

THE SARAWAK NATIONAL PARTY AND THE INTERPRETATIONS
OF ITS NATIONALISM

by

PAUL KADANG anak DINGGAT

B.A. (Hons.), University of Victoria, 1974

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Department of Political Science)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

May, 1979

© Paul Kadang anak Dinggat, 1979

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Political Science

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date June 18, 1979

ABSTRACT

This study focusses on the Sarawak National Party (SNAP) as the political organization sought to cope with changing conditions inside Sarawak and Malaysia. In particular, the thesis investigates two varieties of nationalism and their usage by SNAP for the purpose of survival and expansion. The activities and rise of SNAP are examined over three historical periods which spanned from 1961 to 1978.

As a political party SNAP functions in an electorally competitive situation. Its area of operations is largely limited to Sarawak, which is a plural state. Outside the state is the federal government of Malaysia. These three factors -- electoral competition, Sarawak's plurality, and the federal government -- provided three broad underlying conditions which helped shape the particular emphasis of SNAP's nationalism at different times. In addition, there were immediate stimuli which helped determine SNAP's choice of nationalism. Although SNAP was officially a multi-racial party, it initially recruited most of its members from the Dayak community, the largest ethnic group in Sarawak. SNAP's leaders, who came from the Iban ethnic sub-stratum clearly intended the Dayaks to form the strategic ethnic group in the state. The switch to territorial nationalism came about as a result of an intra-alliance crisis which ended with SNAP's ouster from the government. The advocacy of territorial nationalism enabled the party to recruit a multi-racial following and increase its support. The salience of territorial nationalism continued until 1974 at which time SNAP was invited into power by the government. This invitation, coupled with the downfall of advocates of territorial nationalism from the party's leadership, enabled SNAP to re-emphasise Dayak nationalism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. DEMOGRAPHIC SETTING	21
Chinese	
Malays	
Dayaks	
Occupation	
III. FORMATION OF SNAP	31
Formation of SUPP and PANAS	
Dayak Reactions	
The Founders of SNAP	
Party Objectives	
IV. MALAYSIA	55
Formation of Malaysia	
SNAP's Reaction to Malaysia	
Acceptance	
Alliance Building	
Cabinet Formation	
V. ISSUES AND DAYAK INTERESTS	96
Borneonisation	
Language	
VI. SARAWAK NATIONALISM: MULTI-RACIALISM	118
Land	
Bumiputera	
Withdrawal from the Sarawak Alliance	
Sarawak for Sarawakians	

Chapter	Page
VII. RE-EMERGENCE OF ETHNIC NATIONALISM	162
Debacle of 1970	
State Politics	
Election Manifesto, 1974	
Barisan Nasional	
Ethnic Nationalism	
VIII. BASES OF SUPPORT	207
Bases of Support, 1961-1965	
Electoral Performance, 1963	
Expansion of Party Organisation	
SNAP's Leadership	
Electoral Performance, 1970 and 1974	
The 1978 Parliamentary Elections	
IX. CONCLUSION	254
BIBLIOGRAPHY	267

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Malaysian Population Statistics: Estimated Population by Regions and Groups, December, 1967	21
2 Proportion of Melanaus and Dayaks in Selected Areas (by percentage), 1969	27
3 SNAP's Branches Established from 1961 to 1965 by Divisions and Ethnic Areas	211
4 District Councillors, in 1963, Classified According to Party Allegiance	213
5 Alignment of Dayak Councillors by Parties	215
6 SNAP's Branches Established from 1966 to 1968 by Divisions and Ethnic Areas	225
7 Racial Breakdown of SNAP's Members from 1965 to 1978	227
8 Racial Breakdown of SNAP's National Council from 1972 to 1978	228
9 Sarawak General Elections, 1970; Elected State and Parliamentary Candidates in SNAP by Ethnic Groupings	233
10 Sarawak General Elections, 1970; General State Representatives by Parties and Ethnic Groupings ..	234

Tables	Page
11 Coefficient of Correlation of Ethnic Composition of State Constituencies, Showing Votes Cast for Each Political Party: 1970	235
12 Sarawak General Elections, 1979 and 1974; Ethnic Breakdown of SNAP's Candidates	237
13 Sarawak State Elections, 1974; Votes Cast and Members Elected by Parties	238
14 Coefficient of Correlation of Ethnic Composition of State Constituencies, Showing Votes Cast for Each Political Party: 1974	239
15 Percentage of Ethnic Composition of Each Constituency and Percentage of Votes Cast in the 1974 Elections for Each Constituency	243
16 Sarawak Parliamentary Elections, 1978: Votes Cast and Members Elected by Parties	247
17 Sarawak Parliamentary Elections, 1974 and 1978; SNAP's Votes in Nine Selected Constituencies ..	248

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper would not have been possible without the encouragement and assistance received from others. My greatest debt is to the members of my thesis committee. Dr. Paul Tennant provided encouragement and advice that led to the selection of the research topic. Dr. John Wood gave the much-needed guidance during the different stages of research. Professor R. S. Milne provided useful criticism which led to the completion of this thesis.

A special note of thanks is due to several friends who went out of their way to give me assistance. To Nancy Nasser and Grace Cross for their help in typing the various drafts of this paper, and to Dr. C.L. Lambertson for pointing out my inconsistencies. I also owe a great deal to John and Dale Young whose help has sustained me throughout the course of my study in Canada. My thanks also to the interviewees, the staff of the Sarawak Museum and that of the Office of the Registrar of Societies, Kuching, who were generous enough to give me many hours of their time.

Finally, to Wendy Kadang without whose support, understanding, and patience this thesis would not have been completed.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study is concerned with the nationalism of a party within a plural society. In concrete terms, the "party" refers to the Sarawak National Party (SNAP) and "society" means Sarawak, and, at a later stage, Malaysia as well. The societies are plural in the sense that they are culturally diverse and that their "cultural sections are organised into cohesive political sections."¹

What is a party? The definition which has been adopted here is one used by Ranney and Kendall, who define political parties as "autonomous organised groups that make nominations and contest elections in the hope of eventually gaining and exercising control of the personnel and policies of government."² According to this criterion there is little question that SNAP is a political party: it was founded and registered as an autonomous body that is a self-governing and self-regulating unit; it has its own constitution and officers; and it lists as one of its objectives the goal of establishing a responsible and energetic government for Sarawak.

In the next few pages three sets of factors necessary for the analysis of SNAP's own nationalism are introduced; first, the concept of nationalism itself, particularly what it refers to and what it means to a party; second, the politics of a plural society, particularly the

assumptions which can be made about it; and third, the conditions prevailing within the state which help to determine party activities. But first a brief history of Sarawak and Malaysia.

Until 1963 Sarawak was a British crown colony.³ British presence in the territory was established first by James Brooke, an English adventurer, who arrived in Kuching in 1839. Kuching and the surrounding region at the time was nominally under the Sultanate of Brunei. The local governor persuaded James Brooke to assist in quelling a rebellion by neighbouring Dayak tribes. As a reward for his services he was made Rajah and was given the territory of what is known as the First Division. This was how Sarawak came into being. Rajah James Brooke expanded his dominion by annexation and purchases. His successor, Sir Charles Brooke, expanded Sarawak to its present borders. The end of Sarawak's territorial expansion came in 1917, at which time the Fifth Division was added to Sarawak.

Sir Charles was succeeded by Sir Charles Vyner Brooke. In 1941, the centenary year of Brooke rule, he abrogated his absolute powers and enacted a new constitution which established a quasi-cabinet called the Supreme Council as well as a legislature, named the Council Negri, which the legislature had elected and to which it appointed members. After the Japanese occupation of 1942-1945 the Rajah was faced with the problem of reconstruction. Realizing that the task was too immense, he ceded Sarawak to Britain. To this action, there was some local opposition, particularly from the Malay community.

The colonial era ended for Sarawak in 1963 when it was joined together with North Borneo (renamed Sabah), Singapore, and Malaya. The new nation was named Malaysia. Singapore separated from Malaysia in 1965.

Sarawak embraces three major ethnic groups--Chinese, Malay, and Dayaks. The first political party to be organised in the state, the Sarawak United People's Party (SUPP), was founded in early 1959. Although SUPP was a multi-racial party, it was dominated by the Chinese. Most native (Malay and Dayak) leaders did not join SUPP and, in April, 1960, they formed Party Negara Sarawak (PANAS). The effective control of PANAS was in the hands of Malay leaders. Sarawak's third political party, the Sarawak National Party (SNAP), was founded in April, 1961 by a group of Ibans, the largest sub-stratum of the Dayak group. Like SUPP, PANAS, and SNAP were multiracial parties. The fourth party, Barisan Ra'ayat Jati Sarawak (BARJASA) was formed at the end of 1961. BARJASA's membership was officially limited to natives. Party Pesaka, which limited its membership to Dayaks, was formed by another group of Ibans in July, 1972. The last party to be formed before 1963 was the Sarawak Chinese Association (SCA). Its appeal was mainly to the Chinese of Sibiu.

To prepare for the transition to self-government, several measures were instituted by the colonial government. First, the franchise was extended to all persons over the age of twenty-one who were citizens or residents of Sarawak. Secondly, the seats of the Council Negri (the legislature) were increased to thirty-six elected and three nominated

members. Lastly, Sarawak's first election was to be "indirect" through a tier system--at the base were twenty-four District Councils, followed by five Divisional Advisory Councils (DAC), and finally the Council Negri. In 1963 the voters of Sarawak elected only district councillors to their respective councils. Above this level, the councillors selected among themselves the representatives to their respective DACs. These in turn sent a specified number to the Council Negri. Direct elections to the local council were completed in June 1963, Sarawak's first government being formed by the Sarawak Alliance which was composed of SNAP, BARJASA, Pesaka, and SCA.

Malaya,⁴ which is also variously known as West Malaysia and Peninsular Malaysia, had a longer period of recorded history than Sarawak. For instance, an Islamic civilisation thrived in Malacca before the coming of the Europeans. The earliest Europeans to be in the region were the Portuguese, later supplanted by the Dutch, who were in turn themselves forced to withdraw after the English began to assert their presence after they established themselves in Penang in 1786. Two other settlements, namely Malacca and Singapore, were added to Malaya and together they came to be known as the Straits Settlements. Gradually British influence and power penetrated inland--to the states of Perak, Selangor, Pahang and Negri Sembilan--where the British governed through "indirect rule." These states were provided with British Residents, although they were technically not administrators but mere advisors to the sultans, hence the term "indirect rule." To co-ordinate

administration these states were "federated" in 1895. Further, British involvements spread to other states, namely Johore, Perlis, Kedah, and Kelantan, which in 1914 became the "Unfederated States."

After the Japanese occupation, which ended in 1945, the British established the Malayan Union. Opposition from the United Malays National Organisation (UMNO) proved too great, however, and on February 1, 1948, the Federation of Malaya was formed. It consisted of eleven states. Malaya received its independence from Britain on August 31, 1957. In May, 1961, the Malayan Prime Minister, Tengku Abdul Rahman, produced the Malaysia Plan which in effect proposed to extend the federation to include Singapore, North Borneo, and Sarawak. Malaysia was established on September 16, 1963.

Nationalism

Amongst the students of nationalism there is a general agreement that the term lacks a simple definition. Louis Snyder called it an "elusive term."⁵ Boyd Shafer bemoans the "varied meanings that have been given the word (and kindred words) and the realities and myths--the attributes--that are commonly present." In the end, Shafer concludes that "nationalism is what the nationalists have made it; it is not a fixed concept but a varying combination of beliefs and conditions."⁶

Any definition must be somewhat arbitrary. Yet it cannot be said that the choice of the definition here is totally arbitrary, for it is intended to serve as a useful concept in the examination of the Sarawak

National Party. To this end it is necessary to determine the sense in which the word is employed. According to Carlton Hayes, in scientific research the term nationalism can be used in four ways:⁷

- (a) an actual historical process of nation-and-state-building;
- (b) a theory or an ideal;
- (c) a set of activities, often of a party;
- (d) a sentiment of pride and loyalty.

This paper does not propose to examine nationalism as a broad historical process, that is, as a series of changes and events leading to the construction of the state, which is taken to mean a country or a formal political and military organization of one or more ethnic groups. To do so would require the examination of other parties. Since this paper is concerned primarily with one particular party and its relation to nationalism, such an approach is clearly beyond its scope.

It should be pointed out as well that this paper will not investigate the sentiment of nationalism; that is, it will not measure the attitude and consciousness of party members, for such sentiment is subsumed as part of its nationalism. Rather, as the term is used here, it refers to the party's theory or principles underlying its activities during the processes of independence and nation-building.

As a theory, nationalism may be perceived to be the guideline of party behaviour. In this sense it may appear to be an antecedent condition, an independent variable which will determine political activities. But for the purpose of analysis, nationalism may be

considered not as a given or a static concept. Rather, it is perceived as a dependent variable which may change according to the prevailing circumstances within the state.

The root of nationalism is the "nation", that is, "an aggregation of individuals united by other, as well as political ties--ties commonly of race, religion, language, or tradition."⁸ Central to the doctrine of nationalism is the principle of national self-determination, which may be defined as "the right of a group of people who consider themselves separate and distinct from other to determine for themselves the state in which they will live and the form of government it will have."⁹ The European concept of nationalism in the nineteenth and early twentieth century aimed at fitting people with the same culture and language into one state.

In its colonial manifestation, the principle of self-determination, from which nationalism derived its legitimacy, was extended to imperial territories which usually enclosed several ethnic groups. The term nation in this sense is equated with a country or nation-state. It does not refer to a specific cultural or ethnic community whose members enjoy equal rights, inhabit a given territory, and operate in a common economic system. In its territorial sense the sentiment of nationalism refers to the "aspiration of the colonised population for self-government of the new political community whose boundaries were established by the coloniser."¹⁰ The major characteristic of this nationalism is that it is based on territory; hence it is territorial nationalism, the

assumption being that local loyalties are supplanted by a broader loyalty to the state as a result of the growths of bureaucracy and industry and the improvement in communication.

The other variety of nationalism is centred around the aspirations and assertions of an ethnic group. Such a group may be based on what has been termed as "congruities of blood, speech, and customs . . ." ¹¹. But this is not always the case. Ethnic consciousness "is situationally induced and determined and therefore ultimately definable only in subjective terms." ¹² Obviously, not every ethnic group asserts nationalistic demands; but in every multi-ethnic state there exists the potential for competitive nationalisms which are ethnically based. They could become "a set of solidarity patterns . . . which command the loyalty rivaling in some situations, that which the state itself is able to generate." ¹³ That is, in multi-national states there exists the potential for ethnic nationalist groups to challenge the authority of the state. An example of a country which is facing ethnic insurgents is Burma, where the Karens and Shans, ethnic minorities, have fought since the 1960's for the right to secede. ¹⁴ In short, ethnic nationalism is potentially disruptive.

There is, in effect, more than just one type of nationalism. Rupert Emerson, for instance, writes in an article on Africa that

The heart of the matter is the simultaneous existence of at least three major levels of social and political community, and existence which involves not only living side by side, but also strongly and reciprocally influencing one another. The three levels are the traditional societies of the past, the colonial and

colonially-derived structures of the present, and the several Pan-African aspirations.¹⁵

James Coleman, again writing on Africa, not merely asserts a similar view, he emerges with a schema as well. Since he limits his concept of nationalism to territories with colonial pasts, his schema is useful for the purpose of understanding Sarawak and Malaysian nationalisms. His version of nationalism, synonymous with the notion of territorial nationalism as employed here, recognises the "variety of forms of self assertion" amongst ex-colonial peoples. The usefulness of Coleman's schema is that it illuminates the African situation by recognising the existence of "modes of self assertion" above and below territorial nationalism. In certain situations these nationalisms (or "modes of self-assertion" or "solidarity patterns") are capable of becoming independent variables in the sense that they act as the major determinants or motivations of political activities. If this is true, then it is useful to adapt Coleman's schema to the Sarawak situation in order to illuminate the point.¹⁶

The foci of nationalism may be broadly classified as ethnic groups and territory. Under the ethnic heading are four sub-parts, namely localities, tribes, super-tribes, and nationalities. First, at the base there exist different localities which are geographically small and which contain only a segment of a particular tribe. One example of a locality in Sarawak is the Saribas area, an enclave in the Second Division populated by Saribas Ibans, from which most of SNAP's founders came. The corresponding sentiment of a region or

locality can be termed as "localism." Second, at the level above localities are tribes, defined as small-scale collectivities which share ethno-linguistic characteristics. In Sarawak, examples of tribes are the Ibans, the Kayans, and the Kenyahs. Nationalism or political assertions of tribes such as these are sometimes pejoratively labelled "tribalism." Third, these tribes sometimes acquire a broader solidarity pattern in that they define their identity and self-consciousness in terms of a larger super-tribe. The name for the collectivity of tribes listed above is "Dayak." The corresponding sentiment and activities by which they strive for self-identification and solidarity of this ethnic composite is termed Dayak nationalism. At this stage there may exist other sources of ethnic nationalism. In addition to the Dayak community, Sarawak has two others, namely the Chinese and the Malay-Melanau communal groups, each of which has the potential of asserting its ethnic nationalism. For instance, in the case of the Malays and most Melanaus the focus of their communal assertion may include the perpetuation of the Islamic religion. That is, a factor of their ethnicity or ethnic nationalism may be religious expansion. Given the fact that most Dayaks are either animists or Christians, Muslim proselytising could well become a contentious issue between the Dayaks on the one hand, and the Malays and most of the Melanaus on the other. In short, in the process of self-identification ethnic nationalism may involve inter-communal antagonism. Deep seated cleavages centering around such cultural properties as religion and language could lead to

inter-ethnic conflict.

It should be pointed out that antagonism between ethnic groups need not be permanent. In circumstances where both groups could benefit by their common solidarity, it is possible for the two to collaborate, however temporary or difficult this act may turn out to be. In the case of Sarawak, the Malays and Dayaks utilise the fact that both are natives. Ethnic identification in this sense is used to legitimise claims for political and economic advantages. In the case of Sarawak and Malaysia the collective name for Dayaks, Melanaus, and Malays is Bumiputera. Their privileges are enshrined in the Federal Constitution.¹⁷

There are therefore different varieties of ethnic self-identifications. Ethnic identity is ambiguous, and the choice of which ethnic group a person identifies himself may be dependent upon the issue at hand and the particular advantage which a course of action would give him.

The second concern of nationalism is territory, which is of two sorts. The first is a colonial unit, such as Sarawak or North Borneo. The corresponding activities and sentiment are those of territorial nationalism. The other kind of nationalism emerges when colonial territories are united under a common administrative political unit. In the case of Sarawak this unit was the Federation of Malaysia which in 1963 brought together the two British colonies of North Borneo and Sarawak, the Federation of Malaya, and Singapore. From the perspectives of these

constituent parties, the loyalty to the new federation and the acceptance of its political assertion requires a higher level of nationalism, defined here as pan-nationalism.

How are these different types of nationalisms activated? According to Charles Anderson, Fred von der Mehden, and Crawford Young, from the viewpoint of the citizen the role selection is dependent on the conflict situation.¹⁸ Conflicts which give rise to nationalistic assertions may hinge upon language policy, localisation of the civil service, electoral competition, or resource allocation.¹⁹

Party and Nationalism

The discussion above has attempted to identify the relevant varieties of nationalisms. It has pinpointed where these nationalisms may be found. It has not, however, tried to speculate on how different nationalisms can be activated, and, in a sense, created by a party. This paper does not presume nationalism to be a set of "givens." To do so is to ignore the role of political parties in the rise of nationalism. Obviously not all varieties of nationalisms owe their origins to political parties, but this should not detract from the fact that parties can act as vehicles which initiate and stimulate the growth of nationalism.

Consider, for instance, the implication for a political party when its assumed "terminal community"²⁰ is merely an ethnographical category or expression in the sense that it is too fragmented to assert

its communal demands. In this situation nationalism cannot be assumed to be a set of "givens." After all, nationalism is a matter of self-identification: to this end it may be hypothesised that where one finds a paucity of communal demands and assertions--that is, where there is an absence of opportune nationalism which a party can champion in order to attract political support--the party may create it. The basis of such "creative" nationalism may be a communal group or it may be a territory. In the case of SNAP, what could be expected is that it might have fostered its own interpretations of nationalism founded, for instance, both on territory (Sarawak) and on community (Dayak). In order to evaluate a party's interpretations of its nationalism, it is necessary to examine its activities.

Nationalism may become a factor in a party's pursuit of political survival and popularity. Daniel Bell, in his "Ethnicity and Social Change", points out the efficacy of these territorial and ethnic orientations in such a situation. He says that

ethnicity . . . is best understood . . . as a strategic choice by individuals who, in other circumstances, would choose other group memberships as a means of gaining power and privileges. In short, it is the salience not the persona which has to be the axial line for explanation. And because salience may be the decisive variable, the attachment of ethnicity may flush or fade very quickly depending on political and economic circumstances.²¹

Bell is primarily concerned with ethnic nationalism, but at the same time he recognises the utility of "other group membership" as an

avenue by which political power may be achieved.

As conditions within the country change, the party adjusts to new realities by emphasising certain elements of its nationalism while shelving others; it may temporarily reject one variety for another. The purpose of this paper is to analyse the nationalism of SNAP, particularly the ways in which the nature of SNAP's interpretations of its nationalism changed to meet varying situations. As a very broad hypothesis, the problem may be stated thus: SNAP's interpretations of its nationalism changed to meet changing conditions.

The other factor necessary for the analysis of nationalism concerns the politics in the society itself. In this case it is a plural society in the sense that certain segments of the population are organised into distinct and politicised communal groups. At the root of such a group is the existence of sentiments or loyalties which the party may have created, stimulated, and aggregated. The presence of such loyalties is politically important because citizens of a plural society like Sarawak who possess such sentiments tend to be responsive to communal appeals. This propensity is seen to have a direct bearing on most political plans which aim to elicit public support in a system of political competition such as Sarawak and Malaysia. That is,

the common expectations of the primacy of communal criteria produces the self-fulfilling prophecy of communally-oriented competitive strategies in virtually all walks of life.²²

In this paper an approach for political support falls under the general rubric of ethnic nationalism--that is, as communal or ethnic political

assertions. For instance, it has been said that in a culturally plural and electorally competitive society--of which Sarawak is one--aspiring politicians tend to "make appeals to the most easily mobilised communal interests."²³ If this is hypothesised as a statement of general tendency, it may be expected that SNAP's activities would show evidence of being a function of ethnic demands. It follows that where there exists a paucity of such demands, the party might even create them.

It could be hypothesised that a political party adapts to changing situations and accelerates its own growth by emphasising different varieties of nationalism. Since the appropriate variety may not have existed, a party might have to supply the "missing" factors. It might have to create the right framework (for instance a state) or bases (for example, a myth of common origins and history, and culture differences). By indulging in this sort of creative nationalism a party might expand its political constituency. Conceivably, as a political party, SNAP could take an approach by articulating and aggregating Iban demands over those of similar sub-ethnic or tribal units. Such an obvious preference would identify SNAP as a sub-ethnic party. SNAP could also expand its scope of activities to Dayaks, the ethnic category in which the Ibans belong. The other option which is opened to it lies in an appeal to the additional support of all of the ethnic groups. The base of multi-ethnic solidarity such as this is no longer a social category but a common territory, namely Sarawak. In the Malaysian context this would mean Sarawak nationalism. From Sarawak's viewpoint,

loyalty to Malaysia is pan-nationalism. There are, therefore, several potential varieties of nationalism.

Conditions

The prevailing conditions behind SNAP's various interpretations of its nationalism will be noted in the succeeding chapters. For the moment it is sufficient to illustrate what is meant by the term conditions. Basic conditions associated with the development of nationalism originated from several sources. For instance, there may be a change of status for the territory. In the case of Sarawak this involved the reduction of full sovereignty to a mere component of a federation--Malaysia. The acceptance of the relegation of status by SNAP then required a re-interpretation of its nationalism in that SNAP could no longer aspire to be the dominant "national" party; being based solely in Sarawak, it could at best hope to be the major state party, not a national one. As will be seen in Chapter IV, such a prospect was partly responsible for SNAP's opposition to Malaysia. Most important, SNAP's ultimate acceptance of the Malaysia Plan induced it to define and to clarify the thrust of its nationalism so that SNAP became even more openly protective of the Dayaks and their interests than they were before the Malaysia proposal.

The second condition may emerge from what can be termed as a crisis in which a party faces competition within the governing coalition or is actually ousted from power. In such a situation a

re-interpretation of a party's theory of nationalism may form an effective propaganda strategy to attract political sympathy. In other words, a re-defined nationalism can help a party to focus on issues in a way that can generate support from the citizens. From this perspective, the incorporation of a nationality's or even a community's interests is self-serving. It matters, therefore, which groups receive the attention of the party, for this selection indicates which groups a party aspires to represent. In the case of SNAP, to the degree that it articulates Dayak interests and receives Dayak support, it may be said to be a Dayak party.

The third general condition is the opposite of the second one in that instead of being threatened with expulsion the party is invited into power. The problem for a party in such a situation is that this existing nationalism, which might have had a remarkable success in drawing political support, may now become a stumbling block. The very government which has been subjected to its criticisms now suddenly emerges as a potential partner. In short, changing conditions again demand a re-interpretation of its nationalism. SNAP was faced with just such a situation in late 1974. Its relations to the invitation and the subsequent treatment of its nationalism are discussed in Chapter VII.

Structure of the Thesis

The rest of the thesis is divided into seven chapters. Chapter II elaborates on the plural nature of Sarawak's society. It also brings into perspective the minority situation of the Iban ethnic group in the Malaysian federation. SNAP's ethnic nationalism crystallises around a number of issues. The formations of SNAP and the two parties which preceded it are discussed in Chapter III. Chapter IV is devoted to the Malaysia Plan and SNAP's reactions to the formation of the federation and traces SNAP's activities as it tried to forge an alliance with other parties and as it helped to form Sarawak's first elected government.

Chapter V discusses Borneonisation and language, two of the issues which dominated political and communal interests for several years after independence. In Chapter VI the emergence of SNAP's multi-racialism are discussed; the reappearance of ethnic nationalism is the topic of Chapter VII; and Chapter VIII is devoted to SNAP's bases of support and the growth of its organization. The last chapter summarises the findings of this study.

Footnotes to Chapter I.

