

SOUTHEAST ASIA:
A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL
Vol. 7 (No. 1), 2006/2007

CONTENTS

Editorial Note	1
Peralihan dari ekonomi tradisional ke ekonomi perusahaan minyak 1929 - 1941: pengaruhnya terhadap perubahan sistem pendidikan Brunei <i>Asbol bin Haji Mail</i>	3 - 16
A portrayal of the lives of Bruneian women in the 19 th and early 20 th centuries as reflected in the writings of some contemporary western visitors <i>Asiyah az-Zahra binti Hj. Ahmad Kumpoh</i>	17 - 26
Some observations on the pre-colonial legal culture and system in Brunei <i>B. A. Hussainmiya</i>	27 - 37
A comparative assessment of Islamic reform and revival in Brunei at the beginning and end of the 20 th century <i>Iik Arifin Mansurnoor</i>	39 - 70
Sistem sosial masyarakat tradisional Brunei abad ke-19: suatu pengenalan ringkas <i>Ismail Bin Haji Awang Nordin</i>	71 - 76
Sejarah dan struktur masyarakat tradisional Brunei <i>Mohd Yusop Damit</i>	77 - 88
A historical overview of Brunei's economy before the discovery of oil, and some subsequent issues <i>Nani Suryani Haji Abu Bakar</i>	89 - 103
A note on the dates for the revelation of the correct rites of the celestial heart <i>Tianxin Zhengfa</i> <i>Johannes L. Kurz</i>	105 - 112
Profile of contributors	113

ISSN 1819-5091

Universiti Brunei Darussalam
Jalan Tungku Link, Gadong BE 1410,
Brunei Darussalam
Tel: +673-2463001 Fax: +673-2461003
Web-site: www.ubd.edu.bn

SOUTH EAST ASIA

A MULTIDISCIPLINARY
JOURNAL

Volume 7, No. 1
2006/2007

Special Issue
Selected Papers on Economic and Social History

Published by
Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences
Universiti Brunei Darussalam

ISSN 1819-5091

SOUTHEAST ASIA: A Multidisciplinary Journal

SOUTHEAST ASIA: A Multidisciplinary Journal is published biannually by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. It is bilingual in that it features articles in both Malay and English. Its disciplinary focus encompasses the whole range of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences. The Journal's regional focus is Southeast Asia and, therefore, most of the papers in this journal reflect this geographical region. Nevertheless, articles may still be accepted if the topics are of relevance to the region, or if they are of a theoretical or abstract nature.

BOARD OF EDITORS

K. Upajeeva. Sirinanda (*Chief Editor*)

Noor Azam Bin OKMB Haji Othman (*Deputy Chief Editor*)

Mardina Binti Hj Mahadi Ramlee Bin Tinkong

Asbol Bin Haji Mail Asmali Bin Haji Sulaiman

Asiyah az-Zahra Binti Ahmad Kumpoh Dk Noor Hasharina Binti Pg Hassan

Editorial liaison for Vol. 7(1): Johannes Kurz, Ismail Bin Hj Awang Nordin

EDITORIAL ADVISORY PANEL

Asmah Haji Omar, *University of Malaya* Donald E Brown, *University of California*

Victor R. King, *University of Hull* John D Overton, *Massey University*

Malcolm L Treadgold, *University of New England*

Howard Giles, *University of California*

Administrative Assistant

Nur Farazida Binti Hj Abdullah

Disclaimer:

While every effort is made to see that no inaccurate or misleading data, opinion or statement appear in the Journal, articles in the Journal are the sole responsibility of the contributor(s) concerned. They do not necessarily represent the views of the board of editors or the editorial advisory panel or Universiti Brunei Darussalam. The board of editors, the editorial advisory panel, and Universiti Brunei Darussalam accept no responsibility or liability whatsoever for the consequences of any inaccurate or misleading data, opinion or statement.



© Copyright, Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences (FASS), Universiti Brunei Darussalam (UBD). No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission, in writing, from the copyright holder.

ISSN 1819-5091

**S O U T H
E A S T
A S I A**

A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

Volume 7, No. 1

2006/2007



**Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences
Universiti Brunei Darussalam**

CONTENTS

Editorial Note	1
Peralihan dari ekonomi tradisional ke ekonomi perusahaan minyak 1929 - 1941: pengaruhnya terhadap perubahan sistem pendidikan Brunei <i>Asbol bin Haji Mail</i>	3 - 16
A portrayal of the lives of Bruneian women in the 19th and early 20th centuries as reflected in the writings of some contemporary western visitors <i>Asiyah az-Zahra binti Hj. Ahmad Kumpoh</i>	17 - 26
Some observations on the pre-colonial legal culture and system in Brunei <i>B. A. Hussainmiya</i>	27 - 37
A comparative assessment of Islamic reform and revival in Brunei at the beginning and end of the 20th century <i>Ik Arifin Mansurnoor</i>	39 - 70
Sistem sosial masyarakat tradisional Brunei abad ke-19: suatu pengenalan ringkas <i>Ismail Bin Haji Awang Nordin</i>	71 - 76
Sejarah dan struktur masyarakat tradisional Brunei <i>Mohd Yusop Damit</i>	77 - 88
A historical overview of Brunei's economy before the discovery of oil, and some subsequent issues <i>Nani Suryani Haji Abu Bakar</i>	89 - 103
A note on the dates for the revelation of the correct rites of the celestial heart <i>Tianxin Zhengfa</i> <i>Johannes L. Kurz</i>	105 - 112
Profile of contributors	113

EDITORIAL NOTE

The present special issue of *Southeast Asia: A Multidisciplinary Journal* is a collection of papers written by eight academic staff members of the Department of History (seven current members and one former member), Universiti Brunei Darussalam, representing the teaching and/or research interests of the respective authors. Three of the papers are in Malay (and include abstracts in English) and the rest, in English.

As the readers will notice, seven of the eight papers embrace a fascinating range of facets of Brunei history: economic, social, legal and religious. Earlier versions of these papers were presented at the Seminar on Social and Economic History of Brunei, organized by the Department of History, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, 14 - 15 November, 2006.

Two papers (by **Asbol** and **Nani Suriyani**) are on the economic history of Brunei, with special focus on the discovery and utilization of hydrocarbon resources as the watershed which subsequently saw the country moving on the path towards greater socio-economic development and modernization.

Three authors have treated different dimensions of the social history of Brunei: **Asiyah az-Zahra** attempts to provide her own interpretation of the status and living conditions of Bruneian women in the 19th and early 20th centuries through a critical examination of the writings of some western visitors; and the papers by **Ismail** and **Mohd Yusop** have a common vein insofar as they have shown the patterns and salient characteristics of the stratification of Brunei society before the 20th century.

A subject which has not received sufficient attention by researchers, viz., Brunei's pre-colonial legal institutions and practices, form the scope of **Hussainmiya's** paper. **Iik Arifin**, in his paper, presents a detailed account of the different events and episodes in the Islamic reform and revival in Brunei in the 20th century, according to three stages in the pre-independence era and an overview of developments since independence.

The only paper which departs from the mainstream of contents in this special issue is that by **Kurz**; it provides some insight into the origins of one exorcistic practice in southern China, and should be of particular interest to students of the history of the Far East.

**PERALIHAN DARI EKONOMI TRADISIONAL KE EKONOMI
PERUSAHAAN MINYAK 1929-1941:
PENGARUHNYA TERHADAP PERUBAHAN SISTEM
PENDIDIKAN BRUNEI**

ASBOL BIN HAJI MAIL

ABSTRAK

Artikel ini membicarakan tentang sumbangan minyak terhadap perkembangan dan kemajuan ekonomi dan sosial Brunei sekitar tempoh 1929-1941. Jelaslah bahawa kemajuan ekonomi berlaku apabila sumber kewangan kerajaan semakin mantap dengan sumbangan daripada industri minyak yang semakin bertambah sejak minyak ditemui pada tahun 1929. Ianya membolehkan kerajaan berupaya untuk menjelaskan hutang-hutangnya dengan Negeri-negeri Melayu Bersekutu. Dengan kewangan semakin kukuh maka kerajaan dapat mengembangmajukan bidang pendidikan dengan dipelopori oleh penubuhan sekolah Melayu. Sungguhpun pada awalnya sekolah ini kurang mendapat sambutan dari ibu bapa kerana rata-rata mereka memerlukan tenaga anak-anak mereka dalam mencari nafkah harian, namun menjelang tahun-tahun 1940-an, sikap ini mula berubah. Hal ini boleh dikesan apabila jumlah sekolah Melayu terus meningkat di Brunei. Perkembangan sistem pendidikan ini kemudiannya menjadi aset penting bagi melahirkan tenaga manusia yang berilmu pengetahuan yang buah fikirannya diperlukan dalam pembangunan Brunei.

ABSTRACT

This article examines the contribution of the oil industry to social and economic development in Brunei during the period 1929-1941. Economic progress can be clearly observed, as the government's financial sources were stabilized with the increasing income from the oil industry since the discovery of oil in 1929. This development allowed the government to fulfill its financial obligations to the Federated Malay States. With the increasing financial strength, the government was able to expand its education programme, including the establishment of Malay schools. Although, at the beginning, these schools failed to attract much positive response from parents, as they required their children to support their subsistence economic activities, this perception had begun to change by the early 1940s. This can be seen in the growing number of Malay schools in the country. The development of Brunei's education system has become an important asset towards producing eventually a pool of educated human capital that could potentially provide ideas and skills necessary for nation building.

PENGENALAN

Menjelang akhir abad ke-19 wilayah Kesultanan Brunei yang terhampar dari Tanjung Dato Sarawak ke Pandasan Sabah¹ mula menghadapi cabaran, apabila kuasa Barat yang dipelopori oleh British yang telah menggunakan taktik *gunboat diplomacy*, perjanjian yang berat sebelah, tekanan kewangan dan tipu muslihat telah menguasai sebuah demi sebuah wilayah Brunei. Akhirnya bagi membolehkan Kesultanan Brunei dapat wujud dan bertahan, maka seorang Residen British telah dilantik pada tahun 1906 bagi membantu sultan dalam pentadbiran negara. Dalam hal ini nasihat residen mestilah diikuti oleh sultan kecuali dalam hal agama Islam²

PERKEMBANGAN EKONOMI SEBELUM PENEMUAN MINYAK

Pada peringkat awal pentadbiran Residen, telah dilaporkan bahawa kedudukan kewangan Brunei berada dalam keadaan kurang stabil. Brunei hanya memiliki sumber kewangan

yang berjumlah \$228.173, bagaimanapun dari jumlah tersebut sebanyak \$200.000 adalah wang yang dipinjam dari Negeri-Negeri Melayu Bersekutu di Semenanjung Tanah Melayu.³ Sebelum penemuan minyak, ekonomi Brunei bergantung kepada sumber-sumber alam semulajadi yang diusahakan melalui kegiatan pertanian, perikanan dan pertukangan tangan. Semua kegiatan ini dilakukan secara tradisional. Dalam bidang pertanian, masyarakat Brunei mengusahakan sawah padi, tanaman buah-buahan, sayur-sayuran, menanam pokok rumbia yang kemudiannya dijadikan sagu dan mengutip getah jelutong. Sementara dalam perikanan, mereka menggunakan pukat, jala, balat untuk menangkap ikan. Setelah kemunculan British, maka mereka telah memperkenalkan ekonomi industri dengan membuka lombong arang batu, kilang ubar (*cutch*) dan kemudian tanaman getah yang dikomersialisasikan sebagai komoditi eksport keluar negeri. Kegiatan ekonomi industri yang dibawa oleh pihak Barat merupakan pemodenan kepada masyarakat Brunei yang sebelum ini lebih bergantung kepada kegiatan ekonomi tradisional yang bersifat sara diri dan keperluan pasaran tempatan. Ianya boleh dianggap perubahan positif ke arah pembangunan ekonomi Brunei, namun begitu dalam masa yang sama ia juga menjadi faktor kepada kehilangan kuasa perdagangan yang sebelum ini didominasi oleh masyarakat Brunei. Ia telah jatuh ke tangan kuasa asing. Masyarakat Brunei hanya mampu menjadi pengguna di tanah air sendiri dan tidak lagi sebagai pengeluar atau pendedar barangan secara besar-besaran.

Perusahaan arang batu merupakan sumber utama ekonomi Brunei pada awal abad ke-20. Hal ini boleh dilihat dari tahun 1906 sehingga 1924 Brunei telah berjaya mengeksport sebanyak 313.396 tan arang batu yang bernilai \$26.888. Bagaimanapun perusahaan ini terpaksa ditutup kerana tidak lagi mampu memberikan pulangan keuntungan kepada pengusahanya, berbanding dengan modal yang dikeluarkan bagi kos peralatan dan tenaga buruh. Kali terakhir perusahaan ini mengeluarkan hasil pada tahun 1924.⁴

Selain perusahaan arang batu, industri ubar juga merupakan salah satu sumber ekonomi negara. Kemunculan industri ini telah memberi peluang pekerjaan baru kepada penduduk Brunei terutama kepada penduduk Kampong Air kerana perusahaan ini dijalankan di bandar Brunei. Penduduk Kampong Air telah ditawarkan untuk menjadi pekerja di industri ini terutama sekali berkhidmat sebagai buruh. Dari tahun 1916 hingga 1924 sejumlah \$2.464.980 ubar telah dieksport ke England dan Amerika. Industri ubar masih beroperasi sehingga tahun 1941, namun begitu sumbangannya kepada pendapatan kerajaan semakin berkurangan. Sebagai contoh pada tahun 1939, industri ini cuma berhasil menyumbang kepada pendapatan Brunei sebanyak \$62.945 dan pada tahun 1941 berjumlah \$97.500. Sedangkan sebelum ini hasil yang dikeluarkan oleh industri ini melebihi \$200.000.⁵

Pada tahun-tahun 1930an perusahaan sagu juga merupakan sumber ekonomi kepada Brunei. Komoditi ini mendapat pasaran yang mengalakkan di Singapura. Bagaimanapun perusahaan ini mengalami kemerosotan akibat dari saingan industri getah. Di antara tahun 1916 sehinggalah tahun 1941, industri getah Brunei turut menyumbang kepada pendapatan negara. Boleh dikatakan sebelum minyak ditemui pada tahun 1929, perusahaan getah telah memainkan peranan dalam meningkatkan sumber ekonomi Brunei. Menjelang tahun 1940, pendapatan dari hasil getah telah mencecah jutaan ringgit, iaitu sebanyak \$1 503 801 dan bertambah kepada \$1 758 824 pada tahun 1941.⁶

PERKEMBANGAN EKONOMI SELEPAS PENEMUAN MINYAK

Penemuan minyak pada tahun 1929 di Seria bukanlah satu kejayaan yang mudah dicapai, justeru sebelum ini usaha mencarigali minyak telah dilakukan beberapa kali namun sering mengalami kegagalan dan tidak mampu membuahkan hasil yang diharapkan. Kemunculan

minyak mula-mula diketahui di Brunei sekitar tahun 1904. Menurut laporan Hewett, seorang Konsul British, minyak telah ditemui pada bekas tapak lombong arang batu milik Rajah Brooke di Buang Tawar. Namun langkah-langkah untuk pengeluarannya tidak dilaksanakan.⁷ Sungguhpun syarikat-syarikat yang diberikan konsesi mencari gali minyak di Brunei seperti Syarikat British Borneo Petroleum Syndicate, Nederlandsche Koloniale Petroleum Maatschappij, Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Company, Shanghai Langkat Company dan Asiatic Petroleum Company masih gagal mendapatkan minyak, tetapi mereka tidak berputus asa malah terus mencari takongan minyak di bawah perut bumi Brunei. Gerakan mencari minyak telah dilakukan sekitar tahun 1908 hingga 1917. Bagaimanapun ia masih gagal untuk menjejaki kawasan yang mengandungi minyak.⁸

Selain di kawasan bandar Brunei, pencarian kawasan takongan minyak juga dilakukan di daerah Tutong. Sejak tahun 1914 hingga 1924 beberapa penggalian telaga minyak telah dilakukan di Bukit Puan dan Labi oleh syarikat minyak terawal beroperasi di Brunei iaitu British Borneo Petroleum Syndicate Limited. Pada tahun 1914 syarikat ini telah menemui kuantiti minyak yang banyak di Labi. Sehingga tahun 1924 salah satu telaga minyaknya telah mengeluarkan hasil sebanyak 238 tan. Bagaimanapun kegiatan syarikat ini telah diambil alih oleh British Malayan Petroleum Company (BMPC) yang baru saja ditubuhkan pada tahun 1923. Sementara itu syarikat-syarikat lain masih tidak berjaya menemui minyak. Oleh itu menjelang tahun 1918 banyak di antara mereka yang golong tikar.⁹

BMPC merupakan syarikat minyak yang masih bertahan dalam meneruskan operasi mencari kawasan takongan minyak di Brunei. Pada 12 Julai 1928, syarikat ini telah melakukan penggalian minyak di kawasan Seria. Lapan bulan kemudian, iaitu pada 5 April 1929 barulah syarikat ini berjaya menemui takongan minyak yang besar di kawasan ini. Sungguhpun begitu minyak hanya mula dieksport dari Brunei pada tahun 1932. Kelambatan ini berlaku ekoran dari ekonomi dunia pada tahun-tahun 1930-an sedang dilanda kemelesetan. Tambahan pula pada masa itu Brunei belum mempunyai prasarana bagi mengeksport minyak seperti pelabuhan, perkapalan dan kilang menapis minyak.¹⁰ Selepas penemuan minyak di Seria, bahan ini telah menjadi sumber yang terpenting kepada pendapatan Brunei di samping sektor ekonomi lain.

Peluang untuk Brunei melepaskan dirinya dari kemiskinan dan kekurangan sumber ekonomi mendapat cahaya baru apabila minyak ditemui. Maknanya ia sudah mendapat jalan-jalan mudah untuk mengembangkannya sektor ekonominya. Fenomena ini memberikan impak positif kepada perkembangan bidang-bidang lain seperti sosial dan politik, justeru ekonomi adalah penting sebagai daya suntikan kepada pertumbuhan bidang-bidang yang tersebut di atas.

KEWANGAN KERAJAAN

Dari tahun 1931 hingga tahun 1941 pengeluaran minyak Brunei terus meningkat dan dalam tempoh ini ternyata ia sudah menjadi tunggak kepada pendapatan negara. Pencapaian ini telah meletakkan Brunei sebagai pengeluar minyak ketiga terbesar di kalangan negara-negara Commonwealth pada tahun 1938 selepas Trinidad dan Burma.¹¹ Dengan peningkatan pengeluaran minyak ini bererti sumber kewangan kerajaan juga bertambah, senario inilah yang membolehkan Brunei untuk membayar balik semua pinjamannya kepada Negeri-negeri Melayu Bersekutu. Sebelum penemuan minyak sekitar tahun 1920 dan awal pengeluaran minyak pada tahun 1934, Brunei hanya dapat menjelaskan pinjamannya tidak melebihi \$10.000 setiap tahun, tetapi dengan wujudnya kelebihan pendapatan dari sumber minyak, pada tahun 1935 Brunei berhasil membayar baki hutangnya sebanyak \$245.200. Pembayaran balik baki hutang Brunei tersebut berakhir pada tahun 1936 yang berjumlah \$133.000.¹²

Menjelang tahun 1935, keadaan ekonomi Brunei ternyata semakin mantap berbanding dengan tahun-tahun sebelumnya. Semua ini berpunca dari rahmat minyak yang telah dikurniakan Allah di muka bumi Brunei, sungguhpun keluasannya semakin kecil. Oleh kerana sumber pendapatan Brunei semakin meningkat, ia tidak lagi memerlukan pinjaman luar negeri.¹³ Hasil daripada industri minyak yang semakin berkembang pesat ini, maka syarikat minyak mampu menambah sumber kewangan kerajaan Brunei dalam bentuk royalti. Hal ini jelas sekitar tahun 1932 sehingga 1941 royalti yang disumbangkan oleh syarikat minyak kepada kerajaan Brunei terus meningkat. Pada tahun 1932 kerajaan memperolehi royalti sebanyak \$67.510 dan menjelang tahun 1941 ia telah bertambah kepada \$548.701.¹⁴

Apabila Jepun menduduki Brunei di sekitar tahun 1942-1945, ia memang meninggalkan kesan negatif kepada perkembangan ekonomi Brunei. Bagaimanapun selepas Jepun menyerah kalah pembangunan ekonomi dan sosial Brunei dapat dijalankan dengan cepat kerana negara ini mempunyai simpanan kewangan yang mencukupi.¹⁵ Ini menunjukkan betapa sumbangan minyak memainkan peranan yang amat penting bagi Brunei. Andaikata negara ini tiada memiliki industri minyak, maka pembangunan ekonomi dan sosial akibat peperangan dalam era pendudukan Jepun tidak akan dapat dilaksanakan dengan lancar dan teratur.

PERKEMBANGAN PENDIDIKAN

Menerusi rahmat minyak ini, maka ia telah mempengaruhi kepada perubahan sosial Brunei. Hal ini boleh dilihat dalam perkembangan sistem pendidikan. Sejarah pendidikan formal di negara ini telah bermula pada tahun 1914 apabila sebuah sekolah Melayu ditubuhkan di Jalan Pemanca bandar Brunei. Sebelum kemunculan sistem pendidikan seumpama ini, masyarakat Brunei sudah mempunyai pendidikan tradisional yang dikenali sebagai mengaji.¹⁶ Sebelum penemuan minyak, peruntukan untuk perkembangan pendidikan yang disediakan oleh kerajaan memang sangat sedikit, tetapi dengan adanya pendapatan dari sumber minyak, kerajaan berupaya untuk menambah peruntukan ini sehingga kemajuan bidang pendidikan di negara ini dapat dipertingkatkan secara beransur-ansur. Peruntukan pendidikan yang disediakan oleh kerajaan yang pada mulanya dalam ratusan ringgit telah meningkat kepada puluhan ribu ringgit pada tahun 1940-an. Contohnya pada tahun-tahun 1940-an kerajaan telah membelanjakan sebanyak \$30.900 dan pada tahun 1941 sebanyak \$42.562 telah dibelanjakan.¹⁷ Peningkatan perbelanjaan ini merupakan kesan positif daripada kemajuan dan perkembangan perusahaan minyak di Brunei.

Pertambahan peruntukan kerajaan dalam bidang pendidikan menyebabkan kerajaan dapat menubuhkan dan membina bangunan sekolah Melayu di seluruh negara. Daripada empat buah sekolah pada tahun 1920-an, ia telah bertambah kepada 24 buah menjelang tahun 1941. Pertambahan ini ternyata telah dapat memberikan peluang kepada lebih ramai generasi muda Brunei untuk memasuki alam persekolahan. Pada akhir dekad 1930-an dan awal 1940-an, keramaian murid sekolah Melayu telah mencapai ribuan orang yang sebelumnya jumlahnya hanya dalam ratusan orang saja. Peningkatan keramaian murid-murid sekolah Melayu ini juga mencerminkan secara beransur-ansur ibu bapa masyarakat Brunei sudah mula menyedari betapa perlunya anak-anak dihantar ke sekolah bagi mendapatkan ilmu pengetahuan.¹⁸

Di samping pendidikan Melayu, anak-anak Brunei juga memasuki sekolah beraliran Inggeris. Sebelum wujud sekolah Inggeris kerajaan, mereka yang mahukan pendidikan Inggeris perlu memasuki sekolah misi atau melanjutkan pelajaran ke seberang laut.¹⁹ Sejak tahun 1919 kerajaan telah menghantar pelajar Brunei ke Labuan untuk melanjutkan pelajaran dalam aliran Inggeris. Seramai dua orang setahun telah dihantar ke pulau

tersebut. Perkara ini berlarutan sehingga tahun 1941. Selepas Perang Dunia Kedua, penghantaran ke Labuan telah dihentikan kerana sekolah Inggeris di sini telah musnah ketika Jepun menduduki pulau ini. Penghantaran juga dibuat ke Maktab Melayu Kuala Kangsar, Pusat Latihan Batu Lintang Kucing, Singapura dan Jesselton (Kota Kinabalu).²⁰ Pelajar-pelajar yang menuntut di luar negara ini tidak cuma dibiayai oleh kerajaan, bahkan ada juga hasil usaha orang-orang persendirian.

Sejarah awal kemunculan sekolah misi di Brunei pada dasarnya berkait rapat dengan kedatangan badan-badan dakwah Kristian. Kedatangan mereka mempunyai matlamat untuk menyebarkan ajaran agama Kristian di kalangan masyarakat tempatan. Mubaligh-mubaligh Kristian menggunakan tiga pendekatan iaitu melalui gereja, rumah sakit dan sekolah dalam menyebarkan agama ini.²¹

Berikutan dengan perkembangan pesat industri minyak di Brunei dalam tahun-tahun 1930-an, maka ramailah pekerja luar terutama di kalangan orang-orang British, Belanda dan Cina berhijrah ke negeri ini untuk berkhidmat dengan Syarikat Minyak Shell Brunei. Disebabkan bilangan mereka ini semakin ramai yang datang bersama keluarga mereka, maka mereka memikirkan perlunya ditubuhkan sekolah bagi membolehkan anak-anak mereka belajar secara lebih teratur. Lantaran itu permohonan telah diajukan kepada Residen bagi membuka sebuah sekolah beraliran Inggeris. Pada mulanya permohonan ini ditolak oleh pihak residen, tetapi pada tahun 1931, sebuah badan dakwah Kristian Anglikan telah diberikan kelulusan untuk membuka sebuah sekolah misi di Kuala Belait dengan keramaian pelajarnya 21 orang. Sumber kewangan sekolah ini telah disumbangkan oleh pihak kerajaan dan Syarikat Minyak Shell Brunei.²² Kemunculan sekolah ini sudah jelas ekor dari perkembangan industri minyak di Brunei. Industri ini juga menjadi daya pendorong penghijrahan bangsa asing yang semakin ramai ke Brunei. Mereka kurang bergaul dan terpisah dengan masyarakat tempatan kerana matlamat mereka datang ke negara ini semata-mata mencari sumber kehidupan. Dalam pada itu, satu lagi sistem pendidikan beraliran Inggeris yang baru telah muncul di tengah-tengah masyarakat Brunei, apabila sekolah misi dibentuk.

Pada tahun 1933 sebuah lagi sekolah misi Roman Katolik juga dibuka di Kuala Belait. Ada kemungkinan pembukaan sekolah ini disebabkan sekolah Anglikan sudah tidak dapat menampung pelajar yang semakin ramai. Jelas pada peringkat awal pembukaan sekolah seperti ini tertumpu di daerah Belait. Hal ini berlaku kerana daerah ini, terutama di Seria telah menjadi tumpuan pekerja luar yang sedang berkhidmat dengan Syarikat Minyak Shell Brunei. Hanya pada tahun 1938 badan dakwah Roman Katolik ini membuka sebuah sekolah misi di bandar Brunei. Pembukaan ini bertujuan memberikan kemudahan kepada pelajar-pelajar yang berada di daerah Brunei dan Muara yang mengalami kesukaran untuk pergi ke Kuala Belait. Selain itu ia juga untuk memenuhi permintaan pelajar-pelajar yang ditarik balik dari sekolah Inggeris Labuan.²³

Sungguhpun pendidikan formal yang dirintis oleh sekolah Melayu telah wujud lebih awal, namun pendidikan agama Islam belum mendapat tempat dalam jadual belajar di sekolah tersebut. Sementara itu rancangan hendak mendirikan bangunan sekolah agama yang khas memang belum terlintas dalam pemikiran pemerintah pada masa itu. Perkara ini berlaku kerana pentadbir British pada ketika itu kurang mengambil berat tentang pendidikan agama kerana mereka memikirkan pendidikan seperti ini tidak memberikan sumbangan kepada pembangunan Brunei, tidak seperti sekolah Melayu yang pelajarnya dapat diambil bekerja sebagai pegawai rendah kerajaan dalam melicinklan jentera pentadbiran pada ketika itu.

Sementara itu masyarakat Islam Brunei kelihatannya masih merasa lebih senang mempelajari agama Islam secara tradisional yang dilakukan di rumah-rumah persendirian, balai, surau dan masjid-masjid. Lagipun masyarakat Islam melihat memasukkan pendidikan agama ke dalam sistem persekolahan dianggap kurang penting. Ini disebabkan

majoriti mereka pada mulanya tidak berminat kepada sistem pendidikan tersebut. Tenaga anak-anak mereka diperlukan dalam usaha mencari sumber ekonomi bagi menyara kehidupan keluarga. Sikap yang dilihat oleh kerajaan sebagai negatif kepada pembangunan Brunei ini, telah mendorong kerajaan untuk mengambil tindakan yang tegas dengan mengeluarkan peraturan *The Attendance 1929* yang mewajibkan kanak-kanak yang berumur di antara 7 hingga 14 tahun untuk memasuki alam persekolahan. Manamana ibu bapa yang engkar dengan peraturan ini akan dikenakan denda antara 50 sen hingga \$1.00 bergantung kepada berapa kali kesalahan dilakukan.²⁴

Pendidikan Islam boleh dikatakan menempa era baru pada tahun 1931, apabila ia mula diajarkan sebagai satu mata pelajaran di sekolah Melayu di bandar Brunei. Tindakan ini timbul dari pemikiran tiga orang pembesar Brunei iaitu dua orang Wazir dan seorang Ceteria yang terdiri dari Pengiran Bendahara Abdul Rahman, Pengiran Pemanca Haji Mohd Yassin dan Pengiran Syahbandar Hashim. Pembesar-pembesar ini menyedari bahawa pendidikan agama ini perlu diajarkan di sekolah supaya pengajaran yang lebih teratur dan berkesan dapat diberikan kepada para pelajar.

Pendidikan Islam pada waktu itu diajarkan selepas menunaikan sembahyang fardhu Jumaat. Ia tidak termasuk dalam jadual harian pelajaran sekolah, guru-guru yang mengajar mata pelajaran ini terdiri dari pegawai-pegawai masjid dan orang-orang yang dianggap mempunyai pengetahuan agama yang baik. Ketiga-tiga pembesar yang tersebut di atas telah bermurah hati untuk membayar elau kepada guru-guru yang terlibat dalam pelajaran agama ini sebanyak \$5.00 sebulan.²⁵ Ini mencerminkan pendidikan agama pada ketika itu bersifat mata pelajaran tambahan kerana ia tidak dimasukkan dalam jadual harian pelajaran sekolah.

Pada tahun 1936, Penguasa Pelajaran Melayu telah dipegang oleh seorang anak tempatan, Marsal bin Maun. Beliau mempunyai semangat nasionalis yang tinggi kerana ingin melihat anak bangsanya bukan sahaja maju dalam bidang pendidikan akademik tetapi juga dalam pendidikan agama. Islam dan Melayu merupakan dua elemen yang menggambarkan sebagai identiti dan jati diri Melayu Brunei. Dua unsur penting ini hanya dapat dipelihara dan dikembangkan menerusi pendidikan. Dengan kuasa yang diamanahkan kepada Marsal, maka langkah untuk memperbaiki kedudukan pendidikan agama di sekolah Melayu di bandar Brunei telah dibuat. Beliau telah merancang untuk memasukkan pendidikan agama ke dalam jadual belajar harian, maka pelajaran agama tidak lagi diajarkan pada sebelah petang Jumaat. Pelajaran ini juga diajarkan dua kali seminggu, tidak lagi seminggu sekali seperti sebelumnya ini di sebelah petang.²⁶

Kalau memasukkan mata pelajaran agama ke sekolah Melayu telah dilakukan oleh tiga orang pembesar Brunei pada tahun 1931, tetapi sepuluh tahun kemudian, iaitu pada tahun 1941, Sultan Ahmad Tajuddin (1924-1950) pula mengambil langkah menubuhkan sebuah sekolah agama beraliran Arab. Sehingga saat ini kerajaan memang tidak mempunyai peruntukan kewangan bagi membiayai perkembangan pendidikan agama, oleh yang demikian dalam menubuhkan sekolah agama beraliran Arab ini, sultan telah mengeluarkan perbelanjaan baginda sendiri. Oleh itu sekolah ini dikategorikan sebagai sekolah swasta, tetapi berdaftar dengan Jabatan Pelajaran Brunei. Tenaga pengajarnya seorang bangsa Arab, Syeikh Abd Aziz Al-Shimi. Sekolah ini mempunyai keramaian pelajarnya sebanyak 60 orang termasuk lima orang pelajar perempuan.²⁷ Sungguhpun begitu sekolah Arab ini tidak dapat bertahan lama kerana Perang Dunia Kedua telah tercetus, Brunei telah menjadi sasaran serangan Jepun.

Dari pembicaraan di atas jelaslah rahmat dari kemunculan industri minyak kurang memberikan kesan kepada perkembangan pendidikan agama. Kerajaan hanya setakat menyediakan tempat dan belum menyediakan peruntukan khas kepada pendidikan agama, tidak seperti yang berlaku kepada sekolah Melayu. Sedang kegiatan pendidikan agama masih dibiayai oleh orang-orang persendirian termasuklah sultan.

Begitu juga sekolah Cina yang mula ditubuhkan pada tahun 1916 yang bertempat di sebuah rumah kedai di bandar Brunei. Dalam tempoh ini boleh dikatakan bahawa sekolah ini tidak mendapat kesan positif dari industri minyak Brunei kerana ia dibiayai sepenuhnya oleh masyarakat Cina.²⁸

Perkembangan pendidikan ekoran dari pengaruh industri minyak, maka munculah dua jenis pendidikan dalam masyarakat Brunei iaitu pendidikan agama dan pendidikan akademik. Pendidikan agama bagi membentuk generasi muda supaya tahu dan patuh ajaran Islam agar mereka menjadi umat yang berakhlak mulia. Pendidikan ini juga mengajarkan tentang adanya balasan baik dan buruk selepas mati tergantung kepada perbuatan seseorang itu semasa hidup di dunia. Sementara pendidikan akademik yang diajarkan di sekolah-sekolah Melayu, Cina dan Inggeris bagi membolehkan generasi muda memperoleh ilmu pengetahuan dan membentuk peribadi mulia. Ilmu yang diperolehi adalah penting untuk memperoleh kesejahteraan dalam meniti kehidupan harian.

Ekoran dari kemunculan dua sistem pendidikan ini maka lahirh tiga golongan masyarakat Brunei, pertama golongan berpengetahuan agama, kedua golongan mahir dalam bidang akademik yang memperoleh ilmu menerusi pendidikan formal dan ketiga golongan kurang pengetahuan agama dan buta huruf. Golongan ketiga ini muncul kerana mereka tidak berkesempatan untuk menghadiri kedua-dua sistem pendidikan di atas. Mereka menjalani kehidupan berdasarkan pengalaman yang ditempuhi setiap hari.

Sementara itu golongan kedua merupakan golongan baru dalam masyarakat Brunei, terutama di kalangan masyarakat Melayu dan kaum bumiputera yang lain. Bagi masyarakat Melayu ada di antara mereka ini yang menjadi guru dan pegawai kerajaan. Golongan guru kemudiannya memainkan peranan sebagai kumpulan elit dan bijak pandai yang berpengaruh di kalangan masyarakat Brunei. Mereka inilah yang menjadi pemangkin kesedaran masyarakat Brunei supaya menghantar anak-anak ke sekolah. Anak-anak yang mempunyai persekolahan yang tinggi penting bukan sahaja untuk menjamin masa depannya bahkan penting kepada pembangunan masyarakat dan negara ketika itu. Golongan guru ini memang mempunyai kesedaran untuk sama-sama membangun negara setelah mereka didedahkan dengan suasana kehidupan di luar negeri semasa mereka menuntut di Maktab Perguruan Sultan Idris Tanjung Malim mahupun di Pusat Latihan Batu Lintang Kucing.

Sementara itu golongan wanita dalam tempoh ini masih ketinggalan baik dalam pendidikan Islam²⁹ mahupun pendidikan akademik, justeru masyarakat Brunei lebih suka mengahwinkan anak-anak perempuan mereka dalam usia yang masih remaja, falsafah menjaga kerbau sekandang lebih mudah dari menjaga anak perempuan seorang masih melekat dalam pemikiran masyarakat Brunei ketika itu. Wanita remaja juga penting dalam membantu kerja-kerja rumah tangga dalam keluarga masing-masing.

RUMUSAN

Berdasarkan perbincangan-perbincangan di atas, maka jelaslah bahawa sumbangan minyak terhadap perkembangan dan kemajuan ekonomi dan sosial Brunei tidak dapat dinafikan. Tanpa ada industri minyak maka pembangunan Brunei akan berkeadaan lembab dan kurang berkembang. Dari hasil minyak pelbagai kemajuan dapat dibuat seperti mana yang berlaku ke atas sistem pendidikan. Perkembangan sistem pendidikan ini kemudiannya menjadi aset penting untuk melahirkan tenaga manusia yang berilmu pengetahuan yang tenaga dan buah fikiran mereka diperlukan oleh Brunei.

Selain dari sistem pendidikan, bidang-bidang lain juga sebenarnya mendapat tempias positif dari perkembangan industri minyak di Brunei. Bidang lain dalam tempoh kajian ini juga mengalami perkembangan seperti perkhidmatan kesihatan, apabila banyak pusat-

pusat kesihatan dibina dan pemberian perkhidmatan asas kepada penduduk tempatan. Manakala dari segi sistem perhubungan darat, pembinaan jalan-jalan raya banyak dilakukan bagi memudahkan perhubungan antara satu tempat dengan tempat yang lain. Proses urbanisasi juga turut berkembang pesat terutama di daerah Belait dan Brunei Muara. Kemunculan industri minyak juga telah membuka lagi peluang pekerjaan yang baru kepada masyarakat tempatan.

Di samping kesan-kesan positif yang diperolehi dari hasil industri minyak, terdapat juga kesan-kesan yang negatifnya. Dengan adanya industri minyak, Brunei terlalu bergantung dengan pendapatan minyak. Kemunculan industri ini secara perlahan-lahan telah menenggelamkan kegiatan-kegiatan ekonomi lain seperti pertanian, perikanan, industri getah, arang batu, ubar dan getah jelutong. Sebelum penemuan minyak, sumber-sumber ini merupakan sumber yang terpenting bagi pendapatan Brunei tetapi telah diabaikan sejak minyak ditemui. Sebenarnya aktiviti ekonomi lain terutama dalam sektor pertanian dan perikanan sepatutnya terus dipergiatkan sebagai satu cara mempelbagaikan ekonomi negara dalam jangka panjang. Hal ini perlu dilakukan kerana minyak merupakan hasil alam semulajadi yang pada satu hari nanti akan menghadapi kepupusan. Jika perkara ini berlaku maka pendapatan negara masih boleh dipertahankan dengan adanya hasil pertanian, perikanan atau mungkin kegiatan ekonomi lain yang telah dirancang dengan lebih awal.

NOTA-NOTA

- ¹ William George Maxwell & William Summer Gibson, *Treaties and Engagements Affecting the Malay States and Borneo* (Suffolk: Jas Truscott & Son Ltd, 1924), hlm. 149-150.
- ² *Brunei Annual Report 1907*, hlm. 10.
- ³ Jatswan S. Sidhu, *Sejarah Sosioekonomi Brunei 1906-1959* (Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1995), hlm. 18-19.
- ⁴ Lihat lampiran A. pendapatan Brunei yang diperolehi dari industri getah, arang batu dan ubar 1916-1941. Ibid., hlm. 21.
- ⁵ Lihat lampiran A.
- ⁶ Lihat lampiran A.
- ⁷ Kawasan Buang Tawar terletak di pulau Berambang herseberangan dengan Kampong Petagian Jalan Kota Batu. Lihat M. S. H. McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904 by M. S. H. McArthur*, introduced and annotated by A. V. M. Horton, Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series, No. 74 (Athens: Ohio University: 1987), hlm. 148.
- ⁸ *Menjangkau Enam Puluh Tahun 1929-1989* (Belait: Jabatan Hal Ehwal Awam Shell, 1989), hlm. 4.
- ⁹ Ibid; A. V. M. Horton, *British Administration in Brunei 1906-1959*, Modern Asian Studies 20.2 (1986), hlm. 366.
- ¹⁰ A. V. M. Horton, "Brunei C. 50 Years Ago (1939). The Late 1930s in the Abode of Peace", *Sarawak Gazette*, Vol. CXVII, No. 1512, July 1990, hlm. 17; Sidhu, *Sejarah Sosioekonomi Brunei 1906-1959*, hlm. 35.
- ¹¹ Lihat lampiran B eksport minyak mentah Brunei 1931-1941. A. V. M. Horton, *British Administration in Brunei 1906-1959*, hlm. 366.
- ¹² Lihat lampiran C pendapatan, perbelanjaan dan jumlah pinjaman Brunei 1907-1941.
- ¹³ Menjelang akhir tahun 1950-an Brunei pula memberikan pinjaman kepada negara jirannya yang dulunya memberikan pinjaman kepadanya. Brunei telah memberikan pinjaman kewangan sebanyak \$100 juta kepada Negeri-Negeri Melayu Bersekutu pada tahun 1958 dan sekali lagi dalam jumlah yang sama pada tahun 1959. Lihat Sidhu, *Sejarah Sosioekonomi Brunei 1906-1959*, hlm. 37.
- ¹⁴ Sila lihat lampiran D royalti daripada syarikat minyak kepada kerajaan Brunei 1932-1941.
- ¹⁵ Sahibah Osman, Muhammad Hadi Abdullah dan Sabullah Haji Hakip, *Sejarah Brunei Menjelang Kemerdekaan* (Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1995), hlm. 108-109.
- ¹⁶ Matassim bin Haji Jibah, "Perkembangan Persekolahan Melayu di Brunei dalam Pentadbiran Sistem Residen (1906-1959)", *Dokumentasi* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Jabatan Pusat Sejarah, 2004), hlm. 92.
- ¹⁷ Lihat lampiran E Peruntukan kerajaan Brunei ke atas bidang pendidikan 1915-1941.
- ¹⁸ Lihat lampiran F dan G bilangan sekolah Melayu dan keramaian muridnya.
- ¹⁹ Sekolah Inggeris kerajaan telah ditubuhkan di Bandar Brunei pada bulan Oktober 1951. Sekolah ini dikenali sebagai Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin College. Lihat Haji Awg Asbol bin Haji Mail, "Sejarah

Perkembangan Pendidikan di Brunei 1950-1985," Tesis Sarjana Jabatan Sejarah (Fakulti Sastera dan Sains Sosial Universiti Malaysia, 1995/1996), hlm. 136.

²⁰ *Brunei Annual Report 1919*, hlm. 5; A. V. M. Horton, "The Development of Brunei during the British Residential Era 1906 - 1959: A Sultanate Regenerated", Ph. D. thesis (University of Hull, 1985), hlm. 417; Hisham bin Haji Md Sum, "Educational Dependency: A Case Study on Brunei Darussalam", Ph. D. thesis (University of Reading, 1993), hlm. 169-170.

²¹ Sahibah Osman, *Perkembangan Pelajaran Bumiputera Sarawak 1841 - 1941* (Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1990), hlm. 79.

²² H. J. Padmore, *Brunei Education Department Triennial Report for 1954-1957* (Bandar Brunei: Education Department), t. th. hlm. 13; A. V. M. Horton, "The British Residency in Brunei, 1906 - 1959", Occasional Paper No. 6 (Centre for South East Asian Studies, University of Hull, 1984), hlm. 8; *Brunei Annual Report 1931*, hlm. 18.

²³ *Laporan Tiga Tahun 1964 - 1966*, (Bandar Brunei: Jabatan Pelajaran Brunei, 1967), hlm. 4.

²⁴ *Brunei Annual Report 1929*, hlm. 20.

²⁵ *Risalah Pameran Sejarah Perkembangan Islam di Brunei* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Jabatan Muzium-Muzium, 1979), t. hlm.

²⁶ Haji Awg Asbol bin Haji Mail, "Sejarah Sosial Brunei Darussalam PraMerdeka: Tranformasi Pendidikan Agama dari rumah ke Sistem Persekolahan," *Borneo - Kalimantan 2005: Tranformasi Sosial masyarakat Pesisir Borneo-Kalimantan* (Kota Samarahan: Institut Pengajian Asia Timur Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, 2005), hlm. 445-446.

²⁷ Abdul Aziz bin Juned, *Buku Kenangan Berpuspa* (Bandar Brunei: Jabatan Hal Ehwal Agama, Brunei, 1968), hlm. 45. Gelaran penuh beliau ialah Yang Dimuliakan Lagi Dihormati Pehin Datu Seri Maharaja Dato Paduka Seri Setia Ustaz Haji Awang Abdul Aziz bin Awang Juned. Sekarang memegang jawatan Mufti Kerajaan Brunei.

²⁸ *Brunei Annual Report 1916*, hlm. 5.

²⁹ Yahya bin Haji Ibrahim, *Sejarah dan Peranan Institusi-institusi Melayu Islam Beraja* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Pusat Da'wah Islamiah, Kementerian Hal Ehwal Agama Brunei, 2000), hlm. 30-31. Gelaran penuh beliau ialah Pehin Siraja Khatib Dato Paduka Seri Setia Ustaz Haji Awang Yahya bin Haji Ibrahim, bekas Timbalan Menteri Hal Ehwal Agama Brunei.

RUJUKAN

- Asbol bin Haji Mail (1995/1996). *Sejarah Perkembangan Pendidikan di Brunei 1950-1985*. Tesis Sarjana Jabatan Sejarah, Fakulti Sastera dan Sains Sosial Universiti Malaysia.
- Asbol bin Haji Mail (2005). *Sejarah Sosial Brunei Darussalam Pra-Merdeka: Tranformasi Pendidikan Agama dari rumah ke Sistem Persekolahan. Borneo - Kalimantan 2005: Tranformasi Sosial masyarakat Pesisir Borneo-Kalimantan*. Kota Samarahan: Institut Pengajian Asia Timur Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.
- Abdul Aziz bin Juned (1968). *Buku Kenangan Berpuspa*. Bandar Brunei: Jabatan Hal Ehwal Agama, Brunei.
- Brunei Annual Report 1907-1941*.
- Hisham bin Haji Md Sum (1993). *Educational Dependency: A Case Study on Brunei Darussalam*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Reading.
- Horton, A. V. M (1984). *The British Residency in Brunei, 1906-1959*. Occasional Paper No. 6 Centre for South East Asian Studies, University of Hull.
- Horton, A. V. M (1985). *The Development of Brunei During the British Residential Era 1906 - 1959: A Sultanate Regenerated..* Ph. D. thesis, University of Hull.
- Horton, A. V. M. (1986). *British Administration in Brunei 1906-1959*. Modern Asian Studies 20(2), University of Hull.
- Horton, A. V. M. (1990). *Brunei C. 50 Years Ago (1939). The Late 1930s in the Abode of Peace. Sarawak Gazette*, Vol. CXVII (1512): 10-17.
- Laporan Tiga Tahun 1964-1966*, (1967). Bandar Brunei: Jabatan Pelajaran Brunei.
- Matassim bin Haji Jibah (2004). *Perkembangan Persekolahan Melayu di Brunei dalam Pentadbiran Sistem Residen (1906-1959)*. Dalam Jabatan Pusat Sejarah (ed.), *Dokumentasi*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Jabatan Pusat Sejarah.

Maxwell, W.G. & William, W. S. (1924). *Treaties and Engagements Affecting the Malay States and Borneo*. Suffolk: Jas Truscott and Son.

McArthur, M. S. H. (1987). *Report on Brunei in 1904 by M. S. H. Mc Arthur*. Introduced and annotated by A. V. M. Horton. Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series, No. 74.

Menjangkau Enam puluh Tahun 1929-1989 (1989). Kuala Belait: Jabatan Hal Ehwal Awam.

Padmore, H. J. (t. th.). *Brunei Education Department Triennial Report for 1954-1957*. Bandar Brunei: Education Department.

Risalah Pameran Sejarah Perkembangan Islam di Brunei (1979). Brunei: Jabatan Muzium-Muzium.

Rose binti Karim (1986/87). *Petroleum di Brunei Darussalam: Sumbangan ke atas Ekonomi Brunei*. Latihan Ilmiah Sarjana Muda Ekonomi, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Sabihah Osman (1990). *Perkembangan Pelajaran Bumiputera Sarawak 1841-1941*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Sabihah Osman, Muhammad Hadi Abdullah dan Sabullah Haji Hakip (1995). *Sejarah Brunei Menjelang Kemerdekaan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Sidhu, J. S. (1995). *Sejarah Sosioekonomi Brunei 1906-1959*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Yahya bin Haji Ibrahim (2000). *Sejarah dan Peranan Institusi-institusi Melayu Islam Beraja*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Pusat Da'wah Islamiah, Kementerian Hal Ehwal Agama Brunei.

