

Political Play in Perak History: Pangkor Treaty 1874 at a Glance

Waqgas Zulfiqer

Independent Researcher, Ipoh, Perak, Malaysia

*Corresponding author: waqqasbinzulfiqer03@gmail.com

Received: 11 December 2025

Accepted: 12 February 2026

Published: 30 May 2026

Abstract

Perak stands as a state uniquely defined by its rich historical narrative, particularly from a colourful political perspective. This study focuses intensively on the Pangkor Treaty, signed in 1874, an event that serves as the starting mark to the control of British government over the Malay States. Despite its profound impact on the subsequent governance and socio-political structure of the region, the Treaty is often treated cursorily in official history. Its crucial role is frequently summarized in a highly brief and simplified manner, resulting in a significant scholarly gap that warrants further, dedicated academic exploration. To address this deficiency, this research aims to bring a fresher perspective, opened for further and deeper studies in relation to this topic. The core primary source is the original content of the 1874 Treaty document itself, which is systematically cross-referenced with established historical analyses. This cross-referencing approach forms the backbone of the study, enabling the triangulation of information to ensure a comprehensive, objective, and accurate re-evaluation. The ultimate objective is to offer a clearer, more nuanced, and critical point of view toward this event that had shaped the history of both Perak and the other Malay states. It is therefore the strong recommendation of this study that this part of political play in our history be further examined and into formal academic research in the future.

Keywords: Perak, Pangkor Treaty, Ngah Ibrahim, Sultan Abdullah, Chinese Secret Societies

Introduction

As to achieve the objective of this study, a copy of the treaty itself was referred to as the only primary source to this study. The treaty itself is self-explanatory, as to the consequence of its signing as it had outlined the terms of the treaty in a very detailed manner. While for the creation of the framework of studies in lining out the narration of chronology of events, secondary sources from known and reliable scholars were utilized. The narration of chronological orders of the events relating to the treaty written in this study are not new to the academics nor the mass thus the utilization of the said sources instead of primary sources. However, it is a must to understand that besides from the utilization of the secondary sources for narration of the chronology of the events, they were utilized in the manner of comparison between the existing studies previously made by the scholars.

This study most definitely surrounds the Pangkor Treaty that was signed in the year of 1874 shall be regarded as the beginning of British control over the Malay states. It was an aftermath of the Larut War that happened from the early 1860's until the signing of the Pangkor

Treaty in 1874 (Buyong 2020, 57-72). It is widely argued that the roots to the problem are due to the arrival of the Chinese immigrants that were brought to further expand the mining industry in Perak. Even before the British took control of the state, its mining industry had flourished, thanks to a man named Long Jaafar who had managed to open a couple of new mining settlements in Klian Pauh¹, the area in which he had settled in earlier due to the marriage of his brother to a local chief, the Datuk Panglima Bukit Gantang's daughter. Long Jaafar is a son of a Perakian chief called Dato' Paduka. His grandfather was also a chief, and was called Dato' Johan. This further shows the high status the man who first opened the mining settlements in Perak and somewhat his family lineage had held from the past to his living days (Windstedt & Wilkinson 1974, 78). However, the roots to the problem are supposedly wider than that just that. The roots would involve several parties with multiple agendas to gain what they respectively have aimed and targeted for. Therefore, the term 'Political Play' in this study would best refer to the aforementioned actual roots to the problem as to how all the parties involved, be it the British counterparts, the Chinese or even the Malay Elitists, had imposed political strategies and therefore actions in order for them to reach their goals.

Before gaining control over the Malay states which first started in Perak, the British had first gained their control over the Straits Settlements which first included the settlements of Singapore, Malacca, Penang and Dinding. Firstly, it was Penang that became a colony of the British when the English India Company had managed to gain control over it starting 1786, through questionable methods that if looked from the historical and even legal perspective, shall be invalid. That, however, is not to be highlighted in this study. Singapore was the second, with the British, through EIC, controlling them starting from 1819 through an agreement made between them and Tengku Hussain with Temenggung Tun Abdul Rahman. Malacca was next due to the Anglo-Dutch Treaty that was signed in 1824 which one of the terms gave the British exclusive control over it. Dinding was eventually returned by the British through the signing of the Pangkor Treaty in 1874 (Pangkor Engagement 1874)².