1. Alvin Rabushka and Kenneth Shepsle, Politics in Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1972), p.21. What they mean is that in politics cultural groups usually coalesce around their own organisations. Where there is more than one organisation per group, competition could occur between the parties for control of the group.
2. Austin Ranney and Willmoore Kendall, Democracy and the American Party System (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956), p.85.
3. Before this Sarawak was ruled by the Rajahs Brooke. For an excellent account of the Brooke dynasty, see Steven Runciman, The White Rajahs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).
4. For a cogent account of Malaya up to 1957 see R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Politics and Government of Malaysia (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press), pp.1-43.
5. Louis L. Snyder, The Dynamics of Nationalism (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1964), p.1.
6. Boyd C. Shafer, Nationalism: Myth and Reality (New York: Harcourt, brace, 1955), p.7.
7. Carlton J.H. Hayes, Essays on Nationalism (New York: Macmillan, 1926), pp.5-6.
8. Royal Institute of International Affairs, Nationalism (London: Frank Cass and Co., 1963), p.17.
9. J. Plano and R. Olson, The International Relations Dictionary (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969), p.121.
10. Crawford Young, Politics in the Congo (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 234.
11. Clifford Geertz, "The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States," in Clifford Geertz, et., Old Societies and New States (New York: Free Press, 1963), p.109.
12. James D. Coleman, "Tradition and Nationalism in Tropical Africa," op. cit., p.11. In other words, a person belongs to a particular ethnic group when that person identifies with that group. In this way ethnicity depends on self-identification (Cynthia Enloe, Ethnic Conflict and Political Development [Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1973], p.15).
13. Charles W. Anderson, Fred R. von der Mehden, and Crawford Young, Issues of Political Development (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1967), p.17.

14. For other instances of separatist movements see, for example, Walker Connor, "Self Determination: The New Phase", World Politics Vol. XX, No. 1 (October, 1967), p.52; Walker Connor, "The Politics of Ethno-nationalism", Journal of International Affairs, Vol. XXVII, No. 1 (1973).
15. Rupert Emerson, "Nation-Building in Africa", in Karl W. Deutsch and William J. Foltz, edd., Nation-building (New York: Atherton Press, 1966), p.97.
16. James P. Coleman, "Tradition and Nationalism in Tropical Africa", op. cit., p.9.
17. As of 1971 Malay privileges were extended to other natives in the Borneo states. Federal politicians have tried hard to persuade Dayak leaders to think of themselves as Bumiputeras. See, for instance, Sarawak Tribune, November 13, 1974.
18. Using a fictitious Ibo townsman as an example, they pointed out that he probably voted for the national coalition government during the 1974 Nigerian general election. In another situation, given here as the dispute over the non-implementation of wage policies by the government, the same man may have protested against the government (Charles W. Anderson, Fred von der Mehden, and Crawford Young, Issues of Political Development, op. cit., pp.62-63). This illustrates the personal dimension of ethnicity and the ambiguity of ethnic identification that arises from a multiplicity of roles. In the case of Sarawak, for instance, a Bidayuh or a Melanau who has converted to the Islam religion may call himself a Malay. But in other circumstances he may still describe himself as a Bidayuh or Melanau or whatever ethnic group to which he originally belonged.
19. Charles W. Anderson, Fred von der Mehden, and Crawford Young, op. cit., pp.64-66.
20. To quote Rupert Emerson, a terminal community is one "that when the chips are down, effectively commands men's loyalty" (Rupert Emerson, From Empire to Nation (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp.95-96.
21. Daniel Bell, "Ethnicity and Social Change," in Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan, edd., Ethnicity: Theory and Experience (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975), p.171.
22. Robert Melson and Howard Wolpe, "Modernization and the politics of communalism: a theoretical perspective," American Political Science Review, Vol. LXIV, No. 4 (December, 1970), p.1115.
23. Ibid., p.1122.

CHAPTER II
DEMOGRAPHIC SETTING

Demography

Sarawak is a state of Malaysia. Before Sarawak's own demography is explored it is important to have an idea of Malaysia's own ethnic composition, some indication of which can be seen from its population statistics. Table 1 below divides Malaysia into two regions. Under the name of West Malaysia are the following states: Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Malacca, Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Perlis, Selangor, and Trengganu. Before the formation of Malaysia they were known as Malaya. The second region is made up of the Borneo states of Sabah and Sarawak. They fall under the label of East Malaysia.

Table 1¹

Malaysian Population Statistics: Estimated Population
by Regions and Ethnic Groups, December 1967

	All Groups	Malays	Chinese	Indians & Pakistanis	Others
W. Malaysia	8,655,299	4,351,021	3,157,423	957,944	188,911
Sabah	590,660	145,000	145,000	-	300,660
Sarawak	<u>902,841</u>	<u>163,022</u>	<u>296,977</u>	-	<u>442,842</u>
E. Malaysia	<u>1,493,501</u>	<u>308,022</u>	<u>441,977</u>	-	<u>743,502</u>
Total	10,148,800	4,659,043	3,599,400	957,944	932,413

Note: In the Borneo states of Sabah and Sarawak Indians and Pakistanis numbered less than 10,000.

In the table above, the Dayak population of Sarawak has been grouped under the label "Others" together with Indians and Pakistanis. At just over 440,000, the "others" made up of only 4.3% of Malaysia's total population.

Sarawak

The last census of population taken when Sarawak was still a Crown Colony of Great Britain was in June 1960. During that time the population was 744,529. Two years later, over a period punctuated by the formation of the Sarawak National Party and the proposal for the Federation of Malaysia, the population was calculated at 776,990.² Broken down into three constituent cultural groups, the Sarawak population for the year 1960 was as follows:³

<u>Ethnic Group</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>
Chinese	229,154	30.8
Dayak	333,291	44.8
Malay	129,300	17.4
Melanau	44,661	5.9

The remainder of the population was 6,492, consisting of "other non-indigenous" (0.9%) and 1,631 Europeans (0.2%).

Chinese

Bolstered by immigrations from China--19,000 entries were recorded between 1935 and 1939--the Chinese population grew until by 1960 it was approximately equal to that of the Sea Dayaks or Ibans. In 1960 the numerical composition of the Chinese was as follows:

<u>Dialect Group</u>	<u>Number</u>
Cantonese	17,432
Foochow	70,125
Hakka	70,221
Henghua	8,278
Hokkien	28,304
Hylam	5,717
Teochew	21,952
Other Chinese	<u>7,125</u>
Total	<u>229,154</u>

Within the five divisions of Sarawak, the First and Third were populated by approximately the same number of Chinese at slightly less than 100,000. The Fourth and Second Divisions had over 24,000 and 12,000 respectively, while the Fifth Division had nearly 3,000.

Malays

A definition which seems to be gaining currency characterises a Malay as a person who uses the Malay language and belongs or adheres to the Muslim religion and follows Malay customs.⁴ Thus, for instance, if a Dayak adopts the Mohammedan religion he invariably becomes a Malay as well. The infusion of new Malays in this manner, particularly from the Melanau-Dayak community, was most noticeable from 1949 to 1960, during which the Malay group grew by over 33 per cent. Over the years the Malays have "coalesced into a palpable social category, including most but not all Muslims, which has long functioned as a force of great importance."⁵ The process of drawing converts into this social group

had two direct consequences. By 1970 the Melanaus had come to be included as Malays. The Melanaus bolstered the Malay population so that by 1970 the Malays comprised 24.9 per cent of Sarawak's population--a jump from 17.5 per cent, which had been the case ten years before.

Dayaks

In 1960, the Dayaks outnumbered both the Chinese and Malays. They are defined as non-Muslim natives, a category which covers at least ten "tribal" groups of which the Ibans (Sea Dayaks), Bidayuh (Land Dayaks), Kenyahs, Kayans, Kelabit, and Muruts were the most numerous. In 1960 the Dayak population was as follows:

<u>Dayak Community</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Dayaks</u>
Sea Dayak (Iban)	237,741	71
Land Dayak (Bidayuh)	57,619	17
Other Dayaks	37,931	12
Total	<u>333,291</u>	<u>100</u>

The "Other Dayaks", which in 1960 made up a mere 12 per cent of the total Dayak population, were distributed as follows:

	<u>Persons</u>
Bisayah	2,803
Kedayan	7,207
Kayan	7,899
Kenyah	8,093
Kelabit	2,040
Murut	5,214
Punan	4,669
Others	<u>6</u>
Total	<u>37,931</u>

The Dayaks are by no means a homogeneous group. Generally they inhabit the up-river areas, the so-called ulu; they practice a shifting cultivation⁶ in hill rice and mostly live in long houses. They have very little else in common: they have no common language or culture, and, although they live in the ulu areas, each group is generally secluded in its own territorial domain, where it practices its own life-style.

Comparatively, the Chinese ethnic group showed the fastest rate of growth. From 1947 to 1960 their percentage increase was 57.9. The increase in other ethnic groups for the same period were as follows:

<u>Community</u>	
Malay	32.7
Melanau	25.6
Dayaks	29.3

Occupation

The other point which should be established is that these cultural groups predominate distinct economic occupations.

Malays. Most of the Malays are fishermen and farmers. As the towns in Sarawak grew, the Malays have managed to supply the demands for food by these urban centers. In 1960 over half of the fishermen in Sarawak were Malays. Their second occupation is farming (the availability of swamp areas has allowed them to cultivate wet padi), rubber tapping, and logging. All in all, agricultural pursuits accounted for 72.4 per cent of the Malay work-force in 1960.

Chinese. Perhaps the most significant occupational characteristic of the Chinese is their predominance in the commercial life of the Colony. In 1960, 83.7 per cent of all those who were engaged in commerce were Chinese. Further, they also extended their preponderance into manufacturing, where they led at 57.5 per cent; building and construction (49.3 per cent), transport and communications (58.7 per cent), and services (50.5 per cent). Another notable feature of the Chinese is their extensive involvement in agriculture. In relation to other communities they provided a mere 14.3 per cent of the total agricultural workers in 1960, but within the Chinese community itself more Chinese (50.5 per cent) were employed in agricultural pursuits than in any other sectors. Furthermore, most of them were farmers; that is, they were agricultural entrepreneurs whose livelihood was geared to satisfy the demands of the urban areas. Some were vegetable growers whose products were consumed mainly by the city dwellers. Others were pepper planters and rubber tappers.

Dayaks. Until the late 1950's, few Dayaks were involved in any systematic way with the economic life of the urban areas. Such isolation was, of course, not due merely to the physical distances and poor communication systems which discouraged travelling to the "bazaars", but also to the fact that the low yield of hill padi farming often did not create saleable surpluses. As a consequence, the Dayak economic isolation was almost total. They had no cash crop until the advent of rubber planting; by 1960 only 7.34 per cent of the economically active Dayaks were rubber tappers.

Table 2⁷

Proportion of Melanaus and Dayaks in Selected
Areas by Percentages

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Dayaks</u>	<u>Melanaus</u>
Logging	.7	6.5
Fishing	.2	7.2
Rubber	7.3	22.9
Smallholdings	88.6	48.0
Non-agricultural jobs	<u>3.2</u>	<u>15.2</u>
Total	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>

N. 163241 N. 17712

Most Dayaks in 1960 were engaged in primitive agriculture, ekeing out a livelihood by operating small farms and gardens. In this they fit Wolf's description of people in primitive economies who "control their own labour and its products for the culturally defined equivalent goods and services of others."⁸

Melanaus. At 44,661 the Melanaus constituted only 5.9 per cent of Sarawak's total population in 1960. They are a coastal people whose "territory" is the area west of Sarikei, Sibul, and Bintulu. Their proximity to the sea, coupled with exposure to these towns, means that proportionately more Melanaus than Dayaks were drawn into the urban economy. Although no exact data is available, a high proportion (75 per cent) of the Melanau population are Muslims. There are also some Christian Melanaus. At this stage of the paper it is necessary to note that the Melanaus are a distinct people. In the past decade, however, it has become fashionable for an increasing number of Melanaus to call themselves Malays, so that by 1970 it was not unusual for Melanaus to be categorised as Malays. For the purpose of this paper, the Melanau group will be considered as part of the Malay community.

In summary, it may be said that the Chinese are the most active and advanced ethnic group in the state, since they dominate the commercial life of the colony. Concentrated primarily in the urban areas and the surrounding territories, they are able to utilise more of the social services than either the Malays or Dayaks, who are mainly rural citizens.

Occupying the least accessible parts of the country are the Dayaks. They are also economically the most primitive. The third group is the Malays. A coastal people, they have managed to increase the size of their population by the process of religious conversions. Their prime occupations are fishing and rice cultivation, although a sizeable

segment of their work-force have become labourers. In 1960 the Malays were at the peasant stage of economic development for increasingly they had been able to become part of the urban economy by providing man-power and food supplies. The Malays are therefore more advanced than the Dayaks, but definitely inferior to the Chinese in regard to their economic life.

1. This table is adapted from the one provided by Milton J. Esman, Administration and Development in Malaysia (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), p.18. Other writers on Malaysia have simply classified the Dayaks under the generic name of "Malaysian". See, for instance, Gordon Means, Malaysian Politics (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1976), p.294. Thus not only is the Dayak population of Sarawak small in comparison to other ethnic groups, there also appears to be some confusion as to which category they belong.
2. Sarawak Government, Sarawak Year Book 1962 (Kuching: Government Printer, 1962), p.11.
3. The figures which appear in the rest of this chapter were calculated from those provided in the official census report of 1960. See L.B. Jones, Sarawak: Report on the Census Population (Kuching: Government Printer, 1962).
4. A Malayan was a citizen of the Federation of Malaya regardless of the ethnic group he belonged to. A Malaysian is a citizen of Malaysia. Ethnically, he might be a Malay, Chinese, Indian, Dayak or any other group (Tan Sri Mohamed Suffian bin Hashim, An Introduction to the Constitution of Malaysia [Kuala Lumpur, 1972], pp.247-249, cited in R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Politics and Government in Malaysia [Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1978], p.1).
5. Robert Pringle, Rajahs and Rebels: The Ibans of Sarawak under Brooke Rule 1841-1941 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970), p.19.
6. The Dayaks mostly plant padi to support themselves. In contrast to the method usually practised in Southeast Asia where padi cultivation is equated with wet or swamp padi, the Dayaks plant hill padi. Their rice is therefore of the dry variety. Another difference is that hill padi has a higher protein content than wet padi. The negative aspect of hill padi farming is that it involves the slashing and burning of the vegetation. The practice of slash and burn in turn exposes the land to erosion and loss of soil nutrients. This results in the farmer having to shift the location of his farm from year to year, hence the name "shifting cultivation". On Dayaks' agricultural pursuits, particularly those of the Ibans, see: Derek Freeman, Report on the Iban (London: The Athlone Press, 1970); V.H. Sutlive, "From Longhouse to Pasar: Urbanisation in Sarawak, East Malaysia" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1972).
7. The term smallholdings refers to individually owned and maintained farms and market-gardens. Their products, in the case of the Dayaks, were for home consumption.
8. Eric R. Wolf, Peasants (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966), p.3.

CHAPTER III

FORMATION OF SNAP

The formation of the Sarawak National Party, which had its official inauguration on April 10, 1961, was a response to a number of political developments, each of which was produced by the promise of self-government. The first was the emergence of two political parties, both of which, though avowedly multi-racial, were seen to be dominated progressively by two ethnic groups. The second, essentially a by-product of the first development, was the lack of unity among the Dayaks and their leaders. The third development was the failure of the educated Dayaks, especially those in the civil service, to keep abreast of the political endeavours of other ethnic groups and to form a party which they could dominate. These three developments culminated in a crisis of sorts for the Dayaks, because the established political parties, dominated as they were by the Chinese and Malays, threatened to split the Dayak communities. What made this problem particularly acute was that neither the traditional leaders nor the educated "elite" among the Dayaks was moved to stop this trend, which was in effect a dismemberment of their people. In this respect the entry of SNAP into the Sarawak political scene was an attempt to stem the fragmentation of the Dayaks by uniting them under its own banner.

Formation of SUPP and PANAS

A turn-around in official policy with regard to political organization precipitated a series of political developments in Sarawak. The Brookes, who handed Sarawak, albeit unwillingly,¹ over to the British Crown in 1946 were characteristically intolerant of political activities. Until the late 1950's the Colonial Office continued to suppress political movement in the state. However, faced with the prospect of inevitable independence for Sarawak, the Colonial Government instituted a policy change from suppression to encouragement of political movements.

Not all Sarawakians were able to benefit from this reversal of official policy. Indeed, the only person known to have benefited from the policy change was an urban Chinese named Ong Kee Hui, who received private encouragement from the Governor, Sir Anthony Abell. In 1956² Ong had been one of the initiators of a political party which had failed to develop because of unfavourable official response and native indifference. In June 1959, together with Stephen Yong and Song Thian Cheok, he founded the first registered political party, the Sarawak United Peoples' Party (SUPP). It was to be "non-communal in character with emphasis on loyalty to Sarawak and unity of all races."³ Ong Kee Hui, a career businessman who had done a stint as a civil servant with the Department of Agriculture, was the Chairman, Stephen Yong, a lawyer, was the Secretary General. Sarawak's first

party was thus led by the Chinese.

Significantly, Malay reaction was cool. The Malays, probably mindful of their small numbers, sought from the beginning to unify their own people. This desire was clearly fundamental to the Malay National Union (MNU), the most prominent organization the Malays had. Mohammad Bakri, the President of MNU, for example, stated that if it became necessary his "union would join the party (SUPP) as one unit".⁴ The Secretary General of MNU, Ikhwan Zainie, took an even more extreme view by rejecting the very principle of a multi-racial membership when he said, "it would be much better for each community to form a National Union, such as the Chinese, Malay, Dayak, and Indian National Unions, and eventually merge to form an Alliance like that in the Federation of Malay".⁵ With the MNU throwing its weight against direct membership in the SUPP, a few Malays decided to join the party.

The temporary advantage of being the only party in the state manifested itself in the SUPP's ability to develop into a well organised political machine which enlisted Chinese members en masse.⁶ Further, when the SUPP contested some seats in the local government elections of 1959 it drew even native (that is, Malay and Dayak) support.

Largely because of the success of the SUPP, the Malays decided to form their own political organization. Their leaders in this endeavour were Kuching-bred urban Malays who, by sheer proximity to

the Kuching-based SUPP, directly felt the encroaching strength of the Chinese. In this the timing of the Malay leaders was fortunate, for the Colonial Government had become increasingly disenchanted with the SUPP, since the Party had been infiltrated by communists. So concerned were the authorities with the Communist threat inside the SUPP that a few weeks before its inauguration the Governor declared his doubt that "political parties at the present stage of development will spell faster progress in this small country"⁷ In short, the Malay leaders decided to act when the SUPP actually began to recruit Malayan people as members and when the Colonial Government was increasingly losing its enthusiasm for the party.

The task of formulating a counter stroke fell on Abang Haji Mustapha who, by his influence and position, was the most powerful Malay in Sarawak. He held the post of Datu⁸ Bandar, the highest position in the Malay leadership hierarchy. He was also a member of the Council Negri, the legislative body of Sarawak, as well as a member of the Supreme Council, its quasi-cabinet. Moreover, the Datu Bandar was the Government Advisor for Native Affairs. With the support of those politicians who did not join the SUPP he launched the Party Negara Sarawak (PANAS) barely ten months after the SUPP was organised. PANAS was a Malay-led party; it was also dominated by the Kuching clique of the Malay community, while the Sibuan group remained detached. The Datu Bandar became its Chairman; his brother,

Abang Othman, was the Secretary-General.

Dayak Reactions

Of all the responses of both the Dayak traditional leaders and the educated elite, the most important was that none of them exhibited any desire to form their own political organisation dominated by the Dayaks. This lack of concern was also the reaction of the Sarawak Dayak National Association (SDNU), whose members included most of the educated Dayaks in Sarawak. The SDNU would be the first logical place for Dayak nationalism to be stimulated because it was the association for the Dayak intelligentsia. However, when the SUPP was formed, the SDNU chose to ignore it, claiming that at that juncture a state-wide political party was too premature to contemplate. Its President, Mr. Edward Brandah, a prominent civil servant and obviously a highly regarded Dayak personality in the Kuching area, offered an opinion probably representative of the Dayaks in the civil service at the time.

It is still too premature for the whole of Sarawak to form any political parties. At this state we should concentrate on the education of our younger generation and raising the standard of living for all communities.⁹

Thus, from the beginning the most potent Dayak organization, one which had the potential to counter effectively the political initiatives of the Chinese in the SUPP, chose to emasculate itself.

The apparent disdain of the SDNU for politics stemmed from the

fact that the bulk of its members were civil servants, a group reluctant to trade the security of their careers for the rough and tumble of political life. Moreover, since the majority of them were in fact clerical workers, few, if any, had any knowledge of the operation and maintenance of a political party. Another factor was the diminutive size of the SDNU itself. Not only was it small, it was also insular in that, being limited to Kuching, its influence did not permeate into the Dayaks, most of whom resided in the ulu, the interior and the upper reaches of the state. Thus the traditional isolation of the SDNU itself from its supporters in the ulu, the lack of expertise on the part of its members in party organization, and their general reluctance to drop their careers in favour of politics accounted not only for the refusal of the Dayak educated elite to join any of the existing parties, but also the refusal to form a Dayak-based one.

The other group of Dayaks which could be expected to form an ethnic based party consisted of the traditional leaders, men who exercised considerable political influence. Such men were Temenggong Jugah, the paramount Chief of the Ibans, Temenggong Oyong Lawai Jau, the overall head of the Kenyahs, Kayans, Kelabit groups, and Pengarah Montegrai, the most prominent Iban in the Second Division. In addition, their influence was further reinforced by the fact that they were members of the Council Negri and the Supreme Council. No other

Dayaks exercised as much influence as these three men before 1961. If any group of Dayaks was capable of "delivering" memberships to a political party, this was it. Their political activities were observed with interest by the Dayaks because, being traditional leaders as well as legislative insiders, they provided the source of leadership which at this stage was unchallenged within the Dayak communities.

It is significant that the emergence of the SUPP did not act as a catalyst amongst the Dayak leaders to form a Dayak political organisation, a failure which allowed the SUPP and PANAS to recruit Dayak members and divide their communities. Of the Dayaks who joined the SUPP, one was a Kenyah, Tama Weng Tinggang Wan; another was an Iban, Jonathan Banggau Renang; both were budding businessmen and important Dayak leaders. By and large, however, among the politically active Dayak leaders the tendency at the time was to support PANAS. Its prime movers were not Dayaks but Malays, whose objective was to defend their own communal interests against the SUPP. Why, therefore, was Edward Jerah, one-time president of the SDNU, among the earliest to support PANAS? The answer is probably that he wanted to join forces with his fellow natives in warding off the encroachment of the SUPP into the Dayak communities. Thus under the banner of PANAS, while the Malays worked to bolster their position in the Malay communities, he could do the same in the Dayak communities. The prospect of uniting their own people under the nominal leadership of

PANAS may have convinced the traditional Dayak leaders to join the party, for the Datu Bandar succeeded in gaining the support of Temenggongs Jugah and Oyong Lawai Jau, Pengarahs Sibat, Montegrai, and Penghulus Hang and Umpau.

The choice of PANAS as opposed to SUPP seemed to have been made because the latter was less attractive. In the first place the SUPP was Chinese-dominated and there was a general fear that, being better organised and more aggressive (at least economically), the Chinese were unlikely to relinquish or even to share equally the control of the party. In the second place, both the Dayaks and the Malays had in common an intense interest in Native Rights and such matters as law, custom, and land. By joining PANAS they hoped to make a common cause against any possible encroachment by the Chinese in these areas.¹⁰ Finally, PANAS was more likely to allow the Dayaks to dominate the party apparatus and decision making since the Malays were numerically inferior.

For the Dayak communities the refusal of their leaders to organise their own political party led to further division within themselves as the two political parties scrambled for Dayak members. The division was, of course, not into organised groups: at this state party affiliation was largely made by individual effort. Nonetheless, they could be divided into three distinct groups. The first one, typified by Tama Weng, were those Dayaks who aligned themselves with the Chinese under the SUPP. The second were those who were

persuaded to join PANAS by, for example, their loyalty to the Dayak chiefs or their anti-Chinese-SUPP sentiments. Quite apart from these groups were those among the Dayaks who preferred neither Chinese nor Malay leadership. To them, the Dayaks possessed their own latent, if as yet unarticulated, interests which neither the SUPP nor PANAS could hope to represent because they were led by non-Dayaks. It was from this group of Dayaks that SNAP emerged. In this sense, therefore, the formation of SNAP was a manifestation of ethnic nationalism. On the one hand, ethnic nationalism was a factor that led to the formation of SNAP; it cannot be denied that the sense of frustration among Ningkan and his group at the continuing fragmentation of the Dayaks and the impending dominance of the Malays and Chinese prompted them to form the party. On the other hand, ethnic nationalism was an objective of SNAP in that the party was organised in order that the trend towards Dayak fragmentation could be reversed and that a Dayak nation could be solidified.

The Founders¹¹

The prime movers behind the formation of SNAP were a core of seven men of strikingly similar origin and backgrounds. They were J.S. Tinker, Edward Howell, Stephen Kalong Ningkan, Edwin Howell, Matthew Dana, Julin anak Nyipa of Sebuyau and David Usit. In addition to these seven figures were two British-born Shell workers who acted

as unpaid consultants and who were instrumental in drafting the party's first constitution.

Mr. J.S. Tinker, the party's first chairman, was born in Betong. He received his education in Saba, a village a few miles from Betong town, and in Simanggang, the administrative center for Sarawak's Second Division. In the 1920's, having finished his formal education, he journeyed to Brunei where he found work as a Shell employee. Subsequently he enlisted as a civil servant, under the Brooke Raj and its war-time successor (1941-45), the Japanese. It was during this period that he achieved the apex of his career when he served as a District Officer. Following the withdrawal of the Japanese and after an interim period of rule by the British Military Administration, Sarawak became a Crown Colony. The new administration chose to ignore Tinker's war-time collaboration, and he was allowed to continue his service in the Legal Department. By the time SNAP was formed, he was in his sixth year of retirement.

Directly under Tinker were two Vice-Chairmen: Edward Howell and Lionel Ketit. Both men had spent a good part of their lives away from Borneo. Howell was educated in Singapore, first, at St. Andrews and later, at the Raffles Institute. Ketit too had spent some time in Singapore, where he attended to his family business from 1933 to 1945. After that he worked in Betong for the Food Control Department before making his way to Brunei, where he was employed by the Shell

Oil until his resignation in 1961.

SNAP's first Secretary General was Ningkan, who in time was to develop into the party's major tactician. Like Tinker, Ningkan had worked for the Japanese as a police officer. From 1947 until August 1959, he taught in Betong, his home town. That same year he followed the footsteps of so many other Dayak men from his area by moving to Brunei to look for work. As generally was the case with such men, he served under Shell, but instead of being a labourer or clerk, Ningkan found a job as a hospital assistant. In March 1961, he, like Lionel Ketit, resigned his position in order to help found SNAP. Ningkan himself had a history of community service, particularly among the Dayak enclaves in the oil-rich triangle of Lutong, Miri and Seria which straddles the border between Brunei and Sarawak. It was in Seria that Ningkan founded the Dayak Association and where for the years 1955-1956 and 1958-1959 he was the secretary for the Shell Dayak Club.

