

ULASAN BUKU/BOOK REVIEWS

The Ethnic Factor in Modern Politics: The Case of Sarawak, East Malaysia by Jayum A. Jawan. Centre for South-East Asian Studies, University of Hull, 1991. Occasional Paper No. 20, 75 pp. Inclusive of Bibliography and Appendixes.

This monograph addresses the issue of ethnicity in the East Malaysian state of Sarawak. It attempts to analyse the "processes and factors" that underlie the rise of ethnic tension in Sarawak, with particular reference to the Iban. Parenthetically, the author uses the term "Iban" and "Dayak" interchangeably throughout the monograph but it is clear, however, that the author is referring to the Iban. The term "Dayak" refers collectively to the non-muslim bumiputera group which includes the Iban, Bidayuh and Orang Ulu.

Jayum points to an apparent anomaly in the Sarawak political scene: that the Iban, despite constituting the largest single ethnic group in the state (32% in 1962, 30% in 1988), and despite, together with the Bidayuh and Orang Ulu, forming the majority in 25 out of the 48 electoral constituencies at least up until the 1987 election, had failed to establish control over the political leadership in the state. After a brief period of Iban leadership under Stephen Kalong Ningkan and Penghulu Tawi Sli, political leadership of the state quickly passed on to the Muslim bumiputera group, essentially the Malays and Muslim Melanaus. Jayum argues that as a result of the failure to maintain this political leadership, the Iban had consequently been marginalized.

The author contends that the Ibans have, in fact, never been politically united; they are scattered among SNAP, PESAKA and the Chinese-based SUPP. In contrast, the Muslim bumiputeras and the Chinese have united under their respective ethnic political parties. In 1966 PANAS and BERJASA, hitherto two competing Muslim bumiputera political parties, merged to form BUMIPUTERA. In 1974 SCA was scrapped, thus paving the way for the Chinese to rally behind SUPP. After the 1974 state election the Iban and other Dayak components began to unite behind SNAP. A major set-back occurred in 1983, however, when a faction within SNAP broke away and founded Parti Bansa Dayak Sarawak (PBDS).

Jayum argues that the removal of Kalong Ningkan and the subsequent installation of Abdul Rahman Yaakub as the Chief Minister of Sarawak marked the logical culmination of the power struggle between SNAP, representing the Iban and BERJASA, representing the Muslim bumiputeras. In this enterprise, the latter group secured important support from the Federal Government which

for its own reasons preferred a Sarawak under the political leadership of the Muslim bumiputera group. In 1966 Kalong was removed as the Chief Minister and was replaced with Penghulu Tawi Sli who, Jayum contends, merely provided a front for certain puppeteers in the Sarawak Alliance government. When Kalong got a court order ruling his removal unconstitutional, the Federal Government conveniently declared a state of emergency in the state, despite the fact that the situation did not warrant such a move. And when an election was finally held in 1970, it was BUMIPUTERA that emerged to provide the Chief Ministership of the state. Shortly thereafter BUMIPUTERA coopted PESAKA by merging with it to form Parti Pesaka Bumiputera Besatu (PBB) which then ruled Sarawak in a coalition government with SUPP. SNAP was left out in the opposition. While useful, this historical survey, however, adds little that is new to what have been published in the field.

The particular value of the monograph is in the final part where the author discusses economic development among the Dayak, particularly the Iban, from 1963 through 1990. He argues that "the removal of the Ibans from the centre of power in Sarawak" (p. 28) has led to their marginalization with respect to economic development. Following 1970 government expenditures and economic development policies were concentrated largely in the urban areas to the detriment of rural areas, where the Dayak are largely found. This policy was continued under the administration of Abdul Taib Mahmud who replaced his uncle as Chief Minister in 1980. Using published statistics, Jayum shows that the New Economic Policy (NEP), introduced in 1970 to improve generally the lot of the bumiputeras, had essentially skirted the Iban. Ten years after the inception of NEP, the Iban continued to dominate the traditional low income agricultural sector, while the mobility of Iban from the low income sector to the higher income secondary and tertiary sectors was negligible. The Iban constitute the largest group of those categorized as impoverished and illiterate. The author contends that it was the economic marginalization of the Dayak that had given rise to ethnic tension in Sarawak and accordingly calls on the government to redress the more obvious grievances among the Dayak, and in particular the Iban, so as to contain further inter-ethnic tension.

It is curious that the author ends his discussion of political development in Sarawak with the ascension of Abdul Rahman Yaakub as Chief Minister in 1970. What, it might be asked, happened to the Iban or more generally the Dayak vis-a-vis SNAP following 1970? That party evidently performed creditably in the 1974 state election and this had allowed its president, Dunstan Endawie, to negotiate the post of Deputy Chief Minister I (Sarawak have three posts of Deputy Chief Minister) and other ministerial posts as a condition for the party's entry into the state coalition government immediately before the 1979 state election. This marked an important political development and should not have been overlooked.

The author's basic contention is that the economic marginalization of the Iban had been the outcome of their removal from the centre of political power. This, however, does not explain why despite the inclusion of SNAP in the coalition government the Iban, or more generally the Dayak, as the author maintains, continued to be marginalized in the late-1970s and 1980s. Neither can economic marginalization of the Dayak explain PBDS' willingness to work with Abdul Rahman Yaakub, the very man who allegedly started the process of Iban marginalization, in the 1987 election. It cannot be assumed that politics is a mere complex of economics.

Equally curious is the fact that the author did not discuss the Chinese aspect of Sarawak's ethnic politics, particularly given that the monograph is titled *The Ethnic Factor in Modern Politics*. In view of the fact that SUPP, which is to say the Chinese, had allegedly emerged as the "power-broker" in Sarawak politics, the author would have done well to explain how SUPP had attained that position and contrast the ground gained by the Chinese against that lost by the Dayak.

Despite some shortcomings, *The Ethnic Factor in Modern Politics* is a welcome contribution to the literature on contemporary Sarawak politics, all the more so in light of the dearth of literature on the subject. This monograph, together with the author's earlier work, *The Sarawak State Election of 1987: The Dayakism Factor* (1987) could be read with benefit, and provide useful insights into contemporary Sarawak politics.

Richard Mason
School of Humanities
Universiti Sains Malaysia

Mahathir: Warisan Perjuangan Langkah ke Kadapan, Aziz Zariza Ahmad, Syarikat S. Abdul Majeed, Kuala Lumpur, 1991: 565 m.s.

Buku ini sebenarnya satu antologi 52 teks ucapan oleh YAB Datuk Seri Dr. Mahathir Mohamad sejak 1975; iaitu sejak beliau menganggotai kabinet. Sepatutnya di kulit luar buku ini Aziz Zariza Ahmad dinyatakannya saja sebagai penyuntingnya. Bahkan inilah sumbangan beliau; memilih dan menyunting ke dalam sebuah buku ucapan-ucapan *politician of the hour*, justu menyenangkan kita para pengkaji perjalanan politik tanahair. Aziz memecahkannya ke dalam empat bahagian: UMNO, Orang Melayu dan Politik Negara; Pembangunan Ekonomi Negara; Dasar Pelajaran Kebangsaan – kenyataan dan cabaran; dan Perbincangan Umum. Dalam prakatanya, Dato' Dr. Affifudin Omar, Wakil Parlimen kawasan Padang Terap, Kedah, memperkatakan stail kepimpinan Dr. Mahathir sebagai seorang *intellectual politician* yang *eclectic* yang menolak

fatwa sempit, sosialisme negara, politik etnik-perkauman, peniruan rampang budaya barat, penyebaran maklumat bohong, dan yang menyokong pula pembesaran sektor pembuatan, pembesaran demografi, peningkatan produktiviti dan perlanjutan *Internal Security Act* seperti dalam Operasi Lalang 1987. Bagi Affifudin garistindakan Dr. Mahathir adalah berpanduan 'Kebebasan dan Pertimbangan'. Dalam ungkapan Affifudin itu sendiri sudah terdapat kontradiksi. Ini mungkin seharusnya begitu, kerana politik itu sendiri terdapat atas kiraan kontradiksi sosial.⁴

Bagaimana boleh kita menilai ucapan rasmi seorang menteri (1974), kemudian seorang Timbalan Perdana Menteri (1978) dan kemudiannya seorang Perdana Menteri (1981)? Kerapkalinya ianya disediakan mengikut selera hadirin yang berbeza-beza (seperti yang diakui juga oleh Affifudin). Rata-ratanya teksnya disampaikan pada hadirin Melayu. Kurang dari sepuluh ucapan adalah dalam hadirin Cina (2) hadirin antarabangsa (3) dan persatuan profesional. Mungkin pengagihan sedemikian turut membayangkan satu penekanan besar dalam kerjaya politiknya, yakni Permasalahan Melayu atau the *Malay Question*. Atas pandangannya tentang Permasalahan Melayu inilah Dr. Mahathir telah tersingkir dari UMNO pada tahun 1969. Atas persoalan yang sama beliau menulis *The Malay Dilemma* 1970, *Panduan Perniagaan Kecil* (bersama M. Noor Azam), 1974 dan *Menghadapi Cabaran*, 1976. Beberapa kertaskerja yang terkandung dalam *Menghadapi Cabaran* adalah tertulis sebelum *Malay Dilemma* lagi. Dan kini tersusun pula *Mahathir: Warisan Perjuangan Langkah ke Hadapan*, 1991.