Therefore, the British was actually close enough to the state of Perak, with the nearest post located in Seberang Prai in Penang, just bordering north of Perak. In 1861, the British even applauded the ruler of the time, Sultan Ja'afar Mu'azzam Shah for his blessings in granting an Englishman a piece of land for agriculture works (Windstedt & Wilkinson 1974, 78). The years went by. The industry grew larger over time. The Sultan saw the contribution Long Jaafar had made to the economy of the state. He was then eventually appointed as the chief and ruler for the district of Larut, of which the position was also made hereditary by the Sultan (Windstedt & Wilkinson 1974, 78-79). With such an appointment, one might wonder about the importance of the said industry. The price for the tins, the main earth product produced by the mines owned by Long Jaafar, was listed between the amount of 73 to 80 pounds sterling per common block tin³ (Ken 1965, 243). Just that alone shows us the high price it held during its time, which absolutely had a massive contribution towards the revenue of the state through especially royal taxations on the industry productions.

Chinese miners and gang war

As the time flew by, the mining industry in Perak, and especially in the district controlled by Long Jaafar grew a lot larger in size. This growth then attracted the Chinese who were interested in the industry (Ahmad Jelani 2024, 8). At first, this held no issue for the district under his control, and he eventually passed in peace and wealth in 1857, leaving a huge sum of inheritance and influence to his successor, Ngah Ibrahim who was made the new ruler and

chief of his late father's district the following year. It was under Ngah Ibrahim's rule that his territory received a lot of new Chinese immigrants who came to work for the mines he owned. The number of Chinese grew by multiple folds, which on paper looked just fine. They were grouped into a well-structured society with Kapitan Cina heading various groups of the community. The introduction of the office of Kapitan Cina was to further help Long Jaafar and then Ngah Ibrahim in administering the Chinese community. All of the activities of the Chinese were then vested under the power of Kapitan Cina so that the said activities are well supervised and, as hoped, would avoid stirs amongst the community members. However, if we were to get and look deeper into it, we can see the problem the growth brought with it (Noor Syamimi & Mohd Shazwan 2024, 2).

The Chinese who came to Perak were not from the same area, nor were they belong to the same group of Chinese. They were simply divided amongst themselves. So the mines were divided among two main groups of two Secret Chinese Societies—the Ghee Hin and the Haisan—which had caused chaos in the society of the district (Windstedt & Wilkinson 1974, 79-80). The said chaos became worse when it turned into a full-blown war, the war that was mentioned in the very first paragraph of this study. The Larut War was a series of four separate wars that happened between the two Chinese groups that each controlled some parts of the district under Ngah Ibrahim's rule. The first war in this series of wars happened in 1861 with the result of intervention by the British through the order made by the Governor of the Straits Settlement. This was due to the complaint made by one of the groups, the Ghee Hin to the Governor, mentioning the status of their people of which a large sum of them were British citizens. Due to the intervention, Ngah Ibrahim was made to pay a compensation of over 17 thousand Straits Dollar (Windstedt & Wilkinson 1974, 80; Buyong 2020, 57). Through this act, we can say that it opened the Pandora box to the British. They shall have no say in the affairs of the state, as it was still a sovereign state. Yet, they still did.

Despite the occurrence of the first Larut War, the mining industry there still somehow flourished thus contributed to the elevation of Ngah Ibrahim's financial and especially ruling status. This may further be proven through the bestowment of the title of Orang Kaya Mantri by the Sultan to him in 1862. With this bestowment came the highest award as he was also conferred a ruling status over the area covering from the Kerian River to the Beruas River. He was regarded as a sovereign ruler by the westerners, though not by Malay customs as he was not of royal blood (Windstedt & Wilkinson 1974, 81). This however does not change the fact that he had ruled over the aforementioned area, with full power and authority vested upon him by the Sultan of Perak.

Just a few years later in 1865, another war, a part of the Larut War series, broke out again between the two groups. This time, it was due to a conflict caused by their members' gambling activities. The second war of this series was quite brutal and even regarded as far worse than the first one (Buyong 2020, 58), with it spreading even into Penang, whilst tens of deaths were recorded. It did not stop there as another war happened once more in 1871 which was caused by marital issues between the leaders of the two groups. It ended in 1872 before another war broke out the following year.