LAMPIRAN A

Pendapatan Brunei yang diperolehidari industri getah, arang batu dan ubar 1916-1941 dalam nilai ringgit selat

Tahun	Getah	Arangbatu	Ubar	Tahun	Getah	Arangbatu	Ubar
1916	142,711	206,077	285,400	1932	104,899	--	195,465
1917	248,919	295,800	330,700	1933	236,249	--	123,757
1918	174,868	413,910	361,501	1934	671,970	--	162,861
1919	243,596	296,021	304,249	1935	576,159	--	177,910
1920	214,733	296,000	355,300	1936	796,703	--	178,734
1921	82,217	275,570	240,740	1937	1,240,995	--	212,839
1922	91,104	104,160	172,600	1938	623,565	--	152,366
1923	363,200	102,820	238,000	1939	925,700	--	62,945
1924	387,793	98,202 *	176,490	1940	1,503,801	--	112,129
1931	161,204	--	194,457	1941	1,758,824	--	97,500

*Ditutup pada tahun ini

Sumber: *Brunei Annual Report 1916-1941*; Jatswan S.Sidhu, *Sejarah Sosioekonomi Brunei 1906-1959*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1995,

LAMPIRAN B

Eksport minyak mentah Brunei 1931-1941 dalam nilai ringgit selat

Tahun	Jumlah	Tahun	Jumlah
1931	26,864	1937	3,873,959
1932	1,094,663	1938	5,512,549
1933	1,760,861	1939	6,566,587
1934	2,371,669	1940	7,514,893
1935	2,785,073	1941	4,388,182
1936	2,975,103		

Sumber: *Brunei Annual Report 1931-1941*

LAMPIRAN C

Pendapatan, perbelanjaan dan jumlah pinjaman Brunei 1906-1941 dalam nilai ringgit selat

Tahun	Pendapatan	Perbelanjaan	Jumlah Pinjaman	Bayaran Pinjaman
1906	28,173	5,1423	--	--
1907	51,777	93,334	200,000	--
1908	43,539	75,738	200,000	--
1909	45,562	76,948	300,000	--
1910	77,051	73,513	300,000	--
1911	109,430	79,318	400,000	--
1912	140,847	122,762	400,000	--
1913	165,082	138,665	433,000	--
1914	126,647	163,352	439,750	--
1915	118,972	114,518	439,750	--
1916	127,615	113,317	439,750	--
1917	126,301	106,911	439,750	--
1918	125,726	122,958	439,750	--
1919	162,020	138,844	439,750	--
1920	201,250	223,690	430,000	9,750
1921	161,520	197,469	427,317	2,683

1922	204, 504	188, 250	444, 500	2,817
1923	228, 272	189, 208	440, 000	4,500
1924	268, 024	247, 614	435, 500	4,500
1925	345, 573	245, 286	430, 00	5,500
1926	396, 834	303, 394	424, 500	5,500
1927	402, 870	426, 981	419, 000	5,500
1928	393, 875	350, 005	413, 000	6,000
1929	345, 290	344, 092	407, 000	6,000
1930	333, 069	373, 604	401, 000	6,000
1931	342, 011	322, 791	395, 000	6,000
1932	362, 403	334, 328	389, 000	6,000
1933	580, 750	514, 812	383, 000	6,000
1934	645, 021	545, 021	378, 200	4,800
1935	813, 532	786, 201	133, 000	245, 200
1936	928, 689	779, 521	--	133, 000
1937	1, 049, 293	653, 149	--	--
1938	1, 179, 979	1, 476, 725	--	--
1939	1. 274, 644	1, 181, 325	--	--
1940	1, 556, 354	1, 462, 174	--	--
1941	1, 325, 912	1, 137, 219	--	--

Sumber: A.V.M. Horton, "The British Residency in Brunei, 1906 – 1959", Occasional Papers No.6, University of Hull, Centre for South East Asian Studies, 1984.

LAMPIRAN D

Royalti daripada syarikat minyak kepada kerajaan Brunei 1932-1941

Tahun	Jumlah Royalti	Tahun	Jumlah Royalti
1932	67, 510	1937	482, 567
1933	235, 755	1938	592, 350
1934	286, 929	1939	710, 059
1935	383, 112	1940	792, 537
1936	499, 172	1941	548, 701

Sumber: Rose binti Karim, "Petroleum di Brunei Darussalam: Sumbangan ke atas Ekonomi Brunei," Latihan Ilmiah Sarjana Muda Ekonomi, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 1986/87.

LAMPIRAN E

Peruntukan kerajaan Brunei ke atas bidang pendidikan 1915-1941

Tahun	Jumlah \$	Tahun	Jumlah \$	Tahun	Jumlah \$
1915	405	1924	2,456	1933	14, 742
1916	379	1925	2,770	1934	12, 452
1917	548	1926	3,268	1935	11, 859
1918	713	1927	3,214	1936	1,444,4 85
1919	850	1928	3,425	1937	1,714,9 58
1920	1,380	1929	7,310	1938	--
1921	1,673	1930	7,289	1939	30, 390
1922	2,389	1931	9,603	1940	30, 390
1923	2,466	1932	9,118	1941	42, 562

Sumber: *Brunei Annual Report 1915-1941*

Bilangan sekolah-sekolah melayu Brunei 1923-1941

Tahun	Bilangan	Tahun	Bilangan	Tahun	Bilangan
1923	4	1933	15	1939	22
1924	4	1935	15	1940	23
1925	5	1936	18	1941	24
1932	13	1938	21		

Sumber: *Brunei Annual Report 1923-1941*

LAMPIRAN G

Keramaian murid sekolah melayu 1914-1941

Tahun	Keramaian	Tahun	Keramaian	Tahun	Keramaian
1914	30	1925	169	1934	866
1915	40	1926	190	1935	849
1916	100	1927	183	1936	946
1917	70	1928	198	1937	1,175
1920	42	1929	672	1938	1,810
1921	177	1930	688	1939	1,908
1922	193	1931	598	1940	1,776
1923	175	1932	794	1941	1,746
1924	--	1933	897		

Sumber: *Brunei Annual Report 1914-1941*

A PORTRAYAL OF THE LIVES OF BRUNEIAN WOMEN IN THE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURIES AS REFLECTED IN THE WRITINGS OF SOME CONTEMPORARY WESTERN VISITORS

ASIYAH AZ-ZAHRA BINTI HJ AHMAD KUMPOH

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to examine the lives of Bruneian women in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as reflected in several accounts by British officials and other western visitors. It also attempts to show how erroneous it is to fit women into a mould greatly influenced by the nineteenth century supposition that women were weak and delicate passive creatures that should remain at home and confine themselves largely to "womanly" activities. It was this supposition which, to some extent, influenced the personal judgment of the authors. It was not clear from their accounts whether or not they had acquired prior knowledge that Brunei, or its society, was patriarchally structured, before they conceptualised their experiences while there. If they had, such factors may have further defined the nature of Brunei and women in these travellers' eyes and how they should be treated and portrayed. Through the analysis of the westerners' accounts one could see how the condition of these women did not necessarily conform to nineteenth century supposition. In fact, they were strong women who were fully conscious of their own value, and had successfully fulfilled what was considered an ideal lifestyle for a woman of that era: marriage, children, confinement to the domestic sphere, and autonomy in economic activities. Even in the midst of persistent male domination, which in many ways had forced and reduced them to the situation exactly portrayed by the western accounts, Bruneian women proved to be adaptive, accepting conditions without any resentment; and this, probably, effectively softened the judgmental voice echoed in the westerners' accounts.

INTRODUCTION

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a number of British personnel and western travellers visited Brunei (which had rarely been visited by foreigners earlier) for various purposes. They gathered information on the country's inhabitants, and some of them had evidently even spent brief periods with the Sultans during their stay. Their accounts could not exactly be regarded as presenting a wealth of information on Brunei in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as they are not at all comprehensive reports and, in fact, are rather sporadic; the authors seem to have written only about things that interested them and/or caught their eyes. Nevertheless, their accounts detailing what they learned about Brunei women make their accounts significant. Such accounts became sources of rare information about the attitudes of the Bruneian males, and the society as a whole, towards women.

However, these accounts have rarely become a focus of academic attention, not even from those involved in women's studies, discourse analysis or cultural studies. The reasons for such disinterest have not been ascertained; it may be attributed less to disinterest but, perhaps, more to the inaccessibility of the said material to the prospective students of women's studies. The lack of study on these texts could also be due to the general belief that they are of marginal relevance in women's studies as women only occupied only marginal positions in Brunei society during those centuries.

Many of the westerners' accounts analysed in this paper are those compiled by Peter Blundell in his book *The City of Many Waters* (1923) and Simon Francis in his paper entitled *Pictures of the Palace* (1993). The analysis relies on these texts as being basically "true" in the sense that they are understood to accurately portray the authors' personal feelings about their travel experiences. There are, of course, general arguments which could refute such a premise. Sara Mills, for example, argues that there are various

processes which could pollute an author's ability to produce a text that portrays experience in a pure, untampered way.¹ Anything from the authors' own personal biases, be they conscious or not, may influence them in their writings; this is bound to raise the question of the reliability and objectivity of these texts. However, the present paper would take the position that the accounts are sufficiently reliable as a basis for the analysis attempted here.

Before the paper proceeds with the analysis, it is necessary to provide readers with a brief insight into the situation Brunei were in during the time the westerners, whose accounts are analysed in this paper, visited Brunei: the periods cover the reigns of Sultan Abdul Mumin (1852 AD–1885 AD) and Sultan Hashim Jamalul Alam (1885 AD–1906 AD). These periods were not exactly glorious times for Brunei. Rather, they were dark times in Brunei history. It was during these periods Brunei territories were taken away, one after another, either by the Brooke regime in Sarawak (which was in place since 1841), or by the British North Borneo Chartered Company (which was run by a governor in North Borneo (Sabah) after the granting of a charter by the British Government in 1881)), thus jeopardizing Brunei's survival. The culmination of the land cessions was the annexation of Limbang, which Brunei was resolutely reluctant to let go of due to its economic importance, by Charles Brooke in 1890. This marked the beginning of the end of Brunei as a large kingdom which was once very powerful and commanded the whole of the northern part of Borneo Island and the southern Philippines. The declining prosperity of Brunei during this period was so acute that Hugh Clifford, when he visited Brunei in 1901, characterized Brunei as a dying kingdom.² Brunei was still on the verge of extinction when Peter Blundell arrived in Brunei in 1903, and it was only in 1906 when the British Residency was established in Brunei that the situation gradually changed for the better. This British Residency could be seen as the starting point when Brunei became a part of the British conscience. Other than the system of monarchy, everything else changed with the establishment of a British-style administration and the growth of bureaucracy, the education system, and the extension of a modern health system and related facilities; this may be interpreted as an attempt to resuscitate the 'dying kingdom'. It can be said that socio-economic conditions during the period under study were generally unfavorable, and this, in turn, may have influenced women's status in Bruneian society at the time.

SECLUSION FOR PROTECTION

Most of the accounts analyzed in this paper reinforced the idea that gender differences were seen as a distinct factor in the way that women were regarded. This is manifested in some statements in the accounts suggesting, implicitly, the apparent inferiority of Brunei women when compared with men. Peter Blundell wrote that women, especially the young ones, were strictly kept in seclusion. While they might not really have enjoyed such restrictions, the fact that men of all levels in society, regardless of their marital status, were constantly 'on the prowl', had pushed them to abide by the unwritten rule for the sake of their family's reputation and name³; Blundell's text contains ample examples of this fact⁴, while Juilliard too provide further cases.⁵ The following excerpt from Blundell shows the main reason for the enforced seclusion of young women: "[t]he young women are kept in fairly strict seclusion. They need to be. Bachelors and married men are on the prowl continually, all of them, eager to take advantage of innocence."⁶ However, none of these accounts tend to show any real sympathy for Bruneian women who found themselves in such dire conditions. It is not an exaggeration to say that an inherent pattern in the authors' personal judgments was that Bruneian women could not exactly be seen as fellow human

beings of equal status with men but, rather, as objects to be classified and labelled for fulfilling their basic roles in society.

However, there is more than that. Malay society at all times has viewed women with a great sense of respect although customary laws (*adat*) might recognise some hierarchies.⁷ Islam also provides women with matrimonial and social rights so that they can play their role alongside the opposite sex in society.⁸ Because of such regard that women have within the society, and as a result of the fusion of Malay and Islamic values, there was a tacit rule that needed to be observed by women during those centuries, and this has remained intrinsic within the society even until the present day: the rule is that women should maintain the highest level possible in the moral department by conforming to the codes of morality.⁹ It is obvious from various accounts, though, that such rules were normally imposed only on women whereas there were no such binding rules on men. However this one-sided imposition of rules should not readily be seen as women's submission to male domination. Far from it, since the purpose is to reinforce both cultural and religious values so that women could be guaranteed to have continued regard in the society.

Moreover, in the past, a clear distinction had definitely been made between 'good' and 'bad' women, and only good women were considered as suitable for marriage. It was the general notion that good and ideal young women could only be produced by secluding them and keeping them away from the public eye. This, it was argued, would allow them to build and reinforce high standards of cultural refinements such as good manners, courtesy and, more importantly, purity. This is also in line with the Islamic teaching that men and women should mingle and mix freely only within certain acceptable limits and under proper guidance.¹⁰

MARRIAGE AND CONCUBINAGE

Marriage is not an issue that was commonly included in the westerners' texts; only Peter Blundell elaborated on this issue. His long stay in Brunei may have enabled him to acquire a more detailed understanding of some aspects of Brunei culture, including marriage, that was unavailable to other western travellers. In his book, Blundell endeavoured to give a realistic picture of the relationship between women and marriage where he said that the "... the main occupation of the Brunei women is marriage and the main pre-occupation of the Brunei woman is man".¹¹ His growing personal alignment with Si Ajar¹² confirmed this viewpoint as Si Ajar, while in Blundell's care, was quite concerned about the wellbeing of her secret lover, Pengiran Chuchu, and she was only occasionally conscious of the mutuality of the newly formed relationship between her and Blundell. One could easily see how Blundell's writing entails contradiction. The above extract from the text exhibits his attempt to present what he thought was an objective description of what he saw and, also, clear evidence of his western sensibilities, while his personal choice to make acquaintance with the native woman is another competing voice which sought to understand and absorb the culture of the host country.

One thing that Blundell first learnt about marriages in Brunei society was that they were all arranged by prospective parents-in-law.¹³ The young people did not have much input in choosing a partner, although there had been a few indications that marriages based on romantic attachments were seemingly not uncommon in the early period of the twentieth century. However, the tradition of arranged marriages was still evidently strong. As is indicated in Blundell's text, one prince actually married for love, with the Sultan still insisting that "gold could not mix with brass". This shows how social status is one of the preferential rules for arranged marriages. This was due to the fear that was always prevalent that the lack of ethnic or status compatibility in marital relationships could lead to cultural incompatibility and questionable standards of morality¹⁴ which could

potentially pave the way to divorce, something that was too shameful to be accepted within Brunei society during those times. On the other hand, the system of arranged marriages had a kind of double standard: a man had the freedom to choose the girl he liked and could be nagged into marrying a particular girl only in special situations, whereas young females did not have such freedom and had to allow the parents to search marriage partners for them. If a girl insisted on choosing whoever she fancied to become her partner in marriage, her persistence would be interpreted as an immoral, improper act, and a definite breach of the code of morality.

However, Blundell's earlier statement and the system of arranged marriage should not be seen simply as an indication of the erosion of women's status in relation to male authority in the society. Nor should it be taken as representative of the intellectual capacity of women during those centuries. No one, of course, could debate that in any Asian society, once a woman marries a man, her social circle as well as responsibility shifts from her natal family to that of her husband. As a wife, she should obey her husband and continue to bear the primary responsibility for bearing and rearing children, looking after her husband's needs and doing housework.¹⁵ Married women's initial priorities were towards their husbands and families before pursuing any interest that they might have outside the domestic circle. But such conditions do not necessarily imply that women during the periods concerned were of inferior status and had no authority.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the status of women within the society, was not measured by whether or not they had attained equality in pay, nor was it measured from an increase in women's employment in professional fields, but was determined rather by the woman's success in securing and protecting her status and interests which, as suggested by Blundell, lay within the family circle. In other words, for these women, a role as housewife brought a respectable status, much like any remunerative occupations women are engaged in nowadays. It can be said that while the husbands went out to attend to their work as bark collectors, fishermen and silversmiths, the wives would devote maximum energy and attention to shoulder the full responsibility for the domestic chores.

It was clear that there was no exact definition of, nor a limit on, the kind of domestic burden and chores that women needed to handle. Blundell in his book provided a useful insight of the married life in Brunei which could be used to define domesticity in the context of Brunei in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He made a comparison and saw that marriage in Brunei could never be equal to that in Britain. In fact, Blundell seemed to suggest that Bruneian wives were rather in control of their lives. In addition, the wife's voice carried weight not only in matters relating to childrearing but also in all matters of household expenditures, including having control over every cent of her husband's earnings.¹⁶ What comes out from the comparison is the fact that Bruneian women were strong financial managers within their households. The wives were the ones who actually controlled the domestic purse strings, while men on the other hand could be seen as having no choice but to be dependent upon their wives' decisive voices. Such a phenomenon was not something peculiar to Brunei society only. Two other Asian societies with similar status for women can be cited here: (1) in the Javanese society during the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, women had considerable control over their husbands' income and financial affairs;¹⁷ and (2) similarly, in Japanese society, particularly during the later period of Tokugawa, *Koshu's* (house-head's) authority could easily be tempered by *shufu* (housewife) whose sphere of influence extended to household income.¹⁸ This clearly shows how, in these societies, housewives could easily attain a rather respectable socioeconomic status, and this is perhaps the reason why, according to Blundell, in Brunei, men were "susceptible to the charm of their companion sex".¹⁹

Thus it is clear that domesticity does not necessarily mean inferiority. The spheres of control of power in the family in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as discussed earlier, were rather woman-centred. Domesticity clearly provided the wives with not just wide powers in dictating and shaping the household, but also an effective means for the wives to become confident leaders in their households, usually in some subtle ways. The fact that the family institution during these periods was seen as an essential insurance for social welfare and security has helped to further bolster the socio-economic status of Bruneian women, and would help, thus, disprove the notion of female inferiority and passivism.

Apart from marriage, concubinage is another interesting dimension about women that could be found included in several western texts on Brunei. It appears that concubinage was another kind of "occupation" for Brunei women during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. S. E. Dalrymple writes on the practice with reference to higher strata of society in Brunei.²⁰ as did Walter J. Clutterbuck.²¹ The practice of having more than one wife, though at odds with European thought, was seemed to be perfectly understood by the authors as a well-regulated system in Brunei and also throughout the Malay world.²²

Many now would rather dodge the issue of concubinage practice among the Brunei rulers and nobilities as this could be seen as compromising the Islamic image that Brunei has all this time been striving to achieve. D.E. Brown states that Muslim laws in the past had allowed limited polygyny and concubinage.²³ Polygyny was and is allowed by Islam but this has never been the case with concubinage. But to solely question the integrity of Islam in Brunei in relation to the practice of concubinage will do nothing but injustice and such injustice emerges from several factors. One is the fact that even until the present day, there is still continued conflicts between Islam and local customary laws or *adat*. Islam might have been successful in marginalizing the physical manifestations of other religions such as temples and statues, but it has not been able to find similar success in terms of getting rid of intangible influences of other religions which were already in tune with the local customary laws.²⁴ Despite the fact that Islam has asserted religious influence in Brunei since six hundred years ago, it has not successfully eradicated all the un-Islamic elements embodied in local customary laws. The reasons for the continued apparent contradiction between Islam and local customs are beyond the scope of this paper, but this is raised here if only to bring to the fore the questions of superimposition and integration. If the conflict between *adat* and Islam still persists today, one could imagine how local customary laws could easily have overridden Islamic principles during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In this view, as well as for the reasons which caused the toleration of the practice of concubinage discussed earlier, the practice of concubinage therefore should not solely be seen as an act of transgression of Islamic laws, but rather a way of conforming to popular ideology among the Sultans in the Malay world.²⁵ Similarly, arranged marriages are, in their truest sense, against Islamic principles as Islam never forced women into marriage and, in fact, their consent to engage in marital bondage is necessary.²⁶ However, even if this is the case, arranged marriages were still widely practised during those periods and even later, and this is clearly due to cultural reasons which have been discussed earlier. Another issue is divorce which was seen as taboo; the reason for this is that, despite the fact that it is permissible in Islam, the norms and values of the society was yet to be seen through the true Islamic perspective.

WOMEN AND ISLAM

At present, Islam has gained a strong foothold in the country and this has partly been made possible by the continuous efforts of the government in promulgating Islamic teachings, including the establishment of more and more government institutions which

uphold Islamic principles; declaring Islam as the official religion in the 1959 Constitution; and more importantly, recognising Islam as one of the integral elements of the national philosophy, *Melayu Islam Beraja* (MIB) or the Islamic Malay Monarchy when Brunei achieved independence in 1984. All these efforts in spreading the word of Islam undoubtedly made the religion serve an ideological purpose which increasingly defined and structured the way of life of the population, in ways that emphasise the teaching of Islamic ideals and values.²⁷

And this is exactly what Brunei lacked in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and may explain why Islam did not appear to be an integral part of the people's life. Islam was undoubtedly practised by the population, as illustrated by Dominic Daly in October 1888, where she heard what she called "...discordant clashings of Moslem gongs, as the followers of the Prophet were summoned to their daily devotions".²⁸ However, this could not be used as verification that all Muslims truly observed and practised the religion, let alone understood the religious restrictions, particularly the practice of *adat* which did not go well with Islamic teachings and values. Blundell once recognized the high taste that Bruneian women had for port-wine which, according to the women he met, would "[warm] them up and [do] them good".²⁹ Of course, one should not rush to make generalizations based on such statements. Perhaps the women that Blundell met were those who comprised only a small proportion of the population that remained less attached to Islam and easily forsook religious observances. However, as his writing continues, it became clear that the women's lack of attachment to the religion was not by choice but due to their failure of understanding the fundamental religious principles. From his conversation with the women, Blundell found out that "according to the law of Mahomet no true believer is allowed to drink wine but then, no women are allowed to enter heaven".³⁰ This is an illustration that Islam during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries may have been understood by the population solely as an act of worship. Moreover with the absence of religious institutions in the state, it was difficult to present the population with a comprehensive and balanced understanding of Islam. The religious knowledge of the women that Blundell met was clearly distorted, and might well have led to the misconceptions about Islamic ideology as inhuman and intolerant. However, considering the dire political and socio-economic crises confronting the country during those times, it is understandable why efforts to propagate Islam, so the real essence of Islamic teachings reached the population, took a back seat.

Thus, when one talks about Bruneian women during the periods covered in the present paper, it may be said that their status and position within the society had nothing to do with the teachings of Islam as such. When the country professed Islam as its faith arguably since the fourteenth century, it did not necessarily mean the social institutions in the country would no longer be deeply imbued with local culture, which, for the most part, was not exactly aligned with Islamic teachings that actually determined the status of women in Brunei society. However, a popular view which suggests that Muslim women were traditionally been continuously confronted by oppression, discrimination and prejudice, could easily blind us into a false generalisation that it was Islam which shackled Bruneian women during the 19th and early 20th centuries and beyond.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

There is little historical research directly concerning Bruneian women's economic situation during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In general works, there are sporadic references to the role of women as traders but they are only superficial comments on their economic participation. Some travellers' accounts do mention the women's economic activities during those periods referring exclusively to one kind of activity, that

is as 'traders in boats', or better known nowadays as *padians*. F. H. H. Guillemard, who spent a night in Brunei in June 1883 during his geographical exploration, came across a group of canoes where,

"... the occupants... are almost without exception women... Each wears a palm-leaf hat of enormous size, which serves the purpose indeed of an umbrella also, for it is large enough to protect the whole body from either sun or rain".³¹

A similar account was also given by S.E. Dalrymple where he described a unique market place "where some hundreds of market boats jostle each other, while their inmates shriek and haggle over bargains...".³² Lady Brassey also confirmed the existence of the *padians*.³³ This is actually valuable information about Bruneian women during the periods concerned as it exhibits a clear division of labour, not along gender lines, but rather among the women themselves. The married women, particularly the younger ones, as explained earlier, were in charge of the running of the household and taking care of the young, while the older women would make significant economic contribution to the household by participating in the 'boat market'. These *padians* were those women around the age of forty or above, and their trading commodities included daily food items such as fish, vegetables and fruits.³⁴ Of course, these older women still attended to their matrimonial duties but, unlike the young ones, there were fewer restrictions imposed on them which made it easier for them to make full use of their creative economic abilities. One might think there would have been some conflict between the males and these women. The males had always been seen as breadwinners and the fact that the older women in the family now contributed significantly to the household income, could have bruised their ego and reputation as good providers. However, anything to suggest the existence of such conflicts in the society could not be found in any of the travellers' writings, not even in Blundell's. If pure conjecture is permissible, then it can be suggested that during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, was totally acceptable to run a house with a woman's earnings, and that the economic status of women was in no way inferior to that of men. It may, also, be a reflection of the fact that Bruneian women were accorded equal treatment and respect, particularly within the economic field, during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

CONCLUSION

While a look at the travellers' accounts used in the present study provides some interesting insights, one needs to be very careful so as to avoid making over-generalised conclusions. It is best that each text is examined individually, for treating them together will tend to be arbitrary and may produce an analysis that disregards thinking of the author and the complexities of the creation of the text. The essence of the above discussion is the argument that Bruneian women in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries did not conform to the traditional supposition that that women were weak and delicate; much of the travellers' accounts tend to depict Brunei women according to this supposition. However, the above analysis, on the other hand, tries to present an alternative interpretation of feminine matters, such as the domestic seclusion, marriage, concubinage and economic activities, which were viewed by the travellers as evidence that Bruneian women had been condemned to a position inferior to men. Culture, at one point or another, could tie the women to passivism, but since not all factors which affect women's status necessarily point in the direction of female inferiority, Bruneian women in the periods concerned could not be said to have been generally passive and inferior to men in terms of position and status.

Thus, it would be incorrect to infer that women did not exert any kind of influence on the society and households, although the degree of such influence would be exceedingly difficult to measure. Moreover, women may well have exercised what might be described as indirect or concealed influence over their households and their husbands and the society as a whole. As such, it can be concluded that, despite there being strong male domination within the society, once it had been exerted, and accepted, the way was open for women to enjoy relative freedom and liberty.

END NOTES

¹ Sara Mills, *Discourses of Difference: an Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism* (London: Routledge, 1991), p. 30.

² Clifford, in his writing, also regarded Brunei as a "moribund kingdom" as he viewed "the miserable wreck of past glory". The conspicuous absence of a strong stream of emigration at Brunei Bay, the non-existence of thriving pepper-gardens and groves of rich spices on Brunei hills, and the fact that Brunei's throne was not in the hands of capable men are all clear manifestations of Brunei's departed wealth. Hugh Clifford, "The Dying Kingdom" in *Macmillan's Magazine*, Vol. 86, No. 512, May-October 1902, pp. 106-114.

³ Peter Blundell, *The City of Many Waters* (London: J. W. Arrowsmith, 1923), p. 107. Peter Blundell's real name was F. N. Butterworth, and he was working as an engineer for a cutch factory belonging to Island Trading Syndicate. His book, *The City of Many Waters*, was written during the period prior to the arrival of Malcolm McArthur in Brunei in 1904.

⁴ Blundell, *The City of Many Waters*, pp. 109-110.

⁵ Francis Guillemard was sometime Reader in Geography at Cambridge as well as a traveler, naturalist and writer. His account was written during his one-night visit to Brunei sometime in June 1883. The visit was part of his geographical exploration to Southeast Asia. Simon Francis, *Pictures of the Palace: travellers' accounts of the Brunei of Sultan Abdul Mumin and Sultan Hashim between 1881 and 1906*, (Hull: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, University of Hull, 1993), pp. 42-43.

⁶ Blundell, *The City of Many Waters*, p. 107.

⁷ Wazir Jahan Karim, *Women and Culture: Between Malay Adat and Islam* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1992), p. 7.

⁸ Parven Shaukat Ali, *Status of Women in the Muslim World*, second edition (Lahore: Aziz Publishers, 1986), p. 21.

⁹ Wazir Jahan Karim, *Women and Culture*, p. 182.

¹⁰ According to the Hadith reported by Al-Bukhari, narrated by Anas bin Malik, an Ansari woman came to the Prophet (Peace Be Upon Him) and he took her aside and said (to her), "by Allah, you (Ansari) are the most beloved people to me". The significance of this Hadith is that a private meeting between a man and woman is permissible so long as it is not conducted in seclusion. Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan, *The Translation of the Meanings of Sahih Al-Bukhari*, Vol. VII (New Delhi: Kitab Bharan, 1984), p. 118.

¹¹ Blundell, *The City of Many Waters*, p. 105.

¹² Si Ajar, according to Blundell, was one of the inmates of the harem belonging to one of the Wazirs and she was apparently a prince's favourite. However, Si Ajar was in love with another man, Pengiran Chuchu, and the liaison might just have cost them their lives and brought disgrace on their families for generations to follow. See Blundell, *The City of Many Waters*, pp. 51-53.

¹³ Blundell, *The City of Many Waters*, p. 180.

¹⁴ D. E. Brown, *Brunei: The Structure and History of a Bornean Malay Sultanate*, Monograph of the Brunei Museum Journal, Vol. 2 No. 2, 1970, p. 36.

¹⁵ The Chinese women for example, were traditionally regarded as 'neiren' or 'inside person', who should literally remain inside the house, taking full responsibility of domestic chores and letting the husband be the only 'outside person'. The Chinese society, even until nowadays, still place greater weight on such tradition as it is the bedrock of social order and stability. See Norman Stockman, *Understanding Chinese Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), pp. 110-112; Elisabeth Croll, *Changing Identities of Chinese Women: Rhetoric, Experience and Self-perception in Twentieth Century China* (London and New Jersey: Zed Books, 1995), pp. 120-121.

¹⁶ Blundell, *The City of Many Waters*, p. 93.

¹⁷ Ann Ruth Willner, "Expanding Women's Horizons in Indonesia: Toward Maximum Equality with Minimum Conflict", in Sylvia A. Chipps, and Justin J. Green, eds., *Asian Women in Transition* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1980), pp. 186-187.

¹⁸ Kathleen S. Uno, "Women and Changes in the Household Division of Labour", in Gail Lee Bernstein (ed.), *Recreating Japanese Women, 1600 - 1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), p. 24.

¹⁹ Blundell, *The City of Many Waters*, p. 106.

²⁰ S. E. Darymple was appointed as the Assistant Resident for British North Borneo Chartered Company in North Borneo (Sabah) and he was posted to different areas throughout his appointment. The purpose of his visit to Brunei in June 1884 was not made clear but Simon Francis suggested that he might have been on an official business visit as he was joined by W. H. Treacher, the Governor of the British North Borneo Chartered Company during the visit. See Francis, *Pictures of the Palace*, p. 43.

²¹ Unlike other Western travellers, Walter J. Clutterback, a recipient of Fellowship of the Royal Geographical Society, visited Brunei for pleasure. See Francis, *Pictures of the Palace*, p. 35.

²² According to *Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei*, Sultan Saiful Rijal would take by force fine-looking princesses to be his concubines. See P. L. Amin Sweeney (ed.), "Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei" in *The Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 41, Part 2, 1968, p. 20. Sultan Hassan is also said to have had a few concubines of his own. P. L. Amin Sweeney (ed.), "Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei", p. 55; Y.B. Pehin Orang Kaya Amar Diraja Dato Seri Utama (Dr.) Awang Haji Mohd. Jamil Al-Sufri bin Begawan Pehin Udana Khatib Dato Seri Paduka Awang Haji Umar, *Chatatan Sejarah Perwira-Perwira dan Pembesar-Pembesar Brunei* (Brunei: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1973), p. 33. See also Hugh Low, "List of the Mohamedan Sovereigns of Brunei", in *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 5 (June 1880), p. 26.

²³ D. E. Brown, *Brunei: The Structure and History of a Bornean Malay Sultanate*, p. 37.

²⁴ N. J. Ryan, *The Cultural Heritage of Malaya* (Kuala Lumpur: Longman Malaysia, 1971), pp. 14-15.

²⁵ Hoyt mentions that it was Sultan Mudzaffar Shah of Malacca, a noble character, who proclaimed Islam as the state religion, and had many wives and concubines. Whereas Sir Frank Swettenham, while he served as a Resident in Perak, observed that the Malay Raja not only maintained as many wives as allowed by Islam but the wives should expect, or were educated to expect, that the Raja would have concubines as the ruler was simply following the practice of his ancestors and concubinage was made a custom of the country. See Sarnia Hayes Hoyt, *Old Malacca* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1993), p.11; Sir Frank Swettenham, *Malay Sketches* (Singapore: Graham Brash, 1984), pp. 182-183.

²⁶ Prof. Dr. Anwarullah, *Right of Women in Islam* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Islamic Da'wah Centre, 2002), pp. 1-2.

²⁷ Haji Abdul Latif Haji Ibrahim, "Melayu Islam Beraja: Suatu Pengenalan", in Haji Latif Haji Ibrahim, *Melayu Islam Beraja: Pengantar Huraian* (Akademi Pengajian Brunei: Universiti Brunei Darussalam, 2003), p. 67.

²⁸ Mrs. Dominic Daly was the wife of a senior official who worked with the British North Borneo Chartered Company. Her purpose of visit to Brunei in October 1888 was to accompany her husband who had an important task in hand, that was to reach an agreement with the Sultan on the transfer of land concession of Padas River to the Company. See Francis, *Pictures of the Palace*, p. 12.

²⁹ Blundell, *The City of Many Waters*, p. 107.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Francis, *Pictures of the Palace*, p. 18.

³² Francis, *Pictures of the Palace*, p. 19.

³³ Lady Brassey was the wife of a wealthy politician, Lord Brassey. At the end of their extensive sea journey to the Far East, he was made Director of the British North Borneo Chartered Company. Lady Brassey kept a journal throughout their journey in which she wrote down her experience of a day trip to Brunei in April 1887 in Rajah's infamous steamer, *Lorna Doone*. See Francis, *Pictures of the Palace*, p. 21.

³⁴ Haji Awang Zainuddin Hassan, "Pengalu dan Padian, Suatu Tinjauan Tradisi Perdagangan di Brunei", in *Pusaka*, No. 5, 1992, p. 41.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Latif Haji Ibrahim, Haji (2003). *Melayu Islam Beraja: Suatu Pengenalan*. In Haji Latif Haji Ibrahim. *Melayu Islam Beraja: Pengantar Huraian*. Akademi Pengajian Brunei: Universiti Brunei Darussalam. Pp. 55-74.
- Anwarullah. Prof. Dr. (2002). *Right of Women in Islam*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Islamic Da'wah Centre.
- Blundell, P. (1923). *The City of Many Waters*. London: J. W. Arrowsmith.
- Brown, D. E. (1970). *Brunei: The Structure and History of a Bornean Malay Sultanate*. Monograph of the Brunei Museum Journal Vol. 2, No. 2.
- Clifford, H. (1902). *The Dying Kingdom*. *Macmillan's Magazine*, 86(512): 106-114.

- Croll, E. (1995). *Changing Identities of Chinese Women: Rhetoric, Experience and Self-perception in Twentieth Century China*. London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Muhammad Muhsin Khan (1984). *The Translation of the Meanings of Sahih Al-Bukhari*. Vol. VII. New Delhi: Kitab Bharan.
- Francis, S. (1993). *Pictures of the Palace: travellers' accounts of the Brunei of Sultan Abdul Mumin and Sultan Hashim between 1881 and 1906*. Hull: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, University of Hull.
- Hoyt, S. H. (1993). *Old Malacca*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Low, H. (1880). List of the Mohamedan Sovereigns of Brunei. *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 5: 24-31.
- Mills, S. (1991). *Discourses of Difference: an Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Mohd. Jamil Al-Sufri, Y.B. Pehin Orang Kaya Amar Diraja Dato Seri Utama Dr. Awang Haji, bin Begawan Pehin Udana Khatib Dato Seri Paduka Awang Haji Umar (1973). *Chatatan Sejarah Perwira-Perwira dan Pembesar-Pembesar Brunei*. Brunei: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Parven Shaukat Ali (1986). *Status of Women in the Muslim World*. Second edition. Lahore: Aziz Publishers.
- Rosnah Baharuddin (2000). Citra Wanita dalam Saga dan Bayang-Bayang Ungu daripada Kaca Mata Wanita. In Ahmad Kamal Abdullah and Siti Aisah Murad (eds.), *Citra Wanita dalam Sastera Melayu 1930 – 1990*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Pp. 27-41
- Ryan, N. J. (1971). *The Cultural Heritage of Malaya*. Kuala Lumpur: Longman Malaysia.
- Swettenham, F. (1984). *Malay Sketches*. Singapore: Graham Brash.
- Stockman, N. (2000). *Understanding Chinese Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Sweeney, P. L. A. (ed.) (1968). Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 41 (2): 1-82.
- Uno, K. S. (1991). Women and Changes in the Household Division of Labour. In Bernstein, G. L. (ed.), *Recreating Japanese Women, 1600-1945*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. 17-41.
- Wazir Jahan Karim (1992). *Women and Culture: Between Malay Adat and Islam*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Willner, A. R. (1980). Expanding Women's Horizons in Indonesia: Toward Maximum Equality with Minimum Conflict. In Chipps, S.A. & Green, J. J. (eds.), *Asian Women in Transition*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press. Pp. 182-190.
- Zainuddin Hassan, Haji Awang (1992). Pengalu dan Padian, Suatu Tinjauan Tradisi Perdagangan di Brunei. *Pusaka*, 5: 34-51.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRE-COLONIAL LEGAL CULTURE AND SYSTEM IN BRUNEI

B. A. HUSSAINMIYA

ABSTRACT

This paper probes the characteristics of the law and justice system practiced in the pre-colonial Brunei Sultanate. As a Malay Islamic Monarchy, Brunei's legal system, like in most other Malay States in the region, was a mixture of Islam, customary laws and examples drawn from exigencies of situations. Although the justice system was seen at its best during Brunei's glorious period in the 16th and 17th centuries, in the subsequent periods, until the establishment of the British residency system, the practice of law in Brunei courts showed signs of weakness and laxity. Although the Sultans had become dilatory in conducting trials, foreign observers who visited the kingdom were impressed that cases were handled with reasonable thoroughness before the sentences were passed. Nonetheless there remain many vital areas with respect to Brunei legal history that needs further elucidation by prospective scholars.

INTRODUCTION

Like many other aspects of Brunei's past, a comprehensive study of the Sultanate's legal history is yet to be undertaken. Given the importance of the Brunei kingdom as the foremost sultanate in the Borneo Island that continues to prosper, it is to be anticipated that a firm foundation for a legal system had been laid in tandem with other paraphernalia of a strong State. In fact, a few incidental references to Brunei in the medieval Portuguese and Spanish records point in that direction as the kingdom was known to have practiced a reasonably well established legal system. For instance, Ludovico Varthema of Bologna, one of the early visitors to Brunei in about the year 1505 mentioned that justice was well administered in the island of Borneo[Brunei] (cited in Nicholl, 1975: 3). Similarly Tome Pires, a resident in Melaka as supervisor of spice trade from 1512 until 1515 referred to the Borneans as "peaceable men". Antonio Pigafetta, who visited Brunei in 1521 and wrote a comprehensive and authentic account of Brunei, despite not going into details of legal matters, referred to the adherence to Islamic practices including not eating pork, ritual killing of animals, aspects of personal cleanliness and circumcision (Nicholl, 1975: 8-13). Apparently Brunei's emergence as an Islamic power in the South China Sea region in the medieval period was an important factor that transformed a minor port polity into a strong State. The ascendancy of the State as an economic power as well as an Islamic missionary State required a good legal foundation.

The official history of Brunei generally traces the foundation of Islam beginning from the middle of the 14th century when a local tribal leader known as Alak Betatar became a Muslim and assumed the name of Sultan Muhammad. The third Sultan in the official Brunei genealogy was a foreigner Syarif Ali presumed to have hailed from Taif in Arabia and was a descendant of the Prophet Mohammed's cousin and son-in-law, Ali, the fourth Caliph in the Islamic history. The Brunei chronicles refer to the introduction of Islamic Shari'a law during his period. The 9th Sultan of Brunei, Sultan Hassan, is credited with other achievements in writing down the legal texts in Brunei such as the *Hukum Kanun*.

Without getting into controversies about the dates or the names of the early rulers of Brunei, it is safe to conclude that by the early 16th century, Brunei emerged as a rich, prosperous and stable sultanate in the region, a fact well illustrated by the said writings of

Antonio Pigafetta. Another Spanish document, referred to as the *Boxer Codex*, written in 1599 by a Spanish official who had been resident in Brunei, highlights an elaborate and organized form of a state and government of Brunei (Carroll, 1982). Apart from many authentic observations by the writer of the *Boxer codex*, his description of the legal system in Brunei is quite stunning. It indicated, above all, a very systematic administration of justice in the kingdom. The document also delineates details of court proceedings, law of evidence, and various forms of punishments including the capital punishment meted out to wrong-doers. The 19th century foreign references, particularly by the British observers, also help in understanding the practice of law in Brunei. However, it appears that the system was not as ideal as it was during the 17th century, the glorious days of Brunei.

The 19th century witnessed a decline in Brunei's power and status. This seemed to have resulted in a corresponding laxity in the way justice was administered. At any rate, law is not a static subject; it mutates into various forms in keeping with the needs of the time and exigencies. Moreover, the Brunei laws must have undergone changes throughout the period under study until the arrival of the British in the scene. By that time Brunei was on the verge of extinction. M.S.H. McArthur, a British official who was sent to Brunei in 1904 to report on the conditions of State and government in Brunei, for instance, highlighted the impotence of the Brunei legal system when the authorities were dilatory in punishing the wrong-doers. McArthur (1904: 128) concluded that "[In Brunei] there is the semblance of a judicature, but little justice".

Brunei originally comprised a much larger territory including most parts of the present day Sarawak and Sabah which are now Malaysian territories. After 1890, when Charles Brooke annexed the Limbang territory the Brunei kingdom was reduced to the present borders of two separated enclaves, Brunei-Muara, Tutong and Belait on the one end and Temburong on the other end, covering about 5765 km² in extent. Much of the discussion in this paper is relevant to the practice of law close to the center of power in Brunei, i.e.; Brunei [city] proper where the Sultan held court. It is to be presumed that in the outlying provincial courts, if there were any, were held under his authority by especially nominated officials. In fact, as the *Boxer Codex* mentions, the indigenous tribes such as the Visayas who lived inland submitted themselves to the law of the Sultan, though not always voluntarily.

SOURCES OF LAW

Like in most other Malay sultanates of the period, the Brunei law was said to have derived from three main sources. The first was *Hukum Shara* or *Hukum Shari'a*, religious law, the second was *Hukum Kanun*, the administrative law, and the third was the *Adat* laws, customary laws. In practice the three elements were indistinguishable and the surviving fragments of the written versions of Brunei *Hukum Kanun* texts juxtapose all three sources.

Hickling Report (1955) on Brunei referred to Islam as the state religion of Brunei based on the Shafii sect of the Sunnis. He also quoted (Withers-Payne, 1932:1) as "the Sunni sources of Muslim law that was based on:

- (1) *Al Quran*;
- (2) the *Hadis* or *Sunnat*, the tradition derived from the Prophet by word, action or even silence (*takrir*);
- (3) the *Ijma'a-ul-Ummat*, the decisions of the leading disciples the first four *Caliphs*, Abu Bakar, Omar, Osman and Ali; and
- (4) *Qiyas*, the exercise of private judgment by the use of reason and analogy in interpreting every implication of the Commandments in the *Quran* and the *Hadis*."

It is doubtful if the strict laws of Islam under Shari'a principles were ever implemented in full in Brunei. There must have been many compromises. The customs of the country and various races dictated the resolution of various issues ranging from laws of succession, land and property rights which evolved throughout the period. Knowledgeable Brunei scholars have referred to the system but only in cursory terms. Asbol (2004)) has cited Hajah Masnon Ibrahim, Pehin Mohd Zain, and Mahmud Saedon as those who have readily accepted the prevalence of *Hukum Kanun Brunei*, a somewhat comprehensive but fragmentary legal text in several versions, as an all inclusive treatise on the legal practice in Islamic Brunei in the pre-colonial era. Western scholars, on the other hand, are reluctant to give importance to such Malay legal texts as will be discussed below. The *Hukum Kanun Brunei* was said to have been written during the reign of Sultan Hassan though it was believed that its principles had been laid down even earlier than that. It was completed and enforced during the reign of Sultan Jalilul Akbar and then continued during the reign of his son, Sultan Jalilul Jabbar. Local scholars believe that despite the enforcement of this law, Islamic law had taken precedence to become the basic law and the basis for policy of Brunei Darussalam.

Several manuscripts of *Hukum Kanun*, mostly in fragments, have surfaced. Mahmud Saedon (2002) referred to two manuscripts of the above: the first manuscript was called the "*Hukum Kanun Brunei*" which, contained 96 pages and is kept at the Language and Literature Bureau (*Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka*)¹; and the second was known as "*Undang-Undang dan Adat Brunei Lama*" (Old Brunei Law and Custom), consisting of 68 pages. It is now preserved in the Sarawak Museum (Mahmud Saedon, 1999: 2)

The content of the first manuscript covered a wide range of laws including the Islamic laws of *hudud* and *qisas*. Saedon has said that the overall content of the manuscript was in harmony with the Islamic law. For example: Clause One of the manuscript talks about relationship between people and its ruler, conditions of becoming a ruler, responsibilities of the people towards its rulers; Clause Four talks about various kind of offences such as murder, stabbing, slaying, hitting, robbery, stealing and many others, though no punishment for those offences were stated in this Clause; Clause Five talks about the punishment of *qisas* for murder and also for the murderer to be killed in return for his crime; Clause Seven talks about offence of stealing, the punishment for which would be to cut off certain parts of offender's hand; Clause Twenty-five talks about marriage, requirements of marriage and the words to be uttered during the marriage contract; Clause Twenty-six talks about the number of witnesses in a marriage contract; Clause Thirty-one talks about the rule and conditions in sale and purchase contracts; other clauses which talks about a wide range of laws that are in accordance with Islamic laws.

According to Asbol (2004: 148), several copies of *Hukum Kanun* were in the possession of the Brunei royal descendants. For example, copies were found to have been owned by Pg. Pemancha Mohd. Salleh ibn Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin II, Pg. Yakob ibnu Sultan Mohd. Tajuddin and other Pengirans.

Almost certainly the *Hukum Kanun* was not indigenous to Brunei. Apparently the Brunei text was a variant of the ubiquitous *Undang-Undang Melaka* found in many parts of the Malay sultanates. Liaw Yock Fang listed more than 40 such texts derived from the original legal digest compiled in Melaka as having been adapted and adopted in Kedah, Pahang, Riau, Pontianak, and was quoted in recent times as authoritative (in civil suits) at Brunei (Liaw Yock Fang, 1976: 1, citing Winstedt, 1923). These were the work of the learned scribes at the courts of Sultans. Gullick (1988: 114). mentioned that "no one ever referred to the codesfor guidance in settling a dispute" Furthermore, Wilkinson (1908: 3), a leading European authority on Malay law has warned against taking "the so-called codes too seriously". At most, it can be suggested that an aristocrat learned in the codes sat

in judgment and tried to apply them. It is worth remembering that, as in other parts of the Malay world, in Brunei, there was no written law of any significance as established law in the period under discussion.

The Brunei legal circles must have applied the sources of law somewhat selectively to suit various circumstances. Conflicting parties followed convenience and expediency to draw examples from both sources of laws to settle disputes as, for example, in the cases of determining royal succession in Brunei. Based on McArthur's comments, a mid-20th Century observer on Brunei laws and political system, Hickling (1955: 23, para 32) was constrained to admit the following:

But there exists, alongside the 'hukum shara', the disturbing element of the 'hukum Kannu (sic)', which I cannot attempt to translate by any English phrase, but the bearing of which it is perhaps possible to explain by instances. Malays themselves admit that it is usually invoked to assist in the carrying out of political schemes and intrigues as it gives an excuse for setting aside the usual succession. By the 'hukum kannu', if ever it is put in force, only the descendant of royal ancestors on both sides may succeed as Ruler, though, even so, the property left will be divided according to 'hukum shara'.

The third source was *Adat* laws, practiced mostly at village level to resolve disputes among the civil population. Traditionally the village chiefs could have played their role, although not officially as arbiters of disputes among the people who came under their purview. Almost certainly non-Malay races of Brunei such as Bisayas, Muruts and Dusuns and others must have had their own set of customary laws to settle disputes. Major cases of criminal and civil nature, of course, had to be tried at higher level courts held under the Sultan's jurisdiction, as mentioned specifically in the *Boxer codex* of 1599.