Ada dua kriteria yang menjadi asas pada ulasan saya ini. Pertama saya melihat Dr. Mahathir sebagai seorang ahli politik yang sedang menghadapi peralihan konfigurasi kelas dan hubungan etnik dalam kerjayanya mendapat kuasa dan kedudukan kuasa awam. Sejak beliau diterima balik oleh UMNO pada 1972, beliau membina kedudukan dominan UMNO dalam adu-dombat politik negara. Tetapi sejak 1985 kedudukan kuasa Dr. Mahathir sendiri dalam UMNO sekali lagi tercabar dan akhirnya UMNO pecah dan lahirnya UMNO (Baru) pada 1988 dan Semangat 46 pada 1989. Hal-hal ini jelas tersalur dalam beberapa teks ucapan beliau itu. Keintelektualan politik Dr. Mahathir dapat disukat dari kriteria inilah, terutamanya keanjalan dan daya ketahanan politiknya di samping tahap pemahaman beliau tentang apa itu politik dan peranan politik yang dipanggilnya sebagai 'seorang mandur yang mengurus *the affairs of the state*' (Mahathir, 1991: 509). Pada saya Dr. Mahathir membikin sejarah, tetapi tidak selalunya seperti yang ia mahu. Dari perspektif ini nada penyunting dan Affifudin sendiri adalah agak berlainan.

Keduanya saya akan melihat akan konsistensi dalam huraian diagnosisnya tentang politik Malaysia dan Permasalahan Melayu, konsistensi idea dan program pembangunannya. Hal ini juga pada saya bertali balik pada hukum keintelektualan. Seorang intelek bukan sahaja cerdik tetapi semestinya konsisten. Di sinilah letaknya 'moral' inteleknya. Apakah pemikiran Dr.

Mahathir selepas ianya berkuasa berbeza dari semasa beliau menjadi *rebel* dalam UMNO?

Dr. Mahathir menyarankan tiga hal yang menggerak dirinya: Nasionalisme, agama dan fahaman politik (Mahathir, 1976: XI). Makin jelas dengan 'nasionalisme' ia maksudkan yang ke arah menegakkan sebuah *nation*, iaitu yang bertapakkan *Malay Nation* orang-orang Melayu mesti tidak berpecah-pecah. Bahkan dalam bacaan sosiologi masyarakat Melayunya, Dr. Mahathir dapati yang ianya berat pada berfragmentasi. Bersandar pada inilah ia mencurigai 'polemik' yang tak habis-habis, terutama antara UMNO dan inteligensia bukan-UMNO seperti ulama PAS dan inteligensia sosialis di kampus-kampus. 'Apakah orang Melayu perlu menghabiskan masa dengan *intellectual exercise* ataupun mereka perlu bertindak untuk mengatasi seribu-satu masalah yang mengancam mereka?' Mahathir bertanya dalam penghujung dekad 60-an (Mahathir, 1976: I). Nada yang sama timbul dalam penghujung dekad 70-an apabila ia berkata 'Beribu-ribu *solution* ini telah diamalkan. Tetapi masalah ini nampaknya masih menjadi masalah dan tiap-tiap tahun konvensyen dan seminar dan bengkel tetap akan diadakan untuk membincang masalah ini' (Mahathir, 1991: 289). 'Masalah' itu tadi ialah pembinaan strata usahawan Melayu-bumiputra dan pengawalan 30% ekuiti industrinya. Mahathir berkata lagi yang 'DEB tidak berjanji, bahawa Awang yang tinggal di Kampung Charok atau Mek di Kampung Gunung atau Mat, atau Chin atau ada satu persatu akan menjadi kaya raya – dan tiap-tiap satu daripada orang bumiputera yang ada di Malaysia dan tiap-tiap orang yang miskin akan menjadi kaya' (Mahathir, 1991: 299). Nada yang sama juga terlahir dalam hal nasionalisme ini apabila Dr. Mahathir bertanya lagi 'Apa sebab kita perlu menjaga perpaduan parti? Apa sebab kita perlu jaga perpaduan dalam UMNO? Dan apa sebab kita perlu hapuskan sengketa di antara kita orang Melayu, tuan empunya negara ini?' (Mahathir, 1991: 32). Di sini terdapat satu konsistensi dalam paradigma politik Dr. Mahathir; iaitu tentang betapa genting dan *urgentnya* permasalahan Melayu dan bagaimana 'lekanya Melayu' dalam menghadapi cabaran ini. Juga sekaligus menunjukkan bagaimana seorang ahli politik cuba mengembeling UMNO kerana 'perasaan tamak juga telah membawa kepada perpecahan di kalangan orang-orang Melayu dan kepada percubaan merebut kuasa kerana kepentingan diri. Oleh itu, ada yang berpendapat, mungkin lebih baik jika kita tidak mengejar kemajuan dan sebaliknya kekal dengan kemunduran kita' (Mahathir, 1991: 210).

Dengan 'kemajuan Melayu' Dr. Mahathir maksudkan penglibatan Melayu di dalam perindustrian kapitalisme. Di sini sememangnya terdapat konsistensi yang menonjol. Beliau menolak sosialisme dan komunisme sebagai ideologi yang mengikutnya menganjurkan hidup manusia 'semata-mata untuk merebut kekayaan sebagai cara mencapai kebahagiaan dan keseronokan di Dunia' (Mahathir, 1991: 297). Beliau menyokong kapitalisme sebagai satu cara hidup yang selari dengan naluri semulajadi manusia. Beliau sarankan bahawa 'walau

bagaimanapun kapitalisme tidak dibentuk sebagai ideologi, ianya berasal dari perdagangan dan perniagaan yang tidak dapat tidak mesti wujud dalam masyarakat manusia' (Mahathir, 1976: 40). Bahkan kapitalisme membolehkan para pemodal mengambil risiko, mengeluarkan modal yang berjuta-juta ringgit, menggerak industri dan kilang, memberi peluang pekerjaan pada para pekerja dan pemuda-pemudi dari kampung. Pemerintah pula dapat mengutip cukai yang tinggi (antara 45-50% dari keuntungan syarikat) bagi membiayai pembangunan masyarakat (Mahathir, 1991: 282-288). Ini juga konsisten dengan pandangan Dr. Mahathir tentang betapa buruknya 'politik mogok' yang kerap dilakukan oleh kelas pekerja yang menjejaskan produktiviti kapitalisme (Mahathir, 1976: 79). Dalam hal yang sama apakah boleh kita tanya samada 'feudalisme' itu juga semulajadi?

Saranan begini berkait pula dengan 'Dilema Melayu' yang dihuraiakannya pada 1970 apabila beliau telah disingkirkan dari UMNO di bawah kepimpinan YAM Tunku Abdul Rahman. Mahathir mahukan perjuangan UMNO menegakkan kelas pemodal Melayu-bumiputra yang setanding dengan pemodal-pemodal Cina yang menjadi tulang belakang pada parti MCA. Tesis politiknya ialah keselamatan negara dan integrasi nasional hanya boleh tertegak atas kiraan persamaan ras atau *racial equality*, melalui perancangan oleh pemerintah (Mahathir, 1970: 51-52). Tetapi Mahathir juga yakin yang terlalu bergantung pada pemerintah akan melemahkan nilai *free enterprise* yang menjadi sandaran besar perjalanan kapitalisme. Ia berkata 'Masalah kita sebagai ahli politik dalam negara yang demokratik ialah kita mungkin tidak popular jika kita tidak sanggup mengguna atau lebih tepat lagi menyalahgunakan kuasa politik untuk bukan sahaja memberi peluang tetapi untuk menentu dengan tepatnya hasil yang kita idamkan. Desakan akan datang sepanjang masa supaya kuasa politik digunakan bukan sahaja untuk membuka peluang tetapi kejayaan peluang itu juga ditentukan oleh kuasa politik. Masalahnya ialah, jika kuasa politik digunakan untuk menjayakan peluang, maka kehilangan kuasa politik akan membawa kegagalan walau apa pun peluang diberi. Orang yang mengguna kuasa politik untuk mengatasi semua masalah dan cabaran, akan lumpuh dan gagal apabila dipisah dari kuasa politik' (Mahathir, 1991: 33).

Jika ada yang cukup konsisten dalam pemikiran dan tindakanduk Dr. Mahathir ialah pandangan dan sokongannya pada ragam kapitalisme. Timbul *ambivalence* hanya apabila ia bercakap tentang agama Islam, kerana agama lebih memberi tekanan pada hal-hal *spiritual* dan bukan sahaja *material* justru mengurangkan 'perasaan tamak' (Mahathir, 1991: 210). Tetapi Islam juga pada Dr. Mahathir tidak menolak kekayaan kerana 'Nabi Muhammad s.a.w. dan ramai keluarga dan rakannya adalah daripada golongan yang kaya yang mampu mengeluarkan zakat' (Mahathir, 1991: 67). Atas *rationale* itulah harus diteruskan penerapan nilai-nilai Islam, dan bersama-sama dengan nilai politik dan ekonomi *free enterprise*. Juga sudah tentu kerana musuh ketat dalam politik berparti UMNO ialah PAS. Ternampak juga dalam pandangan agamanya ini satu kontradiksi; yakni antara

Islam dan kesederhanaan, dan perkembangan pesat kelas burjuis industri dengan hambatan untungnya. Apakah kelas menengah (rendah?) sahaja janganlah terlalu tamak? Ini bertali dengan kapitalisme bimbingan pemerintah yang 'cekap, bersih dan amanah', yang perlu dikurangkan tamak dari golongan kelas pekerja dan juga para pengundi jangan minta terlalu banyak hingga menggalakkan korupsi dari kalangan ahli politik. Hal-hal ini cukup konsisten dalam pemikiran Dr. Mahathir di samping menyatakan yang sistem demokrasi itu cukup *hazardous* atau penuh dengan onak dan duri pada mereka yang memimpin.