Seeing this, Ngah Ibrahim did not stand still. He realised that the unit responsible for the security of his district was not enough to cater and cope with the conflicts they are facing. His late father, Long Jaafar, when appointed as chief and ruler for Larut had first formed a security unit to protect his district. This unit was said to be composed of the local Malays that were personally hired for that purpose. When Ngah Ibrahim took over the rule, he expanded the unit into a district police force with a size of no larger than 200 personnel (Hisham & Ishak 2025, 17). The existence of the then-police force was proven incapable of protecting the security interest of his territories through the failures in deterring the wars between the Chinese groups in the Larut War series. Therefore, he met with a British police officer, Captain Speedy

who was serving for the Straits Police. He offered for Captain Speedy to head the police force under his rule. He believed the experience the captain had held in the Straits Police would significantly help him in improving the security of his now-chaotic territories. Speedy accepted the offer and a new police force headed by the captain was officially formed. It was not an issue for Ngah Ibrahim to commit to such action as he was fairly wealthy, thanks to his successful business in the mining industry. He paid thousands of Straits Dollar to the captain to head the new police force (Hisham & Ishak 2025, 17). This is not an overclaim of wealth. He was said to be way wealthier than the Sultan himself. His annual revenue was recorded at the sum of over 200 thousand Straits Dollar (Ahmad Jelani 2025, 8), which if considered in today's value, would be an amount outrageous enough to even think of. To even further this statement, we may look at the fact that he was the first ever Malay in Perak—arguably even the first in the Malay states—to have purchased a steam ship (Buyong Adil 2020, 62).

The last war and Pangkor Treaty 1874

Though it was said that the Larut War was the main cause of the British involvement, we should understand that the Perak courts were already not in alignment with each other by the time the last Larut War occurred (Buyong 2020, 62). The British, known for his political play, would have first seen that as an opportunity for them to start gaining control over the state of Perak. With the occurrence of the last Larut War, further widened the opportunity for them to achieve that very objective. We may say that the root for the occurrence of the last war was somehow related to the conflict in the Perak courts. This statement is related to the dispute over the throne of Perak, with Raja Abdullah, who was the Raja Muda of Perak, disputing that he has the legitimacy over the throne. The problem with the last Larut War was the involvement of the Malay leaders, with mentions of Raja Abdullah supporting the Ghee Hin while Ngah Ibrahim on the Hai San's side, with each of them having personal interest in the affair of the Chinese groups, most predominantly over their financial interest. This led to a further fraction in the Perak courts, leading to the climax of the event. Alternatively speaking, the outcome of this event will definitely be different, saying that both parties never entered into such rivalry, siding with the causing parties of the chaos.

As war grew larger and worse, Raja Abdullah saw this as an opportunity to finally achieve his objective in ascending the throne. As for the background towards the dispute over the throne, we must first look back into the year of 1871 when Sultan Ali Al-Mukammal Inayat Shah passed. Raja Abdullah was already the Raja Muda and according to the succession line, he should have ascended the throne when Sultan Ali Al-Mukammal Inayat passed away. However, there is one custom for one to ascend the throne of Perak. The person shall attend the funeral of the deceased Sultan prior to being declared as the new Sultan. This, however, was not done by Raja Abdullah who refused to travel to Sayong, in fear of being attacked by his enemies in the very Perak courts, due to the previous conflicts of the princes' appointments in the courts. The body of the late Sultan was not buried, awaiting the arrival of Raja Abdullah in respect to his deserved ascension to the throne. However, over a month has passed and Raja Abdullah still has not arrived. The second in line to the throne was Raja Ismail, the Raja Bendahara. As time can no longer wait for Raja Abdullah due to the abandoned body of the late Sultan, Raja Ismail was presented the royal regalia and was made the new Sultan with the regnal name of Sultan Ismail Mu'abidin Riayat Shah. This then caused deep dissatisfaction to Raja Abdullah, but the blame is to be put onto his shoulder as he was the one who failed to attend the funeral of the late Sultan, which he was given an even generous extension of period, of which he had also failed to meet (Buyong 2020, 59-60).

