pa’ Umur, April 2003, and with Pun Tenganen, Kuching, June 2003.
distinction between tung and apu’. Some informants who argue that tung is different from apu’ opine that since there were many different sites of longhouses within the tana’ bawang, the apu’ may have shifted accordingly. Disagreements over the actual location on the tung arise because over time, longhouse sites were sometimes moved. For instance, between Bario Asal (Lem Baa’) and Pa’ Umur, Lun Bario Asal claim that the tung between the two bawang is at Ra’an Berua’, a valley about an hour and a half walk beyond both the present and previous longhouse sites at Pa’ Umur. Lun Pa’ Umur, however, claim that the tung is at Ra’an Tung Bera which today is about an hour’s walk from the site of the Bario Asal longhouse and about an hour’s walk from Pa’ Umur.

The discrepancy stems from the basis on which the claim is made — based on the traditional halfway meeting point where exchanges were made, as in Ra’an Tung Bera, the other purportedly based on boundaries demarcated by the British colonial administrators. Lun Bario Asal claim a colonial officer had declared Ra’an Berua’ to be the village boundary, a claim refuted by Lun Pa’ Umur on grounds that their late headman Balla Ngimat had never acknowledged, known of, or been notified of such an administrative decision concerning the boundary. Lun Pa’ Umur also maintain that their ancestors, and they themselves, many of whom are now in their 70s, farmed Ra’an Berua’ when their longhouse was at Pa’ Tebpung. They argue that the area had traditionally been occupied by their ancestors, and it could therefore have been neither an apu’ nor a tung.

Lun Pa’ Umur maintain that the midway point between the two villages had traditionally been at Ra’an Tung Bera. They point to a transaction that is said to have taken place between Lun Pa’ Umur and Lun Lem Baa’ (as it was known then) in which Lun Pa’ Umur delivered bera (husked rice) in exchange for a belanai jar from Lun Lem Baa’. The exchange was carried out at Ra’an Tung Bera, which is aptly named after that transaction. Sina Napong Aran (also known as Baken Ayu) says that the jar, which was given by the late Penghulu Lawai in that exchange, is still in her possession.

---

43 The local people say they believe there were maps to indicate these boundaries but they were damaged in a fire that engulfed the District Office in Marudi in the 1970s. Copies of the same maps which were retained by Penghulu Ngimat Ayu’ were also destroyed in a fire that burnt the whole longhouse in 1996.

44 There could have been an effort to demarcate the boundaries in the period of the Secretariat Circular No. 12/1939 when there was a policy to survey lands after the Land Order in 1931 (Order No. L-2). This Order was followed by Order No. L-7 (Land Settlement) 1933 which marked the introduction of the Torrens system. It provided for settlement of legal and customary rights to land and required all dealings to be registered in a Land Registry on pain of nullity. Fundamental to the implementation of such a system of land registration was accurate cadastral survey. It required time and adequate staff. In truth, there was no machinery or staff for executing the work. What was undertaken was an interim measure for village committees to be established to assist the government in defining the boundaries. Many of these boundaries were based on traditional communal or tribal boundaries which had existed before the coming of the Brookes. I searched through the record of administrative officers in public service during that period at the Sarawak Museum Archives for the name of an officer “Wan Sulun” who was claimed to have demarcated the boundary but was not able to find a listing of him. Could it have been that he was a junior officer?

45 Personal communication, Bario, August 2002.
instance, quoted both by Sina Napong Aran and Maran Ayu is that when Tama Bulan and his family moved back to Lem Baa’ in 1960, the villagers from Pa’ Umur carried some of their chattels and household goods up to Ra’an Tung Bera where they were met by Lun Lem Baa’.  

The tung and apu’ are concepts indigenous to the Kelabits and as was generally the practice in Sarawak, demarcations by the colonial administrators would have followed the local practice, based on communal or tribal boundaries. With few exceptions, informants are basically in agreement that the tung is equivalent to the erang bawang. Traditionally, up to the 1950s the tung bawang were as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of bawang</th>
<th>Erang bawang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bario Asal and Kubaan</td>
<td>Ra’an Kinidan (Long Semitang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bario Asal and Pa’ Lungan</td>
<td>Ra’an Sinapur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bario Asal and Pa’ Mein</td>
<td>Ra’an Ngaba / Ra’an Buduk Batuh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bario Asal and Pa’ Umur</td>
<td>Batu Libuh (near Ra’an Tung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bera) / Ra’an Berua’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bario Asal and Pa’ Ukat</td>
<td>Pa’ Puak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubaan and Long Lellang</td>
<td>Long Labid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubaan and Pa’ Tik</td>
<td>Ra’an Barat Utap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubaan and Seridan</td>
<td>Leop Kayuh Bukung &amp; Lepo Kayan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46 Interview in Bario, August 2002.

47 The writer’s father Tama Bulan’s father was originally from Lem Baa’. He was taken to Pa’ Umur by his mother after his father’s death and married a woman from Pa’ Umur. He moved back to Bario in 1960 to enable his children to be near the school in Bario at the invitation of his brother-in-law, Penghulu Lawai Besara of Bario.

48 In another instance, Lun Lem Baa’ came all the way to Pa’ Umur to mabah (carry on their backs) Tama Bulan’s household chattels including the kepang (wooden roof tiles) to the longhouse at Bario. The custom in an inter-village migration was that when a family was given the permission and blessings by the headman to leave a bawang, the receiving bawang would welcome the new family by the whole uvang bawang (members of the bawang) of the receiving village helping in the logistics of the migration. Note also that if the family moved without the blessing of the headman of the village of origin, the migrating family as well as the receiving bawang would be asked to pay a fine to the former.

49 Ribuh Ballang (Ulung Palang) and Balang Maten (Long Lellang) are of the opinion the two concepts are different.

50 I counter-checked results of earlier interviews with leaders of the community at a meeting called by Pemanca Ngimet Ayu’ at his residence at Bued Mein Baru “A”, Bario, in December 2003. Present at the meeting were: Pemanca Ngimet Ayu’ (Pa’ Mein/Bued Mein Baruh) Penghulu Henry Jalla (Long Lellang/Bued mein Baruh), TK Tama Pasang (Pa’ Umur), TK Mada’ Karuh, (Kubaan/Arur Dalan), WKK Maran Tunen (Pa’ Bengar/Arur Layun), Balang Radu (Bario Asal), Puun Ulun (Pa’ Dalih) Bawang Nungen (Bario Asal), Udun (Pa’ Ramapuh), David Labang (Pa’ Bengar/Padnag Pasir) and Lucy Labang (Bario Asal/Padang Pasir).

51 There is disagreement on the tung.

52 There is disagreement between some members of Bario Asal and Pa’ Mein (Bued Mein Baru) as to the exact tung.
Kubaan and Lio Buyo
Pa’ Lungan and Pa’ Kabak
Pa’ Lungan and Pa’ Umur
Pa’ Mada and Pa’ Bengar
Pa’ Mada and Pa’ Dalih
Pa’ Tik and Long Lellang
Pa’ Umur and Pa’ Mein
Pa’ Dalih and Pa’ Bengar
Pa’ Mein and Long Dano (Pa’ Mada)
Pa’ Mein and Pa’ Bengar
Pa’ Mada and Ramudu
Pa’ Dalih and Batu Patung
Ramudu and Batu Patung
Ramudu and Long Peluan
Batu Patung and Long Peluan

Gitaan Tatib
Ra’an Abang Bulu’
Rurna’ Maun Teluh
Long Tengaang
Long Serepan
Long Ritan / Batu Lem Ale
Long Labid / Raan Bui
Ra’an Berangad
Ra’an Pehetunen
Long Bada
Ra’an Tuduk Uku’
Ra’an Terap / Buduk Idtung
Ra’an Paad
Buduk Isung
Lepo Ukan / Kawang Tuan
Kawang Tuan (Apad Riku’)

These boundaries appear to follow frequently trodden routes and are mainly in ra’an (valleys on ridge tops). Since the population resettlement in Bario during the Malaysian Indonesian Confrontation when villages were located in a central location, changes occurred in modes of transactions and social interactions such that the tung and apu’ have not featured much in Kelabit everyday transactions. It is interesting though to note that in 1963 at the outbreak of the Confrontation, when new villages were moved to Bario and new areas had to be created for them, the boundaries between villages were based on the traditional boundaries. The tung appeared to have been used by Haddock Wilson in determining village boundaries. For instance, when land in Pa’ Ukat was given to Tama Long and his people who had been moved from Long Rebpun (close to the Malaysian-Indonesian border), Wilson sought the opinion of Tapan Ulun, the headman of Pa’ Umor, in acknowledgement that the area was land which was within the territorial boundaries of his bawang and which had traditionally been farmed by people from Pa’ Umor. Tapan Ulun agreed to let the new settlers live there. It may also be noted that many of those who moved to Pa’ Ukat were originally from Pa’ Umur.

55 Tama Pasang, personal communication, Bario, September 2002, and the general consensus at the leaders’ meeting.
55 Ribuh Balang, personal communication, Bario, August 2002.
56 Ibid.
57 Bala Pelaba, personal communication, Bario August 2002. Prior to the moving of many villages to Bario during the Malaysian-Indonesian Confrontation, a security committee was set up to consider the security and logistics of moving whole villages. Members of that committee were: Haddock Wilson (District Officer), Ngerawe Ulun (Government Up River Agent), Pengful Lawai (Chief), Bala Pelaba (then Chief Inspector, Border Scouts in Bario), Tama Saging (Tua Kampong, Bario Longhouse as Bario Asal was then called), Tapan Ulun @ Bala Ngmet (Tua Kampong of Pa’ Umor), Balang Tuna (Tua Kampong of Pa’ Lungan). Note that prior to 1963 these were the only main villages in inner Bario. Many meetings and different committees were later set up to look into the details of settlement, the most longterm of which was the Land Committee headed by Balang Radu and Ngerawe Ulun.
Inter-Tribal Boundaries

The early writings of colonial administrators recognized clear areas inhabited by indigenous ethnic groups. For instance, a map drawn by R. S. Douglas (1907:57) showed the territories settled by the Kayans, Kelabits, Kenyahs, and Penans. These territories generally followed natural features such as rivers, mountain ranges, ridge tops, or gorges. The Merigong Gorge, for instance, was said to form a natural boundary between the Kayans and Kelabits in the Akah, the latter “believed to have lived on the upriver side of the gorge for centuries” (Southwell 1999:298). Harrisson also referred to the headwaters of the Akah as “on the border of the Kelabit country” (Harrisson 1959:113).

Apart from the natural physical features that were used as boundary points, government administrative forts later became boundary markers for the various tribes. The Brooke administration established control by building forts at the trading centers located at the mouths of rivers to collect duties on riverine trade as well as to collect taxes from the local populace. One such fort was Lio Mato which not only symbolized British sovereignty and protection over the Kelabit and Badang areas, but was the place where all the Kelabit, Badang, and Saban chiefs paid their taxes. Present-day Kelabits talk about this fort as one that was built by Kelabits which they say indicates the extent of Kelabit territory. Bala (2002:24) suggests that Pa Labid, now uninhabited, was a meeting point between Kelabits, Kayans, and Kenyahs where salt, resin, rattan, ceramic bowls, and beads were traded. Since this was the most remote outpost in Kayan/Kenyah country, this was seen as an outermost boundary point between the Kelabits and other groups.

Cultural Landscape: Kelabit Megalithic Stone Culture

The making of Kelabit cultural landmarks on the landscape clothe it with distinctive characteristics of Kelabit habitation and set these landscapes apart from those of other native groups. One of the most distinctive marks of Kelabit settlement and occupation of the land were their unique megalithic stone constructions associated with burial rites. Edward Banks, curator of the Sarawak Museum, noted that the numerous megalithic remains that he found in the Kelabit Highlands were definitely of Kelabit origin. When Tom Harrisson mounted an expedition to Mt. Batu Lawi (6,600 ft) in 1946, he noted that the only signs of previous human life and habitation were the megaliths by the Tabun River, which he took to be an indication that the Kelabits had once inhabited the area. Earlier travelers like Moulton also wrote of the presence of burial urns similar to those used by the Kelabits in the rest of the highlands (J. C. Moulton 1912:1-7).

The Kelabit megalithic stone culture which was associated with burial rites appears to be unique to them and to closely related groups in Sabah and East Kalimantan. There are, of course, archaeological and ethnographic examples of stone monuments from Assam to

---

58 R. S. Douglas (1907:156) reported that Kelabit and Saban chiefs requested the setting up of the fort.
59 Penghulu Henry Jalla (Nepuun Baru), Gerau Ribuh, and Balang Buren, personal communication, Bario, August 2002.
Luzon and out into eastern Indonesia, and there are some uncertain parallels with the stone culture in Java and West Sumatra. It appears, however, that Kelabit stone working, though linked to other cultures, was an isolated tradition with its own peculiarities. Kelabit megaliths do not appear to have any incised patterns, while stone works found in other areas take the form of pole-like monuments, or sculpture of human figures of an origin unknown to today's population.

Harrisson (1962: 376-83) compared what was known of the megaliths in the Kelabit Uplands with those found in Malacca and Negri Sembilan and concluded that “they could quite well have been erected...as a similar integral part of a similar general culture.” However, on the island of Borneo, no other known megalithic culture in the ancient or recent past is identical to that of the Kelabit, apart from that of the Lun Kerayans and Berians in Kalimantan who are of the same stock. The Lun Bawangs in Sarawak, however, do not appear to have practiced the same megalithic culture.

As a mark of respect for their parents or other elderly persons, notable or upper class families gave huge feasts in honor of their parents. This might be done while the parents were still alive, but primarily it was done after their deaths. On such occasions an individual or families erected or carved rocks, monoliths, stone “tables,” “seats,” dolmens, and bridges in memory of the dead. They also constructed slab graves, “forts,” and deep stone burial urns into which the bones of the dead were put (Harrisson 1954). In burial customs that were different from the neighboring lowland tribes, the Kelabits practiced a form of primary and secondary burial (Lian-Saging 1977:145-147, Chong 1954:187). Another group that practiced secondary burial of the dead, but without a megalithic component, were the Berawans, a group related to the Kelabits (see Metcalf 1981).

Stone Megaliths at Pa' Barang. There are eight stones in this group, with the tallest about eight feet in height. (Photo: Ramy Bulan)

---

Close by at Pa’ Barang, a stone bridge on the crest of a hill. There are three bridges at this location. For scale, David Labang standing at the end of the bridge. (Photo: Ramy Bulan)

During the primary burial, an earthen jar would be used as a coffin. The jar was broken off at about three-quarters of its height below the neck, and the corpse was placed in the jar in a foetal-like sitting position with hands clasped on the chest. The jar was then covered with the broken-off top quarter and secured with rattan strips. A hole was pierced in the bottom of the jar and connected to a giant bamboo which was put into the ground to drain the liquids from the decomposing body. Some aristocratic families also used a lungun, an elaborately made wooden coffin, sometimes carved with designs, which was mounted on poles. In the olden days this was kept in the family apartment within the longhouse, but in the late 1930s and early 1940s, after ten days, it was removed some distance away to a separate hut or extension but within the borders of the longhouse. Perhaps this practice of keeping the body for so great a length of time was to buy time to accumulate a sufficient amount of rice for nuba (cooked rice) and burak (rice wine) to feed the whole community, as much as a show of remorse and grief.

After a year or so, a secondary burial was held and the bones were laid in the communal binatuh, the permanent burial place. Traditionally, a person’s bones would always be brought back to his place of origin or birth. This would be done at an elaborate borak ate (lit., death wine-feast) given by the family of the deceased. The level of grandiosity and importance attached to these feasts and the ostentatious sacrifices of labor and wealth expended caused Edward Banks to remark: “I believe that the Kelabits greatest joy is mourning and burying his own and other people’s relations” (1937:429).

Lasting for about four or five days with as many as 500 invited guests, the only
manifest and organized activity was the removal of the bones from the jar-coffin into a
dolmen, vat, or large jar (the latter often of a dragon design) for the permanent burial.
This removal might be accompanied by the erection of a stone monument, ostensibly in
loving memory and tribute to the dead, but no less to demonstrate the family's social
status.

Harrisson referred to this as “semi permanent recording by funerary memorial.” He
noted that there were three common forms of this practice. The first was the erection of a
monument in stone called the batu sinuped. This could be a single stone slab or menhir,
or a bridge. It could be a perupun where a number of stone slabs were placed on top of
each other as a table, or a conical shaped mound. Heirlooms might or might not have
been buried together with the body in the perupun.64 Capstones might have been mounted
on stone legs called batu pelukong, or dolmens.65 The stones were perhaps quarried from
elsewhere, then carried and erected at the chosen spot.

Stone dolmen at Pa’ Umur erected by Sina Bulan and Tama Pasan
in honor of their father Tapan Tepun. (Photo: Ramy Bulan)

Another view of the stone dolmen at Pa Umur. (Photo: Ramy Bulan)

64 Bala Pelaba and Galih Balang talk of the legend of a young lady who died in Patar
Lem Liu’, called Liyu’. Since she died without an heir, her property was buried with her in
a huge mound of stones which may be seen today.

65 Sina Bulan and her brother Tama Pasan erected a batu pelukong at Long Nipat in
memory of their father Tapan Tepun.
Second, memorialization might have taken the form of cutting a clearing through virgin forest on a mountain ridge, often on the most difficult, isolated and distinctive peaks that could be seen from miles around. This was called a kawang.

Third, it might have involved construction of a canal in the ground or even a ditch across a ridge tract called a nabang, either to divert the course of a river, to reclaim a large meander as arable land, or to redirect the flow of water.\(^{66}\) This often resulted in the formation of a lake which was named after the man who sponsored the feast. One such lake is Taka Kara’e’, named after Pun Kara’e’, and another called Taka Pun Ratu named after Pun Ratu who created a nabang there.

![A nabang ditch dug by Utung Ratu at Pa’ Umur in honor of his father. The ditch is 4-5 feet deep, though covered in places with leaves. (Photo: Ramy Bulan)](image)

Outside the main highlands, for example, in Long Lellang, the local practice was the creation of a lega, a large wooden platform built specifically for the slaughter of animals killed to feed the guests at a death feast ceremony. All transactions had to be performed on that lega. Although it did not leave a permanent landmark, the lega served the same purpose as the other monuments. There is evidence of nabang, kawang, and batu sinupep found in the area which were erected by people who came from the northern and central highlands to marry in Long Lellang.\(^{67}\)

Many of the stone monuments that exist today have a known history, and their creators are known. Others, whose creator is unknown, are said to have been erected by the legendary Seluyah or Tokid Rini (see Labang 1958).

Harrisson (1958) suggested a connection between these three forms, for instance, instead of elevating an upright menhir, one could have placed a bridge across a ditch, or any of those combinations. Clear evidence of this is found at a site in Pa’ Berang which the writer visited in November 2002. As Harrisson noted, there was flexibility in the forms these monuments took. Clearly made to commemorate the dead, on rare occasions


\(^{67}\) A nabang may still be seen at Long Dati, and a perupun at Long Sebuloh.
they commemorated the lives of parents who were still living. Harrisson attempted to explain the intent of these expressions as a reassurance to the spirit that everyone back in the highlands was right behind her or him, or that a “path” or “ditch” be interpreted as a path of spirit egress. Although always accompanied by some form of ceremony, this writer’s view is that the Kelabits themselves did not seem to have attached much spiritual significance to these stone monuments apart from their being a mark of respect, in memory or in honor of a loved one, otherwise it would have been imperative for every family to do it. Only persons of means could afford to, and only those who commanded the respect of the community (so as to garner cooperative labor) could embark on such a major undertaking. The higher the status of the person to be commemorated, or the more influential the family, the bigger the feast or the more difficult the task, requiring the whole community to provide the necessary labor. There appears to be no connection with notions of life after death or increasing human fertility, as suggested by Heine-Geldern and Fleming (1963) for other megalithic complexes.

Interestingly, the erection of monuments among the Kelabits was not restricted to honoring the relationship of a parent and child. It could be for a husband or close relative who had died, or it could even be in honor of a parent who was still alive. Sina Bala Ngimet, now 80 years old, related how in her lifetime she had undertaken these ceremonies seven times. Her first was accompanied by the making of a nabang in memory of her deceased first husband, Akun. This was followed by the creation of another nabang in memory of her first husband’s mother. When she remarried, together with her husband Bala Ngimet (also known as Tapan Ulun), they held a number of other feasts accompanied by the erection of monuments.

A nabang was made in honor of Sina Bala Ngimet’s mother, Pun Uwad, who at that time was still alive. That was a feast to nunang (honor a parent who was still alive) her mother, an occasion which was not any less significant than a death feast. Another feast was given in honor of the husband’s deceased mother Pun Bura’, and another feast in memory of Laba Ayu, her husband’s deceased father, and on both occasions, a nabang ditch was created. The last feast she gave was in honor of Belaan Iyu, Sina Balang Imat’s deceased father, upon which occasion they erected a single batu sinuped menhir about seven feet high. That menhir was an upright stone they had found in the plains at Long Nipat, and could have been formerly erected by an unknown person of old. It was uprooted and re-erected at the present site at Ruma’ Maun Long Mein. In another instance, Sina Bala Ngimet and her husband Bala Ngimet also erected a single menhir in honor of her husband’s father’s brother. The latter had no child of his own and no heir to hold such a ceremony for him. In the process, Bala Ngimet inherited the valuable ancient jar that belonged to his uncle. Today that jar has been inherited by Bala Ngimet’s eldest daughter. The commemoration of the life or death of someone without an heir by a close relative was a common way of inheriting their property and keeping the property within the family.

Another example of this practice was in the case of Semera Langit’s (SM) daughters. SM had four daughters. His brother Tadem Ribuh had no surviving children. SM gave a feast and created a kawang in Lem Baa’ (Bario) in honor of Tadem Ribuh, and thus was entitled to take over the belanai ma’un (ancient jar) that Tadem had inherited as elder son of their father. Since SM’s eldest daughter already owned SM’s family belanai (jar),

---

68 Also known as Kareb Ayu’ from Pa’ Umur.
Tadem Ribuh’s jar became the inheritance of SM’s second daughter, Sina Kapong Raja.69

A stone menhir in Bario reputedly erected by Tepun Bawang, an ancestor of Robert Lian-Saging. (Photo: Ramy Bulan)

Expensive burial rights remained a feature of Kelabit life until they turned to Christianity in the mid 1940s when expensive and unhygienic death rites were abandoned in favor of simple funerals. They then transformed the practice of creating nabangs into creating a bakut, which was essentially the digging of drains to create wide laterite roads for use by the public. A bakut was no less prestigious than any other form of commemoration. Instead of creating further landmarks on the land, Kelabit leaders like Aren Tuan of Pa’ Lungan suggested that all efforts ought to be directed at diverting and straightening the meandering rivers to make the rivers more navigable, so that the creation of landmarks on the land would be of public benefit.

Whatever form they took, these monuments embodied a permanent “registering of death upon the landscape” which was a major part of Kelabit life. Remnants of kawang may be seen, although not as distinct as in the past, along the ridges in Bario today. People are still able to tell the exact ridges where they or their ancestors created a perupun, kawang, batu simupa, or nabang, many of which may have been done by them or their parents. A descendant would say “my father lies there” or “my ancestor is on that ridge.” One notable site is a group of eight menhirs that can be seen on a knoll at Pa’ Berang. Four monoliths are between six to over seven feet high, another four small ones are about two to three feet high and yet another four cut stones of about six feet serve as bridges over man-made ditches or nabangs. It is said that when the Kelabits migrated from Patar Lem Liu’, they lived at Pa’ Berang for a time. They moved into the higher plains of Pa’ Debpur because downriver the frequent flooding of the Pa’ Debpur brought fish that ate the stems of their padi plants and this affected their harvests.

Edward Banks, curator of the Sarawak Museum, wrote in 1936 how he had seen nabang, scores of these stones, monuments, jars, both old and recent, and stone “urns” used in burial ceremonies. He also reported seeing a number of crude human carvings cut on stones, often in relief, which his informants said had been created by their ancestors.

69 Kareb Ayu of Pa’ Umur, personal communication, Miri, October 2002. This was also mentioned by Sina Robert @ Adteh Kediah Aran, personal communication, Kuching, November 2002.
He opined that “the stone objects in the Kelabit country are of recent and present Kelabit origin, and not Chinese.” He noted that some identical carvings and numerous stone urns for reception of bones were found in the Naga Country of Assam, similar possibly because the people lived in similar climatic conditions, but concluded, however, that “in Sarawak, at any rate, they are to be found mainly among the Kelabit, occasionally among the Muruts, but among no other people” (Banks 1936). Although we know now that there are similar burial practices in other areas, to the extent that the same practices were confined to people of the same stock, Banks was right.

There have been megalithic activities discovered in other locations in Borneo, for example, by the Kadazans in coastal Sabah (Harrisson 1973:123), in Pulau Usukan and other offshores islets in northwestern Sabah (Harrisson 1962a:386-89, T. and B. Harrisson 1971, Chapter 5), and Kuala Bekukn, Tomani, in southwestern Sabah, but Harrisson argued that Kelabit Highland stone work has unique features of its own (Harrisson and O’Connors 1971:71-77). For instance, the rock carvings discovered in Ulu Tomani, Sabah, in April 1971, had features that closely matched the stone carvings found in the Kelabit country at Pa’ Dalih and also at Long Lellang in the Akah. Since there is no tradition or record of any megalithic activity among the present Tomani inhabitants, the Tagals, nor are any carved or cut rocks known even in the megalithic area of the Kadazandusun peoples further north (T. and B. Harrisson 1971), he posited that “it seems likely that this is one of the many lost signs that the upland Kelabit people...once spread continuously much further north and south until they were decimated by the introduced epidemics after the arrival of western civilisation on the coast.” Such a thesis perhaps supports R. S. Douglas’s statement that Kelabits are practically the same race of people as are those known as Muruts in the Trusan and Padas Districts of Sabah (Douglas 1907:53). 70

These cultural landmarks are revisited as indications and proof of the occupation of the highlands by the Kelabits. Despite the absence of a surveyed and well-delineated boundary, quite clearly they lived and exclusively occupied the highlands as their ancestral homeland for generations from time immemorial. As the next part of this paper will show, there is currently a quest to outline the traditional boundaries between them and other tribes.

Formalizing Historical and Traditional Boundaries

Within the larger concept of territorial domains, native spatial concepts, whether inter-community or intra-community, were underpinned by native customs concerning ownership and use of land. These were based on rotational swidden agriculture and other customary uses of land already in existence when Rajah James Brooke first came to Sarawak in 1839. Native customary rights to land consisted of a right to cultivate land, a right to wild fruits or produce of the jungle, hunting and fishing rights, burial rights and rights of inheritance transfer and temporary assignment. The clearing and cultivation of

---

70 It is not farfetched to say that the people who call themselves Lun Dayeh in the Ulu Padas are of the same stock as the Kelabits. Alison Hoare writes of a burial custom of burying the remains of the dead in jars and the presence of batu nari in the Ulu Padas. See A. Hoare, Cooking The Wild: The Role of The Lundayeh of the Ulu Padas (Sabah, Malaysia) in Managing Forest Foods and Shaping the Landscape, Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Kent at Canterbury, June 2002, p. 157.
virgin land conferred permanent rights on the original clearer which he could pass on to his descendants.

The Land Regulations of 1863 which sought to give the Brooke regime rights over all unoccupied land did not interfere with Dayak and Malay customary land rights. In the 1920 Order No. VIII which came into effect in 1923, Part 5 of the Order said “Natives may occupy land free of all charges in accordance with customary laws provided that, where possible, claims shall be registered.” Supplementary Order No. IX provided for Native Reserves of 5 acres per family. Such occupation of land under customary law appears to have been generally regarded as “lawful occupation” and “lawful ownership” (Richards 1961:8). Later orders, namely Order L-2 (Land) of 1931 and Order L-7 (Land Settlement) 1933, which applied the Torrens system, required all titles and dealings to be registered “on pain of nullity” (Richards 1961:8). This culminated in the Secretariat Circular No. 12 of 1939 which, among other things, ordered the setting-up of village committees to assist in defining community boundaries.

Thus began efforts in the 1930s and 1940s to complete a basic triangulation survey to determine boundaries between longhouses and kampung (generally, Malay villages) and get them marked down. These surveys were done by the District Officers with the help of the village committees. This was interrupted by the Japanese Occupation, during which time records were lost or were not kept up to date, and thus it was impossible to follow them up with surveys, necessitating a fresh start. Notwithstanding the clear provisions of the Secretariat Circular 12/39, a lack of administrative capacity, lack of funds and staff, and, ironically, a fear that there would be no land left to alienate if the demarcations were completed, meant that little was done to survey the land (Richards 1961:9). When efforts were renewed in 1945 to discuss policy and procedure, the old orders were consolidated under the Land Code of 1958 “with the addition only of minor improvements and without reference to the real needs of the people [natives] most concerned” (Richards 1961:9). Thus, it resulted in a code that “did not give effect to any customs whatsoever except codified law of delicts” (Richards, quoting Peter Mooney, as Sarawak Crown Council). Be that as it may, there was no express displacement of customs nor the extinguishment of customary rights to land. The natives continued to practice a system of occupation and inheritance of land based on their customary practices. The incidents of their occupation and ownership of land began to undergo certain transformations due to external pressures on the land and hitherto alien market forces affecting uses of the land.

The Changing Value of Land

Timber logging activities in the 1970s and the growth of a monetary economy brought a change in the value of their lands, resulting in a contest for resources between the neighboring tribes. Quiet tensions between the Kayans, Kenyahs, Penans, Kelabits, and Lun Bawang began to surface. Tensions also mounted between them and other related groups across the Indonesian-Kalimantan border. Differing approaches by different tribes to external encroachments have in some cases given rise to conflict, highlighting the need for clearer demarcation. For example, in the Long Lellang region, the Penan approach to logging has for a long time been to set up blockades in many places, whereas the Kelabits, Kayans, and Kenyahs have taken a pragmatic approach (after many initial

---

71 Temenggung Oyong Lawail Jau, in the Council Negeri sitting in 1957, said that the loss of the Baram Boundary Books had caused many land disputes in the Baram.
clashes) of allowing logging companies to come in, subject to compensation for use of their native customary (NCR) land and to certain benefits being given to the village communities.

Conflicting claims have erupted or are imminent, for instance, in areas where Penans and Kelabits have co-existed, where the Kelabits practiced a swidden cultivation along with their wet padi sawah, and the Penans carried on a hunter-gathering tradition. For over a decade the Kelabits encouraged the Penans to settle down near existing schools where their children could be educated. Many Penan families have now settled down to a more sedentary lifestyle. They farm lands which were traditionally claimed by Kelabits as their amug (formerly cultivated land that is now secondary jungle) and certain virgin jungle which Kelabits claim to be within their tana’ bawang (village communal land). Interestingly, Penans have begun to push for delineation of tribal boundaries for the underlying purpose of claiming specific compensation for their group from logging concessionaires. Penans have in many instances demanded that the government declare communal reserves for them within logging concession areas. Unfortunately, in many instances, these areas were traditionally occupied and claimed by other tribal groups.

Similar disputes have been reported between the Kayans and Ukits in the Belaga area. (Chan 1991). In most cases, the timber logging companies have left the tribal groups to settle their boundaries among themselves. In the meantime, logging operations have proceeded, without any compensation being paid to either party. Added to that are recent alienation of large tracts of land in the interior to various companies for oil palm and forest plantations. These factors have made the issue of boundaries more urgent.

**Boundary Books**

The use of Boundary Books that started in the 1930s and 1940s has seen a resurgence, particularly in areas where logging has encroached on what natives perceive to be their NCR land. The absence of any clear delineation of territories has forced a situation where tribal leaders are now trying to address the issue through negotiations between the tribal groups. A number of different agreements have been signed between neighboring tribes. Boundaries are agreed upon and entered into the Boundary Books by simply stipulating the physical landmarks, accompanied by a sketch map of the area. At times such entries in the Boundary Book may be accompanied by specific conditions.

One such agreement was signed on 13 March 1989 between the Penans, Kelabits, and Kayans of Long Seniai. An entry in the Baram Boundary Book\(^{72}\) simply states the existence of the “Boundary between Penan, Kelabit of Long Lellang Region and Kayan of Long Seniai (Sg. Pengaran on the right side going upriver Akah and Sg. Penan on the left side going up the Akah River). See sketch map opposite page.” Another agreement between the Long Lellang Penans and Kelabits, the Akah and Penan/Kayans of the Patah River signed on 10 March 1989 agreed that the boundary adalah mengikut Sg. Pengaran melalui Simpang Sg. Pengaran (follows Sg. Pengaran through the tributary of the Sg. Pengaran). In yet another agreement, the boundary between the Kelabit Long Lellang and Kayans of Sg. Patah, mengikut gunung besar Patah (follows the mountain ridge).

In the negotiations leading up to this agreement both parties emphasized that the practices of their ancestors should be followed. The Kayans argued for Long Telah, whereas the Kelabits argued that the gorge at Meriggong was the main traditional meeting

\(^{72}\) The Baram Boundary Book, page 96.
place between Kelabits and Kayans and it should be the boundary. In the stalemate, a consensus was reached that the Chairman of the land committee from both parties meet together with the District Officer to make a final decision. At the time of writing, the formal outcome of that meeting is yet to be known.

In some instances, preconditions were inserted for the agreements to be “effective.” For example, in the boundary agreement between the Penans and Long Tunga Kongsi and Lio Mato, it is stated that no virgin jungle is to be felled nor the planting of rubber or fruit trees is to be allowed upriver from Long Tunga and Long Semiang. A condition is inserted that “if there is any dispute or treated (sic) Penan badly the government have to use other means.” This smacks of a silent threat of withdrawal of recognition should the Penans be treated badly.

Apart from agreements, boundary statements also take the form of a declaration made by a District Officer that a certain tribal group has lived on their land according to their adat and that their rights should be respected. For example, in the boundary between the Kayans, Kenyahs, Berawans, and Indonesia, a letter from the District Office with a declaration by two headman of Kebaan Arur Dalan and Pa ‘Tik Arur Dalan simply declares that the boundary runs Dari Kuala Sg. Layun turun ke Merigong (rapid Sg. Akah) ikut banjaran Lepuk ke Ulu Lelang, masuk ke Ulu Tutoh ke Banjaran Temaboh dan Sg. Tudan ke Ulu masok Sempadan dengan Indonesia. Dari Gunung Mulu (Long Tao) ke Kuala Sedong, Limbang melalui Banjaran Pagun Periok ke Ulu Sg. Adang ke Banjaran Murut melalui Ra’an Buluk ke Indonesia (From the estuary of Sg. Layun down to Merigong (Sg. Akah rapids) follow Lepuk Range to Ulu Lelang, into Ulu Tutoh to Temaboh Range and Tudan River and its upper reaches into the Indonesia boundary. From Mt. Mulu (Long Tao) to the estuary of Sedong, Limbang through Pagun Periok Range to Sg. Adang to the Murut Range through Ra’an Buluk to Indonesia).

Apart from formal agreements, informants have given the traditional inter-tribal boundaries as stated below. These were counterchecked with the Kelabit community leaders at a leaders’ meeting in Bario in December 2003. Note that the inter-tribal boundaries refer to specific hawang which are on the periphery of the Kelabit inhabited areas.

**Tribes**
Between:
Kelabit Long Lellang and Kayan

Kelabit Long Lellang and Kenyah
Kelabit Long Seridan and Kayan
Kelabit Long Seridan and Berawan

**Boundary Point**
Long Pengaran (after negotiation and concession, otherwise it was traditionally Fort Merigong)
Long Sa’it\textsuperscript{74} Ra’an Lellang\textsuperscript{75}
Ra’an Sedam
Ikup Long Ta’o\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{73} Personal communication, Ribuh Balang and Balang Buren in Bario, and Petrus Raja in Marudi, October 2002.
\textsuperscript{74} Personal communication, Balang Buren, Balang Maten, Bario, November 2002.
\textsuperscript{75} Leaders gathering, above.
\textsuperscript{76} Personal communication, Ribuh Balang, Bario, and Penghulu Tulu Ayu’, Marudi, August 2002.
Kelabit Long Peluan and Kenyah/Kayan  
Kelabit Long Seridan and Lun Bawang  
Kelabit Long Seridan and Tabun  
Kelabit Pa’ Lungan and Lun Bawang  
Kelabit Pa’ Umur and Berian  
Kelabit Pa’ Bengar and Kerayan  
Kelabit Pa’ Dalih and Saban (Pa’ Nar)  
Kelabit Pa’ Mein and Berian / Kerayan

Long Metapeh
Long Sidung
Long Sidung
Ra’an Buluh
Ra’an Mekang
Ra’an Liwan
Apad Bawang Runan
Apad Uwat

Since many of these boundary points use natural landscape features such as gorges, ridges, hills, watersheds, and confluences of rivers, variations may arise as to the exact location of the boundaries. As evidenced by recent negotiations, parties may still renegotiate their territorial boundaries. The question is, to what extent are these evidences and entries in the Boundary Books binding on the Native Courts?

In one case, *Sungei Kelawit v Sungei Anau* (Tatau District), it was said that the entries in the Boundary Books were not recognized. However, the view of the Native Court Registrar Empepi Lang is that entries in the Boundary book are valid evidence. Lang’s view is supported by at least two cases: In *TR Riggie anak Beluluk & 2 Ors v Land Custody and Development Authority (LCDA) & 2 Ors* (High Court Suit No.22-50-1996 (Miri) a District Officer confirmed the existence of and the validity of a Boundary Book, and testified that it had been used in the past to settle disputes between longhouses (Bian, 2000:18). In *TR Gembar v TR Janting (Land Cases 1969-1987 at 728)* in a dispute between two individuals over their rights to plant padi on certain land, the issue pertained to the extent of the boundary between the two longhouses. The description of the territory in the Boundary Book was upheld. According to the facts, it appeared that a decision had been made in 1950 by the Penghulu’s Court on the communal rights of the longhouses. This was upheld in the Resident’s Court. On appeal before the Native Court of Appeal (the highest court in the Native Courts hierarchy), the court said:

We feel that the boundary as set out by the Resident’s Native Court to be the proper one in all the circumstances and we therefore, under the provisions of the paragraph (e) of the Subsection (1) of section 9 of the Native Court Ordinance bearing in mind the provision thereto confirm that boundary which is: *The Land of TR Gembar shall be divided from the land of TR Janting by a line drawn from Bukit Baram direct to Pulau Batu Mayau which line shall then run at right angles down the Sungei Mengawa to its junction with Sungei Seman, it shall then run at right angles along the left bank of the Sungei Seman to its source of Bukit Taba, and it shall then run along the top of the ridge from Bukit Taba to Bukit Buloh Lachau where it will stop short of the source of Sungei Spaoh.* (Emphasis added.)