Other members of the Central Committee were David Usit, Matthew Dana, Azarias Malong, Andrew Bunga and Edwin Howell. David Usit was a businessman in the then British Colony of North Borneo (Sabah) in the early 1940's. As for Matthew Dana, after his education in Betong he travelled to Malaya and Singapore, where he worked for some time. Edwin Howell was an engineer with Sarawak's Public Works Department; Andrew Bunga had a long career, like Tinker and Ningkan, working as a Shell employee in Seria.

From the above account it is clear that these men had much in common. All were mobile and self-made. True, none of them were particularly successful financially, but insofar as they had journeyed away from home in pursuit of work they were quite unlike most other Dayaks of their generation.¹² More than the common feature of their mobility, however, these men shared a similar origin; not only were all Ibans, they also came from the same Saribas area, whose major center was Betong. In addition, all had received at least part of their education in Betong, specifically at St. Augustine's School, where they had been baptised and confirmed as Anglicans. Ningkan and his group were mobile, a characteristic which sets them apart from the majority of Dayaks. Geographically their place of employment was invariably away from home, and socially they had advanced from the pre-present society of the long-house level to the cosmopolitan life of the urban environment.

It is clear that not only was the core group of SNAP's leaders from the Dayak group but also that they actually emerged from the Iban section--that is, from one sub-unit of the Dayak collectivity. The Dayak group, at this time, was their "terminal community" the largest community that when the chips are down, effectively commands men's loyalty."¹³ True, the three existing parties recruited members from several communal groups, but invariably one group dominated a particular party. Thus in the case of the SUPP, though

multi-racial, it was Chinese based; PANAS, Malay; and SNAP, Dayak.

The competition of party leadership, however, need not be the definitive criterion as to whether SNAP was really a nationalist group. This type of leadership with its common and narrow origin is not an aberration amongst nationalists since in polyethnic colonies it is not unusual to have nationalist parties

which define their aims and policies in terms of wider territorial unit, yet are clearly spearheaded by members of one or other of the strategic ethnie, for example, the Kikuyu in Kenya, the Javanese in Indonesia, or the Baganda in Uganda.¹⁴

In other words, it is possible to be a nationalist and a communal party at the same time--if that party succeeds in gaining political domination either by converting, in this case, the Dayaks into a strategic ethnic group or by successfully appealing to cross-ethnic support.

Objectives

The general guidelines of SNAP's activities, its ideology, can be found in its "Aims and Objects". Typically these are general statements, but at the same time they are revealing in that they help to provide insights into the political persuasion of its leaders and the direction in which they seek to lead the people of Sarawak.

In terms of its nationalism, its ideology incorporates the two orientations--territorial and ethnic--which in varying degrees have

been instrumental in determining party actions. Early in its existence the party published a document entitled "SNAP's Aims and Objects". This statement reveals much of its nationalist ideology, although at that time the gist of its political doctrine was somewhat obscured by the label. The party's Aims and Objects were

1. To promote the political advancement of the inhabitants of Sarawak with the aim of achieving self-government and ultimate independence.
2. To ensure freedom of speech and religion and particularly to secure the blessings of liberty.
3. To establish a responsible and energetic government based on parliamentary democracy.
4. To promote economic and cultural development of the inhabitants of Sarawak and particularly to improve the earning-power of the individual and thereby to raise the standard of living.
5. To safeguard the interests and welfare of the native peoples and the inhabitants of Sarawak in general and especially to protect the rights of the individual.
6. To promote the league of friendship and racial harmony of all races and to inspire all persons with a spirit of cooperation, self-reliance and honest endeavour.¹⁵

There is evidence to indicate that SNAP exhibited territorial nationalism. Proof to this effect is found in its list of "Aims and Objects", particularly in the first goal in which the party bluntly states that it seeks to "promote the political advancement of the inhabitants of Sarawak with the aim of achieving self-government and ultimate independence."¹⁶

The importance of the principle of the ideology outlined above lies in the fact that this aspect of territorial nationalism performs a major function, namely legitimation: i.e., the moral acceptance by the citizens of its particular doctrine that the nation or state as defined by the nationalists themselves should receive such rights as autonomy, or self-government. The propositions of the doctrine itself has been adequately summarised by Anthony Smith, who observes that they appear in every nationalist movement or party--including, presumably, SNAP. According to Smith the groundwork in the nationalist argument runs as follows:

1. The world is naturally divided into nations, each of which has its peculiar character and destiny;
2. the nation is the source of all political power, and loyalty to it overrides all other loyalties;
3. if they wish to be free, and to realise themselves, men must identify with and belong to a nation;
4. global freedom and peace are the functions of the liberation and security of all nations;
5. nations can only be liberated and fulfilled in their own sovereign states.¹⁷

The first and perhaps the basic feature of SNAP's territorial nationalism, then, concerns the issue of sovereignty. SNAP, of course, advocated that the Crown Colony of Sarawak would, as a matter of right, advance to the status of a sovereign nation-state, that is, as a legitimate country. The choice of sovereignty, or "ultimate independence",¹⁸ as a goal was critical to the party's nationalism for it provided the

basis to legitimise, i.e., to ensure a moral acceptance, for the exercise of authority. No disagreement apparently existed over the principle of independence since the colonial power had indicated its desire to depart from the region.¹⁹ In its turn SNAP accepted as fact that, through the courtesy of Great Britain, Sarawak would at some point become a sovereign nation.

The other aspect of SNAP's nationalism was its concept of nation-building, that is, its search to secure the loyalty and commitment of the citizenry of the state. In its prescription for territorial solidarity SNAP clearly sought to diffuse potential flashpoints of conflict, particularly those in which ethnic pride and loyalty were at stake. It rejected the notion of a "melting-pot" nationality in which a common and Sarawak-based cultural group with its own distinctive history is nurtured. In other words, the party rejected the ideal that territory, culture and citizenship be fused.

On the issue of nationality, that is, the legal status of citizenship, the party's position was this: all the inhabitants of Sarawak were entitled to this status. As full citizens they should be given such basic rights as the freedom of speech and religion. Moreover, as inhabitants of Sarawak they were entitled to their own economic and cultural development as well.

On the communal level each group was entitled to retain its own badges of cultural identity such as religion, language, and culture.

This right is emphasised in the party's "Aims and Objects", in which SNAP promised to "ensure the freedom of speech and religion, and particularly to secure the blessings of liberty."²⁰ Further, in its fourth goal SNAP committed itself to the promotion of the cultural development of Sarawakians, a clear indication that the party would not seek to discriminate willingly against any of the component ethnic members. In short, the fourth goal identified at least one dimension of SNAP's policy of multiculturalism.

Introduced as part of the fifth goal was another aspect of its multiculturalism policy. To SNAP the rights of being a Sarawak national were circumscribed by an overriding provision so that one segment, the natives, of the state would by law enjoy certain privileges. This particular position of the party is found in Object No. 5, in which SNAP proposed to "safeguard the interests and welfare of the natives."²¹ Characteristically it was vague on the kinds of safeguards it would advocate. Indeed, having stated its position, the party seemed eager to de-emphasise its importance for it promised also to protect the rights of the individual, including the Chinese. The point which it had established here, however, was that SNAP not only endorsed the growth of each culture--Dayak, Chinese, and Malays--as building blocks of the state, but as well singled out a group of them as entitled to privileges. At this point this group is referred to as "natives", a term which also included Malays. In practice, however, when SNAP's

leaders utilised the term, they meant only Dayaks, a point which SNAP's activities confirmed. For instance, it organised only in Dayak areas and, as has been seen, its leaders emerged from the Dayak community, specifically the Iban group.²²

The other party with Iban leadership was Pesaka. It was formed in June, 1962, by a coterie of traditional Iban leaders²³ from the Third Division. The original leaders were Penghulu (now Datuk), Francis Umpau, and Pengarah Banyang. In its formation it had the support of most of the Penghulus from the Third Division. Soon after the party was formed, the paramount-chief of the Ibans, Temenggong Jugah, was persuaded to resign from PANAS and to lead Pesaka.

The purpose of Pesaka was to form a "common and united front"²⁴ with other Dayaks in Sarawak, that is, it would unite Ibans, Kenyahs, Kayans, and Bidayuh tribes under its leadership. Initially, at least, it had limited its memberships to Dayaks only. Thus in contrast to SNAP which accepted a multi-racial membership from the beginning, Pesaka was at one time a purely Dayak organisation.

Historically the Dayaks were a divided people. The much larger Iban tribe at one time raided and plundered the territories of the neighbouring Bidayuh and Kayan groups. Under the reign of Rajah Sir Charles Brooke, the Ibans themselves fought against each other when the Rajah employed Ibans from the Second Division for his field force in a series of punitive expeditions against the Third Division.²⁵

The intent of the Rajah, of course, was to pacify the territory which he had just acquired from the Sultan of Brunei. Peace eventually came, but the animosities between the Iban groups of the two divisions remained. Given such sentiment it was hardly surprising that instead of accepting the leadership of the Ibans from the Second Division in SNAP, the Ibans of the Third Division embarked on a political party of their own called Pesaka anak Sarawak. Thus in a real sense, SNAP and Pesaks were competitors for the same reservoir of ethnic support.

In summary, then, it may be said that the earliest political parties which preceded SNAP were dominated by the Chinese and Malays respectively. Initially Dayak reactions to the formation of political parties were either to avoid politics altogether or to join the SUPP or PANAS. The most prominent Dayak leaders, the parliamentary insiders, joined the Malay-led PANAS, probably believing that they and the Malays could enter into a common cause in the defence of native rights, then dominate the numerically inferior Malays at a later date. In addition, there was a third group of Dayaks who founded SNAP and whose underlying objective was to stem the fragmentation of the Dayaks and to use the Dayak group as a strategic core from which to gain power. The Dayak community formed the largest voting bloc in Sarawak and, being natives, they were a privileged group as well. The problem was that it was not a homogeneous community, being composed of several sub-ethnic groups having different sentiments and loyalties.

In the few months of 1961 before the Malaysia proposal became public, SNAP was expressing ethnic and territorial nationalisms. The two orientations, though conceptually distinct, were at this time complementary to each other. What made this seem possible was the size of SNAP's assumed base group, the Dayaks, who constituted nearly 44% of Sarawak's population. Presuming that it became a bloc under SNAP, the Dayaks could put SNAP in government. In this sense the Dayak collectivity had the potential of being the strategic ethnic group and SNAP, the only Dayak based party then existing, was in a favourable position to attract Dayak support. Such ethnic preference is not contradictory to the party's concept of multi-racial membership. Rather, it illustrates an aspect of its policy reliance on an ethnic core as the foundation for the building block of the Sarawakian society. It should be noted that the Malays in Sarawak, although also part of the group loosely termed "natives", were numerically inferior and therefore could exert little influence. Their weak position was to change after Malaysia, but even then they derived their strength through the influence of the Federal Government. This means that for SNAP the ethnic core is the Dayak, the dominant ethnic group from whence its leaders emerged. Translated into the Sarawak situation, therefore, an ethnic territorial-nationalism is a Dayak-led aspiration for Sarawak nationhood.

The problem with the Dayaks as a political force was that

while they constituted the majority of Sarawakians, their solidarity remained unrealised. Not only were they divided into sub-ethnic groups²⁶ but their largest component, the Ibans, were split into two major groups centering around SNAP and Pesaka. Their division was based on leadership. While SNAP was led by a self-made elite, Pesaka was headed by a group of traditional leaders who were also parliamentary insiders.²⁷ Since neither group appeared willing to follow the other, the Iban community was therefore saddled with a problem of leadership succession. The relationship between the two contending elites is of some interest. Though cooperation between them was possible--if the situation would benefit both parties--it would be inherently unstable.

1. The transfer of power from the Brookes to the Colonial Government met with opposition, particularly from the Malay community and the heir presumptive to the Rajah, Anthony Brooke. See, for instance, Royal Institute of International Affairs, Sarawak: Political and Economic Background (London: mimeographed, 1957), pp.2-5.
2. Michael B. Leigh, The Rising Moon: Political Change in Sarawak (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1974), p.13.
3. Sarawak Tribune, March 5, 1959.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Part of the reason for this was its success in getting the support of Chinese clan associations. C.A. Lockhard, "Leadership and Power within the Chinese Community of Sarawak", Journal of Southeast Asian Studies (1970-1971), p.212.
7. Michael B. Leigh, The Rising Moon: Political Change in Sarawak, op. cit., p.14.
8. "Datu" is a hereditary title in Sarawak and Sabah. This should not be confused with "Datuk" or "Dato" (and the variants such as "Dato Sri") which are titles awarded by a state and, for a period of time, the Federal Government. Today, a federal "Datuk" carries the title "Tan Sri". Above "Datuk" or "Tan Sri" is another federal title called "Tun". It is also "non-hereditary" and is conferred only by the Yang Dipertuan Agung, the King. Several states in Malaysia still use "Dato", which is the old spelling for "Datuk". In this paper it is employed when appropriate. (R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Politics and Government in Malaysia [Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1978], p.viii.)

The Dayaks do not have any hereditary titles. Their leadership hierarchy was an invention of the Brookes (Robert Pringle, Rajah and Rebels: The Ibans of Sarawak under Brooke Rule 1841-1941 [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970], p.). Originally, the Dayaks had only "Tuai Rumah", literally the head of each longhouse, the Dayak community dwelling which can range from several to over one hundred families. For administrative purposes the Second Rajah, Sir Charles Brooke, introduced a superior level of leadership above the "Tuai Rumah" called "Penghulu" whose jurisdiction usually extended over one or more river valleys. Above the "Penghulu", was "Pengaroh". At the apex of the hierarchy was the rank of "Temenggong", the paramount-chief. In 1963 there were only two "Temenggongs" in Sarawak. They were Jugah anak Barieng and Oyong Lawai Jau. While the former was the "Temenggong" of the Ibans, the latter was the paramount-chief of the Kayans, Kenyahs, and Kelabits.

9. Sarawak Tribune, March 5, 1969, cited by Leigh, op. cit., p.12. Mr. Brandah was awarded the title "Datuk" by the Ningkan government. He is now living in retirement in Kuching. Although his son-in-law Charles Ingka was active in SNAP and later Pajar, the Datuk remains apolitical to this day, preferring instead to devote his time to the Anglican Church. Pajar, a native party, was formed in 1977 by Alli Kawi, who was a senior police officer before he entered politics.
10. Tensions between the Natives and the Chinese have led to some blood-letting. The earliest large scale clash between the two groups occurred in 1857 in the aftermath of a Chinese rebellion against the Brooke Raj. The rebels were Hakka Chinese gold-miners from Bau, the only large Chinese colony in Sarawak. The Chinese sacked Kuching, the capital, on February 18, 1857, and nearly killed the Rajah himself. Rajah James Brooke managed to gather a loyalist force consisting mainly of Skrang Ibans. Soon the Chinese were driven over the border to Indonesian Borneo (Robert Pringle, Rajahs and Rebels: The Ibans of Sarawak under Brooke Rule 1841 to 1941 [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970], p.106). In 1967, it was widely rumoured that the Dayaks of Indonesia had waged a war against the Chinese in the Pontianak region.
11. The information for this section was taken from Nelson Kudu, Sarawak National Party: its History, Organisation, and Leadership (Kuching: Sarawak National Party, 1973). In addition, Datuk Ningkan provided some background information on himself during an interview in June, 1976. See also Michael Leigh, "Party Formation in Sarawak," Indonesia, No. 9 (April, 1970), pp.189-224.
12. Another distinguishing feature was the fact that they belonged to a cluster of Ibans from the Saribas, Second Division, who had served the Japanese during the Second World War and who, as a consequence, had generally fallen into disfavour with the British. If their war-time activities were viewed as acts of anti-colonialism with the object of overthrowing the Brooke Raj, it is possible to view their war-time collaboration as acts of opportune co-operation with a "liberating" power.
13. Rupert Emerson, From Empire to Nation (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp.95-96.
14. Anthony Smith, "Introduction: The Formation of Nationalist Movements," in Anthony Smith, ed., Nationalist Movements (London: The Macmillan Press, 1976), p.5.
15. Sarawak Tribune, April 11, 1961.
16. See Objective One of SNAP's "Aims and Objects" on page 37.
17. Anthony Smith, "Nationalism: a Trend Report and Bibliography" Current Sociology, Vol. XXI, No. 3 (1973), p.10.
18. See Objective One of SNAP's "Aims and Objects" on page 37.
19. See, for instance, Sarawak Government, "The Government Paper on Malaysia and Sarawak", Sarawak Gazette, Vol. LXXXVIII (January, 1962), p.9.

20. See Objective Two of SNAP's "Aims and Objects" on page 38.
21. See Objective Five of SNAP's "Aims and Objects" on page 38.
22. By late 1965 as relations with its alliance partners and the federal government deteriorated SNAP began to recruit non-Dayak members, particularly Chinese.
23. Sarawak Tribune, June 18, 1962.
24. Ibid., July 20, 1962.
25. On the Brookes' punitive expeditions and subsequent peace agreements see: Robert Pringle, op. cit.; Steven Runciman, The White Rajahs: A History of Sarawak from 1941 to 1946 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).
26. To illustrate the point, the Kayans traditionally believed that the Ibans, one-time enemies, were actually descended from worms (Jerome Rousseau, "Ethnic Identity and Social Relations in Central Borneo," in Judith Nagata, ed., Contributions to Asian Studies, Vol. VII (1975), p.45.
27. The tendency for such elites to compete has been noted by Maurice Duverger, Political Parties, the Organisation and Activity in the Modern State (London: Methuen & Co., 1955) pp.xxxiv-xxxv.

CHAPTER IV

MALAYSIAThe Formation of Malaysia

On May 27, 1961, Tengku Abdul Rahman, the Prime Minister of Malaya, called for a closer understanding between Malaya, Singapore, and the three territories of British Borneo--Brunei, Sarawak and North Borneo. His remarks, which set in motion the political forces that were to transform these territories into a legal nation-state, Malaysia, are worth quoting in part.

Sooner or later she [Malaya] should have an understanding with Britain and the peoples of Singapore, North Borneo, Brunei and Sarawak. It is premature for me to say now how this closer understanding can be brought about but it is inevitable that we should look ahead to this objective and think of a way whereby these territories can be brought closer together in a political and economic co-operation.¹

On economic and cultural grounds the idea of a Malaysian federation made good sense since the five territories had much in common. They had a common currency. Singapore served as the main commercial centre for the five territories concerned. Malay and/or English were their lingua franca. In addition they had a common pattern of administration developed by the British.

The Tengku's proposal was well timed. The British, who still controlled the Borneo territories, were favourable to the idea. For example, Mr. MacMillan, then the British prime minister, declared the

following June that the Tengku's proposal merited the widest discussion. Intent on resetting its sights on European integration, Mr. MacMillan's Conservative government was anxious for a phased withdrawal of British administrative and military responsibilities from the Southeast Asian region.

The Singapore government, which by this time had gained the Tengku's confidence, received his proposal favourably, and indeed had evoked it by pointing to the threat of a left-wing takeover in an independent Singapore. In Singapore the question of a merger was resolved by means of a referendum in which over seventy per cent of those who voted indicated that they were pro-merger. In Malaya, Parliament passed a motion of support for the concept in October 1961.

Reaction in Borneo was mixed; "there has been a good deal of confusion and misunderstanding over merger proposals",² wrote one commentator. In 1961 one of the territories was Brunei, a British protectorate, the other two being Sarawak and North Borneo, both Crown colonies. At that time, "a federation of just the Borneo territories was a bigger concept than most Borneans could accommodate--far less an affiliation with far-away Malaya and Singapore."³ In these territories opposition to Malaysia came from a "United Front" of political leaders. This anti-Malaysia front consisted of the Sarawak United Peoples' Party (SUPP), led by Ong Kee Hui, Brunei's Party Ra'ayat, headed by A.M. Azahari and the North Borneo's United National Kadazan

Organization (UNKO) chaired by Donald Stephens.⁴

When the Tengku announced that he was generally optimistic about support from Borneo for his proposal the United Front quickly replied that the

British government should be advised that so far as the wishes of the people in the three territories are ascertainable, any plan in accordance with the pronouncements made by Tengku Abdul Rahman in Brunei and Sarawak would be totally unacceptable to the people of the three territories.⁵

The overwhelming initial rejection against the idea of a merger was not to continue, however. After their initial gestures of opposition, several important leaders reversed their stand, particularly the Datu Bandar of Sarawak, who led the Party Negara Sarawak (PANAS), and Donald Stephens of UNKO. While the former kept a low profile, even after his public declaration of support for Malaysia, the latter became an active proponent of the Malaysia Plan. Donald Stephens' initial opposition was due to his unfamiliarity with the plan itself, and to his belief that a Borneo federation was a truly viable alternative to the Tengku's plan. That he was soon to change his stand was largely the result of persuasive work by the British who convinced Stephens of the danger of a weak Borneo federation in a region of turmoil. In addition to the external threats which could develop into problems of security, British Borneo also faced the possibility of domestic communist insurgency. Given these problems, the British felt that Sarawak and North Borneo would best become parts

of the proposed Malaysian federation where two territories would be protected in a common defence system.

Operating in the generally favourable atmosphere created by the good reception to the merger, the leaders from the five territories agreed on the establishment of a Malaysia Solidarity Consultative Committee (MSCC) to be chaired by Donald Stephens. Chiefly the objectives of the MSCC was to "collect and collate views and opinions concerning the creation of Malaysia...", as well as "to promote and expedite the realization of Malaysia."⁶ To this end the committee met four times, the last of which was on February 3, 1962. Its memorandum to the Cobbold Commission was believed to have reflected the consensus of the delegates from the five territories.⁷

An Anglo-Malayan Commission, the Cobbold Commission, had been provided for in the MacMillan-Tengku agreement of November 23, 1961.⁸ Given the tasks of inquiring into the proposal on the spot and making recommendations, the Cobbold Commission utilised the report of the MSCC as a guide for questions and compromises. It arrived on the scene in February 1962, and confined its survey to Sarawak and North Borneo, where its visit lasted a mere two months. The majority of the people, it concluded, supported Malaysia.⁹

In July 1963, the Sultan of Brunei decided against joining the Federation, but, this setback aside, Malaysia was inching towards reality. Points on individual and state matters raised by the Cobbold Commission

were being sorted out by the Inter-Governmental Committee of Malaya and the two Borneo colonies, chaired by Lord Lansdowne. It was the Lansdowne Commission which worked out the constitutional arrangements of the new federation, thus easing the entry of the two colonies.¹⁰

In Sarawak the partly appointed legislature, the Council Negri, voted on March 8, 1963, to join the Malaysian federation.¹¹ A similar result was reached by the Legislative Council of North Borneo on March 13.

On July 9, 1963, the document--the London Agreement--which established the federation, was finally signed. It provided for the creation of the federation on August 31 of the same year.

SNAP's Reaction to Malaysia

The Tengku's proposal caught SNAP's leaders by surprise. True, such an idea had been proposed before--from as far back as 1949 by the British and again in 1955.¹² But the periodic emergence of the concept had always been followed by ultimate rejection. Prior to May 1961, there had been little evidence to indicate that the proposal at this time was really a serious move by the Tengku. None of the Borneo leaders, for instance, were consulted or informed in advance. Such a lack of courtesy and sensitivity aroused the suspicion in SNAP that the Malaysia Plan would be foisted on the citizens without the approval of the colonies concerned and may have contributed to the party's subsequent decision to oppose the concept. Soon after the United Front was formed,

SNAP announced its support of the body in resisting the Malaysia Plan. The party was barely three months old at the time.

In rejecting the Malaysia Plan, SNAP relied heavily on its nationalist argument that Sarawak would as a matter of right receive full independence. The party charged that the proposed federation was politically retrogressive in nature and would deny Sarawak its statehood; that is, to agree to the Malaysia Plan was to sanction the reduction of Sarawak's aspiration of being a full sovereign power to that of a mere state. Late in 1961, apparently alarmed at the momentum of the plan, Ningkan again voiced his opposition and this time even implored the British for help.

To the supporters of the Malaysia Plan we say: 'No merger with Malaya. We want to achieve self-government and ultimate independence all ourselves. We want to remain in the British Commonwealth. We are not communists. We are Sarawak patriots. We earnestly request the British government to protect us as well as help us to steer our ship in the right direction.'¹³

Clearly, one of the basic reasons for SNAP's opposition was the fear that the proposed merger would permanently arrest Sarawak's progress towards political maturity. The belief in a right to sovereignty is the very groundwork of the doctrine of nationalism. The leaders of SNAP considered that as patriots it "would be fatal to the honour and integrity of the country to hesitate in protesting against the plan at this juncture."¹⁴

Further to the argument, the leaders of SNAP believed that

opposition to Malaysia was a sign of loyalty to Sarawak. Those supporting Malaysia, they contended, "seem to have no loyalty to this country."¹⁵

In addition to their patriotism, their love for Sarawak, and their belief that Sarawak should receive independence was their conviction that this goal was within reach. SNAP leaders were satisfied that not only should Sarawak become a sovereign state but that it could become one. Again, to quote Ningkan:

Since we are given the opportunity to run the show ourselves, why should we refuse it and let other people run it for us? We should be proud to see Sarawak be recognised as a nation, and not as a state within Malaysia.¹⁶

If the first line of argument centered around the doctrine of statehood, the second was the fear of being dominated by Malaya. According to this argument the Malaysia Plan was not only more than a threatened denial of political maturity for Sarawak, but also an exercise of imperial expansion by Malaya. That is, the risk of being a state of Malaysia--as opposed to not being one at all--was that it would leave Sarawak open to a constant infusion of economic, political, and cultural influences from Malaya. In the opinion of party leaders, most of whom were brought up in Anglican mission schools, if there was ever any country with which Sarawak should have had such a close association, it was Britain. Ningkan himself pointed out that Sarawak would remain in the British Commonwealth after independence.¹⁷

SNAP's ethnic concern was one feature which seemed threatened by Malayan imperialism. Under the proposed federation the most vulnerable group would not be the Malays of Sarawak, for they shared broad cultural similarities with the Malays of Malaya, nor would it be the Chinese, for Malaya had a powerful and large Chinese population. Thus discounting strong regional loyalty, for these two groups the Malaysia proposal was an opportunity for closer communal association. Unfortunately for the Dayaks, no such option existed since there were no Dayaks in Malaya. For them their only home was Sarawak. Ningkan alluded to this fact when he said that he was "profoundly certain that the great majority of peoples in this country do not want to sell their one and only home--Sarawak."¹⁸

The other aspect of this fear stems from the practicalities of politics. SNAP with its Dayak base naturally stood a better chance of being the dominant political organisation if Sarawak remained detached from the federation, since the Dayaks, its base group, constitute the majority in the state. This generally good prospect contrasted well with the possible fate of the party in Malaysia; since the Dayaks would constitute a very small minority in the proposed federation, SNAP would appear to be permanently condemned to being a minority and parochial party even if it should succeed in uniting the Dayaks, as well as a sprinkling of Malays and Chinese. In short, the prospect of being a diminutive organisation based in Sarawak ("just a state within Malaysia" as Ningkan had said) was clearly an unattractive one.