Although reference has been made to the three main sources of law, they were not mutually exclusive. As such, too much importance cannot be attached to any specific source as the basis on which legal disputes were resolved in pre-colonial times. *Adat* itself was the overriding element in the legal culture of the Malays in general as illustrated by a famous saying in Malay: *Biar mati anak, jangan mati adat* (literally: Let the children die, but not the customs). The *Adat* practice, however, was not intended to be an organized system of legal sanctions. Sometimes, the customs were coded in maxims and proverbial sayings and, apparently, there were knowledgeable elders who advised the village chiefs or the law-enforcers in resolving some minor disputes by reference to hearsay proverbs.

It may be pertinent to remark that in reference to legal practice in Sarawak during the early 20th century, K. H. Digby, a lawyer who wrote his memoir on his legal experience in Sarawak, referred to "native courts" which constituted of native headmen and administered native law and custom. He concluded that "the customary laws were very undeveloped and unsophisticated. They were concerned largely with sexual and matrimonial matters, although they might in some instances include provisions controlling other activities of which the most important was *padi* farming." (Digby, 1980) He further states that "no distinction was made between civil and criminal matters, and most causes were part one and part the other." (Ibid.) Perhaps his remarks applied to the situation in areas under Brunei's control during the period under study, although evidence rests solely on comparative application of similar situation as elsewhere in the region.

THE COURT SYSTEM

The *Boxer Codex* is by far the best source for portraying the workings of Brunei judiciary at the beginning of the 17th century. Nevertheless, the details cannot be compared or corroborated by any similar document, although it is to be presumed that the legal practice must have undergone some changes at a later period. According to this source, the Sultan of Brunei besides his role as the head of the state also occupied the apex of the judicial system. On the whole, Sultans and chiefs administered the law as part of their function in preserving order. As Gullick (1988: 115) emphasized, "in a sense all law was *droit administratif*." If the Brunei Sultan implemented digests of laws which emanated from him, such rules applied to all in his dominion. It is doubtful, however, if the writs ran wide and, more importantly, whether most of his nominal subjects had any knowledge of the laws. In so far as the Sultan was concerned, as God's representative on earth, his laws were universal in scope and 'God inspired'. He rarely sat on judgment in the principal court, however, although he alone had the power of meting out capital punishment and mutilation in addition to issuing amnesty for pardoned offenders.

In practice, the courts were presided over by the Pengiran Bendahara, the principal Minister and/or, (especially after the middle of the 19th century) Pengiran Temenggung. The latter was in charge of legal matters, especially dealings related to land. During the early 17th century, the sources refer to a general Council of judges (*audiencia*) in which all four principal chiefs, including Pengiran Di Gadong and Pengiran Shahbandar, participated. Pengiran Bendahara and Pengiran Temenggung, however, virtually handled all the cases and lawsuits. (*Boxer Codex*, p. 6) The Pengiran Di-Gadong, as a keeper of royal property determined the cases involving the royal property "and of all the slaves of the king and of all the people who were occupied in royal service..." The last Pengiran Shahbandar held duties as the 'general of the sea'. The latter's duty was mainly in the area of conducting and guiding trade and, as such, he must have arbitrated on matters relating to trade disputes and income involving the large number of foreign traders who flocked to the kingdom at various times.

Each of these judges drew their command from the Sultan. According to the nature of the cases and the ranks of those involved in the cases, the judges on occasion passed the cases to be tried by the one below him. The decisions taken in these courts ended there, but the Sultan held the right to hear cases of appeal. Irrespective of the judgment being, it was considered executed and the king never interfered in the process. Usually the courts held the proceedings in the capital city where the king resided. In addition, courts were held in far-lying areas when some chiefs, styled 'captain' in the codex, and their deputies went inland to collect tributes from the local tribes such as the Visayas. For this purpose, they carried a license from the chief Pengirans to try the law suits among the interior people. These judges took with them many 'bailiffs' [enforcers] known in Malay as *Patih*. Although they did not 'carry batons of authority' (Malay: *vara*), they helped to arrest the delinquents, with the help of people who carried out duties like the modern day policemen.

Brunei did not have jails. Nor was there an elaborate system of deputies to conduct case or keep records. The main judges used oral admissions and judgments. As such, hardly a hearing proceeded beyond its first sitting. If by chance one of the parties was absent, the hearing could go to a second date, in which case the bailiffs guarded the parties in their houses. When the case is heard the second time, the judgment would have been passed but orally. Thus there was no law suit that took two days as stated in the *Boxer Codex*.

The law of evidence (or system of proving a case) in those days followed medieval practice of trial by ordeal. If one party refuses to accept a judgment and wish to proceed with the case there were several methods of proving the guilty by recourse to such ordeals. For instance, the court house lit two candles of equal size, and without any fraud in them,

they were lit at the same time and the person whose candle was the first to be completely consumed lost the case. Similarly, the two contenders would be asked to sink their heads under the water, and the one who withdraws his head first to avoid suffocation lost the trial. The judge rarely changed the verdict thus obtained by such trials. In fact it was not the judge, but the defendant who chose the method of the trial. If, by chance, the plaintiff declined to pass through the test that the defendant chose, he was acquitted of any liabilities that caused the hearing of the case. If "by chance the defendant chose nothing, then the judge would indicate to them that which has to be; and in not wanting any one of them, he is vanquished" (*Boxer Codex*: 7).

MODES OF PUNISHMENT

The Codex also lists various methods of punishments for crimes committed in the kingdom. For instance, the punishment for stealing royal property or counterfeiting money was death by impaling and confiscation of the offender's property by the king. The same applied to foreigners who fled from the kingdom without the permission of the king or the judges. In cases involving the criminal wounding of persons, the wounded was asked to inflict similar act on the accused. The case of theft was dealt by cutting off the hands of the thief, a fact which confirms a common practice recommended by Islamic Shari'a law. The latter punishment was still in vogue until about the late 19th century as reported in the British sources (Treacher, cited in Asbol, 2004). This particular form of punishment has often been highlighted to demonstrate how Islamic *hudud* laws had been practiced in Brunei on the eve of the introduction of the British Residency system (Mahmud Saedon, 2002).

There were also a variety of other capital punishments to those who committed serious crimes such as treason or stealing state property; decapitation, hanging, and impaling were some of them. The Codex further described a specific kind of death sentence that had been carried out in Brunei.

They make the convict sit on the ground woman-fashion, whether a man or a woman, and on the left shoulder they put a leaf on him and through the leaf and shoulder they insert a dagger of three palms [in length] until the point arrives at the right side and then they withdraw the dagger, doing a manner of return with so that it comes cutting toward the heart. They call this kind of death *salan* (Malay *salang*).

The Codex then goes on to describe other forms of executions, one of which was said to have been more recently introduced i.e., in 1588 C.E.

~~Cases of adultery were taken seriously in Brunei as the adulterer was punishable by death.~~ Until he was killed, no harm could be done to the woman who was a partner in adultery. If by chance the aggrieved wounded or killed his own wife, he himself was condemned to die. After killing the adulterer, the aggrieved can kill his wife at any place except in front of the king or judges. "In case the adulterer kills the sufferer (or) any other person defending himself, then the adulterous woman must die for the crime for having been instrumental in that death" (*Boxer Codex*: 8). If the adulterer flees without leaving anyone dead, the husband cannot do any harm to the woman. The husband then can divorce the wife and reclaim the dowry.

The above description is suffice to prove that, as early as the 17th century, Brunei practiced an elaborate system of law and punishment which was partly based on Islamic law and mixed with age old conventions and some locally adapted variations.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY SITUATION

During the 18th and 19th centuries Brunei's fortunes declined. The sultanate underwent a period of considerable turmoil. Internal political strife led to the weakening of its hold on what remained of its empire. With the spread of organized European trading activities in Southeast Asia, Brunei began to shrink in economic importance. Conflicts with the Spanish power based in Manila sapped the energy of Brunei causing further loss of wealth and territories. The worse was to come in the 19th century as a sequel to the active involvement of the British naval power in the region. Brunei gradually lost large chunks of territories due to adventurous intrusions of the Brooke regime in Sarawak and the British North Borneo Company. The history of this has been dealt with extensively elsewhere (Hussainmiya, 2006; Tarling, 1971).

Brunei kingdom not only lost its clout as regional power, but also was on the verge of extinction. In the face of economic crisis, the government institutions could not function properly. That included the judiciary that became so lax as to invite the notice of the European visitors to the kingdom. In the 19th century most accounts agree that the Brunei legal system performed poorly partly because of a weak government at the helm. According to John Leyden (1816: 2, Cited in Asbol, 2004: 146) writing in 1816-18, Brunei was still practicing the laws of ancient times.

Vestiges of the original legal practice seemed to have been still in practice. In accordance with Chapter 6 of the *Hukum Kanun*, the Sultan had the power to try cases involving: (a) murder; (b) taking other people's wives; and (c) running amok. Moreover, the Sultan held the ultimate rights to hear cases in which the punishment would be death or mutilation (Leys: Cited in Brown, 1970: 98). According to one British account, such trials took place with the same significance as if a state matter would be deliberated (C.O. 144/37, Pope Hennessy to Kimberly, 10 August 1871: Cited in Brown, 1970: 98). Many noble and non-noble officials participated during the proceedings. The Sultan gave the judgment which others concurred with. However, this represented one of those special cases involving an official (land chief). He was in principle entitled to hear the cases of appeal from any one, even the inhabitants of private domains who suffered injustice or oppression. Whether the Sultans exercised the rights was a moot point and, as Brown has noted, the Sultan's rights in respect of capital punishment seems to have been imperfectly exercised in the 19th century (Brown: *op.cit*).

In other cases, however, the court was presided over by Pengiran Temenggung, who at this period was responsible for conducting trials although Pengiran Bendahara, as the chief Wazir, and also others might have been involved in the administration of justice in the kingdom. Yet, sources do not agree as to who performed the role of a 'chief justice' in Brunei. According to Pengiran Yusof Rahim's *Book of Brunei Customs (Adat Istiadat)*, (Pengiran Yusof: 1958), it was Pengiran Bendahara as the highest official administering the power or authority of the Sultan was, also, the highest official in matters of law. Brown (1970: 108) has questioned Pengiran Yusof's account of the judicial duties of Pengiran Bendahara as "... unsubstantiated for all periods after about 1850, and is open to question for earlier periods." As Brown, also, states, from the middle of the 19th century the role of principal law-giver has passed into the hands of the Wazir next to him in the hierarchy, i.e. the Pengiran Temenggung. A contemporary British official, Peter Leys, has the following comment to highlight this point.

The Pengiran Temenggung has by his office the chief administration of justice and his ostensible complaint against the Sultan is that His Highness unduly interferes and prevents his sentences from being carried out.
(C.O 144/26, Hugh Low to the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, 25 October 1867, f.301; cited in Brown, 1970: 108)

McArthur's Report of 1904, on the other hand, specifically mentions the functioning of Pengiran Bendahara's court in the capital.

Some Brunei scholars have over-emphasized the practice of Islamic law by the Sultan in Court (Mahmud Saedon, 2000; Pehin Mohd. Shukri Zain, 2005). For example, Sultan Abdul Mumin sentenced to death a certain Pengiran Mohamed who was involved in a murder but was protected by the inhabitants of the Kampung Ayer ward of Brunei Pingai (Spenser St. John, Cited in Asbol, 2004: 150). Similarly, a former British Consul, Treacher, mentioned in 1876 a death by hanging of a murderer, one Pengiran Maidin, by the orders of the Sultan Hashim Jalilul Alam. Treacher also mentioned the cutting of hands, on the Sultan's orders, of three thieves alleged to have broken into a British ship anchored in Brunei harbour.

Other British accounts agree that the justice system in Brunei was dilatory to say the least, and the investigation and judgment processes also could be slow, but sensible and yet at times thorough as highlighted by Peter Leys, a British Consul to Brunei (1881-1889).

The Brunei authorities are extremely dilatory in examining into civil and criminal cases, but once the cases is taken up it is gone into very thoroughly, and usually a very sensible verdict is found.

In real practice, Pengirans (i.e. Brunei nobility) who committed crimes including murder seemed to have escaped the justice system with some exceptions mentioned earlier. Their autocratic behaviour at worst brought them a reputation for cruelty. A senior Pengiran who was known personally to the Consul Peter Leys exercised his rights not only to impose fines on trivial offences, "but actually employs people to seek out little disputes that may exist among families, and by exaggerating them make them occasions for inflicting as heavy fines as the persons can possibly pay." The system allowed these Pengirans to exercise fiscal and magisterial powers in the districts administered by them. Such abuses seemed to have been not uncommon when M. S. H. McArthur visited Brunei in 1904 on his mission to write a report on Brunei to reform the administration. He specially referred to the fact that people shunned the courts of the Sultan and Pengiran Bendahara because, especially in the latter's court, "the fees—not so much for a hearing as for a verdict—are, prohibitive." (McArthur Report: para 55). As a rule, McArthur said the cases "were settled by a system of arbitration among the recognized, if unauthorized, headmen of kampungs". (*ibid.*) In another instances, the Pengiran Bendahara urged the appointments of five Hakims (judges) to inquire into a case of theft that would have supported the claim of one of his supporters.

During Sultan Hashim Jalilul Alam's reign (1885-1906), the Brunei justice system came under further stress for various reasons. Firstly, he lost much of his authority in the face of non-cooperative behaviour by his chief Pengirans, Pengiran Bendahara and Pengiran di Gadong. Secondly, after the annexation of Limbang in 1890 by the Sarawak Rajah, the culprits from Brunei escaped there to return to Brunei under Sarawak flag so that the Brunei Sultan could not punish or try a citizen of a foreign government. The Sultan preferred to avoid confrontation with the White Rajah, Charles Brooke, who was looking for excuses to punish Brunei. Requests by the Sultan for extradition of criminals from Limbang to Brunei were often refused. Thirdly, it cannot be denied that the Sultan scarcely wished to cross swords or sit on judgment with his own kin and the privileged Pengirans for their wrong doings for fear of political alienation, much to the annoyance of the self-righteous visiting British Consuls. Also, by 'the constitution and custom of Brunei', the Sultan could not interfere in other peoples' domains as McArthur admitted. Nonetheless, in order to impress the visiting consuls, especially McArthur, the then Sultan

did constrain to exercise his rights to hear cases with a view to find out the truth behind some bad accusations of, for example, non-settlement of loans.

As a sequel to the 1847 Treaty of Friendship and Commerce between Brunei and Britain, the cases involving the British subjects could not be tried in Brunei courts even if the British Consul would be present during the trials. The Protectorate Treaty of 1888 also reinforced this principle in its article VII:

It is agreed that full and exclusive jurisdiction, civil and criminal, over British subjects and their property in the State of Brunei, is reserved to Her Britannic majesty, to be exercised by such consular or other officers such as Her Majesty shall appoint for that purpose...

Such clauses avoided much friction between the British authorities and Brunei Sultan.

It is important to mention that Brunei lacked the necessary paraphernalia to impose the sequence of justice system in the community. For example, Brunei did not have a police force or prisons to chastise the culprits. On the other hand, as Brown pointed out, the Brunei Sultans had recourse to some crude methods of inflicting punishments. For example, there were two alternatives available to them for punishment of crimes. They could encourage a segment of the population to take up arms on his behalf, or he could give a permit to an aggrieved party which allowed that party to seek its own retribution. In fact, there had been several instances when the sultan used some fierce inland tribes, such as Kayans and Dayaks, to carry out plunder and killings on his behalf. Fear of incurring heavy fines to the point of losing one's livelihood and landed properties prevented the recurrence of reported crimes in the community.

Despite the shortcomings in Brunei's pre-colonial Brunei justice system, foreigners were but much impressed by the absence of many crimes in a State that suffered from several inadequacies for supporting its population. For instance, McArthur noted that Brunei was surprisingly free of crimes "[T]he offence against person and property are not more frequent, when it is remembered that there is no police system, and that the public peace is allowed to look after itself" (McArthur Report: para 36). Was this the inevitable outcome of the Brunei justice system owing to checks and balances that prevented people from committing blatant wrong doings? It is not out of place to mention that the Brunei people were known for their best behaviours during the Residency era, and there were no reason why they would have behaved differently before that era. In 1913, no crime was reported in the town. At most cattle rustling in Tutong district produced some problems. As late as the 1930s, W. M. Johnson, a member of the Brunei Shell staff (in a 1984 letter to author Horton), appreciated the fact that he, or any of his friends, never had anything stolen even after leaving large sums of money when he went out of the oilfields.

CONCLUSION

The prevalence of a legal culture is a necessary concomitant to the functioning of any decent State. Brunei, thus, practiced law and order and maintained its identity as a Malay Islamic Sultanate during the period under study. The essential function of law and order had been to preserve social cohesion. The justice system in any society was not in itself an absolute thing but something relative to the society. The system in Brunei, or for that matter in any other Malay Sultanates in the past, should not be compared to the system in the West. The European system of justice applied fixed codes of law based on precedence and, more importantly, without fear or favour to all and any. However, European systems evolved through centuries of bitter experiences having matured by an unusual sequence of conditions and events. Brunei, on the other hand, especially on the eve of British expansion in the 19th century, showed signs of declining standards in the practice and

implementation of law. Although Brunei's justice system was defective in many ways, it appears that the Sultanate maintained a tight system of social control through a hierarchy-based royal culture. Any suggestion that only fear among the people kept the system intact is fraught with fallacies.

Except what had been stated in foreign sources, the local sources do not exist in writing to highlight examples of judgments from the perspectives of Bruneians. Foreign sources almost always underscored the injustices attributed to this or that rapacious noble. In reality, the people in power need to be mindful of any failure on their part to neglect their people who expected to get justice from them. For, the people could move out altogether from the areas where the ruling class acted despotically. In theory it was up to the Sultan as the fount of all justice and the embodiment of the unity of the State to keep the chiefs in order and to do justice between them. In practice, however, the Sultan was rather weak in compelling the recalcitrant chiefs not to commit any wrong doings to the people under their control. This was the real situation when the British arrived in Brunei. Hence, the reports emphasise the impotence of the Sultan as a justice-giver unless coerced by an outside element, such as a visiting British-appointed Consul to the kingdom.

Much research is still needed to explain the details of personal law in Brunei, especially related to marriage, family, and inheritance. Usually this was the area of Islamic religious officials, such as Imams and Khadis. How far they carried out their obligations systematically with a fixed code of law based on Islamic Shari'a principles need further probing.

Another area that needs further study is the practice of *Adat* laws in Brunei. Very little is known about the legal practice among the interior tribes and how they settled their disputes: if they held formal courts, village assemblies, or whether they submitted themselves for arbitration to their chiefs and so on. Currently some Japanese experts are collecting evidence regarding native courts in Sarawak and Sabah. As these territories were once ruled over by Brunei Sultans, the ongoing studies may become very useful to clarify these areas.

When the British took over Brunei administration in 1906 under a British Resident, the local ruling class insisted that the laws and customs of the State should not be violated. The British flatly rejected their demand because the sole purpose of their administration was to reform the existing laws and institutions and bring modernity to Brunei. In the beginning they needed to do little by way of introducing drastic laws, except that they, by legislation in 1909, dismantled the land ownership and taxation rights of the chiefs closely intertwined with the traditional law in Brunei. Another important reformation was to codify certain Islamic laws as regards marriage and inheritance already codified among the Indian Muslims and in the Straits Settlements. Other than that the history of law in the Residency period was but a history of their administration, and the laws that were introduced were minimal in keeping with the size of the small State and its population.

END NOTE

¹ A copy for reference can be found at the Brunei Museum. Ref. No. A/BM/98/90)

REFERENCES

- Amin Sweeney, P. L. (ed.) (1968). Silsilah Raja-raja Berunai teks 'A'. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, XLI (2): 1-82.
- Asbol Haji Mail (2004). *Kesultananan Brunei Abad ke-19: Sistem Politik dan Struktur Pentadbiran*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Malaya.

- own, D. E. (1970). Brunei: The Structure and History of a Bornean Sultanate. *Brunei Museum Journal Monograph*, No. 2.
- own, D. E. (1974a). Sultan Mumin's Will and Related Documents. *Brunei Museum Journal*, III (2): 156-170.
- own, D. E. (1974b). Antonio Pigafetta's Account of Brunei in 1521. *Brunei Museum Journal*, II(2): 171-179.
- rol, J. S. (ed.) (1982). Brunei in the Boxer Codex. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, LV(2): 1-25.
- gby, K. H. (1980) *Lawyer in the Wilderness*. Ithaca, N.Y. : Southeast Asia Program, Dept. of Asian Studies, Cornell University.
- ree, A. A. A. (1931). *An Introduction to the Study of Mahomedan Law*. London [a.o.] H. Milford, Oxford University Press.
- lick, J. M. (1988). *Indigenous Political Systems of Western Malaya*. London: London School of Economics, Monographs on Social Anthropology, No. 17.
- okling, R. H. (1955). *Memorandum upon Constitutional Practice in Brunei*. Manuscript.
- oker, M. B. (1970). *Readings in Malay Adat Laws*. Singapore: University of Singapore Press.
- oker, M. B. (1984). *Islamic Law in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- ssainmiya, B. A. (1995). *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III and Britain: The Making of Brunei Darussalam*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- ssainmiya, B. A. (2000). *Brunei Constitution of 1959: An Inside History*. Bandar Sri Begawan, Brunei Press.
- ghes-Hallet, H. R. (1998). A Sketch of the History of Brunei. In *Papers Relating to Brunei*. Kuala Lumpur: The Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
- se, J. (1795) Substance of a Letter, to the Court of Directors, from John Jesse, 20 July, 1795, at Borneo Proper. In Dalrymple, A. (ed.), *Oriental Repertory II*, 1. London: G. Gigg, 1793-1797. Pp. 1-8.
- ys, P. (1968). Observations on the Brunei Political System 1883-1885. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, XLI(2): 117-130.
- w Yock Fang (ed.) (1975). *The Laws of Melaka* (1976). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- G. Maxwell, and W. S. Gibson.(eds.) (1924). *Treaties and Engagements Affecting the Malay States and Borneo*. London: Jes. Truscott.
- Arthur, M. S. H. (1987). *Report on Brunei 1904*, introduced and annotated by A. V. M. Horton. Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series, no. 74.
- holl, R. (1975). *European Sources for the History of the Sultanate of Brunei in the Sixteenth Century*. Penerbitan Khas, Bil. 9, Brunei: Muzium Brunei.
- hmud Saedon A. Othman, Haji (2002). Ke Arah Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Di Negara Brunei Darussalam. *Jurnal Undang-Undang Syariah Brunei Darussalam*, 2(2): 2.
- njit Singh, D. S. (1991). *Brunei 1839-1983: The Problem of Political Survival*. Singapore: Oxford University Press. (Reprint)
- John, S. (1974). *Life in the Forests of the Far East*. Vol. I. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press. (Reprint)
- John, S. (1974). *Life in the Forests of the Far East*. Vol. II. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press. (Reprint)
- bbs, R. E. (1968). Two Colonial Office Memoranda on the History of Brunei. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, XLI(2): 83-116
- nstedt, R. O. (1923). A Brunei Code. *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, I(1): 1
- sof, P. M. (1958). *Adat Istiadat Brunei Darussalam*. Brunei.

A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF ISLAMIC REFORM AND REVIVAL IN BRUNEI AT THE BEGINNING AND END OF THE 20TH CENTURY

IIK ARIFIN MANSURNOOR

ABSTRACT

This paper is a modest attempt at presenting some historical evidence on religious reform in Brunei and clarifying some issues pertaining to it. It focuses on the diverse stages of Islamic reform and revival, delineating the continuous and stable historical patterns, and showing the changing and salient historical dynamics. The case of Islamic reform and revival in Brunei Darussalam offers some insights on the historical phenomenon of radicalism and, particularly, the absence of any inherent link between, and logic in, the development of reform and revival and the emergence of radicalism, militancy, extremism, and terrorism.

The reforms undertaken during the latter part of the 20th century are reexamined in order to put it in relief against diverse aspects of reform and the formation of new institutions in the early part of the century. As such, the paper will look into the significance of Haji Muhammad's controversial theological views in the mid-19th century compared to a defensive, if not apologetic, treatise written in 1908 and the implementation of the *Mohammedan Law* since 1911/1912. Various milestones of the reform and revival throughout the 20th century, ending with the formation of the Islamic economic institutions, are discussed and compared with the comparable phenomena during the first half of the century.

INTRODUCTION

The 1905/1906 Residency agreement emerged as a stage and signpost for many changes that took place in Brunei until 1959. In the same way, the declaration of Brunei's independence in 1984 paved the way for major transformations and further changes. What was the position and role of Islam *vis-à-vis* these changes and transformations?

When the history of 19th century Brunei, including the status of Islam therein, was seen from the outsiders' perspective, only little emphasis seems to have been placed on the country's vitality, let alone its strength. More specifically, relevant to this discussion, Islam was considered a spent force. For example, Low, St John and Treacher¹ give their respective impressions of the declining religious vigour in Brunei. Treacher² found that the only marked religious building in the capital, the mosque, was in a dilapidated condition. Yet, even they could not ignore the fact that the religious life in the mid-19th century was thriving. As St. John³ reports, open debate and counter opinions and practices were allowed to take place, as can be seen in the theological controversies initiated by a newly emerging religious scholar, Haji Muhammad, in the mid-19th century.

When searching for the source of vitality and hope in such a difficult situation, it would be appropriate to refer to a situation that arose in Melaka, where Melakan Bendahara assured the Sultan, during their flight in the wake of Portuguese occupation of Melaka in 1511, that there was nothing to worry about if they had to abandon the Melakan capital, since, to him, as long as the *raja* existed among the Malays then the territory and capital will automatically follow. It was the *raja* who mattered. This is not a dogma, but something which had historical and sociological logic.

In Brunei, the monarchy proved to be the *tiang sere* (central pillar) of survival in the 19th century and the source of revival at the beginning of the 20th century. When one looks at the 1888 "Pact" (*wasiat*) which put the country under the protection of Great Britain, one may raise questions such as the following: What were the implications of such an arrangement? How did this idea gain support from the different sectors and determine the forward-looking orientation of the country?

Certainly, the conditions of the country after the Pacific War and, also, later after the declaration of independence, differed from that in the late 19th century. Yet, Brunei continued to witness the continuing patterns of *raja*-centric initiatives and change. The legitimacy and support provided by the ruler remained indispensable in the formation of Islamic institutions and the propagation of reformist ideas and plans. This can be seen in the foundation of diverse bodies and institutions from the *Undang-Undang Ugama Islam* 1955 to the Islamic banks in the 1990s.

When launching a more focused study than had been done previously on Islamic reform in Brunei, the present writer was inspired by the two dominant approaches, if not paradigms, in tracing modernization among Muslim societies and, to some extent, also the other states in Southeast Asia: one, ideological; and the other, institutional.

A crucial point in, or perhaps an assumption of, this paper is the significance of the Holy Cities for the discussion. For, while Islamic scholarship in Mecca and Medina had experienced a decline for centuries, these cities nevertheless figured prominently in arousing a revival of religious consciousness among Muslims. The explanation for this that immediately comes to mind is that the gathering of pilgrims and migrants from all over the Muslim world created an atmosphere conducive to discussion, exchanges, and plans for further action. It is under such circumstances that the Jawah came to and returned from the Holy Cities.

Islamic reform in Brunei followed a different path compared to that in many other parts of the Islamic world, or even in Southeast Asia. Nothing equivalent to Haji Miskin from early 19th century West Sumatra or reformist *Persatuan Islam* in early 20th century Batavia can be found in Brunei. It would be of interest to note that it was during the period of the British Residency (1906-1959) that many aspects of Islamic reform took place in the country; these encompassed education, law enforcement, scripturalization and administration of Islamic affairs.

A number of works have been written on Islamic reforms in many parts of Southeast Asia since the nineteenth century. These were usually related to movements started in the Holy Cities (Mecca and Medina), Cairo, Delhi and Istanbul, including Wahhabism, *Tanzimat* and 'Abduhism. An immediate question arises as to why scholars avoided talking about any similar phenomenon in Brunei. A facile answer would, of course, be that Brunei may have never experienced the propagation of such ideas on its soil. It is, however, the belief of the present writer that this kind of explanation is not fully in accord with the development of various Islamic institutions and the implementation of religious reforms in Brunei since the beginning of the 20th century.

The terms "reform and reformism" used in this paper are intended to imply attempts at the realization of the pristine and true value of Islam, according to the vision of contemporary Muslim communities.⁴ "Revival and revivalism" refer to the determination and conscious attempts by Muslims to relate Islamic values and teachings to their life, especially in the face of rapid change, modernization and globalization.

In Brunei, the turn of the 20th century was marked by many events, religious and otherwise, which have had an extended and significant impact upon its society. Why was reform necessary? Was it natural in Islamic history? What were the conditions that were conducive to Islamic reform? In order to address these issues it would be necessary, first and foremost, to examine the background to the period of reform.

This paper takes the view which asserts that social and economic changes taking place in any part of society have certain impacts on its other domains.⁵ The discussion focuses on characteristics and milestones of religious life in the country starting from the response to scripturalization and vigorous institutionalization and bureaucratization launched by the new administration since 1906, to the transformation and rapid changes in the last decades of the 20th century. It is hoped that through that approach more light could be shed on the patterns and characteristics of Islamic reform and revival in Brunei. It can be said that, in Brunei, reform and revival tended to coincide but they never led to the radicalization of Islamic discourse, let alone terrorism. Brunei's case, also, clearly indicates the importance of considering historical factors in socio-religious, economic and political phenomena, including Islamic revivalism.

SIGNPOSTS IN THE BACKGROUND TO ISLAMIC REFORM AND REVIVAL IN 20TH CENTURY BRUNEI

The Beginning

What happened in Brunei at the turn of the 20th century cannot be seen in isolation from its surroundings and milieu as well as its ties with the Muslim world as a whole and, more importantly, its past. No climax exists in intellectual history since ideas and inventions may be accumulated but not fossilized, nor ossified. Some events which anticipated the changes that were to follow had taken place in nineteenth century Brunei as, for example, the foundation of "Brunei House" (*rumah wakaf*) in Mecca in 1807,⁶ the writing of *Syair Rakis* by Pengiran Shahbandar⁷ and the socio-religious circumstances which surrounded the emergence of Haji Muhammad during the second quarter of the 19th century.⁸

In Brunei, scripturalization was marked by new waves of religious and administrative developments such as the introduction of the Shadhiliya and the newly formed Qādiriya wa-Naqshbandiyya orders, emphasis on reference to the standard *fiqh* texts (Islamic law according to the Shafi'i school), and the introduction of a new system of government from 1905/1906. All these developments facilitated the institutionalization of Islamic visions and teachings within new bodies and forms.

What was novel in Brunei society by the turn of the 20th century? Despite the small size of its population, between 12,000 and 25,000,⁹ Brunei appears to have looked positively toward the twentieth century. The ruling sultan was a strong, experienced and intelligent leader. His decision to put his country under the protection of Great Britain in 1888 and 1905/1906 was a well-calculated move. These political and, consequent, economic changes seem to have some bearing on the socio-religious life of the Brunei people. The sultan became, more than ever before, the paramount symbol of Islam in the state, and responded to this favourable socio-religious development by, for example, initiating closer ties with the Ottoman Sultan, 'Abd al-Hamid (1876-1909). Within this context it is not surprising, therefore, to find that, as reported by Treacher,¹⁰ a Brunei youth was sent to study and train in Istanbul in the 1880s. Indeed, parallel to identical phenomena in Southeast Asia, it is possible that more Bruneians would have had better access to the Middle East, especially through pilgrimage and prolonged stays (*mukim* or *iqāma*) among the Jawi (*Jāwī*)¹¹ community in Mecca.¹² Moreover, these ties were confirmed by a letter that was claimed to have been sent to the Ottoman Sultan requesting help against the threat of the Brookes.¹³

Furthermore, the pilgrimage undertaken by Haji 'Abdul Mokti bin Nassar and his consequent prolonged stay in Mecca around the turn of the 20th century provides us with an interesting case for close examination. The ability of more Bruneians to undertake the pilgrimage to Mecca at this time shows, *inter alia*, the much improved socio-economic conditions of the people,¹⁴ when looked at in the perspective of the earlier situation. Political stability and reforms, and administrative efficiency were the main factors which helped to enhance the country's production levels and, therefore, its economy.¹⁵

The decision by Haji 'Abdul Mokti to stay in Mecca long is interesting in two respects. In addition to his personal inclination for study, it is possible that an additional stimulus may have been the higher level of Islamic scholarship he had achieved at home. This can be gleaned from the fact that despite his stay of only three years in the Holy City of Mecca, he had mastered Arabic and read a number of books. Upon his return to Brunei he was given an important assignments in delivering sermons and propagating religious teachings. Indeed, his *balai* (religious and educational centre) was to become the most influential religious centre in Brunei during the first half of the twentieth century.¹⁶ Secondly, Haji 'Abdul Mokti's stay in Mecca indicates the existence of ties between Brunei and the Jawi community in the Holy City. It is not clear whether the Brunei House in Mecca was still in operation at that time.¹⁷ Nevertheless, it can be assumed that the Jawi community in Mecca must have included some Brunei pilgrims and students. Thus, Haji 'Abdul Mokti's stay served to strengthen already existing ties.

Since the end of the eighteenth century, Brunei had welcomed the newly-propagated *ṭarīqa* orders¹⁸ in Southeast Asia such as Khalwatiya, Sammāniya, and Shādhiliya. Interesting features in this development, as far as this paper is concerned, were their emphasis on al-Ghazālī's reformulation of Muslim worship in a Sufi manner and *vice versa*.¹⁹ Unfortunately, further research on the development of these *ṭarīqa* orders in Brunei remains to be done.²⁰

By the second half of the nineteenth century, however, a large segment of the Jawi community in Mecca was strongly in favour of the Qādiriya, Naqshbandiyya, or the neo-Qādiriya-Naqshbandiyya. The latter was reformulated by the famous Bornean Sufi master, Shaykh Ahmad Khaṭīb Sambas.²¹ Brunei was also not spared the influence of this new *ṭarīqa*. For example, we now know that two Brunei masters, Haji Ahmad bin Dato Imam and Haji 'Abdul Mokti, acted as links to Shaykh Ahmad Khaṭīb Sambas.²²

For the present study of Islamic reform, the introduction of the neo-Qādiriya-Naqshbandiyya to Brunei is significant. The adoption and propagation of this *ṭarīqa* by a group of *sharī'ah*-oriented scholars²³ created closer ties between popular religious practices and scripturalized teaching of Islam in the forms of *fiqh*, *'aqida*, *tafsīr* and *ḥadīth*. In other words, the *ṭarīqa* followers were more exposed to learning, or were at least following some conventional forms of worship as expounded by the *ulama*. This development explains the widespread circulation of short treatises on the basic tenets of Islam among Muslims in Southeast Asia, including Brunei.²⁴

The available texts were not limited to those written in Arabic as more basic religious texts were also translated into Malay. Some were written locally, even though many were still imported. What is the significance of these texts for Islamic reform in Brunei? The most obvious result of the growing number of religious texts was the increasing scripturalization that occurred in Brunei. The texts were read and explained by the better

trained scholars, either Bruneians who had studied locally and/or abroad or peripatetic scholars from many different parts of the Islamic world.

This development was related to several changes in both the Middle East and Southeast Asia since the nineteenth century. Firstly, the reaction of the *ṭarīqa* orders and the *fiqh* schools to Wahhabism resulted in the proliferation of simple religious texts for the masses. Many of these were specifically composed by Jawi scholars or were translated from well-known treatises, mostly by Shafi'i scholars (*fuqahā*).²⁵ Secondly, the Ottoman Sultan, 'Abd al-Hamīd (1876-1909), who vigorously adopted Pan-Islamism in his foreign policy, was in favour of Islamic solidarity and unity. Not surprisingly, the publication of religious books was encouraged and supported. Indeed, in 1884 an official Ottoman press was established in Mecca.²⁶ Its publications included many Jawi/Malay texts. This was facilitated by the appointment of a Jawi scholar, Ahmad bin Muhammad Zayn al-Patani, as head of the Malay section in the press. Thirdly, better communication between Southeast Asia and the Middle East after the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 had a significant impact on the increasing numbers of Southeast Asian pilgrims, including Bruneians.²⁷ Accordingly, more people joined the Jawi community in Mecca to study and, also, more books were sent home to Southeast Asia. Fourthly, the proliferation of the printing press in Southeast Asia since the last quarter of the nineteenth century was partly responsible for the publication of religious texts for local consumption. Finally, the response of the proponents of the *fiqh* schools to Wahhabism and, to a lesser degree, Muhammad 'Abduh's reform, stimulated the publication of texts addressing either the educated or the masses, calling on them to state their position on given issues; this point shall further be taken up later.

The return of better trained scholars in larger numbers from Mecca facilitated the establishment of religious educational centres. In many parts of Java, Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula, such religio-educational centres such as *surau* and *pondok* were founded.²⁸ Through these institutions of learning, the dissemination of more organized and advanced knowledge of Islam was undertaken seriously. In Brunei, the period was signified by the reinvigoration of scholarly circles in *Kampung Air* (Water Village). The *balai* of Burung Pingai led the revival of scholarly undertakings in Brunei.²⁹ Many prominent religious figures' references to Haji 'Abdul Mokti indicates that reform had taken place in his *balai*. There were several factors which had contributed to the prominence of Haji 'Abdul Mokti. Firstly, he was an erudite scholar, having stayed in Mecca for more than three years. Secondly, he was, also, known for his writings on socio-religious subjects which directly answered many of the questions and problems of his contemporaries. Thirdly, he introduced the *sharī'a*-oriented *ṭarīqa*, Qādiriya-Naqshbandiyya, to many people in the country. Finally, Haji 'Abdul Mokti was a man of action, teaching, counselling and preaching. Indeed, as has been elaborated by the present writer elsewhere³⁰, he introduced new religious elements in his teaching, based on the more scripturalized form of Islam.

During the early part of the twentieth century, the Brunei *ulama* were concerned, *inter alia*, with the impact of Islamic reformism on the population. Their concern can be examined through the contemporary writings and treatises. A number of religious writings were produced by Brunei scholars followed further development and institutionalization of religious administration in the 1950s. Around this time, major religious undertakings, including the codification of religious enactment, the *Qadi* laws, and formal religious education, were initiated. The third phase, the maturation of the earlier development, is characterized by the emergence of new generations of Brunei scholars and the proliferation of their writings. Indeed, since the early part of the 1960s, diverse religious publications emerged and more institutionalization took place in the country. This period became crucial and formative in determining the major transformations in the

administration of Islamic affairs and the initiatives to locate Islam in the centre of Brunei's endeavors to maintain an Islamic way of life amidst modernization and globalization.

The present discussion in relation to the above would be only to the extent of covering the major works on Islam before Brunei's independence, for several reasons. First of all, the last decade of the twentieth century appears to be very complex with the amalgamation of diverse factors in intellectual history, especially Islamic revivalism; the Brunei part has become more difficult to interpret without more extended study. More importantly, since historians normally tend to let events "settle" before launching a study, I believe that the phenomenon of religion in Brunei since 1980s should be located within the wider context of Islamic revivalism and its strong link with the extensive international networks. Put differently, more time and endeavor are needed not only to examine the intellectual history but also Islamic revivalism in the country after the 1980s.

THE FIRST STAGE OF REFORM (Pre-1950s)

Islamic reforms have struck a responsive chord in many parts of Southeast Asia since the late-eighteenth century. These reforms are usually related to the movements started in the Holy Cities, Cairo, Istanbul and the Indian Sub-Continent, including Wahhabism, Tanzimat and 'Abduhism. Although Brunei never experienced the propagation of such ideas on its soil, I believe that an identical phenomenon did take place in Brunei, especially with the development of various Islamic institutions and the implementation of religious reforms in Brunei since the beginning of this century.

With the increasing pressure meted out by the European powers in the region since the 19th century, Brunei suffered politically and economically. More and more local leaders at the peripheries exercised power on their own or in collaboration with outsiders. Accordingly, the elites in Brunei competed more aggressively to secure better position and access to limited economic resources available. Not surprisingly, political crises and rivalry among the ruling class became recurrent features during the first half of the 19th century.

Let us now examine the intellectual foundation that paved the way for Islamic reform in the country after 1906. I shall refer to two episodes of intellectual movement launched in Brunei around this period. First, as indicated earlier, Haji 'Abdul Mokti (d.1946) used an evolutionary approach to scripturalization. The tenor of his teachings was Islamic spirituality. They were oriented closely to the Qur'an and other Islamic texts. Many lines were illustrated with citations from the Qur'an, the *Hadith*, the sayings of the *ulama*, and some well-known texts which interestingly, as stated above, belonged to the "book of wonders" (*mujarrabāt*).

Generally speaking, the scholarly world of Haji 'Abdul Mokti belonged to this period of transformation and transition. He was at once an *adat*-oriented expert and a scriptural *'ālim*. He used popular vocabularies, which were certainly familiar to his society, in order to transmit a scripturalized version of Islam to enhance people's religious understanding and practice. In fact, he attempted to facilitate the complex process of adaptation to Islam among his Muslim countrymen.

On the other hand, a text on the centrality of *nīya* (composed in 1902 or 1907), which was added and attached to the Brunei version of *al-Hikam al-'Aṭā'īya*, contains a straightforward emphasis on scripturalization. It deals with the question of intention (*nīya*) in prayers. Reference was always made to prominent Shafi'i scholars such as Imam Haramayn al-Juwayni (d.1105), al-Ghazzālī (d.1111), al-Nawawī (d.1278), al-Zarkashī, al-Subkī, al-Sharbiṇī (d.1569), Ibn al-Hajar al-Haytamī (1565), al-Anṣārī (d.1520), and al-Ramlī (d.1596). This brief text is very important for our present scholarly understanding of the period, in that it helped us to determine the level of scripturalization in Brunei by

the turn of this century. The author warns Muslims not to follow "the teaching of the ignorant people who did not study under knowledgeable figures" (*pengajar[an] orang yang jāhil yang tiada mengambil daripada orang yang 'ālim*). It is clear that the text was written in response to the confusion in society resulting from the spread of the teachings of a particular religious group. This religious group ridiculed those people who had followed the *ulama's* (*fuqahā'*) way of performing the intention (*nīya*) for being "novices." The arguments contained in the group's criticisms and the alternatives they offered indicate that the group based its views on the Sufi approach to divinity. What mattered most for these people was the attainment of unity with God. For example, the *nīya* was not just pronouncement and intention but, more importantly for them, it connoted approaching God directly (*apabila hadirilah dhat Muhammad di dalam hati maka serasa hadirkan zat Allah ta'ala*).

Yet it is possible that the reason for writing the text was to resolve the controversies around the *nīya* raised by the literalists and 'Abduh's followers.³¹ For them, the attachment of the wording *usalli* etc. was regarded as useless or even religiously wrong (*bid'a*). But for the Shafi'i's a *nīya* connoted three basic elements, that is, *qasad* (purpose), *ta'arrud* (concentration), and *ta'ayyun* (specification), which usually materialized in the wording of the "intention" for the prayers. As far as the study of intellectual history is concerned the response of the *ulama* towards the reform movement can be clearly categorized as reform, especially in the context of Islam in nineteenth and twentieth century Southeast Asia. Anyway, this response also contained many elements of readjustment and restatement of well-accepted religious practices and ideas.

If these few intellectual and religious episodes show the internal dynamism of Islamic society, then the administrative reform and socio-political changes since 1906 can be regarded as external factors to the religious reform. In 1911 the British Resident, inspired by the British experience in the Malay Peninsula, requested the *ulama* to formulate a legal document concerning family law, for administrative efficiency. The various religious enactments in 1912, 1913 and 1924³² then became the sole reference in any religious dispute and adjudication in the subject. The administrative reform brought uniformity, standardization, and centralization into the religious administration. The *qāḍī*ship was headed by the *Tuan Qāḍī*,³³ who was promoted in 1941 to Chief *Qāḍī*. The reform was also shown by the centralization and unification of religious education since the 1930s. The post-war period witnessed further systematization of the religious administration by the establishment of the *Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama* (Department of Religious Affairs). All institutional changes in the field of religious organization during the Residency, however, remained fully under the umbrella of the highest religious authorities in Brunei, the ruler, who was assisted by the *ulama* and other experts.

THE SECOND STAGE (late-1940s and 1950s): BUREAUCRATIZATION AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION

The growth of population and the rapid development of Brunei after the Pacific War necessitated the improvement of religious services, particularly after the coronation of the Sultan Begawan in May 1951. For example, on January 31, 1948 Sultan Ahmad Tajuddin approved the formation of a board of 18 religious advisers (*Penasehat2 Jumaah Sharaiah*) with the stipulation that all religious appeal cases be "heard and decided by the Board." On 16 February 1948, the Resident issued a circular notifying the appointment of 19 religious advisers as members of the Board. In order to facilitate the work of the Board, various enactments on the administration of Islamic law (*Jumaah Sharaiah*) that had been put in place in the Malay Peninsula were introduced in Brunei for observation and consideration. Moreover, in response to the changed situation in the Belait district, the ruler appointed

Awang Mohd. Suhaili bin Hj. Yaakub to be a special *qāḍī* for Belait in August 1950.³⁴ As a result, the District Officer of Belait no longer acted as vice-*qāḍī*. A proposal was, also, made the following year to appoint a *qāḍī* for Temburong district. Nevertheless, the position of district *qāḍīs* became formal only sometime after the implementation of the 1955 Enactment (*Undang-Undang Ugama*). Indeed, even by April 1957 the district officers of Tutong and Temburong continued to function also as local *qāḍīs* in their respective district. In addition, the salary of religious functionaries was reviewed and readjusted.

During this period various official religious celebrations were held in Brunei and the beginnings for these came in the 1940s. In 1948, for example, during the celebration of the Hijrah New Year, the *jāmi'*-mosque committee in Bandar Brunei organized a Qur'an reading competition for Muslim men in the town. This was the first open competition ever held in the country, and was the precursor to later developments as, for example, in 1962 when the Qur'an reading competition had been held in conjunction with the coming of the fasting month of Ramadan; more specifically, it was designed to allow Brunei to send its best readers to the international competition organized in Kuala Lumpur during the second half of Ramadan. Moreover, the celebration of the Prophet Muhammad's birthday (*Mawlid*) developed into a public occasion by 1956, and although less elaborate celebrations had been regularly held by the Bruneians even before 1950s, the grand parade around town that was organized only during the 1950s. It is notable that since 1953 two socio-religious organizations took over the sponsorship of public celebrations (*Mawlid* and Hijrah New Year) in their respective districts: the Islamic Unity (*Perkasa*) of Bandar Brunei³⁵ and the *Ikhwānūl Muslimīn* of Kuala Belait. The elaborate celebrations of other important Islamic events took place publicly only in the 1960s. The state dignitaries were invited to these celebrations. Indeed, during these occasions it was customary to have religious messages from the ruler and other religious speeches were also made.

During the 1950s, a number of notable features emerged in conjunction with the arrival of *Hari Raya Puasa* (*Īd al-Fiṭr*). First of all, as followers of the Shafi'i School, Bruneians started and ended their fasting according to the sighting of the new moon of Ramadan and Shawwal respectively. A committee consisting of the *ulama* and meteorologists and surveyors was formed under the aegis of the Chief *Qāḍī* for sighting the new moon from the hills and sea-coasts on the 29th Sha'ban and Ramadan. The observations were then submitted to the Chief *Qāḍī*, who presented it to the Sultan for a final decision. In addition, the collection of funds and goods, besides *zakāt* and *zakāt al-fiṭr* (*fiṭrah*), was centrally organized, and the collections were distributed to patients in the hospital, prisoners, and needy orphans.

In 1951 a proposal was made to replace the Courts Enactment of 1908. With regard to the Islamic court, the proposal made a special reference, in Section 3 of 6 consecutive chapters (Chapter 13 to 18), to the Courts of Kathis.³⁶ The Section specified the formation of the courts of *qāḍīs*, their authority, appointments, dismissals, the cooperation with the Courts of Magistrates of the First Class and appeals against their decision. The consequent Enactment in 1951, while maintaining the *status quo* (i.e., the status of the Courts of *Qāḍīs* was equal to that of the Courts of Magistrates of the Third Class), improved the administration of Islamic law by specifying that, appeals concerning a decision of the Courts of the *Qāḍīs* should be made to "the Sultan in the Religious Council". This is a significant shift from the previous Enactment, especially the Mohammedan Law of 1912, which specified that appeals be made to "the Sultan in the State Council". The change was made possible primarily because of the formation of the board of *Penasehat2 Jumaah Sharaiah* in 1948. On 14 August 1959, the Board was renamed Religious Advisory Board (*Majlis Meshuarat Jumaah Penasehat Share'ah*) and had 16 members. In 1958 the Board

had 14 members and was chaired by the most senior *wazīr*, Pengiran Bendahara. Under this arrangement, the administration of Islamic law came to be solely under the supervision of Islamic experts in the board.