---

77 Personal communication, David Labang, Barlo, October 2002.
78 Ibid.
79 Peter Langan, Sarawak Administrative Officer, was a judge in this case. Personal communication with Langan, Marudi, 6 August 2002.
80 Empepi Lang, Native Court Registrar, personal communication, Kuching, October 2003.
This case refers to an Iban area but by analogy may be applied to Kelabits and other groups. Clearly, the court accepted a local description of the land — one that followed the relief of the area. The above description is common to sketch maps in the Boundary Books.

Today, Kelabits, like other native groups, live in an era where struggle about control over, and/or access to their customary resources has become a reality. Pressure has increased on the land through logging and other development projects such that there is a clamor for compensation for timber in areas that are taken to “belong” to the different groups under native customary rights. The different groups in general have become acutely aware of their need to record their resources in some permanent form as a means of self protection, negotiation, and empowerment. In response to what is perceived as encroachment into their territory, the awareness that their interests need to be made “visible” to outsiders, be it as a boundary delineation, landmark, or details of traditional resources, now fuels the need to record these interests and the alien practice of mapmaking has emerged as one of the means to make their claims visible. Families have begun to draw and “make” maps of the land and resources that they claim.

Making Visible Hidden Landscapes: From Mental Maps to Written Records

To lend order to their world, Kelabits use mental maps, which they carry with them at all times (see Rundstorm 1990:155). In the past, spatial knowledge and information on territorial boundary marks with regard to their neighbors was kept in the minds of the elderly people and passed down to the next generation by word of mouth through stories of exploits on the land. This constituted mapping of their territory. Mapping has always been part of the way they organized their lives, although they knew nothing of mapmaking. To teach the younger generations about their physical world and its terrain, older men take younger ones into the jungle, and by walking and talking, they show, teach and explain the significance of each landmark, ridge, hill, or stream. Older women take groups of younger women on day trips for niap (hand-held net) fishing, to collect jungle produce of vegetables and herbs for food, and leaves for wrapping and basketry. My informants Gerawat and Mawan, now in their forties, tell of how their fathers or uncles, through hunting expeditions, or through gathering of produce in the jungle, not only taught them survival skills, but showed them the jungle terrain, the streams and mountain ridges and their significance.\footnote{Personal communication with Gerawat Gala (also known as Tadun Aren) and Joseph Mawan Imat (also known as Paran Lem Ba’a), November 2003. Gerawat is a lawyer with Messrs. Zaid Ibrahim & Co. He was formerly General Manager (Legal and Corporate Affairs) with Sarawak Shell Berhad and Sabah Shell Petroleum Company Ltd. and General Counsel for Shell Malaysia. J. Mawan is Technical Supervisor with Shell in Miri, Sarawak.}

Their intimate knowledge of the landscape is often manifested in their description of a particular landmark or the river’s characteristic that gave the river its name. The use of the terms pa’ (river) or arur (stream) and the names given by the locals “imprint” their occupation on the landscape. For example, tana’ layu’ means ‘soft slamy soil,’ giving the name to the stream Arur Tana’ Luyu’ and batuh, which means ‘stone,’ refers to the stream with stones and boulders, thus Arur Tadem Batuh (stream of sharp stones). These are among the many tributaries of the Pa’ Umur. As Harley says, “naming the land is one of the most emotive and symbolic acts that cartography constructs” (Harley 1991:9) and
by so naming, the landscape becomes “a reservoir for detailed ecological knowledge and a repository for the memory of past events” (Brosius 1986: 173-184).

The Kelabit experience is not unique to them. It appears to be a characteristic of most indigenous cultures the world over. Writing of the tribes in Brazil, Katherine Milton (Milton 1992:39) reveals a parallel situation when she writes:

The most important possession the Indians carry with them is knowledge...to make a living in the rainforest — each individual must become a walking bank of information on the forest landscape, its plants and animals and uses. This information must be taught anew to members of each generation, without the benefit of books, manuals or educational television.

I visited the plains along Pa’ Umur River and some of its tributaries on foot, a return journey that took over seven hours. I also took boat journeys up and down the Pa’ Depbur, as well as the Long Lellang River. Visiting the previously inhabited plains, and other sites of meaning along the banks, produced rich stories. Along the routes, stories multiply and the significance of old sites emerge, be it of an old longhouse ruin or hearth stone, a mound, an ulang bua’ (an area earmarked or maintained for fruit trees by a village) a valley, a man-made ditch or a stone burial cave. The culture and knowledge of a people is imbedded in the landscape, where sometimes no physical evidence remains. In the face of a “Western” culture that extols written records however, the value of oral transmission of knowledge of the land is often not treated on the same footing as written records or, in this context, a written map.

Maps and Mapmaking

The question is, what is considered a map? Webster’s Dictionary defines a map as “a drawing or other representation of the surface of the earth, or of any part of it, drawn on paper or other material, exhibiting the lines of latitude and longitude, and the positions of countries, cities, mountains, rivers etc...” Any map-like delineation or representation may also be defined as a map.

To make a map is to draw and to inscribe into it “realities of the time, either to record the past, or to make visible the unseen...” (Wood and Fels 1992:5). A map links the territory with what comes with it (ibid:10). To sketch a river is to bring into being the land that it drains; it makes visible to the outside through the medium of paper or canvas information that essentially exists in the mind of someone who knows or sees the terrain, “making experience of the environment shareable” (ibid:79). Every map, from the most apparently objective to subjective ones, necessarily embodies and promotes the interests of the maker and since the map usually tries to pass itself as a picture of the way things are, the mapmaker decides which features are actually to be shown. As Dennis Wood (1992:1) tells us:

Every map shows this...but not that, and every map shows what it shows this way... but not the other.

It is interesting to note that since their rudimentary beginnings, maps are said to have relied more on conjecture than on fact. The medieval maps, for example, were made to
reinforce belief rather than to record fact. It has been said that “landscapes express a vision of the land; maps conceptualise, codify, and regulate that vision” (Huggan 1994:xv). Maps are used to make legible the presences (or absences) in a landscape, revealing landscapes with particular characteristics. To map the presence of certain resources is to acknowledge their existence in the same way that to map a particular state is to assert its territorial expression, and to leave it out is to deny its existence. As Gill, Paterson and Kennedy (2001:) write:

The control of landscape, both in the sense of being able to define it materially and symbolically is central to the exercise of power. Landscapes do not exist of their own accord, they must be continually reproduced and defended and reshaped as challenges arise. To be able to define the nature of the landscape, to be able to compose the world in the likeness of one’s subjectivity and then be able to naturalise and privilege that composition and invest it with moral worth as frontier mythology does, is to be able to define what and who does and does not belong and to create absences and presences according to that scheme.

To this end, as Kelabits begin to adopt modern methods of negotiation to determine their territorial boundaries, mapmaking becomes part of the process. This is not the place to expound on the principles of mapmaking, nor on the accuracy or correctness of the map as an approximation of the territory it purports to represent. The purpose here is merely to indicate that maps constitute a form of communication between the mapmaker and the intended map reader and they can be used not only as a means of claim, but also of political leverage.

Mapmaking indeed has potential as a form of knowledge and as a formidable political weapon. This applies both to the map’s use by the ruling authorities and by those they govern. In perhaps a reaction to what is perceived as “silences” and non-representation of their interests on the state’s maps, and in the absence of government surveys, some forms of community mapping are being carried out by the local communities in Sarawak.

In the remotest of hawangs, there is talk of maps and mapmaking as a way of making legible the presence (or absences) of features in a landscape, revealing landscapes with particular characteristics.

Other neighboring tribes have also begun to draw sketch maps delineating their territorial boundaries in relation to neighboring groups, primarily as evidence and basis of claims against logging concessionaires. Some groups have maps drawn with the help of international non-government organizations, using the most modern technology for recording details of natural resources known to the local people.82 Perhaps the words of a Penan headman best reveal their somewhat simple, if not naïve view, of maps when he said, beaming to me, “whatever is on the map is ours.”83 Another Penan leader said, “We draw maps to delineate the boundary of our land to protect ourselves from encroachments by the timber logging companies and other outside encroachment on our land.”84 He was

82 See, for example, the work of the Borneo Project at www.earthisland.org/borneo/subtopic/work_map.html at 11 November 2004.
83 Personal communication, Penan headman, October 2002.
84 Personal communication, Penan leader, October 2002.
quick to add that the delineation of their boundaries is “not to keep other natives out” as any “other groups are welcome to live and share with us.” These Penans had traditionally lived with the Kelabits.

Ordinarily, the maps that are drawn are sketched maps based on traditional boundaries according to the customary practices of the tribal groups. After negotiation and agreements between the groups, and endorsement by the District Officer, they are entered in the Boundary Books and are accepted as evidence by the Native Courts. The paradox is that maps can instill a false sense of tenure or representation of interest among local people who put their trust in the power of the map.

**Maps as Evidence of Claim**

In *Nor anak Nyawai & others v Borneo Pulp Plantation Sdn Bhd and Anor and Superintendent of Lands & Surveys, Bintulu* [2001] 6 MLJ 241, a form of community mapping was accepted as evidence by the High Court in an Iban claim against a pulp plantation company. A crucial issue in that case was whether the pemakai meno, the territorial domain of the longhouse community, “where they exercised customary rights to land” was within the disputed area where the defendant company had planted trees to feed its paper pulp mills.

Narratives and oral evidence of the longhouse history, the sites of the various tembawai (old longhouse sites) which had existed for decades, descriptions of cultivation of land, farming, planting of trees and fruit trees, fishing, hunting and gathering from the jungles in and along the rivers and their tributaries were adduced and not disputed. The Iban plaintiffs and folks of the longhouse organized themselves into two parties. Each took turns to accompany an unqualified surveyor on foot and traversed the whole area which they claimed to be the pemakai meno for the purpose of producing a map of it. The boundary was laid with reference to various mountains and hills, ridges, and trees.

Given the equipment available to the surveyor, the court felt that the map that the surveyor produced was as accurate as it could possibly be. The landmarks identified by the ground survey properly fixed the situation of the disputed areas. The map showed that fruit trees planted by the plaintiffs and their ancestors bordered the edge of the area of trees planted by defendants. Furthermore, the proximity of the rivers and of the surrounding jungles to Rumah Nor (longhouse) and the tembawai rendered it probable that the plaintiffs and their ancestors had indeed cleared the land for cultivation, accessed these rivers for fishing, hunting and to gather forest produce.

Juxtaposed against the said map was an aerial photograph of the area taken in 1951 to show that there was no clearing or secondary forest in the disputed area. Another aerial photograph taken in 1963, however, showed one 2-acre site where the land was cleared and the rest of the area was in primary jungle. However, there was no evidence to disprove that the land could have been felled years ago and grown to become the jungle as shown in the 1951 photograph. The evidence to prove or disprove the age of the trees had been destroyed by logging in 1989. Apart from the cultivated areas, the court accepted the plaintiffs’ evidence that the jungle in the disputed area had been accessed by the previous and present folks of the longhouse and their ancestors.

Soon after the High Court’s decision in *Nor anak Nyawai & others v Borneo Pulp Plantation Sdn Bhd and Anor* [2001] 6 MLJ 241 there was an unprecedented interest in maps. However, in October 2001 the Majlis Mesyuarat Negeri (Sarawak Supreme Council) passed the Land Surveyors Ordinance 2001 to make comprehensive provisions
to regulate and license persons undertaking cadastral land surveys in Sarawak. Under section 17-18 of that Ordinance, only a land surveyor who is licensed by the surveyors’ board is entitled to practice his profession in Sarawak. A licensed surveyor is authorized to undertake a cadastral survey and to sign a survey plan for submission to the government. Before undertaking any survey, a land surveyor must obtain instructions from the Director of Lands and Surveys, and all cadastral land survey plans have to be approved by the Director or a person authorized by him before being accepted for the purpose of applying the Land Code or any other written law. Section 23 of that ordinance further provides:

that any person who, not being licensed as a surveyor who certifies as to the accuracy of any cadastral land survey, signs or initials or carries out or undertakes to carry out any cadastral land survey, is guilty of an offence and on conviction may be fined not more than RM 50,000 or imprisonment not more than 3 years or both and a penalty of RM 1000 per day for each day.

A cadastral map or survey is a *cadastre*\(^{85}\) or a record of an area, boundaries, location, value and ownership of land achieved by cadastral survey. A cadastral survey therefore shows the extent, value or ownership of land, especially for taxation. The result of the forgoing sections is to make it illegal for any person to survey or make maps, apart from a person approved by the board. Judging from the timing of the bill’s introduction it would not be churlish to suggest that the law was a swift response to *Nor Nyawai*, making community mapping illegal. In the absence of formal surveys made by the government, and what may be seen to be tardiness on the part of the latter, some may argue that the passing of legislation that limits the right of a local community to “show” and “make visible” their rights to land is tantamount to limiting the community’s access to justice.

**Maps and the State**

The combination of the reorientation of market and non market economy, claims against timber concessions, and land acquisition for plantations has changed the concept of land and its value from one where land was a means of continuing social cohesion to new notions of property (land) as commodity. Given the current state of affairs, there are undeniable quiet tensions just beneath the surface in contemporary native society in Sarawak. With the growing consciousness of rights coupled with technological advancement, there is a real danger that differing versions of cadastral maps may surface, to aid in the staking of land claims. It has become easy for people to get hold of computer software packages that enable them to map fairly accurately their own interests. This has been done, for instance, in community mapping elsewhere.\(^{86}\) The question is whether persons involved in mapmaking have the knowledge to correctly read and interpret those maps. In such a situation, Mark Monmonier (1991:123) cautions, saying:

Moreover, because of powerful personal computers and 'use friendly' mapping software, map authority is perhaps too easy, and unintentional cartographic self deception is inevitable. How many software users know
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\(^{85}\) Originated from *cadastre* ‘register of property.’

\(^{86}\) Indonesia encourages community mapping of *tanah adat*.
that using shade symbols with a magnitude data produces misleading maps?
How many of these instant map makers are aware that size differences among areal units such as counties and census tracts can radically distort map comparisons?

It underscores the point that a single variable might yield many different maps giving rise to the question of which is the correct map. It may even give rise to conflict of interests as each produces maps from his point of view.

Stability and longevity are the primary task of each and every state and “cartography was primarily a form of political discourse concerned with the acquisition and maintenance of power” (Harley 1987:1). If the act of designing and producing maps is an inventory-taking, identification and allocation of resources, and a means to exploit strategic resources, then such production of maps may be seen as “an act of subjugation and appropriation of nature” (Rundstorm 1990:155), which no state would easily relinquish. It is not surprising, therefore, that the state would want to control the making of maps. By limiting the making of cadastral maps only to such persons as are authorized by the board, arguably this allows the board to pass only maps or “plans” that are deemed “useful” and acceptable to the state.

The question of how accurate maps can be as a representation of a party’s interest, of course, remains. Whatever the degree of scientific accuracy, maps are said to be neither exact nor entirely objective; and controlled as they are by human interests, they are influenced by the mapmaker’s motives and perceptions (Huggan 1994:3). As Huggan (1994: 9) puts it,

The map’s efficacy as a claim, like its impact as a political weapon, rests on the combined effect of its diverse strategies; the delineation and demarcation of territory; the location and nomination of place; the inclusion and exclusion of detail within the preset framework; and the choice of scale, format and design. Many of these strategies are obvious, but some are subliminal, reflecting the subtlety with which maps operate as forms of social knowledge or as agents of political expediency.

Bearing in mind that the extent to which some kinds of map features are shown is determined partly by the cost of compiling the information, the maps that actually get made are those that the mapmaker is willing to pay for, and that depends on whether it serves his interests (Thompson 1979:27). Since the sources of most map information are aerial photographs, features that cannot be identified on photographs must be mapped by field methods, an expensive procedure which the ordinary person cannot afford. It has often been said that official maps are often drawn on “empty” charts with little or no consideration of the existing interests concerning the land, particularly, the interests of the local communities that have lived on the land for generations (Peluso 1995). Both shifting and settled cultivation may appear on official maps, but boundaries of native customary lands do not. Forested lands are often charted as wild and uninhabited, officially unsettled and thus open for exploitation. “Empty” forests may be given to logging companies to log or, in some cases, for tree plantations, and the native occupants find they have to prove their use and occupation to claim compensation from timber concessionaires.

Quite clearly, maps are not neutral. And when it is not really a matter of accuracy, and
only one single authority has the monopoly to produce maps, there is the lurking fear that certain interests may be excluded. To borrow Peluso’s term, if native peoples do not make their own “counter-maps,” they might find themselves excluded from maps authored by government agencies, and others will produce maps from the “other’s” standpoint and thus subsume the local knowledge of places, plants, rituals, customs and artifacts. That is a factor that has given rise to community mapping as an alternative to authoritative mapping by government agencies in many countries. In Sarawak however, as the law stands, it might not be a ready option.

Does it matter then that they may not have written records in the form of maps? While it does, it is heartening to note that in the case of Sagon Tasi v the Government of Selangor [2002] MLJ 591 that oral evidence based on the traditional stories of Orang Asli were admissible evidence to prove occupation of customary land, subject to the Evidence Act 1950. For Kelabits and other natives who may claim native customary rights to land, the inter-tribal agreements and the process of making accompanying maps (though in most cases sketch maps are used) have shown that proper mapping of their interests is a formidable task not only because they do not have the resources to do so but in some cases, the boundaries are “fuzzy” in the sense that it is not a matter of an exact spot. Perhaps in the clamor about maps, it is well to note Eghenter’s sobering observation (Eghenter 2000:21) that “maps depend on the visual, precise marking of boundaries — these boundaries cannot by definition reveal fuzziness or uncertainty. And where rivers and mountains have been used to mark traditional territories, these natural cues are not always fixed. Maps might highlight the conflict in interests, but they do not solve them.” Perhaps what is of fundamental importance now is to know the substance of their rights and interests so that they have a clear foundation for negotiation and claim.

Concluding Remarks

I have tried in this paper to show that the marks of Kelabit occupation are etched in the physical landscape as in their traditions, stories and customary practices. Apart from physical evidence of presence and occupation of the land through their ruma’ ma’un (longhouse sites) and their amug (previously cultivated lands), there are clear evidences of permanent and semi-permanent marks on the landscape in the form of megalithic and memorial stones (the latter not necessarily related to interment). That the people could have carried the stone slabs from so far away in these large scale operations shows they had a good communal network with no hindrance from any neighboring tribes. They had and still have exclusive occupation. Surrounding every ruma’ maun area are amug, or formerly cultivated land, in various stages of growth which had been left to fallow, along with lands that were clearly regarded as tana’ bawang, used in common by the community. Today, the descendants’ knowledge of these customs and land usages, insight into the significance of monuments as well as stories of exploits on their land, provide a sense of continuity and substance to their attachment to the land.

The existing law under section 5 of the Land Code 1958 restricts recognition of native customary right to land based primarily on a continuous occupation of cultivated land,

87 “Customs and usages having the force of law” are included under the definition of law under article 160 of the Federal Constitution.
88 At the sites of these stones, there are seldom any rock outcrops nearby. The nearest source of rocks was from the rivers which were often far from the scene.
where virgin jungle was felled before the cut-off period of January 1958, or land for burial and shrines and right of way. The statute presumes a static community with limited or no mobility where no new lands would be required for cultivation, or that if new lands were opened, subject to the grant of a permit from the Minister, no customary rights to land would be created. As the preceding account shows, society does not remain static. People move either voluntarily or involuntarily by force of circumstances. With mobility comes the need to clear new land for subsistence farming, as well as change in land use. As to the recognition of land for burial and shrines which is provided for under section 5, there is clear evidence and marks of these on the landscape. This paper cannot deal with these issues in relation to the question of ownership of land.\textsuperscript{89} Suffice it to say that regardless of how the early inhabitants themselves perceived their connection with the land, there is a physical and economic relationship with the land. They were physically present on the lands that they were using for their own purposes, for farming, herding, hunting, fishing, gathering, and a combination of these. This is evidence of occupation, and occupation is a matter which does not depend on the existence of the law. Despite the “absence” of certain boundary delineations, and the non “legible presence” of their resources on official maps, there is no doubt that their lives are interwoven with the landscape. Kelabit permanent and semi-permanent marks on the landscape through cultivation or other uses, historical accounts, oral tradition, stories of exploits, ceremonies and cultural artifacts on the land are important evidence of an enduring occupation of their ancestral land.
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Introduction

Iban land use, their customary land tenure, and inheritance patterns have all undergone many changes in post-independence Sarawak. The purpose of this paper is to examine (1) how customary rights to land were created based on Iban customary law or adat and the relationship between customary tenure and land use; (2) the historical justification of customary tenure; (3) legal constraints on land use under customary law; (4) how inter-ethnic relations have affected, and been affected by land use patterns in Sarawak; (5) the impact of government-sponsored development programs on land use; and (6) the long-term ramifications and/or implications of these changes on property rights regimes in terms of landownership, inheritance, and accessibility to land resources in Iban communities today. These changes have been brought about by the compounding effects of several different factors: (1) the state legal system; (2) land administration policies and practices; and (3) the interplay of market forces and government programs, such as subsidy and involuntary resettlement schemes in the 1960s, the introduction of in situ land development programs in the 1980s, and the implementation of joint venture oil palm plantation projects in the 1990s, all of which were designed, among other things, to address rural poverty.

These different government-sponsored programs have helped to alter forest-fallow land use under shifting cultivation from a settled forest-fallow farming system to a mixed crop system. In addition, from 1995 onward, large areas of forest-fallow land held under native customary rights by members of the Iban community have been converted to oil palm plantations. The radical shift involved from subsistence to a commercial mode of production has changed the legal status of these ancestral lands. It has weakened the Iban land inheritance system based on adat by creating a new property rights regime. This regime in the case of joint venture oil palm projects creates the role of trustee as a custodian of native rights and dictates the transfer of land ownership from individual bilik families to a joint venture company.

Background

The results of a planimetric survey carried out in 1976 (FAO 1980) revealed that out of a total of 12,325,208 hectares of land in Sarawak, 26% was cultivated in various crops. Twenty-three percent of this 26% was under shifting cultivation, 0.4% in wet rice, and 2.5% in various tree crops (rubber, pepper, cocoa, fruit trees, etc.). At any given time, large areas of land under shifting cultivation were left fallow and were held under native rights based on customary law or adat. The Iban farm over 69% of the total area cultivated, and accounted for 47% of all holdings. The Chinese farm 8% of the area and accounted for 16% of the holdings, and the Bidayuh farm 16% of the area and had a total
of 11% of the holdings. The Malay and Melanau farm almost 6% and 4% of the area respectively, and accounted for 15% and 6% of the holdings.

The Iban community, which today constitutes 30.1% of the state population of 2.5 million people (Leete 2004), is the largest single ethnic group in Sarawak. Residing in more than 5,000 longhouses scattered throughout the rural areas of Sarawak, they are predominantly found in the Sri Aman, Betong, Kapit, Sibu, and Bintulu Divisions. Based on 69% of the total arable land area in Sarawak being cultivated by the Iban, the estimated cultivated area farmed by members of this group could be as high as 1,020,000 hectares out of the 1.5 million hectares of native customary land in Sarawak (Zainie 1997). This fact has significant implications for land administration policies and practices in Sarawak, especially with respect to poverty eradication and equity distribution in the context of Malaysia’s “Vision 2020” policy.

Land Use Under Customary Law

A close relationship between land, farming practices, and resource use among the Iban reveals important features of the community’s agrarian roots. The traditional Iban farming system comprised a rich mixture of religious rites and cultural practices (Sather 1980, 1990 and Freeman 1955), and formed the basis upon which the pioneering ancestors of the present-day Iban first created customary rights to land in Sarawak.

Creation of customary rights to land and other natural resources within the territory of a longhouse community began when a ritual ceremony called *panggul menoa* was carried out by the pioneering ancestors in a particular area (Lembat 1994). Once this ritual has been performed, pioneering households known as *bilik* families would then clear plots of virgin jungle to establish individual parcels of farmland called *tanah umai*. These pioneering individuals who first cleared and cultivated the land thereby created rights to the land which were then passed on to their descendants through succeeding generations of *bilik* family members.

Individual plots of farmland are separated from one another by boundaries called *antara umai* in Iban. Traditionally, *antara umai* were demarcated by streams, rivers, watersheds, ridges, and other permanent landmarks used as natural boundaries between individual parcels of farmland. Such boundaries defined the size and extent of individual *bilik* rights over farmland. Rights of ownership are transferable in this system from parents to children. Distribution of plots of farmland among children is not necessarily equal. It is common among the Iban to accord more cultivation rights and privileges to children who look after ageing parents than to those who do not.

A territory or area of land which belongs to a longhouse community within defined boundaries is called its *pemakai menoa* in Iban (Lembat 1994). Each pioneering longhouse has its own territorial domain. A longhouse is separated from others by a *garis menoa* (village boundary). The *garis menoa* is a very important mechanism for resource distribution among pioneering longhouse communities. It also functions as an important resource management strategy because it helps to define areas of constrained space and so reduces inter-community conflicts between pioneering longhouses. At the same time, it also regulates access to natural resources and cultivation rights among the members of the same longhouse within a *pemakai menoa*.

The *pemakai menoa*, both physically and as a concept, is central to Iban resource management. It is the hub of Iban resource tenure and, in a physical sense, constitutes a collective pool of natural resources, such as native farmland, fruit orchards or groves,
primary and secondary forests and forest products (i.e., timber and wild vegetables, edible ferns and palm shoots, rattan, herbs and/or medicinal plants, fruit trees and bamboo); rivers and streams that run through a territory, and water catchments (Ngidang 2000, Lembat 1994, Richards 1961). Thus, pemakai menoa is the territorial domain of a longhouse community where customary rights to land and other natural resources were acquired by pioneering ancestors (Ngidang 2000).

Rights to a piece of land can be lost either by a transfer or when a person moves to another village through migration or pindah. Section 73 of Adat Iban on pindah states that whoever moves from the longhouse to another "shall be deprived of all rights to untitled land or any customary land that has not been planted with crops and all such land shall be owned in common by the people of the longhouse." (Majlis Adat Istiadat 1993: 31). If an individual or family migrates to another village from the longhouse (pindah), such rights can also be transferred to a relative who will in turn provide him with tungkus asi. The term tungkus asi describes a token gift provided by the recipient or as a form of compensation, "ganti tebi kapak, tebi beliong, a replacement of effort and the chipped axe blade, the rice eaten during clearing" (Richards 1961:42). Today, tungkus asi has been replaced a token monetary gift known as ganti rugi.

Thus tanah umai, or farmland, can be either private or common property, or both, depending on whether rights of access are held by individuals or by the community. A resource sharing concept is applied here when cultivation rights and rights of access to land are vested in the community. A community may invoke free access only to certain types of natural resources such as wild vegetables, shoots, etc. when taken for personal use. At the same time, it reserves the right to restrict access to resources which have a high economic value, such as rattan, timber, and fruit trees, the benefits of which are shared by the whole community.

It is customary to leave harvested farmlands fallow. Forest-fallowing as practiced by the Iban is divided into four main stages (Freeman 1955). The first stage of fallow is called jerami. The term jerami or redas (in the Batang Rajang area) refers to bush-fallow land at 1-2 years after a padi crop has been harvested. The next stage is temuda, which has a fallow period of 3-10 years, then damun with a fallow period ranging between 10-20 years. Finally, resembling virgin forest, pengerang is temuda which has been left uncultivated for more than 25 years.

Rights to cultivate temuda land initially belong to, and then are inherited from, the person who first felled the virgin forest. In the past, when resources were still abundant, any member of a longhouse had free access to resources in a temuda. For instance, he could take firewood and bamboo; gather wild fruits and vegetables, etc. without consulting the bilik family having cultivation rights over the land.

---

1 Adat pindah was engineered by Rajah Charles Brooke as stated in the Fruit Tree Order in 1899 in order to stem the movement of Dayaks from one district to another (Porter 1967:13), because they were well known for their migratory pattern associated with "destructive" shifting cultivation (Freeman 1955).

2 According to Pringle (1970), migration was associated with a quest for personal status and achievement and a desire for new areas to farm. For these reasons, the Iban were branded as aggressive migrants (Pringle 1970) and "destructive" shifting cultivators (Freeman 1955), whose movements had to be curtailed.
In addition, a longhouse community has its own forest reserve or *pulau*. The term *pulau* refers to an area of primary forest within a *pemakai menoa*. *Pulau* can be collectively owned under a common property regime and managed by a longhouse community, or individually owned. An individual creates the latter adjacent to the cultivated plot of land he first cleared at the time when a longhouse community established *pemakai menoa*. This reserve is called *pulau umai* and acts to preserve certain natural resources for future use. These resources can be rattan, *tapang* trees, fruit trees, timber, and so on. Rights of access to these resources belong to those who first cleared the land and to their descendants thereafter. In the case of community-owned *pulau*, there are four types of communal forest reserves set aside for hunting, gathering building materials and water catchments within a *pemakai menoa*.

During the process of creating a *pemakai menoa* in the pioneering days in the past, individuals might claim rights to a variety of special trees such as *teras* or *belian*, *engkerebai* (the fruits of which are used to produce textile dyes), *engkabang*, and *tapang* trees (the latter providing a place for honey bees to build hives). Tree tenure is established when the first person who finds the trees clears the undergrowth around them and thereby claims rights to these trees. Such rights were, and continue to be, heritable and passed down to the descendants of the claimant (cf. Sather 1990). The same applies to a planted tree; tenure rights apply to the tree and to the harvest of its fruits. Once an individual has tenure rights over certain trees, whether planted or found, the planter’s or finder’s descendants have the right to demand compensation if these trees are burned or felled by someone else.

**Historical Justification of Customary Land Tenure**

According to the Sarawak Land Code (SLC: Part II, page 27), customary rights to land could only be created prior to 1 January 1958 in accordance with the native customary law of the community, based on any of the methods specified in Section 2, if a permit were obtained under section 10. In Section 5(2) of the Sarawak Land Code, these rights may be created by: (a) the felling of virgin jungle and the occupation of the land; (b) the planting of land with fruit trees; (c) the occupation or cultivation of land; (d) the use of land for a burial ground or shrine; (e) the use of land of any class for rights of way; or (f) any other lawful methods. However, historical evidence suggests that the above land law clearly reflected legislative efforts to deconstruct native rights and reconstruct them based on foreign laws, which were alien to the Iban community.

Sarawak, with two-thirds of its population indigenous Dayaks, had a long history of Brunei rule prior to Brooke and colonial rule, and traditional land tenure, based on customary law or *adat* was in existence even before the Dayaks came under Brunei

---

3 Land classification in Sarawak divides land into five categories: 1) Mixed Zone Land, which refers to land that can be owned by both natives and non-natives; 2) Native Area Land held by natives under title; 3) Native Customary Land in which native customary rights, whether communal or otherwise, were lawfully created prior to 1st January 1958; 4) Reserve Land reserved for the government, including National Parks, Forest or Communal Forest; and 5) Interior Land which does not fall into any of the above categories.

4 “Dayak” is a generic term that refers to tribal groups such as the Iban, Bidayuhs, Kayans, Kenyahs, Kelabits, Lum Bawangs, Penans, Berawans, Sipans, and others.
influence. Brooke land administration gave due recognition to the intimate relationship between adat and traditional land tenure.

Customary law or adat has always been instrumental in maintaining order and providing a state of balance between individuals, between individuals and the community, and between the community and the environment, both physical and spiritual (Langub 1999). Today, adat is still widely practiced among the Dayaks of Sarawak. It is under the custodianship of the village headman and a crucial aspect of adat (Richards 1961; Porter, 1967) is the definition of rules of access and rights of ownership to land and other natural resources within a longhouse territorial domain. Adat dictates the rules of inheritance and/or transferability of land from the pioneering ancestors to the present generation and is used by every longhouse community to regulate social relations and farming and other economic activities (Langub 1999). It is also a collective community framework for regulating resource utilization and management in a sustainable manner for the common good.

In 1842 James Brooke cautiously introduced the Code of Laws, which was principally characterized by respect for people’s customs and traditions. James said that:

I am going on slowly and surely, basing everything on their own laws, consulting all their headmen at every step, reducing their laws to writing what I think right, merely in the course of conversation — separating the abuses from the customs... I follow, in preference, the plan of doing justice to the best of my ability in each particular case, adhering as nearly as possible, to the native law or customs. (Quoted by Porter 1967:27.)

Recognition of native customary law led James Brooke to provide an important provision in the Land Regulation of 1863, in which he declared that no scheme of alienation or land development should ever be introduced except in respect to land over which no rights had been established. The Code of Laws of 1842 permitted Chinese immigrants to settle only on lands not occupied by Malays or Dayaks. A paternalistic relationship between the White Rajah and the natives encouraged subservience to Brooke rule.

When James Brooke was installed the first Rajah of Sarawak in 1841, he deliberately created a dualistic political economy: commercial agriculture and mining for the Chinese immigrants, on the one hand, and a subsistence economy for the natives, on the other. Nevertheless, the Brookes did not encourage the development of large plantations in Sarawak. From 1841 to 1941, “Sarawak was run as a virtual personal kingdom by, in turn, James, Charles, and Vyner Brooke,” in which “government was an amalgam of autocracy and paternalism” (Cleary and Eaton 1996:7). Economic dualism reflected the Brookes’ policy of non-interference in the native way of life. By invoking such policy, the Brooke administration also intentionally created legal pluralism (Hooker 1999) which defined and categorized two types of land tenure. One was based on native customary law or adat perpetuated among the natives. The other was a codified land system, which legalized private land ownership and supported the commercialization of agriculture.
Legal Constraints on Land Use Under Customary Tenure

1) The Iban Inheritance System

The most recent piece of legislation, which has far-reaching implications for the Iban land inheritance law, is the Land Code Amendment Bill 2000. As I have mentioned in the previous section, Section 5(2)(f) of the Sarawak Land Code states that land rights can also be created by "any other lawful methods" in addition to Section 5(2)(a) the felling of virgin jungle and the occupation of the land; (b) the planting of land with fruit trees; (c) the occupation or cultivation of land; (d) the use of land for a burial ground or shrine; (e) the use of land of any class for rights of way. Eaton (1997:7) views the provision in Section 5(2)(f) as a "catch-all clause that allowed for different rules or adat" (page 7). The Dayak community, especially the Iban, interprets this clause to mean that their cultural practices with respect to resource tenure and/or land use and their inheritance system, embodied in notions such as lanting or pesaka, are lawful.5

State authorities have interpreted Section 5(2)(f) of the State Land Code as redundant and ambiguous. Therefore, in their view, customary rights were not taken away when it was deleted. Zaine (1997) interpreted Section 5(2)(f) as a permit given in writing by a District Officer to fell virgin jungle in the interior land. To the indigenous peoples, Section 5(2)(f) is considered crucial to their customary rights because it integrated and codified their cultural practices in the Sarawak Land Code, therefore rendering these practices legal in their opinion. Customary law is a crucial component of their inheritance institutions and therefore a lawful part of their culture. By deleting Section 5(2)(f) from the Sarawak Land Code, it undermines the adat system because it potentially denies native peoples their right to continue the practice of their culture. They can no longer claim rights over their territorial domain (pemakai menoa) and communal forest (pulau galau) (Bian 2000). When culture is detached from rights to land, then the only means of claiming such rights to ancestral lands is through physical occupation. This can be problematic in the case of temuda land under forest-fallow cultivation.

Hollis (2000) argues that Section 5(2) places restrictions on native customary rights because there is no provision for determining the boundaries of ancestral lands. In the absence of written records, even if customary rights were acquired prior to 1 January 1958, lawful occupation is difficult to prove over time, especially when members of the older generations are dead. Again, as stated in the Sarawak Land Code, lawful occupation is allowed if the District Office grants written permission. The proof of lawful occupation is accepted if the evidence can be proved or verified by: (1) aerial photographs, (2) permit or certificate issued pursuant to Order No. VIII, 1920, (3) records kept by Native Courts pertaining to disputes over land claims, (4) proclamation or modification made under the Forests Ordinance, (5) physical occupation of the land coupled with evidence that such

---

5 Lanting is defined (in Adat Iban 1993, English Version, p. 14) as: "item or items of valuable property which may be chosen by the father and mother for their security before all the bilik property is divided to its members. It may be an old jar or gong or rubber garden or a piece of land, or any other valuable property of choice. It is inherited by whoever cares for him or her at the end of life." Pesaka is not explicitly define in Adat Iban 1993, but is commonly understood to refer to any form of inherited property. Included in the notion is tanah pesaka, defined by Richards (1981:280), "land held under free title by persons native to Swk."
occupation began prior to 1 January 1958, or if after 1958, with a permit granted according to the provisions given under section 10 of the Sarawak Land Code.

2) The Forest-Fallow Farming System

Pioneer shifting cultivation on virgin forest land has not been practiced for a long time due, particularly during the last half century, to restrictions of the Land Code of 1958, the Forest Ordinance of 1953, the Wildlife Protection Ordinance of 1990, and the National Park and Natural Reserve bill (1998). Indeed, in some areas of Sarawak, pioneer cultivation appears to have ended much earlier. What is considered shifting cultivation today is essentially the clearing of secondary forest or temuda for re-farming. This cyclic forest-fallow farming system is a common conservation practice among the indigenous peoples of Sarawak (Cramb and Willis 1990). As far as native customary land tenure is concerned, land under forest-fallow is never unoccupied, and more often than not, such land is planted with fruit trees and other tree crops, which is a common traditional agroforestry practice, and hence the land is not “abandoned.” Also, studies have shown that if the fallow period is long enough, shifting cultivation does not cause soil and forest degradation (Hatch 1982) and therefore, from a conservationist viewpoint, is not destructive to the environment.

Forest-fallow land has been subjected to various legislative constraints over the years and has been construed as abandoned or undeveloped in the Land Code and therefore as belonging to the State. Judging from the official argument, the only main reason why the forest-fallow farming system has been heavily criticized and perceived as wasteful by both the public and private sectors is due to an increasing demand for land for commercial plantations. Good agricultural land, which is suitable for commercial plantations, is found in areas where the Iban are practicing a forest-fallow farming system. All these lands are classified as native customary land (NCL) in the Sarawak Land Code. These ancestral lands, which were once considered culturally related property by the Iban, have now become a sought-after commodity and the object of intense competition between various stakeholders.