Back to the war, it started in February 1873 and lasted until 6 months later in August the same year. The war spread fast and far. It was now the concern of the British. They feared—

also keened with the opportunity the war brought to them—that the war would eventually affect their colonies, or specifically Penang. Therefore, the Lieutenant Governor of Penang, Sir Edward Anson had summoned for a meeting to be held between all the parties involved. In the meeting, he asked that both of the Chinese groups enter into an armistice. An agreement was achieved and the British had themselves involved deep into the war. Warning was given to the men of the Chinese groups to lower their arms and surrender themselves to the Lieutenant Governor (Windstedt & Wilkinson 1974, 86-87).

We may then argue that the involvement of the British in the war was further caused by Raja Abdullah. Previously before the occurrence of the fights between the Chinese groups, he had already written various letters to the British government in Singapore to support and proclaim him as the legitimate Sultan of Perak. But he was not entertained at first. Only with the occurrence of the Larut War, had he then retrieved the leverage to get the British attention to entertain his request (Buyong 2020, 70-71). Both of him and the British now had something in common, a mission to accomplish. Him with the aim for the throne while the British with the aim for the state of Perak itself. And that, they did. They had managed to stop the war through an agreement made in early 1874.

20th of January 1874 was the sacred date that is studied here. It was the day when the Pangkor Treaty was signed. The treaty had managed to stop the war. Which sounded like a good term if read until just that extent. However, there are few other conditions which created a new precedent over the state of Perak, like the recognition of Raja Abdullah as the new Sultan of Perak while the reigning Sultan was demoted to the rank of Sultan Muda (Pangkor Engagement 1874). If we ponder further, it is an actual interference for the British to be involved in the affairs, in this context internal affairs, of the state when they clearly had no authority over it. They may have had the authority over Singapore, Malacca and Penang but never was their authority extended into the state of Perak prior and during the signing of the treaty. Arguably, they had longed to rule the state for decades, with the aim to extract the rich Perak mother earth's productions (Windstedt & Wilkinson 1974, 78). This statement may be further supported by the appraisal remark made by Lieutenant-Colonel Henry Man, the Resident Councillor of Penang in 1861 to the Sultan of Perak for the leasing of a piece of land to an Englishman named Mr. Lewis for agriculture purposes. This for a fact is clearly for the benefit of whom? Most absolutely the answer is the British. Finally with the signing of the treaty, their dreams of ruling the rich Perak came true. Looking at a bigger picture, this marked the beginning to their involvement over the administration affairs of the Malay states, hiding behind the legal jargons that the Malay states were never colonies of theirs.

Aftermath

Through the Pangkor Treaty 1874, Raja Abdullah became the Sultan and Sultan Ismail was demoted to the office of Sultan Muda with a pension of 1000 Straits Dollar (Buyong 2020, 73). But most importantly, the treaty clearly outlined that the Sultan must receive a British officer with the title of Resident whom the Sultan shall seek advice from whereas the advice may not be refused except for the affairs of Islam and Malay customs (Pangkor Engagement 1874). This is the argument that shall be presented to strengthen the earlier statement that the treaty was the beginning of the British control over the Malay states. This is due to the fact that such practice was further done by the British in the other Malay states that they have managed to sneak into, the next few years and decades. The statements presented here then further lengthened the thoughts of the British trying to gain control over Perak and thereafter the other Malay states, of which may then be believed as the pure fact instead of just thoughts.

The first British Resident was installed in the same year, the very much popular figure named James Wheeler Woodford Birch or better known as J.W.W. Birch in the official history.

He was popular among the general public, not for his good but for his overly-zealous actions—not in a positive connotation. He had caused enrage amongst the Malay chiefs for multiple factors. One of them being the stripping off of their rights to tax collection. The British believed that the Malay chiefs were the same as the feudal leaders in their country, where they technically own and rule the land bestowed upon them by the King. However, that is not the case for the Malay chiefs, or specifically here in the context of the state of Perak. There were multiple cases of specifically Perakian Malay chiefs being stripped off of their titles and authorities by the Sultans (Azmi 2023, 429), whereas we may not see such cases in the western feudal system. In the western feudal system, a feudal leader has an absolute immunity in the affairs of their territory's administration. Once appointed, they may act as a sovereign ruler of the land (Azmi 2015, 106-108), whereas in layman terms we may say that their words are the law. While Perakian Malay chiefs' words and actions are bound by the decrees of the Sultan. There was a story where the Raja Muda, in the name of the Sultan, dismissed the chiefs in Kuala Kangsar for violating the decrees of the Sultan (Chulan 1991, 22).