'Warisan' Dr. Mahathir dalam politik tanah air ialah lanjutan perkembangan sosio-ekonomi Melayu-bumiputra, tetapi kini jelas dalam pembesaran kapitalisme Malaysia. Anjuran peranan pemerintahnya dalam kapitalisme adalah lebih tertekan pada tahap *circulation of capital* dan kurang pada tahap *production* dan ini melanjutkan kesedaran etnik-ras, seperti 'Cina' (dalam hubungan towkei-coolie), 'India' dalam hubungan *landed (estate) proprietor-coolie* estet dan 'Melayu' dalam hubungan aristokrasi-taninya. Tetapi dalam pemerintahan Dr. Mahathir yang penuh dengan naik dan turunnya kapitalisme, skandal korporat dan parti, politik wang, kemelesetan ekonomi yang memusnahkan ratusan usahawan, krisis parti dan perpecahan UMNO sendiri, kita juga kian nampak beberapa peralihan besar dalam hubungan kaum di Malaysia. Bukan sahaja kapitalisme Cina 'terselamat' bahkan bertambah ekuiti modalnya dari 24% (1970) kepada 44% (1990) juga pertumbuhan kelas menengah dari setiap kaum (termasuk yang di Sabah dan Sarawak).

Timbul pula penglibatan golongan istana dengan pengindustrian yang kian merubahbentuk hubungan kelas dan institusi kuasa yang tersedia ada. Dalam konteks ini pandangan Dr. Mahathir tentang sistem Raja Berpelembagaan amat penting. Ia menyarankan pada tahun 1985 yang 'Kita pilih sistem raja berperlembagaan dan tidak sistem pemerintahan republik dan presiden.... Malayangnya, walaupun sistem ini berjalan dengan baik... sekarang ini ada pihak lain yang ingin menggunakan kedudukan raja-raja untuk kepentingan peribadi masing-masing.... Mereka membuat rancangan-rancangan perniagaan yang memikat hati raja-raja... tetapi mereka boleh bersaing dengan jayanya dengan pengusaha lain, terutama pengusaha-pengusaha bumiputra.... Tidak dapat tidak, rakyat akan mempersoalkan sistem raja berperlembagaan' (Mahathir, 1991: 133-134). Hal raja-raja ini menjadi penting ialah kerana penglibatan diraja dengan pengindustrian menonjolkan pada mereka kehendak-kehendak baru, otonomi ekonomi dan keperluan memilih pegawai kerajaan yang bersimpati dengan kegiatan perekonomian mereka yang mungkin menandingi pula kegiatan bumiputra yang lain.

Tahap kepimpinan Dr. Mahathir boleh disifatkan sebagai tahap perkembangan 'poliitik kelas menengah' dan peranan Dr. Mahathir sebagai *political gatekeeper* dalam perkembangan ini.

Wawasan 2020 (Mahathir, 1991: 548-565) jika dilihat dari tesis kapitalisme Malaysia adalah satu *package* baru antara burjuis industri bukan bumiputra dan pemerintah dan melalui pemerintah peranan bertambah burjuis industri bumiputra (dengan 14% ekuitinya). Melalui penglibatan bertambah burjuis industri Malaysia dalam arena kapitalisme antarabangsa (laburan modal di Vietnam, Cambodia dll.) bukan sahaja menambah lebih modal, tetapi juga 'meluaskan' ruang pertandingan burjuis industri Malaysia dan justeru mengurangkan 'gigit-gigitan' sesama sendiri.

Akhir sekali balik pada prakata oleh Affifudin. Di dalamnya juga ia sarankan betapa benar akhirnya kritikan Dr. Mahathir akan keburukan sosialisme-komunisme. Namun mungkin perpecahan komunisme Soviet dan peralihan dalam komunisme Negara China sendiri, akan melenyapkan satu 'benteng pertahanan' dalam kapitalisme Amerika Utara dan Eropah Barat. Tanpa *the Soviet bogymen*, pergerakan buruh di sini mungkin meningkat dan tak tersekat lagi ke arah peralihan kapitalisme itu sendiri. Apakah hal ini juga akan berlaku dalam peningkatan perindustrian di Malaysia apabila *the MCP bogymennya* juga sudah hilang?

Mohamad Abdad Mohamad Zain
Pusat Pengajian Sains Kemasyarakatan
Universiti Sains Malaysia

Beyond the Tin Mines: Coolies, Squatters and New Villagers in the Kinta Valley, Malaysia, c. 1880-1980, by Francis Loh Kok Wah, Oxford University Press, Singapore 1988. xv, 304, pp. Tables, Figure, Appendices, Bibliography, Index.

This book is an important and well-written study of the history of the "Chinese working people" of the Kinta Valley of the state of Perak, over a period of a century, with the greater part of the work focused on the years from approximately 1920 to 1970. The author has been inspired by recent studies in history and critical social science which have sought to recapture the everyday lives of subaltern classes and their resistance to capitalist relations of production and state power – for instance, by the work of the Marxist historian E.P. Thompson (*The Making of the English Working Class*, 1966), the anthropologist Eric Wolf (*Europe and the People Without History*, 1982), and the political scientist James C. Scott (*Weapons of the Weak*, 1985). These works and others have sought to demonstrate that there exists a history beyond the conventional one of princes, elites, diplomacy, and wars – a history "from below," of the peoples supposedly "without history." This is a history of the quotidian, in which common people exert their agency to make history, if not under circumstances of their own choosing, often in fact under the most

oppressive conditions. With this work, then, the author joins the company of such scholars as Cheah Boon Kheng (*The Peasant Robbers of Kedah 1900-1929*, 1988), Shaharil Talib (*After Its Own Image*, 1984), Jomo K.S. (*A Question of Class*, 1986), James C. Scott, James Warren (*Rickshaw Coolie: A People's History of Singapore*, 1986) and Zawawi Ibrahim ("Malay Peasant Consciousness in Contemporary Malaysia," 1984), and others, in developing a new critical Malaysian social history, one in which the mundane actions of peasant padi cultivators, rubber tappers, tin miners, trishaw pullers, and vegetable farmers have come to play a major part, despite the formidable structures of private wealth and state power that have at times been arrayed against them.

This study is methodologically sound, with the author using a combination of archival research and analysis, participant observation in four Kinta New Villages, and interviews with New Villagers and local political leaders. It is extremely well-documented, with the endnotes by themselves providing the reader with considerable information.

The book is organized chronologically in three parts. Part I deals with the period before the Japanese occupation, during which European tin mining came to dominate the Kinta industry, and Chinese people in the district began to settle in families (rather than as single males) and to engage in vegetable farming. The author makes it clear that the so-called "squatter problem" of Chinese vegetable farmers illegally occupying state forest, Malay reserve, and private land, long predated the Emergency, and represented a necessary adaptation on the part of Chinese working people in the district to the vicissitudes of the international tin market, to increasing mechanization of the industry, and to food scarcity. In short, they had little other choice but to cultivate vegetables by "squattling" on these lands, if they were to survive. Moreover, the author proposes the important point that during the Depression of the 1930s, vegetable cultivation provided working Chinese with the capacity to resist the very low wages and poor working conditions then being offered by the tin industry.

In Part II, the book covers the years of Japanese occupation, the immediate post-war period from 1945 to 1948, the Emergency period during which more than 100,000 rural Chinese in Kinta District alone were forcibly resettled in "New Villages," and the economic and social conditions of life in the New Villages up to Independence in 1957. Here the author makes for this reviewer three important points. First, he demonstrates that during the immediate postwar years, vegetable farming in Kinta, almost always requiring illegal occupation of land, was in fact encouraged by the colonial government, whose officials correctly perceived that labor unrest was being incited not only by the organizers of the Malayan Communist Party, but also by the low wages and high food prices of those years. Squatting was thus – up until the declaration of the Emergency in 1948 – viewed as a necessary evil. In a chilling memorandum of

October 1946 cited by the author, the Malayan Union government declared that "the time was not ripe to declare *general war on illegal squatters*" (p. 82). The cynicism of this statement belies what appears to be a general cyclical colonial phenomenon: when food supplies were scarce (as immediately after both the First World War and the Japanese occupation, and during the Depression), vegetable farmers (like Malay peasant padi farmers) were given inducements to increase production; but at other times of food plenty, vegetable growers were then driven off their holdings (just as Malay peasants were provided with reduced irrigation facilities and other support for padi growing.)

Second, the author provides a convincing argument that the rural Chinese population supported the Malayan Communist Party during the immediate postwar years not out of ideological allegiance to its revolutionary goal for establishing a socialist Malayan Democratic Republic, but because its organizers appeared to be committed to help solve the most serious socioeconomic problems then being faced by that population – the low wages demanded from laborers by employers in the tin and related industries, the unwillingness of Kinta authorities to provide vegetable farmers with secure land tenure, and their attempts in places to evict them from land illegally occupied. With the assistance of MCP cadres, rural Chinese in Kinta were able to show impressive successes in surmounting these problems; there was thus a temporary "coincidence of interests" (p. 87).