3) Restoring Native Customary Rights

The issue of sovereignty and proprietary rights over land is a key point of contention between the government and the natives. Adat defines native customary rights to land as rights of ownership, whereas the Sarawak Land Code, which is an extension of Brooke and Colonial land laws, defines such rights as usufruct rights, which means only rights to use, but not to own, land (Porter 1967). Thus, in the context of the Land Code, natives do not have absolute rights to land; rather they merely have a bundle of rights. Therefore, ownership of land in Sarawak is regarded as ownership of parts of this bundle. “The bundle of rights is made up of rights belonging to the ruler, the tribe, the family, the

---

6 Thus, according to Cramb (1988:106-107), for example, “by the middle of the 19th century the pioneer phase of Iban shifting cultivation in the Lupar and Saribas was largely completed.” Similarly, Sather (1990) found, in collecting oral testimony relating to past land use, that pioneer cultivation had virtually ceased and been replaced by an established pattern of fallow-rotation throughout the Paku River region, a Saribas tributary, sometime shortly prior to James Brooke’s arrival in Sarawak, by local reckoning, some 8 to 9 generations before the present.
village, the household and the individual" (Richards 1961:19). "A chief may have a right of control or even allocation but this too is limited by the rights of other members of the community to which he belongs" (1961:20). Richards points out that adat means law and is binding upon people without sovereign enforcement (1961:16). Because of contradicting interpretations of customary law related to land, efforts to integrate land rights into the Land Code have been problematic.

However, as clearly stated by Porter (1967:10), native customary tenure based on adat existed long before Brooke rule, and Dayak occupation and cultivation of land in Borneo for centuries was more than enough to justify their ownership of it. High Court Judge Ian Chin's 2002 judgment made a landmark decision in favor of the rights of the Iban in Sebauh, Bintulu Division, against the Borneo Pulp Plantation. The judge, in this historic judgment, supported this argument that natives do not owe their customary rights to statute. This judgment restores native rights to their ancestral lands, which have been unlawfully taken away from them since the Brooke era. This, according to Hooker (2002:101), proves that "native rights have not been disturbed by past or contemporary legislation and so persist." The Sarawak government has appealed against the judgment, but the Court of Appeal has, at the time of writing, not yet fixed a hearing date.

Conflicting Economic Interests and Land Use

The Sarawak Land Code, which was legislated on 1 January 1958, was severely criticized in the 1959 Annual Report of the Land and Survey Department. It was stated that:

...the introduction of the Code was premature and its preparation should have been preceded by a review and clarification of Government policy regarding land and an attempt made to obtain some unification of more important principles of Native Customary Rights. The Code is extremely detailed and rigid and the effect of its application is to dictate rather than interpret Government Policy (Land Committee Report 1962).

In 1962, the colonial government commissioned the Land Committee to review policy and problems related to land administration in Sarawak. Following the Land Committee report, a Land Bill was introduced in 1965, which was intended to alienate more land to satisfy Chinese demands for farmland in places where communications were reasonably good, within reach of towns or bazaars. However, the bill was not passed by the state legislature due to strong protests against the idea of converting native customary land to Mixed Zone Land. While the Land Committee appreciated the urgent need of the Chinese for more land, the committee believed that natives must be protected from the disposing of their land until such time as they can protect themselves (Land Committee Report 1962:15).

After this aborted attempt at land reform, a new type of land conflict emerged. This was precipitated by an expansion of both the logging and plantation industries in Sarawak, starting in the 1970s and continuing through the 1990s. With declining timber resources in the 1990s, private developers, local planters and state agencies have turned their attention to areas of native customary land (NCL) as offering the greatest opportunities for commercial agriculture. An expansion of the plantation sector in
Sarawak has given rise to conflicts both between natives and private developers, and between natives and political elites. These conflicts relate to differences in values regarding land use and to a lack of understanding on the part of private developers and elites of the psychological, social and cultural orientation of the local people affected by plantation expansion. On the surface, it looks as though natives view land solely as a means of livelihood, in contrast to the elites’ view of land as a commodity to be traded on demand (Ngidang 2000). Ngidang’s (2002) study of the response of landowners to joint venture oil palm projects in Ulu Teru and Kanowit refutes this notion. Instead, the findings reveal that natives value their land for a variety of reasons, ranging from heritage to savings and wealth for future generations.

A second source of conflict arises from overlapping claims by both natives and private investors regarding lands approved for plantation development. Unfortunately, when some private investors are given a provisional lease (PL) to carry out development activities in a particular locality, they tend to ignore specific conditions given to PL holders that they have to sort out land matters (such as the extent of NCL and the boundaries between NCL and state land) within a given development area through consultation with the affected population. Having a provisional lease does not entitle them to start their operation; only when they have fulfilled the conditions stipulated in the PL will they be given the lease. A major problem arises when investors ignore this and start operations despite unresolved claims by affected landowners having customary rights to the land designated for plantation development.

Impact of Development Programs on Land Use

Government intervention efforts over the past four decades have had a significant impact on land use policies and practices in Sarawak, and these have brought about major changes in the mode of production in the agricultural sector. As a result, the Iban have shifted from a subsistence mode to a mixed farming mode by planting various cash crops such as pepper, rubber, and cocoa on a smallholder’s basis. More recently, some communities have begun to participate in commercial oil palm plantations, in addition to continuing rice cultivation. These changes have reduced Iban dependency on hill rice cultivation, which in turn has propelled them to shift land use patterns from mainly subsistence production to semi- and fully commercial market production, such as involvement in plantation agriculture implemented under in situ land development programs or via joint venture oil palm projects.

1) Land Use Under Smallholder Production

If we examine the Agriculture Statistics published by the Department of Agriculture (DOA) from the 1960s to the 1990s, the estimated area of land under shifting cultivation does not seem to have changed a great deal over the years. The data indicate that 77,631 hectares of hill rice were planted in 1990/1991. About the same area (76,177 hectares) was cultivated in hill rice in 1996/97, as compared to 56,754 hectares of wet rice planted during the same period. These latter figures suggest that almost as much land is in wet rice as in hill rice. This seems unlikely. According to DOA, assistance to padi planting increased markedly from 1981 to 2003, and the Iban community planted 87% of 46,503 hectares under this scheme. In the Eighth Malaysia Plan, a total of 1,050 hectares were approved and are now in various stages of implementation in Iban areas.
Here it can be argued that intervention efforts in rural development, as well as individual initiative, have significantly changed Iban cropping patterns. Indeed, as Cramb (1988) notes, the Iban had already begun, as a result of individual initiative, to plant cash crops such as rubber on their temuda land during the Brooke and colonial eras, in addition to growing hill rice as a staple food crop. Smallholder agriculture became the norm in most areas by the 1960s, involving a mixed crop system that capitalizes on crop diversification, rather than mono-cropping, to maximize land use and utilization of surplus family labor.

Three main tree crops have had crucial socio-economic impacts on land use among the Ibans since the 1960s. The first crop is rubber (or getah pera in Iban), planted as early as the 1920s by the Iban community on a small scale. Records of the development of rubber under assistance from DOA can be traced back to as early as 1956. A total 124,329 hectares of rubber were planted between 1956 and 2003. Of these, 80% were cultivated in Iban areas. Also, between 1996 and 2003, 9,395 hectares of mini rubber estates were established, of which 96% (9,010 hectares) were cultivated by the Iban and the remaining 4% were planted by Lun Bawang in the Lawas District. The rubber-planting scheme introduced in the 1960s provided an opportunity to Iban shifting cultivators to plant this cash crop on an extensive scale in addition to hill rice. Largely as a consequence, the area planted in rubber increased from 25,000 to 36,000 hectares in the Second Division from 1960 to 1972 (Cramb 1988).

The second important cash crop cultivated by the Iban is pepper. Immigrant Chinese in the Kuching and Sibu Divisions have grown this crop since Brooke rule (1841-1941). The Iban, on their own initiative, also cultivated this crop as early as the 1940s, but it was only after the introduction of a pepper subsidy scheme in 1972 that pepper became an important alternative source of cash income for the Iban farmers. The number of Dayaks involved in pepper cultivation increased steadily between 1984 and 2003. According to Morrison (1997), 82% of all 45,000 pepper holdings in Sarawak were owned by Dayaks, but the recent data provided by DOA show the figure as high as 83.2% of the approximately 12,2286 hectares planted in the crop to be owned by Dayaks, of whom 75% were Iban.

A third important crop is cocoa. It was introduced in 1969 under the Agriculture Diversification program and continued until 1984. By 1985 it became one of the major crop schemes under a separate program, the Cocoa Subsidy Scheme. Although a relatively latecomer to Iban farming, it had a significant impact on land utilization, at least briefly. In the 1980s, out of the 11,162 hectares of land planted with cocoa in Sarawak, the Iban farmed about 33%. The total area under cocoa cultivation reached 80,467 hectares in 1991, but declined rapidly to 23,218 hectares in 1996 due to slumping cocoa prices. This was a huge decline in cocoa-cultivating area in only 5 years and it appeared that cocoa was a failure and had little long-term effect on the livelihoods of the Iban. DOA discontinued the scheme in 1995. Today, most lands previously planted in cocoa are used for pepper cultivation or have been returned to forest-fallow.

2) Land Use Under Resettlement Schemes

A type of government-engineered project that has in some areas transformed Iban land use are resettlement farm schemes. During the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, about 15,000 hectares of NCL were acquired by the state government for various resettlement schemes in Sarawak. Beginning in 1964, just one year after Sarawak gained its independence, the
state government carried out its first social experiment by relocating more than 1,000 Iban in land resettlement schemes. Between 1964 and 1970, a total of nearly 5,544.9 hectares of native customary land (NCL), which was traditionally under forest-fallow shifting cultivation, was acquired from host populations and subsequently converted to rubber schemes at Triboh, Melung, Skrang, Meradong, Sibintek, Lambir and Lubai Tengah. These resettlement schemes were implemented at the height of the communist insurgency in Sarawak and during the military confrontation between Malaysia and Indonesia in the 1960s. The costs of development of the farm scheme were treated as loans to the settlers to be repaid in installments in the form of monthly deductions from the proceeds of the sale of rubber sheets to the Sarawak Land Development Board (SLDB). Most land titles are still in the SLDB’s possession due to settlers’ failure to repay their outstanding loans. The resettlement projects were a failure and had to be abandoned by the government in 1982.

In 1972, the state government acquired native customary lands in Nanga Skuaau in the Sibu Division in order to resettle 400 Iban households from Oya. The resettlement scheme, implemented by the Rejang Security Command (RASCOM), was designed primarily to relocate Iban who were being harassed by communist terrorists in the Sibu Division. Due to competing interests, the ultimate goals and priorities of the scheme had to be balanced between improving the lot of rural Iban and security interests of the nation-state. Mono-cropping of pepper was implemented, but due to disease infestation and low prices in the 1970s, this resettlement scheme, too, failed to achieve its goals.

In addition, the Federal Land Consolidation and Rehabilitation Authority (FELCRA) was mandated to create cocoa resettlement schemes in the Sibu Division. These schemes also failed due to low prices. The status of land tenure for settlers, and whether they will be given rights of ownership to the farmland to which they were moved, or whether they are only residential laborers, is still not clear.

In 1982, another resettlement exercise was carried out in Batang Ai as a result of the construction of a hydroelectric power dam across Wong Irup in the Lubok Antu District. The objective of this relocation exercise was to supply hydro-electric power to meet the growing industrial needs of Sarawak and to provide the affected population with a better source of livelihood through the scheme (King 1986). The state and its political leaders argued that the affected communities must give way to development so that socio-economic benefits could trickle down to them in return. About 10,300 hectares of native ancestral land were flooded, compelling the government to resettle more than 3,000 Iban from 25 longhouse communities in Batang Ai to a new area — located just below the dam site. About 3,000 hectares of native ancestral land belonging to several longhouse communities at Nyemungan, Bintong, Bui, Sebangki and Ensawang were acquired to establish the farm scheme and for the construction of new longhouses.

Each longhouse community was allocated blocks of farmland classified as communal land, where each household was given 4.4 hectares of land. This farmland consisted of 2 hectares for rubber, 1.2 hectares for cocoa, and 0.4 hectare for a garden plot. Another 0.8 hectare of rice land was promised but has yet to be given. All plots of land which were previously planted with cocoa, have been replanted with oil palm in the last five years.

It is important to mention in passing that Iban settlers in the different resettlement schemes that we have mentioned were “landlords.” They owned ancestral lands in their former longhouse areas, but without document of title. For objectives not of their own choice, they were relocated to other localities on land which belonged to other longhouse
communities in order to satisfy military objectives or the economic interests of the state. In the process, native customary lands were acquired by the government and redistributed to settlers, which deprived the host population of its limited land resources.

Land ownership in all resettlement schemes is bestowed upon an individual settler, be it husband or wife. Farm schemes are registered under private ownership and become the private property of individual settlers. Because property rights are individualized, the system is contrary to the traditional Iban inheritance system. Second-generation settlers automatically become landless. Thus, by design, the system constitutes a push factor fostering out-migration from the scheme.

3) Land Use Under in situ Land Development Schemes

The first major effort to introduce commercial plantation agriculture to the Dayak community was carried out by the Sarawak Land Consolidation and Rehabilitation Authority (SALCRA) in 1976 after the failure of rubber-based resettlement schemes. Using an in situ land development program, large-scale oil palm plantations were implemented under the integrated agricultural development project concept. Today, 40,000 hectares have been developed using this in situ concept of land development that benefits about 12,000 households, of which slightly more than 50% are Iban and the rest Bidayuh. These projects are designed to consolidate idle Native Customary Land for plantation agriculture as a strategy for poverty eradication among the Dayaks under the New Economic Policy. Tracts of NCL are surrendered to the government for development, and SALCRA acts as a custodian of the land for a period of 25 years. The land is surveyed and documents of title in perpetuity are issued to the participating landowners.

Although SALCRA has been mandated to establish commercial plantations on idle NCL, it does not promote a mono-crop farming system. Rather, its ultimate goal is to diversify income-generating activities among the Iban, who have been over-dependent on subsistence farming for their livelihood. Thus, in contrast with the practice of resettlement schemes, where affected populations were, in virtually all cases (the Lambir LDS in the Miri Division was a partial exception), involuntarily relocated to a designated site for farm schemes, implementation of in situ land development projects takes into account the landowners’ socio-cultural and psychological attributes. Landowners stay put in their longhouses and are encouraged to carry out stipulated agro-economic activities while participating in the farm schemes. This arrangement not only gives time for the Iban to adjust to the new farming system, but also encourages landowners to diversify their crops. Thus, a spillover effect of this scheme seems to intensify the utilization of NCL for the cultivation of various crops. The trustee’s role, land codification process and farm scheme administration all favor the landowners in an affirmative action program implemented under the New Economic Policy.

Customary Land Banks Under the Joint-Venture Concept JVC

In 1995, the state government instituted a new land reform program under the joint-venture concept (JVC) of land development (Ngidang 1997, 2002). Under JVC, a community which owns land teams up in partnership with the private sector that possesses capital and expertise to develop ancestral land into commercial plantations. About 300,000 hectares of NCL have been earmarked and/or approved by the Sarawak
Ministry of Land and Rural Development for the purpose of establishing large-scale oil palm plantations in Sarawak.

1) **Formation of Land Banks**

One of the fundamental features of JVC partnership is the tripartite agreement. After a memorandum of consent has been signed by landowners, parcels of customary land within the territorial domain or *pemakai menoa* of a longhouse are declared as the development area. These lands are surveyed and consolidated into a land bank. The land bank is then surrendered to the managing agents, either to the Land Consolidation Development Authority (LCDA) and/or to the Sarawak Land Development Board (SLDB), which acts as the trustee for the NCL. The land bank is issued a master title and the land is then leased to a joint venture company. In this process, landowners and the managing agent have to sign two important agreements: a deed and a trust deed. The former specifies the duties, obligations, commitments, rights, benefits and responsibilities of parties involved. The latter deals with the protection of the land rights and/or interests of landowners.

2) **Transfer of Ownership**

The land bank is leased to the JVC for 60 years. However, this land bank cannot be mortgaged as collateral to secure any bank loan without the permission of the Sarawak Minister of Land and Rural Development. Throughout the duration of the lease, land ownership is legally transferred from the individual *bilik* families to a corporate body for a period of 60 years. This transfer of ownership requires a third agreement called the joint venture agreement to be executed between the managing agent (as a trustee) and a private investor.

Creation of the land bank under JVC, although it has potential socio-economic benefits, threatens the inheritance system of the Iban. When they surrender their lands to the JVC, land ownership has to be legally registered under private individuals, rather than the *bilik* family as a whole. This requires that parcels of NCL be divided among family members, which leads to land fragmentation. Thus, siblings of landowners and/or other family members, although they may still be living under the same roof, do not necessarily inherit the property from a parent, unless the parent makes a legal will to transfer such property to their children. This automatically renders much of the next generation landless.

3) **Role of Trustee and Contract Arrangement**

Under JVC, landowners collectively acquire a 30% stake in the joint venture company’s share equity. The share equity of landowners under the joint venture arrangement is acquired through the lease value of NCL, which has been officially pegged at RM1200/hectare. Ten percent of the total equity in the company belongs to the trustee, while the remaining 60%, is owned by the investor.

This contract partnership involves trust between and/or among stakeholders: landowners, investors and trustees. This implies the three parties have entered into a covenant based on a contractual arrangement. Trust is “a state involving confident positive expectations about another’s motives with respect to one’s self in situations entailing risk,” according to Boon and Holmes (1991:194). As stated earlier, the trust between landowners and government agents is sealed through two agreements: a deed
and a trust deed. The contract is binding and therefore the rights and interests of landowners are taken over by the trustee, who acts on the landowners' behalf in the joint partnership throughout the duration of a 60-year lease.

The joint venture agreement between the managing agents (SLDB and LCDA) and the private investors provides the legal framework for the joint venture partnership. The JV agreement defines how partner co-operation operates and the contents of the deed and trust deed. Landowners are not represented on the board of directors of the JVC, despite having a 30% stake in the company. Despite being landlords, they have now been reduced to minority shareholders in a joint venture project.

However, one important safety net in this JV arrangement is that government policy does not allow the land bank to be used as collateral or shares of land to be disposed of without the permission of the Sarawak Minister of Rural and Land Development. In the event of bankruptcy, however, the majority shareholder can use the land bank as collateral or mortgage it for purposes totally at odds with the contractual agreements. This potential abuse of the collateral power of the land bank, of course, could happen under political pressure from a private investor, who holds a 60% stake in the joint venture project, especially in the absence of institutional constraints.

The Sarawak Land Code (SLC) does not guarantee automatic reversion of these lands upon expiry of the 60-year lease. In fact, Section 18A (3) of the Sarawak Land Code (SLC) states that:

_On expiry of a lease issued to a body corporate under section (1), any native whose land had been included in such a lease may apply to the Superintendent for the issue to him of a grant over his land or any part thereof. The Superintendent may, subject to the direction of the Director, issue such grant to the native upon such terms and conditions as he deems fit to impose._

**Conclusion**

This paper has looked at the historical, sociological and cultural justifications of Iban customary land tenure, and its legal constraints under the Sarawak Land Code. Several factors are identified as responsible for reducing forest-fallow land use: individual initiative, direct government intervention via various agricultural subsidy schemes, resettlement exercises, _in situ_ land development programs, land bank schemes under JVC and legislative changes in the Sarawak Land Code. Clearly, the dynamics of land use among the Iban have been closely associated with the coming together of political and economic interests of two dominant stakeholders: the private sector and public agencies.

Land utilization in the Iban community today is primarily characterized by mixed cropping, where forest-fallow still dominates. Commercial plantations made significant inroads into Iban community land during the 1980s and 1990s, but the area under plantations is still very small compared to land cultivated under rice and tree crops. Only a relatively small proportion of Iban lands are cultivated under terms of the SALCRA's _in situ_ land development programs or JVC oil palm plantations, as compared to areas under diversified mixed farming.

It is argued that regardless of whether NCL is developed under resettlement schemes, through _in situ_ land development programs, or under a JVC arrangement, all three strategies have long-term implications for native customary land tenure and affect the
socio-economic well-being of the communities directly involved. Invariably, property rights change from collective heritable property to private, often non-heritable ownership in the case of land tenure under resettlement and in situ land development. A transfer of land ownership from individual families to a corporate body, in the case of land banks in JVC projects, also changes property rights, as does the trustee’s role as custodian of native customary rights to land in JVC and SALCRA land development projects.
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THE LONG LIFE OF CHARLES BROOKE
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Charles Brooke, the second Rajah of Sarawak, continues to languish as a subject of biographical interest. Apart from the brief treatment given him by S. Baring-Gould and C.A. Bampfylde, whom he commissioned to write *Sarawak Under Its Two White Rajahs, 1839-1908* (1909), and Sir Steven Runciman's and Robert Payne's somewhat perfunctory accounts in *The White Rajahs* (1961) and *The White Rajahs of Sarawak* (1960), there is only Colin Crisswell's popular biography (1978). *Rajah Charles Brooke: Monarch of All He Surveyed* is a highly readable book which barely touches the extensive documentary record and delivers a necessarily superficial judgment. The relevant section of my own recent pictorial history of the Brooke dynasty is no more than an essay towards a biography. By contrast, James Brooke, the first Rajah, has been the subject of no less than four biographies, the most recent by anthropologist Nigel Barley which offers a revisionist assessment tied to his alleged homosexuality. During his own time, Brooke's journals and letters were also published by his friends Captain Henry Keppel, Captain Rodney Mundy and John Templer and after his death by his great admirer, Miss Gertrude Jacob.

Although Charles Brooke ruled Sarawak not just from his accession in 1868 but from his uncle's final departure in 1862 until his own death at the age of eighty-eight in 1917,

---

1. Henry Sotheran & Co.
2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
his extraordinary achievement has been obscured by the romantic reputation of his more dashing and publicity-conscious uncle. James' ebullient personality and his prodigious capacity for writing (always with an eye to publication) helped to establish his image as a Byronic adventurer-hero in early Victorian Britain. His diplomatic skills (with the Royal Navy as well with the Malays and Dayaks) helped him to consolidate his tiny kingdom. He also made an important contribution to the art and philosophy of government which he instilled into his handful of young European officers, notably Hugh Low. As the recent book by John Walker demonstrates, it is the origins of Brooke rule which continue to be the principal focus of interest.\(^{12}\)

Charles Brooke's one major publication, his autobiographical *Ten Years in Sarawak* (1866),\(^{13}\) was full of robust action but revealed little of his more intimate thoughts and feelings. Indeed, there were those amongst his contemporaries (notably the first Rajah's private secretary and biographer, Spenser St. John) who believed he was incapable of such things. Perhaps the circumstances of his replacing his elder brother in 1862 soured his reputation among those who might otherwise have contributed sheaves of respectful memoirs. He has certainly suffered because of his somewhat dour and ascetic character, which alienated him from his young wife Margaret and his daughter-in-law Sylvia née Brett. In their books about Sarawak,\(^{14}\) both tended towards caricature in their portrayal of him, although Sylvia's vindictive malice contrasted with Margaret's more good-humored tolerance. While Sylvia was dismissive of her hated father-in-law, Margaret retained a strong sense of respect for her husband's achievements and his absolute personal commitment to the cause of Sarawak. In short, most of the modest general writing on Charles Brooke is biased either towards caricature (Margaret Brooke and Sylvia Brooke) or towards uncritical adulation (Crisswell and the original 1928 entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography*).

Academic writing on Charles Brooke has been narrowly focused. The most significant treatment of his Dayak policy was produced by Robert Pringle in *Rajahs and Rebels* (1970)\(^{15}\) which traced in detail his "divide and rule" methods. The only other specific studies of Charles' reign were produced by Otto C. Doering (1965; 1966)\(^{16}\) who focused on the workings of his administration, and D. A. Miller (1971)\(^{17}\) who looked at his values. Nicholas Tarling's article on his and the third Rajah's relations with the Colonial


\(^{13}\) 2 vols., London: Tinney Brothers, 1866.


Office (1970) revealed a good deal about his *modus operandi*. Tarling’s major work on the Brookes’ relationship with Brunei (1971) also charted in detail the process of territorial expansion pursued by Charles and its political and diplomatic dimensions. Charles’ attitude to missionary work, and that of the Church of England in particular, has been dealt with by Graham Saunders (1992), his policy towards the Chinese by Craig Lockard (1971), and his economic policies and attitudes to education by Ooi Keat Gin (1996). In her recent work, Cassandra Pybus (1999) traced the life (mostly in Canada) of Charles’ half-Malay son, Esca, but offered no new insights into Charles’ character. Tarling’s work, minutely thorough and fair-minded as it is, does not tackle Charles’ career *in extenso*. It is Pringle’s book that provides the main building block. Altogether, however, there is a gaping hole in the scholarly knowledge for the vital forty-nine years of the second Rajah’s rule when Sarawak was transformed from a tiny and tenuous private kingdom to a vast territory possessing valuable natural resources but with a sparse population whose introduction to a capitalist economy was deliberately slowed and cushioned.

Recent academic research on Sarawak history has been negatively affected by two considerations (a) the notion that events in Sarawak were not much more than a “footnote” to Southeast Asian history and (b) the post-colonial and post-modernist discourses’ bias against “dead white males” and anything smacking of conventional imperial history. Even more dismissive is the school of writing which prefers to think more in terms of the “imagined power” of long-vanished pre-colonial kingdoms and princeloms than the tangible power clearly exercised by figures like Charles Brooke. Surely it is enough to say in response to doctrinaire objections of this kind (a) that Sarawak’s history possesses its own legitimacy and its own intrinsic importance and (b) that Charles Brooke was an Englishman should not mean that Sarawak can be dismissed out of hand as just another exploitative imperial exercise in which white men ruled over brown.

---

24 My own earlier efforts to obtain research funding to work on a biography of the second Rajah were greeted with the sentiment that this would be yet another piece of “colonial history.”
What makes the Brooke raj particularly interesting, if not altogether unique, is the degree of indigenous agreement that it won through its pragmatic compromise between traditional indigenous forms and European ideas and methods. There was no enduring sense of Brooke rule as an alien imposition to be thrown off at the first opportunity. While the ideological justification of the Brookes as trustees of native rights may seem false and self-serving to us today, such was not the perception of its polyglot population. At the very least, the Brookes were regarded as providing *pentah*, a more informal system of law and order which could adjudicate in a neutral fashion between rival ethnic interests in a highly pluralistic society. Altogether the most successful of various efforts by European adventurers to set themselves up in power in Asia, the hybrid Brooke experiment deserves more careful scrutiny.

Why was Brooke Sarawak the most successful example within the entire genre of Europeans who set themselves up as rulers in mainland and Southeast Asia during the 18th and 19th centuries? The tentative answer is that the first and second Rajahs were by various means able to attain a legitimacy which allowed them to rule *by consent*, in sharp contrast with the position of colonial powers such as Britain, Holland and France in their Southeast Asian empires. This, of course, begs the question: how did they obtain this consent? John Walker has offered an internal explanation for James Brooke’s foothold of power. But what explains Charles Brooke’s success as a ruler for almost fifty years?

Sarawak, at one end of the spectrum of European imperialism in Southeast Asia, was an exercise in “freelance imperialism” by means of which Charles Brooke succeeded his uncle as sovereign and extended his authority over a vast but thinly populated territory rich in natural resources, including oil. His efforts to resist large-scale capitalist plantation and other economic development and his determination to uphold native rights led to an economy in which native and Chinese smallholder producers of rubber, pepper etc. were the mainstay. In other words, it was a model which contrasted dramatically with those developed in the Malay States and the Dutch East Indies during the same period where landless native wage-laborers serviced large foreign-owned estates. The political and economic effects of the second Rajah’s policies are still apparent and relevant today, although the origins of those policies have been long forgotten.

The fact is that the second Rajah built the basis of the Sarawak that we know today. Apart from the territorial extension that he engineered (which almost succeeded in swallowing up what remained of the Sultanate of Brunei after a series of annexations by purchase), he established a properly-ordered system of government, developed a basic economic infrastructure and introduced technological and economic innovations which had established Sarawak as a stable and prosperous plural polity by the outbreak of World War One. So wide, deep and pervasive was his influence from 1862 until his death in 1917 that his biography must also be a history of Sarawak during that period (something that is long overdue). Altogether, Charles Brooke looms large as one of the most significant figures in the history of European imperialism in Asia in the nineteenth century.

---

Charles Brooke's long reign was distinguished more by steady material progress than by dramatic diplomatic and military coups. His extension of Sarawak's territories to their existing borders was accomplished without conflict and his bloody internal struggles with rebellious Malays and Dayaks, serious as they were, did not receive the scrutiny and publicity that attended the first Rajah's feats. He was the single-minded and practical administrator who succeeded the charismatic and colorful founder of the dynasty. At the same time, his apparently opportunistic replacement of his elder brother, John Brooke Johnson (better known as Brooke Brooke) in February 1862 alienated many of his best officers and soured the fraternal ethos that had characterized Brooke government in its early phase. Charles Brooke was always someone whom it was more natural to respect (even to fear) than to love.

A biographical study of Charles Brooke must take account of his multiple personae: as a former Royal Navy midshipman who saw active service; as a Dayak chieftain (Rajah Dayak); as an Englishman ruling over a polyglot and thinly dispersed indigenous population who accepted his legitimacy to a greater or lesser degree; as an administrator personally supervising every detail of government business; as an economic and technological innovator willing to try various ways of developing Sarawak's exports, including oil, and to build up Sarawak's infrastructure by the latest methods; as an enemy of large-scale capitalism who successfully resisted the introduction of a Malayan or Sumatran-type plantation system and protected the rights and interests of the indigenous and Chinese smallholder-producers; as both a sovereign ruler and a British subject with his own peculiar status in relation to the British government and its agencies (principally the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office); as an advocate (and practitioner) of miscegenation who disinherited his own Eurasian son; as an influential lobbyist in Britain with a keen sense of the workings of British politics and press manipulation; as a critic of British and other imperial systems in Asia, notably India and Malaya; as a liberal Gloucestershire country squire with a keen interest in fox-hunting, horses, livestock and bird breeding, horticulture etc.; as an aficionado of opera and other music and with a keen eye for a well-turned ankle; as an auto-didact with a keen interest in French literature, evolutionary theory, theology, geology, ancient history, etc.; and finally, as a parent and grandparent, estranged partner of his wife Margaret and dynastic head determined to protect the succession to the Sarawak raj in his younger son's favor if need be.

Finally, a biography will address Charles Brooke's character. The challenge is to see beyond his apparently ascetic and unfeeling exterior and to understand the complex psyche of a man who was as much at home in the Skrang longhouse as the Gloucestershire fox-hunt, who sang Rossini opera arias in quiet intervals during war expeditions and carried a copy of Byron's Childe Harold in his pocket; who preached miscegenation but refused to acknowledge his half-Malay son and half-Dayak daughter; who appreciated and introduced the latest technology but wanted to conserve indigenous culture by withholding education from all except the urban Chinese and Malays.

Charles Brooke was an altogether less sociable figure than his uncle and his eldest son. Furthermore, he preferred to keep his own counsel and it was not until he reached his eighties that he began to rely on the advice of a handful of retired Sarawak officers and some well-placed figures in British political and journalistic circles. His principal concern was his eldest son, Vyner, who seemed to be altogether negative towards Sarawak and irresponsible in money matters. The answer was the Sarawak Advisory Council, based in London, which was designed to act as a brake on Vyner's policies
when he became Rajah. All this did, of course, was to alienate Vyner and his wife Sylvia from both Charles and from his second son, Bertram, whom Charles would ideally have had succeed him.

These are some of the issues involved in resolving, or at least illuminating, the complex challenge that Charles Brooke presents. We might now ask what kind of conceptual framework is most appropriate in examining his long reign. Was he essentially an idiosyncratic English adventurer-king, inspired (like the two anti-heroes in Rudyard Kipling’s “The Man Who Would Be King”) by the notion of ruling over brown men and women in a tropical setting? Was he an enlightened, semi-indigenized leader who had imbibed much of the Dayak culture in particular and was leading his subjects to a peaceful and economically prosperous condition mediated by European liberal values and European technology? Or was he simply a liberal colonial reformer who resisted large-scale capitalist development in favor of smallholder producers?

We do not have to use our imagination to plot Charles Brooke’s achievement: it is all in there in archival collections in Kuching, London and Oxford. At Rhodes House Library, Oxford, the vast Brooke/Sarawak archive contains many of Charles Brooke’s early letters to his family — his mother, his two sisters and his elder brother, Brooke Brooke — and to his friends from the Sarawak government — John Hay, Spenser St. John, Charles Grant and others. Many of the letters have to do with his effective usurpation of Brooke Brooke’s inheritance of the raj, which caused a great deal of angst within his family and alienated many of his old friends. In the Sarawak Museum Library in Kuching are Charles’s official letter books and proclamations, together with the correspondence and reports of his officers from different out-stations. The Public Record Office in London contains all his correspondence as head of state with the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office and, of course, the minuted comments by officials which often provide some of the clearest insights into this unusual relationship between the British government and a British subject who was also a sovereign ruler in his own right.

A little-known collection also housed in the Public Record Office is the semi-official correspondence between Charles Brooke and his Treasurer, K.M. Dallas, during the years 1902-1917. These are the letters written from the Rajah’s country estate near Cirencester in Gloucestershire during his annual leave when Vyner had been left in charge. Charles Brooke was a strong believer in the need for Europeans to avoid long exposure to tropical climates and as he grew older the harsh stimulus of the European winter seems to have become more important to him. Furthermore, it was only in England that he could indulge his two great passions, the hunt and French and Italian opera.

---

26 Francis Henry Dallas had been employed by the Penang municipal government for some years before he became Manager of the Printing Office and editor of the Sarawak Gazette in August 1897. He quickly assumed further responsibilities, notably Registrar of the Supreme Court (1899), and in June 1900 was appointed Acting Treasurer and Clerk to the Supreme Council. Returning from leave in January 1902, he became Acting Postmaster-General, Shipping Officer, Magistrate of the Court of Requests and Auditor, also serving as Acting Treasurer until his confirmation in the post on 1 January 1903. He retired on pension in March 1907 and died in England in March 1923 at the age of fifty-eight.
Although Vyner was nominally in charge in Sarawak, Charles did not have much confidence in his judgment. The letters to Dallas reflect the fact that he was conducting much of the detailed business of government through this correspondence. And as he came to trust Dallas more and more, so did he begin to take the Treasurer into his confidence over more personal matters — Vyner’s and the Ranee’s debts and their requests for financial assistance, his youngest son Harry’s unsuccessful career as a theatrical entrepreneur and journalist, his second son Bertram’s ill-health and forced retirement from the army, and so on. At the same time he took an increasing interest in Dallas’s indifferent health and Dallas’s wife’s welfare back in England.

Altogether, the PRO collection of letters to Dallas provides an invaluable and as yet untapped source of information on the last decade of Charles’ rule when some very interesting developments were taking place. During the early years of the century, Charles continued to pursue his long ambition to swallow up Brunei, together with its surrounding territories. The Trusan District had been acquired from Brunei in 1885 and the Limbang in 1890. The letters reveal the detailed negotiations and maneuvering which led up to the acquisition of Lawas in 1905 and the Rajah’s further bids to acquire Brunei itself and British North Borneo in the face of strong and finally effective British government resistance.

Although there were still some problems with the Dayaks of the upper Rejang, notably the Baleh area, Sarawak was generally more peaceful than it had ever been. A new concern, however, was the potential threat of Chinese secret society activity against which the Rajah took careful precautions. One of the matters which he kept firmly in his hands was the stationing of officers, their promotion, leave and discipline. In one celebrated instance he demoted a highly promising officer who ignored a government order by bringing in to Sarawak a pair of dogs at a time when there was a rabies scare. Anything approaching insubordinate behavior would trigger the reflexes of a man in whom early years of naval experience had inculcated an ethic of absolute obedience to orders. Imagine his feelings, then, when Vyner refused to lead an expedition against some troublesome Dayaks.

Rubber-planting was beginning to develop as a potential export staple in the First and Second Divisions, despite Charles’ serious doubts about the industry’s long-term viability. Much more significant for the long-term future were Miri’s oil deposits which he was quick to investigate and for which he negotiated exploitation rights with the Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Company, the parent of Shell. Although initial exploitation was slow and expensive, he had faith in the industry as Sarawak’s long-awaited export staple. For some time he was led to believe that Sarawak’s purchase of mineral rights in Brunei gave it the rights to Brunei’s oil, something which would have changed the course of history in northwestern Borneo if it had been true. In the meantime the government opium “farm,” or monopoly, continued to be a major source of revenue and much of the correspondence is taken up with the question of appointing a new “farmer” (monopolist) who could sign a long-term agreement. The lower price of opium in Sarawak meant that it was smuggled both to Singapore and to the Dutch East Indies, arousing the ire of colonial officials. However, when the Singapore Governor and the Colonial Office attempted to intervene, Charles quickly ran up the flag of internal independence under the terms of the 1888 Treaty with the British government.

There were also important developments in public works which Charles both initiated and took a keen personal interest in supervising down to the last minute detail. Following
a cholera epidemic in Kuching in 1901, work was started on an ambitious water supply scheme from Mount Matang. Better communications were a high priority when surface transportation was limited to the rivers and the longest road ran for ten miles out of Kuching. Charles negotiated with telecommunication companies for a system of wireless telegraphy and for the telephone. But his most ambitious project was the railway from Kuching into the interior of the First Division, the first stage ending at the 7th mile Rock Road Bazaar. In all these ventures, Charles dealt personally with the suppliers in England and ensured that detailed specifications were met. He also kept a keen eye on the management of the projects and was quick to sack anyone who was not up to the mark.

By 1910, the correspondence with Dallas is becoming strongly influenced by Charles's obsession with the succession. Although he and Margaret had been permanently estranged since the early 1890s, they could at least agree that their second son Bertram would be a far more suitable Rajah than the feckless Vyner. At the same time, they knew that to interfere in this way would arouse fratricidal enmity. As it was, Vyner's suspicions (no doubt fueled by Sylvia) of being passed over led him to attack his brother and his parents. The compromise was a Sarawak Advisory Council sitting in London and supervising the general business of government, particularly its finances. Vyner's permanent indebtedness (he gambled on horses and Sylvia favored an extravagant lifestyle) had helped to build up the tension between father and son. More importantly, Vyner's friendship with Secretary of State for Colonies, Charles ("Lulu") Harcourt, and his father-in-law Lord Esher's close links with City of London business interests led Charles to suspect that Vyner might be persuaded not just to grant large commercial concessions but perhaps to sell up Sarawak lock, stock and barrel. ("The City" and its financial speculators were always the second Rajah's bête noire. Privately, as his letters to Dallas explicitly reveal, he was anti-Jewish.) The Advisory Council, which he established in 1912 with Bampfylde's assistance, was designed to prevent such an eventuality. Furthermore, his political will of 1913 stipulated that while Vyner was to become Rajah, Bertram's role in government was to be almost as important. The last years of the correspondence reveal a man who feels that he has taken every possible precaution to protect Sarawak, not least from his own successor!