In 1954 the Religious Consultative Council (*Mejlis Meshuarat Shara'iyah*) was established. According to the letter sent by the officer of the Department of State Customs, Religion & Social Welfare, dated 27 July, 1954, five religious officials were re-appointed to the Board for Religious Officials. The Official Notification was, then, issued by the Resident on 16 August, 1954. Ten days later, on 27 August, 1954, the notification of 153/1954 was issued by the Resident announcing the appointment by the Sultan of ten prominent figures to be "members of the Sultan-in-Religious Council" for the State of Brunei.³⁷ The Sultan was chairman of the Council. All five members of the Board for Religious Officials, except Pehin Tuan Imam Haji Sa'at, were included in the list of appointments. Indeed, the formation of the 1954 Religious Consultative Council was "in pursuance of Section 17 (2) of the Courts Enactment [of] 1951." Following the establishment of the Department of Religious Affairs in July 1954, various activities on the propagation of Islamic teachings and the administration of Islam were taken over from the Office of the Chief *Qāḍī*. The link between the Board and the Council was strong. Many proposals put forward by the Board were adopted and ratified by the Council. On many occasions the two bodies held their meetings concomitantly, particularly during 1959. Following the proclamation of the 1959 Constitution on 29 September 1959, both the Council and the Board were dissolved. At the meeting held on 17 September 1959, the Sultan formally announced that the meeting was to be the last. Nevertheless, the decision did not imply that the reorganization and institutionalization of religious affairs in the country was to come to an end.

From the brief discussion above, it is clear that the Residency heralded a new direction in the application and administration of Islamic law.³⁸ During this period the application of Islamic law was circumscribed and restricted to family matters, yet the application of the law became more systematic and fixed. Previously most of the legal issues were dealt with at the local levels through the *ulama* and other local leaders - and only if no solution could be reached at this level, were they submitted to the ruler - but by this time, certain legal cases were reported and transferred to the *Qāḍī* Court. Although such a legal institution was not a novelty in Islamic law and Islamic history, in Brunei it meant much in terms of the systematization of Islamic reform and institutionalization of law.

The 1955 Religious Enactment

The overall administrative reform in Brunei required other government bodies, including the religious bureaucracy, to work more efficiently and professionally. In the eyes of the Resident, for instance, the codification of Islamic law was necessary. Further development during the post-Pacific War even created pressure upon Islamic leaders to respond quickly in this direction. They eventually came up with a plan and a series of religious enactments.

The enforcement of the Religious Council, State Custom and Kathis Courts Enactment of 1955 led to various changes in the administration of Islam in the country. For one, it automatically abrogated the Mohammedan Laws Enactment of 1912, the Mohammedan Marriage and Divorce Registration Enactment of 1913, and the [Kathis] Courts Enactment of 1951 (No. 6). The 1955 Enactment No.20 came into force on February 1, 1956.³⁹ With regard to Islamic affairs, it made provision for the establishment of a religious council for Muslims and for matters relating to marriage and divorce, and revised the powers and duties of the *Qāḍī* Courts. Nevertheless, one important outcome of the 1955 Enactment was the re-organization of religious courts (*qāḍī courts*). For example, they were soon separated from magistrate courts and stood autonomously as a religious institution.

After the implementation of the 1955 Enactment, the offices of *qādis* were established in all the districts. The office was headed by a full *qādī*. Four *qādis* were appointed for Kuala Belait, Temburong, Brunei-Muara and Tutong. Their authority and duties were specified in the Enactment. In addition to their official duties they were also heads of the local mosques and *surau* administrations.

One major outcome of the 1955 Enactment was the formation of the Religious Council (*Majlis Ugama Islam dan Adat Istiadat Negeri*) in 1956. The Council was given the highest authority in religious affairs and, at the same time, it functioned as a body to assist and advise the Sultan in religious matters. According to the 1955 Enactment, the religious Council is responsible for many aspects of religious affairs and activities in the country. Its authority includes: i) the collection of the religious taxes [*zakāt* and *zakāt al-fitr* (*fitrih*)] (No. 114); ii) issuance of permits to mobilize funds for religious purposes (No. 122); iii) supervision of mosques throughout the country (No.123); iv) registration of new converts (No.164); v) supervision over the belief and practice of Muslims according to the concept of the *Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah* and the Shāfi'i school respectively (No.42-3); vi) taking care of wealth and property (*amanah*) which are left without inheritors (No.9, 99); vii) dealing with other parties in all matters under its authority (No.7-8); viii) supervision over the implementation of Islamic law (*Hukum Shara'*); ensuring that all written laws in the country and the state customs are observed and implemented (No.39); and ix) acting as the highest body in managing Islamic affairs and providing assistance/advice to the Sultan (No.38).

The 1955 Enactment shows the strength of Islam in Brunei. On the other hand, it also reflects the influence of the British in the administration of justice in the country. It is stated, for example, in Chapter 39 of the 1955 Enactment, that the Council should consider and implement the meaning (*kehendak*) of all written laws in the country, the Islamic law (*Hukum Shara'*) and the state customs. But since the written laws were derived mostly from Western and British laws, it is clear that the Majlis cannot fully implement the *Shari'a*. More particularly, the 1955 Enactment did not fully reflect the *Shari'a*.

The implementation of the 1955 Enactment brought about the formation, among other things, of two committees in 1956, under the authority of the Religious Council: i) the Committee of Law; and ii) the Committee of Courts. Appointments of members to these committees were made by the Sultan and countersigned by the British Resident. (After the promulgation of the 1959 Constitution, such an interference by the Resident, of course, elapsed.) Nine eminent figures were appointed to the first Committee⁴⁰; this Committee continued to serve until 1963 when the Sultan appointed a new committee. Out of the nine members only three did not belong to the Council. The most important role of this Committee was to provide legal counsel (*fatwā*) to the community.⁴¹ It was, also, responsible in proposing a list of candidates to the posts of *imam*, *khaṭīb*, and/or *bilal* when vacancies fell; this would mean that this Committee, or rather the Religious Council under which it functioned, for some time, especially in the 1950s, also functioned as the Executive in religious affairs. The second Committee had two "regular members" and three "additional members" According to the 1955 Enactment, the *Muftī* automatically assumed the chairmanship of this Committee; however, this stipulation could be implemented only in 1967. The main responsibility of the Committee was to advise the courts in the country on matters related to Islamic law.

A further examination of the *Undang-Undang Islam* of 1911, *Undang-Undang Nikah Cherai Islam*, ratified by the State Council in November 19, 1912 and in June 17, 1913, respectively, and *Undang-Undang Ugama* 1955, is necessary to understand the development of religious intellectual life in Brunei during the Residency period. If the text which discusses the *nīya*, mentioned above, emphasizes the centrality of upholding the Shāfi'i scholars' opinions, the new legal enactments opened the possibilities of using, for

example, a non-Shāfi'i *ulama's* views if they conformed to the needs of the general welfare of the community (*Undang-Undang Ugama*, 1955:17).⁴² Even though this is stipulated only for cases wherein the Shāfi'i school offers opinion (*qaul*) which contradicts the general welfare of the community (*berlawanan dengan m[asla]hat orang ramai*), the spirit is novel in the context of the school of Islamic law, particularly among the Shāfi'is.⁴³ If previously the choice was limited to the Shāfi'i scholars' opinions, including those based on weak argument (*qaul yang dzaif*), now the jurisprudential bases were broadened to cover: general welfare, rationalization (*difikirkan*), explanation and interpretation (*diterangkan*). In this connection, it would be only appropriate to recast the general view about religious change: Islam has central meanings and symbols, which motivate and become the model for Muslims; yet individual Muslims have no stable and unified decoding mechanism (which is of course open to challenges and changes) to internalize and grasp fully the symbols, despite the claim to the centrality of and eternity of these symbols and meanings.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, similar to the processes of institutionalization and bureaucratization found in any modernizing administrative system, the spirit of reform above has to be curbed and conducted through the patterns of unification and centralization of religious affairs. The *Undang-Undang Ugama* 1955 contains many ideas and programmes, which are geared towards increasing the efficiency and modernization of religious management. Despite its apparent contradiction and paradox, we have to bear in mind that we are actually dealing with, at least two phenomena at the same time under each of religion and modernization and reform and institutionalization.

Formal religious education and religious functionaries (*ulama*)

The reorganization of religious education in Brunei since 1930s has resulted in the systematization and sophistication of religious teaching methods.⁴⁵ For instance, the bearers of Islamic knowledge have to go through formal education which usually connotes the award of certificates and degrees. Brunei's links with many Islamic centres within Southeast Asia and to its west is as old as the Indian Ocean trade route when it was dominated by Muslim traders. The much improved economic conditions after the 1930s must have had a direct impact on the increasing numbers of Brunei pilgrims and students proceeding to the Middle East, to mention only the most favored destination.⁴⁶

The impact of the Pacific War on Brunei education, as in many other fields, was negative. Religious education suffered from the closing of the only known private *madrasa* in the country. There is no record about its revival even after the war. Nevertheless, as I have shown above, religious instruction was re-opened in the Malay schools in 1946. Concomitant with this, the organization of religious education was improved by the appointment of a *nazir* and a head of religious teachers. Later, in 1950, three students were sent to *Madrasah al-Junied al-Islamiah* of Singapore and in 1951, a religious official applied to the government to be given permission to study in Mecca for three years. During the 1950s more *ulama* from abroad, especially the Malay Peninsula, were invited to teach at religious educational centres and to manage Islamic institutions in Brunei. It is, therefore, no exaggeration to suggest that the postwar period was a time of major regeneration in the leadership of Islamic administration. Various attempts were made to improve the quality and/or level of scholarship, services, and institution of the Brunei *ulama*, corresponding to the phase of modernization in other fields of the state administration.

Since 1946 particular measures were undertaken to improve the organization of religious centers and their functionaries. As can be seen in the official reports of the period, the salaries of these functionaries was reviewed and readjusted. New appointments were made to various posts, including the various mosque officials. Until 1947 the

*qāḍī*ship had offices in Bandar Brunei, Tutong, and Kuala Belait and later, in 1951, a proposal was made to appoint a Deputy *Qāḍī* for the Temburong District.

During the Residency a number of noted Brunei *ulama* were promoted or had risen to prominence. Some of them held important positions in the religious bureaucracy, for example, Pehin Tuan Imam Haji Muhyiddin (until 1917)⁴⁷, Khatib 'Abd al-Razzaq (1918; and in 1919 as Pehin Siraja Khatib), Haji 'Abdul Mokti (1917 as Pehin Datu Imam), Pg. Mohammad Salleh (1941 as *Qāḍī Besar*), and Khatib Muhammad Sa'd bin Juru Apong (1939; 1945 Pehin Tuan Imam; 1957 Pehin Siraja Khatib). The fact that most of these *ulama* had written several treatises on Islam indicates that besides their formal duties they had ample opportunities to serve the people directly and provide them with religious reference and guidance. This involvement with societal affairs resulted in the emergence of an interesting and unique scholarship which partly depicted the local understanding and reformulation of Islamic teachings.

The participation of the established *ulama* in the new religious institutions continued to be indispensable until the 1960s. Since the Sultan continued to appoint, and gave titles to, *ulama* to religious leadership, no significant change occurred in the real position of established *ulama* in the new institutions. Indeed, the highest religious leadership was given to *pengirans* such as Pg. Pemanca, Pg. Shahbandar and Pg. Anak Kemaluddin. Only slowly, since the early 1960s, were several posts of importance in the new institutions assigned to the newly educated *ulama* who graduated from al-Junied, the Islamic College in Klang and al-Azhar. These few *homines novi* increasingly won the support of the ruler and gained popularity among the people. Shortly upon his return from al-Azhar in November 1963, for example, Awang Haji Mohammad Zain was appointed as Deputy of the Chief *Qāḍī*. He was also known at the time as an influential public speaker.

In a nutshell, several factors can be said to have worked for the intensive reforms in the religious affairs in Brunei during the 1950s. These included: i) reforms in many other fields; ii) the personality of the ruler; iii) national awakening among segments of the population; and iv) better access to information through modern education, visits/exchanges and mass media.

It would be of interest to note here that in 1953, a religious organization, *Ikhwān al-Muslimīn*, was founded in Brunei. It had nothing to do with al-Ikhwān al-Muslimūn of Egypt. Is it possible, however, that the adoption of the name was inspired by the popularity of the Egyptian Ikhwān during the period?⁴⁸ Indeed, the Ikhwān of Brunei set up various activities which had a novel orientation. For example, they actively organized public celebrations on salient occasions in the Islamic calendar, including the birthday of the Prophet Muhammad, the *hijra* and the sending down of the Qur'an.

THE THIRD STAGE (1960s to Independence): INDIGENIZATION AND MATURATION

In studying reform and revivalism in Brunei since 1950s, this section will focus on the major issues that occupied the mind of contemporary Muslim scholars in Brunei with a view to shedding some light on the intellectual development and contemporary discourse among them. For this purpose, I have referred primarily to articles and treatises published by Brunei scholars. Most of their works are found in treatises, local journals and newspapers. Interestingly, in the early 1960s a low profile scholar published his work on *Sifat Duapuluh dengan Syair Nasihat* in Kuala Lumpur.⁴⁹ For the purpose of the present paper, an inclusive approach was adopted in the use of all these materials. It is significant that most writings on Islam during the period were undertaken by newly educated Bruneians⁵⁰; it would be pertinent to remark here that these writers and speakers on Islam

were all *madrassa*-trained scholars.⁵¹ By virtue of their new training, they were better prepared, unlike the previous ones,⁵² to participate in public debate and express their ideas through writing. I must admit, however, that all writings of the period were relatively scanty and no comprehensive and detailed study of particular issues existed. Indeed, this is a crucial distinguishing characteristic of the religious literature in this period compared to that of the later decades. Although the existing literature of the period cannot be dismissed as a natural flow of Islamic intellectual tradition in general, it is clear that many writers of the time responded to the ongoing changes in society. I strongly believe that despite external stimuli and influences, the Bruneians expressed their own understanding, from an Islamic perspective, of evolving modern Brunei and beyond.

It is necessary to note in advance that my preliminary findings suggest that novel ideas about contemporary socio-religious issues were voiced by the newly-educated Bruneians, whereas balancing, and perhaps dominant, opinions continued to be expressed by well-established religious officials. Indeed, the intellectual discourse among Brunei *ulama* has shown the influential position of the well-established scholars, thereby pushing into oblivion the refreshing voices of the newly-educated scholars, thus giving way to a new equilibrium.

One has to admit that studying Islam as a universal religion has a bias toward comparative perspectives. Even though Brunei is taken as a case in the present study, it would be immediately apparent that similar cases in other parts of the Muslim World, especially Muslim Southeast Asia, have to be brought in. The discussion will centre on the following issues: Islam in the modern world; economic development and progress; nationalism and patriotism; concern over negative impacts of rapid change and popular Western culture; equality and brotherhood in Islam; Islam *vis-à-vis* the West and local customs; pluralism; Islam as state ideology and way of life (identity, custom and culture); worldly success and high morality among Muslims; balanced development (material and spiritual components); and evolutionary approach to change.

Almost all of these topics show relevance to contemporary issues and are, thus, contextual. The unfolding of socio-political and economic changes of the period set the background for the intellectual responses among Brunei Muslims. For the sake of clarity, the discussion is under the following three rubrics: political; cultural; and socio-economic.

Political

The promulgation of the Brunei Constitution of 1959 had a direct impact on the position of Islam in the state. The Constitution specifies several edicts on Islam in Brunei, including Islam as state religion, the adoption of Shāfi'i school and the *ahl al-sunna wal-jamā'a* interpretation and the Islamic requirement for higher offices. To the present writer's knowledge, although the Constitution was promulgated in September 1959, no open and detailed discussion of its Islamic contents,⁵³ as far as I know, took place until ten years later in 1969. With the return of an increasing number of graduates from Islamic colleges, especially al-Azhar University, and the appointment of many religious experts from Malaysia, a serious discussion of the formal position of Islam in the country might have taken place.

It was Awang Haji Mohammad Zain, an al-Azhar graduate and an important religious office holder, who first raised the issue of Islam in the Constitution.⁵⁴ According to Mohammad Zain, the official position of Islam in the state structure means that Islam is the philosophy of the state and comprehensive way of life. The official status of Islam has ramifications in the nomination of the ruler, the highest officials, and the setting up of formal Islamic institutions, Islamic schools (of law) or interpretations (in theology).

Mohammad Zain pushes his point by arguing that the official status of Islam should be brought to make it the basis of all aspects of Brunei life from the daily activities to legislation and administration.⁵⁵

Moreover, Mohammad Zain elaborates on the statement of Sultan Begawan on August 3, 1972, about Brunei identity as consisting of the monarchy, Islam and Malay culture; these crucial components of identity should also be considered the state ideology. The important position of Islam in society, state and ideology must be maintained and propagated through the dissemination of better information about Islam to the public and provision of enough instruction on Islam to all students (see *Majalah* 29:3-4). Being educated and, at the same time, occupying a key position in the government, he maintained that Islam needs to be propagated and implemented through diverse channels, especially the official ones. Indeed, toward the end of 1972 special forums on the position of Islam as state ideology were held in all district capitals. The participants at the forums, such as Yahya Haji Ibrahim, 'Abd al-Hamid Bakal, 'Abd al-'Aziz Juned and Mohammad Jamil al-Sufri, came from the leading young religious scholars in the country.

The question of political legitimacy was raised in the context of Islamic experience. Unlike what Braighlinn (1992: 33-34) calls intensive and deliberate use of Islam as novel base of political legitimacy, many Brunei writers of the period insisted on the almost natural right of the rulers to govern by virtue of being *sultan*. One of them (see *Majalah* 27:8-10) insists that modern state requires an honest leader who carries out noble goals and Islamic-oriented programs. In early Islamic period, the Prophet Muhammad won respect and loyalty (*bay'a*) by virtue of his mission in unifying mankind and achieving God's mercy. Being leader of Islam in the country, the ruler has the support of the population.

Better education, professionalism and growing socio-political awareness among the Bruneians also had an impact among the religious circles (*Majalah* 6:8-15). One writer in 1963 argued that the prevailing economic backwardness and the "dual-economic" structure in the country resulted from the imperialist policy, and that Muslims remained poor whereas others grew richer and economically more dominant. In order to alleviate the problem, he suggested that the government should implement the preferential distribution of trading licenses to Muslims and allocation of higher quotas of local workers in all companies, and that Muslims should be given more opportunities to run businesses and open companies. In the same breath the writer quickly adds that Muslims are not xenophobic or racist; however, they need to exert their rights and regain their dignity in their own country. It is also important, he maintains, that the country is open to anyone who honestly wants to develop it and live peacefully with Muslims. He warns his fellow Muslims against letting urban centres be dominated by foreigners and non-Muslims, lest they lose all important modern facilities and find themselves in a disadvantageous position.

The appointment of religious school leavers (Grade Six) as teachers was an attempt to place more locals in teaching positions. Indeed, with the growing numbers of new religious classes throughout the districts, particularly after 1963, the demand for religious instructors and teachers rose significantly (see *Majalah* 7:2; 10:43; 17:27). Although the religious schools were originally intended to provide basic religious training for boys and girls, the school leavers were needed to alleviate the shortage of trained religious teachers in newly established classes. In addition, an increasing number of school leavers happen to work toward self-reliance in skilled and professional sectors.

Patriotism emerged quite clearly in some writings of the period. Islam, which does not distinguish religion and public life is seen as the basis of modern state. Following this argument a writer of the *Majalah* (6:13-14) contends that the government must consistently protect and advance the interest of its Muslim population. This is more

particularly so since Muslims are the prime defenders and vanguards of the ruler, the nation, ruler and Islam. In addition, only by implementing Islam fully in private and public life, can the stability and prosperity of the nation be secured.

Religious teachers who enjoyed close links to, and social prestige in, society should have general knowledge and ongoing developments in the world. In the perspective of the increasing awareness about threats to political instability during the period, religious teachers were regarded as important agents to bring about social harmony in the midst of social uncertainty; this was particularly relevant even more after the December 1962 rebellion. In order to provide the religious teachers with general knowledge, exposure to current issues and relevant guidance so as to make the students to be effective in their role in bringing about social harmony, they were given short courses on various topics such as administration, health, law and economic development. The rationale in this endeavour was that, by virtue of their close contact with the people, they might perform their role better after gaining some training. Indeed, in early 1964 religious teachers pledged non-involvement in any political party or activities (see *Majalah* 2: 4-5; 7: 3, 6; 8: 27).

Nation-building can be more effectively undertaken by utilizing religious institutions. Mosques, for example, have been seen by the authorities as the best venue for establishing links and cooperation among members of the society at large. After 1963, for example, the Friday sermons which were centrally organized focused on real issues relevant to the daily life of the population, such as the value of hard-work, perseverance, thrift and hoping for a better future. Also, public talks and sermons continued to be carefully prepared by the Department of Religious Affairs for uniformity and the avoidance of controversies (*Majalah* 6:3; 17:11).

Cultural

It was evident from various religious publications and other contemporary works that religious leaders in Brunei had serious concern over negative impacts of rapid change and, especially, popular Western, culture.⁵⁶ The range of central issues raised during the period, according to the sources concerned, cover moral decadence, missionary activities, religious controversies, social unrest, political participation, the tendency to adopt various glamorous facets of Western culture, ignorance of Islam, and pornography and reading materials portraying violence.

The progressively increasing impact of modernization on Brunei society from about the early sixties has stimulated a debate over the Islamic stand toward Western culture and local customs. One of the important issues that occupied a considerable attention among contemporary writers was issues related to women. For example, in discussing women, education and morality, Rahmah binti Mustafa (*Majalah* 10-11: 27-8, 40) argues that Islam, like other religions, urges women to study and uphold high standards of morality; yet, it is a fact that many young women who go to school are inclined to imitate the undesirable symbols of Western way of life. She maintains that there was nothing wrong with choosing education and various disciplines, but women should uphold moral values in adopting and implementing their knowledge. Muslim women, she further stressed, should behave in keeping with Islamic and Oriental norms and values (*sebagai seorang wanita Islam dan wanita timur*) and have enough knowledge and high morality; knowledge, morality and adherence to ethics should continue to remain hallmarks of their behaviour even in their old age.

According to some other writers (see *Majalah* 22: 27; *Lambaian Islam* 1971: 55-73, 77-84), the adoption of some aspects of Western civilization, especially in the fields of science, research and technology, should be encouraged, for during the glory of Islamic civilization, Muslim communities were leading in these fields. For example, the prestige

of the Bayt al-Hikma of Baghdad during al-Ma'mun's reign was acknowledged widely. It would be pertinent to note, in this context, that the *Majalah* (23:28-30,33) published a translation of Maulana Mawdudi's response to Pope Paul's letter of "Peace" on December 8, 1967. This publication is significant in two ways: (i) it shows clearly that religious scholars in Brunei were keen to learn about the latest issues discussed by Muslim scholars in different part of Islamic world; and (ii) that it was necessary to take a firm stand on certain issues raised by such non-Islamic entities as the Pope, while acknowledging, at the same time, the shared common ground.

Many articles and speeches published in the *Majalah* and monographs of the Department of Religious Affairs insist on the centrality of Islam in forming modern culture and society; what follows is a summary of the main points they raised. Although they acknowledge the need to learn from many different sources, including the West and local traditions, they single out Islam as the backbone of new society.

It is claimed that Islam has fostered the development of Brunei individuals who have contributed to the emergence of a set of highly sophisticated customs. Islam has become source of unity, loyalty, honesty and love of stability and respect toward the law. Cooperation and stability will pave the way for development and progress (... *bahawa hanya agama sahaja yang dapat memberikan bimbingan prinsipal ke arah tujuan yang murni itu* [prosperity]). Development and prosperity can be completed only by applying Islam fully (*jika agama menjadi terasnya yang utama*). Islam encourages economic development and progress. To do this stability and peace must be maintained in this country. Moreover, the propagation of Islam should be pursued more seriously through mosques, schools, courses, publications and mass media (*Majalah* 28:3-4).

According to Ustadh 'Abd al-'Aziz Juned, civilization did not emerge fully in response to, or by virtue of, physical needs alone. Some form of "belief" must have paved the way for the high levels of culture. From the very beginning of human life, they need principles or beliefs to relate to "God." Islam came with guidance on how to achieve high levels of morality for all. By submitting to Allah it will be easier to achieve that goal. Prophets, as God's messengers, deliver divine guidance to bring humans to full humanity. Islam has a powerful and successful mission in correcting the social evils; for example slavery, violation of the rights of women and economic exploitation. In order to prove that the pre-Islamic period was decadent, the Ustadh quoted some points from such scholars as Wells and Ibn Khaldūn.

The local customs have also been a subject of religious scrutiny in some writings. In general, the Bruneians highly value their customs and culture. With increasing scripturalization and access to diverse religious writings, some Bruneians also raise several issues on particular religious practices which are closely linked to local tradition. In most cases, the practices surrounding the rites of passage, the welcoming of pilgrims, and other ceremonies which are held during the religious celebrations, are criticized of being un-Islamic (*Majalah* 9: 38; 27: 25). However, wisdom is recommended in eradicating such un-Islamic practices. Any reformer should present his ideas in the context of local needs and sensitivity in order to avoid conflict. According to one writer, decadent customs and habits must be changed but with wisdom and sensibility (*Majalah* 28:25-8).

Religious and ethnic pluralism occupied the minds of some contemporary writers and leaders. It is important to state clearly that the prevailing opinion in the country favors the inclusive practical approach to diverse ethnic groups and religious practices; however, such practices do not represent the official stand of the state and its approach to religion and ethnicity (see Pehin Md. Zain 1998: 82-83).⁵⁷ The tone of most articles during the period emphasizes cooperation and harmony in the religious field and ethnic relations. For example, one writer asserts that Islam does not contradict earlier religions, it only introduces changes in accordance with the changing conditions (*Majalah* 4: 4). Another

writer urges Muslims to compete positively and openly with other segments of the population. They should be confident in undertaking economic pursuits and businesses which have been the domain of non-Muslims. They should enter these fields and show that they are capable. Achievements in such pursuits can not only raise the image of Muslims, but they also prove that Islam is a force that is directed toward prosperity and progress (*Majalah* 31: 3,8). Many higher officials never failed to insist on the importance of cooperation among different segments of Brunei plural society. To them, such an approach is consonant with what Prophet Muhammad did after his migration to Medina which had harboured diverse groups and religions.⁵⁸

In their call for social and religious activism, these scholars insist on an evolutionary approach to change, and the importance of ensuring that change does not create confrontation and inability in society. For example, a senior religious official (*Majalah* 32:3-4) urges the conservative and older mosque officials to work closely and exchange opinions with the younger and more educated religious teachers. However, he warns these religious teachers not to act high-handedly and unsettle the prevailing socio-religious harmony. Thus, local religious teachers should prepare themselves well for any religious occasions, including *berzikir*, *bertahlil* and other rites of passage and adapt them to local conditions. Even in introducing changes to decadent customs and habits, they should pay attention to local sensibility and exercise wisdom (*Majalah* 25:13-4; 28:26). Emphasis on maintaining social equilibrium is also shown in the reminders addressed to many degree holders who have been assigned to key position in the government; they should adore local customs and uphold Islamic identity in their attempts to reform and modernize society.

Socio-economic

Many writers of the period emphasize the importance of economic development and progress. They point out that the early Muslim generations succeeded in achieving economic prosperity and progress since they were fully committed to the teachings of Islam. An article in *Lambaian Islam* (1971:107-15) lists five reasons for the decline of Islamic civilization: internal strife, ethnic chauvinism, external threats, structural change of the world economy and the abandonment of Islamic teachings. It seems to suggest that since Muslims fail to apply the divine law comprehensively, they miss God's promise and, therefore, experience adverse consequences. Indeed, one writer (*Majalah* 6: 8-15) argues in a straightforward fashion that the separation between Islam and politics in today's Muslim states forms a central cause for economic and political decline. It is implied that the hesitation of many Muslim leaders to provide clear support economically and politically to the Muslim *umma* results in uncertainty and even backwardness. Put differently, Muslim leaders should adopt political-economic policies, which clearly favour Muslims; only then will development and progress be secured for the community. The success and prosperity of Muslims will guarantee peace and harmony among diverse communities.

The backwardness of contemporary Muslim societies results from imbalance between material and spiritual development. Several articles in *Lambaian Islam* argue quite clearly that the present decadence of the *umma* is caused by the abandonment of Islamic teachings, or by the wrong adoption of pseudo-religious practices, and their backwardness has nothing to do with their adoption of Islam.⁵⁹ On the contrary, they state that half-heartedness and inconsistency in their implementation of Islamic teaching caused indignity and crisis. They further go on to say that, in order to get round the present debacle, Muslims have to return to true Islam and practice it fully as a comprehensive and

balanced approach to the world and beyond. Since Islam gives emphasis on science and technology, Muslims should master both, while refining their spirituality.⁶⁰

The global environment of the Cold War and the threat of major ideologies of the period forced political leaders to campaign for unity and harmony. In Brunei Islam is credited with power to bring unity and peace. Only under such a conducive atmosphere, economic development and political stability can be realized. More particularly, Islam's call for unity and brotherhood is consonant with the prevailing political matrix in the country. Thus support for the government is the only guaranteed channel to progress (*Majalah* 8:5-6).

In its efforts to maximize the mobilization of the *zakāt*, the government, in 1969, introduced via the Department of Religious Affairs, guideline and administrative measures to ensure the maximum collection of the *zakāt* and its utilization for the economic benefit of the community (*Majalah* 24: 3-10).

Moreover, some writers (*Majalah* 13:33) insist that Muslims should aim not only at the worldly glory, but the life after death should also be given high priority. Islam provides a complete set of teaching and discipline in this world, at personal and societal levels and even beyond. In conjunction with this, Islamic states should implement policies based on the Qur'an, the *hadith* and opinions of Muslim scholars (*kerana agama Islam tak pernah bersalahan atau pun memerangi fikiran-fikiran yang waras dan tak pernah agama itu menganjurkan sesuatu atau melarang sesuatu untuk keruntuhan manusia*). Justice and prosperity become Islam's ultimate goal as expressed in a Qur'anic term *balda tayyiba wa-rabb ghafūr*. Rulers must be honest to their people. *'Ibāda* is not limited to worship; it includes any good deeds for the sake of God. Indeed, the Qur'an deals mostly with aspects related to non-worship, in a strict sense. Muslims should take life seriously to prepare their future since this world and the Hereafter cannot be separated (*dunia dan akhirat tak dapat dipisahkan*). Our backwardness now is caused by such neglect of the worldly affairs (*Majalah* 14:13-14).⁶¹

Another writer asserts (*Majalah* 30:15-6,21) that Islam wants its followers to be strong and respected. This can be achieved by making themselves advanced and influential in the world order. Islam is not a barrier to development and progress, even though today's Muslims are backward. For example, the early Islamic glory was due largely to the implementation of Islamic principles. Thus, if today's Muslims are far behind, they must first fully implement Islam in order to overcome this backwardness. Indeed, this world is a preparation for the eternity, and the followers have to take advantage for the benefit of themselves, society and nation. Without the strength, progress and wealth we cannot do much in this world and, logically, for the Hereafter, too. Furthermore, Muslims should be the first to support and take the lead in the government development plans. In this way, the objective of "making Islam a way of life" can be realized. Muslims cannot be disinterested in development and the facilities provided by the state. The building of various infra-structures is intended to stimulate production and industrialization. Muslims should initiate and benefit from all these. They should not think only of self-salvation by following a narrow understanding of worship. Any beneficial deed, which aims to please God is *farāḍ kifāya* [*kehendak Islam* or *'ibāda*]. A Muslim has a double duty for this world and for the Hereafter (*tugas hidup dan tugas untuk akhirat*).

In the editorial of the *Majalah* volume 31 (1973), the head of the Department of Religious Affairs states that development must be based on a balance between spiritual and material components. The government has the objective of creating religious awareness among Bruneians by pursuing many different means such as education, publications and mass media. By providing a strong moral basis in society, the image of the country is enhanced; But this is not enough. The Bruneians have to prove that they excel in economic activities too. The government has provided many facilities and strong

support for Muslims should take advantage and, thus, compete with other segments of society successfully. Muslims should throw away from their minds any ideas as to the superiority of certain groups or their monopoly in economic fields. They should enter those fields and show that they too are capable.

Religious movements: *ṭarīqas* and revivalism

The rapid changes that took place in Brunei following the Pacific War also provided a better opportunity for strengthening ties and relations with the outside world, including the Islamic world. As a part of the wider Islamic world Brunei has always felt the impact of changes occurring among Muslims worldwide. As has been argued elsewhere by the present writer, Brunei, as an Islamic centre, formed a nodal point of Islamic networks.⁶² Religious activities and institutions formed the strongest links in the networks, these links have generally persisted and survived against the vicissitudes of political conflict and decline. The intensity of ties and links with the outside world depended very much on the attractiveness and ability of Brunei to communicate with it. This explains why Brunei was largely excluded from the reformist activities during the early part of the 20th century. It is primarily because of local initiatives that some degrees of ties were kept alive; this was in contrast to the intensive contacts in the earlier period when Brunei enjoyed power and wealth, especially during the 16th and 17th centuries.

More importantly, by 1959 Brunei ended the Residency system, and the Sultan, thus, recovered his full control over the internal affairs of the country, in addition to his authority over religious affairs. During the Residency period, the emphasis on administrative reform in the religious field, did not, indirectly, favour the development of the *ṭarīqa* order. The *ṭarīqa* with its various branches survived, but remained low profile, as they were adhered to at a personal level.⁶³ Nevertheless, the impact of the *ṭarīqa*-styled expression continued to be prevalent among the religious features of Brunei. The popularity of various forms of *dhikr* is a clear example of this. Indeed, participation in such intense religious experience created a conducive atmosphere for further Islamization, that is a practitioner would be more open to pursue more serious religious knowledge. Such closer attachment to religion undoubtedly had potential to link the more-involved Muslims in the country with reformist movements in other Muslim societies.

Since the late 1960s, the Bruneians have seen the emergence of various religious activities, if not movements. Most of them were offshoots of parent-organizations abroad.⁶⁴ Some features of the activities were related to forms of martial art (*silat*). The most influential grouping at the time was the *Naṣrul Haqq*. It grew very fast in the Malay Peninsula following the May 1969 crisis. In Brunei a comparable movement took the form of a martial art association called *Silat Lintau*. It was propagated in the late 1970s by a certain Ishak bin Hassan of the Malay Peninsula. Its impact on Brunei was seen quite strongly among the youth, students and individuals of the armed forces and the police.⁶⁵ Undoubtedly, its strict discipline, protrusive symbols and promise of supernatural power were very attractive for many of them. In the early 1970s, a sergeant in the army propagated the teachings of the Mufarriḍiyya order; this order won a following among diverse segments of the population, primarily due to its liberal ideas on salvation. When these orders received more support among misinformed masses, the Mufti issued a *fatwā* condemning them as un-Islamic.⁶⁶

Brunei also actively participated in enhancing Islamic resurgence during the second half of this century. The concerted efforts at improving Islamic education and restoring institutions during the 1950s can be said to be Brunei's response to the ongoing awakening in the Islamic World. In the second-half of the 20th century, it was the ruler who took the initiative and sponsored many changes in religious administration and activities. The

restoration of Islam as the official religion of the state, as contained in the 1959 Constitution, was a loud and clear statement that Brunei had a firm commitment to Islamization. Indeed, a firm foundation for this had already laid from the 1960s. Towards fulfilling the spirit of the 1959 Constitution in relation to Islam, steps were taken in establishing more religious schools, opening of religious classes for adults, revamping of the mosque committees,⁶⁷ and publishing religious literature. This also coincided with the return of newly educated Bruneians from many higher education centres in the region and the Middle East. They were soon appointed to key positions in the religious bureaucracy. Some even published fresh and stimulating articles on Islam.⁶⁸ Moreover, in 1967 the Sultan called on the Bruneians to strive with greater vigour after implementing Islam as a way of life.⁶⁹

Although Brunei never witnessed the emergence of an Islamic party, the echo of Islamic revivalism can be seen in many features. First of all, the opening of religious schools since 1956 has created the opportunity for girls to be fully enrolled in religious instruction. Accordingly, Brunei women who became mothers since the mid-1960s had much better knowledge about scriptural Islam. In the long run they were more prone to adapt and practice features of orthodox Islam, including those relating to the education of their children and to their public appearance and modes of dressing. Indeed, by the late 1970s, for example, more and more Brunei women covered their heads in public.⁷⁰ Islam has become the subject of public discourse in Brunei, and even those who had advocated a secular lifestyle showed respect for the return to the pristine teachings of Islam.⁷¹ Religious gatherings and lectures became usual features in the government departments and, after independence, ministries.⁷² The initiatives of the ruler in bringing Brunei closer to the Muslim World had a lot to do with the formal adoption of Islamic leaning in the government circles.⁷³

POST-INDEPENDENCE PERIOD (1984 onwards): AN OVERVIEW

New economic and financial institutions: The Islamic system

The increasing pressure on many Muslim countries to have an Islamic system of finance has led to the establishment of many new financial institutions. The tremendous price hike of oil and the consequent financial boom enjoyed by Muslim oil-producing countries after 1973 forced many Muslim governments to reform and modernize their monetary and financial systems. For example, since the mid-1970s attempts had been made among various Islamic circles to run an Islamic banking system. Indeed, the Muslim World League held several seminars on Islamic economics during the period. A positive response to the idea of having an Islamic banking system came from Dubai when the Islamic Bank of Dubai was founded in 1975. Before the end of the 1970s, no less than seven new financial institutions using an Islamic system were established, mostly in the Middle East. Outside the Middle East, Pakistan and Malaysia took similar steps when Islamic systems of banking were introduced into the existing banking system in 1981 and 1983 respectively.

In Brunei concrete steps toward the foundation of Islamic financial institutions took place from the end of the 1980s, after a period of Islamic revival, several aspects of which have already been described in this paper. Perhaps influenced by the increasing numbers of Islamic banks founded in many Islamic countries, a committee for the foundation of an Islamic Bank in Brunei was laid in 1987 (Abdul Aziz Juned, 1992: 186). More specifically, a definite plan for establishing an Islamic system in banking took place after the Ruler announced his support for the enterprise in late 1990.⁷⁴ A year later, in September 1991, an Islamic savings bank, known as *Tabung Amanah Islam Brunei* (TAIB), was established. It was modelled mainly on what had earlier been established in Malaysia. The primary aim of the institution was to provide financial services and business transactions in an Islamic way (*ibid.*: 188). The

success of the TAIB in attracting customers led to another major step in the Islamization of the financial system when, on January 13, 1993, the International Bank of Brunei was restructured to become the *Islamic Bank of Brunei*.

Thus, although Brunei Darussalam was not among the early protagonists of the Islamic financial system, it did not want to be left behind its brethren. Its participation in the increasingly popular and successful system shows that Brunei is well aware of its ties with the wider Muslim World.

When Southeast Asia was plagued with major financial crisis in 1997, Brunei was not exempted. However, its economic structure, especially its principal source of income, oil and gas, saved it from the destabilizing effect of the crisis.

Religious movements: revivalism

Rather serious religious movements emerged in Brunei with the increasing activities of some well-known orders. Since the early 1980s, the representatives of the Ahmadiyya order,⁷⁵ the *Jamā'at al-Arqām*,⁷⁶ and the *Tabligh* movement extended their preaching to Brunei. The *Tabligh* movement had attracted a few but dedicated followers among educated Bruneians, although their numbers were not very large. Perhaps due mainly to its low profile presence, the *Tabligh* did not raise eyebrows among religious authorities.⁷⁷

The leaders of the Ahmadiyya order formed a branch in Brunei in 1982. Since then it has developed into an active group, providing religious guidance for its followers. It has regular weekly meetings. As a group it has become an effective source of spiritual and socio-religious identification for the increasing numbers of followers.

The influence of the *Jamā'at al-Arqām* - elsewhere also known as *Dārul Arqām* - was felt in Brunei since the early 1980s. Many Bruneians who joined *al-Arqām* never formed a formal network linking to its headquarters in Kuala Lumpur. They joined the movements as individuals. The followers of the Arqām in Brunei, however, appeared in public quite similar to their brethren in the headquarters. Since they did not formally found a branch in the country, their activities centred on already existing traditional religious patterns. For example, they organized meetings concomitant with religious gatherings (*majlis*) such as *tahlil*, *tadārus*, and rites of passage. As their numbers increased, regular meetings were also held, especially to strengthen the bond and spread the teachings of the movement. Nevertheless, the stronger nucleus revolved around the individual families. It was here that the Arqāmīs of the country first implemented the religious model established by the leaders in Sungai Pencala in Kuala Lumpur.

When the leadership of the Arqām initiated a few controversial teachings around 1988, their impact upon the Arqāmīs in Brunei was not insignificant. The deviant view upheld by them during the period was that Muhammad al-Suhaimi will emerge as the Saviour (*al-Mahdī al-Muntaẓar*) for Muslims. The Arqāmīs became more exclusive and acknowledged the supreme authority of the Arqām leader, *Ustādh Asy'ari* Muhammad; this can be seen, for example, in the high position given to his picture in the houses of the Arqāmīs.⁷⁸ Many Arqāmīs even went to Sungai Pencala to attend special gatherings (*majlis al-yaqāza*) led by the *Ustādh* to reveal those who sinned; these gatherings were apparently effective in making the Arqāmīs to be rather submissive to him. When it was clear that the Arqāmīs were becoming more aggressive in their efforts at winning over their followers and upholding their newly acquired ideology, the Brunei government banned the propagation of the Arqām teachings in the country on 12 February, 1991. Nevertheless, the Arqām phenomenon in Brunei shows clearly the enthusiasm of some segments of the population to Islamic activities. More specifically, it confirmed the link between Brunei and other Islamic centres.

Education

During the 1990s, the impact of Islamization and revivalism was strongly felt in the country. At the same time, Brunei was also vigilant toward any deviance in this trend as can be seen in its affirmative action against Jama'at al-Arqam in 1991. In the light of the complex contours of Islamic revivalism, Brunei reexamined its overall education policy and undertaking. The focus was redirected towards ways and means of instilling religious values among all Bruneians, especially pupils and students and, at the same time, moving forward as sophisticated citizens in the era of rapid advances in information and communication technology. In this context, higher education remained a pivotal concern. Exclusivism in Islamic education slowly gave way to comprehensiveness as advocated by prominent Muslim thinkers and educators.

Having achieved greater scholarship, Brunei's al-Azhar-trained scholars had no difficulty in building ties with other Muslim scholars internationally. Before joining al-Azhar University they had studied at the Al-Junied Religious School (Sekolah Arab Al-Junied) in Singapore,⁷⁹ and the Islamic College of Malaya in Kelang, Malaysia.⁸⁰ Brunei scholars completing their first degree at al-Azhar enjoyed access to a variegated academic circle. The years of interaction with different colleagues opened their minds to new and wider horizons. Indeed, a Brunei student in Cairo reported that his stay in Cairo not only introduced him to purely religious subjects but also to diverse other disciplines, and even to nationalism and military drills.⁸¹ Moreover, various collections of writings and poems written by Brunei students abroad, including Cairo, indicate that they read widely and participated in current scholarly debates and developments.⁸² Similarly, in her study on Indonesian students in Cairo, Mona Abaza noted that these students brought home with them outlooks nurtured by diverse social, intellectual, political and cultural exchanges during their long stay in Egypt.⁸³ Nevertheless, the strongest link maintained by these graduates was with their *alma mater*; for most of the experts in the different religious disciplines this was al-Azhar University, whereas middle rank officials generally completed their higher studies at religious institutions in Singapore and Malaysia. Despite their erudition and religious scholarship, Bruneians who graduated from al-Azhar opted for the evolutionary approach towards reform in the religious field.

The debates launched, policies made and changes introduced in making Islamic education more easily available and more sophisticated and responsive to challenges can all be considered natural outcomes of Brunei's relentless efforts in the search for a way of life in full consonance with Islamic teachings while maintaining Bruneian identity and within the context of the imperatives of living within a global environment with all its challenges and opportunities.

SUMMARY

The central issue of reform and revival in 20th century Brunei focuses on the relevance of Islam to the life of the nation. The stability and continuing pattern of Islamization in Brunei, including reform and revival, can be explained partly with reference to the country's determination to opt for the moderate implementation of Islam.

Brunei pays special attention to its position as a Muslim state. It has played a significant role among Muslim countries. It is also participating in the diverse networks operating among Muslim states and communities. Although Brunei has definitely opted for a particular version and expression of Islam, it has never closed its doors to more intensive communication with other Muslim countries. Contrary to what has been claimed by Braighlinn (1992: 64-65), Brunei's predilection for a particular version of Islam should not be seen as merely a political contingency. The widespread adoption of the traditional approach to Islam, in fact, has led

the political leaders to accommodate it within Brunei polity. It is pertinent to point out that the religious revivalism among Muslims worldwide has had a positive impact on Bruneian religious attitudes in that it has made Islam more meaningful and relevant. Following the more recent religio-political developments and socio-economic changes in the region, Brunei has pro-actively responded to new challenges; however, this topic which requires further study is more appropriate to be dealt with on another occasion.

By adhering to a well-defined belief system and religious practices, Brunei has maintained a relatively stable religious life. The strength of its religious bureaucracy has been effective in limiting the influence of controversial ideas and personalities. Some might argue that, despite its success in achieving religious uniformity and stability, Bruneians may still be prone to be influenced by new religious movements. The religious establishment seems to be aware of such challenges as suggested by their positive response to various developments in the Muslim World. Attempts made in the country in multifarious ways are a clear testimony that Bruneians are joining their other fellow Muslim brethren to live Islamically within the modern world.

END NOTES

¹ Hugh Low, *Sarawak: Inhabitants and Productions*. New Impression of 1988 (London: Frank Cass, 1848), p. 106; Spencer St. John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East: Travels in Sabah and Sarawak in the 1860s*. Reprint of the 1862 edition (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1886), p. 248; W. H. Treacher, "British Borneo: Sketches of Brunei, Sarawak, Labuan and North Borneo." *Journal of the Straits Branch of Royal Asiatic Society*, 20 (1889): 27; *Brunei Annual Report (BAR)* 1906.

² W. H. Treacher, "British Borneo: Sketches of Brunei, Sarawak, Labuan and North Borneo." *Journal of the Straits Branch of Royal Asiatic Society*, 20 (1889): 27; *Brunei Annual Report (BAR)* 1906.

³ Spencer St. John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East: Travels in Sabah and Sarawak in the 1860s*. Reprint of the 1862 edition (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1886), p. 248.

⁴ Earlier scholars such as Smith, Gibb, Rahman, Voll, and Watt have put forward some characteristics of the reform movement in Muslim society. See H.A.R. Gibb, *Studies on the Civilization of Islam* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1962); Fazlur Rahman, *Islam* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966); Rahman, *Islam and Modernity: Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1984); W. C. Smith, *Islam in Modern History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957); John Voll, "Hadith Scholars and Tariqahs: An Ulama Group in 18th Century Haramayn and Their Impact in the Islamic World," *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 15 (1980), pp. 264-73; Voll, "Renewal and reform in Islamic history: Tajdid and Islah," in J. L. Esposito (ed.), *Voices of Resurgent Islam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983); W. Montgomery Watt, *Islamic Fundamentalism and Modernity* (London: Routledge, 1988).

In Islamic literature the idea of reform is expressed in many different ways. Among them are the emergence of *Mahdi* (saviour), the expectation of a *mujaddid* (reformer) around the turn of each Hijri century, and not least the inherence of *mujtahid* (original thinker and interpreter) for every age and place. On these topics see Abdulaziz A. Sachedina, *Islamic Messianism* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1981); G. Lewy, *Religion and Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974).

⁵ For some comparisons, see Edmund Burke III and Ira Lapidus, eds., *Islam, Politics and Social Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

⁶ See Iik Arifin, (1992), "Brunei Sebagai Sebuah Pusat Jaringan (Network) Intelektual Islam di Asia Tenggara," in *Sumbangsih UBD: Essays on Brunei Darussalam*, edited by Pehin Dato Hj. Abu Bakar Hj. Apang (BSB: Universiti Brunei of Danissalam, Akademi Pengajian Brunei, pp. 148-163; P. L. Amin Sweeney (ed.), "Silsilah Raja-Raja Berunai," *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 41.2 (1968), B.

⁷ On the significance of *Syair Rakis* in the intellectual history of 19th century Brunei, see Hj. Matussin Omar, "Pengarang Syair Rakis -Pengiran Syahbandar Mohammad Salleh Ibnu Pengiran Syarmayuda-, Cita-cita Sosial dan Politiknya" (Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei Museum, n. d.).