Third, the author demolishes the myth that the process of coerced resettlement into New Villages in Kinta and elsewhere was one of "winning the hearts and minds" of the rural Chinese population by providing them with land and living amenities unavailable to them prior to resettlement, and by educating them in the ways of citizenship – a myth today still very much in circulation (viz. Richard Stubbs, *Hearts and Minds in Guerrilla Warfare*, 1988). The author shows instead that most New Villagers were not provided with agricultural land after resettlement, despite the fact that the vast majority were farmers; that New Villages were poorly if at all supplied with the public infrastructural amenities promised; that day-to-day controls over the lives of New Villagers by colonial police and officials approached a Foucaultian nightmare of "discipline" and "regulation," with the infliction on the Villagers of collective punishments such as curfews, with "food controls," body searches, and constant monitoring by Assistant Resettlement Officers. The author concludes that the New Villagers, far from being won in "heart and mind," were "alienated" from the government by these coercive tactics, however necessary militarily they might have been.

In Part III, the book reconstructs both socioeconomic conditions and political processes in Kinta New Villages from 1957 through the early 1970s, while a Postscript describes the situation in the New Villages since then. Here the book discusses the necessary resumption by the New Villagers of vegetable cultivation accompanied by illegal occupation of land (since few of them had

other economic options, yet land was scarce), the neglect by the postcolonial government of the New Villages until the early 1970s, and the limited funding to improve conditions thereafter.

In the last two chapters, the author discusses political developments. In Chapter 6, he describes the growth of the Peoples' Progressive Party from the 1950s onward as a party which gained its electoral power through its support of the class-based demands of Chinese working people in the New Villages for secure land tenure and for employment, as well as its commitments to dealing with ethnic-based "Chinese" issues of language, education and culture. In Chapter 7, the author goes on to recount the reform movement within the MCA associated with the Chinese Unity Movement and Perak Task Force of the 1970s, which finally provided the MCA with a foothold of support in the New Villages.

The author – in my view correctly – takes issue with the prevailing view that the political parties such as the PPP were playing "ethnic politics" by simultaneously reaffirming and inciting the supposed "primordial sentiments" (viz. Clifford Geertz) animating the political life of the New Villagers; we find their view current today – that Chinese will not ally themselves with political parties except on "ethnic" issues (viz. Claes Hallgren, *Morally United and Politically Divided*, 1986). The author argues, instead, that the "Chinese" character of the New Villagers, far from being some immanent or innate feature of the rural population, was created and maintained by the process of its forced resettlement into mono-ethnic enclaves and isolation from non-Chinese, and by the emergence of a milieu hostile to Chinese cultural aspirations within the central government. Although the ethnic dimension of electoral politics has thereby in part gained salience, this is also due, the author notes, to the absence of any alternative class-based interpretation such as that of the MCP, given its extirpation from Malaysian life (pp. 227, 267). And, while conceding that parties such as the PPP did take advantage of some "ethnic" issues of concern to Chinese, he points out that, nonetheless, the greatest successes of this party came only when it began to address the class-based concerns of New Villagers; and that when the MCA Perak Task Force reformers began addressing the serious socioeconomic problems of the New Villages, they were far more successful than the previous MCA attempts at creating Chinese "unity" by raising the consciousness of the supposedly benighted masses of rural Chinese.

Finally, the Conclusion reviews some of the major theoretical points adduced above, and the Postscript provides an update to 1980s, portraying the establishment of new industrial enterprises in the Kinta Valley, and – since these still provide insufficient employment for the dense rural population – the emergence as well of a remittance economy based on male laborers sojourning elsewhere.

In summary, this study provides a fine balance between an analysis of the articulation between global, national, and local economic and political forces, on one hand, and an elucidation of the various forms of resistance by Chinese working people to exploitation by these forces, on the other. For those interested in the new critical Malaysian social history, this excellent work is imperative reading.

Donald M. Nonini
Department of Anthropology
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Themes in Value and Distribution by Krishna Bharadwaj, Unwin Hyman, London, 1991, pp. 341.

Theories of value and distribution form the centrepiece of classical political economy. These have been instrumental in the analysis of the genesis and disposal of surplus which has remained a crucial concept in the development of classical political economy. The book under review is not a *suis generis*. It falls in the well-known *genre* of political economy already treaded by important political economists like Maurice Dobb, R.L. Meek, S. Hollander, P. Garegnani and others.

The present book by Krishna Bharadwaj is an anthology of her earlier writings, including reviews and comments on the basic theme of value and distribution. It is a reappraisal as the subtitle of the book reveals. But why does Bharadwaj play the same theme song of value and distribution when a plethora of literature is available on them? A number of cogent reasons are adduced by her. First, the theme is revealed as a common or shared ground among Smith, Ricardo and Marx.

Second, the present theme has provided the foundation for the analysis of accumulation in classical and demand-supply-based theories. Third, the analysis of value and distribution has played a critical role in determining the course of analytical history of political economy.

I presume that there is another distinct *raison d'etre*. The themes presented by Bharadwaj provide the current state of value and distribution theories. She has very neatly brought to the surface contributions of many renowned economists in this area of economic epistemology and has buttressed their views with her own reasonings, sometimes to differ, and sometimes to concur.

She has competently laid bare the formation and evolution of the basic concepts and categories used in classical political economy and has identified the theoretical basis of its questions and issues relating to value and distribution of

her work. Here lies the cardinal contribution of her work. One notices here some nexus between her present work and her earlier work on classical political economy.

Bharadwaj is careful enough to regard Smith as one of the pioneers of classical political economy. She has projected Smith as an economist of dualism, as was originally done by Schumpeter (1954), and later on by Meek. It is intriguing to note that the Smithian approach incorporates a juxtaposition of morality and materialism, harmony and conflict, labour-embodied theory and labour-commanded theory and also a system of coexistence of market price and natural price.

Ricardo wrote on current problems and his conclusions were politically acceptable. In analysing Ricardian theories of value and distribution, Bharadwaj has cited the studies of Blaug, Dobb, Garegnani, Hollander, McCulloch and Sraffa. However, readers will find that the seminal work of Nicholas Kaldor on value and distribution examining Ricardian and Marxian theories of distribution is conspicuous by its absence. Many readers would perhaps have liked a critical discussion on Kaldor's elaboration of Ricardo's marginal and surplus principles. The omission is perhaps owing to the fact that in the schema of examination of post-Ricardians, the discussion on Kaldor does not slot in well.

The last chapter is a tribute to Piero Sraffa. Bharadwaj critically reviews all major works of Sraffa. It is full of information on Sraffa as a man and economist, his initiation into the classical political economy at the insistence of Gramsci, his attack on the neoclassical orthodoxy, his critique of Marshallian supply curve, his critique of Hayek's "Prices and Production" and also his stimulating views on the growth of theories of imperfect competition.

Students of political economy would have benefitted if Bharadwaj had incorporated a simplistic exposition of the essential ideas of Sraffa as given in his book. However, this would be like a glutton asking for a second helping after a sumptuous full course.

Bharadwaj's book is a veritable rendezvous of ideas old and new, on various facets of classical political economy, and in this firmament of ideas, the theme of value and distribution hangs all the while like Coleridge's albatross. The *differential specifica* of the book lies in its critical analysis of the currents and cross-currents of thoughts developed by celebrated contemporary political economists.

B.N. Ghosh
School of Social Sciences
Universiti Sains Malaysia

Hikayat Banjar oleh Johannes Jacobus Ras. Diterjemahkan oleh Siti Hawa Salleh. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur: 1990, xi, m.s. 484. Kata pengantar, Peta, Glosari-Indeks, Lampiran, Bibliografi, Senarai Singkatan, Indeks.

Pada tahun 1968 Institut Di Raja Linguistik dan Antropologi (Belanda), iaitu Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (KITLV), telah melancarkan satu siri penerbitan yang berjudul *Bibliotheca Indonesica*, dengan tujuan mengeluarkan edisi-edisi kritikal teks manuskrip Bahasa Melayu dan bahasa-bahasa Indonesia, lengkap dengan komentar dan terjemahan ke dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Buku Ras merupakan penerbitan pertama di dalam siri itu.

Pada ketika karya Ras diterbitkan, iaitu tahun 1968, ia boleh dikatakan merupakan satu pendekatan baru di dalam bidang pengajian Melayu, khususnya pengajian hikayat, dalam Bahasa Inggeris, walaupun pendekatan ini sebenarnya telah dicadangkan oleh Snouck Hurgronje dalam Bahasa Belanda pada hujung kurun ke-19. Pendekatan ini boleh dilabel "strukturalis".

Berbeza daripada pendekatan sarjana-pentadbir Inggeris di Malaysia, pendekatan ini menolak pembacaan hikayat-hikayat Melayu sebagai teks sejarah dalam ertikata pemahaman Eropah kurun ke-19, iaitu sebagai satu penceritaan yang menunjukkan hubungan sebab-akibat yang munasabah tentang satu rangkaian peristiwa yang boleh dibuktikan pernah berlaku. Pembacaan seperti ini telah menghasilkan kesimpulan bahawa teks-teks hikayat mengandungi banyak cerita-cerita dongeng. Ia juga memberi tumpuan kepada sumber-sumber hikayat itu di dalam tradisi Hindu, Parsi, Arab-Islam, dll., seperti yang jelas daripada ayat pertama kata pengantar Winstedt di dalam bukunya "A History of Classical Malay Literature": "Anyone who surveys the field of Malay literature will be struck by the amazing abundance of its foreign flora and the rarity of indigenous growths."