Together with Charles Brooke's earlier family letters and his official correspondence, the letters to Dallas will help to map the life of this extraordinary but in some ways chilling figure.
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Introduction

Unlike many areas in Borneo, Bario is cool, quiet, and sequestered. From a health perspective, the Kelabits are better off than many Borneo farmers. They still have a usable environment for subsistence. Bario has a clinic and flying-doctor service, but public information about health is patchy and treatment tactics can be erroneous. Problems such as scabies, intestinal worms, dental decay, and a fatalistic outlook on depopulation plague them. The lure of city life for the many educated Kelabits continues to depopulate Bario and to weaken Kelabit identity.

Food Sufficiency in Bario

After I had studied rural villagers in Sarawak, Malaysia, who were trying to cope with poor soils, land encroachments, and agrobusiness pressures, I longed to see a contrasting area. That's why I went to Bario.

As I found out, Bario also has poor soils but no land encroachments or any threat of large plantations being put there. It is also food-sufficient, unlike many other areas. Bario paddy fields produce ample "Bario rice," which is widely esteemed. While rice thrives on these peaty fields, they are not as favorable for vegetable growing.¹

Where, then, do Bario people get their vegetables? Bario is a flat valley in the highlands surrounded by forested mountains.² Many wild vegetables and medicinal plants are thus available to foragers (Christensen 1997, 2000; Noweg et al. 1998). Other vegetables are grown on the plateau, such as kangkong, spring onions, cabbages, cassava, changkok manis, and taro. But flourishing vegetable gardens are rare, except for those "on contract" to the local schools.³ Since the only easy way in and out of Bario is by the daily (Twin Otter) plane from the urban world, and since most school children are boarders from outlying longhouses, local vegetables for them are a necessity. These contract gardens meet this need.

A few fruits grow at Bario's 1200 meter elevation, including mango, rambutan, guava, and pineapple. The banana trees look rather forlorn, their leaves shredded by the winds.

¹ Rice mills were started in the 1960s but rice husks were fed to pigs at least in the 1970s in some areas (Talla 1979). Burned rice husks from the mills are sometimes spread on the fields, one source of organic fertilizer.
² Bario Valley is less than three miles long by one mile wide, but the Kelabit Highlands is some 40 miles long by 20 miles wide.
³ According to Talla (1979), before paddies flowered or bore grain, vegetables were planted on the bunds, but this seems to be rare now. The bunds were mowed with modern grass trimmers when I was there, even though they are built up of fertile muck from the paddies and could support an edible landscape.
Durian trees and coconut palms are rare. On Bario’s southern outskirts, fruit trees are more common.

Fishing and hunting are variable. When I was in Bario in August, 2001, stream levels were low and it was not “the season” for wild pig. Bario has no proper river, unlike most communities in the Upper Baram area. Small fish can be caught from creeks nearby, but the larger and tastier ones, such as huang pelian (semah), live in rivers that are an hour away by motorbike.4 Except for the pigs, few game animals survived in the highlands once guns became available. Even these few are sporadically hunted. For the rest of the animal-protein supply, there are quite a few chickens and even a few ducks around, the latter introduced by the Agriculture Department. The ducks don’t count for much since their meat is unpopular and many have died of duck disease. One man said he had seven ducks left, all males.5

There seem to be no goats in Bario, but there are water buffalo. They were first acquired, early in the 20th century, from Kalimantan. In pre-buffalo times, the plentiful sambar deer were the main meat source (Talla 1979). The water buffalo are used to eat the old rice stubble, trample the rice-field mud before planting, and fertilize the field at the same time.6 And one farmer said he raises sheep. The buffalo are eaten on occasion, especially during name-changing feasts, but I’m not sure about the sheep. The school boarders have chicken flown in for their meat supply, but not in adequate amounts.

All these resources add up to food sufficiency for the Bario Kelabits and, with supplementation, for the children boarding at the schools. If so, one might expect that undernutrition would not exist there, even though it exists elsewhere in Sarawak. Indeed, according to Bario clinic records, no pre-school Kelabit children were undernourished in 2000. Three, however, were overweight.

**Urban Influences vs. Health**

People in Bario hanker after urban amenities. Motorbikes are handy for getting around on the dirt road that meanders around the valley. Air-borne trucks, the one farm tractor, and the like, arrive piecemeal and are reassembled on the spot. Although most Kelabits are staunch Christians, even cigarettes and beer come in by air, as do sweets, new influences, trekking tourists, petrol, and electric generators.7

Tourists arrive thinking Bario is electrified when they see the miles of power lines and concrete poles. Evidently the mini-hydro project installed in the 1990s was poorly planned. It worked for one Christmas Eve and has been inert ever since. Houses have generators, often used for watching evening TV. The rice cookers and other gadgets once bought in anticipation of mini-hydro electricity have quietly been forgotten. People cook with firewood.

---

4 Carp once imported by the Agriculture Department for fish-farming in bunded fields escaped to rivers when bunds washed out during heavy rains (Talla 1979).

5 Tom Harrisson and others introduced ducks to the Kelabit Highlands just after World War II. By 1948 there were evidently hundreds of ducks there, spread all over by individuals doing duck trading. But by 1954, few were left (Harrisson 1954).

6 In the 1960s, government-funded canals were dug to drain the previously water-logged valley. Drainage of the swamp turned the peat into clay soil (Talla 1979).

7 As a result of this new religion, “many of their age-old practical values have unwittingly been abandoned” (Labang 1979:12).
Meanwhile, urban health problems are creeping into Bario. As people now generally live longer than did earlier generations and as more snack foods are now available, diabetes, poor teeth, and especially high blood pressure (HBP) are not uncommon in adults (Lim et al. 2000). HBP is easily determined at the local clinic, so the HBP “epidemic” may be largely an artifact of ascertainment. That is, HBP may have also been common in the past but seldom looked for. At any rate, people seem to be over-anxious about it, possibly because it’s rather a novelty to them and because it may lead to mortal events.8

Teeth are a health problem in Bario. To fly to a dentist in town can cost more than a month’s supply of cash. Such flights are hardly routine since most Kelabit are cash-poor farmers. While a government dentist visits at times, he only does extractions. On a life-long basis, this is a disservice. Many older people have lost teeth and now cannot masticate food well.9 Also, some elders have gold-capped teeth, due to the fashion introduced by the Chinese long ago.10 Gold-capping leads to rot as it is impossible to brush out bacteria lurking under the caps. Fortunately, there is hope for the teeth of the Bario children, thanks to the efforts of a school principal to obtain restorative dental equipment and thanks to the offer of an urban dentist, also Kelabit, to visit at times to do the work.

Bario has had piped water since 1968 (Saging, 1976/77), but today the water pressure is low in the dry season. Everyone boils their drinking water for fear of gastritis. Even then the water is acidic and suspected of causing upsets. Also, there are no filters on the pipes from the mountains. If working filters equipped with chlorine and fluoride were in place, both stomach ills and dental caries might wane.

---

8 For reliable and plentiful information on HBP, hypertension, hookworm, and scabies (see later sections), and other health issues, a good internet source is the National Institutes of Health in the United States. Its home page (http://www.nih.gov/health/) has a subheading “MEDLINEplus.” Turning to that page, and then to the attached “health topics” page, lets one focus in on HBP and, separately, on scabies. Under the “health topics” page, its subtopic of “parasitic diseases” leads one to a fact sheet on parasitic roundworm diseases, including hookworm. There are also two articles on HBP under the heading “blood pressure” provided under the “Full-text Consumer Health Publications” subheading on the home page.

9 While Harisson (1959:14) reported that young girls used to have their top two front teeth knocked out, he didn’t mention if this was considered beautifying.

10 According to Harisson (1959, p. 14), men gave up blackening their teeth and switched to gold-plating when they began frequenting the coast, if they had “enough gum or bezoar stone or other jungle produce to pay...the price.” Further, he wrote (p. 209), “The Kelabits and other inland peoples had never heard of gold as money. They valued it highly, for one reason only. The habit of chewing betel nut, which spread into the interior in comparatively recent times, damages the teeth eventually. In the interior there are of course no dentists [and] the methods of cooking and many items of diet require strong teeth. So, since the interior came into regular...contact with the coast, far and away the most important reason for collecting jungle produce and carrying it out, with enormous labour, has been the urge to protect these front teeth with gold caps. As well as this, the show of gold in the mouth is regarded as attractive...A set of gold caps, prepared and placed by a Chinese ‘dentist’ at Marudi...cost about £10 before the war—a big sum, involving saving and much effort...”
Other Local Considerations

Other aspects of nutrition, besides food and teeth, include micronutrients such as iodine and the question of intestinal parasites. Unlike many inland people in Sarawak, the Kelabits have probably never been “bothered” with goiter and its attendant harm to thyroid function — which is especially important for neurological development in utero. There are no cretins in Bario. The reason is that Kelabits have long exploited salt springs, as have their neighbors, the Penan. Kelabits make their own mineral salt at the hot springs. Harrisson (1959:6) said it was “stinking of iodine,” but the batch I saw had no smell. Since this ash salt is iodine-rich and has long been traded among highland people, a large territory traditionally was goiter-free (Chen 1990). The salt, however, is not salty enough to be a preservative for “salting down” meat or fish to save for lean times (Harrisson, 1954).

Intestinal parasites are a different matter. Based on a recent study (Nor Aza Ahmad et al. 1998), most of the school children in Bario are parasitized. About 14% had hookworm, one cause of anemia, and 16% had roundworms (Ascaris). Since other parasites were also present, over 60% of the students studied had at least one kind. Many had two kinds. While the primary students are dewormed semi-annually, the secondary students have not received this attention so far. Their principal is trying to remedy this.

While nutrition and its related topics of teeth, goiter, and intestinal problems are basic health concerns, they are not the whole story. However, because little research has been done on the Kelabit, the presence of viral infections, congenital and genetic disorders, typhus, and other conditions cannot be assessed.\(^{11}\)

People say there are few mosquitoes in Bario, which suggests that filariasis, dengue, malaria, and other vector-borne diseases are rare there. Yet a research team looking for mosquitoes in Bario in 1995 found species that transmit malaria, viral encephalitis, and dengue (Chang et al. 1998). Malaria cases have occurred among Kelabits in the south of Bario, perhaps related to their contact with Penans there; Penan school boarders in Bario have also been ill with malaria (Talla 1979). Another consideration about infectious diseases is that twice a year Indonesians arrive in Bario to plant out rice seedlings (in August) and to help in the harvest (January-February). Up to 80% of Kelabit households hired Indonesian farm laborers in 1995 (Hew and Sharifah 1998). The Indonesians come over the mountains from the border, a six-hour walk away. Since Kalimantan does not have health services as good as Malaysia’s, these laborers may bring infections in with them. This has not been studied, although malaria cases have been recorded among Indonesians at the Bario clinic.

On the plus side, it appears that Bario has almost no alcoholism or cirrhosis and not much lung cancer. The reason is the pervasive church condemnation of alcohol and cigarettes there.\(^{12}\) Another plus is that Bario’s clinic is staffed by a medical assistant

---

11 Mental retardates, who never marry, were mentioned by Talla (1979). Whether they were the victims of genetic conditions, congenital iodine deficiency, or some other problem is unknown.

12 Other health advantages of Christianity have been lauded by various Kelabit writers, such as fostering longhouse cleanliness.
(paramedic) and a community nurse, although adding another nurse would be extremely useful (as Bario’s “mayor,” or penghulu, confirmed).¹³

**The Scabies Story**

Lots of soap and water for hand washing and bathing would benefit Bario children. Since many intestinal parasites are transmitted by the fecal-oral route, soaping up would lessen the worm load. It might also alleviate another problem rampant in Bario children when I was there: scabies (*kudis buta*). The scabies epidemic started in the primary school and spread to the secondary school next door. Adults I talked to didn’t understand that it was caused by a skin parasite, a mite, or how it could best be treated.¹⁴ Some thought it was simply an allergy.

The topic of scabies brings up issues about the effectiveness of health service in this remote community, as well as the level of knowledge about health in Bario and in the outlying longhouses that furnish most of the school boarders. The Bario clinic does not stock many supplies for epidemics of any kind, relying instead on the “flying doctor service” and air-cargo shipments for other than basic needs.

Perhaps because scabies is not life-threatening, it has received little action. But scabies is certainly curable. Besides treating individual cases with 5% permethrin lotion put on from the neck down and left on overnight, the usual advice is to boil all clothes, towels, hair combs, slippers, and bedding. This is easier said than done, especially for 7-year-old school boarders who have no “house mother” to do it for them. Also, boarders often journey home to their longhouses on weekends, and the people there may know little about scabies treatment. Re-infections easily occur.

Scabies, therefore, is a problem with social, medical-service, educational, and government-policy dimensions. Coping with it will require unusual luck or unusual cooperation from all sectors. While scabies is endemic to many areas, it waxes and wanes. Luck might be needed for it to wane in Bario.

**The Past and the Future**

The Kelabits are distinctive in several ways. They are more oriented to land than to rivers. They raise water buffalo, unlike most other indigenous groups in Sarawak. And they have grown irrigated rice on their plateau for centuries, with their rice farming techniques differing from those of other Borneo groups.¹⁵ Yet many Kelabit valleys once

---

¹³ Interestingly, the Kelabit *pemancha*, senior to the *penghulu*, was the first Kelabit to receive paramedic training; he then served as a dresser at a dispensary built in the highlands (Talla, 1979).

¹⁴ Later, some parents were said to be applying a weedkiller, Roundup, to affected areas of the skin (P. Bala, personal communication).

¹⁵ The Kelabits evidently once polycultured rice, planting different varieties together in the same field (Harrisson 1954). Long ago, one Kelabit noticed a tall rice plant in his field that had produced well. He saved the seed and used it in a monoculture plot, to avoid wind pollination by the old varieties. The husk, or pericarp, of this new variety was not adhesive to the rice grain. It came off easily during de-husking, unlike that of the old varieties that could only be partially “polished” with the traditional mortar and pestle. The problem that ensued when this new polished rice became popular was beriberi, caused by a deficiency of vitamin B1 (thiamine). This vitamin had been readily available in the semi-polished rice of
used for paddy farming were vacated long before World War II (Christensen 1997). Despite their flair for growing rice, the Kelabit population has experienced a long decline, at least in the highlands. More recently, the confrontation period in the 1960s between Malaysia and Sukarno’s Indonesia led to the evacuation of many near-border Kelabits to Bario, while at the same time people in Bario were flowing to the cities on the coastal plain.

Bario people today seem resigned to the further depopulation of their highlands, a sort of mental fog which is only forgotten temporarily when they go vacationing to see their urban relatives (cf., Labang 1979). Large families are a thing of the past. Family planning is popular, with 111 women on “the Pill” in 2001, according to clinic records. With continual out-marriage in the towns, many Kelabit children have lost their language and traditional culture, a process accelerated by the “national language” and “national culture” taught in government schools.

Perhaps in coming years ecotourists may notice the bleak look of the Bario Valley, despite traces of old bunded fields and irrigation channels there. Where, they might ask, are the 44 varieties of rice once cultivated in the area? Where are the people who can remember the past?
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This paper gives an account of the food resources and diet of the Lundayeh of Long Pasia and Long Mio at the end of the twentieth century. I describe the diversity of resources used and patterns of resource use, investigating the importance of different habitats as sources of food. This research is placed in the context of central Borneo by comparing my own findings with those of researchers who have done similar studies elsewhere in the region. The Lundayeh have experienced rapid social and environmental changes in the last decade. I examine how people have responded to these changes, as reflected in their resource management practices. On this basis, I consider what lessons can be learned from the Lundayeh by those attempting to develop a more sustainable management strategy for the region.

Background

The Lundayeh communities of Long Pasia and Long Mio are situated in the Ulu Padas region of southwest Sabah. These are the only two highland Lundayeh villages in Sabah. The majority of the Sabahan Lundayeh live in the lowlands, particularly in the Sipitang region. However, they still see themselves as essentially a highland people. The Lundayeh regard the Kerayan-Kelabit highlands in Kalimantan as their heartland. It is from here that they are thought to have originated, migrating throughout the region where the states of Kalimantan, Sarawak and Sabah meet, over the last two centuries (Harrison 1967).

Long Pasia is a village of about 400 residents, and Long Mio about 120 residents. The villages are at an altitude of 1000m, and are surrounded by undulating hills, and beyond these, mountains. The vegetation close to the villages is a patchwork of fields and secondary forest of varying ages, a consequence of people’s long history in the region, and their practice of swidden agriculture. Further afield, the region was, at least until very recently, covered by one of the last extensive areas of old-growth forest remaining in Sabah (Payne and Vaz 1998). This forest is a mix of heath and montane forests.¹

The Lundayeh of Long Pasia and Long Mio are primarily swidden agriculturalists, although wet rice cultivation is also important. Cash crops are extensively cultivated, with coffee and tobacco having met with particular success during the time of this research. As well as cash-cropping, the other main source of income is from wage labor. Many people go to work in the logging camps, and in towns and cities in Sabah and further afield. Since 1997 the villages have been linked to Sipitang by a logging road, a journey that takes about four hours. The arrival of the road enabled expansion of cash cropping, and easier availability of processed goods. In addition, it encouraged a number of families to

¹ For a detailed description of the region’s forest types and their botanical composition, see Phillips and Lamb (1998).
return to the village. The population of both villages has grown in recent years, and seems likely to continue to do so. The arrival of the road also marked the beginning of extensive logging activities in the region. These have been going on around the villages, with noticeable impacts on the availability of forest resources and on river quality. However, in spite of the many social and environmental changes which the Lundayeh have experienced in recent years, forest resources continue to make an important and highly valued contribution to their subsistence.

Methodology

Research was conducted from September 1999 until November 2000 as part of a wider Ph.D. study. Hunting and dietary surveys were conducted to investigate the diversity of resources being used, their importance in the diet, and the relative importance
of different environments as sources of these foods. During five seven-day periods in each of the villages, a member of every household was asked to record the foods being eaten within their household. These surveys were conducted at roughly two-month intervals throughout the year, so that any seasonal variation in the diet could be observed. During one survey period, I asked the children to keep their own food diaries, to enable a comparison to be made with that of the adults.

Complementary to the dietary surveys, botanical collecting expeditions were undertaken. These were conducted in the areas surrounding the villages with people from the villages. I collected specimens of plant species used as vegetables, fruits, spices, leaves for wrapping rice, cooking containers, as well as plants that are used to obtain food, for example, to make fishing nets, animal traps, fish poisons and hunting charms. These activities enabled more complete documentation of the edible fruits, since these were often not recorded in the food surveys. In addition, they gave particular insight into neglected food resources — those that are rarely, or never, used today.

Interviews were also undertaken with all households to investigate people’s agricultural strategies and land and resource use practices.

**Food Resources of the Lundayeh**

In common with perhaps all other swidden agriculturalists of Borneo (Chin 1985; Christensen 1997, 2002; Colfer et al. 1997; Dove 1985; Janowski 1995), the food of greatest importance is rice. When asking whether you have eaten yet, the Lundayeh ask whether you have eaten rice (*nekuman luba' ko?*). Only if you have done so are you considered to have eaten. Eaten with the rice are *kikid*, ‘side-dishes’ — these are the vegetables, meat or fruits eaten as side-dishes. It is this aspect of the diet that I describe in most detail.

Snack foods also make a significant contribution to the diet. These were greatly under-recorded in the dietary surveys (an occurrence common to many such studies (Colfer and Soedjito 1996; Etkin 1994)). Therefore, although the diversity of these foods was recorded, it was not possible to determine their significance in the diet, nor determine the relative importance of vegetation types as sources of fruits.

**Kikid**

The foods that are served as *kikid* are diverse. At their most basic, the *kikid* may be simply salt or chillies — although this is only out of necessity rather than from choice. More typically, a meal will include a few vegetables, and perhaps some meat or fish. Appendix I shows the full range of foods that were recorded in the dietary surveys, as well as the few additional foods I observed being eaten at other times. This gives a more or less complete representation of the range of foods that are eaten as *kikid*.

Plant resources make up the vast majority of the *kikid* served, accounting for 68% in Long Mio and 63% in Long Pasia (by frequency) of those recorded in the food diaries (the remainder of which are meat or fish). Apparent from the data is the wide range of plant resources used. The Lundayeh recognize 113 types of vegetable\(^2\) and *ubul* (stem pith), 28 mushrooms and 22 flavorings. Identification to species level was not always possible (because of the absence of specimens or of fertile material for identification, for

\(^2\) Included within my category of “vegetables” are green leafy vegetables, bamboo shoots, and tuberous roots, as well as flowers, seeds, and fruits.
example), and so the number of species used cannot be given precisely. However, they represent at least 107 species of vegetable, 19 species of flavoring, and 10 mushroom species. This is certainly an under-estimate of the number of edible mushroom species, since I was only able to gather specimens for 12 of the types of mushrooms.

Similar arrays of edible plant resources (both with respect to the number of species used, and the actual species) have been recorded for other central Borneo societies (Chin 1985; Christensen 1997, 2002; Colfer et al. 1997). Christensen (2002) collected comparable data on the numbers of species being used by an Iban and a Kelabit community in Sarawak. These data are summarized in Table 1. This suggests that the Lundayeh use slightly fewer edible resources than either the Iban or Kelabit communities (although it should be born in mind that my calculations of species numbers are conservative estimates). There are a number of possible reasons for this. Undoubtedly a significant factor is the degree of isolation of these communities. Unlike the Iban and Kelabit communities, Long Pasia and Long Mio are accessible by road, and this is likely to have resulted in a shift away from the use of some local resources towards processed and shop-bought goods.

Table 1: Comparison of Edible Plant Resources Used as Kikid by Peoples of Highland Borneo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF SPECIES:</th>
<th>KELABIT (PADA LIH) (Christensen, 2002)</th>
<th>IBAN (NANGA SUMPA) (Christensen, 2002)</th>
<th>LUNDAYEH (LONG PASIA &amp; LONG MIO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUSHROOMS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGETABLES</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPICES OR FLAVOURINGS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although plant resources account for the majority of the kikid that are eaten, people have a strong preference for eating meat. When no one has had any recent hunting success, it is common to hear complaints from people about how bored they are with eating 'just leaves' (don mo). The importance of meat and fish in the diet is apparent from the figures showing the percentage of meals in which these are eaten. Thus, in Long Pasia, 49% of meals included hunted meat or fish from the rivers, or if we include meat and fish that have been reared or shop purchased, the figure rises to 64% of meals. The equivalent figures for Long Mio are 42% and 58% respectively.

In terms of numbers of side-dishes, meat and fish account for 32% in Long Mio and 37% in Long Pasia, these figures also include shop-bought meat and livestock. By comparison with data reported from other central Borneo communities, this figure is low. For example, in a Kenyah community, 49% of the side-dishes of three individuals were of hunted meat or local river fish (Chin 1985:90-91). The same figures for four members of a Kantu' community were 43% for hunted meat and river fish, and 45% when including shop-bought meat or livestock (Colfer and Soedjito 1996:176 and 180-181). Although care needs to be taken not to infer too much from this, the data used for comparison being
from relatively small survey numbers, it does suggest that less meat and fish is being eaten in Long Mio and Long Pasia than might be expected. This is perhaps not surprising given the decline in animal and fish numbers that local people have noted in recent years. In fact, there is some evidence to suggest that fewer animals are hunted in Long Pasia today than seven years previously. This comes from hunting surveys carried out in Long Pasia in 1993 (Bennett et al. 2000:307-310). At that time, there was no logging in the area, and the road had not yet reached the villages. The population of Long Pasia was also smaller, with only 40 households, in comparison to today's 68. As part of this research, data were recorded of the percentage of evening meals containing wild meat and local river fish (Bennett, personal communication). I do not know at what time of year this information was recorded. However, these figures are considerably higher than those from all the dietary surveys that I conducted (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR OF SURVEY</th>
<th>1993 (Bennett)</th>
<th>1999-2000 (Hoare)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% MEALS CONTAINING:</td>
<td>Survey 1:</td>
<td>Survey 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTED MEAT</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVER FISH</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certainly, it would be surprising if there has not been a decline in the numbers of game and fish consumed because of the changes that have taken place in the last decade. These have included an increase in population, both within the villages, and from the establishment of logging camps throughout the area. In addition, logging in the area has caused forest loss as well as noise and river pollution, and the logging roads have enabled easier access to more remote parts, both to villagers and to outsiders.

Although hunted meat and fish from the local rivers are still the most important sources of protein in the diet, with declining hunting and fishing returns, people are increasingly turning to shop-bought and processed foods. Such foods accounted for 4% and 7% of kikid recorded in the dietary surveys in Long Mio and Long Pasia respectively. The greater consumption of shop-bought foods in Long Pasia reflects their greater availability there (there are three stores in the village, in comparison to Long Mio's one store), and also the greater affluence of some people in Long Pasia. Tinned meat and fish, salted fish, and chicken eggs are the main foods that people buy from the village stores, and the usual reason for buying these is because people have no fresh meat in the house. For the same reasons, the consumption of chicken and tilapia (from fish ponds) is increasing. Of the domesticated animals, only chickens are eaten as kikid on an everyday basis. The other animals, pigs, buffaloes, and cows, are only slaughtered for special occasions.

**Snack Foods**

Snack foods include cakes and biscuits, fruits, instant noodles, bread, sweets and crisps (see Appendix 1). Many snack foods are eaten while people are out in the fields or forest. When a group is working in someone's field, the owner of that field always
provides drinks, together with cakes of some kind. Often, fried doughnuts (kui tepong, 'flour cakes') are cooked, or during the months of November and December, when the corn is ripe, fried corn cakes are popular. People often eat cucumbers to refresh themselves while harvesting the rice fields (the season when these fruits are ripe). Sugar cane and the young shoots of certain trees, periku, which have a high water content and are astringent to the taste, also provide a ready source of refreshment (Table 3).

Table 3: Species used as Periku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUNDAYEH NAME</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kayu telatang</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Campnosperma auriculatum Hook.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periku bata</td>
<td>Urticaceae</td>
<td>Oreocnide trinervis (Wedd.) Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periku pelanuk/Periku abai</td>
<td>Myrsinaceae</td>
<td>Ardisia sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periku tuer</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Bischofia javanica Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tebpu barok</td>
<td>Begoniaceae</td>
<td>Begonia sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War ilang</td>
<td>Myrsinaceae</td>
<td>Embelia sp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fruits, as well as other snack foods, are particularly important in children’s diets. This was apparent from the data collected in the children’s food diaries. As well as a much higher incidence of snack foods, children also recorded a greater diversity, for example, they recorded a number of fruits that were absent from the adult food diaries, including bua bidang (Rubus rosifolius) and bua buau (Syzigium foixworthianum). Children snack on a wide range of fruits. Those most commonly eaten are listed in Table 4. Characteristics shared by these species are that they are easily accessible, easy to harvest, and have fruits requiring little or no preparation before eating. Adults are generally more discerning in their choice of fruits, preferring the larger and sweeter fruits, most of which are from cultivated varieties. However, there are certain forest fruits that adults will go out of their way for, such as the fruits of species of Durio, Nephelium, and Mangifera.

The most important snack foods are fruits — important both because they are the most frequently consumed, and because of their nutritional value (Hladik et al. 1993). In Appendix 2 I have listed the edible fruits found locally. Not included in the table are those fruits that are sometimes bought in town. Most commonly, people buy fruits grown in the Sipitang area, such as rambutan, durian, mango, and watermelon. Occasionally, other fruits are bought, such as grapes, apples and oranges. 109 Lundayeh names of fruits were recorded, these corresponding to at least 89 species (a conservative estimate, because not all were identified to species). As previously noted for the kikid, in comparison with the data collected by Christensen (2002), this is a lower number of species. The Kelabit community of Pa Dalib were reported to use 125 species, and the Iban community of Nanga Sumpa, 184 species of fruit.
## Table 4: Fruits Most Commonly Eaten by Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lundayeh Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisian</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td>Salacca vernicularis Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerii / Kayu mein /</td>
<td>Clusiaceae</td>
<td>Garcinia parvifolia (Miq.) Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timon labo</td>
<td>Cucurbitaceae</td>
<td>Musia javanica (Miq.) C.Jeffrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ri / Eri</td>
<td>Elaeagnaceae</td>
<td>Elaeagnus ferrugineus Rich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipat</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Baccaurea lanceolata (Miq.) Muell.Arg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taer</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Biscofta javanica Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikali</td>
<td>Melastomaceae</td>
<td>Melasiaora malabathricum L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terur suit</td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>Aglaia korhalosii Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fika labo / Mata lawai</td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>Aglaia odoratissima Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingat</td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>Lansium domesticum Correa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitah</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Ficus racemosa L. var. elongata (King)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Musaceae</td>
<td>Musa sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipet</td>
<td>Myrtaceae</td>
<td>Decaspermum parviflorum (Lam.) A.J.Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambo (Malay)</td>
<td>Myrtaceae</td>
<td>Psidium guajava L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buah</td>
<td>Myrtaceae</td>
<td>Syzgium foxtworthianum (Ridl.) Merr. &amp; Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambo air (Malay)</td>
<td>Myrtaceae</td>
<td>Syzgium samarangense (Blume) Merr. &amp; Perry or S. aeguine (Burm.f) Alston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markisa (Malay)</td>
<td>Passiophoraceae</td>
<td>Passiophora aulitis Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisang labid</td>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>Rubus benguetensis Elmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serinat / Tabpa serinat</td>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>Rubus mollecanus L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidadar</td>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>Rubus rosifolia J.E Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyar</td>
<td>Rutaceae</td>
<td>Citrus microcarpa Bunge; C. maxima (Burm.) Merr.; C. sinensis (L.) Osbeck; C. medica L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teladan</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Hornstedia acaulis Ridl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terebuk</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Alpinia spp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Patterns of Resource Use

Patterns of resource use are shaped by people’s preferences for the particular resources, and the resources’ availability and ease of harvesting. In turn, ease of harvesting is influenced by people’s activities, for example, when people are out hunting, certain resources, such as rattans, are readily accessible. Similarly, during periods of intensive agricultural work, food resources in the fields are those that are most readily available, and consequently, people tend to rely more on these (Colfer and Soedjito 1996; Dove 1985).

These factors are reflected in the data on the relative importance of different vegetation types as sources of side-dishes. As part of the dietary surveys, I asked people to record where they had harvested their foods — whether from old-growth forest, secondary forest, riverside vegetation, the fields or village, field margins and young fallow vegetation, or if they had been bought. The results are summarized in Figures 1 and 2. I included hunting as a separate category because people generally recorded all hunted meat as having come from old-growth forest. This is in spite of the fact that a

---

5 The first dietary surveys are not included because the data on plant resources are incomplete. Subsequent to this, the survey forms were re-designed, enabling better data collection. Furthermore, this data does not reflect the importance of the different vegetation types as sources of fruits, because of the under-recording of these foods in the dietary surveys.
Figure 1: Sources of meat in Long Pasia
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Figure 2: Sources of *kikid* in Long Maq
considerable amount of hunting takes place within secondary forest, and to a lesser extent, in agricultural areas and fallow vegetation. It was therefore often impossible to know in which type of vegetation the animals had been caught. Domesticated animals, and also fish from fishponds and paddy fields, were included in the category of “field / village.”

The data show that the majority of the foods eaten as side-dishes comes from the fields, with a significant number also coming from riverside vegetation. The importance of fields is not surprising, especially given the expansion in vegetable cultivation in recent years. A wide variety of vegetables are grown, providing an abundant supply. Furthermore, many people have fields near to the village, and so the foods here are readily available. Even for those people who do not have land close by, much time is spent working in the fields, and so the resources growing here are those that are easiest to collect.

The riverside is also an important source of vegetables. The vegetation here is often dominated by edible plant species, making them easy to collect. In Long Mio, riverside vegetation is particularly important as a source of foods, because there are extensive areas close to the village. In contrast, much of the riverside in Long Pasia has been converted to fields. Furthermore, there are many more people, and so harvesting pressure on those remaining areas near the village is quite high. At certain times, such as after a period of drought, the women commented that it was difficult to find enough vegetables to provide for their families from the riverbanks close to the village.

Old-growth and secondary forest are the source of relatively few edible plant resources, their main importance being as a source of hunted meat. However, certain plant resources predominate here, such as bamboo shoots. Bamboos (Gigantochloa levis, Bambusa vulgaris and Schizostachyum brachycladum) send up new shoots only a few months each year, between June and August, so there is a glut of this vegetable at this time. During the fourth dietary survey conducted in Long Pasia, bamboo shoots were in season, and consequently, secondary forest is the source of many more kikid during this time.

Many seasonal resources are from swidden fields, the agricultural calendar determining their availability. A few weeks after rice planting begins, mustard greens (Brassica spp.) and spinach (Amaranthus spp.) are ready for harvesting. It is these vegetables that account for the much greater significance of fields as a source of kikid in the fifth dietary surveys which were conducted during the time of rice planting. A contributing factor is that this is a period of intense agricultural activity, and so people do not have time to collect vegetables from elsewhere. A month or so later, around November, the leaves of squashes (Benincasa hispida, Cucurbita spp., Momordica charantia) and cucumbers (Cucumis sativus) can be harvested, and they continue to provide a source of green vegetables until the end of rice harvesting (March or April). Their fruits take a few months to mature, ripening from January onwards.

The availability of snails is also linked with the agricultural calendar. During the relatively slow period between rice harvesting and clearing the fields for next year’s crop, from April to June, snails make up an important part of the diet. This is because at this time of year the women do not have much work to do, and so they have the time to collect snails. Furthermore, the paddy fields are free of rice, and so people are able to collect snails as well as fish. This accounts for the higher numbers of “river fish” recorded in the third Long Mio survey (where most snails are collected from a lake, and
so were included as river fish), and also for the relatively high numbers of side-dishes coming from the "field/village" in the third Long Pasia survey (where most snails are collected from paddy fields).

The amount of hunting that goes on is also related to people's other activities. Thus, when the men are busy with agricultural work, as during the fifth hunting surveys when they were involved with rice planting, hunting activities decline. Also significant in influencing the amount of hunting is the availability of game. Animal populations vary, particularly in relation to the availability of food. Most significantly, boar populations increase dramatically during mast fruiting events. Apparently, at such times many boar are hunted. Although there was no mast fruiting during the period of my fieldwork, many species were in fruit during the first and second dietary surveys. Reflecting this, greater numbers of animals were hunted during these survey periods, and more meat was eaten at this time.

Certain other resources vary in availability, although not necessarily at the same times each year. A major factor influencing the amount of fish that is eaten is the timing of fish spawning. Such an event took place during the second dietary survey in Long Pasia, and many people went fishing and made large catches. Consequently, fish made a much greater contribution to the diet during this period.

In summary, investigation of patterns of resource use show that fields are the source for the most frequently eaten vegetables for the Lundayeh. However, non-cultivated habitats are the source of a wide range of vegetable species and also the source of many fruits. The forest is also the source of most of the meat and fish that is eaten. Thus, fallow fields and forest habitats contribute much diversity to the diet, something that is greatly valued by the Lundayeh. This is not only because of personal taste, people also recognize that forest resources are a valuable source of food at times when other foods, such as cultivated vegetables, are unavailable. Thus, forest foods are important for nutrition and for food security (Appell 1988; Etkin 1994).

Changing Strategies

One feature then of the Lundayeh subsistence system is the use of a diversity of resources, and of vegetation types. Until recently, such a strategy has been possible because of the availability of extensive forest resources. Furthermore, the Lundayeh system of forest management, of which the practice of swidden agriculture is an integral part, has served to create a mosaic of forest patches at different stages of regeneration, thus, helping to increase the availability of a wide range of resources. However, whether this strategy will continue to be possible in future years seems unlikely because of the rapid environmental and social changes that are taking place. Indeed, the evidence cited previously suggests that the use of forest resources is in decline. This was indicated by the lower number of species used as vegetables and fruit by the Lundayeh in comparison with Kelabit and Iban communities in Sarawak. Similarly, data on the consumption of hunted meat show that the Lundayeh are eating less in comparison with other highland Borneo communities, and indeed, that its consumption has declined in the period from 1993 to 2000.

One cause of these changes has been the logging activities in the Ulu Padas, which have resulted in the loss of large areas of forest. Consequently, there has been a decline in the availability of certain forest resources. Logging has also placed increased pressure on the land falling outside the logging concessions. The responses of the Lundayeh to these
changes have been varied. One response has been to put greater effort and resources into the cultivation of cash crops. Parallel to this, there has been a shift away from swidden cultivation, with some people deciding to cultivate only wet rice (for which subsidies are available) and others concentrating entirely on cash crops (with subsidies also available for certain of these). People are choosing to do this partly because they recognize that in the future they will not be able to depend on local resources for their needs, and so will have to buy replacements. This is just part of a more general trend towards greater dependence on a cash economy, with people needing to meet such costs as schooling, medical expenses and to purchase various manufactured goods.

Another response of the Lundayeh to the decline in forest resources has been to bring some of these into cultivation (see Table 5). These include favored rattan species,

### Table 5: Forest Resources Frequently Brought Into Cultivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUNDAYEH NAME</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLAVORING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keduang</td>
<td>Lauraceae</td>
<td>Cinnamomum sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afa' fulung</td>
<td>Menispermaceae</td>
<td>Albertisia sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bua sallah / Bua beludu / Baku ucat</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Elingera elatior (Jack) R.M.Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDIBLE FRUIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felam</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Mangifera sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamut</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Mangifera sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karung / Lam karung</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Mangifera sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beleleh</td>
<td>Bombacaceae</td>
<td>Durio graveolens Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapun salat</td>
<td>Bombacaceae</td>
<td>Durio sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalit</td>
<td>Bombacaceae</td>
<td>Durio sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pugi</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Baccarea macrocarpa (Miq.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muell.Arg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siei</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Baccarea sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berangan</td>
<td>Fagaceae</td>
<td>Castanopsis costata (Bl.) A.DC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingat</td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>Lansium domesticum Correa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelidang</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Artocarpus cf. lancefolius Roxb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feriubi</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Artocarpus cf. primackiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kochummen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiran / Tarap</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Artocarpus odoratissimus Blanco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talun</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Artocarpus tamaran Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sia</td>
<td>Sapindaceae</td>
<td>Nephelium cuspidatum Bl. var. eriopetalum (Miq.) Leenh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nephelium ramboutan-ake (Labill.) Leenh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beritem</td>
<td>Sapindaceae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDIBLE STEM PITH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei sia</td>
<td>Areceae</td>
<td>Daemonorops fissa Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei seseit</td>
<td>Areceae</td>
<td>Daemonorops longistipes Burret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei lingan</td>
<td>Areceae</td>
<td>Daemonorops sabut Becc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
flavorings and spices, and many fruit trees, in particular, species of mango, durian and rambutan. The Lundayeh have a long tradition of bringing fruit trees into cultivation. However, in recent years these activities have expanded, because people fear that these resources will not be available in future years, and also because of a desire to establish fruit orchards for commercial reasons. Similarly, in response to the decline in animal and fish numbers, many people have constructed fish ponds for rearing tilapia, and a number of households keep chickens.