⁸ For more details on this, see the paper, "Intellectual Tradition in A Malay World: Ulama and Education in Brunei". *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 3, pp. 35-60.

⁹ Hugh Low, *Sarawak: Inhabitants and Productions*. New Impression of 1988 (London: Frank Cass, 1848), p. 106; Spencer St. John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East: Travels in Sabah and Sarawak in the 1860s*. Reprint of the 1862 edition (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1886), p. 248; W. H. Treacher, "British

Borneo: Sketches of Brunei, Sarawak, Labuan and North Borneo." *Journal of the Straits Branch of Royal Asiatic Society*, 20 (1889): 27; *Brunei Annual Report (BAR)* 1906; Peter Blundell, *On the Fringe of Eastern Seas* (New York: R. M. McBride, 1924), p. 77; D. E. Brown, *Brunei: The Structure and History of A Bornean Malay Sultanate*, Brunei Museum Journal Monograph No. 2, 1970, pp. 40-41.

¹⁰ Treacher, "British Borneo", p. 40.

¹¹ In this work the term Jawi not *Jāwī* will be used throughout.

¹² Cf. *Brunei Annual Report* 1911:12-3.

¹³ The relationship was close as evidenced by the letter sent on 15 Safar 1321/1903 whereby the Sultan told his Ottoman counterpart about the difficult situation in Brunei. A copy of the letter is kept at the Brunei History Centre in Bandar Seri Begawan. Cf. D. S. Ranjit Singh, *Brunei 1839-1983: The Problems of Political Survival* (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 96, note 71.

¹⁴ See *BAR* 1911.

¹⁵ Blundell's story (1924) gives us a glimpse of the economy of Brunei during the period.

¹⁶ Information on Haji 'Abdul Mokti is scattered throughout various notes and paragraphs written by different scholars, see Pehin Dato Hj. Yahya bin Hj. Ibrahim, "Pehin-Pehin Manteri Ugama Sebagai Institusi dan Peranan Mereka dalam Pentadbiran dan Pemerintahan Negara di Brunei", Paper for the *International Seminar on Islamic Civilization in the Malay World*, 1-5 June, 1989, Bandar Seri Begawan; Ahmad Ibrahim, "Undang-undang Islam di Malaysia", in Ismail Hussein et al. (eds.), *Tamadun Melayu*, 1: 334-53, Kuala Lumpur: DBP, 1989; Suhaili bin Hj. Hassan et al., *Mengenal Tokoh-tokoh Agama di Brunei*, Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei Museum, 1986; Suhaili bin Hj. Hassan et al., *Tokoh-Tokoh Agama di Brunei Darussalam: Pengenalan Ringkas*. Special Publication No. 23, Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei Museum, 1992.

¹⁷ On the purchase of this house by Khatib 'Abdul Latif in 1807, see P. L. Amin Sweeney (ed.), "Silsilah Raja-raja Berunai", *Journal of the Malay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 41.2 (1968): B31.

¹⁸ *Tariqa* is often spelled tarekat in Malay/Indonesian. It is used to denote Islamic brotherhood which emphasizes experiential exercises in order to attach oneself closer to God. The followers of the *tariqa* generally maintain that their exercises are relevant to and derivative of the *shari'a* (Islamic teaching). For more detailed information on the *tariqa*, see F. de Jong, *Turuq and Turuq-Linked Institutions in Nineteenth Century Egypt. A Historical Study in Organizational Dimensions of Islamic Mysticism*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978; Hawash Abdullah, *Perkembangan Ilmu Tasawuf dan Tokoh-Tokohnya di Nusantara*, Surabaya: al-Ikhlās, 1980.

¹⁹ For more information on this development, see M. Chatib Quzwain, *Mengenal Allah. Suatu Studi mengenai Ajaran Tasawuf* Syekh 'Abdus-Samad al-Palimbani, Jakarta: Bulan Bintang, 1985; Anthony H. Johns, "Islam in the Malay World: An Explanatory Survey with some Reference to Quranic Exegesis", in R. Israel and Anthony H. Johns (eds.), *Islam in Asia: Southeast and East Asia* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 115-161; Anthony H. Johns, "Quranic Exegesis in the Malay World: In Search of a Profile", in Andrew Rippin (ed.), *Approaches to the History of the Qur'an* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), pp. 257-8.

²⁰ Some preliminary studies can be found in Hj. Abd. Karim bin Hj. Abd. Rahnan, "Perkembangan Islam di Brunei: Satu Tinjauan dari Beberapa Sudut Bermula dari Abad ke-14 hingga Abad ke-19." Unpublished paper [1989]; also later in this paper.

²¹ For more details on this Shaykh see Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka in the Latter Part of the 19th Century: Daily Life, Customs and Learning. The Muslims of the East-Indian Archipelago*, tr. J.A. Monahan (Leiden: Brill, 1970), pp. 262, 276-78; Syed M. Naquib al-Attas, *Some Aspects of Sufism as Understood and Practised among the Malays* (Singapore: Malaysia Sociological Research Institute Ltd., 1963), pp. 32-33; Hawash Abdullah, *Perkembangan Ilmu Tasawuf*, pp. 177-82; Zamakhsyari Dhofier, *Tradisi Pesantren: Studi Tentang Pandangan Hidup Kyai* (Jakarta: LP3ES, 1982), pp. 85-87; Martin van Bruinessen, "The Origins and Development of the Naqshbandi Order in Indonesia", *Der Islam* 67 (1990), pp. 169-70.

²² See the writings of Haji 'Abdul Mokti, for example the manuscript at the Brunei Museum BM/Arkh/63/80; also the writings of Pehin Mohd. Sa'd bin Juru Apong, for instance BM/Arkh/69/80.

²³ For a brief but helpful insight into the *shari'a*-mindedness of the followers of the Qādiriyya wa-Naqshbandiyya, see Hamid Algar, "The Naqshbandi Order: A Preliminary Survey of Its History and Significance", *Studia Islamica* 44 (1976): 123-52; John Voll, "Hadith Scholars and Tariqahs", pp. 268-70; van Bruinessen, "The Origins and Development", p. 156.

²⁴ The wide circulation of such texts as 'Abd al-Samad al-Palimbangi's *Hidayat al-Sālikin* (1778), 'Abd Allāh ibn Husayn Ba'alawi's *Sullam al-Tawfiq* (1854), and Salim ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Sumayr al-Hadrami's *Safinat al-Najā* (prior to 1853) among Muslims in Southeast Asia is well acknowledged, see Zamakhsyari, *Tradisi Pesantren*, 1982; Mohd. Nor bin Ngah, *Kitab Jawi: Islamic Thought of the Malay Muslim Scholars*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1984; M. B. Hooker and Virginia Matheson "Jawi Literature in Patani: The Maintenance of an Islamic Tradition", *Journal of the Malay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 61.1 (1988): 1-86; van Bruinessen, "Kitab Kuning: Books in Arabic Script used in the Pesantren Milieu", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 146 (1990): 226-69.

²⁵ See for example Arshad al-Banjari's *Sabil al-Muhtadin* (1781), his *Perukunan* (edited by his disciple 'Abd al-Rashid al-Banjari, Daud ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Idris al-Patani's *Kashf al-Ghumma* (1841), and Muhammad ibn Ismā'il's *Maṭla' al-Badrayn* (1885).

²⁶ Snouck, *Mekka*, p. 286.

²⁷ See *BAR* 1911.

²⁸ On this phenomenon see Zamakhsyari Dhofier, *Tradisi Pesantren: Studi Tentang Pandangan Hidup Kyai* (Jakarta: LP3ES, 1982); Hooker and Matheson 1987. The presence of such institutions in Brunei was rejected, see Matassim Hj. Jibah, "Perkembangan Persekolahan Melayu di Brunei dalam Pentadbiran Sistem Residen 1906-1959", *Brunei Museum Journal* 5.3 (1983), p. 2. But as we shall see, by the second decade of the 20th century a number of *balai* in Kampung Air were extensively used for religious and educational purposes.

²⁹ For more information on this, see Hj. Abdul Latif Hj. Ibrahim, "Peranan Rumah-Rumah Perkumpulan dalam Masyarakat Melayu Brunei", in *Ikhtisar Budaya*, Bandar Seri Begawan: DBP, 1986-1976, pp. 87-9.

³⁰ Iik Arifin Mansurnoor (1992). Intellectual Tradition in a Malay World: Ulama and Education in Brunei. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 3(3): 34-60.

³¹ The same spirit of defense was expressed by Awang Ahmad Shah of Tutong when he wrote in *Fajar Sarawak* 8 (15 May 1930) and 9 (June 1930); for more details see Iik, "Socio-Religious Changes in Brunei after the Pacific War," *Islamic Studies Quarterly Journal* 35.1 (1996), p. 49.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 51, referring to Minutes of State Council of 1913.

³³ The appointment of *qādi* seems to have taken place some time after 1913 and before 1915.

³⁴ The *qādi* continued to abide by the Courts Enactment of 1908 until May 1952 when it was replaced by 35¹

³⁵ At the time, this organization (*Persatuan Kesatuan Islam or Perkasa*) was the only one registered formally in the state. Its goals were focused on the achievement of prosperity, harmony, security and happiness of the people and the state; and on the improvement of Islamic education. It strove to defend the monarchy and implement Islamic teachings. The leaders of the organization consisted mainly of the higher nobility and religious officials.

³⁶ The terms *kathi* and *kadi* are the local derivatives of *qādi* (Muslim judge).

³⁷ The establishment of the Council since 1948, and particularly the implementation of the 1951 Courts Enactment on May 1, 1952, improved the reconsideration of appeals submitted by the Courts of Kathis, as the cases would be handled by experts in Islamic law in the Council. Previously the appeals were made to the State Council.

³⁸ Nevertheless we have to bear in mind that the universal contexts of the reform movement in the Muslim world during the period must also be taken into account. Muslims in Southeast Asia in different degrees were involved in the process of on-going Islamization. This means that communication between them on the one hand and with many other fellow Muslims in many parts of the world on the other got stronger with the advance of modern transportation and mass media. Their better knowledge of each other had an effect in magnifying exchanges of experience and information.

³⁹ The Enactment was adapted from the Islamic Laws Enactment of Kelantan. Some adjustment was made in accordance with the local conditions.

⁴⁰ According to the 1955 Enactment the Committee should consist of the *Mufti* as chairman, two members of the Religious Council, and six others either appointed from among the members of the Council or qualified religious experts. The quorum is specified to be a chairman and four other members. Even though the *Mufti* was specified as chairman of the Committee, the post of *Mufti* was left vacant until 1962, and thus the chairmanship was held by others. Only after the formation of the third committee in 1967, the *Mufti* occupied the chairmanship of the Committee.

⁴¹ The procedure of issuing a *fatwā* was specified that the *Mufti* was required to act meticulously by paying more attention to the opinions of the *Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah* school and the benefit and interest (*maslahat*) of the community.

⁴² This option is given in cases where the views of the Shāfi'is are against the general welfare of the community.

⁴³ It should be mentioned that among the *fuqahā'* a negative term (*tafiq*) has been used to indicate an individual's way of following the *shari'a* eclectically, by choosing suitable opinions of the diverse schools for very personal reasons.

⁴⁴ It can be argued that Islamic civilization has produced various works on many different fields, including *tafsir* (Qur'anic exegesis), *uṣūl al-dīn* (principles of belief), *fiqh* (Islamic law), *uṣūl al-fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence), and Sufism. All claimed to have been derived from the two original sources, the Qur'an and the Sunna of the Prophet. Are these works intended to provide Muslims with the standard means and reference? Nevertheless, history of Muslim societies has shown the recurrent emergence of original thinkers (*mujtahids*) and reformers (*mujaddids*) who have also been sanctioned by Islam.

⁴⁵ It can also be argued that the formalization of Islamic education in Brunei has negatively affected the survival of traditional Islamic centers of learning such as the *balai*. The end of the *balai*'s role in providing

instruction and developing Islamic scholarship in general must be acknowledged as a loss for Brunei. Of course modern and sophisticated educational centers have been built to compensate for this; however, as we know they are still working hard to replace the loss caused by the downfall of the *balai* as educational center in this country.

⁴⁶ After 1930, Brunei regularly sent its students to be trained as teachers in many centers in the Malay Peninsula, England, Sarawak, and Sabah.

⁴⁷ Later, on January 28, 1918, he was promoted to a non-religious post, as *Datu' Perdana Menteri*.

⁴⁸ The popularity of the name Ikhwan al-Muslimin in the Malay World and its association with novel Islamic activities and modern organization around this period can be seen in the Malay Peninsula, Singapore and North Borneo.

⁴⁹ Haji Metasim bin Mat Ja'far, *Sifat Duapuluh dengan Syair Nasihat* (Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Melayu Press, 1962).

⁵⁰ Since during the period, the Brunei government appointed religious officials, teachers and administrators from among the Malaysians, it is unavoidable that in some cases the writings in Brunei were products of such expatriates. I maintain that, they are not only few, they also represent the same religious tone and ideas as widely held in Brunei during the period.

⁵¹ Interestingly, one figure, Pehin Dato Mohammad Jamil, who was head of Language and Literature Bureau, participated actively in religious forum and discussions. The only explanation is that he belonged to the well-established religious family. He is a son of a higher religious official, *pehin menteri agama*. Despite his formal secular education, he showed keen interest in and deep intellectual curiosity on Islamic issues.

⁵² Most *ulama* of this generation were occupied with providing immediate religious need of the population. Since literacy was not very high, writing was not very effective in this direction.

⁵³ It is interesting that the Brunei People Party (*Parti Rakyat Brunei*) which mobilized the population for political activism in the late 1950s and early 1960s never seriously adopted an Islamic policy. It is rare that its leaders consciously used Islamic symbols or ideas to win support among Bruneians.

⁵⁴ His argument on the issue can be found in *Majalah Jabatan Hal-Ehwal Ugama Brunei* (hereafter *Majalah*) 23: 11-14; 24: 25-27. Cf. Pehin Dato Hj. Md. Zain Hj. Serudin, *Brunei Darussalam: Persepsi Sejarah dan Masyarakatnya* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Azza, 1992), pp. 91-102.

⁵⁵ In this case he quoted a royal statement during the celebration of the 'Id al-Fitr in 1967. "The aim [of all Islamic activities in Brunei] is to make Islam a comprehensive and auspicious way of life" (*Majalah* 24: 25). Furthermore, a writer argues (*Majalah* 14: 13-14) that Islam provides a complete set of teaching and discipline in this world: at personal and societal levels and even beyond. Islamic states should implement policies based on the Qur'an, *hadith* and opinions of Muslim scholars (*kerana ugama Islam tak pernah bersalahan atau pun memerangi fikiran yang waras dan tak pemah ugama itu menganjurkan sesuatu atau melarang sesuatu untuk keruntuhan manusia*). Indeed, justice and prosperity become Islam's goal - *balda jayyiba wa-rabb ghafur*. Rulers must be honest to their people. 'Ibada is not limited to worship: any good deeds for the sake of God. The Qur'an deals mostly with non-worship in a strict sense. Muslims should take life seriously to prepare their future (*dunia dan akhirat tak dapat dipisahkan*). Our backwardness now is caused by such neglect of worldly affairs.

⁵⁶ *Majalah* 17:21-2, in the context of youth as "hope of the future". The maintenance of morality is obligatory upon every individual Muslim. If necessary, special rules and police have to be established to eradicate immorality. (*Majalah* 10:7-8) Pg. Ali, a former head of Department of Religious Affairs asserts that our quest for modernity should not contradict Islam and Brunei custom. He praised the spread of schools and religious classes for adult. (*Majalah* 10:15-16) Dato Marsal Maun insists that in such crucial time, people need to show responsibility to religion and nation. The government planned to have general elections to give people opportunities to send their representatives to the State Council.

⁵⁷ According to him, *Brunei mengiktiraf wujudnya bangsa lain dan agama, tetapi ini tidaklah bermakna penerimaan terhadap konsep 'Brunei sebagai sebuah negara yang berbilang bangsa dan berbilang agama dalam amalan rasmi begara.'*

⁵⁸ (*Majalah* 17: 12,23) "... kita di negeri Brunei yang penduduknya terdiri daripada berbagai bangsa dan berbagai ugama hendaklah kita mencari semangat dan bekerjasama, khususnya dalam melahirkan keamanan dan ketenteraman."

⁵⁹ *Lambaian Islam* 1971: 77-94. In deflating the popular negative ideas of the time, a writer argues that it is wrong to assume that the present decline of the *umma* has anything to do with Islamic precepts of "do-and-don't". Indeed, modernity cannot be symbolized with night club, sauna parlour and beer. Only with knowledge Muslims may overcome the prevailing crisis and become more assertive.

⁶⁰ (*Majalah* 2: 31-32) When a person feels that success comes only from material gains, he can easily regard Islam as handicap to progress. "*Islam menyuruh berusaha*" (supported with three Qur'anic verses and sophisticated arguments). "*Islam adalah ugama pembangunan yang menggerakkan manusia ke jalan keselamatan hidup di dunia dan akhirat.... Malahan manusia wajib berusaha untuk memperoleh*

kebahagian dan menghindaan kepapaan di dalam dunia. Adalah merusak keimanan untuk mengatakan bahwa kemiskinan adalah nasib dan takdir Allah."

⁶¹ In the words of Ustadh 'Abd al-Hamid Bakal, time in this world is invaluable. Muslims should perform his responsibilities to the world and to God. They should take advantage of their short stay in this world to have enough preparation now and in the hereafter, including worship to God and good deeds toward oneself, family, society and nation (*Majalah* 27: 11-3).

⁶² Iik Arifin, "Brunei Sebagai Sebuah Pusat Jaringan (Network) Intelektual Islam di Asia Tenggara," in Dato Abu Bakar Apong (ed.), *Sumbangsih UBD: Essays on Brunei Darussalam* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Academy of Brunei Studies, 1992), pp. 148-163.

⁶³ In my opinion, several factors caused the *jariga* to be practiced at a personal level. First, the informality of the *jariga* orders did not fit into the legal reform launched by the authorities. Second, the requirement to have a licence to spread Islamic teachings deterred the mushrooming of orders in their full-fledged form. This is despite the fact that the *jariga* practices survived in local forms or practices for personal religious satisfaction. Third, the structure of Islamic leadership in the country in which the ruler topped the religio-political ladder put pressure on the *jariga* to run leaderless or to accept the status quo.

⁶⁴ Since our focus here is on the Islamic organizations, we put aside the discussion on such groupings as the Baha'is who won converts in Brunei during the 1960s.

⁶⁵ Suhaili, "Penyelewengan dari Dasar Aqidah Ahli Sunnah", p. 238.

⁶⁶ See the Mufti's *fatwa* No. 39-46/MKB.2/1971; cf. Hjh. Aishah binti OKML Haji Md. Yusof, "Pusat Da'wah Islamiah dan Islamisasi di Brunei Darussalam" (Thesis. Post-Graduate Studies, State Institute of Islamic Studies, Jakarta, 1993), p. 147-148.

⁶⁷ In 1964 the Islamic Council of Brunei formed a central committee of mosques. It became a model for local mosque committees throughout the country. In 1970 the number of mosques reached 40 with 77 officials, including 54 imams. See Aishah, "Pusat Da'wah Islamiah", p. 318.

⁶⁸ See several religious columns in *Pelita Brunei* 1966.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, December 1967.

⁷⁰ I got this impression when comparing pictures of the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, as well as my own personal observation of Brunei students in Cairo during the mid-1970s and those in recent times. Cf. Robert Malley, "Feature: A New Middle East," *The New York Review of Books* 53 (September 21, 2006): 14.

⁷¹ Aishah, "Pusat Da'wah Islamiah", pp. 338-40.

⁷² A senior officer in the Department of Religious Affairs complained in December 1979 that many prominent Bruneians wanted to negate the role of Islam in public life by among other things encouraging the opening of more places for entertainment. Yet it was these same persons who felt uneasy about the juvenile delinquency and thus advocated "quite seriously" the provision of Islamic teaching to the public. Quoted in Aishah, "Pusat Da'wah Islamiah", p. 338, note 14.

⁷³ Since independence Brunei has become member of various international and regional Islamic bodies and organizations, including the Organization of the Islamic Conference. Moreover, the Islamic influence on government officers grew stronger, see the articles by Hj. Badaruddin P. Hj. Othman, *Ugama dengan Pegawai Kerajaan* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Information Department, 1982); Hj. Badaruddin P. Hj. Othman, *Ugama Rasmi: Latar Belakang dan Sumbangan Pegawai Kerajaan* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Information Department, 1983).

⁷⁴ "As a nation with a strong Islamic basis, we have the obligation to take steps forward presenting ourselves among other countries which have set up [Islamic financial] enterprises" (*Sebagai sebuah negara yang mempunyai teras keislaman yang kuat, maka kita adalah wajib melangkah ke hadapan turut menampilkan diri bersama-sama mereka yang telah memulakan usaha*), quoted in Pehin Abdul Aziz Juned 1992: 190-1.

⁷⁵ For more information on the Ahmadiya order (Tariqa Ahmadiya) in the broader context, see Hamdan 1990. This order should not be confused with either Qadiani or Lahore Ahmadiya. The Ahmadiya order has headquarters in Egypt.

⁷⁶ For more information on the Jam'a at al-Arqam, see Judith Nagata, *The Reflowering of Malaysian Islam* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1984).

⁷⁷ For more details on the Tabligh activities in Brunei see Aishah, "Pusat Da'wah Islamiah", pp. 199-211, and on the Ahmadiya pp. 162-79.

⁷⁸ Aishah, "Pusat Da'wah Islamiah dan Islamisasi di Brunei Darussalam." Thesis. Post-Graduate Studies, State Institute of Islamic Studies, Jakarta, 1993, p.193.

⁷⁹ The first batch of Brunei students joined this institution in 1950. It consisted of three students, including the present minister of Religious Affairs. The sending of Bruneians to Al-Junied continued until 1983, when Brunei Arabic Secondary School graduates were directly admitted to al-Azhar University, without attending preparatory years at Al-Junied.

⁸⁰ The three students who finished their Islamic secondary education joined the Islamic College in 1956. They were followed by others until the early 1970s.

⁸¹ *Pelita Brunei* 19 March 1961, p. 2.

⁸² On these collections see, for example, Yahya M. S., *Perjalanan Malam Kalimantan Menuju Siang: Kumpulan Puisi Pilihan 1961-1984* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Dewan Bahasa & Pustaka, 1988), especially p. 76-9, 118-55; *Puisi Hidayat*, vol. 1 and 2. Bandar Seri Begawan: Jabatan Hal-Ehwal Ugama, Siri Rangkaian Islamiyah No.1 (1971) and 2 (1975); *Pakatan: Antologi Sajak* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1976).

⁸³ Abaza, "Changing Images of Three Generations of Azharites in Indonesia", ISEAS Occasional Paper No. 88 (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1993).

REFERENCES

- Abaza, M. (1990). *Cultural Exchange and Muslim Education: Indonesian Students in Cairo*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Bielefeld.
- Abaza, M. (1993). *Changing Images of Three Generations of Azharites in Indonesia*. Occasional Paper No. 88. Singapore: ISEAS.
- Abdul Aziz Juned, Pehin Tuan Imam (1992). *Islam di Brunei*. Vol. 1. Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei History Centre.
- Abdul Latif Hj. Ibrahim Haji (1989). Peranan Rumah-Rumah Perkumpulan dalam Masyarakat Melayu Brunei. In *Ikhtisar Budaya*. Reprint. Bandar Seri Begawan: DBP.
- 'Abdul Mokti bin Nassar, Hj. (n.d.) *On religious manuals and formulae*. Untitled manuscript. BM/Arkib/63/80.
- Abu Bakar, ed. (1955) *Undang-Undang Ugama 1955*. Bandar Brunei: Star Press.
- Ahmad Ibrahim (1989). Undang-undang Islam di Malaysia. In Ismail Hussein *et al.* (eds), *Tamadun Melayu* 1 Kuala Lumpur: DBP. Pp. 334-53.
- Aishah OKML Hj. Md. Yusof, Hjh (1991). *Pusat Da'wah Islamiyah dan Islamisasi di Brunei Darussalam*. Thesis, Post-Graduate Studies, State Institute of Islamic Studies, Jakarta.
- Alfian (1969). *Islamic Modernism in Indonesian Politics: The Muhammadiyah Movement during the Dutch Colonial Period, 1912-1942*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Wisconsin.
- Algar, Hamid (1976). The Naqshbandi Order: A Preliminary Survey of Its History and Significance. *Studia Islamica*, 44: 123-52.
- Ameen Sweeney, P. L. (ed.) (1968). Silsilah Raja-raja Berunai. *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 41(2): 1-83.
- Anonymous (1805). *Glosses and comments on Ibn 'Ata' Allah al-Iskandari's al-Hikam*. Brunei.
- Anonymous (1902). *On Islamic teachings*. Untitled manuscript Brunei.
- Asbol Hj. Mail, Hj. (1989). *Sejarah Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama*. Dissertation, Universiti of Brunei Darussalam.
- Attas, Syed M. Naquib al- (1963). *Some Aspects of Sufism as Understood and Practised among the Malays*. Singapore: Malaysia Sociological Research Institute.
- Awang bin Ahmad (1989). *Manuskrip Lama Brunei: Sumbangan dan Penglibatan Tokoh Ugama Masa Lalu*. Paper presented at the International Seminar on Islamic Civilization in the Malay World, June 1-5. Bandar Seri Begawan.
- Azyumardi Azra (1992). *The Transmission of Islamic Reformism to Indonesia: Networks of Middle Eastern and Malay-Indonesian 'ulama' in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University.
- Badaruddin P. Hj. Othman, Hj. (1982). *Ugama dengan Pegawai Kerajaan*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Information Department.
- Badaruddin P. Hj. Othman, Hj. (1983). *Ugama Rasmi: Latar Belakang dan Sumbangan Pegawai Kerajaan*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Information Department.
- Bluhm, J. (1983). A Preliminary Statement on the Dialogue Established between the Reform Magazine al-Manar and the Malayo-Indonesian World. *Indonesia Circle*, 32: 35-42.

- Blundell, P. (Frank N. Butterworth) (1924). *On the Fringe of Eastern Seas: The City of Many Waters*. New York: R. M. McBride.
- Braighlinn, G. (1992). *Ideological Innovation under Monarchy*. Comparative Asian Studies No. 9. Amsterdam: Vrij University Press.
- Brown, D. E. (1970). *Brunei: The Structure and History of A Bornean Malay Sultanate*. Monograph of the Brunei Museum Journal No. 2.2.
- Brown, D. E. (1988). *Hierarchy, History and Human Nature: The Social Origins of Social Consciousness*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Bruinessen, Martin van (1990). Kitab kuning: Books in Arabic script used in the pesantren milieu. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 146: 226-69.
- Brunei Annual Report (BAR)* 1906-59.
- Burke, E. III, & Lapidus, I. (eds.) (1988). *Islam, Politics and Social*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cominins, D. D. (1990). *Islamic Reform: Politics and Social Change in Late Ottoman Syria*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Deliar Noer (1973). *The Modernist Muslim Movement in Indonesia 1900-1942*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Federspiel, H. M. (1970). *Persatuan Islam: Islamic Reform in Twentieth Century Indonesia*. Monograph Series No. 47, Modern Indonesian Project.
- Friedmann, Yohanan (1971). *Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi*. Montreal: McGill University Press.
- Gibb, H. A. R. (1962). *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Gibb, H. A. R. (1982). *Islam: A Historical Survey*. First published in 1952 under the title *Mohammedanism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hawash Abdullah (1980). *Perkembangan Ilmu Tasawuf dan Tokoh-Tokohnya di Nusantara*. Surabaya: al-Ikhlas.
- Hickling, R. H. (1955). *Memorandum upon Brunei Constitutional History and Practice*. Typescript. Brunei Museum Library.
- Hooker, M. B. (1984). *Islamic Law in South-East Asia*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Hooker, M. B. and Virginia Matheson (1988). Jawi Literature in Patani: The Maintenance of an Islamic Tradition. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 61.1: 1-86.
- Horton, A. V. M. (1984). *The British Residency in Brunei, 1906-1959*. Occasional Paper No. 6. Hull: University of Hull, Centre for South-East Asian Studies.
- Hussainmiya, B. A. (1995). *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III and Britain: The Making of Brunei Darussalam*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Iik Arifin Mansurnoor (1991). Brunei Sebagai Sebuah Pusat Jaringan (network) Intelektual Islam di Asia Tenggara. In Dato Hj Abu Bakar Hj Apong *et al.* (eds.), *Sumbangsih UBD: Essays on Brunei Darussalam*. Bandar Seri Begawan: University of Brunei Darussalam, Academy of Brunei Studies. Pp. 148-163.
- Iik Arifin Mansurnoor (1992). Intellectual Tradition in a Malay World: Ulama and Education in Brunei. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 3(3): 34-60.
- Iik Arifin Mansurnoor (2005). L'islam à Brunei entre renaissance et radicalisme. *Les Cahiers de l'Orient*, 78(2): 46-47.
- Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama ed. (1981). *Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama 1954-1979*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama.
- Johns, A. H. (1984). Islam in the Malay World: An Explanatory Survey with some Reference to Quranic Exegesis. In Israel, R. and Johns, A. H. (eds.), *Islam in Asia: Southeast and East Asia*. Boulder: Westview Press. Pp. 115-161.

- Johns, A. H. (1988). Quranic Exegesis in the Malay World: In Search of a Profile. In Rippin, A. (ed.), *Approaches to the History of the Qur'an*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Pp. 257-87.
- Jong, F. de (1978). *Turuq and Turuq-Linked Institutions in Nineteenth Century Egypt: A Historical Study in Organizational Dimensions of Islamic Mysticism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Landau, J. M. (1990). *The Politics of Pan-Islam: Ideology and Organization*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Laws of Brunei (1984). *Religious Council and Kadis Courts*. (Revised Edition) Chapter 77, Bandar Seri Begawan.
- Lewy, G. (1962). *Religion and Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lockard, C. A. (1973). *The Southeast Asian Town in Historical Perspective: A Social History of Kuching, Malaysia, 1820-1970*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Wisconsin.
- Low, H. (1848). *Sarawak; Inhabitants and Productions: Being Notes during A Residence in that Country with H. H. The Rajah Brooke*. London: Frank Cass.
- M. Chatib Quzwain (1985). *Mengenal Allah: Suatu Studi mengenai Ajaran Tasawwuf Syekh 'Abdus-Samad al-Palimbani*. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- Mardin, S. (1991). The Naksibendi Order in Turkish History. In Tapper, R. (ed.), *Islam in Modern Turkey: Religion, Politics and Literature in a Secular State*. London: I. B. Tauris. Pp. 121-142.
- Masnon binti Haji Ibrahim, Hajah (1988). *Perlaksanaan Undang-undang Keluarga Islam di Brunei dan Perbandingannya dengan Undang-undang Keluarga Islam di Sarawak*. M.A. thesis, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi.
- Matassim Hj. Jibah (1983). Perkembangan Persekolahan Melayu di Brunei dalam Pentadbiran Sistem Residen 1906-1959. *Brunei Museum Journal*, 5.3 :1-26.
- Matheson, V. (1984). *Perceptions of the Hajj: Five Malay Texts*. Research Notes and Discussions Paper No. 46. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Matussin Omar, Hj. (n. d.). *Pengarang Syair Rakis - Pengiran Syahbandar Mohammad Salleh Ibnu Pengiran Syarmayuda-, Cita-cita Sosial dan Politiknya*. unpublished paper. Bandar Seri Begawan.
- McDonnell, M. B. (1986). *The Conduct of Hajj from Malaysia and Its Socioeconomic Impact on Malay Society: A Descriptive and Analytical Study, 1860-1981*. Ph. D. thesis, Columbia University.
- Mohammed Zain Hj. Serudin, Pehin Dato Hj. (1992). *Brunei Darussalam: Persepsi Sejarah dan Masyarakatnya*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Azza.
- Meglio, R. R. di (1970). Arab Trade with Indonesia and the Malay Peninsula from the 8th to the 16th Century. In Richards, D. S. (ed.), *Islam and the Trade of Asia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 105-35.
- Mehden, F. R. von der (1993). *Two Worlds of Islam: Interaction between Southeast Asia and the Middle East*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Menon, K. U. (1988). *Negara Brunei Darussalam from Protectorate to Statehood: The Ceaseless Quest for Security*. Ph. D. thesis, Victoria University, Wellington.
- Minutes of State Council from 29th June, 1907 to 31st August, 1949* (n. d.). Bandar Seri Begawan.
- Mohammad Pg. Hj. Abd. Rahman, Pg. Hj. (1991). *Kemasukan dan Perkembangan Islam di Borneo British dengan Tumpuan Khas ke atas Brunei Darussalam (Abad 13-20 Masihi)*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
- Mohd Jamil al-Sufri, Pehin Dato Hj. (1992). *Liku-Liku Perjuangan Pencapaian Kemerdekaan Negara Brunei Darussalam*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei History Centre.
- Nagata, J. (1984). *The Reflowering of Malaysian Islam*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Nieuwenhuijze, C. A. O. van (1995). Islamism - A Defiant Utopianism. *Die Welt des Islams* 35.1: 1-36.
- Mohammed Nor bin Ngah (1984). *Kitab Jawi: Islamic Thought of the Malay Muslim Scholars*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Muhammad Sa'd bin Juru Apang, Pehin (n. d.). *On religious manuals and tariqa*. Untitled manuscript: BM/Arkib/69/80.
- Mohammed Zain bin Hj. Serudin, Pehin Dato Hj. (1983). *Peranan Ugama Islam dalam Pendidikan*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama.
- Mohammed Zain bin Hj. Serudin, Pehin Dato Hj. (1988). *Pengajian Islam di Brunei: Satu Tinjauan*. Bandar Sed Begawan: Pusat Da'wah Islamiah.
- Pameran Sejarah Perkembangan Islam di Brunei* (1979.) Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei Museum.
- Pelita Brunei*. 1956-1996. Bandar Seri Begawan: Government Printing Department, Prime Minister's Office.
- Penders, C. L. (ed.) (1977). *Indonesia: Selected Documents on Colonialism and Nationalism 1830-1942*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.
- Puisi Hidayat* Vol. 1 (1971). Bandar Seri Begawan: Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama.
- Puisi Hidayat* Vol. 2 (1975). Bandar Seri Begawan: Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama.
- Rahman, Fazlur (1966). *Islam*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rahman, Fazlur (1984). *Islam and Modernity: Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.
- Ranjit Singh, D. S. (1984). *Brunei 1839-1983: The Problems of Political Survival*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Rashidah binti Hj. Mohd. Hanifah (?-1990). *Sejarah Awal Perkembangan Pelajaran Ugama Sehingga 1959*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Pusat Da'wah Islamiah.
- A. V. M. Horton (ed.) (1987). *Report on Brunei in 1904 M. S. H. McArthur*. Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series No. 74.
- Roff, W. R. (1967). *The Origins of Malay Nationalism*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Roff, W. R. (1984). The Meccan Pilgrimage: Its Meanings for Southeast Asian Islam. In R. Israeli & Johns, A. H. (eds.), *Islam in Asia: Southeast and East Asia*. Boulder: Westview Press. Pp. 238-45.
- Roff, W. R. (ed.) (1974). *Kelantan: Religion, Society and Politics in a Malay State*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Sachedina, Abdulaziz A. (1991). *Islamic Messianism*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Shafruddin Hashim (1996). Ide Kenegaraan dan Negara Kecil: Satu Pengalaman Brunei Darussalam. In Abdul Latif et al. (eds.), *Purih: A Collection of Essay on Brunei Darussalam*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Academy of Brunei Studies. Pp. 337-42.
- Smith, W. C. (1957). *Islam in Modern History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Snouck Hurgronje, C. (1970). *Mekka in the Latter Part of the 19th Century: Daily Life, Customs and Learning. The Moslems of the East-Indian Archipelago*. Tr. J. H. Monahan. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- St. John, S. (1862). *Life in the Forests of the Far East: Travels in Sabah and Sarawak in the 1860s*. Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1862. Reprint. 1986.
- The Subsidiary Legislation of Brunei* (1958). Bandar Seri Begawan: Government Printer.
- Suhaili bin Hj. Hassan et al. (1986). *Mengenal Tokoh-tokoh Agama di Brunei*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei Museum.

- Suhaili bin Hj. Hassan et al. (1992). *Tokoh-Tokoh Agama di Brunei Darussalam: Pengenalan Ringkas*. Special Publication No. 23. Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei Museum.
- Tibbetts, G. R. (1979). *A Study of the Arabic Texts Containing Material on Southeast Asia*. Leiden: Brill.
- Treacher, W. H. (1889). British Borneo: Sketches of Brunai, Sarawak, Labuan and North Borneo. *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 20: 13-80
- Treacher, W. H. (1890). British Borneo: Sketches of Brunai, Sarawak, Labuan and North Borneo. *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 21: 19-122.
- Tregonning, K. G. (1965). *A History of Modern Sabah (North Borneo, 1881-1963)*. Singapore: University of Malaya Press.
- Undang-Undang Ugama (1955), edited by Abu Bakar. Kuala Belait: Government Printer.
- Van Bruinessen, M. (1990). The Origins and Development of the Naqshbandi Order in Indonesia. *Der Islam*, 67: 150-79.
- Van Bruinessen, M. (1990). Kitab Kuning: Books in Arabic Script used in the Pesantren Milieu. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 146: 226-69.
- Voll, J. O. (1980). Hadith Scholars and Tariqahs: An Ulama Group in 18th Century Haramayn and Their Impact in the Islamic World. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 15: 264-73.
- Voll, J. O. (1983). Renewal and Reform in Islamic History: Tajdid and Islah. In Esposito, J. L. (ed.), *Voices of Resurgent Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983. Pp. 32-47.
- Vredenberg, J. (1962). The Haddj: Some of Its Features and Functions in Indonesia. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 118: 91-154.
- Watt, W. M. (1988). *Islamic Fundamentalism and Modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Wertheim, W. F. (1956). *Indonesian Society in Transition: A Study of Social Change*. The Hague: van Hoeve.
- Wink, A. (1991). *Al-Hind: The Making of the Indo-Islamic World*. Leiden: Brill.
- Yahya bin Hj. Ibrahim, Pehin Dato Hj. (1989). *Pehin-Pehin Manteri Ugama Sebagai Institusi dan Peranan Mereka dalam Pentadbiran dan Pemerintahan Negara di Brunei*. Paper for the International Seminar on Islamic Civilization in the Malay World, 1-5 June. Bandar Seri Begawan.
- Yahya M. S. (1988). *Perjalanan Malam Kalimantan Menuju Siang*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Dewan Bahasa dengan Pustaka.
- Yegar, M. (1979). *Islam and Islamic Institutions in British Malaya*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press.
- Zamakhshari Dhofier (1982). *Tradisi Pesantren: Studi Tentang Pandangan Hidup Kyai*. Jakarta: LP3ES.

SISTEM SOSIAL MASYARAKAT TRADISIONAL BRUNEI ABAD KE-19: SUATU PENGENALAN RINGKAS

ISMAIL BIN HAJI AWANG NORDIN

ABSTRAK

Kertas kerja ini akan cuba memaparkan keadaan masyarakat tradisional di Negara Brunei Darussalam di dalam abad yang ke-19 dengan menumpukan kepada kedudukan status sosial yang mewarnai kehidupan harian bermasyarakat orang-orang Brunei. Seperti juga di negeri-negeri Melayu di Nusantara, masyarakat tradisional Brunei mengandungi dua komponen yang saling memerlukan iaitu golongan pemerintah (sultan) dan golongan diperintah (rakyat). Golongan pertama tidak boleh berdiri tanpa sokongan golongan kedua. Dari segi struktur masyarakatnya pula terdapat golongan tertentu yang sangat memainkan peranan penting di dalam kehidupan masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam. Golongan ini terdiri daripada Raja-Raja Betaras (Core Nobility), Pengiran-Pengiran (Nobility), Pehin-Pehin Menteri dan rakyat. Hubungan sosial antara mereka ini sangat memerlukan antara satu sama lain, tetapi pergerakan peringkat sosial sangat terbatas. Dengan kata lain, mobiliti sosial dari peringkat bawah ke atas sangat terbatas.

ABSTRACT

This article attempts to highlight Brunei Darussalam's traditional society in the 19th century, focusing on the social status which coloured the daily life of Bruneians. Like in other Malay states in Southeast Asia, Brunei's society had two important components, the ruler and the ruled, and the former could not stand on its own without the support of the latter. Brunei's traditional societal structure consisted of several groups that played important roles. These groups were the Core Nobility, Nobility, Pehins and the masses. Social relations among these groups were complementary but their social mobility, especially their upward mobility, was rather limited.

Masyarakat tradisional Brunei abad ke-19 dapat dibahagikan kepada dua kelompok sosial yang sangat memerlukan antara satu sama lain. Kelas pemerintah iaitu raja atau sultan dan kelas diperintah iaitu rakyat. Pembahagian ini adalah serupa dengan pembahagian masyarakat di dunia Melayu. Selain daripada itu terdapat juga golongan elit tradisional Melayu Negara Brunei Darussalam abad ke-19 yang berpengaruh di dalam sistem masyarakat di abad tersebut. Golongan ini adalah orang-orang yang mempunyai kuasa dalam lingkungan pengaruh mereka. Golongan pemerintah adalah golongan yang sangat sedikit manakala kelas yang diperintah adalah terlalu banyak dari segi bilangannya. Kelas pemerintah yang paling atas adalah raja atau sultan. Kemudian di ikuti oleh wazir-wazir, cheteria-cheteria, menteri-menteri dan ketua kampung, bagi pimpinan kampung. Manakala kelas diperintah adalah terdiri daripada rakyat Brunei, rakyat bukan Brunei dan hamba.

Golongan-golongan tersebut menggambarkan keadaan masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam dalam abad ke-19 yang diperintah oleh sultan-sultan berikut: Sultan Muhammad Tajudin (1795-1804, 1804-1807), Sultan Muhammad Jamalul Alam I (1804), Sultan Muhammad Kanzul Alam (1807-1828), Sultan Muhammad Alam (1827-1828), Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin II (1828-1852), Sultan Abdul Mumin (1852-1885) dan Sultan Hashim Jalilul Alam Aqamaddin (1885-1906).¹ Dalam hal mentadbir negeri, sultan-sultan itu dibantu oleh pegawai-pegawai kerajaan tradisional yang terdiri dari wazir-wazir, cheteria-cheteria, pehin-pehin menteri serta pegawai-pegawai tradisional lain.

Golongan rakyat adalah hamba kepada sultan. Sebagai rakyat semestinya menanamkan sifat-sifat taat setia, hormat dan rendah diri kepada sultan. Hubungan rakyat dengan sultan sangat penting kerana jika tidak ada rakyat maka tidak ada sultan, begitu juga sebaliknya. Hubungan sultan dengan rakyat ini diperkuatkan lagi dengan ungkapan-ungkapan seperti

"Raja untuk rakyat dan rakyat untuk raja", "Raja tidak boleh zalim" dan "Rakyat tidak boleh derhaka kepada rajanya".² Ungkapan ini sebenarnya selaras dengan perjanjian sosial yang sudah lama wujud antara Sang Sapurba dengan Demang Lebar Daun di Palembang yang menekankan bahawa raja tidak boleh zalim atau menganiaya terhadap rakyatnya dan rakyat mesti setia kepada rajanya.

Sistem masyarakat tradisional negara Brunei Darussalam ada hubungkaitnya dengan sistem politik dan pentadbiran tradisional negara Brunei Darussalam. Kajian-kajian awal tentang sistem politik dan pentadbiran tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam telah dibuat oleh D.E. Brown, bertajuk, *Brunei: The Structure and History of a Bornean Malay Sultanate*, monograf siri no.2, 1970, terbitan Jabatan Muzium Brunei. Selain itu data-data mengenai sistem politik dan pentadbiran tradisional ini banyak terdapat dalam *Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei* versi Amin Sweeney dan juga dalam rencana-rencana yang ditulis oleh pegawai-pegawai Inggeris, umpamanya "Two Colonial Office Memoranda on the History of Brunei" oleh Sir R.E Stubbs dalam JMBRAS, Vol. XLI, Part 2, 1968. Di samping kajian politik dan pentadbiran, kajian-kajian mereka juga menyentuh tentang masyarakat tradisional Brunei. Dalam abad ke-20, ramai sarjana-sarjana tempatan yang membuat kajian atau menyentuh tentang susunlapis masyarakat tradisional Brunei dan juga sistem politik dan pentadbiran zaman lampau. Umpamanya Prof. Madya Dr. Haji Hashim Bin Hj. Abdul Hamid dalam "Islam Di Brunei Darussalam: Satu Analisis Sosio-Budaya", iaitu buku berdasarkan tesis kajian Ph.D beliau.

Dalam kertas-kerja ini saya akan cuba menggambarkan sistem politik dan pentadbiran tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam dalam abad ke-19 dan cuba mengaitkannya dengan sistem masyarakat tradisional Brunei dengan menghadkan kepada hubungannya dengan status sosial masyarakat tradisional Brunei. Sistem politik dan pentadbiran tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam adalah sistem beraja. Sistem ini berterusan sejak penubuhan kerajaan awal Brunei sebelum Islam dan selepas Islam dan kekal berlanjutan hingga sekarang ini. Sistem ini sentiasa dijamin dan akan sentiasa berterusan di masa-masa yang akan datang seperti yang termaktub di dalam pengisytiharan kemerdekaan Negara Brunei Darussalam dalam tahun 1984.³ Sebagai negara Beraja, maka raja atau sultan adalah pemerintah mutlak di Negara Brunei Darussalam.

Dari segi pentadbiran pula, pentadbiran tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam dalam abad ke-19 adalah terbahagi kepada tujuh bahagian, iaitu:

1. Sultan
2. Wazir-Wazir
3. Cheteria-Cheteria
4. Menteri-Menteri
5. Menteri Pengalasan Damit
6. Menteri Darat
7. Ketua Kampung

Bagi tanah-tanah jajahan terdapat pentadbiran tanah-tanah jajahan. Di dalam hal pentadbiran ini, kuasa yang paling tinggi dan teratas adalah sultan. Sultan adalah pemerintah mutlak bagi Negara Brunei Darussalam. Ianya tidak boleh dipertikaikan lagi kerana sudah menjadi teradat dan turun temurun bahawa Negara Brunei Darussalam diperintah oleh seorang raja atau sultan. Tanggungjawab seorang sultan adalah untuk memastikan keamanan negara terjamin dan memberikan kesejahteraan dan kebajikan kepada rakyatnya. Selain itu, mempertahankan negara ini daripada kuasa-kuasa asing selagi mana ianya mampu berbuat demikian. Sebagai contoh ialah peranan yang dimainkan oleh Sultan Hashim Jalilul Alam Aqamaddin dalam menyelamatkan negeri Brunei daripada terus diambil oleh keluarga pemerintah Brookes di Sarawak di akhir abad

ke-19 dan di awal abad ke-20. Selain itu, sultan juga adalah ketua negara, ketua ugama, ketua kanun, ketua adat dan resam.

Sebagai pemerintah negeri yang besar, luas dan bertanah jajahan, di dalam pentadbiran, sultan dibantu oleh pegawai-pegawai baginda iaitu empat orang wazir-wazir yang penting: Pengiran Bendahara Permai Suara, Pengiran DiGadong Sahibol Mal, Pengiran Pemancha Sahibol Ra'e dan Pengiran Temenggong Sahibol Bahar. Wazir-wazir ini diamanahkan untuk menjalankan tugas-tugas yang tertentu. Mereka mempunyai bidang kuasa masing-masing yang tidak tindih-menindih. Dengan adanya pembahagian tugas ini sudah tentu dapat melicinkan dan melancarkan lagi pemerintahan dan pentadbiran negara.