Sebaliknya, pendekatan "strukturalis" memberikan tumpuan kepada struktur perhubungan antara elemen-elemen di dalam sesuatu hikayat dan persamaan dan perbezaannya dengan struktur hikayat lain, iaitu hikayat itu dilihat sebagai kombinasi dan permutasi beberapa elemen yang sama. Pendekatan ini berharap mendedahkan struktur yang terdapat di sebalik karya-karya ini dan menganggap karya-karya ini sebagai tanda akan struktur masyarakat dan struktur ideologi tempatan. Dalam konteks ini, pendekatan ini berharap mendedahkan pensejarahan Melayu berbanding dengan pensejarahan barat dan secara itu membolehkan kita membaca teks-teks ini sebagai sejarah juga.

Pada hal, walau pun pengaruh strukturalis jelas, dan walau pun Ras memberi tajuk kecil "Suatu Kajian tentang Pensejarahan Melayu" kepada edisi asalnya, beliau tidak banyak membincangkan konsep pensejarahan Melayu dalam buku ini. Sebaliknya tujuan sebenar beliau dalam karya ini ialah memberikan

maklumat yang perlu untuk suatu analisis bersifat strukturalis. Ke arah itu, Ras menyampaikan satu perbincangan yang berfaedah dan ringkas tentang pendekatannya, satu perbandingan dengan hikayat Melayu dan Jawa yang lain yang jelas menunjukkan permutasi dan kombinasi unsur-unsur yang terdapat di dalam kesemua hikayat itu, satu sejarah penempatan Melayu di Kalimantan Tenggara dan hubungannya dengan Jawa, serta satu edisi kritikal satu teks Hikayat Banjar sendiri. Segala ini dilengkapi dengan satu glosari-indeks yang amat berfaedah serta beberapa lampiran yang memberikan maklumat yang menarik tentang Kota Waringin.

Malangnya, glosari-indeks dalam edisi Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ini telah kehilangan faedahnya kerana satu ketinggalan yang amat serius. Dalam edisi asal, teks Hikayat Banjar dilengkapi dengan angka-angka garis dan glosari-indeks merujuk kepada angka-angka garis ini. Akan tetapi, dalam edisi ini, angka-angka garis tidak diberi sementara glosari-indeks masih merujuk kepada angka-angka garis yang terdapat di dalam edisi asal. Oleh kerana itu, seseorang pembaca tidak boleh menggunakan glosari-indeks sebagai satu sumber rujukan!

Di samping itu, edisi Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka juga mengubah prinsip transliterasi yang Ras menggunakan di dalam edisi asalnya. Namun demikian, perubahan ini tidak dicatatkan supaya pembaca menyedarinya.

Sebahagian daripada perubahan ini tidak penting kerana ia merupakan perubahan ke sistem ejaan baru sahaja. Tetapi ada perubahan yang boleh mengurangkan faedah edisi ini sebagai satu rujukan sarjana. Tambah lagi, nampaknya perubahan yang dilakukan tidak berapa konsisten. Ini tidak bermakna sistem transliterasi Ras adalah sempurna, tetapi beliau telah cuba mengikuti ejaan manuskrip.

Ambil sahaja muka surat pertama dua-tiga manuskrip Hikayat Banjar yang telah direproduksi di dalam buku ini. Ras transliterasi "p-a-r-i-m-t-a" atau "p-r-i-m-t-a" sebagai "parimata", tetapi ini telah diubah ke "permata" dalam edisi Dewan. Begitu juga, "jambrut" ditukar ke "zamrud" sementara ejaan manuskrip adalah "j-m-b-r-t" atau "j-m-b-r-u-t". Akan tetapi, "gadung" dikekalkan walau pun ejaan manuskrip adalah "g-d-ng" atau "g-d-u-ng", "Ampu Djatmaka" juga dikekalkan sementara ia harus ditukar ke "Ampu Jatmaka" mengikut ejaan sistem baru, dan pastilah "ketji" harus ditukar ke "keci". Tanpa satu perbandingan yang mendalam antara manuskrip asal, edisi Ras dan edisi Dewan, sukarlah menentukan betapa serius perubahan yang dilakukan dalam edisi Dewan ini.

Walau bagaimanapun, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dan Siti Hawa Salleh harus dipuji kerana sanggup menerbitkan buku ini dalam satu edisi yang murah. Akan tetapi, memandangkan kelalaian yang tersebut di atas, pengulas ini harap Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka akan menarik balik edisi ini dan menerbitkan satu edisi baru dengan pembetulan yang perlu.

Akhir sekali, bolehkah kita harap bahawa Siti Hawa Salleh, yang pernah menghasilkan satu teks Hikayat Merong Mahawangsa, akan menterjemahkan buku H. Maier tentang Hikayat Merong Mahawangsa, satu penerbitan yang mewakili pendekatan terbaru aliran Leiden di dalam bidang pengajian Melayu?

Khoo Khay Jin
Pusat Pengajian Sains Kemasyarakatan
Universiti Sains Malaysia

Warkah Eropah oleh A. Samad Said, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur, 1991.

This is a coffee table book, lavishly illustrated with mostly colour snap shots of the author taken in England and France. The two week cultural tour of France was partially paid for by the French government to honor our Sastrawan Negara. A. Samad Said was in London, however, for five days from April 5 to April 9, in Paris from April 19 to April 24, and then back in London for another 20 days, from April 24 to May 13, 1989. This book contains 49 letters, 20 post cards, and two thank you notes. Rashidah received 19 letters, Az 13, Sita Dini five, Sal four, Helmy three, Siti Senja two, Sina Raihan two. The post cards were addressed to his friends in Malaysia and abroad. A thank you note was sent to Catherine Camus and another, to a scholar of Chinese literature.

A Samad Said says in the introduction that this book was planned, though not in this expensive way. What he had in mind was something comparable to, or perhaps slightly better than, his earlier book of letters I read a long time ago, *Warkah Kapada Salmi Manja* (KL: Penerbitan Federal Berhad, 1965). Now out of print, it is a thin paperback, costing \$1.75.

Personal letters sent to one's wife or wives and children are private and confidential. Other than the receiver, no one else should read them. But people have different notions of privacy; most naturally refuse to share family correspondence with others. Family matters stay within the family. However there are those who, like A. Samad Said, do not seem to mind. After all these letters are reports of the various things he saw, and of the important and obscure people he met, along the way. There are no secrets to tell, no gossips to share, no scores to settle. These were left unsaid, for they not necessary. Why cause bitterness and enmity when there is no reason to.

I find the language of A. Samad Said very instructive. This is one reason I read him, a confession I cannot make about the books of other Sasterawans Negara. He cares for the appropriate sentence, correct syntax, minimum use of prefixes, even the placement of the commas. He divides his paragraphs according to one

central idea, thus achieving, even in a casual letter to one of his children, a coherence which is a pleasure to read. He avoids long winding sentences that characterize the style of a number of other prominent Malay writers, whom, I suspect, mistake deliberate obscurantism for profundity of thought. A. Samad Said's concern is to get the message across, and he does it very well.

In France A. Samad Said met with a number of important people. With Levi Strauss he discussed the myth of ancient races, a subject which underpins the theory of structuralism, useful for decoding modern texts and subtexts. The imam of the Paris mosque opposed the fatwa of killing Rushdie. The imam reiterated the injunction of the Quran that those who have gone astray must be given the chance to repent. He added that insulting the prophet of Islam was not a new phenomenon. The enemies of Islam could always find some flaw in the personality of the Prophet to hit Islam with. Islam, thank God, is much too strong to be shaken by a book, written by an ill-adjusted creep too westernised for his own good. Dr. Lombard chaired a gathering at the Institute of Oriental Languages in which Samad gave a talk on Malay literature in general and on his works in particular; he entertained his audience with a reading of his poem "Latah Setingan." Dr. Monique Zaini, the Indonesian-Malay specialist, complained to Samad that she had not received her copies of *Dewan Sastera*, source journal crucial to her study of modern Malay literature. A. Samad Said promised to alert the authorities at the Dewan Bahasa to expedite the subscription matter, upon his return to KL. Milan Kundera he did not manage to meet; Kundera disappeared from public view after having finished a book.

A. Samad Said visited the gravesites of Baudelaire, Cortazar, Sartre, de Beauvoir, Malreaux, Camus and others. I suspect that the purpose of these visits was simply touristic, namely, to have his pictures taken with the tombstones in the background, engraved with the names of the famous dead. In all of us there is that adolescent tourist who gleefully teases his friends, who are not fortunate enough to enjoy the luxury of travel: "See this picture - I was there," sort of thing.

A. Samad Said beheld and entered quite a number of historical and modern buildings, some of which are synonymous with Paris: L'Effel Tower, L'Arc de Triomphe, Le Centre George Pompidou, Le Pyramid of L. M. Oei, L'Institut du Monde Arabe, L' Institut de France, and le Bibliotheque Nationale. He did not manage to visit the Louvre; otherwise he could report to us what he thought of the Mona Lisa. I am particularly curious to read the response of a Malay to this portrait.