The increased pressure on both land and resources is also resulting in a shift towards greater privatization. Today, there exists a great sense of urgency to secure land titles. Furthermore, some people now restrict access to resources that lie on their land. For example, there is a large patch of bamboo forest near Long Pasia which today falls under the ownership of several people. A few individuals have let it be known that they do not want people collecting bamboo shoots from their land, despite there being a long tradition of open access to other villagers for these resources. Although this is the cause of some ill feeling, with such behavior being seen as not customary for the Lundayeh, it has not been openly challenged. Rather, it has led to other people following suit.

Undoubtedly, the Lundayeh of Long Pasia and Long Mio will continue to change and adapt their way of life over the next decade and beyond. Some of these changes will no doubt be welcomed, but others will come about from necessity rather than preference. Already, their future options have been limited by the widespread logging. Consequently, a shift away from a forest-based lifestyle, with more intensive agriculture and greater involvement in the cash economy and in urban life, seems inevitable. What remains uncertain is whether, in this process, any of the particular characteristics of the Lundayeh way of life and of the Ulu Padas will be maintained. The Ulu Padas is a unique region, both biologically and culturally, and it would be both tragic and nonsensical if it were converted to plantations and fields in its entirety. Not only would such a route be unimaginative, it would be wasteful, since it would ignore the potential of local resources and of alternative ways of life. A better route would be to develop a diverse management strategy for the Ulu Padas — i.e., one that would enable local people to continue their current activities of swidden and wet rice cultivation, cash-cropping and hunting, but would also allow the establishment of protected areas, and the development of community forests and agroforestry. (See Christensen (2002:248-249) for similar suggestions regarding Sarawak.) This would enable the Lundayeh to maintain their way of life, an important part of their identity, while enabling economic development, also a local priority. Furthermore, such a strategy has the potential for meeting the state’s goals of economic development and conservation.

That a more diverse strategy is possible is suggested by the Lundayeh’s own response to the recent changes that they have experienced. In particular, the further development of fruit orchards and of agroforestry systems has great potential. Elsewhere in Borneo, highland peoples have successfully developed agroforestry systems that are economically successful, and at the same time, have enabled conservation of much of the local biodiversity and maintenance of many functions of the forest, such as watershed protection (Fried 2000, Michon et al. 2000, Peluso 1996). The potential for the development of agroforestry in the Ulu Padas warrants investigation, particularly in light of the diversity of plant resources found here, including a wealth of local fruit varieties and species (Hoare 2002, Phillipps and Lamb 1998). Agroforestry is also more compatible with tourism, in comparison to intensive agriculture, for example. Tourism to
the region is presently at a low level, but both villages have been working to develop this further.

The establishment of community forests and agroforestry could be encouraged in a number of ways. One priority is the settlement of land claims so that local people have secure tenure. A possible tool is that of subsidies, as these can have a major influence on the decisions made by local people. Thus, subsidies could be provided for agroforestry initiatives, rather than just for wet rice cultivation and cash crops such as coffee and tobacco, as is the case at the moment. Ultimately, what is needed is some imagination, particularly on the part of agricultural extension officers and forest managers, so that there is a shift away from the assumption that the only options available for economic development are the traditional ones of logging, plantations and intensive agriculture. Those people with a role in developing a management strategy for the region (from local people up to government level) need to consider what kind of future they want for the region, and whether they want the Ulu Padas to become indistinguishable from many other places in Malaysia, or if they wish to maintain at least some part of its biological diversity and rich cultural heritage.

Appendix 1: Foods Eaten as Kikid by the Lundayeh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. VEGETABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUNDAYEH NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keduang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuru (sia &amp; bata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ufa'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ufa'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikarok / kelalong batu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butu / kelalong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimudur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pau sia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayur busak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayur peit / sawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedai / abi'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayur picai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayur putih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayur gerinting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesila'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNDAYEH NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riep alud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siluk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udu daya / Udu necing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangkong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubi waar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadjak fadey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timon abai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timon belanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadjak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sifula / petolak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadjak cina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukul langit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubi kayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cangkok manis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peritak boncis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peritak lebing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peritak kadang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bua fayang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pau bulat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feceiruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busak liing felanuk / Busak fayeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulu – bulu ee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulu – bulu betung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulu – bulu telang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulu – bulu poren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulu – bulu sebiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyor (fece', kasturi;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lada rayeh / cabai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VEGETABLES continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUNDAYEH NAME</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomate</td>
<td>Solanaceae</td>
<td><em>Lycopersicon esculentum</em> Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliwan</td>
<td>Solanaceae</td>
<td><em>Solanum americanum</em> Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biterung et lipon</td>
<td>Solanaceae</td>
<td><em>Solanum capsicoides</em> All.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biterung pulung</td>
<td>Solanaceae</td>
<td><em>Solanum ferox</em> L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biterong</td>
<td>Solanaceae</td>
<td><em>Solanum melongena</em> L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bua ulem</td>
<td>Solanaceae</td>
<td><em>Solanum torvum</em> Sw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubi gentang</td>
<td>Solanaceae</td>
<td><em>Solanum tuberosum</em> L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobak merah</td>
<td>Umbelliferae</td>
<td><em>Daucus carota</em> L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bata</td>
<td>Urticaceae</td>
<td><em>Elatostenina</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tengayen</td>
<td>Urticaceae</td>
<td><em>Pouzolzia hirta</em> (Bl.) Hassk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pau abpa</td>
<td>Woodsiaceae</td>
<td><em>Diplazium esculentum</em> (Retz.) Sw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pau abu / Pau kapur</td>
<td>Woodsiaceae</td>
<td><em>Diplazium polypodioideos</em> Bl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. EDIBLE STEM PITH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUNDAYEH NAME</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deremeh</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Arenga brevipes</em> Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei leludu</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Calamus convallium</em> J. Dransf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei peit</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Calamus pogonacanthus</em> Becc. ex Winkl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riman</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Caryota mitis</em> Lour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei tei' lai</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Ceratolobus concolor</em> Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei kurad</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Daemonorops duidymophylla</em> Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei sia</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Daemonorops fissa</em> Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belikakau / Lekakau</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Daemonorops ingens</em> J.Dransf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei laasun</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Daemonorops ingens</em> J.Dransf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei seseii</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Daemonorops longistipes</em> Burret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei lingan</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Daemonorops sabut</em> Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei laya</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Daemonorops sparsiflora</em> Becc. / <em>D. didymophylla</em> Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinangan</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Eugeissina utilis</em> Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei ser</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Korthalsia ferox</em> Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilad</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Licuala valida</em> Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangan / Bara</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Pinanga capitata</em> Becc. ex Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berang</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Pinanga sp. aff. brevipes</em> Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisian</td>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td><em>Salacca vermicularis</em> Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siluk fulung</td>
<td>Costaceae</td>
<td><em>Costus speciosus</em> (Koenig) R.M. Smith / <em>C. globosus</em> Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Musaceae</td>
<td><em>Musa</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. EDIBLE STEM PITH continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUNDAYEH NAME</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sibak</td>
<td>Musaceae</td>
<td>Musa sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terabak</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td><em>Alpinia glabra</em> Ridl. / <em>A. nieuwenhuizii</em> Val.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Terabak fayeh</em></td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td><em>Alpinia ligulata</em> K.Schum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. SPICES AND FLAVORINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUNDAYEH NAME</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Bawang merah</em></td>
<td>Alliaceae</td>
<td><em>Allium cepa</em> L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bawang putih</em></td>
<td>Alliaceae</td>
<td><em>Allium</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusei</td>
<td>Alliaceae</td>
<td><em>Allium</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don sup</td>
<td>Apiaceae</td>
<td><em>Apium</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Piasau / Butan</em></td>
<td>Areaceae</td>
<td><em>Cocos nucifera</em> L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bua terur garang / ticuk mangai’</em></td>
<td>Clusiaceae</td>
<td><em>Garcinia dryobalanoides</em> Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bua kecii / kayu mein / tutuberu</em></td>
<td>Clusiaceae</td>
<td><em>Garcinia parvifolia</em> (Miq.) Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bua lipau</em></td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td><em>Baccaurea lanceolata</em> (Miq.) Muell.Arg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kicut / Bawing kedayan / don sop</em></td>
<td>Hydrocotylaceae</td>
<td><em>Eryngium foetidium</em> L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bawing</em></td>
<td>Lamiaceae</td>
<td><em>Mentha</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kedingau (Kayu mansis)</em></td>
<td>Lauraceae</td>
<td><em>Cinnamomum</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenem</td>
<td>Lauraceae</td>
<td><em>Lindera pipericarpa</em> Boerl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afa’ fulung</td>
<td>Menispermaceae</td>
<td><em>Albertisia</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bua gurah</em></td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Ficus racemosa</em> L. var. <em>elongata</em> (King) Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kavy bawing</em></td>
<td>Myrtaceae</td>
<td><em>Syzygium</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesimau</td>
<td>Poaceae</td>
<td><em>Cymbopogon citratus</em> Stapf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lada</td>
<td>Solanaceae</td>
<td><em>Capsicum</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likua</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td><em>Alpinia galanga</em> Willd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunus</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td><em>Curcuma domestica</em> Valeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bua salleh / Bua beludu / Baku ucat</em></td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td><em>Etinglera elatior</em> (Jack) R.M.Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Baku tubu / Baku tubu nanong / Baku derayau</em></td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td><em>Etinglera punicea</em> (Roxb.) R.M. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halia</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td><em>Zingiber officinale</em> Roscoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Mushrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lundayeh Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aqau</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alub</td>
<td>Amanitaceae</td>
<td>Amanita sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleng</td>
<td>Pleurotaceae</td>
<td>Pleurotus cf. djamor (Fr.) Boedijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibir kelabet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>Lentinaceae</td>
<td>Lentinus squarrosulus Mont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deseit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kecep</td>
<td>Schizophyllaceae</td>
<td>Schizophyllum commune Fr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekudan</td>
<td>Lentinaceae</td>
<td>Lentinus sajor-caju (Fr.) Fr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likudan</td>
<td>Lentinaceae</td>
<td>Lentinus sajor-caju (Fr.) Fr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liputung</td>
<td>Hygrophoraceae</td>
<td>Hygrocybe sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopet</td>
<td>Coprinaceae</td>
<td>Coprinus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawan</td>
<td>Sarcoscyphaceae</td>
<td>Cookeina tricholoma (Mont.) Kuntze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekudan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telub</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terupong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinunger</td>
<td>Auriculariaceae</td>
<td>Auricularia fuscosuccinea (Mont.) Henn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinunger becuk</td>
<td>Auriculariaceae</td>
<td>Auricularia delicata (Fr.) Henn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutung</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upul</td>
<td>Lentinaceae</td>
<td>Lentinus sajor-caju (Fr.) Fr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Animal Foods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lundayeh Name</th>
<th>English Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akep</td>
<td>Snails (freshwater)</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arem</td>
<td>Pangolin</td>
<td>Manis javanica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badan</td>
<td>Small-toothed palm civet</td>
<td>Arctogalidia trivirgata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakaa</td>
<td>Boar</td>
<td>Sus barbatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becuk</td>
<td>Pig-tailed macaque</td>
<td>Macaca nemestrina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beladan / ebu</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belug</td>
<td>Stinging hornet / Night wasp</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. ANIMAL FOODS continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUNDAYEH NAME</th>
<th>ENGLISH COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berangad</td>
<td>Hose's langur / Grey leaf monkey</td>
<td>Presbytis hosei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beruang</td>
<td>Sun bear</td>
<td>Helarctos malayanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falang alud</td>
<td>Banded linsang</td>
<td>Prionodon insang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugeh</td>
<td>Slow loris &amp;/or Western tarsier?</td>
<td>Nycticebus coucang / Tarsius bancanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabuk / Kadarat</td>
<td>Monitor lizard</td>
<td>Varanus salvator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara' arur</td>
<td>Crab</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelabet</td>
<td>Borneo gibbon</td>
<td>Hylobates muelleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelatang</td>
<td>Moth larva</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubeng</td>
<td>Flying lemur</td>
<td>Cynocephalus variegatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuyad</td>
<td>Long-tailed macaque</td>
<td>Macaca fascicularis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawid</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Various species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labo aising / labo julung / sigaa</td>
<td>Squirrels</td>
<td>Various species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menelen</td>
<td>Python</td>
<td>Python sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payau</td>
<td>Sambar deer</td>
<td>Cervus unicolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payu</td>
<td>Bearcat / binturong</td>
<td>Arctictis binturong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelanuk</td>
<td>Mouse deer</td>
<td>Tragulus napu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribuan</td>
<td>Masked palm civet</td>
<td>Paguma larvata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seruang</td>
<td>Cobra</td>
<td>Ophiophagus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talau</td>
<td>Barking deer</td>
<td>Muntiacus muntiac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamai</td>
<td>Frog</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terutung</td>
<td>Porcupine – common</td>
<td>Hystrix brachyura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terutung badak</td>
<td>Porcupine – thick-spined</td>
<td>Thecurus crassispinis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubang</td>
<td>Leopard cat</td>
<td>Felis bengalensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet bulu</td>
<td>Sago grub</td>
<td>Rhynchophorus ferrugineus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BIRDS

| Suit balud     | Green imperial pigeon / Pink-necked green pigeon | Ducula aenea          |
| Suit bau ulun  | Malaysian peacock pheasant / Crested fireback   | Polyplectron malacense / Lophura ignita |
| Suit keruak    | White-breasted waterhen                       | Amaurornis phoenicurus  |
| Suit metor     | Green pigeon / Wild pigeon                    | Treron sp.             |
| Suit sukur     | Spotted dove                                    | Streptopelia chinensis  |
| Suit tapiak    | Bulwer’s pheasant                              | Lophura bulweri        |

### EGGS

| Suit sukur     | Spotted dove                                    | Streptopelia chinensis  |
| Suit keruak    | White-breasted waterhen                         | Amaurornis phoenicurus  |
| Suit pirit     | Sparrow                                          | Unknown species         |
| Seruung        | Cobra                                            | Ophiophagus sp.         |
### DOMESTICATED ANIMALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berek</th>
<th>Pig</th>
<th>Sus scrofa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerbau</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Bubalus bubalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lal – kampong</td>
<td>Chicken – eggs &amp; meat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapi</td>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>Bos indicus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. SHOP-BOUGHT KIKID

- Army rations (e.g. packets of meat curry)
- Tinned meat
- Hot dogs
- Dried meat (e.g. buffalo)
- Frozen meat (e.g. frozen beef tripe; chicken wings)
- Chicken eggs
- Tinned fish
- Salted fish
- Dried prawns
- Instant noodles
- Pasta
- Dried mushrooms
- Soup – tinned
- Soya bean curd

### G. SHOP-BOUGHT FLAVORINGS

- Dried anchovies (ikan bilis)
- Fermented fish paste (belacan)
- Monosodium glutamate (MSG)
- Salt
- Soya sauce
- Tamarind paste
- Garlic
- Onions

### H. SNACK FOODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varieties</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army rations</td>
<td>biscuits; jam; fruit in syrup;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cakes &amp; biscuits – shop-bought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cakes (kui; noney; pinaram) – home-made</td>
<td>banana; cassava; corn; jackfruit; pumpkin;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit – local</td>
<td>various species (see Table 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### H. SNACK FOODS - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Varieties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit – shop-bought</td>
<td>apples; durian; oranges; rambutan; watermelon;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant noodles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peanuts (kacang iana’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porridge (bubur) (delei; kacang;</td>
<td>corn; beans; cassava; taro;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ubi; usi;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreads (for bread &amp; biscuits)</td>
<td>condensed milk; honey; jam; margarine; peanut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sticky rice (fadey mo)</td>
<td>butter;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar cane (tebpu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower seeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young shoots (periku)</td>
<td>various species (see Tables 3 and 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 2: Edible Fruit Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lundayeh Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Itaan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serudang</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken / Tetaken</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tefuduk binei</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War aley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War used</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teberecek buda'</td>
<td>Actinidiaceae</td>
<td>Saurauia cf. longistyia Merr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teberecek</td>
<td>Actinidiaceae</td>
<td>Saurauia sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringirin</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Baccaurea sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belunu (Malay)</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Mangifera caesia Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Mangifera indica L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felam</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Mangifera sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamut</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Mangifera sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karung / Lam</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Mangifera sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rengeh / Telaka’</td>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Semecarpus hunbryanus Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durian belanda (Malay)</td>
<td>Annonaceae</td>
<td>Annona muricata L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nona (Malay)</td>
<td>Annonaceae</td>
<td>Annona reticulata L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelang batu</td>
<td>Apocynaceae</td>
<td>cf. Leuconotis sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNDAVEH NAME</td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>SCIENTIFIC NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelang</td>
<td>Apocynaceae</td>
<td>Willughbeia coriacea Wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecung ubehe</td>
<td>Araceae</td>
<td>Colocasia orebia A.Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piasau / Butan</td>
<td>Areaceae</td>
<td>Coccus nucifera L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei kurad</td>
<td>Areaceae</td>
<td>Daemonorops didymophylla Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likakau / Belikau</td>
<td>Areaceae</td>
<td>Daemonorops ingens J.Dransf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisian</td>
<td>Areaceae</td>
<td>Salacca vermicularis Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beleleh</td>
<td>Bombaceae</td>
<td>Durio graveolens Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapun salat</td>
<td>Bombaceae</td>
<td>Durio sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalit</td>
<td>Bombaceae</td>
<td>Durio sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapun</td>
<td>Bombaceae</td>
<td>Durio zibethinus Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaper</td>
<td>Bromeliaceae</td>
<td>Ananas comosus (L.) Merr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesila'</td>
<td>Caricaceae</td>
<td>Carica papaya L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitong</td>
<td>Clusiaceae</td>
<td>Garcinia bancana (Miq.) Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapab</td>
<td>Clusiaceae</td>
<td>Garcinia cf. beccarii Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keci luang</td>
<td>Clusiaceae</td>
<td>Garcinia cf. parvifolia (Miq.) Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terur garang / Ticuk mangai'</td>
<td>Clusiaceae</td>
<td>Garcinia dryobalanoides Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mata lawid / Riaku</td>
<td>Clusiaceae</td>
<td>Garcinia forbesii King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubul</td>
<td>Clusiaceae</td>
<td>Garcinia maingayi Hook.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keci / Kayu mein / Tutuberu</td>
<td>Clusiaceae</td>
<td>Garcinia parvifolia (Miq.) Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timon labo</td>
<td>Cucurbitaceae</td>
<td>Mukia javanica (Miq.) C.Jeffrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iti / Eki'</td>
<td>Elaeagnaceae</td>
<td>Elaeagnus ferruginea Rich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uleg</td>
<td>Elaeocarpaceae</td>
<td>Elaeocarpus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipau</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Baccarea lanceolata (Miq.) Muell.Arg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pika</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Baccarea lanceolata (Miq.) Muell.Arg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pugi</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Baccarea macrocarpa (Miq.) Muell.Arg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siet</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Baccarea sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terur berek / Terur baka / Terur payo</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Baccarea sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuer</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Bischofia javanica Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatar</td>
<td>Fabaceae</td>
<td>Parkia sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidaawee</td>
<td>Fagaceae</td>
<td>Castanopsis acuminatissima (Bl.) A.DC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berangan</td>
<td>Fagaceae</td>
<td>Castanopsis costata (Bl.) A.DC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abok</td>
<td>Fagaceae</td>
<td>Castanopsis oviformis Soepadmo / C. cf. hypophoenixia (Seemen) Soepadmo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uken</td>
<td>Fagaceae</td>
<td>Lithocarpus psilophylla Soepadmo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tateh</td>
<td>Flacourtiaceae</td>
<td>Flacourtia rukam Zoll. &amp; Mor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNDAYEH NAME</td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>SCIENTIFIC NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanyang</td>
<td>Flacourtiaeae</td>
<td><em>Pangium edule</em> Reinn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labpak</td>
<td>Hypoxidiaeae</td>
<td><em>Curculigo latifolia</em> Dryand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talal</td>
<td>Lauraeae</td>
<td><em>Litsea garchia</em> Vidal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tei</em> suit bueng</td>
<td>Lorantheae</td>
<td><em>Dendrophthoe pentandra</em> (L.) Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Silaku / Tekang</em></td>
<td>Melastomaeae</td>
<td><em>Medinilla crassifolia</em> (Reinn. ex Bl.) Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikali</td>
<td>Melastomaeae</td>
<td><em>Melastoma malabathricum</em> L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merikubit</td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td><em>Aglaia korthalsii</em> Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Terur suit</em></td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td><em>Aglaia korthalsii</em> Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fika labo / Mata lawid</em></td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td><em>Aglaia odoratissima</em> Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingat</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Lansium domesticum</em> Correa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelidang</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Artocarpus cf. lanceifolius</em> Roxb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feriubi</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Artocarpus cf. primackiana</em> Kochummen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagka</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Artocarpus heterophyllus</em> Lamm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fudu</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Artocarpus kemando</em> Miq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiran / Tarap</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Artocarpus odoratissimus</em> Blanco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terur talau</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Artocarpus sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talun</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Artocarpus tamaran</em> Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likabong</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Ficus cf. francisci H. Winkl.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feriboodok</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Ficus cf. uncinata</em> (King) Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arid</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Ficus megalea</em> Corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunuk</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Ficus parietalis</em> Blume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitah</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Ficus racemosa</em> L. var. elongata (King) Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lison okok</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Ficus sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emel</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td><em>Ficus stolonifera</em> King / <em>F. uncinata</em> (King) Becc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bong</td>
<td>Musaceae</td>
<td><em>Musa sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pidara / Semendara</em></td>
<td>Myristiaeae</td>
<td><em>Horsfieldia</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tereh / Decer pelanuk</em></td>
<td>Myrsiniaeae</td>
<td><em>Ardisia</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War ilang</td>
<td>Myrsiniaeae</td>
<td><em>Embellia philippinensis</em> A.D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipet</td>
<td>Myrtiaeae</td>
<td><em>Decaspermum parviflorum</em> (Lam.) A.J.Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jambu (Malay)</em></td>
<td>Myrtiaeae</td>
<td><em>Psidium guajava</em> L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buau / Binuber</em></td>
<td>Myrtiaeae</td>
<td><em>Syzigium foxworthianum</em> (Ridl.) Merr. &amp; Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uber</td>
<td>Myrtiaeae</td>
<td><em>Syzigium polyanthum</em> (Wight) Walp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNDAYEH NAME</td>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>SCIENTIFIC NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambu air (Malay)</td>
<td>Myrtaceae</td>
<td>Syzygium samarangense (Blume) Merr. &amp; Perry; or S. aqueum (Burm.f.) Alston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markisa (Malay)</td>
<td>Passifloraceae</td>
<td>Passiflora edulis Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisang lalid</td>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>Rubus benguetensis Elmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serinit / Tabpa serinit</td>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>Rubus moluccanus L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidang</td>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>Rubus rosifolius J.E.Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyor</td>
<td>Rutaceae</td>
<td>Citrus microcarpa Bunge; C. maxima (Burm.) Merr.; C. sinensis (L.) Osbeck; C. medica L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demicir</td>
<td>Sapindaceae</td>
<td>Lepisanthes fruticosa (Roxb.) Leenh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sia</td>
<td>Sapindaceae</td>
<td>Nephelium cuspidatum Bl. var. eriopetalum (Miq.) Leenh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rambutan (Malay)</td>
<td>Sapindaceae</td>
<td>Nephelium lappaceum L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beritem</td>
<td>Sapindaceae</td>
<td>Nephelium rambutan-ake (Labill.) Leenh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuder</td>
<td>Sapindaceae</td>
<td>Unknown species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arau / Kuceng</td>
<td>Tiliaceae</td>
<td>Microcos cf. elmeri Merr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sifei</td>
<td>Urticaceae</td>
<td>Debregeasia longifolia (Burm.f.) Wedd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terebak becuk</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Alpinia latilabris Ridl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terebak labo / Terebak fayeh</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Alpinia ligulata K.Schum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terebak</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Alpinia nieuwenhuizii Val. / A. glabra Ridl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubu beritem</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Alpinia sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubu bigan</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Amomum cf. polycarpum K.Schum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salleh</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Etingeria elatior (Jack) R.M.Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubu / Baku deravauc</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Etingeria punicea (Roxb.) R.M. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teladan</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Hornstedtia affinis Ridl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teladan becuk / Teladan fayeh / Teladan biki</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Hornstedtia scyphifera Steud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubu becit</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Plagiostachys croycodcalyx (K.Schum.) B.L.Burtt &amp; R.M.Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubu termung</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>Plagiostachys sp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract
A documentation of the traditional medicinal plant knowledge and knowledge of their uses by the Dusun Tobilung was conducted in 1999 in Kampong Toburon, Kota Belud, Sabah. Based on interviews with seventeen informants within the study site, information on the traditional medicinal plants was classified according to their vernacular and Malay names, scientific and family names, parts of plants used and uses. A total of forty-nine species of plants from thirty-three families are hereby reported. All of the plants were collected within the study site. Interestingly only four out of thirty-four plants were cultivated by the villagers while the rest were found growing as garden weed or in the forest.

Figure 1. Map of Sabah

Introduction
Arthur (1954) pioneered research into ethnic *Materia Medica* in Sabah. Ensuing studies on the uses of plants in traditional Dusun medicine included that on the Dusun uses of ceremonial plants (Wati 1978), Dusun/Kadazan of Tambunan (Guntavid 1983,

*Corresponding author. E-mail: mashitah@ums.edu.my; telephone: 088-320135; fax: 088-320291.

The Dusun Tobilung community in Kampong Taburun was chosen as the site for the present study as it is the ethnic community of one of us (G. Pasok). Kampong Toburun (6°30'N 116°30'E) is situated approximately 48 km away from Kota Belud town (Tangah and Wong 1995). It is surrounded by the Crocker and Sir James Brooke Ranges. The main mode of transportation is by pick-up truck. The journey takes approximately one and one-half hours.

Kampong Toburun is divided into Kampong Toburun Damang, headed by village headman Mr. Anggun Ripou, and Kampong Toburun Tembulawan, headed by Mr. Madsikoh Sombiou. The study site is dominated by Dusun Tobilung, the majority of whom are paddy farmers and live in bamboo houses built on stilts.

Objective of Study

The objective of the study was to document knowledge of traditional medicinal plants and their uses by the Dusun Tobilung of Kampong Toburun, Kota Belud.

Methodology

Information was compiled by the direct interview as well as rapid appraisal method using questionnaires. Plant specimens collected were preserved in ethanol prior to drying in the laboratory. Specimens were identified using keys and cross referencing with other herbaria.

Results and Discussion

Information on the traditional medicinal plants of the Dusun Tobilung, their scientific, vernacular and Malay names, uses, parts of plants used, distribution status, informants and voucher numbers are listed in Table 1.

Nearly all the informants were in the 45 and above age group and six of them were women. Only two of them were known healers or bobolians while the rest have knowledge of traditional medicinal plants but were not bobolians. All the informants had acquired knowledge of traditional medicinal plants from a family member. In every village only one to two people were well-versed with the usc(s) of the plants in traditional medicine. On the average, youths demonstrated a lack of knowledge or experience compared to the more senior members of the community on the uses of traditional medicinal plants. Nearly all members of the community approached who were below the age of 45 years preferred visiting the Government hospital in Kota Marudu and using Western medicine versus traditional medicinal plants in treating even non-life threatening ailments because Western medicine took effect quickly and was easier to use.

Conclusion

The documentation of traditional knowledge is inherently important as it provides necessary reference for effective policymaking for the preservation of the natural environment and national heritage. Its importance as cultural evidence can no longer be denied in light of diminishing knowledge.
Table 1. List of traditional medicinal plants of the Dusun Tobilung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Tobilung name</th>
<th>Malay name</th>
<th>Part used</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Informant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANNONACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polyalthia insignis</em></td>
<td>Dolipanas</td>
<td>Mempisang</td>
<td>Fruit, stem</td>
<td>“Susuk”#</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOCYNACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alstonia macrophylla</em></td>
<td>Mengalang</td>
<td>Setinggi</td>
<td>Sap</td>
<td>To treat epileptic seizures</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAEAEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acorus calamus</em></td>
<td>Komburongo</td>
<td>Jerangau</td>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>To ward off evil and evil behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eupatoria odoratum</em></td>
<td>Sojar/Konsuma</td>
<td>Rumput Jepun</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To treat cuts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Blumea balsamifera</em></td>
<td>Tawawo</td>
<td>Daun sambung</td>
<td>Whole plant</td>
<td>To treat gastrospasm</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVULVACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indet</td>
<td>Tawar tangau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>As anti-inflammation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRASSULACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kalanchoe pinnata</em></td>
<td>Kapal</td>
<td>Sedingin</td>
<td>Whole plant</td>
<td>As antipyretic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYPERACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kylinga brevifolia</em></td>
<td>Kingkmut</td>
<td>Rumput teki</td>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>To treat boils</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DILLENIACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dillenia suffruticosa</em></td>
<td>Doringin</td>
<td>Simpoh air</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To treat headaches</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Implanted in the skin to increase physical attractiveness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Malay name</th>
<th>Part used</th>
<th>应用</th>
<th>Informant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DILLENIACEAE</strong></td>
<td>Mempias</td>
<td>Sap</td>
<td>Invigorating</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tecoma scandens</em></td>
<td>Meriokan</td>
<td>Bark</td>
<td>To ward off evil and evil behavior</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUPHORBIACEAE</strong></td>
<td>Jarak Belanda</td>
<td>Bark, leaves</td>
<td>To treat sprains</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Croton angucras</em></td>
<td>Dukung anak</td>
<td>Roots</td>
<td>To treat ailments involving the liver</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jatropha curcas</em></td>
<td>Jarak besar</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To treat temporary deafness</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phyllanthus amarus</em></td>
<td>Rangasan</td>
<td></td>
<td>As antidote for bodily pains</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUPHORBIACEAE</strong></td>
<td>Kulubung tambang</td>
<td>Ruas</td>
<td>As postpartum aid</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Streptocarpus communis</em></td>
<td>Sgumai tanda</td>
<td>Sap</td>
<td>To treat visible ulcers or tumors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAMINAE</strong></td>
<td>Wadan</td>
<td>Bark</td>
<td>To ward off evil and evil behavior</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cymbopogon nardus</em></td>
<td>Morugion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific name</td>
<td>Tobiling name</td>
<td>Malay name</td>
<td>Part used</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABIATAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocimum sanctum</td>
<td>Bawing kuda</td>
<td>Selasih</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To soothe rashes and eczema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAURACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litsea odorifera</td>
<td>Tandas</td>
<td>Padang mawas</td>
<td>Bark, roots</td>
<td>As anti-hypertensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAURACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnamomum iners</td>
<td>Magkapur</td>
<td>Teja</td>
<td>Bark, roots</td>
<td>To treat tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGUMINOSAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derris elliptica</td>
<td>Limpodos/tubo/gamut</td>
<td>Tuba</td>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>Stops crying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGUMINOSAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia occidentalis</td>
<td>Kurubawa manuk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Roots</td>
<td>To treat hoarseness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGUMINOSAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia alata</td>
<td>Kurubawai</td>
<td>Gelenggang</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To treat rashes and eczema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGUMINOSAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalbergia sp.</td>
<td>Kowilan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To treat colds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LILIACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indet.</td>
<td>Tawar tokoro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Isi bawang</td>
<td>To treat hernia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALVACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urena lobata</td>
<td>Tondolupang</td>
<td>Pulut-pulut</td>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>As anti-inflammation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALVACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida rhombifolia</td>
<td>Kotopon wogok</td>
<td>Seleguri padang</td>
<td>Roots</td>
<td>As antidote for poison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific name</td>
<td>Tobiling name</td>
<td>Malay name</td>
<td>Part used</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARANTHACEAE</td>
<td>Lias</td>
<td>Bembang gajah</td>
<td>Sap from shoots</td>
<td>To treat conjunctivitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donax cannaeformis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELASTOMACEAE</td>
<td>Golosing/galata</td>
<td>Senduduk</td>
<td>Roots, leaves</td>
<td>To treat cuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melastoma malabathricum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENISPERMACEAE</td>
<td>Tonsisitou</td>
<td>Akar mengkunyi</td>
<td>Sap from stem</td>
<td>Invigorating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisbraurea chloroleuca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRTACEAE</td>
<td>Bayabas</td>
<td>Jambu batu</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To treat gastrospasms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psidium guajava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLEACEAE</td>
<td>Lampada tikus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Roots</td>
<td>To eliminate toothaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinanthus phriflorus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIFLORACEAE</td>
<td>Tampasak</td>
<td>Letup-letup</td>
<td>Whole plant</td>
<td>To treat asthma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passiflora foetida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMAE</td>
<td>Tingaton</td>
<td>Pinang</td>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>To treat cuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areca catechu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPERACEAE</td>
<td>Dangkar</td>
<td>Kadok</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>As antipyretic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper samentosum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBIACEAE</td>
<td>Sintap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To eliminate headaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeaauclae gigantean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBIACEAE</td>
<td>Siroromuk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sap from stem</td>
<td>To eliminate headaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotria goysulosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific name</td>
<td>Tobilung name</td>
<td>Malay name</td>
<td>Part used</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBIACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Uncaria acidi</em></td>
<td>Langkawit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To eliminate toothaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBIACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mussaenda frondosa</em></td>
<td>Baliadok</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To eliminate headaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Murraya koenigii</em></td>
<td>Tontuk pelanuk</td>
<td>Daun kari</td>
<td>Roots</td>
<td>To treat gingivitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Citrus microcarpa</em></td>
<td>Limau nipsis</td>
<td>Limau nipsis</td>
<td>Whole plant</td>
<td>As antidote for poison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMAROUBACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brucea javanica</em></td>
<td>Riringit</td>
<td>Lada pahit</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To treat gastrospasms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STERCULIACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pterospermum sp.</em></td>
<td>Sungkolingan</td>
<td>Bayur</td>
<td>Bark</td>
<td>To ward off evil and evil behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THYMELAEACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wikstroemia adrosaemifolia</em></td>
<td>Sinantali</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bark</td>
<td>To eliminate headaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMBILLIFERAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Centella asiatica</em></td>
<td>Tolingo ralan</td>
<td>Pegaga</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To treat tinnitus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBENACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Callicarpa longifolia</em></td>
<td>Gonggoloput</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To eliminate headaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITACEAE/LEEACEAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Leea indica</em></td>
<td>Tatip-tatip</td>
<td>Mali-mali</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>To eliminate headaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Knowledge acquired from</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Bunkilou</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mrs Dorinsun</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr Ganang</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mrs Jaminah</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Healer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mr Jumin</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Healer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mr Kunsilim</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mrs Kusinah</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr Kurudot</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr Madsikoh</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Dream</td>
<td>Village Head/Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr Malawit</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Various sources</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr Mansor</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr Matusin2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Father, friend</td>
<td>Retired government servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mr Pasok2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Parents, friend</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mrs Sinandong</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Parents, friend</td>
<td>Healer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mr Sorinon</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Parents, friend</td>
<td>Government servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mrs Timoi</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mrs Yorindo</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ACADEMIC CORRECTNESS UNDER MONARCHY.
UNIVERSITI BRUNEI DARUSSALAM AND ITS RESEARCH

Roger Kershaw
295 Clashnessie
Lochinver IV27 4JF
Scotland


A Retrospective Introduction
The article that follows was written in 1998, four years after I left Brunei Darussalam at the end of a ten-year stint with the Brunei Ministry of Education. That stint had included a short spell at the then embryonic Universiti Brunei Darussalam, as it began to absorb the Institute of Education. The article has not previously been published in English, but appeared in German translation in Periphus (Kershaw 2000). I am grateful for the permissive policy of the Südasien Institut, Heidelberg, towards reappearances in English — not to mention the original, ready acceptance of the article in 1998 and generous departmental mobilization for its translation.¹ Needless to say, the opportunity

¹ Some problems arose with the translation, and the References were incomplete, but the 36 notes were rendered flawlessly and need not be reproduced here. In the German text, the principal corrigenda are as follows:
p. 129, col. 1, l. 28: for Gerichtskreise read Hofkreise (i.e., the translators thought my “Court circles” referred not to the Palace but to the Judiciary — yet I myself passed it at checking stage);
p. 129, col. 1, l. 20: read: Staaten, die durch “soft authoritarianism” gekennzeichnet;
p. 131, col. 1, l. 1: for vorbereitete read das Vorwort schrieb (cf. the first part of footnote 8 for the text in question);
to publish now with the *BRB*, with no changes from the original text, but two new notes, is also greatly appreciated.

**Part I: The “Correct” University**

The oppressive atmosphere of “political correctness” of which conservative opinion in the United Kingdom and United States is wont to complain may be a tribute to the effectiveness of liberal and left-wing thought, in recent decades, in discrediting certain political and social norms of the upper and middle classes, at least to the extent of making their adherents perceive that the norms might reflect “self-interest” in some degree, not exclusively a broader “public good.” There was even a period when some basically conservative individuals in Western universities felt beleaguered on a range of issues, both internal and external to university life — and behaved as if discreetness was the better part of valor. In Britain, so it seemed, “academic freedom” was less often invoked as a bulwark of self-expression, indeed became subject to self-doubt in its own right. The doctrine which depicts that freedom as a subtle instrument of the hegemony of “capital” or the State was not without its own subtle effect on the intellectual climate — notwithstanding the relative unconditionality of state funding of British universities in those days; the almost total freedom of revolutionary expression; and the striking reluctance of governments of any hue to tender support to university authorities in conflict with radical students.