At the ethnic level there was fear that the Malaysian federation would institutionalise Malay domination, which would then be manifested in such areas as religion, language, education, and culture. In such a situation it would be difficult to cultivate the solidarity of the Dayaks, much less to attract Chinese and Malay support.

The last dimension of this fear of domination was at the state level. "How could it be guaranteed," Ningkan said, "that Sarawak would truly have equal voice in the running of Malaysia?" If this could not be arranged, "would it then be possible for Sarawak to safeguard its immigration laws, citizenship, and state sovereignty, and all other matters we [SNAP] intend zealously to keep free?"¹⁹

In summary, it may be said that SNAP's opposition to Malaysia was based on two objections. First, that the federation would deny Sarawak's deserved right to independence. Second, that the federation could fuse the Dayaks into a Malay melting pot--a notion which conjured up the idea of assimilation or cultural genocide. Certainly, the Dayaks would constitute a minority in the new federation and as such could not be expected to become the strategic ethnic group. The implication of this for SNAP was that it would have to forfeit its aspiration of becoming the dominant party of a truly independent state. Lastly, SNAP was concerned about the conduct of policy decision-making within the federal structure, about the prospect of being a partner having equal power with the rest of the states.

Acceptance

SNAP's opposition to Malaysia persisted into the early part of 1962; it was not until March that its leaders gave in. Ningkan who announced the switch after a meeting in Betong, Second Division, gave no definite reason except to admit to the "vital necessity of the realization of Malaysia."²⁰

Why did SNAP change its policy and accept Malaysia? Several factors were responsible. The first of these was the issue of communism.

For SNAP, which considered itself right-wing, the threat of communism to Sarawak was a constant irritation, a potential vulnerability which in the end weakened its resolve to fight the Malaysia proposal. The party perceived its anti-communist posture to be an important part of its particular nationalist doctrine. This was made clear by Ningkan in July 1961 when he declared that his party would "never be sympathetic with the Reds."²¹ With such an uncompromising viewpoint the party was increasingly perturbed by mounting government revelations of communist subversion in Sarawak. This was one of the underlying anxieties of SNAP's leaders as they mulled over the prospect of being independent; alone Sarawak might fall victim to a communist engineered takeover. At the same time, proponents of Malaysia changed their line of argument for the cause of the federation to emphasise the threat of communism in the region. The participation of British Borneo in the proposed federation had been explained as a way for the

natives of Borneo (the Dayaks and Malays) to reinforce numerically the Malays of Malaya so that within Malaysia an ethnic balance between Chinese and non-Chinese could be affected. They were therefore unwilling to commit themselves to a cause in which they would not benefit. With the increased exposure of communist threat not only in Malaya and Singapore, but also in Sarawak, they were now given an opportunity to re-appraise the Malaysia Plan in a positive light.

The threat of communism was a powerful argument which highlighted a major danger to the state and government of an independent Sarawak. The Malaysia Plan offered an opportunity of common defence against this menace. It could be said, therefore, that in accepting the Malaysia Plan, Ningkan was seeking the most practical way for Sarawak to survive as a state. It is in this context that Ningkan referred to Malaysia as a "vital necessity" in his acceptance.

The second factor centered on the threat of Malay domination, not only on Sarawak as a functioning state but also on the Dayaks as a people. This fear of subjugation, as stated above, was one of the fundamental reasons for SNAP's opposition to Malaysia. By January 1962 SNAP had softened its stand considerably, retreating from complete rejection to conditional acceptance in which the party sought safeguards and concessions. The object of getting concessions was evident in the party communique that emanated from a special meeting held in Betong on January 18, 1962, when SNAP declared that "the Sarawak

National Party's door is opened for negotiations on the concept of Malaysia. We suggest that this should be dealt with by a referendum."²² When by March SNAP gave up its fight it did so only after demanding a number of safeguards for Sarawak, safeguards which were designed to insulate the state as much as possible from the federal government. These proposed safeguards were presented to the Cobbold Commission, which had been set up to "ascertain the views of the peoples of North Borneo and Sarawak"²³ on the Malaysia Plan.

Perhaps the most important factor and one which finally compelled SNAP to fall in line was the momentum of the Malaysia Plan itself. By late 1961 and early 1962 as support began to mount for the proposal and organisations established to push for its cause, SNAP found itself shunted aside from the proceedings and threatened with isolation. Worse, continued resistance to the concept of Malaysia might even push the party into the position of parliamentary opposition after Independence Day. Party officials feared that, should this happen, SNAP would wither away since it would be devoid of rewards and patronage commonly associated with the government of the day. Isolation then, was viewed as a dangerous situation; faced with this prospect the leaders of the party concluded that they had no choice but to accept the proposal.

SNAP's protestations had little if any impact on the rest of Borneo's political leaders. In July 1961, the Malaysia Solidarity

Consultative Committee (MSCC) was formed in order that the proposal could continue to be discussed and the realization of Malaysia expedited. Bornean leaders were prominent in this body: its Chairman was Donald Stephens and the delegation from Sarawak had eight members.²⁴ They were Yeo Cheng Hoe, Ong Kee Hui, Temenggong Jugah, Pengarah Montegrai, Datuk Abang Haji Openg, Ling Beng Siew, James Wong and Remigus Durin. None of them were in any way associated with SNAP.

Perhaps because it was excluded from the only important debating body, SNAP failed to act as a catalyst for anti-Malaysia sentiment. Its exclusion from this body meant that it was not able to introduce its views formally, much less sway the MSCC to its direction. As late as December 1961 an opportunity apparently existed, for uncertainties about the plan still abounded. At that time no consensus was reached in the MSCC as delegate Yeo Cheng Hoe observed after one of its meetings in Kuching:

What transpired in those [Kuching] debates seems to have caused greater confusion in the minds of our people here.²⁵

There was therefore a prolonged period of ambivalence about Malaysia, a situation which SNAP could not exploit simply because it was not a member of the MSCC. In frustration, its leaders were reduced to vilifying Malaysia supporters, accusing them of having "no loyalty to this country ... no faith in themselves ...".²⁶ SNAP was even outmanoeuvred by PANAS, whose Chairman claimed that two-thirds of the natives had by then given their support to the plan. SNAP, which

considered the figure inflated, objected vigorously. Whether the opinions of the two parties were ever considered seriously by the MSCC may never be known. What happened, however, was that at the end of its meetings in Kuching the MSCC resolved to support Malaysia.

SNAP's opposition began to falter at this point. In a special meeting in Betong, convened in January 1962, the party condemned the MSCC as having "no mandate ... and therefore their acceptance of the plan could not be taken for granted."²⁷ Nonetheless, after this, SNAP conceded that its door was now open for negotiations on the concept of Malaysia.

Further evidence of the momentum of the Malaysia Plan was, in addition to the MSCC's work, the progress of the Cobbold Commission. It was a Commission of Inquiry established by the British and Malayan governments and one which traversed the whole of Sarawak, first touching Limbang, its northern-most tip, then on to the Rejang Basin. The itinerary was such that by the time the Rejang was covered, the trend of Sarawak's opinion on Malaysia could have been established. The implication for SNAP was this: since most Dayaks resided in the Rejang Basin, it greatly mattered which way it inclined.²⁸ To differ from the Rejang Dayaks was not only to split the Dayak peoples but also to become a minority over any issue since the Rejang Dayaks constitute the majority of this ethnic group. This situation was applicable to the Malaysia issue. An overwhelming vote of confidence

for Malaysia in the Rejang was bound to have an important effect on SNAP, since to continue its opposition to the plan at this time was to break-away from the Rejang Dayaks and to risk exacerbation of the traditional rivalries between the two peoples of the Rejang and Saribas, SNAP's heartland. Since SNAP's objective was to unite the Dayaks under its leadership, it was therefore unwilling to cause this kind of split. In this respect over the Malaysia issue, at least, SNAP would have to follow the lead given by the Rejang Dayaks.²⁹

The direction in which these Dayaks would go was made clear even before the Cobbold Commission arrived in Sarawak. On February 15, fifty-one chiefs from the Rejang met in Sibu, the administrative centre for the Third Division, where they declared their support for Malaysia.³⁰ They had their conditions, of course, and their resolutions, known as the Kapit Resolutions, were presented to the Cobbold Commission on March 19. The impact of the move by these chiefs was taken as important by the Cobbold Commission which allowed that

This was an expression of opinion to which we attach very great weight. The 51 Chiefs at the conference together were said to represent some 112,000 Iban-Dayaks out of a total of nearly 238,000 and many delegations of Iban Dayaks who came before us at different centres confirmed that they support the Kapit Resolutions....³¹

The move by these chiefs on SNAP was pivotal. After the February 15 meeting, SNAP finally conceded defeat, although this was not

announced until March 2. On that same day it published its own list of safeguards for the state of Sarawak. On March 26, when the Cobbold Commission arrived in Betong, Ningkan led a deputation of SNAP members. It was here that SNAP's conditions for acceptance of the Malaysia Plan were presented. They are: (1) The Head of State of Sarawak should be called Rajah, who must be of the indigenous people, and be elected by the people of the country; (2) The Supreme Head of the State of the Federation of Malaysia should be nominated by rotation; (3) Each Head of State in Malaysia should be eligible for nomination as the Yang Dipertuan Agong of the Federation; (4) There should be no alteration of the boundaries of any state, especially those between Sarawak, Brunei, and North Borneo; (5) The preservation of customary rights should remain the responsibility of the State; (6) The protection of land rights should remain the responsibility of the State; (7) English should remain the official language, not only in Sarawak but also in the Federation of Malaysia for at least fifteen years; (8) The English language should remain as the medium of instruction in schools. The study of other languages should not be prevented; (9) As Malay would be the national language in Malaysia, Iban should therefore be one of the secondary languages especially in Sarawak; (10) Expatriate officers should remain until or unless suitable local people were found to replace them; (11) Powers reserved for the State should not be changed without being agreed upon by the State; (12) Immigration

should be under the control of the State; (13) Development should be accelerated but subject to the agreement of the State; (14) The indigeneous peoples should have a fair share of government employment; enjoying the same privileges and having a fair share of overseas training and scholarships; (15) All states should have equal opportunities in regard to education; (16) The Malaysian Constitution should guarantee that all person be equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right to profess, practice and propagate religion freely; (17) Sarawak should have adequate representation in the Federal government; (18) The State should be provided with constitutional safeguards; (19) Each State should have a fair contribution of manpower to the armed forces (the Army, Navy, and Air Force) of the Federation of Malaysia.³²

SNAP then faced Malaysia by stating several conditions and safeguards which it tended to consider no longer negotiable. Not that the party was unwilling to consider further forms of changes, but any amendments were to be mutually agreed upon by both sides. Certainly it regarded the terms of Sarawak's entry as beyond the power of the federal government to change unilaterally. At first, the terms concerned issues of communal and state interests. Specifically, they relate to language (Iban, it should be a national language) and privileges. Secondly, SNAP was now concerned about the place of Sarawak within the Federation. A number of issues were involved which seemed

to suggest that SNAP was intent on insulating the State and therefore the Dayaks from federal intervention. It demanded that Sarawak retain jurisdiction over customary rights, land, immigration, and development, and that it should have educational opportunities equal to that of other states. Thirdly, SNAP made it clear that its loyalty to the Federation was conditional on federal goodwill to keep the terms of Sarawak's entry. In an incident of unwarranted federal interference, it could be expected that the party would resist or even undertake the ultimate protest by advocating separation. Given the situation, SNAP-federal relations could be expected to be acrimonious as Malaysia underwent the process of modernisation and nation building.

Alliance Building

The Malaysia Plan was an important issue, but once party leaders had accepted it they were eager to move on to the next problem: the formation of government. Their preference, obviously, was for SNAP to constitute the only ruling party, but early in 1962 this did not seem possible. The party was far too small and too weak³³ to mount an electoral campaign through the three-tiered electoral system from the district level to the Divisional Advisory Council (DAC) and finally to the legislature, the Council Negri. It was clear, therefore, that if SNAP was to be in power at all it would have to be in coalition.

Ningkan worked early towards this end. Twenty-six days after he

had accepted the Malaysia Plan, on March 27, 1962, he announced that his party would form an alliance with BARJASA "very soon".³⁴ This was a significant overture, particularly since he could have courted PANAS, another right-wing and pro-Malaysia party. But at that time PANAS was regarded the greater threat of the two because of the preponderance of Dayak members in its organisation. As well, PANAS had many traditional Dayak leaders, such as Temenggong Jugah, the paramount chief of the Ibans, Pengarah Montegrai, his lieutenant in the Second Division, and Temenggong Oyong Lawai Jau, the paramount chief of the Kayans and Kenyahs. These men were not only communal leaders but members of the Council Negri as well. At that time they appeared satisfied with their position; whatever the reason, PANAS refused to enter into any political alliance. Ningkan professed to favour the principle but explained that "since the subject had not been discussed before, it has to be left in abeyance until such time when members had unanimously agreed to the proposal."³⁵ PANAS' recalcitrance was timely since SNAP's leaders looked upon PANAS's members, particularly the Bidayuh Dayaks, as fair game for defections. In contrast BARJASA lacked important Dayak support either in terms of leaders or pockets of followers and was therefore more attractive than PANAS.

Despite his early optimism, Ningkan was to be disappointed by the results of his initiative. SNAP and BARJASA representatives met at the end of June "but negotiations floundered when SNAP demanded two-

thirds of all offices and control on the basis of their claimed membership",³⁶ an indication that its leaders would not give way to Malay domination lightly.

By the end of June, SNAP was facing something of a crisis. The political alliance which it had cultivated since March had failed to materialise. Worse, Ningkan appeared to have lost the initiative since it appeared that BARJASA and PANAS were moving closer. The appearance came closer to reality when the latter announced late in June that it was prepared "to work out a feasible agreement with any right-wing party that had declared its support for the formation of an alliance."³⁷

BARJASA was quick to offer its congratulations to PANAS; and the prospect of a Malay dominated alliance, with its strong Dayak component (at the time) which could isolate SNAP with its 50,000 or more claimed members, seemed close to reality.

Faced with the possibility of a Malay-dominated Alliance, Ningkan next turned to the nascent Party Pesaka Anak Sarawak (Pesaka). Formed the same month (June) that the SNAP-BARJASA negotiations had broken down, Pesaka was led by Third Division Iban chiefs. The founders were Penghulu Francis Umpau, Pengarah Banyang, and Penghulu Chundi. Upon announcing their intention to form a political party, both Pengarah Banyang and Penghulu Umpau, who were to become Pesaka's chairman and secretary-general respectively, warned that unless the Dayaks "could present a common and united front, they would be completely overwhelmed."³⁸

It should be noted that the statement was intended as justification for the formation of Pesaka, which was intended to be wholly Dayak. What Ningkan did was to interpret their political rhetoric so that the "united front" Pesaka talked about could become a reality--a SNAP-Pesaka alliance.

To SNAP such an alliance had a practical attraction. For once the Dayaks had a chance not only to present themselves as a united organisation but also to work towards the realization of Dayak dominance in Sarawak. This was desirable from SNAP's nationalist outlook for here the Dayaks from SNAP's ethnic base, together with other Dayaks from Pesaka, would be in control. If SNAP could not draw all Dayak support to itself, then the preferable alternative was to enter into an alliance with the other Dayak party to pool their strength. The second advantage was that such an arrangement would afford SNAP additional means by which to hold on to its territorial gains. The appeal of the traditional Dayak leaders was still considerable to convention-bound Dayaks. In order to prevent defections SNAP therefore needed to reach an understanding with Pesaka not to poach on its territory. For this reason a SNAP-Pesaka alliance would have been ideal, since its very presence would underscore such an agreement.

On July 8, less than one month after Pesaka was founded, over one hundred delegates of the two parties met in Betong where they agreed in principle on the formation of a SNAP-Pesaka alliance. To facilitate

negotiations, a Pesaka leader, Temenggong Oyong Lawai Jau, was recruited as the Vice-President of the bi-lateral "Council of Alliance". By September, it was hoped, negotiations would have been completed and SNAP and Pesaka would have formed the pillars of a system from which SNAP "would seek to form alliance with all other right-wing parties in Sarawak",³⁹ Ningkan was again to be disappointed at the outcome, but the problem centered not on SNAP but Pesaka. Banyang and Umpau effectively scuttled the move towards an alliance by denying that the Temenggong had any authority to represent Pesaka. They protested that they themselves did not know what was meant by Ningkan's "Council of Alliance", and declared that "no single member of Pesaka anak Sarawak has the authority to act at this stage on behalf of the party...".⁴⁰ Thus, with the role of the pro-Alliance Temenggong undermined, and Pesaka in clear disarray, the momentum to effect an intra-ethnic alliance was again temporarily lost. Pesaka's disorganisation could be explained by its unresolved leadership question: it had yet to lure its expected leader, Temenggong Jugah, away from PANAS. Until his assumption of power could be arranged any effort to construct an alliance had to be deferred. By late August, Jugah was firmly ensconced in his new position and early the next month, Ningkan was able to announce that

SNAP's alliance with Party Pesaka anak Sarawak would be established first after which an alliance with all right-wing parties would follow.⁴¹

Ningkan's statement confirms that, although his belief in Dayak unit and his desire to effect a Dayak alliance accounted for much of SNAP's activities during the middle of 1962, there was a secondary objective, an umbrella alliance which would involve PANAS, BARJASA, and the SCA, which were the political organizations of other communal groups. Thus, the very month that SNAP was negotiating with Pesaka, Ningkan was also waiting for BARJASA to respond to his "terms and conditions".⁴² In this respect SNAP's policy was to co-operate with other pro-Malaysia parties, but in 1962 its priority was clear: Dayak-based parties must first be given a chance to unite. That the SNAP-Pesaka alliance was to fade into limbo was due, not to the lack of goodwill on the part of SNAP, but to rather to indecision on the part of Pesaka, to inadequate organisation, and to insufficient funds. Finally, the straw that broke the camel's back, so to speak, was the drive by other pro-Malaysia parties to form an alliance around the issue of the Federation.

Ningkan's insistence that a SNAP-Pesaka alliance be formed first, was due not only to his belief that such a unity was essential to ensure Dayak domination; it was also to his response to the threat of external intrusion into Sarawak politics. In particular there was concern about Malayan intervention which would assist the Chinese and Malays, leaving the Dayaks isolated. At that time, such an event seemed likely, for the formation of the Sarawak Chinese Association

(SCA) was inspired by the Malayan Chinese Association (MCA).⁴³ On September 6, 1962, the latter's secretary-general, T.Y. Tan, confessed that the two parties were "exploring the possibility of bringing the MCA and SCA together".⁴⁴ Likewise, early in July 1962, representatives of the United Malays National Organisation (UMNO) were conferring with PANAS on the prospect of forming an affiliate party in Sarawak, to be called the United Malaysia National Organisation, a group with which other Sarawak right-wing organisations such as SNAP and Pesaka could join. UMNO's favourite protégé in Sarawak was therefore a fellow-Muslim party. Faced with the prospect of meeting challenges of communally based affiliate parties, Ningkan's reaction was to unite SNAP and Pesaka, arguing that for the Dayaks, ancient rivalries should not be allowed to divide them.⁴⁵ In mid-September 1962, the situation was as follows: the leaders of SNAP and Pesaka were still trying to cement their parties into an operating political alliance--much to the consternation of PANAS, BARJASA, and SCA. Until the two Dayak parties were satisfied that the threat of external intervention from Malaya had ceased to exist, they would remain adamant that they be given the chance to form their own communal alliance first.

At this point the British and the Malaysians intervened. They "were still anxious to have all major ethnic groups represented in a united pro-Malaysia front against the SUPP",⁴⁶ and as a result of their pressure, PANAS, BARJASA, and the SCA agreed that

all the so-called right-wing parties--PANAS, BARJASA, SNAP, SCA, and Pesaka--should come together first and thrash out their differences which they have, so as to have a better understanding of each other. When this had been completed, an alliance of all should take place as soon as possible.⁴⁷

Clearly the Malaysians had given up on the notion of extending their parties to Sarawak and thus paving the way for serious negotiations with SNAP and Pesaka. On October 22, 1962, it was announced that a "Sarawak United Front" (SUF) had been forged from the parties. It listed four objectives: (a) to unite all races to work for the harmony and prosperity of the country; (b) to work for the realization of Malaysia provided that adequate safeguards would be obtained for Sarawak; (c) to form an alliance among all the political parties having similar aims and objectives in Sarawak; (d) to cooperate with and assist the Inter-Governmental Committee and its Sub-Committees in their present negotiations for terms acceptable to Sarawak in the participation of Malaysia.⁴⁸ As a bona fide member of the Front, SNAP had agreed to these objectives. Given SNAP's concern for a strong Sarawak within the Federation it was probable that the second and fourth objectives, which respectively dealt with "safeguards" for the state and terms "acceptable to Sarawak", would have received Ningkan's eager endorsement.

Simultaneously, Ningkan continued to pursue his SNAP-Pesaka alliance; on October 22, the same day that the SUF was formed, the

alliance between the two Dayak-based parties was also made public. It was called the Sarawak National Alliance. The immediate consequence of the first meeting, at which party officers were elected, was significant, for on the basis of officers allotted to each party, SNAP clearly emerged as the junior partner. They were as follows:⁴⁹

President	Temenggong Jugah (Pesaka)
Deputy Chairman	Pengarah Montegrai (Pesaka)
Chairman	Penghulu Umpau (Pesaka)
Secretary General	Stephen Ningkan (SNAP)

Of the four only Ningkan was a SNAP functionary. Since Ningkan himself presided over the meeting, which was "conducted in a friendly and cordial atmosphere",⁵⁰ it was evident that SNAP had readily allowed Pesaka at least numerically to dominate the new organisation. SNAP's voluntary acquiescence may have been an example of deference for the traditional posts of these men; more important, it indicated that the SNAP chairman gave way in order to effect a Dayak alliance, even at the cost of accepting a second spot. Ningkan was clearly ecstatic after the agreement, but added some words of caution:

We must uphold and maintain its [SNAP's] solidarity in order that it will become a strong foundation of our political emergence ... Without unity among us we should become utterly down-trodden and [have] no future.⁵¹

Yet despite Ningkan's valiant words, the SNAP-Pesaka alliance was more apparent than real. With the election of the office bearers it appeared that SNAP was indeed working. But as it turned out, their elections were the crowning point of the whole exercise. Beyond this,

nothing had been achieved.⁵² By November 1962, the SNA had ceased to exist as a formal bureaucratic body. So fast did the organisation fade into limbo that there was not even time to make it a legal alliance--no one had bothered to register it. In a way this was unfortunate, for at that time both parties had agreed in principle on some provisions for their constitution. Had such a document materialised it would probably have formed the basis for an institution which would strive for Dayak unity with authority over such matters as political strategy, language, religion, and customs. In the absence of such a body, an informal alliance grew up between the two parties. This form of alliance had one major flaw, however: the continuation of such an arrangement, was contingent upon the good faith of individual leaders. By 1965, when Temenggong Jugah was replaced by Thomas Kana, a rival of Ningkan, as the major tactician in Pesaka, the alliance began to wither.

In contrast, the advent of the Sarawak United Front marked not only the decay of the SNU but also a more intense level of co-operation between the five pro-Malaysian parties in preparation for the coming general elections. From SNAP's standpoint, being part of a multi-party electoral machine was an acceptable way to ensure that it would also be part of the next government. Moreover, as a right-wing association the SUF's stand on communism was satisfactory. On the day that it was formed, the SUF--which was later called the Sarawak Alliance (SA)--promised to protect Sarawak in particular, and Malaysia in general, from the scourge of communism.⁵³

Lastly, SNAP was able to be satisfied with the SA because of what it did not do--specifically the SA decided not to invite Malayan parties into Sarawak and not to establish affiliate parties. That SNAP was anxious to prevent Malayan parties from taking roots in Sarawak was consistent with its nationalist sentiment--its fear of external intervention, particularly of a kind from which the Dayaks might not benefit. This was why SNAP sought to oppose the MCA and UMNO overtures in Sarawak.

From SNAP's standpoint, then, the SA was a satisfactory arrangement. True, it took Malayan and British guidance to establish the loose political alliance, but the Malaysians had acted with tact and diplomacy. Moreover, the nature of Malayan intervention, in contrast to its first partisan attempt to enter Sarawak politics, was perceived this time by SNAP as impartial. Furthermore, with the presence of the SA--in place of political branches of the Malayan Alliance--which was controlled totally by Sarawakians,⁵⁴ the prospect of uninvited meddling from the federal government was diminished greatly. In short, federal capacity for underhanded intervention in policy implementations within Sarawak appeared to have been circumvented. As far as SNAP was concerned, this was a welcome development, a proof finally that the federal government was amenable to state minority urgings.

In numerical terms SNAP did not dominate the leadership of the SA. The composition of the leadership was as follows:⁵⁵

<u>Position</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Party</u>	<u>Ethnic Group</u>
Chairman	T. Jugah	Pesaka	Dayak
Vice-chairmen	L.Y. Tan	SCA	Chinese
	L.H. Yuen	PANAS	Chinese
	P. Montegrai	Pesaka	Dayak
	T.H. Bujang	BARJASA	Malay
Secretary-General	S.K. Ningkan	SNAP	Dayak
Financial Officer	L.B. Siew	SCA	Chinese
Publicity Officer	K. Menon	SNAP	Indian

It may be said, however, that Ningkan and Menon (who was married to a Dayak woman and who lived in the Second Division) controlled the operations of the party; Ningkan was secretary-general, and Menon was publicity officer. Both offices dealt with the dissemination of information from the Sarawak Alliance. Furthermore, the SA chairman was a charming man, but since he lacked formal education, Ningkan was soon able to assert his influence in such areas as policy decisions and implementation.

SNAP, represented by Ningkan, played a significant part in drafting the Sarawak Alliance's election manifesto, a role which ensured that the resulting campaign literature of both the SA and SNAP were complementary. Indeed, since SNAP's manifesto ante-dated that of the Sarawak Alliance by six months, it could have been the prototype for the latter's document. Certainly on most issues there were wide areas of agreement. For instance, on education SNAP pledged to

revise the education policy and work towards a minimum of school-leaving age of 16. It [SNAP] will [work to] enhance [the education] facilities in every way.⁵⁶

The Sarawak Alliance in its turn, elaborated on the same principle when its manifesto was finally publicised on June 4, 1963. While SNAP merely proposed to revise the education policy the Sarawak Alliance made concrete proposals--namely to (a) provide free, compulsory primary education; (b) introduce post primary education, with some agricultural or technical training, up to the age of 15 years; and (c) expand secondary education, and lower the fees for secondary education, if possible.⁵⁷ The overall impact of such marked congruence of policy issues was that the SA's political platform was hardly distinguishable from that of SNAP's.