Therefore, in a sense, the British action to strip off the rights and authorities of the chiefs was an intervention of the power the Sultan had held for centuries. This, in a way, was also one of the major factors that caused the enrage of the chiefs. To them, the Sultan holds the utmost power. An intervention, especially from an outsider, is an insult to the sovereignty of the Sultan. With that mentioned, one might rhetorically ask; how can they stand still and be silent while their very Sultan was offensively insulted in that manner? That would be the correct perspective to look from, if we are to argue from the chiefs' point of view. This brings us back to one of the historical principles; the context. We should never look at a historical event in the context of current days.

The Residency system that was introduced in Perak as the first Malay state to even have such a system, is similar to the power of the current Prime Minister of Malaysia. His advice is almost absolute, whereas the Sultan shall act in accordance to it except for the affairs relating to Islam and Malay customs. The same thing applies to the power of the Prime Minister we have now. But looking in the context of the time, sudden introduction to such a system was unsuitable as it was not mutually agreed by all the parties in the state, which include the chiefs. As for the case of the current premiership system, the system was largely accepted through the acceptance of the Malayan Agreement which was signed on 21 January 1948 by the Malay Rulers and no other than Sir Edward Gent representing the Crown, and it was further ratified through the gazette of the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya 1948. Therefore, despite the similarity they were both imposed in totally two different scenarios.

Besides this, the British also abolished the so-called slavery system of the Perakian Malay society. Looking from just one perspective will give us a positive connotation. Rhetorically asking; how is it bad that the British abolished the slavery system? The issue with this was that the British did not fully understand the very system that they had abolished. To them, the definition of 'hamba' or slave was, is and will always be the same as what they might define in their part of the world. They thought of slavery as the cruelty that their very own people have acted against their slaves. While in the Malay world, there are two systems of slavery, the western type of slavery—which was indeed cruel—and the more commonly Malay type of slavery is the 'sistem hamba berhutang' or debt bond slavery. The latter type of slavery is far beyond similarity against the common type of slavery. Debt bond slavery was a system where a person may voluntarily offer their services to a chief in return for the help offered by the respective chief (Andaya & Andaya 1982, 160). Besides debt bond slavery or the 'hamba berhutang', there is one more type of Malay slavery; the 'Hamba Raja' or the royal slave. The system of the royal slave is actually a lot different than of the debt bond slave as in the Malay slave-societal hierarchy puts the royal slave at the top of the chart. It is known that such a slave held a lot of power bestowed upon them by the Sultan, and that they are accountable to the

Sultan alone (Asilatul 2021, 171). Despite the terminology used; slave or slavery, the definition should vary looking at the practice of the system itself. How can one say that it defines exactly the same while it is absolutely two different practices of systems. Thus, the British still did not care to learn and they did abolish it. This burdened many of the chiefs as they relied on those very individuals who had voluntarily offered their services in return for the chief's help.

Then, we must understand the concept of Residency. Perak is the pioneer for such a system amongst the Malay states as it was the first Malay state to receive such an imposition in its administration. Some academics might argue that the appearance of a Resident in Perak was a result of a mutual agreement between both of the responsible sides, as the treaty was signed by all the parties (Kobkua 2011, 21). However, a question arises as the signatories did not involve the legitimate Sultan of Perak. Would it not require the sovereign to agree to such an important piece of document which would totally affect and transform the framework of the state administration? With that being mentioned, we are now unable to say that the treaty was a result of a mutual agreement between the parties involved.

One might as well argue that the treaty was not a form of colonization, unlike the method of the Straits Settlement's formation. The argument presented was that the Malay states with the given exhibit of the case study for British control over Pahang, was not directly ruled by the colonial government in London, whereas the rule is still exercised in the name of the Sultan and that whereas the sovereignty of the state was never transferred to the Crown, still lying before the very Sultan of Pahang (Fauzi, Farid & Anwar 2024; 137-138). However, it is from my perspective that such argument is backed by the legal concept of literalism-sticking to the exact words and only that, of which may be suitable in legal context but not in the field of historical studies. Not saying that literalism is absolutely incorrect or flawed, but in making a fair judgment, especially when writing with a historical approach, the bigger context is a must. How could one say that the Malay states were not colonized when the executive authority, however vested upon the Sultan, is exercised by the Resident, of whom is directly appointed by the British through the government of the Straits Settlement. Again, unlike the current premiership system we have, the Prime Minister at the very least holds the mandate of the local people of this very land, which is the very opposite of the Residency, where he holds the mandate of the colonial government.