One of A. Samad Said's delights in France was entering the house of Albert Camus. He was shown Camus's bedroom, study, balcony, garden, and bathroom - what a privilege. A. Samad Said noted that in such an environment, Camus produced *The Outsider* and *The Plague*, masterpieces of French

existentialist literature. A Samad Said sought the spirit which pervaded the room in which Camus worked, writing at his standing table. There is no magic in the pieces of furniture, or in the writing paraphernalia of an author. But there must be something there, an aura perhaps, preserved in the tangibility of things. I hope A. Samad Said's intuition grasped that aura from which to draw inspiration. His letters inform his readers that you need not have to live in poverty to produce great pieces of writing. Camus's villa, by any standard, is grand. The serenity of the place too was inspiring to the visitor. A. Samad Said visualized the lean figure of Camus, exhausted from a day's work, standing on the verandah, contemplating the vast landscape, waiting to be recharged. Was it on this balcony that Camus wrote: "Works of art are not born in splashes of inspiration but in a daily fidelity. And one of the real secrets of the French novel is its ability to show at the same time a harmonious sense of fatality and an art that springs wholly from individual liberty – to present, in short, the perfect domain in which the forces of destiny collide with human decisions."?

To be in the homes of famous writers do provide some hints which might explain the mystery of the creative process. I visited Walden Pond in Massachusetts once for the same reason, but alas, Thoreau's cabin was not original. But the replica by the pond was good enough. I saw the grandeur of the landscape surrounding the pond in the rolling hills of New England, burning with the red of autumn leaves. I sensed the joy Thoreau must have experienced in the solitude and silence of the woods in which he penned his thoughts on the human conditions, drawing dazzling metaphors from the vast world of nature.

In *Warkah Eropah* there are quite a number of colour pictures of A. Samad Said calculating his money. So much francs for trains, meals, books, movies, plays, presents. He was on a shoestring budget which proved distressing at times; he would have liked to buy more books but his funds were simply insufficient. To save money he contemplated on staying for free at the residence of Datuk Hassan Ahmad, our representative at the UNESCO in Paris. But he decided against it, opting instead, to pay for his meals. I find this rather revealing. Our Sastrawan Negara is no freeloader, mindful of his status as he is of his flowing beard and long white hair. He travelled within his frugal means, an attitude reflected in many of his poems, especially in his choice of imagery.

Thus, reading these letters one captures something of the personality of A. Samad Said: not a mythic distant figure but a writer who is generous enough to share with others his observations and thoughts while he is far away from home.

Zakaria Ali
School of Humanities
Universiti Sains Malaysia

The Malayan Union Controversy 1942-1948 by Albert Lau, Oxford University Press, Singapore 1991. vii-xvi, Tables, Plates, Bibliography, Index, 308 pp.

Readers who are familiar with the existing literature on the Malayan Union will inevitably judge this book against earlier studies by Allen (1967), Sopiae (1974) and Stockwell (1979), especially because the strengths and weaknesses of these earlier studies have been highlighted in several able reviews, in particular those by Stenson (1969), Cheah (1980) and Wong (1982). Wong's conclusion after surveying the literature on the Malayan Union was that its historians, hampered by insufficient documents and limited perspectives, had yet to arrive at "a satisfactory history, not to mention a definitive one".

Against this background, readers will no doubt be looking out for new historical insights into this crucial period in the history of the Malay peninsula. They will also expect the author to locate his work within the context of preceding studies. In addition, given that questions about perspective, focus and historical method in the writing of "imperial" history has attracted considerable debate amongst Commonwealth and Southeast Asian historians since the early sixties, many readers are also likely to examine critically the techniques of historical research and reconstruction employed in a study of this kind.

Dr. Lau's book is revised from his Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of London in 1986. As he explains in the Introduction, his study was prompted by the availability of additional official sources opened since Stockwell's study in the seventies. Though he obviously takes off from many of the questions raised in Wong's review article, he modestly disclaims any attempt to arrive at a "complete history". Instead his purpose is "to augment preceding studies" in recounting certain aspects of British constitutional policy.

Consistent with this objective, Lau reconstructs the Malayan Union episode exclusively from British official records. He begins in Chapter One with an account of the legal problems the British faced in trying to create the constitutional basis for a united Malaya when the war ended. He then proceeds to provide, in the rest of the book, an extremely detailed narrative, arranged in strictly chronological order, of each step in the process of the planning and implementation of the Malayan Union up to its replacement by the Federation of Malaya. Thus, Chapters 2 to 4 trace the formulation of the Malayan Union from the twin aspects of "Union" and "Citizenship" while the process of implementation begins with an account of the infamous MacMichael treaties (Ch. 5) to the release of the White Paper (Ch. 6). Chapter 7 details the famous British volte-face on the Malayan Union which is followed by Anglo-Malay negotiations (Ch. 8) and attempts to take non-Malay views into account (Ch. 9). Chapter 10 then focusses on the question of Singapore's separation. Finally, in a brief concluding chapter, Lau highlights his major findings.

Crudely summarized, Lau has established that Gent was not the originator of the idea of a Union as was commonly thought. Secondly, he has found that "strategic and power considerations" were the prime motivations of British policy, with the vocabulary of self-government being deployed more as "an expedient tactical device" (276-277). The relative importance of various motivations for British policy had, as is usually the case in historical studies, been a matter of disagreement amongst earlier researchers. However, Lau does not unearth any dramatic new insights into the reasons why the British changed from Union to Federation with the accompanying changes in the status and power of individual states and citizenship provisions for non-Malays, though he does take us in great detail (in Chs 7, 8 and 9) into the "actual behind-the-scenes negotiations which led to the formation of the Federation" (4).

We find that Lau's evidence confirms what most other researchers had contended, namely, that both Gent and MacDonald realized that the only sane thing for the British to do in the circumstances was to immediately draw the leaders of UMNO together with the Sultans into quiet negotiations on an acceptable constitutional alternative. Their job was to persuade the Colonial Office and the government in London that they were right. Similarly, on the reasons for Singapore's separation (Ch. 10), Lau confirms that the principal motivation was to remove what could be a major obstacle to "the Colonial Office's foremost objective of a constitutional union of the peninsular states" (282) rather than the strategic importance of Singapore as a defence base. Lau does augment earlier studies by providing a more detailed account of the communications between officials based in Malaya and those in England.

This is certainly a carefully researched book and there is no doubt that Lau has gone through a great deal more of the documents than his predecessors. Lau has meticulously pieced together a monthly, in some instances weekly, monitor of developments by tracking down innumerable minutes, memoranda and official reports. If the additional documents do not reveal much beyond what was "surmised", "alleged", "asserted without much documentary proof" by earlier researchers, this certainly is not his shortcoming and does not detract from the value of his work.

The problem, however, lies in the extent to which the researcher is too immersed in his sources. Consequently the account that he reconstructs is a uni-dimensional narrative of what this or that British official thought, said and did with the views and deeds of non-British personages reported through British eyes. Thus, for example, Lau's account of MacMichael's mission (Ch. 5) to obtain the "agreement" of the Sultans of all the Malay states to new treaties is presented largely through MacMichael's eyes despite the fact that from Allen's and Stockwell's work we already learnt that what MacMichael did not report to his superiors in London could be as important to our understanding of the situation as what he did report. Kedah is a good case in point. Both Lau and

Allen devote one short paragraph to MacMichael's meeting with the Sultan of Kedah. Lau's account (114) is drawn totally from MacMichael's memoranda while we learn from Allen (32) that the Sultan, after entertaining MacMichael with immaculate courtesy, complained to E.V.G. Day the Senior B.M.A. Officer in Kedah, about MacMichael's tactics and sent a telegram to the Secretary of State that very evening to declare that the treaty he had signed under duress was null and void.

In similar fashion in Chapter 8 where Lau narrates in great detail the discussions in the Anglo-Malay Working Committee, his account of the negotiations is again directly extracted from British officials' reports and impressions. By locating his centre of gravity throughout within the thinking of British officials, he fails to give the reader a clearer picture of the dynamics of the political situation inside and outside the Anglo-Malay Working Committee.

Granted that his objective is a study of British policy and not the post-war political scene, nevertheless as he himself acknowledges the Malayan Union was stillborn because however logically conceived and carefully planned it may have been, it simply became untenable "under the onslaught of new post-war forces" (282). Yet there is little attempt on the author's part to inform the reader sufficiently on what these new post-war forces were, even though several studies are available and cited in his bibliography.

A reader who has not read elsewhere about the "intensity of Malay feeling which impressed both Gent and MacDonald" (279) is unlikely to understand from Lau's six – page account of Malay reactions to the release of the January White Paper (130-136), why the "British volte-face" was necessary. Similarly though Lau does in passing refer to British fears of radical Malay nationalists and the increased influence of the Malayan Communist Party, their importance in a redefined post-war political equation is given scant attention. Consequently Lau does not address a pertinent issue which Stenson raised in his 1969 review article on the Malayan Union and its historians: was the Federation really a volte-face on the surface with British objectives essentially quite intact?

Indeed, Lau has insufficiently discussed the overall economic, social and political difficulties the British faced in the immediate post-war situation which help to explain why "strategic and power considerations" dictated the formulation of the Malayan Union as much as its withdrawal. The evolution of British constitutional policy cannot be divorced either from its specific political setting or from the larger considerations which post-war Britain had to bear in mind while attempting to come to terms with the inevitability of decolonization in the long run. Several articles published in the *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* in the early eighties have argued, for example, that economic factors must be taken into account in any attempt to understand British "strategic and power considerations" in the aftermath of World War II.

Lau does not attempt to address these issues nor does he locate his study of British policy in Malaya and Singapore in the context of current thinking on the historiography of decolonization.