The consistent factors behind SNAP's activities were ethnicity and the pursuit of power. Ethnicity manifested itself in its efforts at alliance building, that is, its choice of alliance partners. Thus, it avoided PANAS and SUPP because both had large segments of Dayak members which the party was eager to attract--obviously the task would be much easier if the two parties were not fellow alliance members. BARJASA AND SCA were considered as appropriate partners because they did not have any large pockets of Dayak members, although they had non-Dayak leaders like PANAS and SUPP. The other dimension of ethnicity was in SNAP's effort to come to terms with Pesaka, the other Dayak-based party. The method chosen was that of a formal tactical alliance and, when that failed, an informal one.

Cabinet Formation

The General Election of 1963⁵⁸ is discussed more fully in Chapter VIII. For the moment it is sufficient to note that the Sarawak Alliance emerged victorious with a total of 23 out of 36 seats in the state legislature (the Council Negri). Within the Sarawak Alliance the distribution of elected representatives was uneven: Pesaka had eleven, SNAP six, BARJASA five and SCA one. No party had absolute control, therefore, and the question of leadership was thrown into the open. That is, the Sarawak Alliance may have been an effective organisation with which to contest the General Election, but in the absence of a dominant party which would be accepted as the leading organisation of the Sarawak Alliance, there was intra-Alliance competition for the position of leadership, namely the office of Chief Minister. This contest provided for SNAP and Pesaka an instance in which ethnicity was the basis for political action.

Ningkan's emergence as the Chief Minister of Sarawak was a product of his own popularity, the near absence of competitors, and the support given him by Pesaka and later the Sarawak Alliance. His own party, SNAP, was important also; but at this juncture SNAP merely provided an operating base from which he was recognized to have come. As SNAP's secretary-general he was its major tactician and representative who was empowered to enter into negotiations with other political parties. Since SNAP was only the second largest party in the Sarawak Alliance, it would have been difficult if not impossible

for Ningkan to rise to the top without the assistance of Pesaka and to a degree of BARJASA and the SCA. In other words, since SNAP did not control the legislature, it had to have the support of other Alliance members, particularly of Pesaka.

Such support did materialise. After a period of continuing cooperation between the two Dayak parties, SNAP and Pesaka entered into an understanding of mutual assistance⁵⁹ by which SNAP would back Jugah's quest for the post of Governor while Pesaka would support SNAP and Ningkan's pursuit of the Chief Minister's office. In addition, SNAP was to concentrate at the state level, while Pesaka would restrict itself to the federal level of politics. Thus, just as the two parties had divided Sarawak into respective areas of operation, they now allotted themselves specific levels of government.

There were three candidates for the office of Chief Minister. Despite the fact that the SUPP was outside the Sarawak Alliance, the British colonial administration backed SUPP's chairman, Ong Kee Hui, as Chief Minister.⁶⁰ Ong, it suggested, would preside over a grand coalition of the Sarawak Alliance, PANAS, and SUPP. Their suggestion was rejected by the Sarawak Alliance, which could not accept Ong as Chief Minister.

The real arena of struggle was within the Sarawak Alliance itself. It was here that Ningkan's advantage became evident, for quite apart from being SNAP's primary operative, he had developed into an extremely important functionary of the Sarawak Alliance.

That party, admittedly, was only a loose association of four disparate elements, but the facts were that it had the majority in the legislature and that Ningkan was its secretary-general, responsible for its operations. The chairman of the SA was Temenggong Jugah, who was, as a fellow Dayak and a Pesaka member committed to supporting Ningkan as Chief Minister.

Ningkan's primary challenger for the post was Abdul Rahman Yakub.⁶¹ A major leader of BARJASA, he was also an executive member of the Sarawak Alliance. He was thus much like Ningkan in that he had a party for a base and was an Alliance executive. His advantage was that he was academically more qualified, being a trained lawyer; he also enjoyed the backing of the Malayan government. In the end, Ningkan proved too strong for Rahman Yakub to dislodge. For one thing, Ningkan had the support of both Dayak parties. Given the predominance of SNAP and Pesaka in the Sarawak Alliance, only the candidate who received their backing had a realistic chance of becoming the Chief Minister: this indeed was the dominant factor behind Ningkan's emergence. For another, he had the support of the SCA, the only Chinese-based party in the Sarawak Alliance.

Secondly, Ningkan enjoyed a personal victory as well: he had won his seat in the 1963 General Elections. By mid-July his position had improved, for he had been elected as member of the Second DAC, and from that body into the Council Negri. Ningkan's

string of electoral victories was by no means unique, for at this time he showed the same record as thirty-three other Council Negri members. But the fact that he managed to be elected strengthened his candidacy just as Abdul Rahman Yakub's was weakened by his electoral defeat. In the post-election days, therefore, Yakub's only real strength was the support he received from the federal politicians who at that time had neither power nor real influence, since technically, there were foreigners. They did try to intervene, but it was a lame effort which backfired. On June 25, 1963, the Straits Times, quoting an unnamed source, leaked the news that Rahman Yakub would be Sarawak's Chief Minister. Ningkan's reaction was prompt. Annoyed, he called the leak "absurd and ridiculous", and warned against other "malicious stuff" being speculated upon in the future.⁶²

The day that the Sarawak Alliance was declared the winner of the General Elections, its executives met in Sibu to discuss the formation of Sarawak's first government. Following a two-day deliberation, it was announced that Ningkan was the Sarawak Alliance's unanimous choice as Chief Minister. Upon his selection, Ningkan was duly appointed to the office of Chief Minister by the Governor. The placements of cabinet portfolios were made by the Sarawak Alliance Council with British advice.⁶³ The following appointments were made:

Stephen Kalong Ningkan (SNAP), Chief Minister
James Wong (SNAP) Deputy Chief Minister
Abdul Taib Mahmud (BARJASA), Minister of Communications
and Works

Dunstan Endawie (SNAP), Minister for Local Government
 Teo Kui Seng (SCA), Minister of Natural Resources
 Awang Hipni bin Penigiran Annu (BARJASA), Minister of State
 G.A.T. Shaw (British expatriate), Secretary of State
 B.A. Hepburn (British expatriate), Financial Secretary
 P.E.H. Pike (British expatriate), Attorney General

Ningkan's cabinet was ethnically balanced: excluding British expatriates, the three major ethnic groups had two members each in the cabinet. Further, it may be observed that Pesaka was excluded, as arranged by the Ningkan-Jugah agreement. Since Pesaka constituted the largest single bloc in the Sarawak Alliance, its allegiance became critical to the survival of the government. In the case of the Ningkan administration, it would survive as long as the Ningkan-Jugah agreement endured.

Summary

SNAP's participation in the Sarawak Alliance was an alignment which enabled it to share power with the other parties. From the beginning it sought to forge Dayak solidarity through a formal Dayak-based party to be known as the Dayak National Alliance. This body, however, failed to function and in its disappearance, SNAP and Pesaka settled for an understanding of mutual assistance, followed by a division of their respective areas of operation. Their understanding was evident in the following instances: (a) areas of influence-- SNAP was to concentrate in the Second and First Divisions while Pesaka was to limit its activities in the Third Division; (b) posts-- SNAP would support Jugah's bid for the position of Governor in return

for Pesaka's backing of Ningkan as Chief Minister; and (c) SNAP was to concentrate at the state level while Pesaka was to operate at the federal one. This, then, was the extent of Dayak unity in the early days of independence.

It should be stressed that the modus vivendi between the two Dayak parties concerned the delineation of posts and territories which affected both organisations. They were matters which the parties were then faced with. The weakness of this intra-communal arrangement was that the matters involved other sources of power which were able to veto their decisions. Thus, in the case of Jugah's bid for the post of Governor,⁶⁴ their common agreement was nullified by the Central Government--that is, problems not entirely of their own making began to weaken their unity. More important, the two parties failed or neglected to reach any agreement on substantive issues common to their ethnic group, such as language, Dayak privileges, and land. The absence of any comprehensive agreement on these issues led to the rise of contending positions being expounded by the two parties. Competition between the Dayak-based parties, SNAP and Pesaka, did not surface until early 1965. When it did, the immediate stimulus was party-building. Here the issues of language, Dayak privileges, and land were important in that they crystallised the political persuasions of the leaders of SNAP and Pesaka and illuminated the competition between the two parties. That is, instead of becoming

the foci of intra-ethnic solidarity, these issues became points of disagreement in which SNAP and Pesaka sought to "out-bid" in their struggle for political support.

Footnotes to Chapter IV

1. Willard Hanna, The Formation of Malaysia (New York: American Universities Field Staff, 1964), p.7. See also J.M. Gullick, Malaysia and its Neighbours (London: Routledge, 1967), p.28.
2. T.E. Smith, "Proposals for Malaysia", The World Today, 18 (May, 1962), p.197.
3. Peter Boyce, Malaysia and Singapore in International Diplomacy; Documents and Commentaries (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1968) p.5.
4. Ibid.
5. Sarawak Tribune, July 31, 1961.
6. J.M. Gullick, Malaysia and Its Neighbours (London: Routledge, 1967), p.61.
7. Smith, op. cit., p.199.
8. H.F. Armstrong, "The Troubled Birth of Malaysia", Foreign Affairs, Vol. 41 (1962-63), p.682.
9. Gullick, op. cit., p.87.
10. On September 26, 1962, seventeen months after the Tengku's Malaysia proposal, the Council Negri met. But it was not to discuss the plan; it was to approve it in principle. When Mr. (later Datuk) James Wong objected that the body was being presented with a fait accompli, he was told that "if [the Honourable Member] felt this way ... there are procedures of this Council by which they can force the Government's hand" (The Attorney-General, Council Negri Debates, September 26, 1962, p.380, cited by Edwin Lee, Sarawak in the Early Sixties, Number Five: Singapore Studies on Borneo and Malaya [Singapore: University of Singapore, 1964], p.40).
11. Ibid.
12. See for instance, M.N. Sophe, "The Advocacy of Malaysia before 1961" Modern Asian Studies, Vol. 7, No. 4 (1973), pp.717-723; R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Politics and Government in Malaysia (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1978), pp.44-76; M.N. Sophe, From Malayan Union to Singapore Separation (Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1974).
13. Sarawak by the Week, 50/61, December 10-December 16, 1961, p.4.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Sarawak Tribune, July 31, 1961.
19. Sarawak by the Week, 42/61, October 15-October 21, 1961, p.11.
20. Sarawak Tribune, March 2, 1962.
21. Sarawak Tribune, July 31, 1961. In a statement to the press, Ningkan refuted the Tengku's charge that those who were opposed to Malaysia were communists. "SNAP", Ningkan continued, "was a right wing [party which would] ... never become a communist party."
22. Sarawak by the Week, 3/62, January 14-January 20, 1962, p.3.
23. Report of the Commission of Enquiry, North Borneo and Sarawak, Lord Cobbold, chairman (Kuching: Government Printing Office, 1962), p.vi. This body became commonly known as the Cobbold Commission. None of its members were from Sarawak.
24. Ibid., p.86.
25. Straits Times, December 20, 1961, p.13.
26. Sarawak by the Week, 50/61, December 10-December 16, 1961, p.11.
27. Ibid. 3/62, January 14-January 20, 1961, p.4.
28. The Rejang is the longest river in Sarawak. The acquiescence of the Rejang Dayaks to the Malaysia plan was a grave disappointment to SNAP.
29. Several sources within SNAP confirmed this.
30. Report of the Commission of Enquiry, North Borneo and Sarawak (Lord Cobbold, chairman) op. cit., p.9. Note that SNAP had suggested a referendum as the proper way to determine the wishes of Sarawakians. In this instance the Cobbold Commission chose to rely on the collective wishes of these penghulus as representative of the attitude of the Rejang Dayaks. Since these headmen only met for one day in the Kapit bazaar, they could not be expected to be conversant with the Malaysia plan and its implications.
31. Ibid., p.43.
32. Ibid., p.72. See also Sarawak Tribune, March 28, 1962. In contrast to the population of the Dayaks in the Rejang, the Saribas region had only 14,000 members. SNAP's founders came from the Saribas area. Obviously the Saribas is the less significant of the two regions.
33. For instance, in mid-1962 its claimed membership stood at 50,000, less than that of PANAS. See ibid., June 12, 1962. Both figures were probably inflated.

34. Ibid., March 28, 1962.
35. Ibid., June 12, 1962.
36. Michael Leigh, The Rising Moon: Political Change in Sarawak (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1974), p.52.
37. Sarawak Tribune, June 28, 1962. In the same month when Pesaka was formed, SNAP's priority was switched from building an inter-ethnic alliance between SNAP and BARJASA to an intra-ethnic one between SNAP and Pesaka.
38. Ibid., June 18, 1962.
39. Ibid., August 29, 1962.
40. Ibid., July 21, 1962. The speed in which Ningkan tried to forge an alliance here and the exclusion of the Rejang Iban leaders from his "Council of Alliance" probably resulted in increased mutual distrust between the two Dayak leadership cliques of the Saribas and Rejang.
41. Ibid., September 7, 1962.
42. Ibid., August 29, 1962.
43. Ibid., June 27, 1962.
44. Straits Times, September 7, 1962.
45. Margaret Roff, The Politics of Belonging: Political Change in Sarawak and Sabah (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1974), p.121. Ningkan also argued that the two Dayak parties which in 1962 claimed to have a total of 100,000 members, could dominate the politics of Sarawak.
46. Ibid., p.125.
47. Ibid., September 7, 1962.
48. Ibid., October 22, 1962.
49. Ibid., October 23, 1962.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. This was to be replaced by an informal alliance -- a gentleman's agreement between Jugah and Ningkan, the two principal operators behind Pesaka and SNAP respectively.
53. Ibid., November 30, 1962. Another worry of the proponents of the Sarawak Alliance was the possibility of the pro-Malaysia parties splitting their votes in the general elections scheduled for the middle of 1963. See Sarawak Tribune, October 18, 1962.

54. The exclusion of Malayan participation in Sarawak was a major objective of SNAP.
55. Sarawak Tribune, January 22, 1963.
56. Ibid.
57. Ibid., June 4, 1963.
58. See, for instance, "Report on the General Elections, 1963" Sarawak Gazette LXXXIX, 1266 (August 31, 1963), pp.174-192. For an excellent account of the 1963 General Election see K.J. Ratnam and R.S. Milne, The Malayan Parliamentary Election of 1964 (Singapore: University of Malaya Press, 1967), pp.266-311. See also Michael Leigh, The Rising Moon, op. cit., pp.51-72.
59. There is no common opinion between the two sides as to when this understanding was actually reached. According to various sources in SNAP it was not reached until early 1964 (before that cooperation between them was on an ad hoc basis). Even then it was not a formal understanding but a gentleman's agreement between Temenggong Jugah and Ningkan. Pesaka-SNAP cooperation thus rested on the goodwill of two men. See footnote 49. Years later, in June 1976, the two major Pesaka leaders, Temenggong Jugah and Thomas Kana, were to deny to this student that there was such an understanding.
60. Michael Leigh, The Rising Moon, op. cit., p.78.
61. Straits Times, June 25, 1963, cited in Leigh, The Rising Moon, op. cit., p.79.
62. Sarawak Tribune, June 27, 1963.
63. British influence extended beyond this stage. Three expatriates were retained in the Supreme Council (cabinet) and one of them, G.A.T. Shaw, the state secretary, was particularly close to Ningkan. For an account of cabinet formation in Sarawak see M.B. Leigh, "The Development of Political Organization and Leadership in Sarawak, East Malaysia" (Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1971), pp.138-140.
64. Temenggong Jugah's idea of who was the culprit responsible for his failure to become the Governor seemed to have changed over the years. In June 1976 he informed this student that the person to be blamed was Ningkan, since it was through his behest that he (Jugah) agreed to offer his candidacy. But in the period following the Malayan veto Jugah clearly blamed the Central Government. Such was his anger that he was ready to reverse his support for Malaysia, op. cit.; see, for instance, ibid, p.140.

CHAPTER V

ISSUES AND DAYAK INTERESTS

It is necessary to note from Chapter IV that although SNAP relied heavily on territorial nationalism, a fact manifested by its espousal of the principle of self-determination, a more salient nationalism in its campaign against Malaysia and its subsequent activities was its ethnic (Dayak) nationalism. True, little was said or admitted publicly about the factor of ethnicity, but the fact remained that the Dayaks formed SNAP's primary community, the strategic group which could put SNAP in a dominant position is Sarawak. The party opposed Malaysia because it threatened to deny the Dayaks their potential for hegemony; in this case the principle of self-determination merely provided a convenient public reason.

Chapter V deals with two issues in which SNAP was involved. The purpose of the chapter is to confirm the salience and the development of ethnic nationalism. Again, other factors will come into play: as will be seen, SNAP employed technical constitutional arguments, but beyond this, the party acted to defend and articulate Dayak interests.

Borneonisation

Borneonisation was a fairly straightforward idea. It referred to the replacement in the civil service of British expatriates by local Bornean officers. It was a process which entailed first, the infusion of local talent into the civil service, and second, the concomitant departure of expatriates. The principle of Borneonisation had wide acceptance.

The Malaysia Solidarity Consultative Committee (MSCC), led by Donald Stephens of Sabah, not only endorsed the principle of Borneonisation but also suggested that its implementation be left to the states concerned. Moreover, the MSCC recommended that state control over Borneonisation be constitutionally safeguarded.¹ Concern over the issue in Borneo was recognised by the Cobbold Commission which recommended that

Borneonisation of the public services should proceed as quickly as possible.

Every effort should be made to encourage British officers to remain in the service until their places can be taken by qualified people from the Borneo territories.²

In its turn, the Inter-Governmental Committee (IGC), which was charged with constituting the terms of the federation, ultimately gave the state government considerable leeway in determining how fast or how slow Borneonisation in the state civil service should be.³ This was because the IGC "saw the process of replacing expatriates by local

officers in somewhat rational formal terms; it considered local expectations of tenure, and the need to programme the handover so as not to destroy the efficiency of the services."⁴ It was left to the state government concerned through its Public Service Commission, which in the case of Sarawak was chaired by Ningkan, to reconcile these "expectations" and to produce the "programmes". In practice, therefore, the IGC actually put Ningkan in the position of deciding what posts in Sarawak were ready to be Borneonised. What the IGC Report did not do was to rule out the prospect that civil servants from West Malaysia or Malaya would fill federal, as opposed to state, positions in the states. The admittance of Malayan civil servants into Sarawak would hasten the departure of expatriates who were holding positions which were now under federal jurisdiction in the state. That is, although the IGC gave Borneonisation the status of "first priority", it did not provide "any absolute guarantee that no Malayan would be appointed to any federal posts in the Borneo states".⁵ The IGC seemed to accord Ningkan the position of deciding what posts in Sarawak were ready to be Borneonised. In practice Ningkan did not enjoy such an overriding power over Borneonisation. Part of the reason was from the fact that the civil service in Sarawak were under two lists--federal and state. The problem for Ningkan was that although the IGC Report recognised the jurisdiction of his government over Borneonisation it did not rule out the prospect of civil servants from Malaya procuring federal

jobs in Sarawak.⁵ Indeed, Malayan civil servants did move into federal and state jobs in Sarawak, although it should be pointed out that the actual number was small and that most were in the federal service. In short, Ningkan's position was weakened by the ambiguity of the IGC Report.

Compounding the technical issue of what the IGC actually stated, Ningkan's actual authority on Borneonisation was further weakened by political pressure from the federal government. Eager to see the removal of the expatriates and their influence from Sarawak, the federal government exerted pressure on Ningkan to accelerate their removal. Again, Ningkan found himself at odds with the federal government; while the former favoured the hasty release of expatriates, the latter was convinced of the merits of their gradual removal. Disagreements also centred on the questions of replacements. The federal government not only insisted that Malaysians be eligible as replacements, but also appeared to favour, in order of preference, Sarawak Malays, Sarawak Dayaks, and Sarawak Chinese. Ningkan, in contrast felt that Malaysians should be excluded from jobs in the state. Further he clearly favoured Dayaks as the prime contenders to replace departing expatriates.

Barely four months after the inception of Malaysia, Borneonisation in both state and federal services was to become a bitter and protracted political issue in which the Ningkan administration

was pitted against both the Sarawak Government Asian Officers Union (SGAOU) and the federal government. SNAP's position on Borneonisation was made clear in August 1962, at which time it conceded that Borneonisation should proceed, but at the same time, that it was concerned about the quality of replacement. It said that the "efficiency and integrity of the public service must be maintained in a high pitch,"⁶ and that the "present serving Expatriate Officers should not be discouraged from remaining in the Public Service as long as their services are required."⁷

The Ningkan government largely retained the views which his party held; he endorsed Borneonisation but felt that competent and acceptable replacements would have to be found before British expatriates could be invited to depart so that the efficiency and integrity of the public service would not suffer in the process. Here then was the core of Ningkan's public argument.⁸

Ningkan's resolve to find competent and acceptable replacement meant that Borneonisation was of necessity slow and deliberate. The term "competent" is self-explanatory, but "acceptable" needs further elaboration because it has political overtones. It means that in finding a replacement, the right candidate would not only have to be competent, but of the acceptable ethnic kind as well. Milne and Ratnam had this to say about Borneonisation at this level:

There was in fact provision for the protection of Natives in the new Sarawak and Sabah constitutions drawn up at the time of Malaysia. But the protection was not complete; beyond its limits, the quicker the expatriates were removed the greater the chances that a Chinese would be appointed to a vacancy. However, if the expatriates' departures could be slowed down a little, the time could be used to train a Native to fill the post.

Even inside the category of "Natives" there were conflicts between the claims of different ethnic groups. In Sarawak, for example, since the days of the Brookes the Malays had been traditionally more prominent than other Natives in the civil service.⁹

Thus, domestically Borneonisation had become a political issue in which communal interests were at stake.

The motive behind the gradual approach which both SNAP and Pesaka advocated meant a lease of time which would allow qualified Dayaks to take over.¹⁰ The other motive was to ensure a period of British tutorship. SNAP has always accepted as a matter of course a continuing relationship between Great Britain and its representatives and Sarawak, even if the latter were to become independent. Indeed, it was the belief of its core leaders that such a relationship should be sufficient to guide and guard Sarawak as a politically independent nation-state. Great Britain, they felt, would ensure that Sarawak would remain a viable independent country and, convinced of this, they were quick to reject Malaysia: "When Sarawak has attained independence she [too] will remain in the British Commonwealth."¹¹ After their acceptance of Malaysia, the party still advocated a strong British bias.

In Sarawak, Ningkan's most vocal critics were SGAOU and the opposition parties, PANAS and SUPP. In the main they found that Borneonisation had gone far too slowly. Thus, for instance, Ong Kee Hui of the SUPP concluded in February 1964, that "so far what has occurred or failed to occur in the process of Borneonisation of the public service has not given people much confidence in the government".¹² Abang Othman of PANAS was even more scathing in his attack. He charged, without substantiating his remarks, that "what has happened since Malaysia Day is that instead of relinquishing some of the less senior posts to local officers, we see the reverse happening. Young and inexperienced expatriate officers have been promoted, even overpassing senior local officers".¹³

The most consistent attack on the way Ningkan handled the Borneonisation issue came from SGAOU. Not satisfied with Ningkan's slow speed of Borneonisation or his explanation, the Union enlisted the help of the federal government. It was Tun Razak himself, then the Deputy Prime Minister, who discussed the issue of Borneonisation and SGAOU's complaints with Ningkan. The Chief Minister's reaction to the federal government's initiative was one of displeasure. He apparently informed Razak that in Sarawak the process of replacing the expatriates was actually faster than that in the Malaysian states, thus implying that the Deputy Prime Minister had no justification for pointing the federal finger, so to speak, at Sarawak. It was his hope, Ningkan

remonstrated, that there be "no further accusations from the Federal Government on the matter".¹⁴

On its own SGAOU continued to press the issue.¹⁵ It was an exasperated Ningkan who scolded the Union in mid-1965:

I find your proposals and indeed your interference in matters which do not concern your Union entirely unacceptable I trust there will be no further occasion when your Union steps beyond the bounds of its proper functions.¹⁶

Ningkan's commitment to a slow rate of Borneonisation also raised the ire of the federal government, which was convinced that the influence of the expatriates in Sarawak was pervasively harmful. The position of the federal government was that the expatriates be encouraged to leave and that replacements could be either from Sarawak or West Malaysia.

Declared the Prime Minister,

if the British continue to run the administration of the country, when can the people of Sarawak claim to be independent? Although the British flag is no longer flown in the country, many British officers are still administering and holding key appointments in the Government. I, therefore, asked that Sarawakians should replace them; if there is none available, then we in Malaya could come to assist.¹⁷

Ningkan was opposed to the suggestions of the federal government.

It was his view that British presence in Sarawak was advantageous for Sarawakians and the expatriates were therefore welcome to stay until the appropriate Sarawak-born replacements could be found. He rejected the contention that Sarawak was still under undue British

influence. In his retort to the Prime Minister he said, "The Public Service is no longer serving under a Colonial Government; it is no longer there to carry out colonial policies. Today, even the expatriate officers who remain in the Service have had to realize that they are now carrying out the policies made by the people themselves through the elected representatives."¹⁸ In rejecting any hasty withdrawal of the expatriates, Ningkan in effect was establishing a case for a slow rate of Borneonisation. More than that, he was rejecting the Tengku's offer of Malayan bureaucrats for service in Sarawak.

In order to achieve a gradual implementation of Borneonisation, however, Ningkan needed a plausible basis for his argument. He was convinced that he had found this in the IGC Report. Ningkan's tactic was therefore to rely on a constitutional underpinning, specifically the provisions provided by the IGC Report which he regarded as the conditions for Sarawak's entry into Malaysia.¹⁹ Hence his defence of the IGC Report. But, as has been pointed out, the IGC Report did not preclude the possibility of Malaysians serving in the state. In other words, although Ningkan wanted to keep Malayan civil servants out of Sarawak, the constitutional justifications which he offered were inadequate. Unable to block this loophole completely, Ningkan sought to restrict the number of Malayan born officials in the state to the minimum. Again, he referred to the IGC Report:

The State Government of Sarawak intends to see the terms of the Inter-Governmental Committee Report are strictly observed in Borneonisation

and that Malayanisation would be resisted....

As a result of this policy, the opportunities for Sarawakian officers in terms of promotion are immense.²⁰

The term Malayanisation implies at least some degree of takeover of the civil service by Malaysians born in Malaya; its usage betrays Ningkan's general suspicion of Malayan presence and intentions in Sarawak.

Resistance to Malayanisation means that in Sarawak no Malayan-born civil servants should take over any senior positions (even those under federal jurisdiction) from departing expatriates. This is important, for it meant that neither Ningkan nor SNAP had retreated from the "stand on Malaysia" of August 1962. At that time the party not only endorsed Borneonisation, but also insisted that positions under federal jurisdiction in Sarawak be filled by Sarawakians.