One after another. The British had clearly shown pure ignorance. They did not care for the customs and traditions of the locals. They cared only for their interest, which obviously was to rule the state and garner the profits off the state's produce. With the fire enraging inside many of the chiefs' hearts, they eventually came to a consensus to assassinate the British Resident. The despised Resident was eventually assassinated by a few Perakian Malay chiefs alongside their followers in November 1875, just days before his first anniversary as the Resident (Isa 2002, 91-93; Windstedt & Wilkinson 1974, 114).

The British retaliated in response to the death of Birch. They sent a force of about 100 men to attack the individuals behind the assassination of the Resident. The attack however failed with a few casualties on their side alongside tens others who went home heavily injured. The British took this failure seriously and came back a lot stronger for their follow-up attack. This time, they had managed to destroy multiple stockades of the chiefs involved in the assassination. They did not stop there. They sought reinforcements from overseas outposts from the third attack. In this final attack was where they received their very victory (Hisham & Ishak 2025, 61-65) with the capture of the chiefs namely; Dato' Maharaja Lela, Dato' Sagor, Sultan Abdullah, Ngah Ibrahim and a few others who were brought to courts of justice at the end. The likes of Dato' Maharaja Lela and Dato' Sagor were convicted and sentenced to capital punishment where the both of them were finally hanged to death in the following year. The likes of Sultan Abdullah and Ngah Ibrahim were exiled to overseas territories; both of them sent to Seychelles (Isa 2002, 94; Buyong 2020, 100). While in exile, Raja Yusuf was installed

as the Pemangku Raja (regent) as he was the only person of the Perak courts, found not guilty by the British in the planning of Birch's assassination. He held onto the office until 1886 when he finally ascended the throne as the new Sultan (Buyong 2020, 100-10).

Subsequently, we may now understand that the introduction of the Residency system in Perak had thereafter become the precedent and the standard of the British in their efforts to control the other Malay states. We can see this in the other Malay states which were then grouped into a federation called the Federated Malay States. This federation comprises Perak, Selangor, Pahang and Negeri Sembilan. All of these states each received their very own British Resident; Selangor in 1874, Pahang in 1888 and Negeri Sembilan in 1895, with a Resident General overseeing all the Residents of the respective state of the federation.

Conclusion

One might argue that all these conflicts which ended in Perak losing her sovereignty was caused by the very individuals with power and might like Raja Abdullah and Ngah Ibrahim. As for Raja Abdullah, many would be arguing that he was the perpetrator in 'inviting' the British into Perak through his help-seeking from the British on multiple occasions along the years, from the day he lost his deserved legitimacy to the throne of Perak. But to be fair to him, we may argue that he was just striving for what he believed was his rights. We can never deny or refuse the fact that he was the Raja Muda, the office that, if according to the customs of the Perak succession, shall ascend the throne upon the death or abdication of the Sultan. Though this argument is widely open to be debated on, it should not be blindly and totally disregarded. While for Ngah Ibrahim, despite his status as the chief and ruler for his territories, he was merely another businessman who, in the nature of one, would always seek for rooms to further expand their business which would then lead to the growth of their profits. We should look into his very own perspective that his territories and businesses were his personal obligation to the Sultan as they were blessings bestowed upon him by the Sultan. With that being said, a responsible person, like him, will always try and work to fulfill such obligations.

The events leading to the Pangkor Treaty 1874 may arguably be said as a precedent of the British rule over the other Malay states that followed suit right after the fall of Perak into the hands of British. But the clearer option of opinion is of that the treaty is the beginning of all. Right after Perak, Negeri Sembilan (through the events surrounding the conflicts in Sungai Ujong) came under the British rule. Then, Selangor came right in before finally Pahang. The four mentioned states then were grouped into a federation called the Federated Malay States (FMS) in 1896. It is then clear to us that the British has no other purpose in signing of the treaty, other than of to gain control over the Malay States. The hypothesis of such purpose, is then proven by the fact of the formation of the FMS. What other reason could it be other than to gain control over the Malay states.