This homily, even if it be accepted as a reflection of typical late 1960s/early 1970s academic reality in one country of the West, may seem a rather off-beat way of introducing Universiti Brunei Darussalam and its works. But connections can be established, both causal (in real life) and heuristic (i.e., at a comparative-analytical level). In causal terms, the image of “student revolution” in the West made it not only possible but politically prudent for the Minister of Education-cum-Vice Chancellor to declare, at the launch of the University in 1985, that “academic freedom” would not be tolerated. It was left to expatriate staff to work out, in due course, how far this was applicable to

---

p. 132, col. 2, l. 30: for *Malaien*, read *Malaysiern*;

p. 134, col. 2, l. 35: for *Brunei insöfern* read *insöfern Brunei*;

p. 136, col. 2, l. 12: for *Lohn* read *Preis*;

p. 137, col. 2, ll. 10-12: the words from *Diese ungefähre Zeitspanne* to *Verfassung von Brunei* (1959) refer only to *Sultan Omaers sechsjähriger Kampf...*, not to chapters before 5 or after 7 of Hussainmiya’s book, and would be well placed in brackets, with congruent adjustments to the rest of the sentence;

p. 139, col. 1, l. 4: for *und weniger unter* substitute *doch ohne*;

p. 141, col. 2, l. 23: for *mit dem britischen Residenten* substitute *um die Machtübertragung*;

p. 142, col. 1, l. 6: delete *darstellt*;

p. 142, col. 1, l. 38: for *PRB*, read *PRO*;

p. 145, col. 1, l. 32: after *entgegenzutreten* insert *untergeordnet*;

p. 149, col. 1, l. 25: for *ersetzen*, read *einpflanzen* (cf., p. 132, col. 1, sentences 2-3, for the argument about the conditions for the wide establishment of English to which this concluding comment refers. I spotted this error in the first proofs but failed to rectify it in on a subsequent disk).
teaching and research as well as to student discipline. And for comparative purposes, it is in fact interesting to notice how “political correctness” in any area of Brunei life (not only the academic) becomes “immanent” without being formally spelt out, at least in any law or regulation. There is a lacuna even of any posterior enactment of laws to enforce a requirement of “correctness” after it has begun to gain limited acceptance in society, as often happens in the West. This facet may perhaps serve to illuminate another, more fundamental divergence from the West, and thus cast doubt on any would-be “structural affinity” across boundaries: namely that in Brunei “correctness” serves political stabilization or the status quo of a permanently dominant State (a dominance which operates through a bureaucracy but often proves willing and able to forgo written regulation), whereas in the democratic West the functions of “correctness” are “subversive” and initiate change (change which needs the backing of law in order to institutionalize it in a society which respects law but does not bow to the State on principle).

There is, however, one ironical, partial affinity between the university scene in Britain and Brunei which should be mentioned for the sake of completeness. In the event, “the student revolution” had very little long-term impact, apart from lowering the prestige of universities and their freedoms in the eyes of Conservative leader and monetarist-to-be, Margaret Thatcher. The State has now intervened to abolish security of academic tenure, for all intents and purposes — though in the name of economic accountability, not, of course, for the weakening of “reactionary attitudes in the intellectual agencies of capitalism.” Arguably, British universities approximate far more closely to a model of “agencies of capitalism” today than ever they did before 1968. If Marxist analysis of academic structures had scant applicability in the 1960s, there is certainly room for postmodernist critiques in the 1990s. Such critiques might also include in their scope the impact of “Islamic” beneficence in the funding of new university buildings and programs. The analytical skills thus developed could in due course be applied to the interaction of State power and academic expression in the “oil-rich” societies of the Muslim world itself.

With reference to Brunei, this essay has already proposed, in effect, as one possible starting point or angle of approach, the non-salient role of written law. In fact the Brunei State, as paymaster, does indicate its displeasure, and thus its expectations, obliquely and retrospectively, when refusing to renew the contract of any expatriate who did not toe the invisible line of “correct” criteria. But before the first three years of a contract are up, an expatriate at UBD could well have been misled by the more audible honoring, at the level of official declaration, of the principles of innovative research and stimulating teaching. The fact is that the Brunei authorities are not unaware of the tradition of academic freedom which accounts for so much of the achievement and prestige of universities in the West — to emulate which, at least in superficial or nominal respects, is one potent way of symbolizing independent statehood and modernity. In other words — and ironically — the Brunei authorities are themselves subject to the pressures of a progressive kind of “political correctness,” emanating from the West. The unique challenge for the bureaucracy of this Malay absolute monarchy, in the development of a university, was to achieve a workable compromise between international credibility, based on the presumed international norms of academic life, and control of the free flow
of ideas which could subvert the monarchy. One expression of the search for a compromise has been the accent on research that is “relevant to the needs of the nation.”

The fact that even a number of Western staff employed at UBD have seen their way to making personal accommodations along lines acceptable to the territorial authority might seem to be to the credit of Bruneian acumen in political management. Such a compliment might appear to be less valid, however, in the light of cases of political accommodation back home when academics were assailed by a diametrically different consensus from “the left,” which the State power never actively backed but may have viewed permissively; or latterly by pressures from a more “right-wing” State which was interventionist in reducing academic autonomy, yet distanced in terms of reducing State funding and forcing universities to seek subsidies from the private sector or abroad. The compliment (to Bruneian political management) might prove even less tenable with regard to Asian expatriates whose professional socialization took place in politics typified by “soft authoritarianism” and universities subject to the interventionist tutelage of nationalist elites.

As things worked out, however, the Brunei State did not have to be concerned wholly with “damage limitation” on the campus. As the early years passed and the bureaucracy and court circles saw that the campus could indeed be controlled, contrary to their worst fears, they began to see it as a potential haven and shrine of “Bruneian” rather than “Western” values, and a pillar of the independent State, not just its symbol — though not without the potential to contribute some useful ritual to the process of political maintenance, at the same time. An Academy of Brunei Studies (Akademi Pengajian Brunei, hereinafter APB) was established, with a brief not only to teach the compulsory State ideology courses to students but to act as research directorate to the National Committee on M.I.B. (Melayu Islam Beraja). The creation of the APB was realistic from a staffing point of view, since from 1989 numbers of History, Malay Language, Malay Literature and Islamic Studies graduates of UBD itself, taught by Indonesians and Malaysians, had been coming on stream. State ideologues have set particular store by the claim that the Malay Muslim Monarchy is not a figment of their own minds but a “living reality” with a long history, the more extensive truth about which can and should be revealed by dedicated research — preferably by members of that same society and polity.

Nevertheless, as far as research on Brunei generally is concerned, the Minister is on record as praising the UBD expatriates for having shown an unexpected capacity for empathy with “Brunei conditions.” We may take it that these complimentary words were not particularly intended for the writers who had kept to subjects without any sociocultural dimension or implication — as in the uncontroversially mathematical piece on investment by the first Head of Economics and current Head of Research at APB (Mochammad Nazir 1992). Yet UBD did owe a considerable debt to this versatile Indonesian for his involvement in the establishment of the APB and his dynamic lectures on “Bruneian identity,” which had helped to lend credibility, on its own terms, to the early M.I.B. course. (Those who attended the lectures had been much struck by Dr. Nazir’s own identification with the “Bruneian identity,” as passionate as his denunciations of Western culture.) But uppermost in the Minister’s mind, in launching UBD’s contribution to the Sultan’s Silver Jubilee celebrations, must have been the Sri Lankan Muslim scholar who had written a laudatory essay on a national icon, the late
Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddien III (Hussainmiya 1992), and was on the point of completing a monumental work on the same subject (Hussainmiya 1995).

There is a kind of symmetry in the fact that foreign academic clients of the Brunei absolute monarchy may become involved in elaborating a State ideology which rationalizes the legacy of the architect of that form of rule, or in weaving legend around the memory of the late Sultan as an historical figure. Interestingly, as far as “legend” is concerned, its principal thread would seem to consist in the denial that the late Sultan was the architect of anything other than the welfare of his people. It is the essence of any expression of “correctness” in Brunei, as has been suggested, that it helps to stabilize and consolidate the status quo. Because of the pervasive and penetrating (not to say “correct”!) example of democracy in so many countries of the world, the Brunei State prefers to project a “caring monarch” rather than an “absolute ruler” to its subjects. Such revelation about the present Sultan and his father must be the most “correct” of all tenets of Brunei doctrine. And where better to create academic underpinnings for it than in the local university? It would not be solely the Bruneian staff who would be aware of the “correct” doctrinal parameters for writing about the monarchy, for this is one area where propagation is far from informal or tacit: it occupies many an official speech and, by the time of the Silver Jubilee, was seen in a significant work by the leading Bruneian historian (Mohd. Jamil 1992).

Before pursuing the analysis of B. A. Hussainmiya’s powerful opus, a little more institutional context may be helpful, by way of validating the foregoing assertions about UBD and providing an equitable yardstick for judgment on its most productive author. Let us briefly peruse the author-lists in UBD’s two major commemorative volumes to date: the royal Silver Jubilee volume (Abu Bakar [ed.] 1992) and the UBD 10th Anniversary volume (Abdul Latif [ed.] 1996). It is noticeable that out of 24 contributors to the 23 papers in the first volume, only four were Westerners, while in the second commemorative volume, of the 38 contributors to 31 papers, only two appear to be Westerners. Of course, non-appearances in their pages could conceivably be evidence of lack of a “research-active” status on someone’s part. But it is surely extraordinary that in the first volume only one Westerner features from the Departments with a more salient disciplinary interface with politics: History, Critical Thinking, Economics, Public Policy and Administration (PPA), and Management Studies; and in the second volume, no one. If one knows the several Western expatriates who were on the strength of these Departments during the years in question, one is more likely to suspect that research was going on but that its practitioners felt prudently “constrained,” or were officially discouraged, from publishing through UBD; while a number of others may have decided not to add Brunei to their research interests in the first place.

A tangential glance, first of all, at two pieces which were contributed from the notionally less “sensitive” Department of English and Faculty of Education (in 1992 and 1996 respectively) will suggest that constraints are certainly in play when publication does ensue. It seems at least mysterious that an essay on the prospects for successful implementation of the “bilingual” system in Brunei schools tells us that one of the important enabling conditions, as prescribed by theory, that is also provided on the ground is that the native tongue is as dominant and prestigious as English (Mohd. Gary 1992a:101). This perception is seriously at odds with the superior prestige of English
among the English-educated secular elite (which is precisely why it was felt politically prudent to extend English-medium education to the masses!). And surely the new Bilingual System itself is eroding the prestige of Malay — while creating a generation of semi-linguals who are not functional in English either. Even less true to sociological reality and possibilities is the paper on an “early childhood education program” for UBD, based on Piaget’s constructivism and Dewey’s progressivism and thus fundamentally revolutionary in principle for Brunei, unworkable in practice. The scheme is vitiated out of its author’s own mouth where she simultaneously advocates “an attitude that enables practitioners to take risks and challenge tradition in order to implement their ideals into sound educational practice” (Noori 1996:103) but proposes to “transmit teachings which are consistent with national aspirations whereby the nation is seen as a Malay Islamic Monarchy” (Noori 1996:104).

Reverting to the five “sensitive” Departments, it is similarly noticeable that the single Western contributor in 1992 had chosen an anodyne or nationalistically “correct” subject — actually in literature (Gunn 1992) — even though at that very time a quite “explosive” study was on the stocks in Australia (Gunn 1993), which was to play a part, one cannot doubt, in the abrupt foreshortening of the author’s second contract in 1994. Of the two papers on International Relations, both by Malaysians in the Department of PPA, the first is notable for devoting only 13 lines to Brunei (Shafruddin 1992:276); the second for not mentioning the Sultan’s personal financial diplomacy, especially in the Nicaraguan Contras affair, even after stating that “as head of State and Government, Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah takes a personal interest in Brunei’s foreign policy” (Thambipillai 1992:281).

The third study from a member of the PPA Department (a Sri Lankan) merges Public Administration with History, and overlays a fundamental soundness on the foundation-laying for the absolute monarchy in the 1950s with soothing formulations such as “He [Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin] brought to bear upon matters of administration an assertion of national pride and integrity, amply supported by the growing financial reserves of the state,” or “Thus [through the 1959 Constitution], the three pillars of the M.I.B. concept associated with Brunei’s past were put in place, as an expression of cultural nationalism” (Wijeweera 1992:184; 189). For every writer on historical, administrative and economic aspects of Brunei the question of how monarchy and government divide up the revenues is apparently off-limits. In fact there is no article on public finance at all (though three articles on economic subjects: one from the Department of Economics, on investment, i.e., Moehammad Nazir 1992, as cited above; and two from the Department of Management Studies, on industrialization, and small businesses, respectively).

Significantly, the volume leads off with an article by the Minister on the national ideology, in somewhat pseudo-scientific mold (Abdul Aziz 1992); another on the same, by a local lecturer who had been sent to the University of Malaya to do a Ph.D. on the subject (Hashim 1992); and a piece by one of the local graduates at APB, who makes a none-too-convincing attempt to demonstrate that the magical invocations of court ceremonies, derived from the Hindu era, and the Malay tradition of blind loyalty to the Raja, are in fact fundamentally “Islamic” (Abdul Hamid 1992). A more convincingly pioneering and professional essay on Islam in Brunei, by an Indonesian (Iik Arifin 1992), is the third piece from the Department of History (counting Gunn 1992) and the third piece on History (counting Wijeweera 1992). For the present reviewer’s taste, Iik Arifin
Mansurnoor’s work is in a class of its own. But one may be permitted to observe with a friendly smile that here, part of the writer’s talent goes into “making the best of a bad job” as far as the paucity of documents to support any thesis on Brunei is concerned.

In the second commemorative volume, as has been mentioned, neither of the two contributing Westerners is from one of the five “sensitive” Departments, which again produce nine papers (two from Economics, three from History, one from Management and three from PPA). Of three papers on International Relations, the first, by a Pakistan-born specialist (History Department), contains no commentary on Brunei’s role as such, although its synopsis portends otherwise: “Negara Brunei Darussalam has played an active role in ensuring continued progress on both these subjects [regional security and trade liberalization]” (Muhammad Kamlin 1996:326). The second (Shafruddin 1996) is by the Malaysian author of the first IR paper in the 1992 collection, but covers much the same ground as the paper by his colleague in 1992 (i.e., Thambipillai 1992). The essay may be judged more versatile than its “forerunner,” but seems to be geared to an “agenda,” namely to argue that actually Brunei Darussalam is not a real “small state” at all, because it possesses remarkable assets which guarantee its recognition and survival. Then the second International Relations author of 1992 extends the discussion of regional economic cooperation begun by her colleague in 1992 — and with rather more reference to Brunei’s role (or at least its need for trade-driven diversification) but no reference to the long slump in oil prices which most fundamentally has necessitated economic rethinking, especially in a situation where the royal “take” from oil revenues is inelastic and non-negotiable (see Thambipillai 1996). There is again one paper on an aspect of public administration: by a Malaysian (the third writer from PPA) writing on land policies and planning, who mentions the Sultan’s inherent mineral rights and recent power of veto on land transactions but, predictably enough, not the mechanisms whereby the royal family acquires land in private ownership (Lim 1996). Public finance is now represented, from the Department of Economics (Manan 1996). This author discusses in not a little detail how, in a climate of (admitted) oil-price decline and rising population, the government can and should fund higher public expenditure by a more efficient mobilization of non-tax revenue. However, his taciturnity on the fact that such revenue includes royalties suggests that he is aware of certain sensitivities in this area. The contribution from the Department of Management, on the Islamic Bank of Brunei, usefully identifies the fact that it was converted from the previously existing International Bank of Brunei, but attributes this to a “royal command.” It is not mentioned, even in a spirit of commendation or flattery, that the Sultan was the owner of the first IBB and thus acted to transform his own property into a religious-cum-political asset (Murshid 1996:193). (The second article from the Economics Department is also on banking, but deals with the overall scene, and from a strictly banking point of view.) In this volume the main ideological exercise comes from the editor and Director of APB (Abdul Latif 1996), while the by now successful candidate for a doctorate in M.I.B. argues against equal rights for Chinese except on the basis of total assimilation (Hashim 1996). The role of the late Sultan in the 1950s is again presented, and from a not very different perspective than was seen in 1992 (Hussainmusa 1996). And last, but very far from least, one is again moved to express admiration for the third contributor from the Department of History — one of only two in the subject of History (Iik Arifin 1996) — for his versatile review of
the idea of monarchy in Malay history. But once again one might comment in the
driendliest possible spirit that inasmuch as the Brunei case is sui generis, the specifically
documentary evidence for it is hardly extensive, and that the authenticity of one source
discovered in recent years by the Head of the Brunei History Centre is not unassailable.

The recurring theme of non-participation by Westerners, running through the previous
three paragraphs, probably calls for a little justification, short of apology, before we move
on. The exercise may appear to involve a crude classification of UBD staff according to
“ethnic origin,” and some readers may suspect a latent presumption of concealed
excellence in the Western quarter. It cannot be too much stressed that several of the
Asians at UBD have gained Ph.D.s from world-class universities and share universally
authoritative academic values to the full. In particular, a period of membership of a
prestigious research program, with an uncorrupted background of Southeast Asian
culture, makes an absolutely unbeatable scholarly combination in Southeast Asian
Studies, in the present writer’s view. Nor should the presence of a sprinkling of able
African staff be left out of any account of UBD. The purpose of the “ethnic calculation”
has been simply to suggest that natives of “Western” countries are surprisingly
underrepresented in the University’s publications, even though they were numerically a
quite prominent element in the early years, and not professional novices for the most part.
In fact their standing may have been equal to the demands of international refereed
journals; but then, why not offer at least some preliminary work on Brunei to UBD?
Admittedly again, some of the first wave had already moved on by 1992; but it is well-
known that in some cases this was not unconnected with pessimism about the way the
University was evolving. Meanwhile, the present discussion has inferred that certain
Asian expatriate writing has evinced a degree of political accommodation. But in the light
of the “Western” examples cited from the English Department and Faculty of Education,
and indeed in view of the sheer absence of many of the Western expatriates from the two
collections, there can be no question, and has been no intention, of claiming an
exclusively Asian “ethnic trait” in this respect.

At all events, after everything that has been said or insinuated about an unconducive
research environment, the most remarkable feature of the second volume remains to be
mentioned: the disarming appeal from the Vice Chancellor to the expatriates who are not
“research-active” not to use the alleged “sensitivity” of any research as an excuse for
inactivity. Yet the very fact that a high Brunei official should be moved to mention such
a sensitive matter publicly at all does suggest the existence of a negative perception that
was prevalent and deeply rooted, having impinged on his consciousness and challenged
complacency. And precisely in such a critical situation one wonders whether the
statement as a whole will have assuaged cynicism, for the Vice Chancellor still admits
that anything seriously political (i.e., analytical of politics, not just political in the sense
of evincing a committed position at odds with the regime) is off-limits. This principle is
hardly belied by anything in B. A. Hussainmiya’s book, for which the Minister (now
Chairman of the University Council) acted as an indispensable sponsor. Indeed it may be
relevant to reflect that Hussainmiya took up research on the life of the late Sultan after the
Minister had stopped recruitment to the undergraduate degree in History. The Minister’s

---

2 The full quotation is printed (in English) in note 17 of the German version; see p. 135.
motive was largely to channel future student cohorts into more practical subjects and make them more employable upon graduation, not any clear bias against history as such. But the effect of the move was that Hussainmiya himself, as the latest recruit to the Department, found that his own employability was cast in doubt. One can have nothing but admiration for Hussainmiya’s vigorous fight against redundancy, and it may also have been his achievement to acquaint the Minister with some potential benefits of historical research. But some readers might infer from certain features of the literary sequel that, on occasion, security of tenure at UBD carries a tacit intellectual price-tag.

**Part 2: The Correct Kingdom**

The first thing that must be said, ungrudgingly, about *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III and Britain*, is that it is a pioneering work which also invites admiration or envy for the monumental scope of its analysis and supporting documentation, researched and written in little more than two years, as the author states (p. xi). Even allowing that the author was not bearing an onerous teaching load during the period, and was amply funded for world-wide travel, especially to the Public Records Office (PRO) in London, the product is no mean achievement. To do justice to its strengths while advancing a credible critique may only be possible through a series of discrete chapter précis, such as the present critic has attempted elsewhere (Kershaw 1998). Within the constraints of a Review Article, however, it will be necessary to illustrate perceived weaknesses by way of a few selected examples, after first outlining the fundamental themes of the book. The weaknesses in question may inhere in or derive from these themes, or may relate to methodology and the interpretation of individual documents.

As far as scope is concerned, we are introduced to the rise of the British Residency; the salient contrasts between Sultan Ahmad Tajuddin II (reigned 1924-1950) and his brother Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III (reigned 1950-1967); the genesis of Brunei nationalism in both their reigns; Sultan Omar’s six-year struggle for absolute power, in contest with both the Brunei People’s Party (*Parti Rakyat Brunei* or PRB) and the British (more particularly Sir Anthony Abell, the Governor of Sarawak and High Commissioner for Brunei), spanning roughly the period between the First Five-Year Development Plan (1953) and the Brunei Constitution (1959); the Northern Borneo Federation Proposal; the issue of merger with Malaysia; the Rebellion (1962) and its political aftermath (but with a rather evasive treatment of causes); further royal contention with democrats and “the British” (now a Labour Government), up to and including Sultan Omar’s abdication (1964-1967); and the phase of consolidation, comprising the first seventeen years of the formal reign of Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah, up to and including Independence (1967-1984). This final phase is covered very perfunctorily, though with no lack of adulation for the principal protagonist and his son, while Sultan Omar’s six-year struggle prior to 1959 fills nearly four weighty chapters. Sure enough, this is a book focused essentially on the reign of one Sultan and his relations with late-imperial Britain.

If one comes to the volume with a slightly jaundiced preconception of the parameters of allowable research under the Brunei monarchy, one may be surprised at first by the “frankness” of the presentation of the Sultan’s struggle to establish absolutism in the face of populist nationalism and British constitutional doctrine of the time. But this is rationalized by rejecting “democratic correctness” in favor of a “Brunei correctness,” viz.
“the restoration of tradition,” which was especially necessary, it is asserted, because the British had done nothing to create a modern society, ready for democracy; but also (in apparent contradiction with the said omission, one may feel) because the British were tied into a special relationship with the Brunei monarchy which, ultimately, it proved difficult or unacceptably immoral (for Britain) to break out of. By eschewing cross-reference to the other Malay States (especially those of the Unfederated variety) the author avoids having to deal with the awkward reality that British intervention under the 1906 Supplementary Agreement was less accommodating to the Sultanate (that is, more in the mold of “direct rule”) than for all the Peninsular States, whether “Federated” or “Unfederated,” in their Treaties. Surely it was not predictable from the nature of the various Treaties that, when nationalism arose, the British would “abandon” the Peninsular royalty (whose authority over both religion and custom they had always recognized) in favor of democracy, but would “stand by” the Sultan of Brunei (who was autonomous only in religious matters) and allow him to substitute the power of the Resident with a monarchical neo-absolutism under the Constitution of 1959. It is true that the first British Resident had given an undertaking to Sultan Hashim to uphold the succession in the existing line, but that was already more or less standard procedure in the other Malay States too, provided that Sultans were accommodating towards British political priorities; and anyway, does this imply that democracy should be rejected in a time of nationalism, fifty years later? It seems more to the point, with regard to what transpired, that the democratic option in the 1950s was represented by a party (PRB) in a very different mold from the Peninsular UMNO, and that the Sultan of Brunei between 1950-1967 was a political activist without a peer among the royalty of the Malay world in that era. Neither factor was in any way “traditional,” by the way, nor caused by previous British omission or commission. At any rate, the two in combination posed a considerable dilemma for British gradualist constitutionalism, which deserves more empathy than it receives from Hussainmiya, ever ready as he is to mock it — rather in the mode of recent “Asian values” discourse — as Eurocentric, cultural imperialism, insensitive to an “ancient Asian way of life” and even in breach of sacred undertakings. The latter slant seems distinctly odd, when we note that Brunei’s chief ideologist, on the eve of Independence, had compared Brunei and the other Malay States in exactly the opposite sense, saying that the British had broken faith with the Peninsular Sultans but did not do so with the Brunei dynasty (Kershaw 1984:76).

It is also odd to meet, in Hussainmiya, echoes of an anti-British Asian nationalism of yesteryear, which so far from being an inspiration to the late Sultan himself at the time, constituted a democratic anti-model and even more fundamentally an anti-imperialist anti-model, for a dynasty and micro-state which he preferred to see continue under benevolent British protection — less the democratic preconditions for Independence should Independence eventually become unavoidable. Conceivably the author felt it necessary to conjure up a form of British “absolutism” in order either to distract attention from the Brunei version and its contest with democracy, or to justify the Brunei version because of the odds allegedly faced by this micro-polity in search of rightful autonomy. An alternative intuition suggests that Hussainmiya is trying to make his text “M.I.B.-compatible” by insisting on the viability of monarchy and nationalism as a combination. This intellectual position is the vital corollary, of course, of the Sultanate’s denial of the
relevance or sincerity of the PRB’s nationalist project for the country. But Hussainmiya
forgets that the official ideology denies, at the same time, that Brunei was ever colonized.
Thus the “struggle” which he attributes to the Sultan, in so far as it is “against” the
British, is politically “incorrect” in M.I.B. terms, though “correct” where the Sultan is
claimed to have been a more effective fighter for the people’s interest (their welfare under
benign monarchical rule) than the PRB could ever be. What is true, historically, is that the
Sultan was in contest with both the democratically-minded (gradualist) British and the
democratically-minded (radical) PRB, but in playing one off against the other generally
succeeded in keeping the British “on board” for his goals. The evidence for what was
essentially a geo-political “dynastic intrigue” is all present in the text, and Hussainmiya
sometimes hints as much. But being unduly concerned to pass “correct” moral judgments
and present the material within an acceptable framework, he obfuscates the role of
dynastic self-interest in his interpretation; and at the same time exaggerates the “imperial
self-interest” of the British (in order, as we have already speculated, to give the Sultan a
more virtuous reason for “struggle” than that of staving off democracy); but thereby
places himself off-side, ironically, in relation to M.I.B., because pre-Independence Brunei
comes to look like a part of the British colonial imperium. In fact, Hussainmiya’s
solecism is doubly ironical, since the reason for Brunei ideologues’ denial of colonization
is in order to assert the continuity and legitimacy of a monarchical tradition, and
Hussainmiya does uphold this doctrine by way of the myth of a “non-interfering” British
Supplementary Agreement in 1906. Hussainmiya’s taunts at the “lack of British empathy
with the Sultan” in the mid-20th Century may even implant an inkling that the motivating
perception of British colonial officials, of a Sultan who was fighting for his dynasty in a
self-interested rather than altruistically revivalist way, was not untenable.

The chapter which comes nearest to collapsing under the weight of its own
contradictions is Chapter 9, dealing with the barely avoided merger with Malaysia. In an
interpretation which is slightly redolent of the “neo-colonialism” thesis of President
Sukarno, we find the British trying to foist their “late-imperial design” on the Sultan (as
either a development from or alternative to a Northern Borneo Federation), and Kuala
Lumpur trying to do the same as part of its “neo-imperial design” (purely as an alternative
to a Northern Borneo Federation). But this fits uncomfortably with the evidence revealed
in passing that Brunei’s “visionary leader” was alternately totally adrift or rushing into
Malaysia’s embrace in order to save his dynasty from the PRB. If the author had intended
to make a “political” statement, he would have done better to write a book less loaded
with detail, much of which turns out to be “compromising” in terms of the dominant
discourse. He should even have avoided the occasional, self-conscious attempts at
“balance” in interpretation, which have the effect of exposing the dominant discourse for
what it is, with all its fundamental weaknesses. (Note that the surreptitious plurality of
perspectives does not arise from an open-minded “dialogue” with the material, but
consists rather of “nods” in the direction of this or that alternative, with the effect,
whether or not intended, that no reader will be able to say that a particular — often more
natural or conventional — construction is completely missing.) One senses that
Hussainmiya is glancing over his shoulder at a potential academic audience as well as the
Brunei official intelligentsia. But in attempting to render homage, “correctly,” to two
“gods” simultaneously, he may have jeopardized his credibility in the sight of each of
them. It is not without pathos that since and although the Brunei Ministry of Education had fulfilled its presumed deal with Oxford University Press by buying up the whole stock not long after publication, the book has been virtually unobtainable in Brunei because it was locked away instead of being distributed to school libraries.

More graciously, some of the anomalies might be suspected to be the result of an author coming to the subject with no background in modern Southeast Asian history. For instance, there is one plausible perspective on the Malaysia negotiations which would have exonerated the British from the charge of neo-imperialism while making the Sultan’s willing orientation towards Malaysia less “unmentionable” for a pro-monarchy writer: the onward march of communism in the region. This process had already drawn the USA into Vietnam, through the intermediary of the NLF; in the guise of the left wing of PAP (subsequently Barisan Sosialis) it was probably the overriding factor making both Tunku Abdul Rahman and Lee Kuan Yew desire to see Singapore in the Federation; and in the shape of PKI, one of the pillars of Sukarno’s Guided Democracy, it was a key part of the crystallizing strategic menace to Brunei’s south, translated ideologically into Brunei’s midst (Brunei conservatives would think) through the PRB, which had copied much of its rhetoric and its party flag from Indonesia from the start and would have been supported by Indonesian troops in the Rebellion had the party’s military wing not jumped the gun by four months. No matter that the Malaysia Plan itself had galvanized Sukarno and Subandrio to plan military actions to forestall it, quite apart from being the proximate cause of the Rebellion too. It was not least because the British intervened so effectively to sniff it out before international support was forthcoming, and then stationed a battalion of Gurkhas permanently in the oilfield, that the Sultan could contemplate a secure future outside Malaysia when the moment of decision came in July 1963. But this fundamental change in Brunei’s strategic situation is ignored by Hussainmiya as much as the gloowering menace of communism previously. One understands, of course, that in a text which concludes with a glowing tribute to the man who realized his grand vision of resurrecting the glories of Brunei — “in the manner of the legendary golden age of Brunei during the reign of a fifteenth-century ruler, Sultan Bolkiah” (p. 384) — a reminder of the presence of British mercenaries as a psychological, if not strictly physical, prop to the regime of his son, the present-day Bolkiah, would have a somewhat jarring effect. But arguably, a meaningful incorporation of the strategic scenario before the rebellion would not have been “out of step” with regime priorities.

It would be gratifying if the previous paragraph has begun to provide some concrete underpinning for the sweeping assertions which preceded it — in this case by focusing on a surprising lacuna or two in the book’s handling of security (one of them rather unhelpful to the author’s case, the other highly functional to it). Another way of alerting the less specialist reader to the possibility of more pervasive imbalance may be to cite a striking case of both omission and anachronism in the treatment of one minor episode during the preparations for a Constitution. The episode in question concerned the status of the Iban minority in the Bruneian nation-to-be. Generally, Hussainmiya seems to lend tacit support to (or prefers, delicately, not to highlight) the Brunei elite’s paradigm of the Muslim identity and ethnic-Brunei leadership of this nation, by maintaining an almost complete silence on the late Sultan’s vision of it as he worked to transfer the power of the British Residency into his own hands. Specifically, the author’s sympathies are tangible
where he notes the PRB rally in 1960 in support of citizenship for the Ibans yet not the editorial sympathy of the local English-language press. Since editorial opinion at the Borneo Bulletin typically reflected British Residency/High Commission thinking at that period, it seems clear enough that the restrictions in the proposed Nationality Enactment reflected Brunei elite thinking, opposed by the British authorities as well as PRB. The author himself does note the existence of a more liberal British view in June 1959, but mocks it, in a characteristic way, as illustrating the ingrained British proclivity to interfere, improperly, in the “sovereign rights of Brunei” (p. 203). It is not made clear why the British had no right to attempt to influence the future political structure of Brunei at a moment when the 1906 Supplementary Agreement was still in force, and negotiations in progress, precisely, over what form of semi-independent polity the British government should surrender its authority to. Hussainmiya also omits from his documentary appendices the section on citizenship in the Report of the Advisory Committee on the Brunei Constitution (State of Brunei 1954), which recommended that the Dayaks be recognized as indigenous Bruneians. On the other hand, no rationale whatsoever is offered of the Brunei Government’s stand — in spite of the book’s sub-title (“The Making of Brunei Darussalam”) which evokes a nation in process of invention and arouses expectations of some effort of analysis and definition in this respect.

Even where well-known or manifest dimensions of a situation are not omitted or distorted, the reader may experience a nagging curiosity as to the precise content of the vast number of Colonial Office dispatches and minutes cited in the footnotes but rarely excerpted. Do they really all sustain the particular meaning attributed to them individually, let alone the sweep of Hussainmiya’s overall thesis? To give a thoroughly fair answer to this question would require an exposure to the same files as Hussainmiya studied at the PRO, in equivalent if not greater depth. Such a project is beyond the present critic’s reach, but he has, like a number of students of Brunei history, been the recipient of the unstinting generosity of a certain archivist based in London. Among a handful of documents made available, a dispatch from Abell to the Colonial Office (A. M. MacKintosh), dated 30 April 1956, has excited special interest. This is because it is used by Hussainmiya on p. 164 in support of the argument that at that time, just as at other times before and after (i.e., between 1953-1959), the Sultan was pressing for a Brunei Mentri Besar, against the unyielding British. Indeed it is inferred that the Sultan was partly moved by the feelings of his subjects on the matter — but not against his own will. The following two sentences are quoted from the dispatch: “His Highness feels strongly about this matter. He believes that his more vocal subjects will not regard the new Constitution as any advance towards Merdeka if no provision is made for the replacement of the Resident as Chief Executive Office by a Malay.” What Hussainmiya does not quote is the comment which makes it clear that the Sultan himself had no heart for it at all in 1956 — not least because of the parlous condition of royal authority in the Peninsular States in face of the rise of Malay Chief Ministers — and was waiting for an opportunity to side-step popular pressure. For his part, Abell thought such a tactic would be unwise, given the rapid growth of political consciousness. Such selective quotation prompts a slight apprehension as to the soundness of the “populist Sultan versus reactionary Abell” thesis more broadly. It even prompts a query as to the soundness of the alternating “wise
Sultan versus impetuous, democratizing Abell” thesis, since it is manifest that the High Commissioner’s support for a Malay Mentri Besar, here, is pragmatic, not doctrinaire.

Another conspicuous example of selective presentation occurs in Hussainmiya’s discussion of the Rebellion, where he quotes High Commissioner White’s musings about the possible complicity of the Sultan — in order to dismiss the idea as fantasy (pp. 306-308). If one is going to rule out a “Sultan’s-conspiracy theory” one should surely also mention White’s own best evidence to the contrary: that it was a popular revolt against the Sultan and aristocracy, fired by their general conduct as well as the specific policy of merger with Malaysia. White goes on to express his moral repugnance at having to stand by such a government. Were these observations deemed too indecent for royal and aristocratic consumption in 1995? Consistently, there is no reference, either, to the post-Rebellion reporting and scorching analysis by the local weekly newspaper. The analytical emphasis by Hussainmiya is on British failings of internal security, and the weaknesses of Brunei Government communication with the people during the Rebellion itself, as reported and criticized after the event by the Straits Times of Singapore.

We have given examples of (a) significant oversights regarding the relevant context of an episode; (b) omission of germane information, in combination with anachronism, in the delivery of a moral judgment on an episode; (c) gross selectivity in quotation from a Colonial Office document, in order to maintain the consistency of an anti-British interpretation; and (d) a possible case of selectivity in quotation where certain reporting (both diplomatic and journalistic), if it had been included, would have enabled readers to weigh a particular factor in the Rebellion — the erosion of amity between Sultan and people — which as it happens must cause embarrassment to the royal family of today and is also in conflict with the tenets of M.I.B. It is much to be hoped that other reviewers will find a preponderant balance of more edifying examples of the historian’s craft. But pending contrary judgment, the present critic remains inclined towards the view that the work is motivated by a certain “agenda” and that the research has been allowed to serve that, at least in part. As the author disarmingly states at the outset, “I trust that readers will be able to appreciate the standpoint I have taken — that is, not presenting the evidence alone to speak for itself but interpreting it imaginatively and with an understanding of the psyche of the principal actors around which the history of Brunei revolved” (p. xi).

Lastly, regarding this theme of possible political motivation, Hussainmiya is perhaps at his most “correct” in the Epilogue on Omar Ali Saifuddin’s life, where we read that “he had devoted his career to the restoration of Brunei’s monarchic dignity in a manner that promoted the peace, security and well-being of its people, and in a way that harmonized the traditions of the Sultanate with the needs of the modern world” (p. 383). This is “correct,” above all, because it highlights bonds of duty binding a “caring” monarchy to its people, and claims that this is an ancient and (for this very reason) highly viable and legitimate tradition. In this respect Hussainmiya is fully in tune with the historical dimension of M.I.B. However, historians of a different proclivity may remain skeptical on two counts.

Firstly, where Hussainmiya invokes the memory of the first Sultan Bolkiah, it is surely conceivable that the more authentic and relevant “ancient tradition” of Brunei monarchy comprised relations between ruler and ruled which were less intimate and less
infused with mutual respect than those which characterize the modern nation state. If that were so, one would have at hand an alternative theoretical model for elucidating the values of the late Sultan and the whole drama of the last reign — without of course going so far as to propose that Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin was himself purely “traditional” in an archaic/authoritarian way. Indeed the whole point about the invocation of “tradition” in Brunei ideology is that it should appear to foreshadow and thus legitimize relationships which, while certainly idealized in their own right or sustained partly by coercion, are in fact quite modern, though yet not as modern, on the Western time-scale, as democracy.

But the second basis for skepticism arises from this. The reviving monarchical regime has needed legitimation so badly because the people, too, are no longer “traditional.” Their world has been exposed intensively to new possibilities and new ideas, especially since the shattering experience of the Japanese occupation and its aftermath. Some historians might even be tempted by parallels between the idealistic hopes of a democracy movement in a time of cataclysmic change, and millennialist movements among oppressed peasants earlier in colonial history. But in case one would seek some external origin or stimulus for the nationalist and democratic ideas which infused parts of Brunei society in the 1940s and 1950s, then surely it is towards Malaya and Indonesia that one should look, not towards Britain. The British in Brunei were responding to the democratic impulse in the hope of molding it, far more than promoting or provoking it. Perversely, all the evidence for this is present in Hussainmiya’s text, but it is subordinated to an ingenious agenda for exalting the monarchy as the only true repository of insight into the popular condition and interest, destined to oppose the “imperialism” of democracy. Ironically, the overwhelming dependence of the author on British records, with only a few acknowledged interviews with Bruneians, adds to the remoteness of the study from the people of Brunei. But in a kingdom in which the democrats were the historical losers, could it be that this, too, is “correct”?