Clearly Ningkan was determined to resist any call for an accelerated programme of Borneonisation for such an approach, as has been pointed out above, would put the Dayaks at a disadvantage since at that time very few Dayaks were qualified to fill the posts held by expatriates. It could be said, therefore, that Dayak nationalism was partly responsible for Ningkan's position on Borneonisation. The other determinant of Ningkan's position stemmed from the other orientation of SNAP's nationalism. Manifested by Ningkan's insistence that Malayan-born civil servants be excluded from Sarawak, this aspect of its nationalism was clearly territorial, for SNAP's argument was based on the provisions of the IGC Report. For SNAP, here, the role

of the expatriates had been extended from a communal purpose to a regional concern. Expatriates were a valuable source of manpower in helping Ningkan to insulate Sarawak against federal encroachment. That is, the expatriates were not only useful in tutoring potential Sarawak candidates, but also in occupying these civil service posts and therefore denying them to Malaysians.

It was not until early 1966 that Ningkan finally agreed to accelerate²¹ the departure of the expatriates--and even then only on the terms which he had prescribed. First, it was to be Borneonisation. To ensure this, he had created the Sarawak Borneonisation and Establishment Committee, which he chaired, "to fill all top posts with local officers".²² Second, it was to be cautious and programmatic in character: Borneonisation was to be planned and executed with care, "not...haphazardly", he asserted.²³

At this point, Ningkan's position encountered problems. Hitherto, Ningkan was able to follow a fairly independent policy in implementing Borneonisation, largely because of his strong constitutional argument and because, since he did not institute many changes, the financial outlays were small. With the new phase of Borneonisation, Ningkan also instituted various developmental projects. It would appear that Ningkan was ready to demonstrate the viability of his contention that Sarawak could and should implement Borneonisation on its own. In this, however, Ningkan badly miscalculated, for his

projects needed financial backing which Sarawak was unable to raise by itself.²⁴ His only recourse was to turn to the federal leaders for financial assistance. But by this time the federal government had had serious rifts with Ningkan over other issues and was convinced that Ningkan had to be removed from power. Ningkan's intransigence over Borneonisation, rooted as it was in Dayak and Sarawak interests, was a major obstacle to the federal objectives of nation-building, that is, of developing political consensus and administrative co-ordination between West and East Malaysia. In a very real sense, the squabble over Borneonisation was a clash between two competing nationalisms.

Language

Before SNAP's position on language is examined, it is necessary to explain the application of the term national as opposed to official language. The essential difference between the two lies in their usage: a national language would be taught in the schools of the country, as would also the official one, but there the similarity ends, for only the official language could be used in official communications --that of the courts, offices, and correspondence between the different levels of government. Under Article 161 of the Constitution of Malaysia, Parliament was empowered to terminate the use of English as its official language in 1967 in West Malaysia. Elected representatives from Sarawak, Singapore, and Sabah were still allowed to use English

in the Federal Parliament until 1973. Further, English was to be used in Sabah and Sarawak as their official language at least up to 1973, and after that time, until their respective legislatures decided otherwise.²⁵

SNAP did not establish a position on language until March 1962. The immediate stimuli was the party's impending acceptance of the Malaysia plan and the concomitant need to establish conditions and safeguards. On the matter of language, the party felt that "English should remain the official language not only in Sarawak but also in the Federation of Malaysia for at least fifteen years."²⁶ The choice of English and the condition contained therein was regarded by party leaders as evidence that they had adopted a national Malaysian outlook, since English was used in both British Borneo and Malaya. To them, at least, this was an important concession, a sacrifice on their part since being Iban themselves, there was little doubt that by this time they were tilting towards the preservation and perpetuation of the Iban language in Malaysia.

SNAP soon introduced a number of additions to its position. Since the first publication of its safeguards, it had time to process the feedback from party members. It was likely that their dissatisfaction was responsible for the inclusion of a clause demanding that Iban be one of the national languages. The new position was as follows;

While it is generally and strongly felt by the majority of people that IBAN should be one of the

national languages of Malaysia, the subject is best solved...(by) the fully elected representatives of the National Legislative Council of State Parliament.²⁷

This new addition, which reflected the wishes of its supporters, highlighted the concern in the state for the survival of the Dayaks, particularly the Ibans, within the federation. It was an expression of the primordial sentiments of party leaders and supporters which emerged out of the fear among the Ibans that their distinctive culture, of which their language was one facet, might be diluted or even inundated by the infusion of things Malay into Sarawak. The advantage in having Iban as a national language was that it would have been learned and used in the schools of the state, clearly the best way of perpetuating the Iban language. In short, SNAP's intention was not to spread the language to the rest of Malaysia, but merely to ensure its survival within Sarawak. In this way their aspiration could be reconciled with their need for an acceptable Malaysia.

The second part of SNAP's language position was more uncompromising than its demand in March. While previously it had insisted that English should be retained for at least fifteen years, it now argued that there be no time limit.

The Constitution of the new federation must guarantee that English is the official language of Sarawak for all purposes...without limitation of time.

The continuation of English as an official language as it is today in Malaya should not be imperatively discontinued in the new federation of Malaysia.²⁸

Given the fact that SNAP wanted to retain the use of English indefinitely and to perpetuate the growth of Iban, the subsequent constitutional provision on language was something of a disappointment. The Inter-Governmental Committee (a) established Malay as the sole official and national language; (b) restricted the use of English to ten years after independence, although in East Malaysia English might be used until 1973 or beyond, depending on the decision of the Council Negri; and (c) dismissed the notion that Iban be made into a national language in Sarawak.²⁹ The Ningkan government considered itself bound by the IGC Report and defended the document as it passed through the Council Negri in September, 1963. Less than a year later a dispute erupted over language between the two levels of government.

By July 1964, the Director of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Tuan Syed Nasir bin Ismail, was proposing that Malay be used as the medium of instruction in all schools and as the only official language in 1967.³⁰ This seemed to suggest that the federal government was prepared to throw aside the IGC Report. Dayak reaction to the federal initiative was immediate. The Sarawak Dayak National Union (SDNU) warned that "as far as Sarawak is concerned, such steps, instead of unifying the various races as he [Nasir] had claimed, would destroy racial harmony ... and dampen the spirit of the Dayaks"³¹ The Ningkan administration was therefore buffeted on one side by pressure from the federal government, which regarded its language programme as

a critical feature of nation-building, and on the other by the SDNU and SNAP, both of which feared that such a programme would lead to the demise of the Iban language and eventually the Dayak culture as well.

In response to the federal government, Ningkan promised that he "would speed up the teaching of Malaya in our schools ... as soon as possible"³² Clearly he was rejecting Nasir's position. To reinforce his point he declared that "English will continue as a medium of instruction in our schools."³³ His justification was a constitutional one; he explained that his language policy was in line with the recommendation of the Inter-Governmental Committee. In subsequent discussions with the federal government he evidently convinced them that the lack of facilities and of teachers of Malay dictated that Sarawak be exempted from the national programme proposed by Nasir. In August 1964, Ningkan confidently declared that

We are not rushing the process of learning the National Language. The Malaysian Government recognises our special interests in the matter and the special difficulties which apply here.³⁴

Ningkan wanted a slow development and was dragging his feet about heeding federal plans. Besides, he argued, the state lacked the facilities for the kind of programme which the federal government had in mind.³⁵ Federal pressure continued to mount, however, and a running battle ensued between the two levels of government.³⁶

There were therefore three aspects of Ningkan's language position:

the infusion of Malay, the future of English, and the future of Iban. Evidently Ningkan tried to negotiate a place for Iban, a form of recognition so that the language could be taught in schools. The federal government's reaction was to deny that there was such a thing as an Iban language. Early in May 1966, as relations between his administration and the federal government became progressively worse and SNAP's working relationship with its Alliance partners was on the point of breaking, Ningkan departed from his administration's language policy. Hitherto, the focus of his attention had been to exempt Sarawak from the National Language programme, to push for the cause of English and Iban. Then without consulting his cabinet he sought to exempt the whole of Malaysia from the programme. His argument was that the introduction of the "National Language in West Malaysia and later in East Malaysia" would be an "uneven exercise"³⁷ for it would put the latter at a disadvantage. He continued,

I feel that this unevenness is not a good thing for our national unity. It can set up unwanted and unnecessary strains and stresses between the Borneo states and the rest of Malaysia What I would like to see, therefore ... would be that ... any changes that are to be made would be considered for the whole of Malaysia until 1973.³⁸

Ningkan's object was clearly to modify the federal policy on national language and perhaps defer indefinitely the full use of Malay as an official language.³⁹ The second point was his insistence that "English would continue to be used for many purposes."⁴⁰ The importance of his suggestion was not only in his temerity in attempting to

influence national policy, an act which earned him the enduring hostility of the federal government, but also the fact that it was designed to elicit favourable response in Sarawak. In its election campaign during the 1969-70 general election, when it was in opposition SNAP again insisted on the "liberal use of other languages. The English language should ... be retained ... for official use"⁴¹ until the Council Negri decided otherwise. The intended effect of SNAP's language policy was to help create a groundswell of support in SNAP's favour. When SNAP advocated the use of Iban, it could be said that the party was making a direct appeal for support from this sub-ethnic group.⁴² Likewise, when SNAP argued against the federal government for the continued use of English, it was partly to incite Sarawak patriotism.

Summary

The two issues of Borneonisation and language indicate the importance of SNAP's nationalism. The party's insistence that both the rate of Borneonisation and the introduction of Malay in Sarawak should be delayed reflected the concern of party leaders that a hurried implementation of these two policies would put the Dayaks at a disadvantage.

By 1965 relations within the Sarawak Alliance began to show more strains. Policy issues again formed the overt centres of these intra-Alliance wranglings. As well, such infighting could also be

interpreted as the struggles for positions of advantage within the Alliance itself and for mass support inside Sarawak. In the succeeding pages two other issues will be examined: these are land and native privileges. Of the two, the question of land received greater public attention in 1965. In terms of SNAP's nationalism, its position on land indicated a time when the party began to emphasise Sarawak nationalism.

1. Malaysia Solidarity Consultative Committee, "Memorandum on Malaysia," in Report of the Commission of Enquiry, North Borneo and Sarawak, Lord Cobbold, chairman, (Kuching: Government Printing Office, 1962), p.85.
2. Ibid., p.35. My emphasis.
3. Report of the Inter-Governmental Committee, Lord Lansdowne, chairman, (Kuching, Government Printing Office, 1963), p.25, hereinafter referred to as the IGC Report. The IGC was charged with working out the constitutional arrangements for the new federation including such matters as safeguards for the special interests of the new states (Sabah and Sarawak), religion, education, position of indigenous groups and control over immigration and citizenship.
4. R.S. Milne and K.J. Ratnam, Malaysia -- New States in a New Nation: Political Development in Sarawak and Sabah in Malaysia (London: Frank Cass, 1974), p.34.
5. Ibid., p.37. See also the IGC Report, Annex B, paragraphs 5-13 and 30.
6. Sarawak Tribune, August 31, 1962, p.6. It also added that all federal posts in Sarawak, that is, those positions in the civil service which fall under federal jurisdiction, must be filled by Sarawak born citizens.
7. Ibid.
8. From a statement to the press on December 31, 1965. See for instance, Sarawak Tribune, January 1, 1966, p.1. Ningkan also said that "we cannot ask the expatriates to go for no reason and although the government is accelerating Borneonisation, the process must go step by step."
9. R.S. Milne and K.J. Ratnam, Malaysia -- New States in a New Nation, op. cit., p.34.
10. That the Dayaks were behind other ethnic groups in literacy was well known. For instance, in 1957 98% of Ibans were illiterate, and 93% of Bidayuhs. In contrast, only 66% of Chinese were illiterate and 85% of all Malays. These figures were compiled from Noakes, J.L., The 1947 Population Census Report of Sarawak and Brunei (Kuching: Government Printer, 1950), cited by Liang Kim Bang, Sarawak 1941-1957 (Singapore: University of Singapore, 1964), p.8.
11. Sarawak Tribune, July 31, 1961.
12. Ibid., February 28, 1964.
13. Ibid.
14. Sarawak Tribune, September 25, 1964.

15. Ibid., May 12, 1965.
16. Straits Budget, September 23, 1964, p.2. Cited in James Ongkili, Modernization in East Malaysia, (Juala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1970), p.35.
17. Sarawak Tribune, July 5.
18. Ibid., January 13, 1964.
19. The IGC Report was a constitutional framework for the new federation. It contained safeguards to protect Borneo interests in Malaysia. In the case of Borneonisation, the recommendation that the process should go slowly coincided with Dayak interests which considered a slow rate of Borneonisation as a way of "reserving" posts for the Dayaks.
20. Sarawak Tribune, January 13, 1964. See also ibid., July 5, 1966.
21. Ningkan maintained close contact with Temenggong Jugah of Pesaka during the period. On Borneonisation, at least, Dayak unity was maintained. See for instance, Sarawak Tribune, March 31, 1966.
22. Sarawak Tribune, April 1, 1968. Ningkan complained however, that implementation of Borneonisation would still take some time even if the federal government was willing to funnel in the necessary funds. Ibid., April 3, 1966.
23. Ibid.
24. The IGC Report recognised the conditions of underdevelopment in Sarawak and Sabah. Under Section 24(7) it recommended that Sarawak receive annual grants from the Central Government. The Federal Constitution specifies under Section 109 of the Federal Constitution, the Federal Government is to make to each state two grants called capitation grants and grants to maintain the roads of the states. Part IV of the Tenth Schedule provides for an annual grant of \$5,800,000 for Sarawak. Further, from 1964 to 1968 Sarawak was to receive a total of 59 million dollars. (Malaysia, Attorney General's Chambers, The Federal Constitution (Kuala Lumpur: Government Printer 1963), art. 161). The Central Government tried to use its financial leverage to influence the course of Borneonisation. (James Ongkili, Modernisation in East Malaysia 1960-1970 (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1971), p.39).
25. Malaysia, Attorney General's Chambers, The Federal Constitution, op. cit., art. 161.
26. Sarawak Tribune, March 2, 1962.
27. Sarawak Tribune, August 31, 1962. The point that Iban should be the national language was only one of the concessions which the party demanded for Sarawak. The Inter-Governmental Committee began its work in August of 1962.

28. Ibid.
29. IGC Report, Sections 28 and 30.
30. Sarawak Tribune, July 21, 1964. The Tengku, for his part, did not do much to allay the fears of the Borneo peoples when he stated that those who had not mastered Malay by 1967 were disloyal to Malaysia. After all, the Tengku reasoned, "it takes a child less than three years to qualify in Malay and it should take an adult half that time to do so," (Straits Times, June 14, 1964).
31. Sarawak Tribune, July 21, 1964. Like the Ningkan government, the SDNU saw the IGC Report as the protector of Sarawak's special interests. The SDNU warned that "what may be acceptable to the Malaysian states may not and cannot be taken for granted as being good for Sarawak."
32. Sarawak Tribune, July 22, 1964.
33. Ibid.
34. Sarawak Tribune, August 20, 1964.
35. Ibid., August 9, 1964. Language was one of the issues which contributed to the acrimonious relations between the two levels of government. Other issues include the role of expatriates and security. At this time SNAP and Pesaka both managed to maintain a united front and from time to time the possibility of a merger was discussed and publicised. Over the language issue, Jugah was quick to side with Ningkan, saying that "one cannot expect results overnight and one cannot expect results without the means of teaching" (See for instance, ibid., August 21, 1964.)
36. Ibid., August 20, 1964. The federal position over language and education was that Sarawak should develop along parallel lines and that Sarawak should not be left behind in the field of education. These are from the statements made by the Federal Minister of Education, Khir Johari, in Kuching. (See the ibid., February 18, 1965.) See also the issue of February 21, 1965.
37. Sarawak Tribune, May 3, 1966.
38. Ibid.
39. The Director of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Syed Nasir, rejected Ningkan's plea, saying that, "we (West Malaysia) cannot wait for Borneo to catch up." See the Straits Times, May 4, 1966.
40. Ibid., May 3, 1963.
41. Ibid., April 30, 1969.
42. In contrast, the party which was supposed to represent the Dayaks in the government failed to establish any position on the future use or role of the Iban language. This was Party Pesaka. Unlike SNAP it supported the use of Malay as the sole National Language. (See, for instance, ibid., February 26, 1969.)

CHAPTER VI

SARAWAK NATIONALISM: MULTI RACIALISM

By the middle of 1965 SNAP had been in power for less than two years. But as will be seen, intra-alliance schism and competitive party-building soon threatened to isolate the party and put it at a disadvantage relative to other members of the Sarawak Alliance. How SNAP reacted to these challenges, that is, how it re-interpreted its nationalism, is the subject of this chapter.

To illustrate the change in SNAP's nationalism three factors will be examined. These are the matters of land and the placement of the Bumiputeras (natives) in Sarawak. The third, and most important factor was in fact that the SNAP party had given up hope of acting in concert with its fellow-Dayak party, Pesaka, through an alliance. The conviction that a SNAP-Pesaka collaboration was no longer possible led the leaders of SNAP to try to "neutralise" Pesaka by expanding directly into Pesaka areas. In doing so SNAP was hoping to draw away support from Pesaka. In short, SNAP was challenging Pesaka for Dayak support. Further, as will be seen, SNAP sought to recruit Chinese and Malay members. After that the paper will relate SNAP's formal downfall followed by a discussion on the emergence of its territorial (or Sarawak) nationalism.

Land¹

The evaluation of land "reforms" was begun well before Ningkan took over the office of Chief Minister. For instance, the colonial government, mindful of the increasing demands for land ownership by the burgeoning Chinese population, had actually set up a Land Committee in 1962.² It was this committee which recommended that natives be allowed to "dispose of their land subject to the approval of the Resident".³ The significance of this proposal was that it would have allowed the Chinese to buy land much more easily.

From the beginning Ningkan offered no resistance against efforts to transform the recommendations into law. After all, both the Sarawak Alliance and SNAP had expressed support for such a measure. To illustrate: SNAP on January 3, 1963, had indicated its support for such a plan, even to the point of declaring that it would, if elected, "give land to the landless" whether Chinese or not. Further, the Sarawak Alliance expressed similar arguments. In its manifesto it supported the principle of allocating "sufficient land to farmers",--again without any apparent misgivings about the inclusion of Chinese.⁴ However, when the proposal was brought before the Alliance Council, Pesaka and Bumiputera voiced opposition, claiming that it did not contain enough safeguards for the natives. According to Pesaka and Bumiputera the proposed legislation would make the allocation of land to non-natives too easy. Whether Pesaka and Bumiputera were correct in their

assessment is not important. What is significant, however, was the emergence of a battle line within the SA between those, namely SNAP and the SCA,⁵ who favoured the Land Bills and, by association, a set of genuinely multi-racial policies, and those opposed to the Bills such as Pesaka and BARJASA⁶ who sought to discriminate against the Chinese and to protect the natives under an umbrella of privileges.

As Ningkan pressed on with his land proposal, opposition mounted which brought into question not only Ningkan's premise of equal opportunities (i.e. SNAP's multi-racialism) for all Sarawakians, including the right to own land, but also his leadership as well. To supplant Ningkan, BARJASA and Pesaka agreed to resign from the Sarawak Alliance, a move which would have scuttled Ningkan's government --and, together with PANAS formed the "Native Alliance".⁷ Ningkan averted political defeat by withdrawing the land legislation⁸ which deprived his opponents of a major point around which to rally against him. In addition, he survived because he succeeded in retaining the support of Temenggong Jugah, the leader of Pesaka who could not yet bring himself to topple a fellow Dayak.⁹ Lacking in issue and the support of Temenggong Jugah, the Native Alliance was dropped.

The tabling of the land legislation in the face of opposition from BARJASA and Pesaka signalled that SNAP was now prepared to implement multi-racial policies; in effect this acted as a signal that SNAP was now willing to welcome Chinese members. SNAP had always

opened its door to non-natives (Chinese), but until its show of initiative in the land legislation it was unable to offer the Chinese any incentives. Consequently, its efforts to recruit Chinese members had only produced lacklustre results. That is, before it openly advocated the land legislation, the Chinese had little reason to support SNAP. Now in the new land legislation SNAP had found an issue which would be popular with the land-hungry Chinese. In other words, the Land Bills demonstrated that SNAP's commitment to multi-racial policies extended beyond routine pronouncements. The proposal in effect signaled to Chinese Sarawakians that the party was well disposed toward their interests--the only native-based party to be so--and was therefore worthy of their support.

Sponsorship of the Land Bills, then, was an indicator of SNAP's rejection of apparently discriminatory concepts against the Chinese. This fact also became evident when Ningkan urged that the word Bumiputera be eliminated.¹⁰ The term Bumiputera is a Malay word meaning "son of the soil". In practice it describes a native who, by virtue of being one, is entitled to certain constitutional privileges over such matters as custom and language.¹¹ The idea was therefore similar to SNAP's original concept of safeguarding the interests of natives which it expressed in 1961. The fundamental difference between the two conceptions lies in the beneficiaries. Had the Dayaks been numerically superior in Malaysia they could in effect

define the terms of privilege to their advantage. Such a course would have been possible, for instance, had Sarawak been a sovereign state, and SNAP, being a Dayak party, could be expected to legislate laws which would favour the Dayaks. But within Malaysia the Dayaks were not a majority, a fact which meant that neither they nor their party (whether SNAP or Pesaka) would ever be in a position to determine the nature of privileges according to their interests. That is, from their point of view, the concept of Bumiputera privileges was defined by the Malays to serve Malay interests. Since the Dayaks were distinct from the Malays--in religion, language, custom, and culture --they, the Dayaks, should not at this time be subsumed under the Bumiputera umbrella. According to SNAP the Dayaks should remain a distinct ethnic group. Underlying the party's objection to the extension of the term Bumiputera to include Dayaks was the suspicion that this would be a step toward assimilation.

By late 1965, when SNAP was openly courting non-natives (the Chinese) as members and party-financiers, it was in need of some tangible policies as incentives for new members to espouse.¹² In this respect the federal concept of Bumiputera or native privileges, was a good one to attack because in practice the Chinese would be victimised, and in a different sense the Dayaks as well, by the advent of Bumiputera privileges. In November 1965, Ningkan thus stated his case:

All Malaysians are "sons of the soil". In the role of nation-building no one needs to be reminded constantly of one's racial origin¹³

It was his hope, he said, that the word Bumiputera would soon disappear. It could be said, then, that far from becoming uni-racial in tendency, championing as they did the cause of the natives, the party at that time continued to espouse multi-racial policies.

The other part of its response following the crisis of 1965 was to continue and to expand party support along a multi-ethnic line; indeed, it embarked on a party-building campaign which sought the support of all ethnic groups in Sarawak. Such a policy was of course ideologically consistent, but at the time its real significance was that it afforded SNAP a method by which to circumvent the SNAP-Pesaka understanding of non-interference. SNAP could not challenge Pesaka for officially they were still together in the Alliance, but as the crisis of 1965 showed, SNAP's future was contingent upon the continued support of Pesaka and its leader. As relations between the two Dayak parties deteriorated, SNAP's need to be independent of Pesaka therefore became more pressing. In a very real sense SNAP's recruitment of Chinese and, to a lesser extent, Malay members was an effort to compensate for the loss of support that would occur should Dayak solidarity between Pesaka and SNAP fail to endure at some future date. In other words, SNAP's multi-racialism was part of an

electoral strategy designed to reduce SNAP's dependency on Pesaka and, ultimately, to gain a majority in the legislature.

Beginning from early 1966, SNAP accordingly began to open a series of urban branches with multi-racial membership. The most celebrated of these was in Kuching, where Ningkan had secured the open support of a prominent Chinese businessman, Datuk Wee Hood Teck.¹⁴ It was Datuk Wee who brought the long-term plans into focus when he declared, on the day the branch was opened, that

Although the general elections would not be held until 1969, it is not too early to prepare for it [sic] by disseminating their (SNAP) party's manifesto and recruiting members.¹⁵

Consistent with SNAP's advocacy of multi-racialism during the post 1965 period, later, when in opposition, the party vehemently protested¹⁶ against Parti Bumiputera's "Directive No. 8" signed by Taib Mahmud, a top Parti Bumiputera leader who was also an Assistant Federal Minister. The document declared

We ... in Parti Bumiputera cannot be forced to give away Malays seats to Pesaka [a Dayak party]. Our basic objective was to unite the Malays and Bidayus ... we oppose any one who becomes the tool to split our race.¹⁷

The row between Pesaka and Bumiputera at this time concerned the allocation of seats for the election due early in 1969. The original agreement entered by the members of the Sarawak Alliance was for the three parties to contest and to campaign in their respective

areas; for this purpose Pesaka was allocated 22 seats, Bumiputera 15, and SCA 11. This arrangement would not only have kept the Alliance intact by denying any one party the chance of achieving the majority of seats; it also would have made each of the three parties basically uni-racial. Thus Pesaka would have been mainly Dayak, and SCA Chinese. Parti-Bumiputera's base would have been expanded to what Taib Mahmud called above "our race", that is, a mix of Melanaus, Malays and Bidayuhs. The problem was that Party Pesaka had recruited Malay members. Pressed to find acceptable constituencies for its Malay candidates, Pesaka then insisted that it be allowed to contest any seat it deemed necessary.

For SNAP, the importance of Directive No. 8 was that here was the final and documented indication of what the party had suspected: Parti Bumiputera represented communal chauvanism of which the objective ultimately was to assimilate the Dayaks into the Malay mould under the guise of native unity. For its part SNAP concentrated on policy and constitutional issues and offered its prescriptions as Sarawak's solutions for the problems of the state. This strategy was to broaden SNAP's appeal to a pan-Sarawak base. At one point Ningkan even appeared to repudiate SNAP's objective of safeguarding native interests when he condemned SNAP's opponents as agitators for "communal superiority and distinction."¹⁸ The reasonable interpretation of this statement was that it intended to highlight SNAP's sincerity towards the Chinese --that is, as a direct appeal for support from the Chinese community

since in rejecting the notion of communal privileges Ningkan implicitly accepted non-natives as equal. The time in which this statement was made, June 1966, was important for this was the period when SNAP was embarking on its party-building campaign and recruiting members from all ethnic groups.

It should be noted that Ningkan's statement was not a call for the abandonment of native privileges, at least not in a permanent way. Indeed, it would be accurate to say that SNAP advocated both policies simultaneously. Chronologically, it was even before SNAP's withdrawal from the Alliance that it emphasised multi-racialism, particularly if its listeners were urban dwellers, who were most Chinese. For its rural members, SNAP still advocated Dayak causes, such as the need for a Ministry of Dayak Affairs. For both groups the party also brought in the danger of federal intervention. Implied here was the threat of Malay expansionist communalism, that is, of being overwhelmed by Malay culture and language. Obviously, its anti-Malay bias could not be expected to elicit much sympathy from the Malay community in Sarawak.¹⁹

Withdrawal from the Sarawak Alliance

Another factor which aroused the ire of his opponents persisted after the 1965 crisis. This was the question of Ningkan's leadership. In the succeeding months after July 1965, his opponents shifted their attack against Ningkan: he was faulted not only because he and SNAP

espoused multi-racial policies,²⁰ but also because he personally had various shortcomings which required his removal from the office of Chief Minister. The focus on Ningkan's personality--he was alleged to be hot-tempered and polygamous--allowed his opponents to separate him from his supporters. The object was to isolate the man and to bring to the fore those in SNAP who were willing to cooperate with the rest of the Sarawak Alliance and the federal government. From this viewpoint, this was a realistic recourse, since within SNAP there were those such as Dunstan Endawie who were less intransigent, and therefore more cooperative than Ningkan on policy issues. Secondly, such attacks on Ningkan's shortcomings gave those who were undecided cause to jump on the anti-Ningkan bandwagon while still giving SNAP the option of remaining in the Sarawak Alliance. In particular this recourse was taken by Temenggong Jugah, a pivotal centre of influence, who in time concluded that Ningkan was unfit to lead. As the major leader of Pesaka, Temenggong Jugah was increasingly distressed at Ningkan's multi-racial policies, since from Pesaka's viewpoint the Chief Minister ought to have done more for natives, particularly the Dayaks.