These weaknesses arise largely because Lau has chosen to use a straight narrative style throughout his substantive chapters (i.e. Chs. 2-10), withholding any discursive intrusions from the author. He makes little attempt to indicate, even in his footnotes, where his narrative differs from or confirms the findings or views of earlier researchers, using footnotes mainly to indicate his sources. This technique restricts him to a recounting of chronological events which are not then located in a larger historical setting from which both the researcher and the reader might understand better what is happening at the narrative level.

Tan Liok Ee
School of Humanities
Universiti Sains Malaysia

Syair Pangeran Syarif Hashim al-Qudsi by Arena Wati, Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, 1989, 192 pp., Jadual, Glosari, Bibliografi, Indeks Watak, Indeks Tempat.

Arena Wati has prepared an annotated transliteration of a 19th century Malay *syair*, analysing it as both a work of literature and a historical document. He worked in the Netherlands on the manuscript, and used archival sources from Leiden and the Hague. The *syair*, composed in Penyengat (Riau) about events in Kalimantan, underlines the breadth of the Malay cultural world, and reminds us that Arena Wati, (Haji Muhammad bin Abdul Biang), a highly-acclaimed Malaysian writer and Sasterawan Negara 1988, himself spans political boundaries, being born in South Sulawesi. *Alam Melayu*, the Malay world, with its distinctive cultural and political representations, still flows across international boundaries.

The *syair* is based on a prose account by Pangeran Syarif Hasyim, a Riau-born mercenary, of his campaigns in Banjarmasin against the local rulers who were resisting Dutch control. The prose narrative was versified by Engku Raja al-Haji Daud ibnu Raja al-Haji Ahmad, whom Arena Wati does not point out, was a half brother of the better known Penyengat writer, Raja Ali Haji. The *syair* is thus another example of the interesting works which were composed by the prolific writers of 19th century Penyengat.

Arena Wati compiles a biographical sketch of Pangeran Syarif Hashim from five letters from Dutch officials to the Pangeran which are bound in with the *syair* manuscript, details from the *syair* itself, and from references to him in

Tuhfat al-Nafis. The Pangeran was the son of Engku Said Muhammad Zain al-Kudsi, a Palembang born part-Arab who married into the Riau Bugis royal line, and became a court official in Riau-Lingga.¹ With forty of his own men, Pangeran Syarif Hasyim fought for the Dutch between 1860 and 1864 in the early stages of the Banjarmasin War. The Dutch decorated him for his services and awarded him special privileges.² As Arena Wati points out there are very few writings connected with the colonisation of the Malayo-Indonesian world written from a local point of view. What is particularly striking about Pangeran Syarif Hasyim is that he is pro-Dutch, and fights against the Banjarese. The *syair* offers a totally different perspective from raja-centred Malay texts which are predicated on total loyalty to the ruler. Pangeran Syarif Hasyim shows that loyalty can also be given to those outside the traditional system, although it can still be described in traditional terms, as the *syair* notes:

*senang sentosa di dalam negeri
tetapi adatnya kompeni Belanda (p. 129).*

The Dutch are depicted as rewarding his loyalty in the traditional manner, with *nama*, women and symbols of status such as weapons and parasols. Arena Wati has used one of two known manuscripts of the *Syair Pangeran Syarif Hashim*³ for his transcription. This is MS Orient No. 2094 in the Library of the University of Leiden, which has been dedicated to the Dutch Resident C.C. Tromp. The other manuscript, (Bat. Gen. 196), in the Jakarta Museum, is dedicated to another Dutch official, F.N. Nieuwenhuysen, but is almost illegible because of the deterioration of its paper.⁴ Now that we have Arena Wati's transcription it would be interesting to try and compare the two versions.

Arena Wati's description of the text as a work of literature leads him to analyse the poetic form of the *syair*. His consideration of two definitions of the ideal number of words in a typical *syair* line, raises the very difficult issue of the definition of a word in traditional Malay. Although it is not Arena Wati's aim to resolve the debate about the poetic form of the *syair*, his work does urge us to once again consider the relationship between the written, visual form of a Jawi *syair* and its aural, heard reception. The definition of the word as a unit when written in Jawi script may be different from listening to words as parts of an utterance. In Jawi script a reduplicated form may be indicated by the numeral '2', particles, prepositions, emphatics and qualifiers may be joined to other words, and thus not be visually separate, although when spoken they may be separated by emphasis or pauses. We still have more to learn about these basic aspects of Malay. In the particular case of the *Syair Pangeran Syarif Hashim*, which was composed it seems, for presentation to Dutch officials, the written form of the text may have been considered more important than its aural impact. The drawings which adorn the early pages of the MS add support to this view.

After his detailed description of the form of the *syair*, Arena Wati gives some historical background to the events it describes. These enable us to appreciate the unusual context in which Pangeran Syarif Hasyim operated as a Dutch mercenary. A section on the changes which have occurred to place names in Banjar region is interesting and useful.

The transliteration of the *syair* is set out very clearly and unusual Jawi spellings are noted in the annotations, while difficult or unusual words are explained in a glossary. The romanisation of the Jawi is largely faithful to the MS⁵ although I note that the editor has not preserved such Jawi forms as r-g-y-n and g-w-b-r-n-m-n, but has normalised them to 'Regent' and 'Government' (see for example, p. 79). For the purposes of comparing the spellings of non-Malay words in a range of MSS, it is helpful to retain the original Jawi spellings.

We must thank Arena Wati for making this semi-biographical, historically interesting *syair* available to a wider readership. It adds to our knowledge of late 19th century Malay writing and provides an unusual perspective on Malay-Dutch relationships. It is also valuable as a representation of non-Malays, the Dayaks and Banjarese whom Pangeran Hasyim was fighting, and provides further evidence of Riau's long involvement with the coastal areas of Kalimantan, a subject which deserves fuller treatment.

The corpus of published romanised *syair* is now quite considerable. Using texts which are carefully presented like this one, it is now feasible to begin comparative studies of this enduring poetic form, which has been used in the Malay world since the 16th century, and was still popular until relatively recently.

Virginia Matheson Hooker
Faculty of Asian Studies
Australian National University
Canberra

NOTES

- ¹ For further details see Virginia Matheson, 'Kemantapan Syair sebagai Satu Genre dalam kesusasteraan Melayu dengan Catatan Khusus mengenai *Syair Pangeran Syarif Hasyim*, (Penyengat, 1870)', in *Cendekia Kesusasteraan Melayu Tradisional*, ed Siti Hawa Haji Saleh, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1987, pp. 150-1.
- ² Further information is given in contemporary Dutch accounts of the war, e.g. W.A. van Rees, *De Bandjermasinsche Krijg van 1859-1863*, Arnhem,

1865, p. 337 and p. 413ff; H.G.J.L. Meyners, *Bijdragen tot de Kennis der Geschiedenis van het Bandjermasinsche Rijk, 1863-1866*, Leiden, 1886, pp. 185, 193, 197.

- ³ The *syair* is also known under the title of *Syair Perang Banjarmasin*, see Ph S. van Ronkel, *Catalogus der Maleische Handschriften in het Museum van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*, VBG, 57, 1909, p. 345. For a description of this MS see Liaw Yock Fang, *Sejarah Kesusasteraan Melayu Klasik*, Singapura, 1978, p. 309.
- ⁴ For a description of this MS see Liaw Yock Fang, *Sejarah Kesusasteraan Melayu Klasik*, Singapura, 1978, p. 309.
- ⁵ Comparing Arena Wati's transcription with my own I would suggest for example, that his, 'kejara' (verse 108, p. 80) could be 'gembira', and in verse 105 on the same page I have 'Berjalan ke hadapan', the *ke* being omitted in the published transcription. These are small discrepancies which are almost inevitable when one works with older handwritten Jawi texts.

Historical Dictionary of Singapore. Compiled by K. Mulliner and Lian The-Mulliner. Asian Historical Dictionaries, No. 7. The Scarecrow Press, Metuchen, NJ, and London, 1991. Pp. xxxii, 251.

A historical dictionary is the sort of publication that historians are always delighted to find that someone else has prepared. Were history a properly constituted craft, acolytes would be required to produce something useful – a bibliography, a research aid, or a work such as this – as a precondition to being permitted to enter upon a career spent writing books and articles whose utility is very doubtful. As matters stand, historians depend on charitable souls, often (as in the present case) from the honourable Order of Librarians, to provide such tools.

The measures of a historical dictionary are its degree of comprehensiveness, the reliability and clarity of the explanations, and the usefulness of the index in helping readers pursue crossreferences. On the first two counts the work under review is eminently satisfactory. I spotted no conspicuous omissions (apart, perhaps, from Singapore's newspapers, past and present), and the explanatory material does an excellent job of calling attention to significant issues with an admirable economy of words.

The index is much less satisfactory. First, it is cluttered with single-entry items which seem pointless in a volume organized alphabetically (what earthly use is it to show in the index that the name Sir Franklin Gimson appears on page 60, when page 60 is part of the "G" section, and Gimson dutifully stands between

"Generations of Leadership" and "Goh Chok Tong"? On the other hand, items in the index which are very lengthy (India has 26 entries, Lee Kuan Yew 29, Malay 34, and Chinese 36) cry out for subheadings, which are not provided. Moreover, runs of pages where, for example, Malay or Chinese appear as part of different items are drawn together (under "Chinese" the reader finds 38-45, 47-50), a practice which is unhelpful and discouraged by many publishers. On the plus side, the index enables the reader to find some information about the newspapers, which are mentioned in passing in some of the entries.