Part 3: A Correct Analysis?

If the alleged “British urge to control” is a thesis out of tune with the Anglophile sentiment of the contemporary elite, one can nevertheless guess that it was urged on Hussainmiya by the knowledge that his sponsors would welcome an account of a Sultan who fought for a popular good, not for a dynastic interest. To draw a contrast with the “selfish motivations of British imperialism” was useful, if not necessary, in this connection. Taking a post-modernist kind of approach to a quite different book that is itself an exemplar of a post-modernist idiom (Gunn 1997), one may surmise that Geoffrey Gunn’s framework was likewise influenced by his personal relationship to the regime. However, no doubt his experience, with all its tensions, was itself partly structured, in terms of events as well as perception, by prior ideological proclivity or moral outrage. We have already surmised that his publication of 1993 will have played a part in his premature “termination” as a Senior Lecturer of UBD. But his fearless activism in the cause of East Timor — on campus, face to face with the Secretary General of the United Nations, no less — must have played some part as well.

After a theoretical grand tour d’horizon, in the twenty-seven page Introduction, and despite a political Chapter 1, “The Fundamentals of Power in Brunei Darussalam,” the book then proceeds historically, through “The Origins of a Brunei Literate Tradition,”
"The Rise of Bureaucratic Literacy," "The Wartime Legacy," "The Origins and Development of a Brunei Media," and "Postwar Education and the Rise of Literacy" (Chapters 2-6), before tackling "Language, Power and Ideology in Brunei Darussalam" and "Transitions from Authoritarianism: Changes in Ideology and Culture" (Chapters 7 and 8). (But be it noted that already Chapter 6 evinces a strong political "agenda," with its expressions of chagrin that literacy in Brunei does not seem to foster "scientific literacy.") That Chapter 7 is intended as a high-point may be inferred from the fact that its title replicates the title of the book (yet in the end, a scattering of examples of Bruneian linguistic behavior and State control of the media do not seem to enlighten us coherently about the "definite correlation" that is claimed "between language, language use, status and social empowerment" — pp. 204-205). The "optimistic" title of Chapter 8 seems to foreshadow an even higher aim, that is, either to pick up traces of current movement, or to speculate about future movement, away from the established rigid mold (yet in practice, neither existing traces of transition nor changes in the pipeline are much in evidence in this chapter, so its title may be less than apt).

It is not a little presumptuous on the critic's part to suggest what the author "may have intended to say" or "would have said if the Brunei case could in some way have sustained it." But there is a clue in Gunn 1993, as to the preferred thesis of a dependency theorist — though also the obstacle that the Brunei case erects in his way. A micro-state whose oil is pumped by a powerful multi-national company seems a natural candidate for analysis in terms of exploitation by international capital, and/or the nefarious role of local "compradors" in facilitating this. Yet Brunei, precisely because of its small territorial extent and population, has been able to save such vast reserves that it never needs to borrow abroad. Moreover (if not by definition), the continuing export of oil sustains a permanent balance of trade strongly in its favor. Thus post-modernist contempt has to be directed, one senses, at the "unnatural" (no matter how autonomous) use of the state's reserves to earn "rent" on the international money markets, rather than investing in industrial production — an investment which would engender, in the process, an authentic and historically "correct" local bourgeoisie and development towards a civic society.

The "historical correctness" here mentioned is not an example of the subversively "correct" political attitudes propagated to Western public, especially in universities, through mainly informal mechanisms in recent decades (and with which this article began). Rather, it is a case of the formal Marxist-Leninist doctrine which lurked in the deeper philosophical and organizational background behind that propagation, and was held to be "correct" among its devotees either because based on sound scientific prediction or because expressing the party line laid down for the realization of historical goals. Now the intellectual left has undergone its own historic shift away from rigid Marxism, both in a philosophical sense and in terms of party discipline. Flexibility and new perspectives are precisely what define political post-modernism, and Gunn himself is very far from being a doctrinaire. Nevertheless, one may just detect a nostalgia for the older certainties between the lines of this book on literacy in Brunei. Attention is initially directed towards the overwhelming power of the "rentier state" — as mediated potentially to the population through the manipulation of literacy levels — by the large corpus of analytical literature on other countries that is cited, some of which focuses on the
equation between literacy and people's power, or between control of literacy and state power. The cited corpus is so pre-eminent in a book not notably strong on empirical detail, that one may find oneself wondering whether its function is to provide authority for a certain line of analysis, as much as a heuristic reference point.

In fact, it needs no prompting from theory to have the sensation that the more contingent types of circumstance — such as Britain's willingness to deploy massive military force in 1962 or the personality of the Sultan at that time — are oddly inadequate as explanations of the present extraordinary dominance of the State in Brunei. One is reluctant to eschew any approach from political economy and say that as there is no "dependency" which involves "Western subsidies" or "Third World debt," there is absolutely no condition worthy of the name of "underdevelopment" either. It is true that nothing has been "imposed" by the West; but can we say, alternatively, that the present "formation" was "chosen" by an autonomous indigenous elite? The crucial historical role of the British in 1962 is "awkward" in this context: possibly some formulation of that event in terms of world-wide economic forces would indeed be helpful. But strangely, while the author certainly pulls no punches in identifying the British role (c.f., pp. 17, 144, 175), he does not attempt to demonstrate how the British intervention and its long-term consequences may have a causal relationship and clarificatory utility vis-à-vis features of the contemporary State, society, and economy which are (he himself claims) "as much a function of the state in specific historical context, and a country's particular subordination within the world-system as of the legacy of culture per se." In other words, on the terms of the historiographical tendency to which the author himself inclines, the key event in modern Brunei history is actually not addressed. But nor is it addressed at the simple level of acknowledging that once a historical crisis has delivered concentrated power into the hands of a totalitarian-minded regime, empowered by victory to consolidate success by way of doctrinal propagation and other modalities, even a high degree of popular literacy may not generate any significant leverage against it, as 20th century European history has shown. In the Brunei case, on one recent occasion (1985), the revival of political expression through a party system was blocked by the simple expedient of a government ban on government servants (and, according to rumor, Shell employees) joining the newly launched Brunei National Democratic Party. As for culture — if at all it is accorded a role — perhaps the political culture of the courtiers who protect Sultans and project their image is of at least equal import with the culture of the masses. Who was it who blocked the political party after "Democracy" had been included in the Independence Declaration?

Seen as a first-hand account of modern Brunei, the reviewer can confirm the veracity of the overwhelming majority of facts and minor linkages recorded in the book as a whole, and finds their presentation invariably stimulating — while on a careful second reading some specific assertions turn out to be less dogmatic or daring than at first sight. The overall weakness of the study, the reviewer would suggest, lies not in the facts, by and large, but in the way their analytical treatment fails to live up to the high theoretical pretensions of the study, either because of insufficient local data, or because the framework itself is less than optimally focused. Thus the coming of academe to Brunei has not yet opened any world-dazzling perspectives on the Sultanate — even with this high-minded and thought-provoking second work from (though not sponsored by) the
UBD Department of History. On the one hand — thinking around the development and ramifications of literacy in Brunei of which Geoffrey Gunn’s book is itself one small part — this is one refreshing case where language, power and ideology in an “oil-rich state” have not subordinated intellectual production into slavish compliance. But on the other hand, if we may postulate that the control of intellectual production and its consumption is achieved by quite subtle mechanisms (including the academic!) which indeed invite a post-modernist treatment, the book does not in the end demonstrate how or whether this government controls literacy for political ends. No doubt it becomes clear that it is the regime itself (rather than anonymous “international capital”) which controls the people for such purposes of self-perpetuation, having won the contest for political autarchy with the British and against domestic populist nationalism. But there is a need for a more conscious emphasis (whether in a liberal, or more positivist, historiographical mode) on that transfer of power over the bureaucracy, without democratic constraints.

Part 4. Conclusion

The paradoxical conclusion seems to be that Hussainmiya comes closer to the mark on the dynamics of modern history, though glossing the takeover with myth about altruistic royal motives, as required by State ideology. What a pity that both kinds of book cannot be sponsored by UBD (at least their respective biases would provide a reciprocal antidote)! But more seriously... a government which claims to want modernization surely needs lucid analysis of the baleful effects of bilingual education. In practice, the fact that the government does not encourage such work merely reinforces the suspicion that the negative effects of bilingualism are somehow “functional.” (Members of the political elite will only go as far as to admit — in private — that the purpose was to “keep the masses happy,” but even that points in the direction of control.) Meanwhile, it is surprising and regrettable that even the independent Gunn, though “getting warm” with his observations on poor Standard Malay, fails to relate the Bilingual Education Policy to a political control scenario.

For the time being, research and publication sponsored by UBD seem firmly wedded to legitimating the status quo. It will be difficult to amend that judgment until — for instance — the linguists advance beyond anodyne and abstractly-phrased observations that the Bilingual Education System will not implant English language competence if either the cultural conditions are conducive (Mohd. Gary 1992b) or native language competence is not maintained (Mohd. Gary 1996: 130), towards a rigorous theoretical and empirical dialogue with the substantive problématique of the decline of Malay literacy despite a cultural milieu which seems to support this rather than English.

This is a question of acutely political significance, even if the fossilization of the masses’ mental development was not quite consciously planned at the time of Independence. As of mid-1998, the very survival of the regime seems to hang on the incapacity of the people of Brunei to conceptualize either the degree or the enormity of the diversion of State assets which they themselves allege against a brother of the Sultan; and to rethink the myth of “living, ancient bonds” between monarchy and people so assiduously propagated by foreign writers as well as Bruneian theorists of M.I.B. In this situation, it may be to the advantage of the regime that Bruneian doctrines have more typically not been spelled out, and that the ideologues have been completely silent on the
correctness or otherwise of delegating control of the national reserves within the royal family, let alone on what the Sultan should do in the event of some breach of trust. These gaps may leave room for some pragmatic management of the crisis.

But by the same token there will be a heavy premium on less formal kinds of propagation in rationalization and support of the measures taken. The effectiveness of these mechanisms will depend considerably on the credibility and good standing of their ultimate authority, the Sultan himself, among the political elite. Yet ironically, it is precisely faith in “a correct Sultan” that this propagation will be attempting to defend and consolidate — not only in spite, but because, of what has happened in his name. Moreover, it is in the nature of a hierarchy headed by a monarch that the person at its pinnacle defines doctrinal “correctness” but can never be judged by such a standard. At least the non-formal emphasis of the propagation should largely exempt the academic community from involvement in these dilemmas.
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BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

A Letter from Lundu
(19 October 2004)

Otto Steinmayer
P. O. Box 13
94500 Lundu, Sarawak
Malaysia

The official name of our kampong is “Stunggang Dayak” but I constantly drop the “Dayak” as our Kpg. Stunggang is the real Kpg. Stunggang, the site of the huge Rumah O.K.P. Jugah where James Brooke first toured to a longhouse back in 1839. We orang Stunggang held our biggest and most boisterous bash in decades last Friday evening. The occasion of this gawai was the 151st (and a half or so) anniversary of the arrival of Rev. William Henry Gomes and the establishment of Christianity and the Anglican Church in Lundu in January 1853.

Preparation took months. We held extra gotong royong to cut the grass, repair the road, build steps from the church to the hall, paint walls. Since I am the resident scholar here, Father Jackson Jaraü assigned me to researching and writing up the history of the Mission and of Christchurch. I rummaged and scratched all over for material. My wife Nusi was in charge of the cake, which we ordered from Kuching.

Christchurch is our local church, and the present concrete building is its third incarnation, after Father Gomes’s first atap-roofed church, then the belian one built by Bakih anak Negi in 1863. By dark the church was packed. Then a cheerful service, Father Jaraü preached a sermon on the history of the Mission, and everybody listened attentively, naturally enough, because everybody in the room (except me) was a descendent of one original convert or another. Rev Gomes’s great-grandson, George Gomes, who works at SESCO, was there, beaming with delight; but unfortunately none of the many Zehnders, descendants of Rev. John Lewis Zehnder, our second priest, showed up. Two Iban political higher-ups attended. They had been at daggers drawn in the newspapers but here they had to be reconciled for an evening. Andrew Jika anak Saban got a round of applause after Fr. Jaraü told us how he had cleverly prevented the registers and papers from being destroyed by the Japanese. The baptismal register goes back to the very beginnings, and is a gold mine for the genealogy-conscious, which we all are.

After the last hymn there was a quick grace, and we poured out to dig into the food. I only got one plate, I was so busy selling copies of my Christchurch History. When everybody was full, we all grabbed our Stella Artois and listened to the kampong band and the singer with the ukulele from Kuching, and after enough Stella we began dancing. Nusi and I left at 3:00 a.m., while the jogetting showed no signs of ending.

This was the most genuine kind of gawai, and everyone knew it and was happy for it. We had religion and thanksgiving, and remembrance and reverence of ancestors — my
son's if not mine — and lots of food, beer, and fun. The only difference from a gawai of 200 years ago was that the feat's patron was now Jesus Christ.

The other hot event here in Sarawak also involved history, in a tragic way. In the wee hours of Thursday 7 October the cables of the old suspension bridge at Satok over Sungai Sarawak parted and the roadway and the aqueducts went to the bottom of the river. This old bridge, built in 1926 by PWD engineer A.S. Lowe, was the marvel of Kuching in its time, and remained in use and beloved well after the big concrete bridge was put up. Kuchingites poured out their feelings of regret in the papers and over the radio, and of dismay that the poor thing had not been properly maintained. A good many people were left without water. The bridge meant a lot to the orang Lundu also, those of us who had been in and out of Kuching, or lived there, over the decades. And bridge collapses especially concern us, who are watching the new cantilever bridge slowly go up over the Batang Kayan. We want it to stay safe.

Just to put the final nifty detail on my perception that so many of the past was coming together during this last week, while I was playing the organ during the anniversary service — we of course sang "Mansang kitai kristian" (Onward Christian Soldiers) — I noted for the first time the author of that hymn, S. Baring-Gould, the same Sabine Baring-Gould who co-wrote A History of Sarawak under its Two White Rajahs with Charles Bampfylde.

NEW AND MORE RECENT DATING FOR THE BRONZE WATER BUFFALO AND RIDER FROM EAST KALIMANTAN

Dr. Martin Baier
W.-Fra. Laur Weg 6
D-72378 Hechingen
Germany

In a brief communication in the Borneo Research Bulletin, Volume 29, pages 226-231 (Baier and Sather 1998), we described the circumstances surrounding the purchase by an Austrian traveler, Mr. Edmund Grundner, of a bronze figure of a water buffalo and rider in the Sekatak area, Tarakan district, East Kalimantan. The figure, which is 25 cm long, presented an archaeological enigma at the time because of the surprisingly early age, 2670 years BP, attributed to it according to thermoluminescence dating carried out by the Max Planck Institute in Heidelberg, Germany.

Since the appearance of our report, a number of scholars have called into question this early dating, particularly in view of the fact that the figure was found without a clear archaeological or ethnographic context. As a consequence, Mr. Grundner ordered a second examination of the figure by Oxford Authentication Ltd, Wantage, England, and by Rathgen-Forschungs labor in Berlin, Germany. The results of both laboratories, indicating the probable date when the figure was last fired, are almost identical: "less than 200 years ago" in the former case, and "approximately AD 1856" in the latter.

These new dates would appear to invalidate the earlier Max Planck Institute's dating. They strongly suggest that the figure is much more recent than originally indicated,
chronologically within the time period of Brunei bronzes, although, iconographically, it appears to be more in a continental East Asian tradition (see Tillmann 1939).
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ANNOUNCEMENTS

To be published in September 2004

SOUTHEAST ASIA
A HISTORICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA,
FROM ANGKOR WAT TO EAST TIMOR
3 Volumes

Ooi Keat Gin, Editor

Publisher: ABC-CLIO, Santa Barbara, California; Denver, Colorado; Oxford, England

Southeast Asia: A Historical Encyclopedia, from Angkor Wat to East Timor is a three-volume reference work of more than 800 entries covering the historical development of Southeast Asia, including Borneo, from the prehistoric period to the early years of the 21st century. Included are entries on a wide range of historical topics, arranged in a dictionary-style A-Z format, inter alia archaeology and prehistory, major historical periods and eras, cultural heritage, ethno-history, wars and conflicts, notable personalities, and religions and popular beliefs. There are also themes focussing on political developments, economic and social transformation, constitutional developments and legislation, and historical geography and the environment, as well as entries dealing with institutions and organizations, concepts and ideas, and slogans and terminologies.

The contributors include over 130 scholars, representing, in addition to historians, archaeologists, sociologists, political scientists, anthropologists, geographers, economists, and demographers.

The Editor

Dr. Ooi Keat Gin, the editor, is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, London, and an Honorary Fellow of the Faculty of Political Science and International Studies, University of Hull. Currently he is an Affiliate Fellow of the International Institute of Asian Studies (IIAS) attached to its branch office in Amsterdam, and Visiting Fellow (2005-2006) at the Netherlands Institute for War Documentation (NIOD), The Netherlands. He is also associate professor and coordinator of the Asia-Pacific Research Unit (APRU) at the School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.

The Launch

Southeast Asia: A Historical Encyclopedia will be launched in Amsterdam, The Netherlands on 11 November 2004. Professor Wim Stokhof, Director of the International Institute of Asian Studies (IIAS), will launch the work, and Professor Victor T. King, University of Hull, will deliver a keynote address. In conjunction with this launching, a round-table seminar with the theme "Southeast Asian Studies in Europe: Reflections and New Directions" chaired by Dr Ooi Keat Gin will be held on 12 November 2004 organized by the IIAS.
Call for Papers 3rd BBEC International Conference 2005

Biodiversity conservation as a way of life

FIRST ANNOUNCEMENT

Borneo Biodiversity and Ecosystems Conservation Programme (BBEC) is going into its third year now. Since it was launched in February 2002, various activities such as expeditions and inventories, trainings and workshops, campaigns and dialogues have been conducted by its four components; Research & Education, Park Management, Habitat Management, and Public Awareness.

For the previous two BBEC International Conferences, we have received overwhelming responses and continuous supports from the public, government agencies, and private sectors in Malaysia and from the international communities.

BBEC members are organizing its third International Conference (BBEC IC 2005) to be held on February 21st to 26th at Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, with the theme “Biodiversity Conservation as A Way of Life.” The agenda will emphasize on increasing partnerships between policy makers and local communities, and integrating industries into biodiversity conservation.

The Organizing Committee welcomes papers to be presented in this upcoming BBEC IC 2005. Four main topics had been selected to further discuss the above theme and to be included in concurrent sessions.

Call for Papers

Topic 1: Rules and Regulation
- From “Papers to Community” sharing experiences the process of getting legislation into communities.
- “Myth or Reality” — Getting rules and regulations to be understood, appreciated and enforced effectively at different levels of communities.

Topic 2: Conservation through Partnership
Partnerships experiences among policy makers, government administration, industries, NGOs and communities. Looking into experiences on “Living Together” for biodiversity conservation.

Topic 3: Market Mechanism
Case studies on market driven biodiversity conservation models. Involvement of people from market and industrial sectors into conservation.

Topic 4: Community/Alternative Models on Sustainable Use of Resources. Extraction of NTFPs
Ecotourism Traditional knowledge practices

Kindly spread this news to your interested colleagues and friends.

We are expecting participations from various government agencies, non-governmental organizations and institutions, industrial and commercial sectors and the public to share
their opinions and experiences on the above mentioned topics. Potential papers from ASEAN nationals may get sponsorship from Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) for their traveling expenses.

Please send your abstract (max one page in A4 size)/enquiries on registration to: BBEC IC 2005 Secretariat Institute for Tropical Biology & Conservation Universiti Malaysia Sabah Fax: 60 088 320291 (ITBC) or 60 088 250590 (JICA-BBEC) E-mail: bbec@sabah.gov.my or danielpamin@hotmail.com or Kertijah.AbdKadir@sabah.gov.my

Dateline of abstract submission is on November 2004.

Further updates and information of the conference will be e-mailed to you regularly. Otherwise, related updates and more information on BBEC is available at our official website http://www.bbec.sabah.gov.my/

Reed L. Wadley, Department of Anthropology, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia MO 65211 USA. Phone: 1-573-884-0600. Fax: 1-573-884-5450. E-mail: WadleyR@missouri.edu. Links: Reed Wadley Danau Sentarum Dana Declaration; Benih buntih, padi baru; Berita agi Melaga, pesu menoa ulu.

First Announcement

An International Conference on
WALLACE IN SARAWAK – 150 YEARS LATER

Introduction

Exactly 150 years ago while in Sarawak, A. R. Wallace came up with world-shaking ideas in the understanding of biological diversity and organic evolution. Wallace spent the whole year of 1855 in Sarawak, and it is therefore appropriate for Sarawak to host the sesquicentennial celebration.

The history of the man himself is of interest and has been the subject of several recent biographies but new materials are still coming to light.

The biogeographical ideas originated by Wallace are still topical to modern science and relevant to policy makers concerned with conservation. However, new technologies are contributing new perspectives on the concept of speciation and evolution that were prevalent at Wallace’s time.

The theme of the conference will therefore bring together the old and new, and will be a platform from which local scientific strengths will be demonstrated. A strong contribution will also be expected from ASEAN regional participants and colleagues from other countries working on this subject.

Date: 13 – 15 July 2005

Venue
Sarawak Tourism Centre
Kuching, SARAWAK

Theme

Recognizing that Wallace and his ideas have been the subject of many studies worldwide and the environment that he worked in has undergone tremendous changes in the last 150 years, we have chosen the following theme for this conference:
Wallace in Context
Biogeography
Speciation and Organic Evolution
Biodiversity Conservation
Call for papers

The Organizers welcome all papers related to the theme of this conference for oral or poster presentation.

The deadline for submission of title and abstract of your paper is 4th February 2005. The papers should be written in English and submitted in electronic form to the Organizing Chairperson not later than 30th April 2005. Papers received later than this will not be published in the proceedings.

All papers accepted for presentation at this conference will be edited and published as proceedings which will be made available to the participants during the conference.

Side Events & Tours

The conference will feature a visit to the famous Sarawak Cultural Village in Santubong, about 35 km north of Kuching. It was while in Santubong that Wallace was inspired to write his paper on the geographical distribution of species.

Post-conference tours include a choice of three destinations: Day trip to Bau caves and Peninjau Hill where Wallace collected most of his insect specimens; Sarawak Museum and Sarawak River Cruise; Semengoh Wildlife Rehabilitation Centre.

For further information and registration, please contact
Dr. Andrew Aick Tuen, Director
Institute of Biodiversity and Environmental Conservation
Universiti Malaysia Sarawak
94300 Kota Samarahan, SARAWAK
Tel: 6082-671000 ext 259
Fax: 6082-671727
e-mail: aatuen@ibec.unimas.my

Registration Fees

Registration fees include a conference bag and proceedings (softcopy), trip to Sarawak Cultural Village at Santubong, lunch and tea/coffee breaks during the conference and a conference dinner.

International Participants
- Early bird (before May 31st, 2005) US$200.00
- Normal US$250.00

Local Participants
- Early bird (before May 31st, 2005) RM400.00
- Normal RM500.00
- Accompanying person(s) RM150.00/person (include conference dinner and a trip to Sarawak Cultural Village, Santubong only)
THE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES OF WESTERN BORNEO:
144 YEARS OF RESEARCH
31 January-2 February 2005, UKM Campus, Bangi, Malaysia

The year 2005 marks the 144th anniversary of the publication of the oldest dictionary of a western Borneo language. While there were a few brief wordlists published earlier by other authors, *Vocabulary of English, Malay and Sarawak Dayaks*, published by William Chalmers in Canterbury, England, in 1861 contains more than 3000 entries in English, Sarawak Malay and Biatuh, the Bidayuh language spoken near Kuop, just south of Kuching. This early trilingual dictionary marked the beginning of the serious study of indigenous languages in the western part of this enormous and diverse island.

To commemorate this milestone event, both in the history of Borneo language studies as well as in the development of colonial knowledge about the Malay World, and to celebrate the continuing language diversity of western Borneo, the Institute of the Malay World and Civilization (ATMA), together with the new Institute of Occidental Studies (IKON), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM) and the Tun Jugah Foundation and Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka have organized an international conference on the languages, literatures and oral traditions of Sarawak and Kalimantan Barat, scheduled for 31 January-2 February 2005 at the main UKM campus in Bangi, Selangor.

For further information on the international conference, contact Professor James Collins at pshatma@pkrisc.cc.ukm.my or write to:
Institute of the Malay World and Civilization
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor
MALAYSIA

BORNEO NEWS

REGIONAL NEWS

*Tree Flora of Sabah and Sarawak*, Volume 4, was published in 2002. It contains information on 24 genera, 321 spp. (45 new); Aquifoliaceae (S. Andrews), Ebenaceae (F.S.P. Ng), Lecythidaceae (M.A. Pinard), Oleaceae (R. Kiew, 8 new species), Proteaceae (R.C.K. Chung), Sapotaceae (P.P.K. Chai and P.C. Yii, 1 new comb by W. Vink); dedication to T.C. Whitmore, portr.; indices to scientific and vernacular names.

Manuscripts of the following families: Apocynaceae, Bombacaceae, Dipterocarpaceae, Escalloniaceae, Magnoliaceae, Meliaceae, Symplocaceae, Thymelaeaceae, and Tiliaceae are currently being prepared/edited for publication in Volume 5 (targeted date of publication December 2003).

For the next five years, beginning May 2002, the project is fully funded by the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment of Malaysia and the Malaysian Board of Forestry Research and Development. To ensure that the project runs smoothly, a Memorandum of Understanding for 2002-2006 was signed by the Forestry Research Institute Malaysia, Sabah Forestry Department and Sarawak Forestry Department at Semenggoh, Kuching, Sarawak, on 19 August 2002.
The project is planning to conduct botanical expeditions to Ulu Padas, Sabah (2002) and Usun Apau, Sarawak (2003).

**Wildasia.net** is an initiative led by Reza Azmi, a Malaysian-born conservationist. It is an internet-based resource about nature and the natural areas of Asia. Simple guides have been produced for a number of natural areas throughout Malaysia and more are being developed to cover other countries, like Thailand and Indonesia. There is also a rich collection of articles about nature, natural history, and travel. The site also fills the divide between scientist and the public-at-large, helping share information that has previously been restricted to technical journals and papers.

Wildasia welcomes articles from anyone who has something to share: information about wild species, habitats, or simple natural history observations. To learn more about Wildasia check [http://wildasia.net/main/mainindex_about.cfm](http://wildasia.net/main/mainindex_about.cfm) or contact Reza (reza@wildasia.net).


**BRUNEI NEWS**

Mr. Leslie Harold Newsom Davis, British Resident (administrator) in Brunei between January and August 1948, died peacefully at home in Heyshott, Sussex, on 16 June 2003, aged ninety-four. He is survived by his widow, three children and four grandchildren (London, Wednesday 18 June 2003, page 24, column six, paragraph four from foot).

Born on 6 April 1909, Mr. Davis was educated at Marlborough (an elite school) and at Trinity College, University of Cambridge. He was a member of the Malayan Civil Service between 1932 and 1957, interrupted by a spell of internment under the Japanese. In recognition of his standing, he was appointed CMG (Commander of the Order of Saint Michael and Saint George) by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II in 1957. From 1958 until 1963 Mr. Davis stayed on in post-independence Malaya as Special Representative of the Rubber Growers' Association.

His death leaves Sir John Peel (91) as the sole surviving British Resident. "Mr. W. J. Peel" at the time, he occupied the post between the restoration of civil administration in July 1946 and the arrival of Mr. Davis in January 1948.

For at least this historical researcher, Mr. Davis was a correspondent, generous with his time (and willingness to incur postal charges) way beyond the call of duty, patiently answering endless enquiries about his time in the sultanate. I take the opportunity to pay tribute to him and to record my appreciation in print (A. V. M. Horton, 13 November 2003).

**KALIMANTAN NEWS**

Dr. J. P. Moga is studying the diversity of rattan in Kalimantan and Dr. R. C. K. Chung obtained his Ph.D. with a study of taxonomic and micromorphological studies of
Grewia l. and Microcos l. (Tiliaceae) in Peninsular Malaysia and Borneo at the University of Malaya.

Lieutenant-General Sir Tom Daly (1913-2004), Chief of the Australian General Staff between 1966 and 1971, died in Sydney on 5 January 2004, aged ninety (Daily Telegraph, London, Thursday 15 January 2004, page 31, illustration). During the Second World War he was awarded the DSO (Distinguished Service Order) for his acts of leadership as a member of the 2nd/10th Battalion, Seventh Australian Division, during the “seaborne assault on the heavily-defended oil port of Balikpapan,” beginning on 1 July 1945. He emulated thereby the achievement of his father, who had been appointed DSO during World War I.

Winner of the Sword of Honour at Duntroon in 1934 and knighted (KBE) in 1967, General Daly is survived by his widow, whom he married in 1946, and three daughters [A. V. M. Horton, 15 January 2004].

Between 19 May and 10 June 2003, Dr. Irawati and Mr. U. Mahyar (BO) in collaboration with the WWF Indonesia went to the Kayan Mentarang National Park for orchid training. They visited Tarakan, Long Bawan, and Data Dian and were accompanied by the people from the surroundings of the national park. Seventy-six herbarium specimens and 142 living sample specimens were collected and deposited at the Bogor Botanic Gardens.

Ms. Rugayah and Mr. A. Hidayat (BO) went to Bukit Bangkirai, West Kalimantan, between 18 August and 1 September 2002, for exploration of this area. One hundred numbers were collected.

F.S.P. Ng writes in Flora Malesiana Bulletin, Volume 13 (2) – December 2002 (pp. 126-17):

“Forest fires in Kalimantan: who is responsible? For several weeks in August 2002, the atmosphere in many parts of Malaysia was polluted with haze originating from ‘forest fires’ in Kalimantan and Sumatra. The fingers of accusation have been pointed at the usual suspects.

“The Indonesian Government blamed ‘shifting cultivators.’ The NGOs blamed the oil palm and logging industries.

“During one of my visits to South and West Kalimantan a few years ago, I found that, in the peat areas of South Kalimantan, all the areas of logged ramin forest were being occupied by settlers from other parts of Indonesia as soon as the logging was over. The settlers would occupy and parcel out the land among themselves. Then they would cut and burn the remaining trees and plant pineapples on the peat. Every year, in the dry season, they would set fire to the peat and burn off the top layer. After 5 to 10 years, depending on the thickness of the peat, they would reach the mineral soil at the bottom, which would then be suitable for planting rice, bananas, and fruit trees. At this rate, we can expect peat fires every year until all the peat is burnt off, and the carbon added to the atmosphere. That should take about 10 years.

“In the inland areas, the situation is different. All along the roads in the interior, I saw small dwellings, each with an adjacent small home garden of bananas and tapioca, shrouded in smoke from the burning of surrounding secondary vegetation. Each settler occupied land far in excess of what his family could farm. The excess would revert to forest if left alone. To maintain ‘ownership’ the settler had to burn the secondary woody
vegetation every year, in the dry season. Eventually, the whole area will become a fire-
climax grassland of *Imperata cylindrica*, as has already happened in vast areas between
Banjarmasin and Pulau Laut. Why are the settlers clearing so much land? I am told they
are hoping to ‚sell‘ their land to others for a good ‚compensation.‘

‚For their own reasons, the Government and the NGOs do not want to admit the truth.
The establishment and enforcement of land ownership laws is long overdue, but the
Government seems to lack the will. As for those NGOs who have been most vocal, I do
not think they want to save forests or reduce greenhouse gases. They just want the
opportunity to bash the logging and plantation industries.‘

**Indonesia Forests and Media Project (INFORM).** The GEF has approved a
“medium-sized” project to generate concern and to encourage action to enhance the long-
term social and political foundations for forest conservation in western Indonesia. It is
intended to be complementary to other activities designed to address the overall
Indonesian forestry crisis (e.g., policy dialogue, programs, and projects), and to address
locality-specific interventions. The INFORM campaign will work to create a local
regional enabling environment in which these other activities are more likely to succeed.
It will thus serve to reduce further forest loss and to promote conservation at the local,
provincial and national levels.

It is hoped that success will be seen in an increase in the number of substantive
decisions taken by central, provincial and district governments to address forest
protection issues, changes in knowledge, attitudes and behavior in ways that enable
popular support for forest biodiversity conservation in western Indonesia. The project is
being executed by Conservation International-Indonesia [A. Whitten, *Flora Malesiana
Bulletin*, 13 (2)].

**Taufiq Tanasaldy** is currently enrolled as a Ph.D. student in the Department of
Political and Social Change, the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, the
Australian National University. Born in Mempawah, West Kalimantan, Taufiq completed
his undergraduate studies in the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of
Indonesia, and received a masters degree in International Studies from the Korea
University, Seoul.

The topic of Taufiq’s Ph.D. research is the political resurgence of the Dayaks of West
Kalimantan. The research will focus not on the area’s recent ethnic conflicts, but rather
on the politics of the Dayak ethnic group as a whole and will cover several issues. First, it
will examine the historical background to Dayak politics during the period of the Malay
Sultanates and Dutch colonialism. Second, it will look at the rise of Dayak politics from
1945 until its “demise” after 1966, covering important aspects of Dayak ethnic politics
that have not been touched on before. Third, it will look at some issues of Dayak
“politics” during the New Order, and, finally, it will trace the development of the Dayak
political revival that occurred after reformasi, looking, among other things, at bupati
elections, district divisions, political appointments, and affiliation during elections.

**Christian Oesterheld** recently received his MSc in *Conflict, Violence and
Development* from SOAS, University of London. Born in 1980 in Eschwege, he has done
undergraduate studies in *Languages and Cultures of Austronesia, Philosophy and Social
Anthropology* at the University of Hamburg. Now back there at the University’s Asia-
Africa-Institute, he is doing his Doctorate on *The Ritual Economy of Violent Death in Kalimantan*. Apart from investigations on ethnic violence, his academic record includes studies on healing rituals in Kalimantan and Dayaknese mythology. In addition to his Doctorate, he is currently compiling a Dayak Benuaq dictionary and working on oral literature of the latter ethnic group. He has done extensive field research in Kalimantan and Java several times from 2000 to 2004. He is a member of the Borneo Research Council and, since 2002, president of the Kalimantan Education Project. Contact: oesterheld kep@web.de

SABAH NEWS

**WWF Malaysia** has obtained funding from the ASEAN Regional Centre for Biodiversity Conservation (ARCBC) to conduct botanical studies at Ulu Padas, in the extreme southwest of Sabah. A first expedition was carried out in April 2002 to the Maligan Virgin Jungle Reserve with a total of 9240 ha, located 300 km S of Kota Kinabalu at 1220-1940 m in altitude. It is subject to seasonal flooding as it is within a shallow sandstone basin. The Reserve is mainly made up of montane forest and still undisturbed. The montane marsh peat swamp forest/community there is very special and does not occur anywhere else in Sabah or Borneo.

Members were WWF Malaysia staff together with botanists from the Forest Research Centre, Sepilok, students from the Universiti Malaysia Sabah, and Dr. A. Lamb. About 300 higher plants were collected during this first trip, while the university students concentrated on soil micro-organisms associated with identified plants. Many new plant records were discovered here, of note are *Alpinia tamacensis* (Zingiberaceae), *Dendrobium spectabile* (Orchidaceae), and *Phasmina prinifolia* (Rosaceae). Other collecting trips to the many forest types (11 have been recognized) will proceed until early 2004) [G. Davison and J. Sugau, reported in *Flora Malesiana Bulletin*, 13 (2)].

A scientific expedition to Malawati Island (7-12 August 2002) was organized by and for the **Sabah Forestry Department**. Malawati is an ultramafic island with an area of 3400 ha, located 115 km E from Kudat. The island is mainly covered by *Gymnostoma sumatrana* (Casuarinaceae). Pole-like casuarinas forest develops right behind the mangroves up to the hill top (c. 90 m alt.), which had been burnt. Plant identification is in process.

**Dr. A.D. Poulsen** (AAU) has been to Sabah (also Sarawak) early in 2002 collecting material for his monograph on *Etingera* (Zingiberaceae).

**Dr. J. H. Beaman** is busily slogging away on Part II of the Mount Kinabalu dicots at Kew, for *Plants of Mount Kinabalu*, and has good hopes that he will have it ready in 2004.

**The Michigan Herbarium** has a redesigned website, which includes the Kinabalu checklist as searchable database. All the groups so far published are represented (ferns, gymnosperms, orchids, the rest of the monocots, and dicot families A-L). See [http://herbarium.lsa.umich.edu](http://herbarium.lsa.umich.edu). The Kinabalu pages are under "Collections & Databases," and listed on that page as the last entry "Vascular Plants of Mount Kinabalu." The searches allow for listings of families, genera, and species, types, references, and collections.
C.E. Carr’s Kinabalu field diary has been found at Singapore Botanic Garden. R. Kiew has extracted Carr’s travels and collections for Mount Kinabalu, citing interesting passages from it (Gardenwise 20: 8-12, 2003). She provides a map with the route Carr took and a summary day-by-day account.

The Forest Research Centre, Sandakan (SAN) opened their new herbarium building officially on 26 April 2003.

SARAWAK NEWS

A botanical expedition to Ulu Sg. Palutan, Usun Apau was carried out between 23 March and 10 April 2003. Fifteen Malaysian and Singapore botanists involved in the Tree Flora of Sabah and Sarawak Project from FRIM, the Forest Departments of Sabah and Sarawak, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, and the Singapore Botanic Gardens, took part in the expedition. The base-camp was established at Ulu Sg. Palutan, about 300 km from Miri Town and about 20 km from the Indonesian-Sarawak border. Botanical collections were made at various forest habitats (primary mixed dipterocarp, keraph [water logged heath forest], kerangas [dry heath forest], and ridge-top lower montane forests), at altitudes up to 1200 m, within a 10 km radius from the base-camp. The specimens are currently being processed and curated at SAR (Sarawak Forest Department).

New Records of Orchidaceae from Sarawak. During a series of field trips in Sarawak between 1991 and 1998 by staff of the National Herbarium Nederland (L.), in close collaboration with the Sarawak Forest Department (SAR), a considerable number of living orchid specimens were collected for cultivation at the Leiden Hortus Botanicus.