The behind-the-scene opponent to Ningkan from the 1965 Cabinet crisis was the federal government, made uneasy by Ningkan's multi-racial policies which appeared to accord the Chinese equal opportunities in defiance of the Bumiputera stipulation of the federal government. In addition Ningkan was increasingly adamant about executing what he

called "Sarawak solutions" to the state problems. It was Ningkan's argument that in formulating his state policies over such issues as land and language, primary consideration should be given to Sarawak's own conditions. Since such outlook was state-centred they were often at variance with those of the federal government whose aim it was to develop policies designed for nation-building. Ningkan's provincialism was therefore becoming increasingly unpalatable to the federal government.

Subsequent to the first crisis (mid-1965) neither Pesaka nor BARJASA were again willing to give Ningkan their full support. By this time Thomas Kana was fully entrenched as Pesaka's top tactician.²¹ It was he, for instance, who engineered Pesaka's expansion into the Batang Ai (in Lubok Antu District) area of the Second Division, thereby finally breaking Pesaka's informal "alliance" with SNAP. It was during this foray into the Batang Ai that Ningkan physically clashed with one of Pesaka's party workers, an incident which finally convinced Temenggong Jugah that the Chief Minister must be ousted.²²

Within Ningkan's Supreme Council wranglings over policy matters increased. Unlike the period preceding the first crisis, by early 1966 Pesaka was solidly against him. Worse still, the federal government, which hitherto had adopted a surreptitious role in trying to unseat Ningkan, was now openly against him. When finally in mid-1966 the Sarawak Alliance was divided into two camps; only SNAP and, for a

while, the SCA, remained unshaken in their support of the Chief Minister. Within the forty-two member legislature, those against Ningkan numbered twenty.²³ The rebels were led by Taib Mahmud, the state Minister of Telecommunications and Works, and Thomas Kana, the Secretary-General for Pesaka. Both were consistent adversaries of Ningkan and SNAP since the abortive attempt to unseat the Chief Minister in 1965. Further, as in 1965, the followers of Thomas Kana and Taib Mahmud were now once again declaring their support for them. It appeared that the revolt of 1966 was a repeat of the one in 1965. One major difference was the fact that in contrast to 1965, Ningkan lost the critical support of Temenggong Jugah, who was somehow convinced quite early that a majority of the Council Negri members, twenty-three out of forty-two, were now actually against Ningkan. The other difference was the overt and active role of the Federal Government on the side of the rebels.

Partly to underscore their determination and partly to ensure unity in their ranks the rebels were flown to Kuala Lumpur on June 13. Together they had signed a letter which expressed "no confidence" in Ningkan and which they had submitted to the Federal Government. That was enough for the Federal Government to call for the Chief Minister's resignation. Quoting Article 7(1) of the Sarawak Constitution the Prime Minister called on the Governor of Sarawak, Tun Abang Haji Openg, to ask Ningkan to resign. Ningkan refused and

instead indicated that he would convene a scheduled meeting of the Council Negri on June 14 with his twenty-one supporters, which had by now included the SUPP and some PANAS members. From the Malaysian capital and with federal support, Thomas Kana announced that the twenty rebels would boycott the meeting of the legislature. The Council Negri thus met without the rebels to disrupt the proceedings. There were six members from SNAP, two from PANAS, three from SCA, five from SUPP, one from Machinada, one Independent, and three ex-officio members. At the meeting four bills were passed and forty-five questions answered without any dissenting vote. It appeared that Ningkan was able to carry on governing in the face of opposition from the rebels and the Federal Government. His opponents countered by flying the rebels back to Kuching together with representatives of the national Alliance in order to demand Ningkan's resignation and to submit the name of Penghulu Tawi Sli as the new Chief Minister. As if to demonstrate the coercive power held by the federal authorities, they were also accompanied by the Inspector General of Police, and the Director of Special Branch. On the basis of the letter of "no confidence", the federal authorities on June 17 managed to persuade the Governor to dismiss Ningkan and his cabinet and to appoint Tawi Sli as Chief Minister.²⁴

The intrusion of federal power was received with indignation in SNAP. Ningkan's dismissal provoked reactions from outside the

party where there were those who were sympathetic to the party's contention that Federal complicity in the crisis was unjustified, since the Sarawak Alliance was a "fully autonomous body registered in Sarawak and only affiliated to the Malaysian Alliance in Kuala Lumpur".²⁵ Convinced that he would be reinstated by the courts, Ningkan capitulated in order, he explained, to "avert any possible trouble ... and to stick to a peaceful and constitutional approach to the settlement of the dispute regarding the office of the Chief Minister of Sarawak".²⁶ On June 20, three days after Penghulu Tawi Sli had become the de facto Chief Minister, Ningkan vacated his official residence, the Panggau Libau.

In bringing the matters to court, Ningkan kept alive the issue of who was Chief Minister. Consequently, the crisis did not end in July, 1966. By September the struggle between SNAP and Ningkan on the one hand and the Federal Government, Sarawak Alliance, and Tawi Sli on the other, had reached a new level of intensity. In order to arrive at an understanding of SNAP's position in the long-drawn crisis, it is necessary to outline the sequence of events. Soon after his dismissal by the Governor, Ningkan filed a suit against the Head of State in which it contended the legality and legitimacy of the dismissal. Ningkan argued that under the Sarawak Constitution a "no confidence" motion or letter in the Council Negri need not lead to the removal of the Chief Minister from office. On July 1, he filed

another suit in which he sought to restrain the Tawi Sli and his cabinet from acting as ministers. Ningkan thus fought in the court and outside of it in his attempt to survive as Chief Minister. But outside the court he committed a tactical blunder which in the end contributed to the party's isolation. On July 3, SNAP withdrew from the Sarawak Alliance. As a consequence of this move, its last remaining allies in the government switched their support away from SNAP. Three days after SNAP's withdrawal the SCA announced its support for the new government and soon after some members of the badly-split PANAS also declared their support for Tawi Sli.

During the preliminary hearings on Ningkan's suits which were heard in the High Court of Borneo on August 22 and 25, Chief Justice E.R. Harley scheduled a hearing for August 29. This act in effect made the identity of the Chief Minister sub judice. Thus, when the Council Negri met the next day, on August 26, the Speaker adjourned the meeting after only several minutes but not before noting that he did not know who was the legal Chief Minister. A constitutional impasse had thus developed in Sarawak. After hearing the case the Chief Justice handed down his judgement on September 7, in which he reinstated Ningkan as Chief Minister. For a while, at least, Ningkan appeared to hold the initiative. All that remained to be done, it seemed, was for him to regain the confidence of the Council Negri. Since his defeat was assured in the legislature he was under-

standably reluctant to face the house. What he needed was time in order to persuade at least some rebels to support him and thereby regain a majority in the Council Negri. His advantage rested on the fact that according to the Sarawak Constitution, the Governor summons the Council Negri to meet only on the advice of the cabinet. In short, it appeared that so long as the Council Negri did not meet he would continue as Chief Minister. Further, so long as he was able to communicate with at least five of the rebels and win their confidence, there was a chance for him to survive a vote of "no confidence" in the Council Negri. SNAP leaders felt that at the worst Ningkan could continue as Chief Minister by simply advising the Governor that the Council Negri be dissolved and a general election be held. Thus, as far as Ningkan was concerned, he could simply wait until either the rebels broke ranks or he advised the Governor to dissolve the Council Negri. His tactic had one major flaw, however, for critical to the success of his method was the assumption that the court would decide in his favour and that the court's decision was not nullified by a higher authority, such as the Federal Government, or over-turned by a higher court.

The Federal Government, for its part, continued to work against Ningkan. To isolate the legislative insurgents from Ningkan and to ensure their loyalty to Tawi Sli, the rebels were corralled once more from their temporary sanctuaries in Kuching and were flown to

to Kuala Lumpur. On September 6 they were flown back to Kuching and were thus in town to hear Ningkan's reinstatement the next day. The Chief Justice's verdict, at least temporarily, resolved the constitutional impasse, but it did not provide a solution to the political stalemate since Ningkan was unable to contact and urge the rebels to defect. Convinced that Ningkan could not be persuaded to resign or to convene a meeting of the Council Negri, where he would have to face a vote of "no confidence" and be forced out of office, the Federal Government declared a state of emergency on September 15. Subsequently, it amended the Sarawak Constitution which gave the Governor powers to convene the Council Negri and to dismiss the Chief Minister at the direct request of the majority of Council Negri members. On September 23, the Council Negri met and a "no confidence" motion was formally passed against Ningkan and his second cabinet. Ningkan was dismissed the next day.

In theory, at least, SNAP could have elected to support the new government, thereby even earning re-entry into the Alliance. This could have happened had Ningkan been replaced by Endawie, for instance. At one point there was indeed an attempt within SNAP to make Endawie the party leader; but, convinced that such a takeover at this time would wreck the party and destroy the chance of attracting new supporters, he refused. Ningkan therefore continued as leader. One it became clear that Ningkan would retain the leadership, there

was little chance of reconciliation with the rest of the Sarawak Alliance.²⁷ The first reason involved personal pride; after his ouster he could not very well support the government which had just ejected him. The second reason, and politically the more significant one, involved the conflict of values between the two sides. As a nationalist party which was committed to democracy SNAP considered Ningkan's ousting as an underhanded exercise which lacked constitutionality since in the opinion of party leaders, the rule of due process of law had not been fully applied.

Thus, soon after his ouster, Ningkan initiated legal proceedings against the new government. SNAP explained that

until the courts decide otherwise, Penghulu Tawi Sli is only a pretender to the office of the Chief Minister of Sarawak. Although the Prime Minister said in Kanowit that the removal of Datuk Stephen Kalong Ningkan was done lawfully, the Sarawak National Party and most people in Sarawak, and indeed Malaysia cannot agree with the Prime Minister that Penghulu Tawi Sli's Government has been lawfully formed when the very question as to whether Penghulu Tawi Sli has been lawfully appointed Chief Minister of Sarawak is sub judice.²⁸

The third reason why SNAP did not support the new government was because to do so would mean having to compromise on another of its nationalist principles: multi-racialism. It was this aspect of SNAP's Political Manifesto, and the attendant willingness to accord the non-natives (of Sarawak that is, the Chinese) a measure of economic freedom greater than its major partners in the Sarawak Alliance would have

tolerated, a fact which prompted PANAS, BARJASA, and Pesaka to form the "native alliance" in 1965. Thus, before SNAP could become acceptable to the new coalition, it would need to modify its policy of multi-racialism. Since SNAP regarded multi-racialism as a critical incentive to attract non-Dayak support, it was loath to throw away a valuable aspect of its policies.

The fourth basis of its objection was the composition of the new government, primarily the dominance of Muslims in it. At first glance, the opposite appeared to be true. Numerically, at least, the new government was maintained not by a Muslim organisation, but by Pesaka, a Dayak-based party. But seen from SNAP's viewpoint, Pesaka's participation was largely symbolic. It was not that Pesaka was unimportant to the new government; indeed, because of its numerical strength in the Council Negri, Pesaka's support was critical if only to maintain the new organisation. To underscore this point the new Chief Minister came from Pesaka. To SNAP, however, Pesaka's participation was merely a self-serving manoeuvre, for its leaders lacked the resolve to pursue either the interests of the Dayaks or those of Sarawak within the federal set-up.

Lastly, as a state-centered party, SNAP believed that Sarawakians should enjoy self-government with respect to state politics, free from any interference from outside sources. The major target here was the federal government's potential for manipulation and inter-

ference, a possibility which SNAP had feared from the beginning. In 1966 this suspicion festered into bitter resentment against the federal government when it violated what SNAP considered as the proper conduct of state-federal relationships. The object of limiting federal capacity to influence state politics was to create within Sarawak a strong multi-racial identity distinct from that of other states within the Malaysian federation. With reference to intra-Alliance affairs in Sarawak, it was SNAP's contention that the Sarawak Alliance was an autonomous body. As such the federal government had no power to intervene in its affairs. To protest such intervention and to draw support from similarly enraged Sarawakians, SNAP formally withdrew from the Alliance in July 1966. The party explained that

In view of the undemocratic and unconstitutional and dictatorial actions taken by the Grand Alliance in Kuala Lumpur whereby only two parties of the Sarawak Alliance, namely, Pesaka and BARJASA were consulted about the removal of the Chief Minister of Sarawak, Datuk Stephen Kalong Ningkan and the nomination of another Chief Minister to replace him, and that no consultations were made at all with the other three component partners in the Sarawak Alliance, namely SNAP, PANAS and SCA, the Sarawak National Party therefore has no option but to withdraw from the Grand Alliance in Kuala Lumpur.²⁹

In accusing the federal government of unconstitutional and dictatorial actions, SNAP clearly aimed at exploiting the crisis, to turn it into a catalytic event by which it would draw widespread notice and

sympathy. Its announced withdrawal simply highlighted the drama. Thus, by the time SNAP was ousted from power it had identified itself with two themes. The first was its multi-racial policies which contended that the citizens of Sarawak, irrespective of race, should have received equal treatment under the laws of Sarawak and Malaysia. The second theme was the party's anti-federal sentiments; to this end the federal Grand Alliance was viewed as an oppressive organisation which was partial to Malays, particularly those originating from West Malaysia.

Sarawak for Sarawakians

If there was a single slogan which came to represent SNAP's nationalism in the period after SNAP's withdrawal, it was the catchphrase "Sarawak for Sarawakians". Ever since the term was first employed it has always been associated with the party's position with regard to Malaysia.

First employed in October 1961, the term was used at a time as nationalistic demand that Sarawak ought to receive sovereign status. Though Sarawak was then a colony of Great Britain, the target of the slogan was not the retreating colonial power, but the Malaysia proposal which sought to deny Sarawak its independent status. That is, the slogan "Sarawak for Sarawakians" was an assertion for self-government and independence as well as the rejection of the Malaysia

Plan. It expressed a sentiment that was not so much anti-British, for Britain had indicated its desire to confer independence to Sarawak, but anti-Malaya, the perpetrator of the Malaysia Plan. In time SNAP was to give up its opposition to the proposal. But this did not lead to the abandonment of any lingering aspiration for separate nationhood for Sarawak. When the slogan was revived in the latter half of 1966, it was again directed at the Malaysia issue. This time, however, there was a shift in meaning. In 1961 the slogan stood for independence. From 1966 onwards, owing to prevailing conditions, it became more ambiguous, its meanings multi-faceted. Depending on the time, and to an extent the audience, the slogan sometimes meant a call for just treatment by the federal government, as an expression of protest. It could also stand for separation,³⁰ particularly when the listeners were Dayaks. In other words, the difference was in degree: separation here was the most extreme of its nationalism continuum while the belief in "proper" treatment, of equal status, provided the other extreme.

SNAP's concern about the conduct of federal-state relations and the right to secede can be traced from the beginning. It was SNAP which worried about the guarantees for an equal voice in the running of Malaysia; it was also SNAP (and independently Pesaka as well) which demanded that the right to separate be incorporated into the Constitution of Malaysia.³¹ It was hardly surprising that in

1966, party leaders protested vigorously when federal interference proved instrumental in Ningkan's downfall and the party's fall from power. SNAP's reaction grew even more extreme when the federal government involved itself more deeply by mid-September 1966. At that time the High Court of Borneo had reinstated Ningkan as Chief Minister. Once in office, Ningkan immediately called for a general election in an effort to re-constitute the Council Negri, while his opponents demanded an immediate meeting of the existing Council Negri.

From SNAP's point of view it had much to gain from such an election. This course of action was congruous with the party's belief in parliamentary democracy. In the second place it was a tactical exercise through which Ningkan could avoid defeat by having to call the much wanted sitting of the legislature. At that moment Ningkan's opponents had increased their group to a majority of twenty-five in the forty-two member legislature.

More important, from the perspective of its nationalism an election that centered on separation as a core issue might possibly catapult SNAP into a majority position--a victory which could be interpreted as a mandate for separation. As far as SNAP was concerned, an election having such a result could constitute an acceptable reason for separation. Ningkan himself made this strategy clear in detailing his "State Policy" soon after his reinstatement in September, 1966.³² When the government refused him permission to

use of the state's radio facilities, Ningkan was forced to disseminate his "State Policy" by the newspapers, which were less widespread and therefore less effective than the radio. Regarding the election Ningkan said that he

support[ed] the provision of the Bangkok Agreement which calls for the reaffirmation of their [Sarawak's] decision to enter Malaysia by the people of Sarawak.³³

According to Ningkan's argument the means for such a reaffirmation, one that would also solve the constitutional impasse in Sarawak, was a general election.³⁴ The constitutional crisis referred to here was Ningkan's refusal to call the Council Negri into session. This was within his power to do since he was the Chief Minister. The problem for him was that the federal government and twenty-five members of the Council Negri demanded that a sitting be held. Ningkan's call for an election thus heightened the tension created by the confrontation between his government on the one hand and the rebels and the federal government on the other.

In its response the federal government ignored Ningkan's formula for secession. But its subsequent action indicates that it was clearly concerned. Claiming that it did not want the situation to escalate into disorder which the local communists might foment even further, the federal government on September 15, declared a State of Emergency. The declaration was within the power of the federal authorities to issue. Under Article 150 of the Federal Constitution

the Yang Dipertuan Agung, on the advice of the Central Government, may issue a Proclamation of Emergency if he is "satisfied that a grave emergency exists whereby the security or economic life of the Federation or any part thereof is threatened"³⁵ Explained Tun Razak, who was acting Prime Minister,

...a serious situation has developed in Sarawak in the last few days and therefore we have to take action. The crisis in Sarawak poses a serious threat to the security of the State and of Malaysia as a whole. There is a communist menace and now there is political instability and uncertainty ... the situation can get out of hand.³⁶

SNAP condemned the federal intervention as a breach of faith; the power to amend or suspend the Constitution of Sarawak, it protested, belongs to the people of Sarawak.³⁷ Significantly, the party refrained from further public statements about secession. The reason was not that the party had suddenly renounced its secessionist intent but that during the period of emergency such a call would surely lead to reprisals such as detention of party leaders.

This form of sanction would surely cripple SNAP as a well-functioning party. The first interpretation of the slogan "Sarawak for Sarawakians" is, then, that it suggested secession. Through 1967 and even to 1968, as SNAP spread to the Rejang Basin, Pesaka's stronghold, and as it opened more urban branches, SNAP's field workers relied at least on separation as an issue to attract new party members. Thus, for instance, when the Federal Minister of Land and Mines, Datuk

Abdul Rahman Yakub, charged that Ningkan was attempting "to get the state to break away from the Malaysian federation",³⁸ the party again refused to deny it, a lack of response which indicated that SNAP indeed favoured the idea. Why then would the party not admit it? The answer is simple: to preach secession is an act of sedition for which its leaders could be arrested. Under normal circumstances this would be a dangerous undertaking: it was more so in 1967 when Sarawak was in a state of emergency. At a time when the party was undergoing a period of massive expansion, arrests of this sort were not welcomed.³⁹

Moreover, the party has always been committed to constitutional means. With this guideline in mind, it can be said that although SNAP's nationalism was manifested by its support for the cause of separation, the party's ideology which eschews violence severely limited its option only to constitutional means. Among the Dayaks at least, SNAP's long-term target had always been state autonomy, but withdrawal from Malaysia as far as the party was concerned would only occur through the process of negotiations after, for instance, a clear vote against Malaysia in an election or through a referendum. Since the "Emergency" situation made open advocacy of separation impractical as a rallying cry in order to gain support, SNAP concentrated its publicity campaign on the oppressive aspect of the federal intervention. In SNAP's judgment the declaration of the "Emergency"⁴⁰ was unwarranted

and based on a "very isolated and flimsy evidence of a small gathering ... of irresponsible persons in Kuching"⁴¹ Also it was SNAP's view that the IGC Report, the London Agreement of 1963, and the Cobbold Commission Report were treaties which provide the basis for the conduct of relations between state and federal governments and the framework for the Constitution of Sarawak. The "Emergency" which suspended the Constitution in SNAP's viewpoint contravened the spirit and letter of these "treaties". In short, with the tampering of the State Constitution, the federal government had reduced Sarawak to the unequal position of a "neo-colony", and therefore deserved to be challenged.⁴² Without openly instigating separation, SNAP worked toward it in piecemeal fashion. In this instance its nationalism was directed at an external target.

Another feature of "Sarawak for Sarawakians" was SNAP's objective of building a "dynamic, progressive and peaceful multi-racial Sarawakian society...."⁴³ SNAP was not engaging in the reiteration of a political cliché when it said that it wanted such a society in Sarawak, because central to that objective was the notion that Sarawak ought to have a society distinct from that of the Malaysian whole.

Part of SNAP's nationalist sentiment was a conviction that the federal government was essentially a negative force which invariably interfered with Sarawak's affairs. In order to build a Sarawakian society it was therefore necessary to isolate Sarawak as much as possible

from the central government and its influence. As the party explained,

We [Sarawakians] have no other land. Sarawak is our home and there is nothing too big or too much to sacrifice for her defence against the evil forces trying to dominate and destroy her Her economic and political stability shall be her greatest security. This can only be achieved when it is realised that Sarawak is for the Sarawakians.⁴⁴

From SNAP's viewpoint, patriotism meant not only love for Sarawak but also an anti-federal sentiment. A Sarawakian society could not be built properly if the federal government was allowed to "dominate" the state.⁴⁵

The other prerequisite for such a society was a strong state government. In SNAP's view the Sarawak Alliance under Tawi Sli was a weak administration. For instance, in the case of the "Emergency" it was clear that in its subservience to the federal government, the Sarawak Alliance failed to "preserve, honour and defend the State Constitution."⁴⁶ Underlying this assertion was the belief that in the process of nation building the SA would be either unwilling or unable to resist federal directives, and therefore it would be inherently incapable of realising a dynamic and separate Sarawakian society. In contrast to the SA, SNAP considered itself as a "nationalist party which would always oppose any attempt to sell out the interest of our state."⁴⁷ The problem with the SA, SNAP contended, was that it had become a tool for federal manipulation of state affairs.

The other conception of SNAP's Sarawakian policy was that it would

be multi-racial. It means that instead of favouring one particular culture, religion, or custom the government would encourage the growth of Sarawak's different ethnic groups. Since the federal government considered the Malay culture, religion, and language as composites of exemplary Malaysian identity, SNAP's multi-culturalism was opposed to the policy of the federal government.⁴⁸ In this way SNAP's argument for multi-cultural policies served its anti-Malay sentiment. Further, SNAP's multi-racialism⁴⁹ gave the party a direct appeal to the different ethnic groups in Sarawak in that SNAP gave them the opportunity to perpetuate their own culture, while the SA and the central government threatened Sarawakians with assimilation, or at least a push for a "Malayanised" Sarawak. Thus while the SA was depicted as a tool which threatened Sarawak's communal groups, SNAP presented itself as their saviour which therefore deserved their support. This was the major interpretation for SNAP's argument that "Sarawak's identity must be preserved at all cost, and let no one deny us of this heritage."⁵⁰

Lastly, SNAP's conception of its Sarawakian society contained a general proposal for economic policies. Again, the federal framework was viewed as a debilitating factor and isolation from the federal government was considered a prerequisite. As Ningkan explained,

There is always the Constitution of Sarawak with which we work for the achievement of its economic, social, and political stability, not only for us today but also for generations to come.⁵¹

With SNAP out of office, the main objective of its nationalism came to include not only the determination of policy orientations and the appraisal of governmental measures to see whether an ethnic group would benefit more or less, but also the recruitment of support which would put the party back in power. That is, espousal of its nationalism served to mobilise political sympathy from as wide a base as possible. Although it still championed Dayak interests, it had extended its activities to include non-native ones as well. Hence its multi-racialism. Hitherto SNAP had concentrated mainly on Dayaks; in 1965 it shifted to Sarawakians, and ostensibly at least Dayak interests were overshadowed by those of Sarawak.

Evidence indicates that in shifting its strategy SNAP struck a sympathetic chord among non-Iban/non-Dayak Sarawakians.⁵² In January 1967 it won a by-election (for a district council seat) in Pelagus, an area within Pesaka's heartland. In March it won another election in Lawas, Fifth Division, with a Chinese candidate. In January 1968, it won still another one in Limbang. SNAP therefore won all the elections in 1967 and 1968.⁵³

The immediate results of SNAP's party building were encouraging. With finances readily available from such tycoons as Wee Hood Teck of Kuching, James Wong of Limbang, and less openly from those within the SCA in Sibul as well, more urban branches were set up. In October 1966, one branch was set up (in Bintulu); in November two more (Kampong

Gita, and Tatau), while in December it opened up branches in the major towns of the Third Division (Sibu, Binatang, Kanawit, Kapit, Song, and Sarikei). By June 1967 SNAP had established itself in Miri, the last major town without a SNAP branch.

Emboldened by SNAP's electoral victories, and organisational resurgence, Ningkan began to press for a general election. The life of the existing Council Negri would not expire until August 1968. But Ningkan and other leaders of SNAP were convinced that SNAP had increased its popular appeal and that there existed a state-wide backlash against the state and federal governments over the dismissal of Ningkan and the suspension of the Sarawak Constitution. They were therefore eager to have a general election, preferably in 1967 or, at the latest, in 1968. Ningkan led the rest of SNAP's leaders in condemning the Alliance leaders for having "no respect for the law... the very dictatorial kind who will in pursuit of their personal gains rule against the wishes of the majority."⁵⁴ Otherwise, Ningkan reasoned, they would have arranged for a general election to seek a new mandate. Partly to underscore this point and partly to protest the illegality of the new government, SNAP's Council Negri walked out of a meeting of the legislature on June 6, 1967. When asked to explain SNAP's decision to boycott the sitting of the Council Negri, James Wong said that the real issue was whether Datuk Ningkan was still the Chief Minister, a matter which remained to be decided

by the Federal Court of Malaysia. Until the matter was cleared, he said, the Alliance "ministers" had "no right to present bills and palm themselves off as ministers."⁵⁵ The Federal Court rejected Ningkan's contention that the Federal Parliament did not have the power to pass the Emergency Act of 1966, which empowered the Governor of Sarawak to dismiss Ningkan as Chief Minister should he refuse to resign as Chief Minister after a vote of "no confidence" against the Government in the Council Negri. Ningkan launched a final appeal to the Privy Council in London which recommended that it be dismissed. The conclusion of the legal process was in October, 1968,⁵⁶ two years after Ningkan's ouster. Ningkan's appeal was based on his contention that a situation of emergency which threatened the security of the state had not existed. Ningkan thus applied a narrow meaning to the word emergency. In dismissing Ningkan's appeal, Lord MacDermott of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council said that "the natural meaning of the word [emergency] itself was capable of covering a wide range of situations and occurrences, including such diverse events as wars, famine, earthquakes, floods, epidemics and the collapse of civil government."⁵⁷ He further said that Ningkan had failed to establish his (Ningkan's) assertion that a situation of emergency had not existed.