The Bibliography is arranged topically, and follows an arrangement set in the Table of Contents (a useful point to bear in mind if one is looking for a specific title, since the bibliography is 57 pages long). It will be of use primarily to readers wanting to get a rough idea of what works have been published concerning some particular area of concern. Inevitably there are anomalies, which limit the value of the bibliography even for this purpose. Historical works on the Indian community S. Arasaratnam's *Indians in Malaya and Singapore* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1981) and Kernial Singh Sandhu's *Indians in Malaya* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1969) appear under Society, subheading Indians, while Lee Poh Ping's *Chinese Society in Nineteenth Century Singapore* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1978) and Yen Ching-hwang's *A Social History of the Chinese in Singapore and Malaya 1800-1911* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986) are under History, subheading General. And so on.

Otherwise, the work has a number of helpful features: maps, a chronology of important events, and appendices listing Heads of Government (with their dates, Cabinets, General Election results, and population by ethnicity) since 1821. It is a mine of information and can spare researchers hours of digging to locate names and dates. And it reflects a massive amount of work on the part of the compilers, for which others in the profession should be very grateful.

Paul H Kratoska
History Department
National University of Singapore

Hikayat Siak disejenggarakan oleh Muhammad Yusoff Hashim, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur, 1992, 327 pp. Peta, Gambarfoto, Bibliografi, Indeks.

Sekali lagi Datuk Profesor Yusoff Hashim dari Universiti Malaya menunjukkan kehandalan beliau sebagai seorang ahli sejarah yang paling produktif dan berminat mengkaji dan menyelenggarakan teks-teks lama sejarah Melayu. Sejak dua tahun ini Muhammad telah menerbitkan tiga buku yang mengandungi teks-teks dalam kelompok pensejarahan Melayu tradisional – satu tentang Pahang, satu lagi tentang Terengganu dan kali ini tentang Siak. Menurut esei pengenalannya, ada empat naskah *Hikayat Siak* yang terwujud kini. Naskah yang dikaji telah dijumpai oleh Muhammad di perpustakaan Universiteit Bibliotheek di Leiden semasa beliau bercuti sabbatikal. Naskah ini adalah paling sempurna, dan telah dihadiahkan oleh R.O. Winstedt dan merupakan satu salinan dari satu naskah lain yang Winstedt telah menghadihkan kepada Royal Asiatic Society di London. Selain esei pengenalan yang diisikan di dalam 95 halaman, Muhammad juga menyampaikan satu ringkasan cerita-cerita di dalam *Hikayat Siak*. Ini diikuti dengan transkripsi rumi seluruh teks hikayat dengan nota-nota filologi. Akhirnya teks ini disertakan dengan 20 keping gambarfoto berwarna-warni tentang tokoh-tokoh Siak, makam diraja dan petempatan bersejarah.

Selain dari Winstedt, sarjana-sarjana lain yang telah menggunakan *Hikayat Siak* ialah E. Netscher, Leonard Andaya dan Virginia Matheson, namun ini pertama kali seluruh teks satu naskah *Hikayat Siak* telah disampaikan kepada orang ramai. *Hikayat Siak* menceritakan keturunan raja-raja Siak yang bermula daripada Raja Kecil yang menyerang Kerajaan Johor pada tahun 1718 dan menumbangkan Sultan Abdul Jalil. Ia mendakwa dirinya sebagai putera Sultan Mahmud Mangkat Dijulang, iaitu Sultan Johor yang dibunuh oleh Megat Seri Rama, seorang laksamana muda yang berkomplot dengan Bendahara Tun Abdul Jalil, yang kemudian menaiki takhta.

Hikayat Siak ialah satu sumber sejarah yang penting kerana ia memberikan satu sejarah Kerajaan Johor yang berlainan daripada *Tuhfat-al-Nafis* yang sangat pro-Bugis. *Tuhfat* sangat berpengaruh di kalangan para sarjana hari ini dan menonjolkan peranan Bugis kerana orang Bugislah yang mengusir Raja Kecil dan melantik Raja Sulaiman, anak Sultan Abdul Jalil sebagai Sultan, tetapi merekalah yang terus memerintah secara mutlak bagi pihak Sultan Sulaiman yang dijadikan raja boneka. Walau bagaimanapun, pemerintahan Bugis ditentang oleh orang Melayu dan perlagaan Melayu-Bugis yang berterusan membuka pintu kepada, pertama, orang Belanda, dan kemudian orang Inggeris untuk campur tangan. Perkembangan ini pula, akhirnya membawa kesan perpecahan Kerajaan Johor-Riau-Lingga-Pahang.

Raja Ali Haji, pengarang *Tuhfat-al-Nafis*, pernah merujuk kepada *Hikayat Siak* sebagai salah satu sumber rujukannya, tetapi mengikut Muhammad beliau sering

menganggap karya ini sebagai tidak bernilai tinggi dan cuba memutarbelitkan perkara-perkara yang disampaikan di dalam kandungannya. Apa yang dikatakan putih oleh *Hikayat Siak* kerap dihitamkan oleh Raja Ali Haji. Oleh demikian, usaha Muhammad menerbitkan seluruh teks naskah *Hikayat Siak* ini harus dipuji kerana dengan itu ia memberikan peluang kepada para pelajar dan ahli sejarah untuk mengkaji dan membandingkan kedua-dua karya yang bersaing ini. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka juga harus diberikan tahniah kerana sanggup mengeluarkan sebuah naskah sejarah yang bernilai tinggi dan berharga hanya \$18.00 senaskah.

Cheah Boon Kheng
Pusat Pengajian Ilmu Kemanusiaan
Universiti Sains Malaysia

Catatan ringkas/Briefly noted

History of Penang: A Selected and Annotated Bibliography, comp. Joceline Tan Poh Choo, Perpustakaan Universiti Sains Malaysia, Pulau Pinang, 1991, pp. 170.

Bibliografi ini cuba menyenaraikan segala tulisan dan penerbitan yang berkaitan sejarah Pulau Pinang di dalam bahasa Inggeris sehingga tahun 1984. Maklumat terperinci tentang setiap karya, esei atau rencana dan pengarangnya diberikan di dalam lapan bahagian, termasuk pemerintahan dan pentadbiran, sejarah, sosio-budaya, ilmu alam, sains tulen, deskripsi, dan suratkhabar. Bahagian sosio-budaya, misalnya, dipecahkan lagi kepada ethnografi, demografi, adat resam dan kumpulan sosial, pendidikan, kebajikan sosial, ugama, muzik, drama, bahasa dan kesusasteraan. Selain daripada tulisan dan karya orang Inggeris di zaman kolonial, rencana akademik, tesis dan laporan penyelidikan juga diberikan perhatian. Ini adalah pertama kali satu bibliografi yang begitu lengkap disusun tentang Pulau Pinang. Usaha-usaha penyusun Joceline Tan harus dipuji kerana ia telah menghasilkan sebuah buku rujukan yang sangat berguna untuk pegawai kerajaan, pengusaha di pihak swasta, penyelidik, pelancong, guru dan pelajar di sekolah dan universiti. Penerbitan ini dibiayai oleh Kumpulan Wang Majlis Perbandaran Pulau Pinang untuk Kerusi Pengajian Pembangunan di Universiti Sains Malaysia. Joceline Tan dilantik sebagai penolong penyelidik pada tahun 1984 dan kini bekerja sebagai wartawan dengan suratkhabar tempatan.

Index to British Colonial Office Files Pertaining to British Malaya, 1838-1946, comp. Paul H. Kratoska, Vol. 1-9, Arkib Negara Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, 1990. Vol. I: Contents, preface, introduction, appendices.

Setakat ini sembilan jilid dalam siri Indeks kepada fail-fail Pejabat Jajahan British berkaitan dengan British Malaya dari tahun-tahun 1838-1946 telah diterbitkan oleh Arkib Negara Malaysia. Indeks ini merupakan panduan yang sangat penting kepada rekod-rekod Pejabat Jajahan British mengenai Negeri-Negeri Melayu Semenanjung, Sabah, Sarawak dan Labuan. Indeks ini terbahagi kepada beberapa siri kumpulan rekod seperti CO 273 (Straits Settlements), CO 717 (Malay States), CO 144 (Labuan), CO 938 (Sarawak), dan CO 874 (British North Borneo Company Papers). Tiap-tiap siri ini mengandungi senarai fail. Tajuk-tajuk fail ini disusun menurut abjad subjek utama tajuk-tajuk fail tersebut untuk memudahkan rujukan. Seluruh indeks ini mengandungi 12 jilid terdiri daripada senarai fail. Paul Kratoska, bekas pensyarah di Universiti Sains Malaysia, telah berusaha menyediakan indeks ini hingga dapat diterbitkan. Jilid 1-9 adalah kena mengena dengan CO 273 sahaja. Jilid 10 akan mengandungi senarai fail CO 717 (Malay States), CO 953 (Singapore), CO 1022 (South East Asia Dept.) dan CO 1030 (Far Eastern Dept.); jilid 11, senarai fail-fail tentang Labuan, British North Borneo, Sarawak, dan Cobbold Commission, dan jilid 12, senarai file list Eastern Department, Economic File List dan Eastern Confidential Prints. Seluruh set indeks 12 jilid ini berharga M\$300.00. Sudah tentu panduan ini harus mendapat tempat di setiap perpustakaan universiti atau institut penyelidikan. Adalah difahami bahawa Arkib Negara Malaysia telah menerbitkan bilangan naskah yang terhad kerana kos percetakan.