Pengiran Bendahara Permai Suara adalah wazir yang terpenting sekali, kerana beliau adalah orang yang sangat terdekat dengan sultan dan menjawat jawatan timbalan sultan apabila sultan berangkat keluar negeri.⁴ Selain daripada itu, beliau juga pegawai yang tertinggi dalam hal ehwal Agama Islam.⁵ Tugas lainnya ialah menjadi pengetua tertinggi untuk menjalankan kekuasaan sultan dan menjadi pengetua tertinggi dalam kehakiman.⁶

Wazir yang kedua penting ialah Pengiran DiGadong Sahibol Mal. Antara tugas-tugas beliau ialah: Menjadi pengetua tertinggi bagi kekayaan negara, menjadi pengetua tertinggi dalam ketenteraan dan menjadi pengetua tertinggi bagi negara-negara yang ditakluk.⁷

Pengiran Pemancha Sahibol Ra'e pula bertugas sebagai: Pengetua tertinggi dalam urusan hal ehwal dalam negeri, pengetua tertinggi dalam hal ehwal adat istiadat, resam dan kanun negara. Tugasnya lain ialah menjadi pengetua dalam mengesahkan perkara-perkara yang dijalankan. Jikalau perkara-perkara itu difikirkannya tidak munasabah, bolehlah perkara itu dibatakkannya.⁸

Wazir yang keempat ialah Pengiran Temenggong Sahibol Bahar. Tugas dan tanggungjawab beliau ialah: Menjadi pengetua tertinggi dalam hal ehwal ketenteraan laut, menjadi pengetua tertinggi dalam hal urusan pemerintahan negeri-negeri yang baru ditaklok. Tetapi apabila masa penaklukan selesai ianya diserahkan kepada Pengiran DiGadong Sahibol Mal. Tugas lain ialah menjadi pengetua tertinggi dalam hal ehwal penerangan dan pengetua tertinggi bagi orang-orang yang terukum.⁹

Kemudian, wazir-wazir ini pula dibantu oleh pegawai-pegawai diraja yang terdiri daripada pengiran-pengiran Cheteria yang mengandungi Cheteria Empat, Cheteria Lapan, Cheteria Enambelas dan Cheteria Tiga Puluh Dua. Kesemua cheteria-cheteria ini adalah 'orang-orang bergelar'.¹⁰

Di bawah cheteria-cheteria ialah Pehin-Pehin Menteri. Golongan ini juga terdiri daripada 'orang-orang bergelar'. Seperti cheteria, Pehin-Pehin Menteri juga mengandungi Menteri Empat; Lapan; Enam belas dan Tiga Puluh Dua, dan ini termasuklah Menteri-Menteri Darat (land chiefs). Wazir-wazir, Cheteria-cheteria, Pehin-pehin menteri dan Menteri-menteri darat adalah pegawai-pegawai tradisional kerajaan Negara Brunei Darussalam khususnya dalam abad yang ke-19 yang mana jawatannya dilantik oleh Sultan sama ada ianya berciri ataupun tidak berciri.

Tingkat pentadbiran yang paling bawah sekali ialah ketua kampung. Perlantikan ketua kampung ditentukan oleh penduduk-penduduk kampung masing-masing.¹¹

Struktur pentadbiran tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam seperti yang telah diterangkan tadi dari segi gambar rajah adalah seperti berikut:

Sultan Dan Yang Dipertuan
Wazir-wazir (4)
Cheteria-cheteria (4, 8, 16, 32)
Pehin Menteri (4, 8, 16, 32 termasuk Menteri Pengalasan Damit)
Menteri-menteri Darat
Ketua Kampung

Dalam sistem masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam khususnya dalam abad ke-19, kedudukan sultan dan pembesar-pembesar negara ini tidak berubah iaitu kedudukan atau hierarki dari atas ke bawah. Status sosial masyarakat itu lebih luas lagi pembahagiannya kerana ia melibatkan keseluruhan komponen-komponen masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam abad ke-19. Menurut kajian D. E. Brown,¹² stratifikasi masyarakat Negara Brunei Darussalam adalah terdiri dari:

Sultan dan Wazir-wazir (Raja-Raja Betaras)

Cheteria (Pengiran-Pengiran yang bergelar)

Pehin-Pehin Menteri (Golongan aristokrat)

Rakyat Brunei

Rakyat bukan Brunei

Hamba

Sultan dan wazir-wazir terdiri daripada raja-raja betaras (core nobility). Cheteria pula adalah pengiran-pengiran yang bergelar. Ianya terdiri daripada pengiran-pengiran yang disampiri gelaran (common nobility). Wazir-wazir selalunya adalah orang-orang yang paling dekat dengan Sultan dari segi kekeluargaan. Begitu juga dengan pengiran-pengiran cheteria.

Pehin-pehin menteri terdiri dari orang-orang biasa dan bukannya golongan raja-raja betaras atau pengiran-pengiran. Status pehin-pehin menteri adalah paling atas di kalangan rakyat biasa tetapi kedudukannya berada di bawah cheteria-cheteria atau pengiran-pengiran biasa yang bergelar.¹³ D.E Brown mengkategorikan mereka ini sebagai golongan aristokrat.

Di bawah golongan aristokrat adalah rakyat biasa (orang-orang Brunei). Manakala di bawah rakyat biasa pula ialah rakyat yang bukan orang-orang Brunei. Status sosial yang paling bawah sekali dalam masyarakat tradisional Brunei dalam abad ke-19 ialah golongan hamba. Gambaran ini menunjukkan struktur masyarakat tradisional Brunei dalam abad ke-19 yang Darussalam dalam abad tersebut.

Dengan berdasarkan strata sosial di atas, status sosial masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam sebahagian besarnya dihubungkan dengan kedudukan mereka di dalam pentadbiran Negara Brunei Darussalam. Umpamanya jikalau kedudukan Sultan adalah yang tertinggi dalam struktur pentadbiran Negara maka status baginda juga yang tertinggi di idalam sistem sosial masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam. Kedudukan ini diikuti pula oleh status sosial wazir-wazir yang mana mereka ini dikategorikan sebagai raja-raja betaras. Ini diikuti pula oleh raja-raja tidak bertaras iaitu cheteria-cheteria. Di kalangan rakyat biasa golongan aristokrat (pehin-pehin menteri) adalah yang paling atas. Kemudian diikuti oleh golongan rakyat (orang-orang Brunei), orang-orang bukan Brunei dan seterusnya hamba. Pada realitinya sistem ini berterusan sehingga awal abad ke-20, tetapi tanpa komponen rakyat yang bukan orang Brunei dan juga hamba.

Untuk mendapat kedudukan yang tinggi dan dihormati di dalam masyarakat bukanlah suatu perkara yang mudah. Ianya berkehendakkan syarat-syarat yang tertentu, yang membolehkannya mendapat sesuatu gelaran. Dalam *Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei*,¹⁴ ada menyebutkan empat syarat untuk seseorang itu dikurniakan gelaran oleh Sultan, iaitu, "...pertama orang berbangsa, kedua orang yang bijaksana lagi berakal, ketiga orang yang berani lagi perkasa pada barang pekerjaannya, keempat orang itu takut akan rajanya, maka

jikalau tiada salah satu syarat yang tersebut di atas maka tiadalah sempurna dijadikan wazir atau menteri atau hulubalang atau pegawai".

Dalam masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam jikalau seseorang itu digelar oleh Sultan maka kedudukannya dalam masyarakat adalah sangat tinggi dan dihormati. Selain daripada itu, mereka juga digalati di dalam masyarakat. Selain diukur dengan gelaran, mereka juga diukur dengan harta kekayaan yang mereka miliki.¹⁵ Dalam sistem masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam, kedudukan mereka dibezakan mengikut peringkat status sosial mereka. Ini dapat dilihat dari segi kedudukan mereka dalam majlis-majlis beristiadat dan keramaian. Dalam majlis adat istiadat umpamanya tempat duduk sultan, wazir-wazir, cheteria-cheteria, pehin-pehin menteri dan lain-lain telah ditentukan. Waimapun sekarang ini, kedudukan ini masih berfungsi. Di samping itu keluarga-keluarga mereka juga mendapat penghormatan mengikut pangkat dan status mereka.

Taraf dan kedudukan mereka dalam masyarakat juga dilihat dari segi sapaan atau ganti nama diri orang pertama dan kedua. Tujuannya ialah untuk menunjukkan peringkat ketuaan seseorang, rasa hormat dan kesantunan masyarakat. Umpamanya sapaan bagi sultan atau raja ialah 'Duli Tuan Patik' dan 'Hamba Duli Tuan Patik'. Bagi wazir-wazir pula ialah 'Hamba Tuanku' dan 'Hamba Duli Tuanku'. Pengiran-pengiran cheteria dan pengiran-pengiran ialah 'Tuan Peramba' dan 'Peramba'. Pehin-pehin menteri pula ialah dengan perkataan 'Kaola'. Begitulah seterusnya dan seterusnya.¹⁶

Pergerakan sosial atau mobiliti sosial dari bawah ke atas dalam masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam adalah sangat terhad atau terbatas sekali. Ini adalah kerana masyarakat tradisional Brunei sangat mementingkan darjat dan keturunan. Jarang sekali atau mungkin tidak pernah berlaku golongan rakyat biasa berkahwin dengan golongan pengiran-pengiran. Apatah lagi berkahwin dengan golongan Raja-Raja Betaras. Dari segi perkahwinan ini, kalau ianya dari golongan Raja-Raja Betaras adalah lebih baik berkahwin dengan golongan yang dalam lingkungan yang sama taraf dengannya. Selalunya, rakyat biasa akan merasa takut untuk membuat hubungan kekeluargaan dengan golongan pengiran-pengiran jika pihak golongan orang biasa itu orang perempuan, apatah lagi orang lelaki. Dalam hal lain, rakyat biasa juga boleh dinaikkan status sosialnya apabila ianya mendapat gelaran daripada sultan. Umpamanya gelaran pehin-pehin menteri, damong, pateh, pengarah, panglima dan sebagainya.

Sebagai kesimpulan, masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam dalam abad ke-19 dikawal, dalam kehidupan harian mereka oleh suatu sistem yang amat unik. Status sosial mereka adalah berhierarki iaitu dari atas ke bawah. Status ini dihubungkan dengan status pegawai-pegawai itu di dalam pentadbiran negara. Status sultan dalam sistem politik dan pentadbiran serta dalam sistem sosial masyarakat tradisional Negara Brunei Darussalam, khususnya dalam abad yang ke-19 adalah di dalam peringkat yang tertinggi sekali. Ini di ikuti oleh wazir-wazir, cheteria-cheteria, pehin-pehin menteri, menteri-menteri pedalaman, ketua kampung, rakyat biasa orang Brunei, rakyat biasa orang bukan Brunei dan hamba. Pergerakan sosial di peringkat masyarakat masing-masing adalah lebih kerap. Manakala pergerakan sosial dari bawah ke atas sangat terbatas. Masyarakat Melayu tradisional Brunei dalam abad ke-19 sangat mementingkan darjat dan keturunan. Sungguhpun begitu, ianya telah mengalami perubahan yang boleh dikatakan sangat drastik pada abad ke-20.

NOTA-NOTA

¹ Mohd Jamil Al-Sufri (Pehin Dato Dr.), "Brunei Di Tengah-Tengah Nusantara", dalam *Brunei Di Tengah-Tengah Nusantara: Kumpulan Kertaskerja Seminar Sejarah Brunei*, Jabatan Pusat Sejarah, 1994, hal. 35.

² P.M.Yusuf, "Adat Istiadat Diraja Brunei Darussalam" dalam *Jurnal Muzium Brunei*, Jabatan Muzium Brunei, 1975, hal. 43.

³ Lihat Pemasyhuran Kemerdekaan, 1984.

⁴ D. E. Brown, *The Structure and History of a Bornean Malay Sultanate*, Monograph of the Brunei Museum Journal 2.2, 1970, hal.106.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ P. M. Yusuf., *op.cit.*, hal. 45.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Hashim Bin Hj Abdul Hamid, *Islam Di Brunei Darussalam: Suatu Analisa Sosio-Budaya*, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, 2003, hal. 35.

¹¹ D. S. Ranjit Singh, *Brunei 1839-1983: The Problems of Political Survival*, OUP., Singapore, 1991, hal. 26.

¹² Lihat juga D.E.Brown., hal. 241.

¹³ D. E. Brown, *op. cit.*, hal. 87.

¹⁴ Ibid., hal. 88.

¹⁵ Amin Sweeney, "Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei", dalam *JMBRAS*, Vol. XLI, Part 2, 1968, hal. 21.

¹⁶ Lihat Muhammad Isa Othman, *Politik Tradisional Kedah 1681-1942*, DPB., Kuala Lumpur, 1990, passim.

¹⁷ Hashim Bin Hj Abdul Hamid, *op.cit.*, hal. 57-58.

RUJUKAN

- Amin Sweeney, P. L. (1968). Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei. *Journal Malaysian Brnach of the Royal Asiatic Society*, XLI(2): 1-82.
- Brown, D. E. (1970). *The Structure and History of a Bornean Malay Sultanate*. Monograph of the Brunei Museum Journal.
- Hashim Bin Hj. Abdul Hamid. (199). *Cerocok Budaya Brunei*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Universiti Brunei Darussalam.
- Hashim Bin Hj. Abdul Hamid (2003). *Islam Di Brunei Darussalam: Suatu Analisa Sosio-Budaya*. Bandar Seri Begawan:Universiti Brunei Darussalam.
- Horton, A. V. M. (1985). *The Development of Brunei During the British Residential Era 1906-1959: A Sultanate Regenerated*. PhD thesis, University of Hull.
- Muhammad Isa Othman (1990). *Politik Tradisional Kedah*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Yusuf, P. M. (1975). "Adat Istiadat Diraja Brunei Darussalam. *Brunei Museum Journal*, 3(3): 43-108.
- Mohd Jamil Al-Sufri (1994). Brunei Di Tengah-Tengah Nusantara. Dalam *Brunei Di Tengah-Tengah Nusantara: Kumpulan Kertaskerja Seminar Sejarah Brunei*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Jabatan Pusat Sejarah.
- Pemasyhuran Kemerdekaan, 1984.Brunei
- Ranjit Singh, D. S. (1991). *Brunei 1839-1983: The Problems of Political Survival*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.

SEJARAH DAN STRUKTUR MASYARAKAT TRADISIONAL BRUNEI

MOHD YUSOP DAMIT

ABSTRAK

Artikel ini membicarakan sejarah dan struktur masyarakat Brunei sebelum abad ke-20. Masyarakat Brunei tradisional terdiri dari dua golongan, iaitu golongan bangsawan atau diraja sebagai lapisan atas dan golongan rakyat, lapisan bawah. Kumpulan bangsawan adalah terdiri dari puak Brunei yang dipercayai berhijrah dari Funan atau Seriwijaya dan menubuhkan kerajaan Brunei. Golongan rakyat terdiri dari puak asli yang diperintah oleh puak Brunei. Kedua-dua golongan tersebut terbahagi kepada beberapa susun lapis mengikut keutamaan masing-masing. Golongan bangsawan terdiri dari Pengiran bertaras dan Pengiran kebanyakan. Pengiran bertaras terdiri dari keluarga diraja yang memerintah dan pengiran kebanyakan pula adalah terdiri dari keturunan diraja pada masa lalu. Sementara golongan rakyat juga mempunyai susun lapis tersendiri. Lapisan paling atas bagi golongan ini adalah aristokrat, lapisan kedua adalah rakyat biasa dan paling bawah ulun atau hamba. Selain itu seluruh rakyat terbahagi pula kepada lima golongan, iaitu hamba Raja, hamba Pengiran Bendahara, hamba Pengiran Digadong, hamba Pengiran Temenggong dan hamba Pengiran Pemanca. Tiap-tiap golongan tersebut di atas mempunyai tugas dan peranan tertentu dalam masyarakat.

ABSTRACT

This article discusses briefly the history and structure of Brunei society before the 20th century. Brunei society was divided into two groups, the nobility in the upper stratum and the subjects in the lower stratum. The nobility were ethnically Bruneis who were believed to have migrated from Funan Kingdom or Srivijayan Kingdom, and they founded the Brunei kingdom. The subjects were the indigenous people who were colonised by the Bruneis. Each of the two groups was further subdivided into several strata according to their importance. The nobility consisted of the core nobility, who were the close family members of the ruling raja, and the common nobility, who were descendants of past rulers. The subjects were divided into the aristocracy, commoners and the slaves. Meanwhile the whole society was further divided vertically into five groups: the followers of the raja, the followers of the Pengiran Bendahara, the followers of the Pengiran Digadong, the followers of Pengiran Temenggong and the followers of Pengiran Pemanca. Their function was to serve their masters.

PENGENALAN

Agak sukar untuk mengenal pasti dengan jelas rupa bentuk atau struktur masyarakat Brunei pada zaman silam kerana kekurangan sumber sejarah yang dapat memberikan maklumat yang muktamad dan lengkap tentang perkara tersebut. Beberapa sumber yang ada setakat ini kebanyakannya berupa catatan ringkas dari pengembara-pengembara asing yang pernah singgah ke Brunei pada suatu masa dahulu.

Sumber tempatan juga tidak selalu lebih baik dari sumber luar. Sumber bertulis yang mengandungi sejumlah maklumat mengenai masyarakat Brunei pada zaman silam ialah *Silsilah Raja-Raja Berunai (SRB)* yang mula ditulis oleh Dato Imam Ya'qub pada tahun 1735 Masihi. Karya dalam tulisan Jawi ini, kemudiannya disalin dan disambung oleh beberapa orang penulis yang akhirnya menghasilkan berbagai-bagai versi SRB. Sehingga kini hanya dua versi saja yang telah dirumikan dan diterbitkan dan versi lain masih dalam bentuk manuskrip dan tersimpan dalam arkib dan perpustakaan.¹ Selain dari bahan bertulis, rujukan tentang masyarakat Brunei zaman silam boleh juga didapati menerusi sumber tradisi lisan. Antara jenis sumber ini yang penting dan sudah ditulis dalam bentuk syair ialah *Syair Awang Semaun (SAS)*. Syair ini dipercayai telah ditulis oleh Pehin Siraja

Khatib Abdul Razak bin Hassanuddin pada tahun 1920an. Syair dalam tulisan Jawi mempunyai pelbagai versi kerana ia telah disalin oleh beberapa orang penulis lain. Sungguhpun *SAS* telah dikaji dan beberapa tulisan telah dihasilkan namun nas manuskrip *SAS* yang lengkap belum pernah diterbitkan.²

Kekurangan sumber sejarah ini telah menimbulkan masalah dalam mengkaji penulis sejarah masyarakat Brunei tradisional hingga kini. Dengan mengambil kekurangan tersebut di atas, maka artikel ini ditulis secara ringkas untuk memperkenalkan masyarakat Brunei tradisional sebelum abad ke-20 Masihi. Selain itu, ia juga bertujuan untuk melihat dinamika serta hubungan di antara sejarah dengan struktur masyarakat tersebut. Bagi memudahkan perbincangan, artikel ini dibahagikan kepada tiga bahagian. Pertama, pembicaraan ditumpukan pada definisi masyarakat Brunei; bahagian kedua melihat sejarah pembentukannya dan akhirnya perbincangan difokuskan kepada struktur masyarakat tersebut.

SIAPAKAH MASYARAKAT BRUNEI?

Brunei dihuni oleh berbagai-bagai puak, tujuh di antaranya, adalah puak Brunei, Bisaya, Belait, Dusun, Kedayan, Murut dan Tutong. Puak-puak ini telah diiktiraf oleh Perlembagaan Negeri Brunei 1959 sebagai keturunan Melayu dan puak asli Brunei. Puak-puak lain tidak diakui sebagai keturunan Melayu Brunei kerana mereka dianggap bukan puak asli negara ini. Di antara tujuh puak asli Brunei itu, Brunei merupakan puak yang dominan dan menjadi pemimpin dan pemerintah yang berpengaruh sejak zaman silam lagi. Memang, keturunan raja yang memerintah kerajaan Brunei sehingga ke hari ini, seperti yang dianalisis di bawah, adalah datang dari puak Brunei.

Donald E. Brown yang mengkaji masyarakat Brunei pada akhir tahun 1960an mengatakan: perkataan 'Brunei' itu sendiri mengandungi berbagai-bagai makna. Ia boleh jadi sebuah bandar, sebatang sungai, satu bangsa, sebuah daerah, sekelompok masyarakat, sebuah empayar, suatu masa dan, untuk satu ketika, ia juga dikenali sebagai keseluruhan Borneo.³ Justeru itu, konsep masyarakat Brunei bagi Brown tidak termasuk puak-puak lain atau bangsa-bangsa bukan Brunei (*non-Bruneis*), kecuali puak Sakai, yang tercatat dalam *SRB* sebagai golongan yang mendiami Kampong Air dan menjadi pengawal kepada raja Brunei. Dewasa ini puak Sakai sudah diasimilasikan dan digolongkan ke dalam puak atau bangsa Brunei yang lebih dominan itu. Identiti mereka yang masih kekal adalah gelaran tradisional yang dianugerahkan oleh sultan kepada ketua puak ini, iaitu gelaran *Pateh* dan *Damong*. Keduanya diberi tugas mengangkat tombak diraja dalam majlis adat berpuspa atau mengangkat Pengiran Muda Mahkota. Brown juga berpendapat bahawa puak-puak lain di bawah takluk Brunei adalah merupakan penduduk sebahagian dari empayar Brunei, tetapi bukan tergolong dalam masyarakat Brunei kerana mereka mempunyai sistem sosial yang berlainan.

Pada pihak lain, Allan Maxwell, yang menumpukan kajiannya kepada puak Kedayan di Daerah Temburong, melihat bahawa puak Kedayan merupakan sebahagian dari masyarakat Brunei kerana kedua-dua puak tersebut mempunyai banyak persamaan dari segi sistem sosial, agama dan bahasa. Bagaimanapun beliau tidak menerima puak-puak lain sebagai sebahagian daripada masyarakat Brunei.⁴

Memang puak Kedayan digambarkan sebagai puak yang mempunyai hubungan dan interaksi yang rapat dengan puak Brunei kerana mereka tinggal di kawasan-kawasan sekitar bandar Brunei. Antara kedua-dua puak ini tidak dapat dipisahkan kerana mereka saling bergantung di antara satu dengan yang lain. Puak Brunei, yang tinggal di bandar Brunei dan bertumpu kepada kehidupan di atas air, sangat bergantung kepada puak Kedayan untuk mendapatkan bahan makanan seperti beras, sago, ubi, sayur-mayur dan keluaran sumber hutan seperti rotan, sarang lebah dan wangi-wangian. Begitu juga dengan bahan-bahan lain sama ada untuk kegunaan sendiri mahupun dieksport dalam kegiatan

mereka. Bagi puak Kedayan pula mereka bergantung kepada puak Brunei untuk mendapatkan sumber laut seperti ikan, kerang dan bahan-bahan import seperti kain, seramik. Kedua-dua puak ini menggunakan sistem pertukaran barang (*barter*) bagi mendapatkan bahan-bahan tersebut dan nampaknya sistem ini terus wujud di awal abad ke-20.

Hubungan yang rapat inilah puak Kedayan lebih awal memeluk agama Islam berbanding dengan puak-puak lain yang tinggal jauh di pedalaman. Seorang informan mengatakan bahawa puak Kedayan berasal dari puak Bisaya. Semasa kecil, beliau pernah mendengar cerita dari datuknya bahawa moyangnya bernama Khatib Hassanuddin sangat berakhlak di kalangan puak Bisaya yang banyak mendiami kawasan Limau Manis di Pulau Sungai Brunei. Menurut beliau lagi, orang-orang Bisaya yang diislamkan itu kemudian dikenali sebagai puak Kedayan pada masa ini.⁵ Brown pula, yang memetik maklumat daripada salah seorang informan beliau semasa membuat kerja lapangan di Brunei pada akhir tahun 1960an, mengatakan bahawa puak Kedayan berasal dari puak Murut.⁶

Dari sudut pandang sistem sosial yang lebih luas, Victor King bersetuju dengan Maxwell bahawa puak Kedayan merupakan sebahagian dari masyarakat Brunei. Beliau melihat bahawa masyarakat Brunei atau sistem sosial Brunei itu lebih luas dari puak Brunei sahaja dan berpendapat bahawa bangsa-bangsa atau puak-puak lain yang bukan Brunei (*non-Brunei peoples*), termasuk yang berada di wilayah-wilayah berhampiran dengan sempadan Brunei sekarang, adalah sebahagian dari masyarakat Brunei.⁷ Menurut King, etnik-etnik berkenaan juga ikut memainkan peranan dalam masyarakat Brunei. Bagaimanapun peranan mereka agak kecil, di antaranya, termasuklah membayar cukai dan juga menerima gelaran-gelaran tradisional seperti Orang Kaya, Panglima dan Datu. Oleh yang demikian mereka adalah sebahagian daripada sistem stratifikasi di bawah pemerintahan etnik Brunei dan merupakan sebahagian daripada masyarakat Brunei.

Jadi bagi King keahlian masyarakat Brunei itu merangkumi semua puak yang mempunyai interaksi dengan puak Brunei, yang menjadi komponen dominan dalam masyarakat Brunei. Pendapat ini sukar untuk diterima kerana kebanyakan puak-puak yang tinggal di kawasan Teluk Brunei tidak mempunyai interaksi yang rapat dengan puak Brunei dan mereka mempunyai sistem sosial dan bahasa yang berbeza. Jika dilihat hanya dari sejarah puak Kedayan dan Bisaya sahaja memang mereka mempunyai hubungan dan pertalian sosial yang rapat dengan puak Brunei sejak zaman silam. Sementara itu puak Bisaya merangkumi beberapa klasifikasi kumpulan etnik kecil lain seperti Dusun dan Tutong yang mempunyai banyak persamaan budaya dan bahasa.

PEMBENTUKAN MASYARAKAT BRUNEI

Puak Brunei yang menjadi teras kepada masyarakat Brunei mempunyai sejarah yang panjang. Puak ini telah menubuhkan kerajaan Brunei, yang bangkit dan berjaya menjadi sebuah kerajaan yang dominan di Pulau Borneo dan Kepulauan Filipina pada abad ke-16. Bagaimanapun kekurangan sumber yang relevan telah menjadikan kajian menyusur galur asal-usul puak tersebut tidak mudah. Oleh yang demikian sejarawan masa kini tidak lebih hanya dapat mengeluarkan pandangan yang berbentuk teori tentang asal-usul bangsa Brunei.

Dengan menggunakan berbagai-bagai sumber luar seperti Arab dan China, Robert Nicholl mengemukakan satu teori tentang pembentukan kerajaan Brunei awal yang dihubungkannya dengan kejatuhan kerajaan Melayu Funan di Indochina pada akhir abad ke-7. Menurut beliau pada kira-kira dekad Masihi 680an, kerajaan Melayu Funan yang pada suatu masa pernah bangkit menjadi sebuah empayar yang kuat di Alam Melayu telah ditakluk oleh bangsa Khmer. Ekoran dari serangan ini, keluarga diraja Funan bersama

hamba rakyatnya telah melarikan diri ke utara Pulau Borneo di mana mereka mendirikan sebuah kerajaan baru yang disebut dalam sumber Arab sebagai Kamrun. Nicholl berpendapat Kamrun inilah yang kemudian dikenali sebagai Brunei seperti dicatat dalam sumber China sebagai P'o-ni. Beliau percaya bahawa pusat kerajaan Kamrun itu terletak di muara Sungai Lawas dalam kawasan Teluk Brunei dan berpindah ke dalam Sungai Brunei setelah pengislaman rajanya kira-kira pada tahun 1515 Masehi.⁸ Jika teori ini diterima puak Brunei yang menjadi dominan itu adalah keturunan dari Melayu Funan. Bagaimanapun sehingga hari ini belum ada bukti-bukti kukuh dijumpai di kawasan sepanjang Sungai Lawas dan sekitarnya yang boleh menjadi petunjuk tentang wujudnya penempatan di zaman silam di kawasan ini. Justeru itu, teori Nicholl yang hanya bersandarkan kepada teks lama Arab dan China ini masih banyak menimbulkan berbagai-bagai persoalan kerana gambaran yang dianalisis berasaskan sumber-sumber ini masih lagi samar-samar.

Pehin Haji Mohd Jamil Al-Sufri dengan memetik cerita lisan yang terdapat di kalangan masyarakat Brunei telah mengemukakan pandangan, bahawa kerajaan Brunei telah diasaskan oleh keluarga diraja dari kerajaan Pagar Ruyong yang terletak di bahagian barat Sumatera. Pagar Ruyong adalah salah sebuah kerajaan Melayu dalam federasi Minangkabau yang wujud selepas kejatuhan kerajaan Seriwijaya.⁹ Sementara itu, Sanib Said pula mengungkapkan pendapat yang lain, tetapi juga merujuk kepada Sumatera. Beliau menyatakan bahawa kerajaan Brunei lama telah ditubuhkan oleh keluarga diraja Seriwijaya di Palembang, Sumatera. Menurut beliau, pada pertengahan abad ke-9 Masihi, kerajaan Seriwijaya telah jatuh ke tangan kerajaan Sailendra yang berpusat di Jawa. Serangan Jawa itu telah menyebabkan keluarga diraja Seriwijaya berpindah ke Jambi dan menubuhkan pusat pemerintahan baru Seriwijaya di sana. Sanib percaya sebahagian dari keluarga tersebut telah berpindah ke Pulau Borneo dan mendirikan kerajaan baru di pulau ini pada pertengahan abad ke-9 Masihi. Kerajaan baru itu juga bernama Seriwijaya atau dikenali sebagai Zabaj, Randj atau Sarbaza dalam sumber Arab dan Po-ni dalam sumber China.¹⁰ Po-ni yang telah diterima sebagai kerajaan Brunei lama mula muncul dalam sumber China pada tahun 860 Masihi. Sanib juga membandingkan beberapa persamaan nama tempat dan bahasa di antara Pulau Sumatera dan Pulau Borneo untuk menguatkan hujahnya tentang hubungan Seriwijaya dan penubuhan kerajaan Brunei lama. Bagaimanapun, sama ada kejatuhan Seriwijaya di Palembang ada hubungannya dengan kemunculan Po-ni yang diterima sebagai Brunei awal itu masih memerlukan kajian susulan dan mendalam untuk mendapatkan bukti-bukti yang lebih kukuh, atau paling tidak penjelasan kesejarahan yang munasabah.

Hubungan puak Brunei dengan penghijrahan dapat juga dilihat dalam sumber Sepanyol abad ke-16, *Boxer Codex*. Menurut sumber ini terdapat dua golongan bangsa di Brunei. Pertama, bangsa "Uisayas" atau Bisaya yang merupakan penduduk asli. Mereka tidak mempunyai agama dan raja tetapi di setiap kampung terdapat beberapa orang penting dan berpengaruh yang dilantik menjadi ketua bagi kumpulan mereka. Bangsa ini mengakui ketuanan raja Brunei dan telah membayar ufti kepada baginda. Mereka mendiami bahagian pedalaman dan menjual hasil tanaman mereka kepada orang Brunei.¹¹ Bagaimanapun asal-usul bangsa Bisaya ini tidak pula dinyatakan dalam sumber tersebut. Salah satu kajian yang dibuat terhadap puak ini mengaitkannya dengan bahasa Tau Sug (Sulu) dan bahasa Maranao (Mindanao) yang bermaksud 'hamba'. Adakah ini kerana orang Bisaya adalah hamba kepada raja Brunei? Taburan penduduk Bisaya sangat luas dari lembah Sungai Rejang di Sarawak sehingga ke Utara Sabah dan Filipina.¹²

Kedua, adalah golongan Islam yang disebut dalam *Boxer Codex* sebagai 'Borneyes' atau orang Brunei. Menurut sumber Sepanyol, mereka ini adalah golongan pendatang yang berasal dari sebuah bandar atau negeri bernama 'Cauin' yang terletak di wilayah atau kawasan Melayu di sebelah Mekah. Adalah masih tidak diketahui di mana tempat Cauin

itu. Menurut Carroll yang menterjemah manuskrip Sepanyol itu ke dalam bahasa Inggeris, berkemungkinan bandar Cauin itu terletak di kawasan Selat Melaka.¹³ Menurut *Boxer Codex* raja Cauin bernama Sultan Yusof bersama rakyat dan hamba baginda telah datang dalam kapal yang banyak dan mendirikan sebuah kerajaan di kawasan Sungai Brunei setelah berjaya mengalahkan bangsa Bisaya dan memaksa mereka membayar ufti.

Boxer Codex yang dipercayai ditulis oleh seorang bangsa Sepanyol di Manila pada tahun 1589 Masihi yang memetik cerita lisan masyarakat Brunei pada ketika itu menyatakan, bahawa penghijrahan Sultan Yusof dengan pengikut-pengikut baginda dari Cauin itu berlaku lebih kurang 300 tahun terdahulu.¹⁴ Ini bermakna kedatangan orang Brunei dalam *Boxer Codex* itu berlaku kira-kira pada akhir abad ke-13 Masihi. Pada masa yang sama timbul cerita tradisi di kalangan orang-orang Filipina tentang penghijrahan orang-orang Visayan atau Bisaya yang diketuai oleh Datu Merpati dari Pulau Borneo ke Filipina. Adakah serangan Sultan Yusof terhadap bangsa Bisaya yang terdapat dalam *Boxer Codex* itu telah menyebabkan penghijrahan orang-orang Bisaya beramai-ramai itu? Keturunan orang-orang Bisaya Borneo itu juga terdapat di Kepulauan Bisaya atau Visayan Islands di tengah gugusan Pulau Filipina.

Sekiranya penghijrahan Sultan Yusof itu pada abad ke-13 itu dapat diterima ia juga bermakna bahawa kedatangan Islam ke Brunei lebih awal seratus tahun. Menurut *SRB*, raja Brunei yang pertama memeluk agama Islam bernama Sultan Muhammad¹⁵ dan dalam sumber China pula sultan Brunei yang memerintah pada tahun 1370 Masihi bernama Muhamad Shah. Pehin Haji Mohd Jamil Al-Sufri berpendapat mereka adalah orang yang sama dan pengislaman baginda terjadi pada tahun 1368 Masihi. Bagaimanapun Carroll berpendapat bahawa Sultan Yusof adalah juga Sharif Ali, sultan ketiga seperti yang tersenarai dalam *SRB*. Jika ini diterima Islam telah dibawa ke Brunei oleh Sultan Sharif Ali pada abad ke-15 Masihi atau paling awal pada akhir abad ke-14 Masihi kerana tarikh kemangkatan baginda adalah pada tahun 1432 Masihi seperti yang tercatat di atas sebuah batu nisan yang terletak di Kota Batu kira-kira sembilan kilometer dari Bandar Seri Begawan. Persoalan lain pula muncul, siapa pula Sultan Muhamad dan Sultan Ahmad yang dicatat dalam *SRB* sebagai sultan Brunei yang pertama dan kedua itu? Sehingga ke hari ini belum dijumpai makam mereka.

Jika masalah kronologi dan kedudukan sultan-sultan awal itu diketepikan, secara konsisten timbul idea penghijrahan dan hubungannya dengan asal-usul bangsa Brunei yang menjadi dominan di kawasan utara Pulau Borneo. Cerita mitos penubuhan kerajaan Brunei seperti yang dirakam dalam *SAS* bermula dengan perkahwinan di antara seorang dewa yang turun dari kayangan dalam sebiji telur, dengan empat belas orang perempuan kesemuanya di tempat berasingan di kawasan Teluk Brunei. Perkahwinan itu telah melahirkan empat belas orang putera yang kemudian bertemu untuk menubuhkan sebuah kerajaan di Sungai Brunei. Mereka kemudian menakluk kawasan-kawasan di sepanjang pesisir Pulau Borneo dan pulau-pulau berhampiran dan membina sebuah masyarakat Brunei melalui perkahwinan, misalnya, di antara Raja Alak Betatar dengan Puteri Johor dan peperangan dengan membawa ramai tawanan perang yang dijadikan hamba. *SAS* menceritakan tentang penghijrahan puak Murut ke bandar Brunei setelah kerajaan mereka bernama Berayong yang terletak di daerah Lawas pada masa ini, ditakluk oleh Brunei. Raja mereka bernama Jerambak bersama seluruh rakyatnya telah ditawan dan dibawa ke Brunei dan bermastautin di kawasan Butir di tebing Sungai Brunei.

Kebangkitan Brunei sebagai sebuah pelabuhan yang besar pada abad ke-15 dan 16 telah menarik ramai pendatang, seperti pedagang dan pendakwah. Sumber Sepanyol menyebut tentang kedatangan pedagang-pedagang dari bererapa buah negeri dan ramai di antara mereka berkahwin dan menetap di Brunei. Sumber yang sama juga menyebut tentang ramai orang Cina mendiami Kota Batu dan kemudian orang dari Mekah telah datang untuk mengislamkan mereka. *SRB* juga menceritakan tentang bangsa Cina di Kota

Batu yang menjadi hamba rakyat Sultan Sharif Ali pada abad ke-15 yang dikerahkan membina kota batu.¹⁶

Apabila kerajaan Brunei tertubuh masyarakat Brunei pun terbentuk yang didominasi oleh bangsa Brunei yang berasal dari penghijrahan Sultan Yusof dan pengikut-pengikut baginda. Bangsa yang minoriti itu kemudian membuka keahliannya kepada bangsa dan puak lain yang mengamalkan bahasa dan budaya serta agama Islam. Perlu dicatatkan di sini, sehingga *Undang-Undang Kerakyatan* digubal pada tahun 1961, pengislaman lazimnya disebut sebagai 'masuk Melayu' atau menjadi orang Melayu. Jadi dengan cara ini ramai di kalangan puak atau bangsa lain menjadi "Melayu" atau diasimilasikan ke dalam puak Melayu Brunei. Dalam konteks Brunei, puak atau bangsa Brunei sinonim dengan bangsa Melayu. Panggilan Melayu terhadap puak atau bangsa Brunei itu berkemungkinan diberikan oleh Inggeris pada abad ke-19 Masihi kerana melihat persamaan dari segi agama, budaya dan bahasa dengan bangsa Melayu di Semenanjung Tanah Melayu yang dikuasai mereka ketika itu. Sebagai masyarakat kuala sungai dan pesisir puak Brunei mudah menerima pengaruh luar terutamanya agama Islam dan budaya serta bahasa Melayu yang menjadi bahasa perdagangan sejak zaman silam lagi. Apabila undang-undang kerakyatan tersebut di atas diperkenalkan kesemua puak yang diterima sebagai puak asli Negeri Brunei, walaupun mereka bukan beragama Islam, diiktiraf sebagai bangsa Melayu.

STRUKTUR MASYARAKAT BRUNEI

Sebagai puak minoriti, pada hakikatnya puak Brunei perlu membuka keahliannya kepada puak lain untuk *survival*. Bagaimanapun pada masa yang sama ia perlu mengawal kemasukan keahlian baru itu supaya ia tidak kehilangan identiti dan pengaruhnya. Bagi tujuan ini telah diperkenalkan satu sistem stratifikasi yang membahagikan masyarakat Brunei kepada beberapa susun lapis. Yang jelas, semakin tinggi kedudukan tingkat lapisan tersebut, maka semakin tinggi kuasa yang diberikan dan untuk mengawal kuasa itu diletakkan syarat-syarat kemasukan ke dalam lapisan-lapisan yang diberi lebih kuasa itu. Dalam kata lain, susun lapis dalam masyarakat Brunei itu diperkenalkan dan dijaga untuk mengekalkan kuasa dan pengaruh di tangan kumpulan kecil yang memerintah.

Sejak dahulu lagi masyarakat Brunei sudah terbahagi kepada beberapa susun lapis. Pada abad ke-16 terdapat dua lapisan utama masyarakat, iaitu bangsawan (*nobility*) di lapisan atas dan rakyat (*non-nobility*) di lapisan bawah. Setiap tingkat lapisan ini terbahagi lagi kepada beberapa lapisan yang ditentukan oleh keturunan sebelah ayah dan juga kedudukan dalam struktur kerajaan.

Menurut *Boxer Codex*, semua ahli golongan bangsawan atau diraja dipanggil Pengiran. Bagaimanapun dalam golongan tersebut terdapat golongan 'Pengiran utama' yang dipanggil 'raja'.¹⁷ *SRB* yang ditulis pada abad ke-18 menjelaskan bahawa golongan Pengiran yang menduduki tempat di atas sekali adalah dipanggil Pengiran bertaras. Pengiran utama atau pengiran bertaras ini adalah menandakan bahawa golongan ini adalah kerabat sultan yang memerintah atau keturunan terdekat sultan terdahulu. Pada zaman dahulu golongan ini dipercayai menggunakan gelaran Raja, seperti Raja Bendahara Sakam, adinda Sultan Saiful Rizal (m.1533 – 1581 Masihi), seorang pahlawan Brunei dalam Perang Kastila pada tahun 1578, dan Raja Dungu, puteri baginda. Sementara itu pada abad ke-19 muncul pula gelaran Raja Muda Hashim Pengiran Bendahara yang terlibat dalam perjanjian penyerahan Sarawak kepada James Brooke pada tahun 1841 Masihi, Raja Api dan Raja Nooralam.

Sekarang gelaran raja tidak lagi digunakan tetapi diganti dengan gelaran Pengiran Muda. Seperti juga gelaran Raja gelaran Pengiran Muda ini hanya terhad kepada anak lelaki sultan dan anak lelaki yang gahara Pengiran Perdana Wazir (gelaran yang

diperkenalkan pada tahun 1967 Masihi) dan Pengiran Bendahara dan anak lelaki tua dan gahara Pengiran Digadong. Bagi anak lelaki wazir-wazir lain dipanggil pengiran anak. Begitu juga bagi puteri-puteri sultan dan wazir-wazir serta pengiran-pengiran bertaras yang lain menggunakan gelaran Pengiran Anak. Justeru, kadang-kadang Pengiran bertaras ini dikenali juga sebagai pengiran-pengiran peranakan.¹⁸

Jelaslah dari *Boxer Codex* ini bahawa sultan dan keempat-empat orang pembesar utama yang dipanggil wazir adalah terdiri dari ahli kerabat sultan yang terdekat. Wazir yang bersal dari perkataan Arab yang bermaksud menteri atau orang kanan sultan. Pengiran Bendahara dan Pengiran Temenggong adalah adik sultan, Pengiran Digadong ialah sepupu sultan dan Pengiran Syahbandar adalah adik tiri dari anak gundik sultan.¹⁹ Ini menandakan bahawa pelantikan bagi sultan dan wazir hanya terdiri dari golongan Pengiran utama atau Pengiran bertaras. Walau bagaimanapun mereka juga boleh dilantik sebagai ahli cheteria, iaitu kategori pembesar di bawah wazir. Berkemungkinan cheteria berasal dari perkataan sanskrit iaitu kesateria yang bermaksud perajurit yang gagah berani yang sudah tentu merupakan golongan penting dalam pertahanan kerajaan.

Pengiran yang bukan tergolong dalam Pengiran utama atau bertaras menduduki lapisan tingkat bawah yang dikenali dalam *SRB* sebagai Pengiran kebanyakan. Pengiran dalam golongan ini merupakan keturunan yang sudah jauh dari jalur kerabat sultan dan mereka menggunakan gelaran pengiran bagi lelaki dan perempuan yang sudah berkahwin. Bagi lelaki yang belum berkahwin menggunakan gelaran Awangku dan perempuan sebagai Dayangku.

Pengiran-Pengiran di bawah kategori ini boleh memegang jawatan cheteria. *SRB* tidak menyebutkan keramaian cheteria, tetapi P.M. Yusuf menyebut tiga tingkat lapisan iaitu Kepala Cheteria seramai empat orang, Cheteria Besar seramai lapan orang, Cheteria Pengalasan seramai enam belas orang dan Cheteria Damit seramai tiga puluh dua orang.²⁰ *Boxer Codex* tidak menyebut Pengiran-Pengiran di bawah kategori ini. Bagaimanapun, semasa serangan Sepanyol terhadap Brunei pada tahun 1578 Masihi, disebutkan adanya dua orang pembesar yang memainkan peranan penting dalam peristiwa itu. Mereka ialah Pengiran Seri Laila, bapa saudara Sultan Saiful Rizal yang memerintah ketika itu²¹ dan Pengiran Maharaja Diraja;²² mereka ini dipercayai adalah golongan cheteria.

Satu golongan yang dikategorikan di bawah bangsawan adalah ampuan-ampuan. *Boxer Codex* atau sumber lain yang awal tidak menyebutkan adanya golongan ini. Bagaimanapun *SRB* yang disalin pada 1936 merekodkan tentang 'bangsa peampuanan' yang mempunyai peranan khas untuk mengangkat usungan diraja semasa Sultan Jamalul Alam dipuspan pada tahun 1918.²³ Seorang informan memberitahu bahawa ampuan-ampuan adalah golongan bangsawan yang dipanggil 'raja-raja peampuanan' dan menurut beliau suatu masa dahulu ramai mereka tinggal di sebuah tempat bernama Kampung Peampuanan dan ramai di antara mereka telah mengambil gelaran Pengiran.²⁴ Bagaimanapun, Brown berpendapat bahawa golongan ampuan lebih merujuk kepada orang-orang yang tinggal di kampung bernama Peampuanan dari kelas keturunan.²⁵

Golongan bukan bangsawan atau rakyat juga terbahagi kepada beberapa lapisan. Susun lapis bagi golongan ini adalah lebih rumit untuk ditentukan kerana senarainya kurang jelas. *Boxer Codex* ada menyebut "orang baik, merdeka, lashkar dan orang berkalahi".²⁶ Orang baik barangkali boleh ditafsirkan sebagai lapisan di kalangan golongan rakyat yang teratas sekali di mana beberapa jawatan seperti orang kaya dan menteri dilantik. *Boxer Codex* menyebutkan adanya gelaran-gelaran orang kaya yang diertikan sebagai 'orang utama' (*the principal man*) dan menteri yang diertikan sebagai 'ketua' (*captain*).²⁷ Terdapat tiga orang pegawai bergelar Orang Kaya Digadong yang mempunyai tugas untuk mentadbir harta benda diraja dan mengutip cukai daripada puak Bisaya dan mereka bertanggungjawab terus kepada Pengiran Digadong. *Boxer Codex* tidak menyatakan berapa orang menteri dan apa peranan mereka ketika itu dan kenapa Orang Kaya

diasingkan daripada menteri. Dalam *SRB* menteri-menteri mempunyai gelaran Orang Kaya dan Orang Kaya Digadong merupakan kepala menteri.

Menurut Brown golongan di mana menteri direkrut adalah dari lapisan yang diistilahkan sebagai aristokrat untuk membezakan mereka dari golongan Pengiran-Pengiran atau raja-raja dan rakyat biasa. Menurut P.M. Yusuf golongan ini mempunyai beberapa pangkat gelaran iaitu tiga menteri utama, diikuti dengan menteri empat, menteri lapan, menteri enam belas dan menteri tiga puluh dua.²⁸ Seperti wazir dan cheteria perlantikan menteri disempurnakan dalam satu upacara yang disebut sebagai menyampiri gelaran dengan dibacakan "ciri" yang pada masa dahulu terdiri dari ayat-ayatnya dalam bahasa sanskrit dan pada masa ini dimasukkan pula ayat-ayat dari kitab suci Al-Quran. Tujuannya adalah untuk mensucikan dan meninggikan martabat serta memberi kuasa kepada individu yang disampiri gelaran itu. Bagi menteri yang disampiri gelaran akan membawa gelaran Pehin. Terdapat juga gelaran Pehin tanpa melalui proses upacara seperti disebutkan di atas dan kedudukan mereka dalam kategori ini adalah lebih rendah dari gelaran Pehin yang berciri. Sebenarnya tidak diketahui bila gelaran Pehin mula diperkenalkan kerana sumber awal termasuk *SRB* tidak menyebut tentang gelaran tersebut. Bahkan sumber-sumber Barat abad ke-19 juga tidak pernah mencatatkan istilah ini. Berkemungkinan gelaran Pehin pada mulanya hanya diberikan kepada jawatan-jawatan agama seperti Imam dan Khatib yang kemudiannya digolongkan sebagai Pehin-Pehin Menteri agama dengan memasukkan gelaran baru seperti Pehin Seri Maharaja, Pehin Tuan Imam, Pehin Siraja Khatib dan Pehin Udana Khatib. Berkemungkinan keahlian Pehin-Pehin Menteri agama ini tidak semestinya datangnya dari golongan aristokrat tetapi direkrut berasaskan lebih kepada ilmu dan kepakaran individu tersebut, kerana terdapat orang asing yang dilantik menjadi imam dan disampiri gelaran seperti Datu Imam Ya'qub yang berasal dari Penderang, Sulawesi pada abad ke-18 Masihi dan Pehin Datu Imam Haji Ahmad yang berasal dari Banjarmasin pada akhir abad ke-19 Masihi. Selain daripada menteri-menteri tersebut terdapat juga jawatan-jawatan dalam istana seperti Jejanang, Penyurat dan Jawatan yang menjalankan tugas-tugas seperti setiausaha dan kerani dalam istilah moden sekarang yang direkrut bukan saja dari golongan aristokrat tetapi juga berkemungkinan dilantik kerana kelayakan masing-masing.