This has already resulted in more than one hundred new records for Sarawak and in the description of several new species, which made their way into Beaman et al.’s excellent Orchids of Sarawak (2001). Since this publication, several of these living orchids have flowered for the first time in cultivation and proved to be additional new records for Sarawak, including three new species (Bulbophyllum grootianum J.J. Verm., Coelogyne renae Gravendeel and de Vogel, and C. yili Schuit. and de Vogel). The records for Bulbophyllum manubulare Ridl. and Dendrobium olivaceum J.J. Sm. are particularly noteworthy, as these are striking, large-flowered species. Spirit material of all specimens listed is preserved at Leiden.
BOOK REVIEWS, ABSTRACTS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOK REVIEWS


Facts are stubborn things. This book starts with the fact that Malaysia has built, and continues to build, large dams. As is well known, dams often usurp the livelihoods and human rights of rural, indigenous people. Some of the dams in Sabah are the Pinangsoo, completed in 1969; the Sepagaya, 1984; and the Babagon, 1997. Sarawak has the Batang Ai Dam, 1981: the Sika, 1983; and the ongoing Bakun Dam project. Dozens of more dams are contemplated for Malaysia as a whole over the next few years.

What do all these dams signify for the rich and poor, the environment, and the political process? In this book, Carol Yong studies these questions in terms of the Babagon Dam and associated forest destruction. This dam is part of a large commercially run project for supplying drinking water to the state capitol, Kota Kinabalu, and nearby areas.

The unquantified but heavy social and environmental costs of dams became recognized world-wide in the 1980s and 1990s. Their economic costs, as opposed to benefits, have also been acknowledged. Low-tech options such as drip irrigation for market gardening and rainwater collection for drinking water are now increasingly considered in a favorable light. Such options are ecologically saner, relying on existing water sources instead of endless mega-dams.

The Sabah state government expropriated Kampung Tampasak land to make way for the Babagon Dam, resettling the evictees in 1994. Until Yong’s field work in 1997, no study of this forced resettlement existed. She first documented the events leading from dam planning to the post-dam situation. Throughout her study, she paid particular attention to the destabilizing effects on village women, since women had been largely ignored in resettlement policies and reports in many countries. Yong’s social-impact assessment shows just how dictatorial and secretive “development” can be. It also shows how development of the rich and urban environment can degrade the poor and rural one. This development-degradation coupling has become an increasingly uncomfortable fact on the global stage, and Yong’s report reveals many lapses on the part of government and its business partners in pursuit of the development dream. These lapses run from disorganization to ineptitude, seemingly even to indifference to the villagers’ rights and needs.

That nothing might be wanting in this book, Yong first provides a global and state-level perspective on dams and resettlements, as well as a literature review, before turning to survey her study village in Chapter 3. Chapters 4 and 5 give the recent history of the Tampasak community, especially in terms of women’s lives and gender relations at the family and community levels. Once the villagers discovered what would be imposed on them in the early days of this dam project, they protested many aspects of it in peaceful and thoughtful ways, but were essentially ignored. Some, notably women, protested in meetings and demonstrations against the entire project. However, in 1995 the villagers
were forced to evacuate their old village area under an ultimatum order. Despite the fact that some public services were soon provided in the resettlement area, 83% of the now relocated families were against resettlement, mainly because of the loss of their communal forest and farming areas. By 1998 many of the relocated families said they wanted to move out of the cramped resettlement space.

The final chapter, Chapter 6, turns naturally to suggestions for the future on the question of resettlement. As Yong points out (pp. 164-169), there is a clear need in Malaysia and elsewhere for binding legislation that requires fair dealing when state or federal governments usurp traditional, but often untitled, lands and relocate communities permanently elsewhere. (A. S. Baer, Department of Zoology, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA)


James Brooke’s amazing career as Rajah of Sarawak has been explored in a number of biographies and histories, during his life and well beyond it. All of them generally confirm and re-confirm a set of widely accepted facts about Brooke’s life: For Brooke’s help in putting down a rebellion against his rule, a grateful Brunei sultan gave him the governorship of Sarawak. In consolidating his power, Brooke sought to end Malay exploitation of the Bidayuh Dayak, though he sought also to govern indirectly, making use of existing Malay hierarchies. The British Royal Navy was essential to Brooke’s expansion of power against Iban and Malays who threatened British trade interests, and Brooke had to deal with three attempts to topple him, one by Chinese antimony miners in 1857 and two by jealous Malay nobles who plotted against him. The first heir to Brooke’s throne, his nephew Brooke Johnson, became mentally unstable and could not ascend to the throne; Johnson’s younger brother, Charles, stepped up and took his place, eventually becoming the second Rajah in 1868.

In Power and Prowess, John Walker goes back to the primary sources and shows systematically that “facts” are “at best, misrepresentations” (p. xix): Brooke seized power with the help and support of those whose rebellion he had helped put down; the Bidayuh resisted Brooke’s attempts to extract taxes and corvée labor from them; Brooke held power directly, and his careful manipulation of native rituals and symbols helped secure his rule more firmly than naval expeditions alone allowed; the alleged Malay plotters were victims of local power struggles, and Brooke’s heir was not mad so much as intent on preserving Sarawak’s independence from the threat Brooke imposed through his repeatedly unsuccessful attempts to cede Sarawak to a European power.

Walker’s dismantling of built-up myth about Brooke is a considerable contribution to Sarawak history, but treating this book as consisting of just that would itself be a serious misrepresentation. Power and Prowess is much more: Walker carefully examines the culturally specific bases of power in nineteenth-century Sarawak, how local actors perceived how power worked and whence it derived, how they perceived Brooke to be a ritual center, and how they acted on those concepts for their own locally motivated purposes. He also shows that Brooke was an astute observer of indigenous culture, manipulating ritual and symbol in his favor. In doing so, Walker moves us away from the
traditional tack of Sarawak history, namely the emphasis on colonial history as European, toward colonial history as locally perceived, interpreted, and experienced.

In Chapter One, Walker describes the three ethnic groups that confronted the ambitious Brooke in his state-building efforts — Malays, Iban, and Bidayuh (formerly known as Land Dayak). Of particular focus is the cultural and ideological bases of political power, namely the notion that political power is tied inextricably to natural and supernatural conditions. “Power” is not merely a social, political, or economic thing, but flows fundamentally from spiritual prowess and health. This prowess (Walker chooses to use the Malay term, *semangat*) must be protected and enhanced; it is a thing that inattention may diminish, resulting in misfortune and disaster. Thus, a leader’s success in attracting followers is seen as a result of prowess, while failures such as defeat in battle or natural disasters reflect diminished prowess. Political power, however, was contested and impermanent, with leaders emerging and disappearing, as fortunes, both economic and spiritual, waxed and waned. Walker also notes the important link between political power and trade in the region, something that aided outsiders (often Arabs or Bugis) in establishing their own bases of power.

Chapter Two examines the roots of the conflict that led to Brooke’s ascension to the Sarawak throne, two important factors being the establishment of Singapore and the concomitant expansion of free trade throughout the region. This resulted in political fragmentation of Brunei’s power along the north coast of Borneo, and the insurgency of Sarawak nobles against a heavy-handed Brunei. Brooke’s intervention was not merely military, for he successfully exploited Malay notions of power and prowess to gain a degree of legitimacy among the Sarawak Malays that other Europeans might have been unable to achieve. Indeed, Walker discusses Brooke’s formative years in India that shaped his character and understanding of native cultures, quoting Bishop McDougall, who said that to know Brooke was to “know quite well what a Malay man of rank is” (p. 48). Of the Europeans who might have had aspirations for their own kingdoms in the colonies, Brooke was most suited to the task.

The next two chapters show Brooke’s considerable efforts to solidify his control in the immediate vicinity of Sarawak proper among both Malays and Bidayuh, expand his power among the Iban beyond Sarawak, and acquire the economic resources he needed to stay at the center of the local universe. Wealth and one’s ability to convert it into people’s loyalty and well-being is a mark of prowess, and Brooke’s success at this brought people into his entourage and sphere of influence. Yet without his own personal fortune (and wealthy donors in England), Brooke would probably never have lasted on the throne: He had to tax subjects who often resisted paying up, and his efforts at trade ran in the red. In addition, Brooke’s extension of power over the Iban shows quite well the importance of prowess to understanding the Iban responses to the Rajah. Military superiority, demonstrated by repeated and brutal defeats of “rebellious” or “piratical” Iban, was essential to Brooke’s success, but the Iban themselves saw their defeats and Brooke himself within their own concepts of power, thereby affirming Brooke’s power. Yet they were also fundamentally changed as the Rajah’s expanding state offered new outlets for their energy through trade, wage labor, education, and religious conversion.

Chapters Five, Six, and Seven provide detailed analysis of the challenges Brooke faced from internal Malay struggles for power and influence in Sarawak, and in the Rejang River Basin as his power expanded there. Walker shows that competition and resistance were essential aspects of indigenous power, and that native peoples did not
blindly jump on Brooke’s ship of state. Likewise, being a member of Brooke’s extended entourage did not preclude competition within it. From this perspective, Walker interprets the various “Malay plots” against Brooke. He also sees Bidayuh resistance to state taxes and corvée labor as local attempts to remain independent while still retaining important ritual associations with Brooke and his agents. In contrast, the revolt of 1857 by Chinese miners, who overran the capital of Kuching and forced Brooke to flee, shows that his success as a ritual center for indigenous people could not be extended to the Chinese. Instead of seeing the Rajah as a supreme man of prowess, the Chinese regarded him as “just another barbarian with too much power” (p. 143).

Walker’s examination of the succession struggle in Chapter Eight is perhaps the most fascinating of all. For Brooke aficionados, it will possibly be the most disturbing. Brooke’s nephew, heir, and administrator of Sarawak in the Rajah’s later years, Brooke (Johnson) Brooke, challenged the Rajah when, in 1862, he discovered the Rajah’s plans to cede Sarawak to the British Crown. This precipitated a struggle for control of Sarawak and for the heirship, and it pitted the Rajah and his supporters among the European officers in Sarawak against Brooke Brooke and his supporters, both among the Malays and Europeans. The Rajah ultimately won, and Brooke Brooke’s own brother, Charles, ended up on the throne, having given his support early on to the Rajah in exchange for the heirship. What Walker spells out most clearly is that this was not merely an internal family contest for succession, but rather a conflict over Sarawak’s future. On the part of the Malays, it was an attempt to preserve the independence of Sarawak, hard won by their struggle over three decades.

Walker acknowledges that many of his re-interpretations of James Brooke and his role in Sarawak history are contentious, and thankfully he details his documentary sources. He is also careful to avoid the trap of “culturist” interpretations of history (i.e., an overemphasis on symbolic and cultural coherence and integration) by demonstrating the importance of dissension, aims and motivations of differently placed actors, and economy. Additionally, he shows how Brooke’s presence changed native notions of power and opportunity, just as it reinforced those notions in other ways. Power and Prowess challenges us to look differently at Sarawak history, and it does so convincingly. (Reed L. Wadley, Department of Anthropology, University of Missouri-Columbia, USA, reprinted from Moussons, 6. 2002, with permission of the editor)


Indonesia has long been a favorite “locus” in the socio-political discourse on policies concerning natural resource management and forestry. The momentous political and social events of 1998 in Indonesia created new conditions and opportunities for policy reform and affirmation of the rights of local people in the management of natural resources. The issuing of new laws and decrees, and their contested implementation, have in turn stimulated a new stream of analyses of the effects of decentralization, the status of social forestry after 1998, and so on.
It is in this context that the edited volume, *Which Way Forward? People, Forests, and Policy Making in Indonesia*, can offer readers an extremely rich, multi-layered, and multi-perspective reading of forestry policy-making in Indonesia.

The book most convincingly and most forcefully looks at what has happened with regard to government policies in order to “help us to learn what went wrong,” (Jeffrey Sayer in the Forward) and what structural and ideological constraints might have caused it.

The risk of a volume where a good number of chapters take turns at examining the same key laws and policy environments might be substantial overlap and analytical redundancy, but the editors and authors successfully manage to offer an engaging, “spiraling” view of policy-making in social forestry. The fixed focal topic is the evolution of policies concerning people and forests in Indonesia, yet it is approached from different angles to render the complexity of the issues, the conflictual discourses and interests that intersect and still divide the context of forest policy-making in Indonesia.

In the introduction, the editors explicitly state that the focus of the book is on the Outer Islands of Indonesia (all islands of the large archipelago with the exception of the densely populated islands of Java and Bali) because of their “comparative importance in recent decades as generators of foreign exchange; as sources of livelihood for a rich potpourri of ethnic groups… and the ecological importance of the Outer Island forests” (p. 3).

The editors posit three main aims for the volume:

- “Document what is happening to the people and forests of Indonesia” (p. 10).

Policies, rather than governance, form the core subject of the analyses in this volume. Local people, and their point of view, come alive only in the background of some papers like the one discussing preventive measures against forest fires and the “specific or particular causes behind the fires” (Carol Colfer, Chapter 14:310).

- “Provide insights to policymakers, policy researchers, and concerned citizens who are interested in the development of policies that will benefit the nation” (p. 10).

This is indeed the real strength of the volume where several contributors convincingly examine the policy context and the policy networks “formed along two ideological lines — those who believe in state control and those who are convinced that this authority should be devolved to local communities” (Rita Lindayati, Chapter 2:53).

Whether by defining “the conflicting discourses associated with forest control, management and ownership” (Chapter 1, Rachel Wrangham), or highlighting “the policy ideas that have encapsulated different modes of people-forest relations” (Chapter 2, Rita Lindayati), or exploring “the complex continuum of contending perspectives on community control and management of forest resources” (Chapter 5, Jeffrey Campbell), the authors look at policies and laws as social and political products, the unfinished outcome of a range of conflicting interests, ideas, and claims in a country for decades
dominated by the inequitable distribution of resources and their control by state elites and their business partners.

If anything, some of the contributions remain a little deprived of the rich “humus” of experiences on the ground, the local interpretations and experimentations with regard to regulations, the fertile territory that lies in-between what is regulated by state laws and what is not, but is very much a part of everyday management of natural resources. The interesting argument on the centrality of village governance in guaranteeing a more transparent, equitable, and accountable management of natural resources comes a step closer towards a more experience-based policy analysis (Chapter 3, Chris Bennett). Similarly, the description of the policy process and role of civil society in pushing forestry reform and the recognition of customary rights also go further in bridging between a strict policy analysis and a more experiential analysis of policies (Chapter 6, Chip Fay and Martua Sirait).

Interestingly, there is little explicit discussion of the role that local legislation (PERDA) may take with regard to the future management of forest resources and community control in this era of autonomy and decentralization.

- “Students, policy makers, project managers, and researchers in other countries may be able to benefit from these analyses... both in helping to identify potential problems and in structuring new solutions to old ones.” (p. 11)

Suggestions and recommendations that would foster further reform in the forestry sector towards a more sustainable and equitable model of forest management are more noticeable in some chapters on sector-level analyses (Chapters 7-12). In particular, Christopher Barr (Chapter 9) convincingly questions what he calls the “sustainable logging paradigm” or a set of prescriptions (selective cutting; full rent capture; and market-based efficiency) that are commonly assumed by the government and institutions like the World Bank to be needed and sufficient steps for reforming the logging industry. Nevertheless, the author argues, without limiting the demand for wood or slowing forest conversion the prescriptions alone might not secure sustainability in the management of forests.

In general, in the second set of chapters, the enduring economic crisis, economic restructuring (Chapter 12), and the rapid growth of other sectors like oil palm (Chapter 10) loom more consistently prominent and help define the larger context which also affects the forestry sector and policy reform. In the chapter on the dynamics of illegal logging (Chapter 16), Richard Dudley points to the large numbers and excess capacity of sawmills and plywood overproduction as the main causes of the rampant illegal logging that is now contributing to forest loss in Indonesia. The author uses system dynamics as an approach to uncovering the causal relations between qualitative variables, and how consequences of certain actions can in turn become causes of those actions (causal loops, page 360). For example, as more villagers participate in illegal logging activities, these activities become more acceptable. Logging increases forest loss, which in turn weakens the perspective of long-term benefits of the forest for villagers, and thus more villagers might decide to participate in illegal logging. Similar to the discussion of the specific causes of forest fires (Chapter 14), the description of the actions of illegal loggers and the
context of those actions come closer to what can be termed a “causal analysis of events,” or explanation that helps convincingly link the events in question to the specific circumstances and variables of their occurrence.

After 2001, paradigms in social forestry and forest management are shifting more rapidly. To quote from Emil Salim (Afterword), “Indonesia is changing from an authoritarian to a democratic regime,” “authority is becoming decentralized,” and a “policy of uniformity is giving way to diversity” (page 398). If we take another forest management example, conservation management (a topic strangely absent from the volume except for a brief reference on page 345), the stronger government commitment and draft legislation in favor of collaborative management of protected areas reflects the new overall tendencies towards reform, participation, and equity in forestry policymaking in Indonesia.

The reform process in Indonesia will certainly continue, but we can expect complications and resistance in certain sectors. On the positive side, we can also expect increasing “localization” and “experimentation” in forest management and community forestry. “Which Way Forward?” is not the question this book sets out to answer, but rather the challenge that policy makers, policy analysts, non-governmental organizations, civil society, and government in Indonesia have to confront. (Cristina Eghenter, WWF Indonesia, Jalan Gunung Belah 188, Tarakan 77114, Kalimantan Timur, Indonesia)


Bernard Sellato, the author of this book, is Director of the Institute for Research on Southeast Asia (IRSEA), University of Provence; a member of CNRS, the French National Science Research Center, and editor of the Southeast Asian studies journal Moussons. As he tells us in his introduction to Innermost Borneo, he first came to the island in 1973. At the time, working as a uranium geologist, he came to know well the Aoheng and neighboring tribal peoples of the remote Müller Range, where he was then engaged in geological mapping. Eventually, after living for two years with the Aoheng, a community of forest farmers inhabiting the headwaters of the Mahakam and Kapuas Rivers, he abandoned geology for anthropology, receiving his doctorate from the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in 1987. Today, he is the undisputed authority on the smaller Dayak groups of the central Borneo interior, including not only farming communities like the Aoheng, but also a variety of rainforest hunter-gatherers.

Innermost Borneo comprises 13 chapters, most of them previously published as articles or book chapters, but also including five previously unpublished essays. Additionally, many of the published papers originally appeared in French and are translated here for the first time into English by the author himself, including two major essays, “Social Organization in Borneo: A General Overview” and “How Tribes Come into Being.” The latter, which was originally published in 1992 as Rituel, politique, organisation sociale et ethnogenèse: les Aoheng de Bornéo, deftly combines a micro-sociological analysis of ritual, politics, and society with insights from history and
comparative linguistics in one of the finest examples of anthropological writing in the Borneo literature. The publishers are to be commended for bringing together this significant, but scattered, body of scholarly work in one readily accessible volume.

Despite being written over a period of twenty years and treating a variety of topics, the collection hangs together remarkably well. First, the focus is clearly interior Borneo and, in the author’s words, the “small tribal minorities living in [this] most remote nook of the Borneo hinterlands” (p. 13). Its object, as set out in the introduction, is “to provide the reader with a few keys to a better understanding of traditional life in one of our planet’s last isolated spots” (p. 14). At the same time, Sellato relates, one of the things he learned in living with the Aoheng is that they “were just regular people, in no way different from the average French person,” and so a further object of the book is “to make the Aoheng and their neighbors appear less foreign, less ‘exotic,’ and more familiar” to its readers. Also contributing to the book’s coherence is a brief, but engaging introduction. Here, Sellato draws out some threads that he sees as connecting the essays and the logic behind their arrangement. He also reflects, although in a much more cursory way, on the changes that are now transforming interior Borneo and how, in some cases, his own thinking has moved beyond the ideas expressed in some of the earlier essays that are republished here.

The book begins with an account of the earliest European explorations of central Borneo, particularly those of Anton Nieuwenhuis at the turn of the twentieth century. This account originally appeared as the author’s introduction to an abridged Indonesian translation of Nieuwenhuis’s classic In Central Borneo and is here appropriately re-titled “The First Written Sources.” This is followed by two introductory chapters, the first describing the upper Kapuas region, the second the upper Mahakan. While providing necessary background, both chapters warrant an update in view of the massive destruction of the rainforest, road building, and population displacements that have occurred since they were first written. In fairness, Sellato addresses some of these changes head on in the next chapter, “Forest Economics: The Dayak and their Natural Resources.” Here he examines the experiences of two interior communities, the Aoheng and Punan Tabang, in their encounter with government agents of change intent on imposing governmental control, settling them down, and appropriating their resources. In a postscript, Sellato acknowledges his own increasing doubts about his earlier assumption that traditional cultures are necessarily good custodians of the natural environment. Here, it must be added, however, that customary conservation practices are now under pressures unimaginable even twenty years ago.

The next two chapters deal with social organization and are substantial contributions. The first, “Social Organization in Borneo,” explores the applicability of Lévi-Strauss’s concept of “societies of the house,” proposing, instead, a four-fold typology of Bornean societies. The second is similarly comparative in scope, but addresses a much narrower topic, looking at kinship terminology among nomadic groups in Borneo and correlating a nomadic way of life with utrolocal residence and a complex pattern of sibling-in-law terminologies. The chapter that follows, Chapter Seven, “Reconstructing Borneo’s Culture History,” examines a variety of hypotheses that have been advanced to account for the origin of hunter-gatherers in Borneo, taking issue in particular with revisionist, and especially devolutionary, explanations. Sellato argues, instead, for the ancient colonization of the interior of Borneo by Austronesian-speaking foragers and
horticulturalists, before the use of metal made possible the opening of the rainforest to extensive swidden rice cultivation. Chapter Eight, “History and Myth among Borneo People,” examines a legend recorded in writing by a Bukat leader to demonstrate the way in which identities are constructed from oral historical traditions and how these traditions may be manipulated to create a group image that a community wishes to project to the outside world.

Chapter Nine, already alluded to, is an exemplary work of ethnohistorical analysis, exploring the interconnections of ritual, politics, and ethnogenesis among the Aoheng, a group that came into being only during the last two hundred years through a coalescence of hunter-gathering and farming groups. The last four chapters, all but one of them previously unpublished, comprise a group which Sellato himself describes in his introduction as “sketchy.” As such, they form a nice balance to the much longer, more densely argued papers that immediately precede them and deal briefly with questions of gender, sacrifice, genres of Aoheng oral tradition, and, finally, Aoheng geological taxonomies and notions relating to stones, their uses and cultural significance.

*Innermost Borneo* is an important volume, bringing together twenty years of writing by a distinguished anthropologist, and deserves to be viewed as essential reading for all Borneo specialists and others concerned with upland minority peoples in Southeast Asia. Although, regretfully, lacking an index, the book is otherwise enhanced by a wealth of maps, figures, and by 41 black-and-white photos. In his introduction, Sellato tells us that he began his fieldwork among the Aoheng by being interested in everything. “I worked,” he writes, “on language, ritual, history, social organization, oral literature, and more” (p. 14). That he did so, taking the time to inquire deeply and at length into so many diverse facets of Aoheng life has since served him well and is richly apparent in this collection in the close attention he gives to ethnographic detail and cultural interconnections. “Later on,” he continues,

I focused on the modalities of interaction between society and the environment, and the customary institutions controlling the access to and management of land...Through time, I became increasingly involved in investigations in ethnohistory and comparative linguistics, in an attempt to reconstruct Borneo’s culture history.

In the same way, these interests, too, are amply on display here. (Clifford Sather, Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Helsinki, Finland. This review originally appeared in *Asian Folklore Studies* (2003) and is reprinted here with the permission of the editor)

Herwig Zahorka is a forester who lives in Bogor, Indonesia, and who has worked in Kalimantan as a consultant for the Indonesian government and GTZ (Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit).

In honor of the 100th birthday of Dr. Habil. Karl Helbig, the author has written this book. Karl Helbig was a German geographer who went on an expedition through Indonesia. In Kalimantan he began the expedition at Pontianak on 2 April, 1937, and ended it at Banjarmasin on 25 November, 1937. Karl Helbig wrote several books about this journey, including *Eine Durchquerung der Insel Borneo (Kalimantan): nach dem Tagebüchern aus d. Jahre 1937, Vol. I and II*, Berlin 1982.

The author, Zahorka, who knows Kalimantan well, wrote this book with the purpose of comparing the natural and social environment nowadays with what it was at the time of Helbig's expedition. He also describes the impact of so-called modernization in Kalimantan. The first part of the book tells us about the circumstances of Helbig's expedition. The author takes note of some of the ethnographic details which Helbig noticed. The second part gives us some idea of the influence of modernization and state development since 1937, e.g., the impact of forest concessions and logging roads, and of transmigration, in which the Indonesian government has sent people from Java, Madura, and Bali to Kalimantan since 1970. In the last part the author writes about the practical operation of the system of decentralization, which the government has applied since 2001 in the regions of West, Central, and East Kalimantan.

This book should be of interest to the newcomer in offering a general view of Kalimantan.

**Bibliography of the major writings of Karl Helbig:**

Helbig, Karl


1940  *Urwaldwildnis Borneo*. Braunschweig.


The central theme that runs through Kerry B. Collison's novel, *Indonesian Gold*, is that the natural environment of Kalimantan is now in peril, and consequently the whole social fabric of the indigenous Dayak communities is also at risk. Throughout this long book of 613 pages, Collison progressively peels back the many layers of physical, commercial, political and social influences which have contributed to environmental degradation, showing the complex interactions of all these factors.

Rapid economic exploitation and industrial development since the 1980s have put the natural environment of Kalimantan in jeopardy, with the pressures escalating since the downturn in the Indonesian economy following the 1997 financial crisis. No doubt the best known example is the expansion of the timber industry, resulting in the rate at which forest cover is being depleted exceeding twelve thousand square kilometers each year. In his novel Collison illuminates some of the less well-known aspects of these developments. For instance, he highlights the use of fire on a large scale to clear forested land in Kalimantan in order to accommodate the expansion of palm plantations for the production of palm oil. This has led to annual widespread fires covering most of Kalimantan and spreading as far as the Malay peninsula to the west. Collison also writes of the rapid destruction of Kalimantan’s peat swamp forests. The government-sponsored attempt to convert the peat lands to agricultural land has entailed the destruction of the distinctive fauna and flora of the swamp forests, unbalancing the natural ecosystem.

The damaging impact of mining is less well-known than the effects of destruction of the Bornean forests. In the novel the plot which Collison develops focuses attention especially on the destructive impact of mining operations in Kalimantan, particularly gold mining. He shows how the flood of immigrants seeking gold, including Javanese and Madurese transmigrants, has put intense pressure on both Dayak lands and communities. These immigrants, many of them illegal, came either as individual prospectors or were imported as a labor force by Indonesian and foreign mining companies. Their methods of extraction used large amounts of mercury, producing noxious gases and toxic residuals which were introduced into the river systems, polluting water supplies used for drinking, cooking and washing, and endangering fish in the streams and those who ate them. Problems have also arisen with the methods of waste disposal adopted by the larger mining operations, resulting in chemicals such as sulphuric acid, mercury, copper and arsenic entering the water system. Among the innovative extraction processes used is cyanide heap leaching, which involves spraying a cyanide solution over crushed rocks heaped into open piles. Collison states that this process brought with it “extremely high pollution risks and long-term toxic contamination” (p. 197).

Kerry Collison is an Australian author with long-standing connections with Indonesia. His previous novels set in Indonesia, which like *Indonesian Gold* he describes as “fact-based fiction,” include *The Fifth Season* and *The Asian Trilogy*, comprising *Jakarta,
*Merdeka Square* and *The Timor Man*. These books have all dealt with political corruption, business wheeling and dealing, and high finance in Indonesia in the era of globalization.

Under the “New Order” both the mining and timber industries of Kalimantan became enmeshed in political relationships involving Suharto, his children, military leaders, and Chinese entrepreneurs. Collison is at his best in capturing the nature and motives of these web-like political interrelationships. Nor does Collison pull any punches in describing the deadly activities of the Kopassus Special Forces section of TNI, the Indonesian army, in Kalimantan as well as in Aceh, Irian Jaya and East Timor. Collison often identifies what has been taking place in Kalimantan, as in other parts of Indonesia, as a process of internal colonization within Indonesia by the politically dominant Javanese.

Dayak communities have generally not been consulted about the vast industrial changes taking place in their traditional country. They have received little or no compensation for the loss of their lands. Along with widespread environmental degradation, the social impact of recent industrial developments in Kalimantan has threatened indigenous Dayak communities. Violence has regularly broken out between Dayak and immigrant Indonesian and foreign mining groups. Dayak women have often borne the brunt of this, with rape a frequent occurrence in the cultural contact zone. Collison dramatizes this situation in the novel, in an incident involving the brutal rape and consequent death of a young Dayak girl who, like many of her friends, was attracted to the mining camps by the economic opportunities offered them as laborers, cooks and domestics.

Collison succeeds in dealing with these serious environmental and social issues by weaving them into a riveting story combining elements of romance together with high finance, stock market swindles, mining fraud, murder, and corporate skullduggery, along with occasional sex scenes and frequent coarse language. The story is based on the notorious billion-dollar BRE-X Canadian gold fraud in 1997 at Busang in the province of East Kalimantan. An interesting feature of the novel is the author’s creation of a Penchung Dayak woman as the central character and heroine of the story. Angela Dau, the daughter of a shaman-chief, is herself initiated as a shaman, and after undertaking environmental studies in Bandung returns to her own people to assume the role of their leader in their attempts to resist the pressures being imposed upon them from outside. A romance – never consummated – develops between Angela and an American geologist, Stewart Campbell, but ultimately their relationship cannot be fulfilled because of the unbridgeable cultural differences that separate them.

*Indonesian Gold* is not great literature. The amount of detailed information offered is frequently tedious. Yet the issues dealt with are important, and they are wrapped up attractively in an exciting, even sensational package. As a vehicle for raising popular awareness about the environmental devastation facing Kalimantan and the risks of social and cultural degradation facing its people, the novel deserves to be commended.

(Christine Doran, Southeast Asian Studies, Faculty of Law, Business and Arts, Charles Darwin University, Darwin NT 0909, Australia)

The Right Honourable Sir Julian Pauncefote (1828-1902), created Lord Pauncefote of Preston in 1899, was Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United Kingdom to the United States of America from 1889 until 1893, being upgraded to Ambassador there from 1893 until his death in 1902. He will be better known to readers of this journal, however, for his rôle in the chartering of the British North Borneo Company in 1881, a subject covered in chapter four (pp. 69-101) of the volume under review.

Pauncefote was born in Munich in 1828. He hailed from a Gloucestershire gentry family, wealthy but somewhat outside the social élite. A younger son, he had to make his own way in the world. His education was at Marlborough (rather than Eton or Harrow) and, instead of proceeding to Oxbridge, he was called to the bar at Inner Temple in 1852. A conveyancing barrister for the next ten years, he was also private secretary for a few months in 1855 to Sir William Molesworth (1810-1855), Secretary of State for the Colonies. This appointment terminated because of Molesworth's untimely death.

Pauncefote married on 14 September 1859 and was blessed with five children, one of whom died in infancy. Crippling financial losses caused him to look to the colonies. He began practice as a barrister in prosperous Hong Kong in 1862. Rapidly recovering financially, he became acting Attorney-General of the colony in 1865 and was appointed to the substantive office in the following year. His achievements there included the systematizing of the statutes in his preparation of the *Hong Kong Code of Civil Procedure* (p. 10). He also drafted the ordinance for the establishment of the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation (1865). Throughout his official career Pauncefote continued in lucrative private practice as a barrister. He was generally well liked and built up a network of contacts which facilitated his subsequent Whitehall career. Already knighted, Pauncefote departed from Hong Kong in late 1873 and for a few months in 1874 he was Chief Justice of the Leeward Islands in the West Indies. That post, however, was too insignificant for a man of his talents. He was brought back to London as Legal Assistant Under-Secretary of State at the Colonial Office. In 1876 he transferred to the more prestigious Foreign Office at the same level, being promoted Permanent Under-Secretary in 1882.

Besides his expertise in international law and his influential contacts, Pauncefote "represented the new professionals who were innovative and imaginative, and willing to try new and even unorthodox ways based on reason and experiment, and not necessarily on traditional practices" (p. 15). His Whitehall career lasted fifteen years followed by thirteen years in Washington. He became the Foreign Office's recognized "China hand" (pp. 28, 60) and played a key role in the Chefoo negotiations (pp. 103-126). This "decade-long issue" arose out of the 1875 murder of Augustus Margary, a young British consular officer who had been killed at Manwyne (Burma) by Chinese and Kachin tribesmen (p. 108).

When a Foreign Secretary was "weak" and/or the Prime Minister of the day took little interest in foreign affairs, officials such as Pauncefote could exercise a strong influence on policy; when the Foreign Secretary was strong, on the other hand, there was less scope for official action. Lords Derby (1874-1878) and Granville (1880-1885) were examples of
weak foreign secretaries during the relevant era. Lord Salisbury (1878-1880, 1887-1892, 1895-1902), by contrast, exercised a much stricter oversight: his relationship with Paunceforte was strictly that of superior and subordinate (p. 33).

There are no "Paunceforte papers" in existence. Having no diaries or private correspondence to mine, the author is necessarily unable to draw a picture from the inside. Hence this concise monograph cannot be a biography as such; instead the author uses the records of the Colonial and Foreign Offices in London to work out Paunceforte’s influence on British imperial policy between 1855 and 1889. The Washington period is deliberately relegated to an epilogue here by Dr. Wright because the topic has already been covered in a 1929 volume by Professor R. B. Mowat.

The main strengths of Julian Paunceforte and British Imperial Policy are the author’s knowledge of the British and colonial historical background plus his grasp of the internal workings of Whitehall. In the chapter endnotes there are helpful potted biographies of the dramatis personae; and the author is particularly good on the aristocratic family interconnections. The characterization of cabinet infighting during the second Gladstone ministry (1880-1885) is excellent. Overall, the monograph is well-balanced, fair, lacking in bias.

Dr. Wright (b. 1925), already well-known to readers of this journal for a long sequence of monographs and articles about Sarawak and North Borneo, particularly The Origins of British Borneo (1970), is currently Adjunct Professor of History at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Publication of his latest book happened to coincide with the centenary of Paunceforte’s death although there is no explicit indication that this was intentional. Whether it was or not, the author undoubtedly provides an insight into a principal designer of British foreign policy, particularly during the shambolic second Gladstone ministry.

Errata
p. 13: Sir John Bowring (rather than ‘Bowering’).
p. 44: Midlothian campaign: 1879-1880 rather than Autumn of 1885?
p. 46, line 6 from foot: for ‘set read ‘sent’.
p. 50, line 8: for ‘affect’ read ‘effect’.
p. 56, line 3 from foot: for ‘Camaroon’ read ‘Cameroon’.
p. 57, para. 1, line 4: for ‘affected’ read ‘effected’.
p. 65, note 5, line 3ff: for ‘threads’ read ‘threads’.
p. 75 for ‘Sarawaks’ read ‘Sarawak’s’.
p. 104 for ‘Irriwaddy’ read ‘Irrawaddy’.

(A. V. M. Horton)

ABSTRACTS

In the past decades, Indonesia has undergone intensive socio-economic changes that have had a profound impact on traditional family structures and the upbringing of children. These changes have been as significant among the different ethnic groups of the outer islands as elsewhere in Indonesia and consequently these societies are continually modifying in order to deal with changing realities. The author’s interests were to see how these socio-economic changes are affecting the family structure among the Iban of West Kalimantan. The study is based on the conviction that Iban children play a central role in the above-mentioned issues, and that their voices therefore should be heard. Until recently anthropologists studying cultural change have mainly confined themselves to the behavior and ideational system of adults. For this reason, the author found it important to see how children and young people themselves, in relation with friends, parents and other adults, learn to become competent members of their own community and the surrounding society. By focusing on children, the author provides a different picture of the processes that change a society, and how children are actively engaged in those changes (Reed Wadley).


This dissertation is based on fieldwork done between 1987 and 1992. It deals with the manarung ceremony, part of the Tiwa h or secondary burial, performed by the Ngaju of Kahayan, Central Kalimantan. With the help of the priests, the author recorded, transcribed and translated the whole ceremony. This study includes the tandak, which normally were passed on from teacher to pupil in ritual exchange, often involving the presentation of a gift (author).


The Kalimantan village of Tumbang Malahai celebrates a death festival (Tiwa h) during which 23 families re-inter a total of 35 dead family members and commend their souls to the afterworld. The celebration takes 33 days and consists of various phases: building a music house, erection of the Sangkaraya, arrival of the priests, setting up the gongs and trumpets, contacting the people of the afterworld, arrival of the guests, the animal sacrifice Tabuh, the first soul escort for the dead souls, the second soul escort for flesh and blood souls, exhumation of the bones from the cemetery, the third soul escort for the bone souls, burial of the bones, cleansing the houses of the organizers of the Tiwa h, cleansing the other participants in the celebration, removal of the festival buildings, erection of the Sangkaraya in the forest, distribution of sacred names among the Tiwa h organizers, and departure of the priests.

Further information on the film is available from the distributor: vertrieb@iwf.de or can be found on their homepage, www.iwf.de.


Even before the first European penetration of Island Southeast Asia, the maritime boat people of the region were already engaged in trade and in many areas were incorporated in state-based political and economic systems. This paper examines one particular group, the Bajau Laut, of southeastern Sabah, seeing them as players in a historical circulation of goods. Different modalities of exchange, within and outside the group, involving both gifts and commodities, helped to define the embedded nature of the Bajau Laut community and its place vis-à-vis more settled populations in a hierarchical division of economic and political labor. The paper looks in particular at the symbolisation of exchange, especially in local mythic discourse, in order to understand better the role that nomadism played, down to the beginning of the last century, in sustaining this circulation and in reproducing the contrasting identities of its different players, including the sea nomads themselves (author).


Shifting social and political factors influence the management of and allocation of rights to local resources, and this paper illustrates one approach that isolates important variables involved in access decisions. The paper thus deals with the influence of local-level social-political processes on resource management and its relevance for conservation. Examples are drawn from non-timber forest product collection in Indonesian Borneo (author).


The history of internal territorialization in West Kalimantan, Indonesia, reveals the interplay between state and local concepts of territory. Both colonial and national authorities sought to divide natural resources and ethnic groups through boundary making, and local peoples have accommodated and challenged state concepts of territory in their competition over natural resources. This history highlights a common situation in which local people incorporate state boundary concepts in order to make claims on resources in a way the state recognizes. Yet indigenous concepts of territory and resource claims persist as local people seek multiple, practical ways of securing rights to resources, and as the power of the state fluctuates over time (author).
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