The occurrence of the treaty also teaches us through the lenses of historical discipline that one shall not look at an event from just one perspective prior to concluding an opinion. While on the surface, many of the official factors presented may sound logical and reasonable, they will become absurd if we try to look from another perspective. That is the reality of the study of the past; history. As we will forever be unable to be absolutely fair, the very capability to put justice in place shall always be the utmost priority in concluding one's history. While there may already be studies on this very specific topic, the author believes that there should be fairer studies on it, with justice put in place for the very people involved in the event of this study. The historical principle of context should be a priority in interpreting the narratives that are to be brought forward. This study therefore serves only as a brief and hopefully fresh insight into the very event that this study focuses on, where rooms for further extensive studies are definitely available and awaiting just the right time for it to be fulfilled in the future.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers appointed by *MINDEN Journal of History and Archaeology* for their constructive comments that helped improve this article. Appreciation is also extended to the copy editor for refining the language and presentation.

Notes

1. This area is now known as Taiping, the capital for a current-district known as Larut, Matang dan Selama.
2. Refer to Appendix.
3. Common block tin is weighted at the estimation of 150kg to 200kg.

Appendix

Contents in the Pangkor Treaty 1874

Whereas, a state of anarchy exists in the Kingdom of Perak owing to the want of settled government in the Country, and no efficient power exists for the protection of the people and for securing to them the fruits of their industry, and,

Whereas, large numbers of Chinese are employed and large sums of money invested in Tin mining in Perak by British subjects and others residing in Her Majesty's Possessions, and the said mines and property are not adequately protected, and piracy, murder and arson are rife in the said country, whereby British trade and interests greatly suffer, and the peace and good order of the neighbouring British Settlements are sometimes menaced, and,

Whereas, certain Chiefs for the time being of the said Kingdom of Perak have stated their inability to cope with the present difficulties, and together with those interested in the industry of the country have requested assistance, and,

Whereas, Her Majesty's Government is bound by Treaty Stipulations to protect the said Kingdom and to assist its rulers, now,

His Excellency Sir Andrew Clarke, K.C.M.G., C.B., Governor of the Colony of the Straits Settlements, in compliance with the said request, and with a view of assisting the said rulers and of effecting a permanent settlement of affairs in Perak, has proposed the following Articles of arrangements as mutually beneficial to the Independent Rulers of Perak, their subjects, the subjects of Her Majesty, and others residing in or trading with Perak, that is to say:-

1. That the Rajah Muda Abdullah be recognised as the Sultan of Perak.
2. That the Rajah Bandahara Ismail, now Acting Sultan, be allowed to retain the title of Sultan Muda with a pension and a certain small Territory assigned to him.
3. That all the other nominations of great Officers made at the time the Rajah Bandahara Ismail received the regalia be confirmed.
4. That the power given to the Orang Kayah Mantri over Larut by the late Sultan be confirmed.
5. That all Revenues be collected and all appointments made in the name of the Sultan.
6. That the Sultan receive and provide a suitable residence for a British Officer to be called Resident, who shall be accredited to his Court, and whose advice must be asked and acted upon on all questions other than those touching Malay Religion and Custom.