SRB mengkategorikan golongan aristokrat kepada dua tingkat lapisan iaitu awang-awang langgar bagi yang tergolong di lapisan atas dan awang-awang damit bagi lapisan bawah. Pembahagian ini sama seperti pembahagian bagi Pengiran-Pengiran kepada kepada lapisan atas adalah golongan utama (*core*) yang sudah tentu mempunyai lebih kuasa dan pengaruh dari lapisan bawah. Golongan aristokrat ini mempunyai gelaran awang bagi lelaki dan dayang bagi perempuan. Dalam *SRB* gelaran awang digunakan oleh Alak Betatar yang kemudian menjadi Sultan Muhammad. Gelaran ini diwarisi turun-temurun daripada bapa ke anak. Gelaran awang dan dayang ini hanya digunakan oleh ahli-ahli golongan ini sahaja sehingga pada tahun 1964 apabila kerajaan telah meluaskan gelaran awang dan dayang kepada semua rakyat yang bukan dari golongan Pengiran-Pengiran dan ertinya sama seperti *Mister* dan *Miss* dalam bahasa Inggeris. Terdapat usaha untuk mengekalkan dan membezakan gelaran awang dan dayang yang diwarisi melalui keturunan dengan bukan keturunan. Misalnya bagi orang yang sudah menunaikan fardhu haji menggunakan *Haji Awang* untuk menandakan keturunan aristokrat tetapi rakyat biasa menggunakan *Awang Haji* dan *Hajah Dayang* dan *Dayang Hajah*.

Orang 'merdeka' dalam *Boxer Codex* boleh ditafsirkan sebagai rakyat yang tidak terkandung dalam golongan aristokrat. Mereka merupakan rakyat kebanyakan atau rakyat biasa yang tidak tergolong di bawah ulun atau hamba. Berkemungkinan mereka ini adalah terdiri dari nakhoda atau orang kaum pendatang yang telah bermastautin atau hamba yang telah dapat menebus dirinya dari perhambaan. Status golongan ini dalam masyarakat tidak

jelas tetapi berkemungkinan ada di antara mereka mempunyai pengaruh yang tinggi seperti nakhoda kerana ekonomi mereka yang lebih baik.

Menurut seorang informan selain dari pembahagian kepada lapisan-lapisan tersebut di atas seluruh penduduk atau rakyat Brunei termasuk Pengiran-Pengiran dibahagikan kepada lima golongan mengikut lapisan keutamaan seperti berikut: hamba Raja, hamba Pengiran Bendahara, hamba Pengiran Digadong dan hamba Pengiran Pemanca dan menurut beliau lagi hamba Raja lebih tinggi statusnya dari hamba Pengiran Bendahara dan hamba Pengiran Bendahara pula lebih tinggi statusnya dari hamba Pengiran Digadong dan seterusnya hingga hamba Pengiran Pemanca. Beliau mengatakan juga pada tahun 1950an masih ramai orang Brunei yang masih berpegang kepada status golongan masing-masing dan selalunya perkahwinan hanya berlaku di antara ahli golongan masing-masing misalnya hamba Raja dengan hamba Raja. Sekiranya ada perkahwinan di luar dari golongan masing-masing hendaklah dikenakan denda dengan membayar sejumlah wang yang dipanggil "tebus bangsa" kepada keluarga yang mempunyai kedudukan status yang lebih tinggi dan jumlahnya ditentukan oleh status golongan berkenaan iaitu lebih tinggi statusnya lebih mahal bayarannya.²⁹

Pembahagian seperti ini sama seperti pembahagian kepada hamba kerajaan, hamba kuripan dan hamba tulin seperti yang dicatat dalam sumber Inggeris pada abad ke-19 Masihi. Hamba kerajaan adalah sama dengan hamba Raja dan hamba kuripan adalah hamba kepada wazir-wazir yang empat disebutkan di atas dan manakala hamba tulen adalah hamba Sultan atau wazir-wazir yang dipunyai sebagai hak peribadi yang boleh diturunkan kepada waris masing-masing. Manakala hamba kerajaan dan hamba tulen adalah hak atas jawatan dan dipindah milik kepada pengganti masing-masing. Pembahagian rakyat kepada golongan tersebut di atas adalah bertujuan untuk memudahkan pengutipan cukai yang menjadi sumber pendapatan kepada pembesar-pembesar berkenaan dan pada lazimnya pembahagian rakyat itu mengikut pembahagian tanah atau wilayah dengan menggunakan sungai atau anak sungai.

Dalam kajiannya, Brown berpendapat etnik bukan Brunei menduduki tempat di bawah dalam struktur masyarakat Brunei tradisional. Pendapat ini didasarkan beliau kepada hanya jawatan rendah yang diberikan kepada golongan ini. Bagi puak Sakai yang tinggal di Kampong Air diberikan jawatan menteri laut yang membawa gelaran Pateh, Pengarah dan Damong dan bagi puak yang tinggal di darat seperti Kedayan, Bisaya dan Tutong diberikan menteri darat dengan gelaran Orang Kaya. *Boxer Codex* dan *SRB* tidak menyebutkan tentang kedudukan mahupun gelaran yang diberikan kepada golongan ini. Berkemungkinan jawatan menteri darat hanya diperkenalkan pada awal abad ke-20 Masihi. Bagaimanapun, *SRB* ada menyebutkan beberapa gelaran seperti Datu Patinggi, Datu Bandar dan Datu Temenggong bagi ketua-ketua masyarakat di tanah jajahan Sarawak dan Sadong. Sebenarnya yang jelas, gelaran Pehin tidak pernah diberikan kepada puak bukan Brunei sehingga menjelang pertengahan abad ke-20.

Di peringkat bawah sekali dalam struktur masyarakat Brunei adalah golongan ulun atau hamba. Golongan ini dipercayai sudah wujud sejak penubuhan kerajaan Brunei. *Boxer Codex* menyatakan bahawa Sultan Yusof telah membawa rakyat dan hamba baginda dalam penghijrahan ke Brunei.³⁰ Dalam menyatakan gelaran-gelaran pada abad ke-16 *Boxer Codex* telah menyebut gelaran 'lascar' atau askar yang dijelaskan sebagai hamba. Ini berkemungkinan bahawa hamba digunakan sebagai askar dalam peperangan. *Boxer Codex* juga menyebut 'oranbarcalai' atau orang berkalahi yang diterangkan sebagai orang malas dan mungkin juga dikategorikan sebagai golongan yang sama dengan golongan hamba.³¹ Menurut pengamatan seorang pengembara yang pernah menjelajahi kakinya ke Brunei pada pertengahan abad ke-19 Masihi bahawa sebahagian besar penduduk bandar Brunei ketika itu terdiri dari ulun atau hamba.³²

Terdapat sekurang-kurangnya tiga tingkat lapisan dalam golongan hamba ini. Pertama, ulun pesaka iaitu hamba yang sudah menjadi milik beberapa generasi dalam sebuah keluarga. Hamba seperti ini dipanggil sebagai 'Anak Amas' dan menurut adat Brunei generasi ketiga bagi ulun dalam sebuah keluarga menjadikannya berstatus Anak Amas. Menurut seorang informan, hamba seperti ini hanya dapat dijual oleh keluarga yang empunya hamba tersebut dengan persetujuan hamba berkenaan. Selalunya hamba seperti ini diberikan layanan yang baik, dan diberikan kebebasan yang tinggi serta dilayan seperti juga ahli keluarga. Bagaimanapun mereka tidak mendapat sebarang upah bagi sebarang khidmat yang diberikan kepada tuannya, malah mereka bekerja untuk tuannya dan sebarang upah atau pendapatan yang didapati akan diserahkan kepada tuannya.³³

Hamba yang di tingkat bawah sekali ialah ulun dibeli. Hamba dalam kategori ini tidak ada apa-apa hak dan tidak ada tempat dalam masyarakat dan boleh dijual tanpa persetujuan hamba itu sendiri. Hamba seperti ini sama juga dengan hamba yang ditawan dalam perang atau ditangkap dalam serbuan di pesisiran laut atau pedalaman.

Terdapat satu golongan hamba yang tidak termasuk dalam dua kategori hamba di atas ialah ulun berhutang, iaitu seseorang yang terpaksa menyerahkan dirinya atau ahli keluarganya sebagai hamba kepada orang yang memberi hutang, jika ia tidak dapat menjelaskan hutangnya. Adalah tidak jelas sama ada ahli keluarga yang diserahkan itu hanya berbentuk cagaran sehingga hutang dapat dibayar atau terus menjadi hak pemberi hutang tadi. Selain hutang seseorang boleh juga menjadi hamba apabila dia gagal membayar cukai atau ufti kepada tuan punya sungai atau daerah di mana dia tinggal. Bagi membayar cukai atau ufti yang belum selesai itu seseorang itu akan sama ada menyerahkan dirinya atau ahli keluarganya kepada tuan punya sungai atau daerah itu sehingga dia atau keluarganya dapat menjelaskan cukai atau ufti berkenaan.

Seseorang ulun atau hamba boleh mendapat kebebasannya atau merdeka dengan membayar wang kepada tuannya. Selain itu seseorang ulun atau hamba itu boleh juga bebas atau merdeka apabila tuannya menaikkan kedudukannya seperti mana yang tercatat dalam *SRB* seperti berikut:

Bermula adapun adat segala raja2, apabila ada hambanya kasehinya akan dikayakannya, maka disuruhnya membuat negeri, dijakikannya jejanang atau penyurat dagang negeri atau pawang. Apabila ia sudah kaya, maka bicaranya pun baik akan Duli Yang Dipertuan. Maka dijadikan menteri atau hulubalang atau pegawai serta diserahkannya sakai kepadanya.³⁴

Kenaikan status kedudukan yang direkodkan oleh sumber tradisi ini pernah berlaku dalam sejarah Brunei abad ke-19 Masihi iaitu apabila Raja Muda Hashim telah menaikkan taraf seorang hambanya dan dilantiknya sebagai Panglima Raja.³⁵

Sebenarnya sistem perhambaan tidak pernah dihapuskan secara formal di Brunei. Tetapi apabila Labuan menjadi tanah jajahan British pada tahun 1847 dan wujudnya kerajaan Brooke di Sarawak pada 1841 dan Syarikat Berpiagam British Borneo Utara di Sabah pada 1881, ramai hamba telah melarikan diri dan diberikan perlindungan oleh kerajaan-kerajaan berkenaan. Selain dari itu, para pemilik hamba juga telah secara suka rela membebaskan hamba-hamba mereka. Antaranya ialah Dato Imam Haji Ahmad Al-Banjari (meninggal pada 1906) yang banyak membebaskan hambanya dan beliau juga menasihati orang-orang yang mempunyai hamba supaya mengikut langkah beliau untuk membebaskan hamba masing-masing.³⁶ Kemiskinan dan kesempitan hidup yang dihadapi oleh hampir semua orang pada akhir abad ke-19 Masihi dan awal abad ke-20 juga memaksa ramai orang-orang yang mempunyai hamba untuk membebaskan hamba mereka kerana tidak dapat menanggung hamba mereka itu. Selepas Perang Jepun sistem perhambaan sudah tidak wujud lagi di Brunei.

PENUTUP

Sistem sosial Masyarakat Brunei tradisional dicorakkan oleh sejarah pembentukannya. Berdasarkan teori beberapa orang sarjana, puak Brunei sebagai bangsa pendatang yang berjumlah kecil dan yang kemudiannya menjadi masyarakat dominan, telah mencipta satu sistem sosial yang bertujuan untuk mempertahankan kuasa dan pengaruhnya. Justeru itu, masyarakat telah dibahagikan kepada beberapa tingkat lapisan dengan setiap lapisan mempunyai peranan dan bidang masing-masing. Lapisan atas yang terdiri dari golongan pemerintah mempunyai sistem yang jelas dan ketat dalam keahliannya supaya tidak mendatangkan komplikasi. Bagi lapisan-lapisan di bawah yang terdiri dari golongan rakyat juga mempunyai sistem berlapis-lapis, walaupun agak kabur dan kerananya kemasukan atau mobilitinya dari satu tingkat ke tingkat lain dapat berlaku lebih mudah. Sebenarnya dalam struktur masyarakat yang dicipta itu, rakyat adalah berperanan untuk mendukung lapisan di atas. Dengan pengaruh modenisasi sejak awal abad ke-20 tingkat lapisan masyarakat tidak lagi begitu penting, kecuali di peringkat kerabat diraja. Pendidikan moden telah mengubah corak kehidupan dan keperluan yang menjadikan kedudukan dalam pekerjaan menjadi lebih penting dalam struktur masyarakat Brunei masa kini.

NOTA-NOTA

- ¹ *Papers Relating to Brunei*, with an introduction by Cheah Boon Kheng, Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Reprints no. 18 (1998), p. i.
- ² Lihat Mohd Yusop Damit, "Syair Awang Semaun Sebagai Sumber Sejarah", *Beriga*, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Brunei Darussalam, Bil. 63, April - Jun 1999, ms 32 - 44.
- ³ Donald E. Brown, *Brunei: The Structure and History of A Bornean Malay Sultanate*, Brunei Museum: Brunei, 1970, ms 76.
- ⁴ Allan R. Maxwell, *Urang Darat: An Ethnographic Study of the Kadayan of Labu Valley*, [PhD Thesis, Yale University, 1980].
- ⁵ Temubual dengan Dato Paduka Pengarah Awang Haji Othman bin Abdul Kadir. Beliau lahir pada tahun, 1918.
- ⁶ Brown, *Brunei: The Structure and History of A Bornean Malay Sultanate*.
- ⁷ Victor T. King, "What is Brunei Society? Reflections on Conceptual and Ethnographic Issues", *South East Asia Journal*, 2.2, 1994, ms. 177-178.
- ⁸ Robert Nicholl, "Brunei Rediscovered: A Survey of Early Times", *Brunei Museum Journal* 4.4, 1980, ms 219-222.
- ⁹ Pehin Orang Kaya Amar Diraja Dato Seri Utama (Dr) Haji Awang Muhammad Jamil A-Sufri, *Tarsilah Brunei, Sejarah Awal dan Perkembangan Islam*, Brunei: Jabatan Pusat Sejarah, 1990, ms. 37.
- ¹⁰ Sanib Said, "Pembentukan Kerajaan Brunei Lama: Teori Penghijrahan dari Sumatera", *Jurnal Darussalam*, Bil. 1., 1992, ms. 91-92.
- ¹¹ John S. Carroll, "Berunai in the Boxer Codex", *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 55, Part 2, 1982, ms. 3.
- ¹² Mustaffa bin Omar, "Bisaya: Suatu Tinjauan Ringkas", *Brunei Museum Journal*, 8:17, 1993, ms. 18-19.
- ¹³ Carroll, "Berunai in the Boxer Codex", ms. 4.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵ *Papers Relating to Brunei*, ms. 56.
- ¹⁶ Amin Sweeney, *Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei - Text of Manuscript A*, dalam *Papers Relating to Brunei*, ms 56.
- ¹⁷ Carroll, "Berunai in the Boxer Codex", ms. 5, 11 and 12.
- ¹⁸ P. M. Yusuf, "Adat Istiadat Diraja Brunei Darussalam", *Brunei Museum Journal*, Vol. 3, 1975. ms. 46.
- ¹⁹ Carroll, "Berunai in the Boxer Codex", ms. 6.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.* ms. 47-50.
- ²¹ D. E. Brown, "Spanish Accounts of Their Expeditions Against Brunei 1578 - 1579", *Brunei Museum Journal*, 3:2, 1974, ms. 196.
- ²² *Ibid.* ms. 198.

²³ Amin Sweeney, "Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei" Text of Manuscript B", dalam *Papers Relating to Brunei*, ms. 125.

²⁴ Temubual dengan Dato Paduka Pengarah Haji Awang Othman bin Abdul Kadir.

²⁵ Brown, *Brunei: The Structure and History of a Bornean Malay Sultanate*, ms. 14.

²⁶ Carroll, "Berunai in the Boxer Codex", ms. 11-12.

²⁷ Ibid. ms. 11.

²⁸ P. M. Yusuf, "Adat Istiadat Diraja Brunei Darussalam", ms. 52-57.

²⁹ Temubual dengan Dato Paduka Pengarah Haji Awang Othman bin Abdul Kadir.

³⁰ Carroll, "Berunai in the Boxer Codex", ms. 4.

³¹ Ibid. ms. 12.

³² Brown, *Brunei: The Structure and History of a Bornean Malay Sultanate*, ms. 19.

³³ Temubual dengan Dato Paduka Pengarah Haji Awang Othman bin Abdul Kadir.

³⁴ Amin Sweeney, "Silsilah Raja-Raja Brunei Text of Manuscript B", ms. 73.

³⁵ Brown, *Brunei: The Structure and History of a Bornean Malay Sultanate*, ms. 18.

³⁶ Temubual dengan Dato Paduka Pengarah Haji Awang Othman bin Abdul.

RUJUKAN

- Abd Hamid bin Jaludin, (1995/1996). *Syair Awang Semaun Sebagai Epik Bangsa Melayu*. Tesis Sarjana Sastera, Universiti Malaya.
- Brown, D. E. (1970). *Brunei: The Structure and History of A Bornean Malay Sultanate*. Monograph of the Brunei Museum Journal, vol. II no. 2.
- Carroll, J. S. (1982). Berunai in the Boxer Codex. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 55 (Part 2 no. 243): 1-25.
- King, V. (1994). What is Brunei Society? Reflections on conceptual and ethnographic issues. *South East Asia Journal*, 2(2): 176 - 198.
- Maxwell, A. R. (1980). *Urang Darat: An Ethnographic Study of the Kadayan of Labu Valley*. Tesis Ph. D., Yale University.
- Mohd Yusop Damit (1999). Syair Awang Semaun Sebagai Sumber Sejarah. *Beriga*, 63: 32-44.
- Mustapa bin Omar (1993). Bisaya: Suatu Tinjauan Ringkas. *Brunei Museum Journal*, 8: 17-28.
- Nicholl, R. (1980). Brunei Rediscovered: A Survey of Early Times. *Brunei Museum Journal*, 4(4): 219-237.
- Papers Relating to Brunei* with an introduction by Cheah Boon Kheng (1998), *Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Reprints* No. 18.
- P. M. Yusuf (1975). Adat Istiadat Diraja Brunei Darussalam. *Brunei Museum Journal*, 3(3): 43-108.
- Sanib Said (1992). Pembentukan Kerajaan Brunei Lama: Teori Penghijrahan dari Sumatera. *Jurnal Darussalam*, 1: 91-92.

A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF BRUNEI'S ECONOMY BEFORE THE DISCOVERY OF OIL AND SOME SUBSEQUENT ISSUES

NANI SURYANI HAJI ABU BAKAR

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to give an overview of Brunei's economy before the discovery of oil at Seria in 1929 and some issues after its discovery. Starting from its early history, Brunei's economy depended on trade. The Chinese accounts before the 10th century A.D. recorded Brunei's richness. However, in the 14th century, Brunei had become impoverished as a result of the Sulu's pillage. Nevertheless, in the early 16th century there was a resurgence of Brunei's power and wealth but this was short-lived as the Spanish occupied Manila in the 16th century. In the 17th century, Brunei's economy suffered since the kingdom experienced a civil war for nearly twelve years. In the 19th century, Brunei's economy weakened even more as Brunei experienced the rapid disappearance of its territories to either the Brooke regime in Sarawak or the British North Borneo Company (BNBC) in North Borneo. The most damaging impact of Sarawak's expansionist policy on Brunei's economy was the occupation of Limbang in 1890. Although in the 1900s there were British mandarins who would have liked to see the introduction of the Residency System in Brunei, they doubted if it would be justifiable in terms of returns to Britain as most of Brunei had been lost to Sarawak and the BNBC. M.H.S. McArthur, an acting consul to Brunei in 1904, however, recommended that an initial loan to Brunei would help Brunei to become self-sufficient. This recommendation had been one of the factors that led Britain to change its policy towards Brunei thereby leading to Brunei becoming a British protectorate in 1906. Until the development of oil, Brunei's treasury produced nothing which could generate a substantial income for the government. However, the discovery of oil at Seria in 1929 changed Brunei's economy considerably. It turned Brunei from a backward state to a modern nation and helped preserve Brunei as a Malay Islamic Monarchy.

INTRODUCTION

Oil (along with gas, later on) is the main source of Brunei's economy. Brunei is the third largest oil producer in Southeast Asia, averaging about 180,000 barrels (29,000 m³) a day. It also is the fourth largest producer of liquefied natural gas in the world.¹ Brunei's gross domestic product soared with the petroleum price increases of the 1970s to a peak of \$5.7 billion in 1980. The income derived from oil and gas enabled the Brunei Government to launch the Five-Year National Development Plans from 1953.

In the First Five-Year National Development Plan, an amount of \$100 million was allotted by the government and emphasis was placed on where importance was given to the development of infrastructure such as transport and communication, and upgrading agriculture and fisheries, resettlement schemes, education and medical services.² The *Borneo Bulletin's* editorial of 29 September 1959 describes the progress that took place under the 1953-1958 Plan as a 'bloodless revolution unmatched anywhere in the world'.³ Indeed, the prosperity from oil has turned Brunei from a backward state into a modern nation. Nevertheless, what was Brunei's economy like before the discovery of oil in 1929?

BRUNEI'S ECONOMY FROM THE 10TH TO THE 19TH CENTURY A.D.

During Brunei's early period, its economy depended on external trade. The earliest Chinese accounts of Boni gave details of Brunei's external trade which was based mainly on exports of foodstuffs, jungle produce and minerals, while imports were mostly confined to manufactured products. Evidently, Brunei had trading relationships with China which

predated the 10th century A.D., and also with its neighbours such as Java, Cochin, Pahang, Trengganu and Kelantan.⁴ Trade was controlled by the King, and business between traders could only be carried out with the King's approval. The King would receive special gifts, as would the members of his entourage.⁵ According to A. V. M. Horton, the pre-Islamic Brunei empires (from 7th to 9th centuries) depended prosperity on gold and camphor derived from the west coast of Sabah and the Philippines.⁶

After the 10th century, accounts of Brunei's economy can be found in Chinese sources. Boni's wealth was portrayed in the 13th century account of Chau Ju-kua, Inspector of Foreign Trade in the Province of Fukien. In his *Chu-fan-chi* (Record of Foreign Nations), he wrote about the wealth of Boni, its camphor and its large fleet.⁷ However, by the end of the 14th century, as recorded in the Chinese account, Boni had become poor. This was as a result of the activities of the Sulu (Boni's former vassals) which ransacked and looted Boni. When a Chinese ambassador reached Boni in 1371, he found 'little more than a poor fishing village.'⁸ Here, the Chinese envoys' description of Boni emphasized its poverty:

The country of P'o-ni [*sic*] is hot and torrid with frequent storms. The town has no outer wall, and its defence is effected by a fence of tree poles. The Residence of the king has upper storeys, the roofs of which are covered with pei-to (nipa palm?) leaves. The king ties his hair in a knot, wears a piece of coloured cloth round his waist, and goes barefooted.⁹

Boni became a dependency of Majapahit until the latter weakened after the death of Hayam Wuruk in 1368.¹⁰ Although the official relationship between Brunei and China was distant during this period, trade was still conducted between the two countries.

In the early 16th century there was a revival of Brunei's power and economy. Antonio Pigafetta (Ferdinand Magellan's chronicler) in his account of Brunei in July 1521 recorded Brunei's immense wealth and power. He visited the Sultan's palace and described it as follows:

The men in the palace were all attired in cloth of gold and silk which covered their privies, and carried daggers with gold hafts adorned with pearls and precious gems, and they had many rings on their hands. We returned upon the elephants to the governor's house, seven men carrying the king's presents to us and always preceding us.¹¹

During the reign of Sultan Bolkiah, Brunei expanded to its greatest extent where it experienced the re-establishment of the third time of thalassocracy which embraced the trading ports of Borneo, Sulu and the Philippines.¹² In this period, Brunei's power and wealth could have been the result of the fall of Malacca to the Portuguese in 1511. Writing in about 1586, a Spaniard described the city of Brunei as it had been in 1578:

The city was very large and rich, and was built over a very broad and deep river and had the appearance of another Venice. The buildings were of wood, but the houses were excellently constructed, many of them being constructed of stone work and gilded, especially the King's palaces which were of huge size. The city contained a very sumptuous mosque, a very large and interesting building, quite carved with half relief and gilded.¹³

However, from late 16th century until the 18th century, Brunei's economy weakened following the occupation of Manila (which was once under Brunei's influence) by the Spanish before the end of the 16th century. When the Spanish occupied Manila, trade between Brunei and Manila was severed and Manila did not send any more tributes to Brunei. Brunei's trade with Manila included iron and tin, porcelain, copper gongs, benzoin, India cloth, tempered iron, pans, spearheads, knives and other goods to trade for gold, slaves and cowries.¹⁴

Between 1661 and 1673, Brunei's economy suffered even more when it experienced a succession dispute which led to a civil war between Sultan Abdul Mubin and Sultan

Muhyiddin. As a result of the dispute, Brunei's politics were destabilised and its economic activities were interrupted for at least twelve years. After the civil war, Brunei lost control of North Borneo when it came under Sulu's hegemony (which proclaimed its independence). The emergence of new governments such as Sambas, Banjarmasin and Sukadana also affected Brunei's economy as traders who used to come to Brunei to trade now spread out to the new trading ports. In other words, they no longer came only to Brunei's port to trade. Furthermore, the Chinese traders ceased coming to Brunei and trade was mostly by European traders who practised a trade monopoly.¹⁵

Between 1840 and 1890, Brunei's economy weakened further as Brunei experienced the rapid disappearance of its territories to the Brooke family in Sarawak and the British North Borneo Company in North Borneo. The loss of Brunei's territory was a result of Britain's imperial policy which allowed Brooke to expand its territories with limited interference from Britain. At this time, Britain did not raise objections to the private efforts of British citizens or British sponsored trading companies to own settlements in Northern Borneo as Britain could exercise indirect control over new territories that were strategically and commercially important to them.

It was during this time that James Brooke took over half of Brunei's territory. In July 1842, Brooke acquired the territory of Sarawak (i.e., the portion of what is now Sarawak extending from Cape Datu to the Sadong River), which was rich in antimony, for an annual tribute of \$2,500. This was as a result of Pengiran Muda Hashim's agreement with James Brooke that the former would make the latter governor of Sarawak if he could put an end to the rebellion in Sarawak. After Sarawak was officially given over to him by Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin II (r. 1824 - 1852) in 1847, James Brooke expanded its territory (from one area to another) usually at the expense of Brunei.

Brooke used various tactics to make the Sultan and the aristocrats cede Brunei territories to him. In 1853, Brooke annexed the areas drained by Rivers Samarahan, Sadong, Lingga, Skrang, Krian, Sribas and Rajang, which were rich in jelutong¹⁶, beeswax and rice, having earlier not honoured the agreement he had with Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin II to collect taxes from these areas on his behalf and forward the revenue to the Sultan; Brooke himself was keeping the revenue. Arising out of James Brooke's behaviour, Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin's successor Sultan Abdul Momin (r. 1852 - 1885) complained to the British government. Consequently, Brooke was cautioned by British authorities, but he did not retreat. Instead he pursued a more legal course and negotiated for the cession of the said areas, thereby keeping them under his control in return for a fixed payment of \$1,500 per year and half of any surplus revenue. The revenue that Sultan Abdul Momin received was considered significant at the time because he had previously derived no benefit at all from these territories. This additional income also helped him to consolidate his position vis-à-vis his own subjects.

In 1861, James Brooke expanded the area under his control by acquiring the territory between Rajang and the Bintulu Rivers (the area rich in jelutong, beeswax and rice) including Rivers Mukah (a centre of sago trade) and Oya. He gained these areas through his manipulations in the context of local disputes in the territory. In 1861, James Brooke visited Brunei to negotiate the annexation of Mukah with Britain intervening in favour of Brooke. As a result, an agreement was reached by which Mukah and Bintulu were ceded to Brooke in return for the payment of \$4,500 per year to the Sultan. Thus, Brunei lost its valuable sago exports from this territory to Singapore.

In 1865, Sultan Abdul Momin leased almost the whole of North Borneo to American Charles Lee Moses; this changed hands several times before it was retained by Alfred Dent and his associates of London who then formed the North Borneo Company. The lease was made by Sultan Abdul Momin in order to counter the activities of the Brooke family in Sarawak and, also, because of economic benefits whereby the Sultan received

\$4,500 in annual payments while Pengiran Temenggung Pengiran Anak Hashim received \$4,000.

In 1868, when Charles Brooke attempted to expand the Sarawak territories by acquiring the Baram River basin (which Sultan Abdul Momin described as 'the well from which our people drink water'¹⁷) from the Sultan, the latter protested at Brooke's attempt, referring to the 1847 Agreement with Brunei. Consequently, the British Foreign Office placed a ban on Sarawak acquiring any further territories for the next ten years. It was apparent from this that Britain was content with the policy of limited involvement in Borneo, as long as its commercial interests and political influence were not under any threat.

However, when a charter was granted to the North Borneo Company in November 1881, Britain could no longer continue its ban on Sarawak's expansion imposed in 1868. This was because there was, at this time, increased competition especially between Britain and France in Africa and the Far East and those powers such as Italy and Germany which possessed no colonies. In 1882 Peter Leys, the new consul-general in Labuan, applied diplomatic pressure on the Sultan to cede Baram to Charles Brooke. The Sultan, who realized that further opposition was futile, gave in transferring all the rivers from Kidorung to Baram. From this, the Sultan received \$3,000 and the Temenggong received \$2,000 per year.

The cession of Baram subsequently initiated a period of intense competition between Sarawak and North Borneo for the control of the few territories now remaining to Brunei. In 1884, the British North Borneo Company obtained the lease of the Padas region from Brunei for \$3,000 per year. Meanwhile, private individuals also began to obtain leases: two cases are (a) in 1882 W.C. Cowie acquired from the Sultan of Brunei a lease of mineral rights at Muara, the coal-rich peninsula at the mouth of the Brunei River; and (b) in 1884, A.H. Everett, a former employee of the North Borneo Company and, since 1881, Rajah Brooke's agent in Brunei, acquired mineral rights and the revenue rights of the Padasan River.

Because of the alarming rate of the loss of Brunei's territories, Sultan Abdul Momin called a meeting of his *pengirans* in 1885 where they made an oath or *Amanat* not to cede anymore of Brunei's territories to foreigners. In order to further protect Brunei's remaining territories and its dynasty from the Brookes in Sarawak and the British North Borneo Company, Sultan Abdul Momin entered into an agreement with Britain in 1888. By this agreement Brunei handed over the conducting of its foreign relations to Britain and, also, agreed not to cede any more territory without prior British consent. However, Britain gave protection to Brunei not to save Brunei from Sarawak and North Borneo, but to secure Brunei against any foreign interference so it can eventually be absorbed within either Sarawak or North Borneo. This strategy was quite obvious when Brooke annexed Limbang in 1890 and Britain gave it legal recognition instead of objecting to it.

The loss of Limbang was damaging to Brunei's economy as the Sultan and many of Brunei's aristocrats lost their only source of revenue, especially from the decline in sago exports. While before the annexation of Limbang by Sarawak, Brunei could export 2,000 bags of sago, by 1898 it exported only 600 to 700 bags.¹⁸ Almost all of the four sago factories in Brunei had to be closed down by 1903 as the trade shifted from Limbang to Kuching.¹⁹ In 1904, M. S. H. McArthur, the Acting British Consul to Brunei, reported that Brunei had lost annual revenue estimated at about \$200,000 because of the loss of Limbang.²⁰

Although in terms of the economy there was little left to the Sultanate, Brooke in Sarawak still intended to absorb what remained of Brunei within its territory. When a rebellion broke out in Tutong in 1899 and Belait in 1901, Rajah Brooke of Sarawak offered to rule the districts.²¹ The rebellion broke out in both territories as a result of heavy

taxation imposed on the population by the Sultan and the *pengirans* (due to the loss of Limbang territory to Brooke in 1890). Brooke offered cession money of \$3,000 for the Tutong and Belait River basins, with a further \$1,000 if Brooketon, the coal mining district of Muara, were included. In June 1902, Brooke extended his offer to cover the whole of Brunei, including the capital. Under this offer, the Sultan and the remaining two wazirs were to retain their honours and titles and receive annual pensions: the Sultan \$12,000 and the Pengiran Bendahara and the Pengiran Pemancha \$6,000 each (half of these amounts being paid to their descendants after their deaths).²² Sultan Hashim, however, rejected the offers considering them a breach of the 1888 Agreement.

After the annexation of Limbang by Sarawak, both officials at the Colonial and Foreign Offices debated the future of Brunei. Most of the debates on Brunei centred on whether Brunei should be absorbed by Sarawak or preserved as a kingdom. Sir Charles Mitchell, British High Commissioner for Borneo, suggested that no changes be made in Brunei until the Sultan's death and that, following his death, Brunei be handed over to Sarawak.²³ This suggestion was supported by Lord Salisbury who, before the 1888 Protectorate Agreement, wanted to 'finish off' Brunei.²⁴ According to K.G. Tregonning, 'in 1900, instructions were given that on the death of the Sultan, if not earlier, the existing administration should be brought to an end and the country partitioned completely.'²⁵

In 1903 when Hewett reported that Sultan Hashim had asked for Turkey's protection in a letter which the consul had intercepted, the British became concerned about Brunei.²⁶ Moreover, oil was discovered at Rajah Brooke's coal mine on Berambang Island in 1903. Following these developments, some British officials at the Foreign and Colonial Offices started to consider introducing the Residency System in Brunei. Frank Swettenham, Governor of the Straits Settlements,²⁷ made the recommendation but had reservations for he did not believe that Brunei would be able to afford the resident's pay and other necessary expenses. This thought was similarly shared by F. H. Villiers of the Foreign Office who argued that so much of 'the ancient kingdom has been acquired by Sarawak and the British North Borneo Company'.²⁸ Most officials at the Foreign and Colonial Offices thought that the best solution to Brunei's problem was the absorption of Brunei by Sarawak. Consequently, in 1904, McArthur was dispatched to Brunei to study the situation and to make recommendations about Brunei's future.

McArthur in his report made it clear that the absorption of Brunei by Sarawak was not appropriate because Brooke was 'generally disliked and distrusted'.²⁹ He also argued against leaving matters as they were because this would lead to the loss of Brunei's sovereignty.³⁰ On the other hand, McArthur recommended British protection as it would be 'less obnoxious to them than loss of identity as a mere part of Sarawak or North Borneo'.³¹ He also recommended that Brunei be administered with Labuan as Labuan depended to a large extent on Brunei for its trade. Moreover, communication with the outlying districts of Brunei was easier from Labuan.³² Regarding the cost, he explained that 'it could not be hoped that the country would prove self-supporting at first, but it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that' (given) '...a substantial volume of trade, a fertile soil, and natural and mineral resources hitherto hardly tapped, its future would ultimately be one of prosperity'.³³ Thus, by revealing the full depth of opposition to Rajah Brooke in Brunei, the Sarawak option was finally ruled out and, by suggesting that after an initial loan Brunei might soon become self-supporting, the principal objection to the Residency System was removed. Thus, in 1906 an agreement was made between Sultan Hashim and John Anderson whereby Brunei became a British protectorate. By this agreement the Sultan received the services of a British officer whose advice had to be followed and acted upon regarding all affairs in Brunei, other than those affecting the Islamic religion.

In the above context, a question may arise as to whether the discovery of oil at Rajah Brooke's coal mine in Berambang Island in 1903 influenced Britain to reconsider its

policy towards Brunei. In 1903, Hewett reported that 'oil had been discovered in Brunei with every indication of being in great abundance'.³⁴ When McArthur was sent to Brunei to report on conditions there in 1904, one of the first matters on which the Acting Consul reported was the granting of the oil concessions. John Anderson told him to discourage the grant of oil concessions 'in its present circumstances.'³⁵ Brookes' rights on Berambang Island were secured, but other concessions may be acquired elsewhere. The Sarawak agent had made an offer for a concession, but the Sultan could not give a definite answer which made Hewett think that the Sultan might turn to others. In Hewett's dispatch to Lansdowne he mentioned that 'the Sultan...neither refused nor accepted...I have no doubt he will do all he can to sell it to other people first before accepting the Rajah's offer'.³⁶ In the dispatch of the Colonial Office to the Foreign Office, Britain's concern over the oil concession is clear: 'it would appear to Mr Chamberlain to be very desirable that whatever influence can be legitimately brought to bear upon the Sultan, should be used to prevent a concession for working this oil into the hands of private adventurer'.³⁷ From here one can see that Britain was deeply concerned about the oil concessions passing to another foreign power. Thus it appeared that in order to secure it, Britain needed to reconsider its policy towards Brunei.

BRUNEI'S ECONOMY AFTER THE INTRODUCTION OF THE RESIDENCY SYSTEM

The repercussions of the cession or the loss of Brunei's territories to Sarawak and North Borneo were that Brunei lost its valuable resources forever. The loss was clearly felt when the Residency System was introduced in Brunei in 1906 and the task of generating income for Brunei's treasury became a big challenge to the British Resident. The Residency system had to create income for Brunei's treasury in order to pay for Brunei's administrative costs. From the beginning of the Residency System until the end of 1927, the British government had to pay the resident's salary. In 1927, this payment was abolished 'in view of improved finances of Brunei and pressing need for economy in imperial expenditure'.³⁸ Consequently, the resident declared that the withdrawal of the subsidy came 'as a distinct blow to this struggling State, where every cent is doubly precious'.³⁹ (vide Appendix at end of paper for a broad picture of the revenue and expenditure of Brunei for the period 1907-1935)

The problem with Brunei's economy in the early stage of the Residency System, according to McArthur, was that Brunei had no public treasury and 'had no government in the usual sense of the term - only ownership'.⁴⁰ The Sultan and his *pengirans* held all the land and people lived on it divided under three forms of tenure: *kerajaan* (crown lands), *kuripan* (lands held by the *wazirs* as appanages) and *tulin* (private hereditary domains). Under this system, the owners of the *kerajaan*, *kuripan* and *tulin* could impose taxes upon the people who lived in their territories as they wished and everything they earned from these territories went into their pockets.

When the Residency System was introduced in 1906, the land tenure system in Brunei was scrapped. In accordance with the 1905 - 06 Agreement, the Sultan and *wazirs* gave up their traditional rights of income from *kerajaan* and *kuripan* holdings. In return they received fixed annuities of \$12,000 and \$6,000 respectively. All lands became state property except those held with registered titles. The British administration borrowed money from the Federated Malay States and some of it was used to redeem the lands. During the years between 1906 and 1909 at least \$7,045 was spent on the redemption of *tulin* rights.⁴¹ The government also bought monopolies as no administration was possible as long as these monopolies remained in existence; a loan of \$200,000 was obtained from the Federated Malay States (FMS) to enable the government to buy them out. Toward

1908, the original Malayan loan was already virtually exhausted. By 1914, no less than \$439,750 had been borrowed, of which \$72,009 had been used for the redemption of monopolies.⁴² Once monopolies affecting trade had been redeemed, a fixed scale of import duties was introduced.⁴³

In 1906, Brunei's revenue came mainly from such sources as licences, customs duties, land and mining, poll-tax, postal revenue, launch fares and freight, market boat tax, interests, court fines and fees, and over issues refunded. Brunei's revenue for the year 1906 was \$28,174.⁴⁴ In 1907, it increased to \$51,777, as there was a significant rise in customs revenue, but the state's economy was in deficit as the total expenditure exceeded revenue.⁴⁵ Until the discovery and development of oil, Brunei's economy produced nothing which could generate a substantial income for the government. In 1914, its economy was about \$40,000 in deficit. In this year rubber, which had been introduced in Temburong in 1908, was exported for the first time but the export value contributed only a little to the national exchequer.

Initially the main exports of Brunei were cutch and sago. Sago was the staple industry in the Belait, Tutong and Temburong River basins. The approximate value of the exports of sago in 1915 was \$37,229.⁴⁶ This, however, had not been encouraging as a result of the very low price of sago. The cutch industry, which was operated by the Island Trading Syndicate (established in Brunei Town in 1900), exported tonnes of bark extract (cutch), but its export value was again trivial.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, cutch was Brunei's most valuable single export from 1906 to 1922 (except in 1918 and 1921).⁴⁸

In 1921 when the government for the first time imposed a tax on the export of coal, its export value was also little. One of the reasons for this was the shortage of shipping.⁴⁹ Moreover, the Brooketon colliery suffered heavy losses from the outset and it was not until 1917 that a minuscule surplus was shown on a year's trading. Although good profits were made in the years 1918 - 1920, the colliery lapsed into red in 1922, and despite small surpluses in 1923 and 1924, Brooke closed the mine in November of 1924.⁵⁰ Since the transfer of these rights to Brunei, various syndicates were interested in carrying out mining. However, their inability to attract sufficient capital brought their efforts to nought.

In 1924 the output of cutch decreased and the sago trade continued to decline. The drop in the output of the cutch industry was partly because of the short-sighted policy of the Island Trading Syndicate which had not done any reforestation in the Temburong District.⁵¹ The sago industry weakened, because the price of sago was very low. Consequently, many peasants turned to the rubber industry which was more profitable.

The rubber plantations were operated by smallholders and estates in the Temburong, Tutong and Brunei districts. In 1925, when the export value of rubber reached its peak of \$1,859,736, Brunei had surplus revenue of about \$69,973.⁵² The rubber industry was, however, hit hard by economic depression of the 1930s. During the slump in the price of rubber, the planters began to pay more attention to their sago plantations which had been badly neglected since rubber planting began to engage their attention. Over 6,000 *pikuls* of sago flour were exported in 1930 against 3,000 *pikuls* in 1929 and there was also a much increased production for local consumption too mainly as an insurance against a possible failure of the rice harvest. By the end of the year, however, the price of sago flour had fallen so low that production declined that export levels declined⁵³; only 2,206 *pikes* to the value of \$3,485 were exported as against 6201 *pikuls* to the value of \$21,481 in 1930. The price declined to such an extent that the production of sago flour became rather uneconomical.⁵⁴

Meanwhile in 1931, a report on the possibility of developing Brunei coal was made by a geologist of the Federated Malay States (FMS) Mines Department. This report stated that the development of coal mining would be very expensive and difficult due to the peculiar nature of the seams. The Syndicate that was negotiating at the beginning of the

year 1931 found them unable to accept the conditions lay down by the Brunei government and consequently no interest was shown by any company.⁵⁵

Other resources being tried out in order to generate income for Brunei's treasury included timber. However, since the government was struggling to keep up with domestic demand, only a small amount of timber was exported. The government trials with cash crops such as tea, coffee, manila hemp and cotton were also unsuccessful.⁵⁶ When McArthur reported that Brunei would become a prosperous state because of its fertile soil, it would appear that he was being somewhat over-optimistic. Very little of Brunei's soil is suitable for agriculture because of the intense leaching of nutrients caused by heavy tropical rainfall. G.E. Wilford described Brunei's soil as 'mostly thin and poor in assimilable bases and many are highly acid'.⁵⁷

The dried prawn trade which was started in 1918 also brought in little revenue to Brunei, as did the export of arts and crafts such as brass, silverware, sarongs, baskets and hats. In the 1930s weaving began to decline because Brunei producers were unable to compete with the Japanese.⁵⁸

As stated before, the chief source of income for Brunei's treasury was revenue from customs duties levied mainly on imports. The government opium monopoly was the next most important item. Opium however provided a much smaller share of Brunei's revenue than was the case in the Straits Settlements or the Federated Malay States (FMS). Further revenue came from license fees, land rents and survey fees, interest and the rare issues of new stamps. Thus, until the development of the oil industry, Brunei's economy produced nothing which could generate a substantial income for the government. As a result, development in Brunei was modest. With Brunei's limited economy, only a few specialised government departments, namely Agriculture, Posts, Customs, Public Works, Police, Health and Education were established.⁵⁹ This modest development continued even after the first twenty years from the discovery of oil as the British Residency was too cautious to spend the money (for Brunei's development and welfare of the people) as it feared that the oil wells in Brunei may not last very long coupled with the initial administrative experience of 'grappling with a nearly bankrupt State'.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, after the initial stages immediately after the discovery of oil in 1929, the oil industry changed Brunei's economy drastically.

SOME ISSUES AFTER THE DISCOVERY OF OIL

The British Malayan Petroleum Company Limited, which was allied to the Sarawak Oilfields and which obtained a lease at Labi in the District of Belait, had been for several years carrying out vigorous prospecting operations under license in the coastal area of the Belait District. In April 1929 oil was found at Seria about 10 miles north-west of Kuala Belait.⁶¹ This was only exported in commercial quantities in 1932. The royalties from oil alone brought huge incomes to the state's treasury: the Brunei government received \$340 million in royalties for the period between 1932 and 1959. While in December 1932, the total value of Brunei's assets in the form of investments and cash amounted to only \$309,724, in 1952, this amount jumped to \$144.5 million.⁶²

With its oil-based economy, Brunei was able to unleash mega development plans for every five years. As mentioned earlier, in the First Five-Year National Development Plan, \$100 million was allotted by the government for the development of various fields such as communication and infrastructure. Within the Second Five-Year National Development Plan (1962 - 1966), in the 1963 December budget, \$30 million was apportioned for development; of which a good slice went to improve health, education and public works. The Legislative Council also passed the National Development Fund Bill, authorizing expenditure of \$47 million.⁶³ On the other hand, as a result of oil production, the original

sources of Brunei's income such as exports of rubber, sago and cutch were gradually neglected. Brunei became, and still is, almost completely dependent on revenue from oil and gas to finance its development programmes.

The wealth from oil did not only enable the government to start on super development plans, it also enabled Brunei to maintain its sovereignty (though small in size) as a Malay Islamic Monarchy. In the 1950s, when the Colonial Office proposed to associate Brunei closely with Sarawak and North Borneo and then with Malaya (before it was granted independence), Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III disregarded it. One of the reasons was that the Sultan did not want to share Brunei's oil wealth with Sarawak and North Borneo.⁶⁴ Then again in the 1960s when the Malayan Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman proposed the formation of the Federation of Malaysia consisting of Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, Sabah and Brunei, the Sultan rejected the idea and this was partly because he did not want the Malaysian government to control Brunei's oil revenue.

During the discussions between the Malayan government and Brunei, the former insisted that the control of Brunei's oil revenue should be passed to the federal government ten years after Brunei's entry into Malaysia. However, the Sultan wanted to retain Brunei's control over any revenue and income relating to oil in perpetuity. The Malayan government also wanted the right to tax immediately any new oil and mineral finds discovered after the Sultanate joined Malaysia, whereas the Sultan maintained that Brunei should retain such revenue. It thus looked as if the Federal government wanted to control Brunei's oil wealth, but Brunei would not surrender its oil wealth to the Federal government because it would be left with nothing.