7. That the Governor of Larut shall have attached to him as Assistant Resident, a British Officer acting under the Resident of Perak, with similar power and subordinate only to the said Resident.
8. That the cost of these Residents with their Establishments be determined by the Government of the Straits Settlements and be a first charge on the Revenues of Perak.
9. That a Civil List regulating the income to be received by the Sultan, by the Bandahara, by the Mantri, and by the other Officers be the next charge on the said Revenue.
10. That the collection and control of all Revenues and the general administration of the country be regulated under the advice of these Residents.
11. That the Treaty under which the Pulau Dinding and the islands of Pangkor were ceded to Great Britain having been misunderstood and it being desirable to readjust the same, so as to carry into effect the intention of the Framers thereof, it is hereby declared that the Boundaries of the said Territory so ceded shall be rectified as follows, that is to say:- From Bukit Sigari, as laid down in the Chart Sheet No. 1 Straits of Malacca, a tracing of which is annexed, marked A, in a straight line to the sea, thence along the sea coast to the South, to Pulau Katta on the West, and from Pulau Katta a line running North East about five miles, and thence North to Bukit Sigari.
12. That the Southern watershed of the Kerian River, that is to say, the portion of land draining into that River from the South be declared British Territory, as a rectification of the Southern Boundary of Province Wellesley. Such Boundary to be marked out by Commissioners; one named by the Government of the Straits Settlements, and the other by the Sultan of Perak.
13. That on the cessation of the present disturbances in Perak and the re-establishment of peace and amity among the contending factions in that Country, immediate measures under the control and supervision of one or more British Officers shall be taken for restoring as far as practicable the occupation of the Mines, and the possession of Machinery, &c., as held previous to the commencement of these disturbances, and for the payment of compensation for damages, the decision of such officers shall be final in such case.
14. The Mantri of Larut engages to acknowledge as a debt due by him to the Government of the Straits Settlements, the charges and expenses incurred by this investigation, as well as charges and expenses to which the Colony of the Straits Settlements and Great Britain have been put or may be put by their efforts to secure the tranquility of Perak and the safety of trade.
15. The above Articles having been severally read and explained to the undersigned who having understood the same, have severally agreed to and accepted them as binding on them and their Heirs and Successors.
16. This done and concluded at Pulo Pangkor in the British Possessions, this Twentieth day of January, in the year of the Christian Era, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-four.

References

- Ahmad Jelani Halimi. (2025). "Perdagangan dan Perkapalan Perak Abad ke-18 dan ke-19." *Misa Perak Jurnal Bilangan 2025/2026*. Ipoh: Persatuan Sejarah Malaysia Cawangan Perak.
- Asilatul Hanaa Abdullah. (2021). *Colonial Historiography: A Non-Western Perspective of the Larut Wars (1861-1875)*. Doctoral Thesis, International Islamic University of Malaysia.
- Azmi Arifin. (2015). *Feudalisme Eropah Barat Zaman Pertengahan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Azmi Arifin. (2023). *Feudalisme: Sejarah dan Pensejarahan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

- Barbara Watson Andaya & Leonard Y. Andaya. (1982). *A History of Malaysia*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Buyong Adil. (2020). *Sejarah Perak*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- “Documents Archive - Pangkor Engagement of 1874”. (2015). National University of Singapore.
- Kobkua Suwannathat-Pian. (2011). *Palace, Political Party and Power: A Story of the Socio-Political Development of Malay Kingship*. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Mohd Isa Othman. (2002). *Sejarah Malaysia (1800-1963)*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publications & Distributors Sdn. Bhd.
- Nor Hisham Zulkiflee. (2025). “Pasukan Sepoi Ngah Ibrahim dan Kapten Speedy.” *Misa Perak Jurnal Bilangan 2025/2026*. Ipoh: Persatuan Sejarah Malaysia Cawangan Perak.
- Noor Hisham Zulkiflee. (2025). “Perang Perak 1875: Strategi dan Taktikal.” *Misa Perak Jurnal Bilangan 2025/2026*. Ipoh: Persatuan Sejarah Malaysia Cawangan Perak.
- Noor Syamimi Mohamad Nazri, Mohd Shazwan Mokhtar. (2024). “Konflik Kongsi Gelap Cina di Perak, 1861-1874.” *Jurnal Wacana Sarjana* 1-14.
- Winstedt, R. O. & Wilkinson, R. J. (1974). “History of Perak.” *JMBRAS* 12(1): 1–180.
- Raja Chulan. (1991). *Misa Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbitan Pustaka Antara Kuala Lumpur.
- Wan Ahmad Fauzi Wan Husain, Ahmad Farid Abd Jalal dan Mohamed Anwar Omardin. (2024). “Negeri Melayu Pahang Tidak Dijajah: Satu Analisis Dokumen Perundangan Sehingga Triti 1948.” *BITARA International Journal of Civilizational Studies and Human Sciences* Vol. 7(2): 116-140.
- Wong Lin Ken. (1965). *The Malaysian Tin Industry to 1914 with special references to the state of Perak, Selangor, Negeri Sembilan And Pahang*. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press.