The failure to reach any consensus regarding the future of Brunei's oil economy with the Malay Federation became one of the main reasons for the Sultan's refusal to join Malaysia in 1963. Indeed, the Sultan had already stated in his correspondence to Tunku Abdul Rahman between July 1961 and October 1963 that Brunei should only join the federation if the Malayan government could accept all of Brunei's terms.⁶⁵ There have also been some suggestions that Brunei refused to join Malaysia as the Brunei Shell Petroleum Company had influenced the Sultan not to join the federation. During the Sultan's meeting with the Malayan government in Kuala Lumpur, the Brunei Shell Petroleum Company sent a telegram indicating a large commercial discovery of oil at Southwest Ampa Field. The Company warned the Sultan that if Brunei joined Malaysia, the control and management of Brunei's oil resources would be merged with the Federation. According to B.A. Hamzah, the telegram was sent purposely to the Sultan to influence him to stay out of Malaysia.⁶⁶

In 1966, when the British Labour government decided to end its 1959 Agreement with Brunei, the most pressing matter that the British thought would affect them was their economic interests in Brunei. In this regard, the Commonwealth Office was apprehensive that the Sultan might retaliate by not giving any new concession to the Shell Petroleum Company in Brunei and by withdrawing its sterling reserve from the Bank of England in London. A record of a meeting at the Commonwealth Office on 27 November 1967, stated that 'If Brunei wished to retaliate Brunei's sterling reserves and the Shell Company would be the most obvious targets'.⁶⁷ In 1965, the British government received net profits from the Brunei Shell Petroleum Company of about £4,000,000 (which is approximately £35,000,000 at 2005 prices). Furthermore, in 1966 the Brunei government held reserves in London amounting to £133 million (which is approximately £800 million at 2005 prices).⁶⁸

In 1974, when the British Labour government revived its 1966 decision to end its 1959 Agreement with Brunei, once again the most pressing matter that the British thought would affect them was their economic interests in Brunei. Because of these, in 1978 Britain continued to station a battalion of Gurkhas in Brunei for five years from the date of

the signature. In this regard, the British government delayed the withdrawal of the British Gurkha battalion in Brunei from 1976 to 1983. The decision to continue stationing the Gurkhas was believed to stem from the British concern that the former Sultan Sir Omar might withdraw Brunei's sterling reserve from London. If the Sultanate suddenly decided to pull out nearly £400 million from London, the ailing British economy would suffer even more.⁶⁹ Moreover, Brunei had remained faithful to British economic management of its resources, despite successive devaluation of the British pound that entailed a depreciation of Brunei's reserve.⁷⁰ However, Brunei and British sources continued to maintain that Brunei's investments in Brunei 'were not being used as a lever to retain the Gurkhas in the State'.⁷¹

The wealth from oil undoubtedly also helped to protect the Sultanate from any internal and external threats. With its oil economy, Brunei was able to retain the British Gurkha forces in Brunei. According to Major General Lewis Pugh, the Sultan's objective for retaining British military protection was undoubtedly the result of security concerns, that is to 'secure the safety, economic stability and progress of Brunei in the face of a political threat should Brunei become independent, in the short term from Malaysia and in the longer term from Indonesia'.⁷² With the population standing at only 114,145 in 1967 and with an army of only 692,⁷³ Brunei would clearly not be able to defend itself against any internal or external attacks. As the Sultan once stated, 'even if half of the male population of Brunei were to join the armed forces, the little kingdom could not defend itself'.⁷⁴ Moreover, the regiment had only been in existence for a few years and the officers had been fully occupied in undergoing courses and training abroad.⁷⁵ That is why the Sultan valued British military protection for Brunei and was willing to pay for the stationing of the British Gurkha battalion in the Sultanate.⁷⁶ The cost was not a problem for the government because it would be equally costly for Brunei to raise its own forces.⁷⁷ Since the end of the Indonesia-Malaysia Confrontation in 1966, the Brunei government had paid about half of the cost of maintaining the Gurkha Battalion in Brunei, which was approximately £500,000 per year. In April 1968, the Sultan declared his willingness to pay the entire sum of about £1,000,000 a year for the British battalion until the time of its withdrawal in November 1970.⁷⁸

Brunei was now able to defend itself by purchasing sophisticated weapons. As Brunei did not have a sufficiently large population to set up sizeable armed forces, it had to turn to technology to compensate for the lack of manpower. The Regiment, which was established in 1961, acquired a flotilla based at Muara and an air wing of helicopters. The make of *Pahlawan*, the flagship of the flotilla in the early 1970s, was in her time the fastest warship afloat. The flotilla also boasted a troop-carrying hovercraft. In 1978, Brunei ordered a battery of *Rapier-Blindfire* surface-to-air missiles. New patrol boats ordered in 1979 were fitted with French Exocet missiles. In the same year, six BO105C-armed helicopters were ordered.⁷⁹ In early 1981, the government ordered three Rotork 12.6m patrol boats, SF260 armed training aircraft and three Bell 212 helicopters.⁸⁰ A squadron of British-made Scorpion tanks provided extra power on land. The armed forces also deployed a highly sophisticated and advanced tactical communications system.⁸¹ By 1983, Brunei's forces were well-equipped and able to deal with emergencies on the oilfields and to respond to a threat of sabotage or attack by pirates at sea. On land they could respond to a cross-border incursion or domestic insurrection.⁸² According to the Deputy Commander of the Royal Brunei Malay Regiment, Colonel Pehin Mohamad Daud, when Britain gave up its responsibility for Brunei's defence, Brunei would be 'as well equipped as any army in this neighbouring region. The only danger is if we equip ourselves too much, we could land ourselves with problems'.⁸³

While, in 1974, the British government delayed the withdrawal of the British Gurkha battalion in Brunei from 1976 to 1983, before Brunei's independence in 1984, the British

government agreed to retain the battalion after Brunei's independence. The decision to continue stationing the Gurkhas was again based on British concerns that Brunei might end the agreement under which the Royal Dutch Shell Group jointly exploited the Sultanate's resources.⁸⁴ since 1975; the Brunei government has had a 50-50 shareholding agreement with the Royal Dutch Shell Group. The Brunei government, according to the *Borneo Bulletin* of 7 May 1982, however, strongly denied the report which was made by the international news agency *Reuters* and stated that the agreement had no relation whatsoever directly or indirectly to defence talks between Brunei and Britain. Nevertheless, in May 1982, a deal was signed between the Brunei government and Jasi Jackson Private Limited (which was 25 per cent Brunei and 75 per cent owned by United States firm called Jackson Exploration Incorporated) whereby some 700,000 acres had been granted for oil exploration.⁸⁶

Moreover, the Shell Company, which had provided the garrison accommodation in Seria, had made it plain that they wished the Gurkha battalion to remain there as they believed the presence of the battalion underwrote the security of their personnel and installations since the oil refinery was under British control in Southeast Asia.⁸⁷ The British Ministry of Defence was well aware that the Gurkha presence provided good experience for nearly 200 British officers and NCOs, as Brunei had an excellent jungle training school.⁸⁸ Furthermore, the fact that the Sultanate continued to pay for the upkeep of the battalion in Brunei was another important factor in Britain's decision to allow the Sultan to retain the Gurkha battalion, as that would reduce the cost of deploying the Gurkhas to Hong Kong in times of emergency there.

CONCLUSION

The paper has outlined the historical circumstances which accounted for the ups and downs in the economic fortunes of Brunei from early times, when it depended entirely on the export of primary produce, to the present era when the discovery of oil in the early 20th century set the pace for its affluence and modernization. It is the contention of this paper that the contribution of the oil industry has proved to be a significant factor in the modern economic, social and political history of Brunei, and helped preserve Brunei's sovereignty as a Malay Islamic Monarchy.

END NOTES

¹ Government of Brunei, http://www.brunei.gov.bn/about_brunei/economy.htm (2007).

² CO1022/436, Confidential, *Five Year National Development Plan: Summary of proposals*. Enclosed in C. J. Thomas to Sir Gerald Whitley, 15 July 1953. Cited in B.A. Hussainmiya, *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin II and Britain: The Making of Brunei Darussalam* (Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press, 1995), p.120.

³ *Borneo Bulletin*, 29 September 1959. Cited in Hussainmiya, *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III*, p. 120.

⁴ J. Crawford, *A Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries*, (London: Bradbury & Evans, 1856), p. 69. Mohd. Jamil Al-Sufri (Pehin Dato Haji) (ed.), *History of Brunei in Brief* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei History Centre, 2000), p. 6.

⁵ Friedrich Hirth and William W. Rockhill (transl.), *Chau Ju-kua; His Work on the Chinese and Arab Trade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, Entitled Chu-fan-chi* (New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp. 1966), p. 156.

⁶ McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*, introduced and annotated by A. V. M. Horton, Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series, No. 74 (Athens: Ohio University: 1987), p. 209.

⁷ Hirth and Rockhill, *Chau Ju-kua*, pp. 155 - 159.

⁸ Carrie C. Brown, "An Early Account of Brunei by Sung Lien", *Brunei Museum Journal*, 2.4 (1972): 221.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 219.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 219.

- ¹¹ Cited in Robert Nicholl (ed.), *European Sources for the History of the Sultanate of Brunei in the Sixteenth Century*, (Bandar Seri Begawan: Muzium Brunei, 1975), p. 10.
- ¹² Saunders, *A History of Brunei* (Kuala Lumpur/New York: Oxford University Press), p. 40.
- ¹³ Cited in Nicholl, *European Sources*, p. 54.
- ¹⁴ Saunders, *A History of Brunei*, p. 52.
- ¹⁵ The Portuguese for example controlled the spice trade in the Malay Archipelago after the fall of Malacca.
- ¹⁶ The jelutong (*Dyera costulata*) is a species of tree in the oleander subfamily. It is used for its wood and its latex is a basic ingredient of chewing gum.
- ¹⁷ Bachamiya Abdul Hussainmiya, *Brunei: Revival of 1906* (Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei Press, 2006), p. 11.
- ¹⁸ No. 2322 Annual Series, Diplomatic and Consular Reports: "Borneo, Reports for the year 1898 on the Trade of Borneo and Sarawak" (London: Harrison and Sons, 1899), pp. 4-5. Cited in Haji Abdul Karim bin Haji Abdul Rahman, "Cabaran Ekonomi Brunei Pada Abad 19: Implikasi dari Dasar Perdagangan Bebas Inggeris di Borneo", paper delivered at the *International Seminar on External Challenge and Local Response: Modern Southeast Asia In Historical Perspective*, organised by Department of History, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University Brunei Darussalam, 20-22 September 1997, p. 13.
- ¹⁹ Hussainmiya, *Brunei: Revival of 1906*, p. 22.
- ²⁰ See McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*, p. 123.
- ²¹ Saunders, *A History of Brunei*, p. 95.
- ²² McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*, pp. 21-22.
- ²³ Ranjit Singh, *Brunei 1839-1983: The Problems of Political Survival* (Singapore/New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 92.
- ²⁴ PRO, FO12/78, Salisbury Minute, 1 January 1888.
- ²⁵ PRO, FO12/113, FO to High Commissioner for Borneo territories, 27 April 1902, cited in K. G. Tregonning, "The Partition of Brunei", *Journal of Tropical Geography*, 11 (1958): 88.
- ²⁶ Nicholas Tarling, *Britain, the Brookes and Brunei* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press), p. 5.
- ²⁷ PRO, CO144/77, FO to CO, 26 February 1903.
- ²⁸ PRO, CO144/77, FO to CO, 26 February 1903.
- ²⁹ McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*, p. 161, para. 112.
- ³⁰ Ibid., p. 156, para. 135.
- ³¹ Ibid., p. 172, para. 135.
- ³² Ibid., p. 172, para. 137.
- ³³ Ibid., p. 177, para. 146.
- ³⁴ PRO, CO144/77, Hewett to Lansdowne, 28 March 1903.
- ³⁵ Tarling, *Britain, the Brookes and Brunei*, p. 506.
- ³⁶ PRO, CO144/77 Hewett to Lansdowne, 28 March 1903.
- ³⁷ HCO, Borneo 29/03, Swettenham to Consul for Brunei, 19 June 1903, and enclosures, cited in Singh, *Brunei 1839-1983*, p. 96.
- ³⁸ CO717/58, file 29220, item 1: CO to High Commissioner, telegram 17 October 1927. Cited in McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*, p. 204.
- ³⁹ CO 717/59, file 52345, memorandum by E. E. F. Pretty, 4 January 1928. See also McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*, p. 204.
- ⁴⁰ See McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*.
- ⁴¹ Ibid., p. 56.
- ⁴² Ibid., p. 58.
- ⁴³ Saunders, *A History of Brunei*, p. 111.
- ⁴⁴ *Brunei Annual Report*, 1907.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid., 1907.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid., 1916.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid., 1933.
- ⁴⁸ McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*, p. 225.
- ⁴⁹ *Brunei Annual Report*, 1917.
- ⁵⁰ McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*, p. 217.
- ⁵¹ *Brunei Annual Report*, 1924.
- ⁵² Hussainmiya, *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III and Britain*, p. 30.
- ⁵³ *Brunei Annual Report*, 1929.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid., 1930.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., 1933.
- ⁵⁶ A. V. M. Horton, *The British Residency in Brunei 1906-1959* (Hull: Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, University of Hull, 1984), p. 19.

- ⁵⁷ G. E. Wilford, *Geology and Mineral Resources of Brunei and Adjacent Parts of Sarawak: With Descriptions of Seria and Miri Oilfields* (Kuching: Geological Survey, Borneo Region, Malaysia, 1961), p. 261. Cited in McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*, pp. 208-209.
- ⁵⁸ *Brunei Annual report*, 1938.
- ⁵⁹ Hussainmiya, *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III*, p. 32.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 35.
- ⁶¹ *Brunei Annual Report*, 1930.
- ⁶² BA/0871/1983(SUK Series 3, Box 73), State Treasurer's Statement of Assets and Liabilities as at 31 December 1952, Appendix B. Cited in Hussainmiya, *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III*, p. 31. However, much of the 1940 'expenditure,' incidentally, represented funds invested on behalf of Brunei by the Crown Agents. Cited in McArthur, *Report on Brunei in 1904*, p. 257.
- ⁶³ Hussainmiya, *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III*, p. 347.
- ⁶⁴ R. Singh, *Brunei 1839-1983*, p. 140.
- ⁶⁵ Muhammad Hadi Abdullah, "Brunei's Political Development", p. 137.
- ⁶⁶ B. A. Hamzah, *The Oil Sultanate: Political History of Oil in Brunei Darussalam*, (Kuala Lumpur: Mawaddah Enterprise, 1991), pp. 225-226.
- ⁶⁷ T3122320, Record of Meeting held in the Conference Room of Commonwealth Office, 27 November 1967.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid., 27 November 1967.
- ⁶⁹ Hussainmiya, *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III*, p. 380.
- ⁷⁰ *Borneo Bulletin*, 3 January 1976.
- ⁷¹ Hussainmiya, *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III*, p. 380.
- ⁷² FCO24/739, Major General Lewis Pugh to H.C. Byatt, 4 September 1970. He had an audience with Sir Omar in September 1970.
- ⁷³ Brunei Government/State of Brunei, *Annual Report*, 1967.
- ⁷⁴ *Borneo Bulletin*, 24 May 1969.
- ⁷⁵ FCO24/739, Major General Lewis Pugh to H.C. Byatt, 4 September 1970.
- ⁷⁶ WO32/21069, Henn's Minutes to the War Office, April 1968. See also Webber to Commonwealth Office, 11 March 1968.
- ⁷⁷ WO32/21069, Webber to Commonwealth Office, 19 March 1968.
- ⁷⁸ FCO15/288, Record of Meeting between the Commonwealth Secretary, Sultan Hassanah Bolkiah and Si Omar, 7 April 1968.
- ⁷⁹ See Table 4 in Tim Huxley, *Brunei Defence Policy and Military Expenditure*, Working paper No. 160 (Canberra: Australian National University, Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, 1988), p. 32; Tim Huxley "Brunei: Defending a Mini-State", in Chin Kin Wah (ed.), *Defence Spending in Southeast Asia*, (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1987), p. 232.
- ⁸⁰ Huxley, "Brunei: Defending a Mini-State", p. 232.
- ⁸¹ *Far Eastern Economic Review Asia 1980 Yearbook*, p. 145.
- ⁸² Saunders, *A History of Brunei*, p. 167.
- ⁸³ *Borneo Bulletin*, 12 June 1981.
- ⁸⁴ *Borneo Bulletin*, 1 April 1978.
- ⁸⁵ Ibid., 7 May 1982.
- ⁸⁶ Ibid., 5 June 1982.
- ⁸⁷ FCO24/1688, H. J. Blanks to Hickman, 28 December 1973.
- ⁸⁸ "Who calls the shots?", *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 5 May 1983, p. 28.

REFERENCES

Unpublished Primary Sources

CO144/77
FO12/78
FCO24/739
FCO15/288
FCO24/1688
T312/2320
WO32/21069

Newspapers and Periodicals

Borneo Bulletin, published in Brunei Town/Bandar Seri Begawan.

Far Eastern Economic Review, published in Singapore.

Straits Times, published in Hong Kong

Secondary sources

- Abdul Karim bin Haji Abdul Rahman (1997). *Cabaran Ekonomi Brunei Pada Abad 19: Implikasi dari Dasar Perdagangan Bebas Inggeris di Borneo*. Papr presented at the International Seminar on External Challenge and Local Response: Modern Southeast Asia In Historical Perspective, organised by the Department of History, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University Brunei Darussalam, 20 -22 September 1997.
- Brunei Government/State of Brunei (1906 - onwards). *Annual Report*.
- Chin Kin Wah (ed.) (1987). *Defence Spending in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Government of Brunei Homepage, Information on Economy (2007). http://www.brunei.gov.bn/about_brunei/economy.htm.
- Hirth, F. and Rockhill, W. W. (Transl.) (1966). *Chau Ju-kua; His Work on the Chinese and Arab Trade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, Entitled Chu-fan-chi*. New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp.
- Hamzah, B. A. (1991). *The Oil Sultanate: Political History of Oil in Brunei Darussalam*. Kuala Lumpur: Mawaddah Enterprise.
- Horton, A. V. M. (1984). *The British Residency in Brunei, 1906 - 1959*. Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, Occasional Paper no. 6. Hull: University of Hull.
- Hussainmiya, B.A. (2006). *Brunei: Revival of 1906*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei Press.
- Hussainmiya, B.A. (1995). *Sultan Omar Ali Saifuddin III and Britain: The Making of Brunei Darussalam*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Huxley, T (1988). *Brunei Defence Policy and Military Expenditure*. Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Working paper No. 166. Canberra: Australia National University.
- McArthur, M. S. H. (1987). *Report on Brunei in 1904*. Introduced and annotated by A. V. M. Horton. Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series, No. 74. Athens: Ohio University.
- Mohd. Jamil Al-Sufri (Pehin Dato Haji) (ed.) (2000). *History of Brunei in Brief*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Pusat Sejarah Brunei.
- Muhammad Hadi Abdullah (2002). *Brunei's Political Development and the Formation of Malaysia: 1961-1967*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Hull.
- Nicholl, R (1975). *European Sources for the History of the Sultanate of Brunei in the Sixteenth Century*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Brunei Museum.
- Ranjit Singh, D. S. (1984). *Brunei 1839 - 1983: The Problems of Political Survival*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Saunders, G. E. (2002). *A History of Brunei*. London: Routledge Curzon. (Second ed).
- Shuhud Said (1988). The Royal Brunei Armed Forces - Money Cannot Buy Men. *Asian Defence Journal* January, p. 12.
- Tarling, Nicholas (1971). *Britain, the Brookes and Brunei*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX

Revenue and Expenditure, 1907 - 1935 (in Straits Dollars)

Year	Revenue	Expenditure	Year	Revenue	Expenditure	Year	Revenue	Expenditure
1907	51,777	93,334	1917	126,301	106,011	1927	402,134	426,981
1908	43,539	75,738	1918	12,5726	122,958	1928	354,762	350,005
1909	54,562	76,948	1919	162,020	138,844	1929	345,290	344,092
1910	77,051	73,513	1920	201,250	223,690	1930	333,079	379,604
1911	109,430	79,318	1921	161,520	197,469	1931	342,010	322,791
1912	140,847	122,762	1922	204,504	188,250	1932	362,403	334,329
1913	165,082	138,665	1923	221,767	189,208	1933	580,756	514,812
1914	126,647	163,352	1924	257,474	247,614	1934	645,020	545,021
1915	118,972	114,518	1925	315,261	245,286	1935	813,532	786,201
1916	127,615	113,317	1926	367,344	297,894			

Source: *Brunei Annual Reports 1906 - 1935*

**A NOTE ON THE DATES FOR THE REVELATION OF THE
CORRECT RITES OF THE CELESTIAL HEART
TIANXIN ZHENGFA**

JOHANNES L. KURZ

ABSTRACT

The present paper discusses alternative dates for the origins of an exorcistic practice which usually has been identified with the early Northern Song period (960-1126). It argues that the origins of the cult are much earlier, namely the middle of the tenth century, based on the reading of historical texts dealing with the history of the Five Dynasties and Ten States period (907-960).

INTRODUCTION

The tenth century in Chinese history is referred to as a "transitional period", bridging the years between the fall of the Tang in 907 and the start of the Song dynasty that began in 960. The period in between these two dates is only very rarely treated in Western and Chinese research, which has to do with the apparent confusion resulting from the division of the country into a northern half and a southern half. The north was dominated by five succeeding dynasties, while the south experienced the existence of several states and empires that ruled simultaneously.

As the Song dynasty arose out of this confused situation it is, nevertheless, worthwhile to take a closer look at what actually happened within those 53 years and on the form of transition that occurred. Much of what came to be identified with the new Song dynasty had its roots in the preceding period of the Five Dynasties and Ten States, such as the preservation of books that were going to be the foundation of the Song imperial collection, and the personnel that was going to use them for the compilation of some of the most influential works during the early Northern Song, among many others.

The focus of this paper is on one aspect which is relevant for the understanding of events and people in the southern part of China prior to the reunification of the empire by the Song dynasty in 960. More specifically, the matter in question is the origin of a text of an exorcistic practice and cult that came to be linked to Daoism called *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart* (*Tianxin zhengfa*) and which attained some prominence under emperor Huizong (r. 1101-1125) of the Song.

TAN ZIXIAO AND THE CORRECT RITES OF THE CELESTIAL HEART

The origins of the *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart*, whose practitioners claimed to be able to perform exorcism, and which subsequently came to be linked to Daoism, are recorded in the *Case History of Fouqiu, Wang and Guo, the Three Perfected from Mt. Huagai* (*Huagai shan Fouqiu Wang Guo san zhenjun shishi*) a text, which composed of several other texts, was compiled in the early Ming dynasty (1407). The first chapter is the work of an anonymous author, the second chapter is attributed to Shen Tingrui, a Daoist practitioner, who died in 985,¹ while the attribution to the following four chapters is a matter of scholarly debate.² The entry in question reads:

Rao Dongtian was a man from Linchuan in Fuzhou prefecture (Jiangxi). In the beginning he was a clerk in [his home] district. Later he dreamt of a divine being who told him: "Since you use your heart in a balanced way and you grasp the rules in an upright way, your name should make heaven shake." When he awoke from the dream and became aware of it, he changed [his name to] Dongtian.³ One night he saw a multi-coloured radiance rise before the altar for the ascension (?) to Mt. Huagai. He climbed the mountain to the summit, and ...⁴ following the radiance he dug in the earth and found a golden box. When he opened it he saw an immortal's scripture in jade characters whose title read: "Tianxin jing zhengfa" (Correct Rites of the Scripture of the Celestial Heart). He consequently took the spiritual text but nobody understood its wisdom. An immortal being told him: "You, sir, should see master Tan with the name Zixiao who can teach you in it." From then onwards he searched him for several years, and finally met the master at Nanfeng. ...⁵

This is the accepted version of the events that lead to the discovery of the text which was to play a major role during the reign of the last Northern Song emperor Huizong (r. 1101-1124). The story is included in chapter 5 of the *Case History of Fouqiu, Wang and Guo, the Three Perfected from Mt. Huagai* which is attributed by Hymes to Zhang Yuanshu, who lived in the 13th century, or more than 200 years after the event.

Rao Dongtian here is told by a supernatural being that he needs to seek instruction from master Tan Zixiao, whom he can find only after a search of several years. We are also given the geographic location in the east of modern day Jiangxi province but there is no indication to the period in which the story is set.

For that we have to turn to the preface of the *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart of Shangqing[-Daoism]* (*Shangqing tianxin zhengfa*) by Deng Yougong (1210-1279), where we find an exact date for the discovery of the scriptures:

On the 15th day of the 8th month of the 5th year of the Chunhua era (994) a real and virtuous gentleman⁶ saw in the night above the peak of a mountain a brilliant multi-coloured radiance. ...⁷

The date given corresponds to September 22, 994. According to John Didier this is proof that Tan Zixiao lived at least until that year, and from the evidence he carefully presents, he ends up with ca. 910- ca. 994 as the approximate life dates for Tan Zixiao.⁸

All of this fits into the narrative that Robert Hymes presents in his description of the *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart*. Hymes argues convincingly against a Southern Song origin of the *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart* as presented by Judith Boltz and identifies the new cult as of definitive and undeniable Northern Song origins.

There is however a possibility that the text of the *Case History of Fouqiu, Wang and Guo, the Three Perfected from Mt. Huagai* has been tampered with, a possibility that John Didier has alluded to already some time back⁹ and one that I will outline in more detail in the following.

Zhang Yuanshu's text places the events at an unspecified time, which leaves a lot of space for more speculation. The connection between Zhang's and Deng's texts is only made in the Southern Song in an anonymous interlinear commentary to Zhang's text, which Boltz vaguely dates to the years between 1138 and 1293.¹⁰ Now that we know about the place and the time, what about the actors involved in the discovery of the *Correct Rites* scriptures?

Rao Dongtian does not have any biographical entry in any historical work from Song times. He is however credited with being the first adept of the *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart* after its recovery. A close look at texts dealing with the period preceding the Song dynasty however is rather helpful. In the following I will attempt to clarify the identity of Mr. Rao.

The first person we meet in our investigation is a Yao Dong, who is the addressee of a petition by Song Qiqiu (886-959), the infamous minister of the Southern Tang, asking him

for help at a time, when he was still unemployed and poor. That is all the information the *Historical Record of the Region Around the Yangzi* (*Jiangbiao zhi*), written in 1010, provides us with.¹¹ The *Private History of Jiangnan* (*Jiangnan yeshi*) which probably was written between 1010 and 1023, taking up the information about Song's initial poverty and his search for a patron, has this to say about Mr. Rao:

The (later) first ruler (of the Southern Tang) [Li Bian] at that time was prefect of Shengzhou (in Jiangsu). His close friend Rao Dongtian left the capital to take up the post of commander in Luling (J'an). Since Qiqiu sent him a name card, he talked with him a whole day and welcomed him as his retainer. He entertained him with feasts from dusk till dawn¹²; afterwards he asked his advice in present matters. A short while afterwards Dongtian gave up his command and was ordered to return to Guangling (Yangzhou). He had hardly arrived there when he seriously fell ill and was about to die. Thereupon, in his last will, he recommended [Song] to the last ruler.¹³

Amazingly, this story fits in some parts Shen Tingrui's story, in addition to the exactly similar characters for the name. Rao Dongtian is an official and he is here serving in the geographical region which constitutes today the province of Jiangxi. Moreover we learn that he was a good friend of Li Bian. It is quite obvious that Song deliberately approached Rao to gain access to bureaucratic circles and Li Bian, who then was beginning to accumulate influence and power.

The *Separate Historical Record of Jiangnan* (*Jiangnan bieleu*) by Chen Pengnian (961-1017) contains this anecdote as well, but the cavalry officer here is called Yao Dongtian. Chen stresses the fact that Yao recommends Song to Li Bian, and Li Bian thinks that Song's skills are 'extraordinary'.¹⁴

The *Supplement to the History of the Five Dynasties* (*Wudai shi bu*, attr. to Tao Yue (?-1022)) embellishes this story even more, giving more details about Song's dire conditions.¹⁵ He is helped by a singing girl (who appeared already in the *Separate Historical Record of Jiangnan*), who provides him with money to buy paper, ink and a brush, and he composes a poem, to introduce himself to Yao Dongtian. The latter is described as a military commander in Huainan and is known for his sympathetic attitude towards scholars. As Song's poem is alluding to a potential change of dynasty, Yao is getting angry and refuses to see him. Thereupon Song changes the tone of his note using very humble vocabulary, which is noted by Yao, who then starts to support Song. There is no mention however of a relationship between Yao and Li Bian. Though the family name of Song's patron is different from the story in the *Private History of Jiangnan*, we can assume with certainty that Yao Dongtian is identical with Rao Dongtian. The different character for the family name may hint to an oral transmission of the story and the name, for Yao and Rao are phonetically rather close together.

A further modification of the name but not of the person itself is found in Lu You's (1125-1210) *History of the Southern Tang* (*Nan Tang shu*). The relevant entry reads:

When Li Bian was prefect of Shengzhou, Qiqiu was able to see him with the help of the cavalry commandant Yao Kezhan.¹⁶

From what we know so far, Yao Kezhan, can be none else than the Yao Dong of the *Historical Record of the Region Around the Yangzi*, the Rao Dongtian of the *Private History of Jiangnan*, and the Yao Dongtian of the *Supplement to the History of the Five Dynasties*. It is tempting and to a certain extent legitimate to speculate that the Rao Dongtian of the *Private History of Jiangnan* is the same as the Rao Dongtian mentioned by Shen Tingrui.¹⁷

The religious as well as the purely historical texts provide Rao or Yao with a specific regional background and anchor him in Jiangxi. This is the same place that is regarded as the origins of the *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart* to which we will turn now.

Boltz follows the Deng Yougong account in establishing the date for the revelation as well as Catherine Despeux,¹⁸ so that we are faced with statements from both authors, concerning the 12th century as the time when the *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart* flourished.¹⁹

Tan Zixiao probably lived in Fujian from the reign of Wang Shenzhi (907-925) until 939, when Wang Chang, the ruling emperor posthumously known as Kangzong was murdered. Tan had enjoyed the support of Chen Shouyuan (?-939), an influential Daoist priest at the court, and had been conferred the title of Feathered Guest of the Golden Gate, Master of Orthodox Unity (*Jinmen yuke zhengyi xiansheng*) by the emperor. It is therefore understandable that Tan wanted to move after the murder of the emperor, since in the cleansing following the usurpation, Chen Shouyuan, his patron, was caught and executed. This example and the change in government may have prompted Tan to escape and await the further developments abroad.

Didier dismisses the historical accuracy of the record preserved in the *Comprehensive Mirror on Successive Generations of Transcendents and Those Who Embody the Dao* (*Lishi zhenxian tidaotongjian*), a hagiographical work usually attributed to Zhao Daoyi (fl. 1294-1307). This text relates how Tan Zixiao traveled to Jinling (modern day Nanjing) and was given an audience by Li Bian, who in 936 had usurped the throne of the state of Wu, and in 937 established the Southern Tang, that roughly covered the modern provinces of Jiangsu, Jiangxi, and parts of Anhui.²⁰ Didier indicates that it was not possible for Tan to meet Li Bian after the fall of Min, as that occurred in 946, three years after Li had died. The problem here is twofold, concerning one of translation as well as one of understanding of the historical situation. Apparently Didier translated *Min wang* as "the fall of Min".²¹ However *wang* may also be translated as disorder, chaos, decline and the like. Such 'disorder' actually happened in late 939, when the ruling emperor Kangzong was killed. Though the history of that empire (as of some of the other states in the period) is rather 'bloody', it would appear that the regicide and the killing of even more people that followed it is a brutal enough event to gain it the designation 'disorder'. Moreover Kangzong had surrounded himself with Daoists and shamans who earlier had assassinated two uncles of Kangzong and their sons.

If we accept the date 939 as historically more accurate than the date 946, escaping to the neighboring state of the Southern Tang, Tan Zixiao would have been able to meet Li Bian. That Li Bian in this text is addressed with his posthumous title as emperor "Liezhu of the Southern Tang" thus is not surprising. If of course one accepts Didier's reading of "Min wang" as the 'fall of Min', which occurred in 945, the reigning Southern Tang emperor would have been Li Jing (r. 943-961) who was canonized as Yuanzong.

In 939 Tan could well have met and made the acquaintance of the following Southern Tang rulers including Li Yu (r. 961-976) as well. The date of his death reported in *Comprehensive Mirror on Successive Generations of Transcendents and Those Who Embody the Dao* also roughly corresponds with information found in Ma Ling's (early 12th cent.) *History of the Southern Tang* (*Nan Tang shu*), according to which he died shortly after the fall of Jinling to the Song armies in 976. I find it therefore appropriate to trust the *Comprehensive Mirror on Successive Generations of Transcendents and Those Who Embody the Dao* even though the age of Tan, - "more than hundred fifty years" -, definitely is exaggerated there.

As to Rao Dongtian, it would be very coincidental if the Rao Dongtian, who discovered the scriptures, would be different from the one who is a military official in the same region, almost eighty years earlier. The texts tell us that Rao (or Yao) held his post at a time, when Li Bian was prefect of Shengzhou. We know that Li was appointed to manage the affairs of Shengzhou in 908²², and relieved of his duties by his step-father in early 917.²³ He first was sent to Runzhou as military training commissioner, a place he did

not like, but one which moved him close to the capital of the state of Wu. The following year his step-brother who had acted as regent for the ruler of Wu was murdered in the capital. Li consequently crossed the Yangzi with his troops, quelled the rebellion and was installed in Guangling.

As to when Song actually met Li Bian we are enlightened through the *Yuhu qinghua* which reports that Song became a follower of Li Bian, when he was prefect of Shengzhou.²⁴

From the various stories, anecdotes and biographical details we can conclude, that Rao Dongtian lived between 908 and 917 and that he recommended Song Qiqiu to Li Bian. Tan Zixiao at roughly the same time may have been active in Min under its first ruler Wang Shenzhi, as stated in the account in the *Comprehensive Mirror on Successive Generations of Transcendents and Those Who Embody the Dao* and become friends with Chen Shouyuan (?-939). Chen Shouyuan served at the court of Wang Yanjun (posthumous title Xianzong, r. 916-935), the first of the Min rulers to adopt the title emperor. Chen and three shamans seem to have encouraged Wang Yanjun to renounce the suzerainty of the northern dynasty (in that case the Later Tang) and acquire independence as an empire.²⁵

Lu You credits him with digging up the *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart* scripture that were said to have originated with the first Celestial Master Zhang Daoling (2nd cent. C.E.). The story, as Didier correctly remarks, is reminiscent of the story told by Zhan Yuanshu in the *Case History of Fouqiu, Wang and Guo, the Three Perfected from Mt. Huagai*. The relevant part reads²⁶:

Tan Zixiao hailed from Quanzhou. In his youth he became a Daoist priest. Earlier, by digging in the earth [Chen Shouyuan] had received several tens of wooden tablets, that were contained in a copper vessel. [The wooden tablets] bore the amulet-seals of Zhang Daoling of the Han. Their vermilion and black colours [shone], as if they were new. He stored them but could not use them, so he gave them to Zixiao. Zixiao understood them completely and said consequently that he had acquired Daoling's *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart*. He uncovered demons and cured diseases with much effect.²⁷

With the knowledge and power of the scriptures, Tan Zixiao was able to cure illnesses and exorcise demons, which he proves in the case of He Jingzhu (887-964), who had been a commander during the invasion of the state of Min in Fujian in 945:

He Jingzhu, military governor of Wuchang, once had killed a female slave and thrown her corpse into a well. Nobody knew about this. When he fell ill, he summoned [Tan] Zixiao. In the middle of the night, [Tan] let his hair hang loose and held a sword in order to examine and cure [He's illness]. He saw the girl sternly complaining until the morning broke. People that had been hiding there told this to Jingzhu. [Tan] gave him an amulet written in vermilion seal script and the disease was cured at once.²⁸

He Jingzhu had moved to Wuchang in 950, but the story related here according to Ma Ling²⁹ must be placed at the start of the Song, in the Jianlong era (960-963). Tan Zixiao here was able to apply his magical powers to cure a man, who interestingly was involved in the destruction of his home state in Fujian.

Two parallels exist between this text by Lu You and the story by Zhang Yuanshu. In both texts the scriptures are dug up, having been stored in a case. The finders, Chen Shouyuan and Rao Dongtian do not know what to do with their find and in both instances Tan Zixiao is able to read the text. He does not only do that, but he also starts to take advantage of his knowledge, by using his exorcistic powers given by the scriptures in the Lu You text, and by teaching Rao Dongtian their application in the Zhang Yuanshu text. Incidentally, Rao consequently becomes the first master of the new cult, even though Tan should rightfully be given that honour, as Lu You does by addressing him as Patriarch Zixiao of the Celestial Heart Rites. So there is at least partial consistency, even though the

locations are different, and the 'finders' of the text – Chen Shouyuan in Lu's text³⁰, Rao Dongtian in Shen's – vary.

Under the circumstances it is possible to consider the Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart as a cult which had its roots in southern China. The hagiographical text that explains the revelation of the Correct Rites, places this in Jiangxi province at Mt. Huagai, while the more historically oriented text by Lu You identifies the place of the 'rediscovery' in Fujian. The apparent inconsistency between the two versions has been explained by Didier as stemming from the inclusion of the part of Chen Shouyuan's biography that deals with the discovery, in the later account of Rao Dongtian's hagiography.³¹ Even though he does not explain in detail how this occurred, it seems quite plausible, that the author of the later text included any bit of information he could find admitting even material that on closer inspection did not really fit his account.

CONCLUSION

The Correct Rites case shows that reliance on religious and hagiographical texts only presents a story that is more or less stringent as such. However, consulting historical texts in addition to the religious texts, results in some changes to the accepted version of the discovery and revelation of the Correct Rites. The two major characters accordingly can be identified as having southern China origins, and as is apparent in the dates for Rao Dongtian, must have lived in the first half of the 10th century.

The texts of the Correct Rites enjoyed great popularity which is evident in their inclusion in various imperial and private collections. Robert Hymes accepts the revelation of the Correct Rites as a major event in the religious history of the early Northern Song. As we have seen, the cult may have originated much earlier in the south. Its appropriation under Northern Song auspices can be seen in the same light as that of other cultural features preserved especially under the Southern Tang. As I have explained elsewhere, the second Song emperor Taizong (r. 978-997) in particular, took advantage of what the Southern Tang had to offer not only in literary traditions, but also in material and in manpower.³² It is certainly no coincidence that the revelation of the Tianxin zhengfa in Song sources is identified with the reign of Taizong.

ENDNOTES

¹ Shen Tingrui has biographical entries in his father Shen Bin's biographies in Long Gun (fl. early 11th cent.), *Jiangnan yeshi* (Yuzhang congshu) 6.6b-7a; in Lu You, *Nan Tang shu* (Beijing: Zhongguo shudian, 1986) 7.29; Wu Renchen (1628-1689), *Shiguo chungiu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983) 29.416. Shen Bin had served under the first and the second rulers of the Southern Tang. In the *Nan Tang jinshi*, which was written in 977, we find the information, that Shen at that time was still living in the region of Mt. Yusi (modern day Hunan) and Mt. Fouyun (modern day Hubei). See *Nan Tang jinshi* (Congshu jicheng), 4. Thus it seems he was prominent enough to be mentioned by Zheng. The two chapters in question form part of Shen's otherwise lost *Er zhenjun shilu*. There is no reason to doubt that this book was written by Shen, since his father had also shown great interest in Daoist matters and written a text about them. This earned him an entry in Xu Xuan's (917-992) work on extraordinary people in the region of the Yangzi and Huai rivers, entitled *Jiang Huai yiren lu*.

² On the composition of this text see Judith M. Boltz, *A Survey of Taoist Literature: Tenth to Seventeenth Centuries* (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 1987), 78-81, and Florian C. Reiter, *Grundelemente und Tendenzen des religiösen Taoismus: Das Spannungsverhältnis von Integration und Individualität in seiner Geschichte zur Chin.-Yüan, und frühen Ming-Zeit* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1988), 108-111. For a diverging view of the same text, Robert Hymes, *Way and Byway: Taoism, Local Religion, and Models of Divinity in Sung and Modern China* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002), 277-280.

³ "To make heaven shake" (*dongtian*) is homonymous with Rao's name Dongtian (grotto heaven).

⁴ I cannot make any sense of the character *han* that appears at this place.

⁵ *Huagai shan Fouqiu Wang Guo san zhenjun shishi* (HY 777) 5.313.

⁶ I have not been able to find a more convincing translation for *roushen dashi*. *Roushen* means the body; is used in Buddhism to denote a Bodhisattva for instance, while *dashi* means a man with high qualities.

⁷ *Shangqing tianxin zhengfa* (HY 566), 1.743.

⁸ John Didier, "Mssrs. Tan, Chancellor Sung, and the Book of Transformation (*Hua Shu*): Texts and the Transformations of Traditions", in *Asia Major* 11.1 (1998):122.

⁹ John Didier, "Mssrs. Tan", 121, note 66. Note that Didier's article does not appear in Hymes' account.

¹⁰ Boltz, *Survey*, 287, n. 217.

¹¹ Zheng Wenbao (953-1013), *Jiangbiao zhi* (Xuehai leibian), 3.4a

¹² The *Siku quanshu* recension reads here "[Rao] feasted with him from dusk till dawn".

¹³ *Jiangnan yeshi* 4.1a-b.

¹⁴ Chen Pengnian (961-1017), *Jiangnan bielu* (Xuehai leibian), 6a.

¹⁵ Tao Yue, *Wudai shi bu* (Siku quanshu), 2.10b-11b.

¹⁶ Lu You, *Nan Tang shu*, 4.15.

¹⁷ In a commentary to the *Huagai shan Fouqiu Wang Guo san zhenjun shi* we find Rao Dongtian as R Dongqi. See *Huagai shan Fouqiu Wang Guo san zhenjun shi* (HY 777), 2.286.

¹⁸ Catherine Despeux, *Taoisme et corps humain: le Xiuzhen tu* (Paris: Tredanie, 1994), 173-174. Tan Zixi is mentioned as the 'founder' of the *Correct Rites of the Celestial Heart* on 185, note 91.

¹⁹ On the dating problem and Tan Zixiao see also Poul Andersen, "Taoist Talismans and the History of the Tianxin Tradition", review article of Monika Drexler, *Daoistische Schriftmagie: Interpretationen zu d. Schriftamuletten Fu im Daozang* (München, 1994), *Acta Orientalia* 57 (1996), 3-8.

²⁰ *Lishi zhenxian tidaotongjian* (HY 296), 43.8a.

²¹ The exact same formulation "Min wang" is also found in Lu You's biography of Tan Zixiao. See Lu You *Nan Tang shu*, 17.72.

²² Xue Juzheng (912-981), *Jiu Wudai shi* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977), 134.1785. The *Zizhi tongjian* lists this event under 909. See Sima Guang (1019-1086), *Zizhi tongjian* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976) 267.8708. I tend to rely on the older account, for that we know that Xuanzhou was seized by Chai Zaiyong in 908 and that it was right after that, that Li Bian was promoted to the position in Shengzhou. See *Xi Wudai shi* (Beijing, 1974), 62.765.

²³ *Zizhi tongjian* 269.8815.

²⁴ Wenying (fl. 11th cent.), *Yuhu qinghua*, 10.103, in *Xiangshan yelu, xulu, Yuhu qinghua* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1984).

²⁵ For this see Edward H. Schafer, *The Empire of Min* (Tokyo/Rutland, Vt.: Tuttle, 1954), 96-100.

²⁶ Didier did not translate this passage but paraphrased it.

²⁷ Lu You, *Nan Tang shu*, 17.71.

²⁸ Lu You, *Nan Tang shu*, 17.71.

²⁹ Ma Ling, *Nan Tang shu* (Congshu jicheng), 24.162-163. In this work that dates from the early twelfth century no mention is made of a connection between Tan Zixiao and the Correct Rites; it does however emphasize his relationship to Chen Shouyuan and his practicing Daoist rites.

³⁰ Note that Kenneth Dean referring to Lu You identifies Tan Zixiao himself as the finder of the scriptures, which is incorrect. See Kenneth Dean, *Taoist Ritual and Popular Cults of Southeast Asia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 219.

³¹ Didier, "Mssrs. Tan, Chancellor Sung", 121, note 66.

³² Johannes L. Kurz, *Das Kompilationsprojekt Seng Taizongs* (reg. 976-997) (Bern: Peter Lang, 2003).

REFERENCES

Primary sources

- Chen Pengnian. *Jiangnan bielu*. Xuehai leibian.
Deng Yougong. *Shangqing tianxin zhengfa*. HY 566.
Huagai shan Fouqiu Wang Guo san zhenjun shishi. HY 777.
Long Gun. *Jiangnan yeshi*. Yuzhang congshu.
Lu You. *Nan Tang shu*. Beijing, Zhongguo shudian, 1986.
Ma Ling. *Nan Tang shu*. Congshu jicheng.
Ouyang Xiu. *Xin Wudai shi*. Beijing, Zhonghua shuju, 1974.

Sima Guang. *Zizhi tongjian*. Beijing, Zhonghua shuju, 1976.
 Tao Yue. *Wudai shi bu*. Siku quanshu.
 Wenying. *Xiangshan yelu, xulu, Yuhu qinghua*. Beijing, Zhonghua shuju, 1984.
 Wu Renchen. *Shiguo chunqiu*. Beijing, Zhonghua shuju, 1983.
 Xue Juzheng. *Jiu Wudai shi*. Beijing, Zhonghua shuju, 1977.
 Zhao Daoyi (attr.). *Lishi zhenxian tidao tongjian*. HY 296.
 Zheng Wenbao. *Jiangbiao zhi*. Xuehai leibian.
 Zheng Wenbao (attr.). *Nan Tang jinshi*. Congshu jicheng.

Secondary literature

Andersen, P. (1996). Taoist Talismans and the History of the Tianxin Tradition. Review article of Monika Drexler, *Daoistische Schriftmagie: Interpretationen zu den Schriftamuletten Fu im Daozang* (München, 1994), *Acta Orientalia*, 57: 3-8.
 Boltz, J. M. (1987). *A Survey of Taoist Literature: Tenth to Seventeenth Centuries*. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California.
 Dean, K. (1993). *Taoist Ritual and Popular Cults of Southeast Asia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 Despeux, C. (1994). *Taoisme et corps humain: le Xiuzhen tu*. Paris, Tredaniel.
 Didier, J. (1998). Mssrs. T'an, Chancellor Sung, and the Book of Transformation (*Hua Shu*): Texts and the Transformations of Traditions". *Asia Major*, 11.1: 99-150.
 Hymes, R. (2002). *Way and Byway: Taoism, Local Religion, and Models of Divinity in Sung and Modern China*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
 Reiter, F. C. (1988). *Grundelemente und Tendenzen des religiösen Taoismus: Das Spannungsverhältnis von Integration und Individualität in seiner Geschichte zur Chin-, Yuan, und frühen Ming-Zeit*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
 Schafer, E. H. (1954). *The Empire of Min*. Tokyo/Rutland, VT.: Tuttle.

PROFILE OF CONTRIBUTORS

ASBOL Bin Haji Mail, Haji: CertEd MPSHB, BA UBD, MA PhD Malaya; Senior Lecturer & Head of the Department of History, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. (*Brunei History, Education and Culture and Southeast Asian History*)

ASIYAH AZ-ZAHRA Binti Haji Ahmad Kumpoh, Hajah: BA UBD, MA ANU; Lecturer, Department of History, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. (*East Asian History, Chinese Studies*)

B. A. HUSSAINMIYA, Haji: BEd BA PhD Perad'ya; Associate Professor, Department of History, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. (*South and Southeast Asian History, Classical Malay Literature*)

IIK ARIFIN Mansurnoor: BA Drs Surabaya, Dip Cairo, MA PhD McGill; Associate Professor, Department of History, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. (*Islam in Modern History, Social and Intellectual History*)

ISMAIL Bin Haji Awang Nordin: BA UBD, MA Hull; Lecturer, Department of History, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. (*Nineteenth Century Brunei, Southeast Asian History, World Civilizations*)

MOHD YUSOP Bin Haji Damit, Haji: CertEd MPSHB, BA MA Kent, PhD Lond; Deputy Rector, Universiti Islam Sultan Sharif Ali, Brunei Darussalam. (*History, Politics & Culture of Brunei and Borneo*)

NANI SURYANI Binti Haji Abu Bakar: BA UBD, MA PhD Leeds; Lecturer, Department of History, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. (*Colonialism: the British and North Borneo, British Imperial Policy in North Borneo, Global War*)

Johannes L. KURZ: MA PhD Heidelberg; Senior Lecturer, Department of History, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. (*Socio-political History of 10th-11th Century China, Book Collecting in China*)

NOTES TO PROSPECTIVE CONTRIBUTORS

- Manuscripts must be single-sided and double-spaced (including references and endnotes). All pages should be numbered and the title, author and institutional affiliation should be presented on the first page. An abstract of up to 150 words, in both Malay and English, where possible, should be included. Papers should be succinct and not normally exceed 8000 words.
- Sections, figures and tables should be titled and numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals. Illustrations should be in black and white.
- Mathematical and statistical formulations should be as simple as possible and numbered by consecutive Arabic numerals in brackets at the end of the equation. Lengthy mathematical formulations should be placed in appendices.
- Endnotes should be presented at the end of the manuscript and listed by consecutive Arabic numerals. An asterisk should be used for a note attached to the author.
- The APA style should be used for references. That is, references in the text should be made by providing the author's surname followed by the publication year in parentheses. An alphabetical listing of references by author should be given after the endnotes as follows:

Department of Economic Planning and Development (2005). *Brunei Darussalam Statistical Yearbook*. Bandar Seri Begawan: Statistics Division, Ministry of Finance, Brunei Darussalam.

Gore, A. (2006). *An Inconvenient Truth: The Planetary Emergency of Global Warming and What We Can Do About It*. New York: Rodale

Sirinanda, K. U. (2004). Education for sustainable development: its relevance to Brunei Darussalam. In Bhandari, B. B., Abe, O., and Nakamura, R. (eds.), *Education for Sustainable Development: Putting Research Knowledge into Action*. Tokyo: Ramsar Centre Japan & Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES). Pp. 15-36.

Jones, G. M. (2005/2006). English as a Bruneian language: fact or fiction? *Southeast Asia: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(2): 104-111.

- Papers will not be considered if they have already been published or are being considered for publication elsewhere. They will be published only if data used in the study are documented and available to researchers for replication. Papers will not normally be published if they are minor variations of existing studies.
- It is a condition of publication of articles in *SOUTHEAST ASIA: A Multidisciplinary Journal* that copyright in any article published is transferred to the Publisher. Submission of a paper will be taken to imply that the author agrees that copyright for the paper is transferred to the Publisher if and when the article is accepted for publication. The copyright covers the exclusive rights to reproduce and distribute the article, including photographic reproductions, microfilm or any other reproductions of similar nature, and translations. However, the Publisher will freely give permission to authors to reproduce articles, or parts of articles, for scholarly purposes.
- A hard copy and an electronic version (MS Word) of the manuscript of each article for consideration of publication should be mailed to the Editorial Assistant, *SOUTHEAST ASIA: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Jalan Tungku Link, Gadong BE 1410, Brunei Darussalam.