The prolonged legal proceedings served SNAP's interest. The court case helped the party to focus on the high-handed nature of federal intervention, the court case helped to arouse an anti-federal sentiment.

Further, since the matter was sub judice, an apparently illegal Tawi Sli government was a boon for SNAP's field workers. It gave credence to the party's argument that the new government was led by opportunists who cared little for the law. By the time the matter was settled by the Privy Council the momentum of SNAP's expansion was well underway.

The reaction of the Alliance was to persuade SNAP to return to the government. The party rejected the offer, pointing out that it and the SA were "poles apart, especially on matters of interest to Sarawak and her people."⁵⁸ Party leaders were hopeful that SNAP's multi-racial policies and strong stand against the federal government would be a popular platform from which to contest the general elections.

Finally, it should be noted that by 1968, SNAP was showing signs that it had shelved the notion of separation. The first signal came on February 18. Although separation remained as an objective, it was never an all-consuming aspiration except for a very brief period late in 1966, when Ningkan suggested that Sarawakians be allowed to reaffirm their desire to remain in Malaysia. After that the leaders of SNAP were pre-occupied with the building of the party's organisation and preparing for the coming general elections. The party leaders made no attempt to disassociate themselves with any break-away attempts until September 29, when Ningkan denied that the slogan "Sarawak for Sarawakians" contained any sentiments or reference that were anti-Malaysia. He added,

I...as leader of SNAP declare on behalf of all our members our unswerving loyalty to the Nation⁵⁹

On January 13, 1969, Ningkan reaffirmed this new line. SNAP, he said,

is irrevocably committed to a full support of Malaysia and in fact it always has been in spite of the unfounded insinuations made by certain unscrupulous and dishonest propagandists from the Alliance Party in their futile efforts to discredit the party.⁶⁰

The motive behind the new line is fairly easy to establish. SNAP's loud assertion of loyalty was made with the coming election in mind. In this instance, electoral exigency which might involve coalition building after the votes had been cast became a factor in modifying SNAP's nationalism. Here the pursuit of electoral office moderated the centrifugal force of Ningkan's provincialism. SNAP's affirmation of loyalty was in effect a message to its potential allies, particularly those who might have been sympathetic to SNAP's concern for the rights of the state but who were uneasy at the latter's apparent flirtation with separatism. Amongst those who might have been in this position was Pesaka.⁶¹ As Dayaks, its leaders might be expected to have close affinity with their Dayak counterparts in SNAP--enough at least to form the foundation for the next government. The major disagreement between the two parties at this time was that while Pesaka's chieftains were more trusting of the designs of the federal government, SNAP's leaders perceived them as potentially damaging to the political process of the state. Thus, while SNAP was rumored to be contemplating separation, Jugah announced

that Pesaka would never allow the state to break away.⁶² In this respect Ningkan's subsequent declaration of loyalty to Malaysia was a tactic to gain Pesaka's confidence, which would be necessary if they were to form the government.⁶³

In addition SNAP's message of loyalty was directed at the federal government. As an exchange for a hands-off policy by the federal government during the coming elections and the period following, SNAP would offer to Malaysia its unreserved loyalty. Obviously the party was concerned that an unfriendly central government could not only complicate state-federal relations, but it feared that in the event that SNAP should constitute the government, the Central Government might obstruct its assumption of office. This was clearly expressed by the party in 1969:

The present Sarawak Alliance Party is accepted and recognised...as the legitimate administration by the Central Government.... What we do ask is that the Central Government gives the Sarawak National Party the same recognition when we form the Government with a clear mandate from Sarawakians....⁶⁴

Summary

The salience of SNAP's Sarawakian nationalism, which was most evident in the party's position on the land legislation, was incited by an intra-Alliance competition between member parties to improve their respective electoral machines. The thrust of the initiatives taken by

SNAP's partners, such as the proposal for an UMNO-backed Bumiputera party or a Pesaka-BARJASA "Native Alliance", had threatened to exclude SNAP and in doing so to put it at a disadvantage. In this respect the tabling of the land legislation only further destabilised the Sarawak Alliance. Federal complicity in intra-Alliance affairs and the opportune alliance which later coalesced around the rebelling Pesaka and BARJASA parties resulted in the ouster of SNAP's Stephen Kalong Ningkan as Chief Minister in 1966. That same year the party withdrew from the Sarawak Alliance largely because it was no longer welcome in the new government, and SNAP was left without power. Moreover, had it remained inside the Alliance, there was the possibility that it would have been overshadowed and replaced by the more powerful Pesaka as the Dayak-based party. In contrast, being in the opposition gave SNAP the opportunity to incite and to exploit whatever pan-Sarawak popular resentment was generated against the new administration and the federal government by Ningkan's downfall. In short, the prevailing conditions had changed against SNAP and the party reacted by changing the emphasis of its nationalism. The nationalistic features which were salient during this period were, as noted above, its anti-Malayan sentiment, which also implicated federal collaborators in the state, namely members of the ruling Sarawak Alliance. SNAP's nationalism also expressed itself on policy issues. On Sarawak affairs, SNAP advocated the policy of multi-racialism and on state-federal relations

the party contended that the federal government should abstain from purely state affairs. Incorporated under the slogan "Sarawak for Sarawakians", this nationalism served to attract support for the expansion of SNAP's branch organisation on a state-wide basis and for the formation of an election platform. It should be noted that the slogan had been associated with separatist aspirations which SNAP evidently harboured. But in the late 1960's party leaders were unprepared to tackle such an explosive issue. Consequently the objective was deferred to an indefinite date, and SNAP loudly proclaimed its loyalty to Malaysia. In short, the objectives of its nationalism, which were characterised mainly by its multi-racialism and anti-federalism, were to recruit support, and put the party back in power.

Footnotes to Chapter VI

1. Sarawak has an area of about 48,000 square miles, three quarters of which in 1962 were still primary forest. At that time land was classified into the following categories: Mixed Zone Land, an area of 4,600 square miles which may be alienated to any Sarawakians; Native Area Land of 2,600 square miles which was under native customary tenure; Native Customary Land which covered all land under native customary tenure and which became Mixed Zone Land or Native Area Land after title was given; Reserved Land which included Crown land and parks and Interior Area Land which covered land not under the four categories. See Great Britain, Sarawak: Report for the Year 1962 (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963), pp.50-52.
2. At that time the administration of land in Sarawak was under the Land Code, first introduced in 1958. All land was vested in the Crown and a native was regarded as a licensee of the Crown. Alienation of land to a Mixed Zone Land classification was the responsibility of the Land and Survey Department. In 1960 the area of land under this classification was 4,400 square miles. By 1962 only 200 square miles were added, which was evidently not satisfactory to the Chinese.
3. Under the new proposal, the system of land classification was to be abolished. The administration of the sale of land was to have been through local committees composed of appointed officials and headmen. The Resident, the chief administrative officer in each of Sarawak's five divisions, would have to approve each sale, however. For a text of a speech given by Mr. Teo Kui Seng, Minister for Natural Resources, over Radio Malaysia (Sarawak) on the new Land Code see Sarawak Tribune, February 22, 1964.
4. Ningkan considered the recommendations of the land legislation beneficial for Sarawakians in general. For the Chinese it would mean the availability of more land and for the Dayaks, who he curiously called the "communities of hill padi" the recommendations would lead to more intensive forms of land settlement schemes with modern amenities such as electricity and medical dispensaries. Ningkan professed to see little problem in the Dayaks relinquishing any land which they didn't immediately need. For Ningkan's explanation see ibid., March 17, 1966.
5. The Minister for Natural Resources, Teo Kui Seng, whose jurisdiction included land, was from the Sarawak Chinese Association (SCA). By February 1965 this ministry was making good its promise to alienate more land to non-natives. For instance, out of 47 lots between five to 20 acres for cultivation in the First Division, only two were reserved for natives. Mr. Teo may have pushed for Chinese interests within the Ningkan administration, but it was Ningkan, for the Chief Minister, who had to shoulder the ultimate responsibility.
6. In its annual general meeting held in March 1965, BARJASA argues that natives should have special privileges in such areas as education and the civil service. See ibid., March 22, 1965.

7. A major proponent of the "Native Alliance", Taib bin Mahmud, who was a state Minister from BARJASA, explained that "the Native Alliance" could "work better (than a multi-racial party such as SNAP) among the various races in Sarawak by pulling together racial groups which had common problems and interests at heart." See ibid., May 15, 1965.
8. BARJASA and Pesaka legislators had resolved to block the Bills if they were presented in the Council Negri. These were the Land Adjudication Bill, the Land Acquisition Bill, and the State Land and Registration Bill.
9. Though Temenggong Jugah favoured the proposed "Native Alliance," he regarded the inclusion of SNAP as a necessary condition.
10. Straits Times, November 17, 1965.
11. While Article 29 of the IGC Report recommended and Article 161A of the Constitution of Malaysia gave the Borneo natives their "special position," they did not specify fully what this was supposed to have involved. The initiative to draw the legislation and execute the law was left largely to the Chief Ministers of the two states. While he was the Chief Minister, Ningkan would not press for any legislation, evidently because to do so meant that he would have to recognise the special positions of Bumiputeras. His successor, Tawi Sli of Pesaka, was too timid to assert native rights. This was a cause of much frustration in his own party: once, in a hardly veiled threat to the Chief Minister, Pesaka demanded that Article 29 of the IGC Report be "fully implemented". See the Sarawak Tribune, April 8, 1969.
12. In 1965 Ningkan's apparent rejection of Bumiputera privileges and his refusal to extend them to the Dayaks were not well received by the Sarawak Dayak National Union (SDNU). In a memorandum to the Chief Minister early in 1965 the SDNU protested that it was not fair that after Malaysia had been established the Dayaks were not treated on equal footing with the Malays of Malaya (Sarawak Dayak Nation Union, "Memorandum to the Honourable the Chief Minister of the State Government of Sarawak in (sic) the matters of Constitutional (sic) General Safeguards, Special Privileges and Preferential Treatment given to the Dayaks" (Kuching: typewritten, March 12, 1965), p.7).
13. Straits Times, November 17, 1965.
14. See Chapter Eight for an account of SNAP's growth. Other Chinese businessmen were active in their support for SNAP. Perhaps the most prominent was Wee Boon Ping, (no relation to Dato Wee). After Ningkan's downfall in 1966, they continued to support SNAP, apparently on the conviction that Ningkan would be reinstated as Chief Minister by the courts, and that they would receive favours from the party in return. After the Privy Council decided against Ningkan, their open support subsided with the notable exception of Datuk James Wong's. Both Datuk Wee and Wee Boon Ping resigned from SNAP later in 1968.
15. Sarawak Tribune, June 3, 1966.

16. Angered by the document which they considered as racist in character, SNAP leaders repeatedly demanded Taib Mahmud's dismissal.
17. Sarawak Tribune, November 17, 1968. Parti Bumiputera's expansionist communalism echoed the Prime Minister's argument made over two years back. In a visit to Santubong, Sarawak, in March 1966, the Tengku had argued for Malay unity: "The other races will laugh at us," he said, "if we are not united" (ibid., March 2, 1966).
18. Ibid., June 3, 1966.
19. Consequently, although SNAP was not totally devoid of Malay supporters, their presence had always been minimal. SNAP's Malay supporters were concentrated in three clusters; Kuching, Sibul, and Limbang. In Kuching the Chief SNAP operative was Abang Othman who chose SNAP at the dissolution of PANAS in 1966. In Sibul the local Malay leader was Ainnie bin Dhoby. In Limbang it was Awang Bungsu. All were once parliamentarians. What they had in common was their inability to get along with Parti Bumiputera's leaders.
20. Ningkan's actions were remarkably similar to that of his counterpart in Sabah, Donald Stephens. Both men enjoyed close ties with expatriate officers and both disliked federal intervention in the affairs of their respective states. As a consequence, the federal government was to consider their leaderships unacceptable. Another reason which did not endear Ningkan to the federal government was the fact that he was sympathetic to Singapore and Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew's conception of multi-racialism.
21. Thomas Kana, who is a Dayak, was a medical dresser in Seria. He returned to Sarawak at Temenggong Jugah's behest in February 1965. His immediate objective was to rebuild Pesaka which had stagnated into a shell organization after 1963.
22. Temenggong Jugah's momentous decision was precipitated by an incident which was to become known as the "Mason Affair". Alfred Mason was working for Party Pesaka and was a major figure in the party's attempt to establish a foothold in the Lubok Antu area of the Second Division. This unilateral move by Pesaka angered Ningkan who allegedly injured Alfred Mason by choking him at the throat. The incident took place in Simanggang, immediately after Pesaka's initial incursion into Lubok Antu. On Temenggong Jugah's view of the "Mason Affair" (Sarawak Tribune, September 14, 1966). Ningkan's version was that he had merely rested his hand on Mason's neck and that Mason's injury was due to Ningkan's occult powers (R.S. Milne and K.J. Ratnam, Malaysia -- New States in a New Nation (London: Frank Cass, 1974), p.448).
23. The immediate incident was Ningkan's dismissal of his Minister of Communication and Works, Taib Mahmud, who had been gathering support within the Sarawak Alliance against Ningkan. Following Taib Mahmud's dismissal, other ministers resigned and the 20 dissident members, including Taib Mahmud himself, flew off to Kuala Lumpur from where they demanded Ningkan's resignation. One key figure in SNAP who was distressed

by the imminent break within the Dayak ranks was Datuk Dunstan Endawie, a SNAP Vice-President and Council Negri Member from Krian. He and Edmund Langgu, SNAP's Secretary-General and Member of Parliament from Saratok, consulted their constituents from the Kalaka district. Datuk Endawie was rumoured to be ready to defect at this time, but that he stayed with SNAP was probably at the urging of the voters from his constituency.

24. Sarawak Tribune, June 18, 1978. See also: Gordon Means, Malaysian Politics, (London: In a New Nation, op. cit., p.226.
25. Straits Budget, September 14, 1966, cited in Michael Leigh, The Rising Moon: Political Development in Sarawak. (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1974), p.104.
26. Sarawak Tribune, June 29, 1966. See also Footnotes No. 55 and 56.
27. Ibid., August 9, 1967.
28. Ibid., July 4, 1967.
29. Ibid., July 3, 1967.
30. The notion of state autonomy remained an objective of the party until it joined the government in 1976. It had always been seen as the ultimate target, however, not necessarily as an urgent goal which overrides all others. The apparent case in which Singapore was ejected from the federation in 1965 was probably not lost on Ningkan. In standing up to the federal government he may have wished to have Sarawak ejected from the federation.
31. See Report of the Commission of Enquiry, North Borneo and Sarawak, Lord Cobbold, chairman (Kuching, Government Printing Office, 1962), p.18. SNAP's view that Sarawak should be free to withdraw from Malaysia was shared by Temenggong Jugah who even submitted a personal memorandum to the Cobbold Commission. See, for instance, Sarawak Tribune, March 20, 1962.
32. Sarawak Tribune, September 14, 1966.
33. Ibid.
34. The "Bangkok Agreement" which is formally known as The Agreement to Normalise Relations Between the Republic of Indonesia and Singapore ended the period of confrontation between the two countries. Article I of the Agreement states in full: "The Government of Malaysia in order to resolve the problems between the two countries arising out of the formation of Malaysia, agree to afford the people of Sabah and Sarawak who are directly involved, an opportunity to reaffirm, as soon as practicable, in a free and democratic manner through General Election, their previous decision about their status in Malaysia." See Franklin B. Weinstein, Indonesia Abandons Confrontation: An Inquiry into the Functions of Indonesian Foreign Policy (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), pp.93-94.

35. Malaysia, Attorney General's Chambers, The Federal Constitution, (Kuala Lumpur: Government Printer, 1963), p.94. See also: R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Politics and Government in Malaysia, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1978), p.43; Harry E. Groves, The Constitution of Malaysia (Singapore: Malaysia Publications Ltd., 1964), p.222.
36. Sarawak Tribune, September 16, 1966.
37. Ibid., September 20, 1966.
38. The Minister specifically accused SNAP of trying to work out an alliance with the SUPP, which had never accepted Malaysia. Ibid., July 5, 1967. During the election campaign in 1969, the leaders of Party Pesaka claimed that SNAP's executives had not declared their "unequivocal support" for Malaysia, (ibid., May 4, 1969).
39. Given SNAP's aspiration for an independent Sarawak, there was no doubt that had the federal government forced Sarawak out of Malaysia as it did with Singapore, the party would have consented.
40. On the role of the federal government and its major operative Syed Kechik in staging the declaration of the Emergency and Ningkan's subsequent downfall, see Bruce Ross-Larson, The Politics of Federalism: Syed Kechik in East Malaysia (Singapore: by the author, 195-b Penang Road, Singapore 9, 1976), pp.34-53. The State of Emergency was proclaimed under Article 150 of the Federal Constitution (R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Politics and Government in Malaysia, op. cit., p.42.
41. Several sources claim that the demonstration was stage-managed in order that a state of emergency may be declared. There is no conclusive evidence to corroborate this allegation.
42. According to the party's argument, Sarawak joined Malaysia on the understanding that only Sarawak could amend the Sarawak Constitution. (Sarawak Tribune, September 20, 1966.)
43. SNAP used the slogan to stir up support. The audience in this instance was largely Malay; the occasion was the opening of a party branch -- the Ikatan Tujoh Branch. Its membership was largely Malay (ibid., May 1, 1967).
44. Sarawak Tribune, April 19, 1967.
45. The Party continued: "Sarawak's identity must be preserved at all costs ... let no one including the federal government deny us of (sic) this heritage." (Sarawak Tribune, April 19, 1967.)
46. Ibid., May 1, 1967.
47. Ibid., July 6, 1967.

48. Ningkan was not alone in his stand in favour of multi-racialism. Before the ouster of Singapore from the federation, its Prime Minister, Lee Kuan Yew, a strong proponent of a "Malaysian Malaysia" in which neither the nation nor the state would be identified with or defined by any particular communal group. A similar viewpoint was held by Donald Stephens, Sabah's first Chief Minister. See for instance: Nancy Fletcher, The Separation of Singapore from Malaysia (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), p.58; Margaret Roff, "The Rise and Demise of Kadazan Nationalism," Journal of Southeast Asian History, Vol. 10, No. 2 (September 1969), p.338.
49. Sarawak Tribune, May 15, 1967.
50. Ibid., April 19, 1967.
51. Ibid., May 1, 1967.
52. See Chapter Eight for an account of SNAP's expansion and performance.
53. Section 21(3) of the Sarawak Constitution provides that the Council Negri has a maximum life of five years following its election. Since the last General Elections were completed in July 1963 and the reconstituted Council Negri first sat in August of the same year, it follows that the latest time for a General Election to be held was August 1968. See Great Britain, Malaysia: Agreement Concluded Between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Federation of Malaya, North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963).
54. Sarawak Tribune, March 4, 1967.
55. Ibid., June 7, 1967.
56. Sarawak Tribune, October 6, 1968.
57. Ibid.
58. After SNAP's withdrawal from the Sarawak Alliance in 1966, party leaders, led by Ningkan, resolved that SNAP would contest the elections on its own. Overtures from the Sarawak Alliance that could have led to the party's return were therefore consistently rebuffed. See, for instance, ibid., June 7, 1967.
59. Ibid., September 29, 1968.
60. Ibid., January 14, 1969.
61. Ningkan was quick to try and exploit apparent disunity within the Sarawak Alliance. For instance; when the Alliance was threatened with a rift following Temenggong Jugah's open complaint that bias in the allotment of development projects by Parti Bumiputera's ministers resulted in the Dayaks being denied their fair share, Ningkan promptly showed his support of the Temenggong's position. Declaring that SNAP

would not rejoin the Sarawak Alliance, Ningkan made it obvious that he would welcome collaboration with Pesaka. (Ibid., October 28, 1967.)

62. Ibid.

63. In this SNAP was successful. After the 1970 general elections, Pesaka's leaders such as Thomas Kana and Temenggong Jugah indicated their preference for an alliance with SNAP. However, they were unable to enforce discipline within their own party. As a result, defections to the Parti Bumiputera camp eventually ended in the Pesaka rejoining the new government led by Parti Bumiputera.

64. Sarawak Tribune, January 6, 1969.

CHAPTER VII

THE RE-EMERGENCE OF ETHNIC NATIONALISMIntroduction

This chapter seeks to establish the factors which determined the revival of SNAP's ethnic nationalism. First to be discussed is the debacle of 1970, when SNAP was excluded from the ruling coalition, and the effect which it had on the attitude of party leaders. This is followed by an examination of state politics and will centre on two themes: the acceptance of the national Malaysian approach to nation building and state development, and SNAP's response to the evident emasculation of Dayak leaders in the Sarawak Coalition Government (SCG). Lastly, the chapter will chronicle the formation of Barisan Nasional and explain how SNAP's subsequent entry into the government was consistent with the readoption of its Dayak native nationalism.

The Debacle of 1970

The outcome of the 1970 general elections was a disappointment to SNAP. Hoping to achieve a simple majority, it had fielded forty-seven candidates in the forty-eight state constituencies and twenty-three of the available twenty-four parliamentary seats. The outcome

was therefore something of a let-down, for SNAP won only twelve seats. To be in the government, the party would have to join a coalition.

SNAP was clearly eager to become a part of the new administration. At one point it even proposed an all-party government,¹ which would mean the inclusion of Parti Bumiputera, whose leaders' mutual antipathy for Ningkan was well known. Further, Parti Bumiputera had a history of close alliance with the federal government which, seen from SNAP's provincial outlook, was a serious fault. It was therefore strong evidence of how much SNAP leaders aspired to be part of the new government when they suggested that they would co-operate even with Parti Bumiputera.

What SNAP really wanted was a Dayak-based government with Chinese support. That is, it preferred a SNAP-Pesaka-SUPP alliance, which would have been sufficient for a majority in the Council Negri but small enough to exclude the chauvanistic and Malay-dominated Parti Bumiputera. Negotiations to this end were apparently successful and representatives from SNAP and Pesaka duly gathered at Temenggong Jugah's house on July 7² before proceeding across river to the Governor's Astana to announce that they had formed a government.

Unknown to the leaders of SNAP, and evidently to Jugah and Kana of Pesaka as well, while one group of the SUPP was holding talks with SNAP, another was at the tail-end of a bargaining session with the leaders of Parti Bumiputera and representatives of the federal

government. At that time the SUPP was needed by both SNAP and its rival, Parti Bumiputera. That is, for the SUPP the question was not whether it would be in the next government but rather which party it preferred as a partner. Its choice was Parti Bumiputera, primarily because it had "reservations about a SUPP-SNAP-Pesaka government...."

It had also been antagonised by the coolness which SNAP had shown towards its overtures for working together during the 1966 cabinet crisis, and to possible arrangements for the two parties not opposing each other during the 1969-1970 elections Furthermore, if the only Malay party was excluded, might there not be a fear of Malay violence?³

These considerations, and others, persuaded the SUPP to ally itself with Parti Bumiputera, with the SCA as a junior partner. Their combined strength was 26, just enough to constitute the majority, although it lacked Dayak representation. Assisted by a worker from the federal government and led by the Parti Bumiputera, the new group immediately sought to redress this shortcoming.⁴

From Parti Bumiputera's point of view, Pesaka was clearly preferable to SNAP, if only because Pesaka was already in the Alliance and its leaders had a more satisfactory working relationship with their counterparts in Parti Bumiputera. The problem was that Pesaka did not consider its membership in the old Sarawak Alliance binding on its post-election alignment. Had it done so it would not have courted SNAP and SUPP so assiduously. Besides, the prime

tactician for Pesaka, Thomas Kana, not only objected to Bumiputera leader as the Chief Minister but aspired to the post himself. The problems of Pesaka's recalcitrance and Dayak representation did not endure, however, for when Pesaka exhibited signs of obstinacy, Parti Bumiputera simply bypassed its top echelon and approached Pesaka's elected members on an individual basis. One such member, Penghulu Abok Jalin of Bintulu, was ensnared on July 7, just in time for the announcement of the formation of the government. For his trouble he was awarded a cabinet portfolio.⁵ Faced with breaches of discipline and further disarray within its ranks, Pesaka capitulated and on July 8, Temenggong Jugah announced that

Party Pesaka is definitely within the Alliance and fully supports the Coalition Government headed by the new Chief Minister, Datuk Pattinggi Haji Rahman Yakub.⁶

With Pesaka in, the problem of Dayak representation was solved and SNAP once again became odd party out.

The failure of a SNAP-Supp coalition to materialise had two important consequences. First, the "defection" of the SUPP effectively undercut Ningkan's strategy for coalition, which was also to include both Pesaka and the SCA. In the opinion of SNAP's leaders, their party's exclusion from the coalition was needless. The SUPP was in the position of being wanted by both SNAP and Bumiputera as a coalition partner. The difference between the two was that while SNAP consented to have Bumiputera in an all-party coalition,

Bumiputera refused to have SNAP as a partner. In other words, had the SUPP chosen SNAP the result would have been a five-party government composed of SNAP, Pesaka, SUPP, Bumiputera and SCA. As it was the SUPP's choice of Bumiputera ended in only a four-party government: SNAP was kept out of the coalition. SUPP's choice of Parti Bumiputera therefore led to the exclusion of SNAP from the government. Further, the double-cross of July added a good measure of personal humiliation. The top leaders of SNAP and Pesaka had donned formal attire prior to meeting the Governor to announce the formation of their "government". When, therefore, they were informed that the SUPP had reneged on their verbal commitment of support, they were naturally enraged. As Ningkan mildly put it,

Everything was agreed on July 6.... I am surprised and sad to see the SUPP leaders changing their stand.⁷

Unlike the SCA and Pesaka leaders, whose consolation was to become part of the new coalition--although the SCA did not have any cabinet seats--SNAP's chiefs were to remain isolated and without power as Opposition Members of the Council Negri. That is, the opportunism of the SUPP leaders, which put SNAP at a disadvantage, earned the SUPP leaders the lasting enmity of their counterparts in SNAP.

To recapitulate, it should be pointed out that SNAP had been out-manoevered in its bid for participation in government; its "territorial nationalist" strategy for an anti-federal front lay in

shambles after the unexpected withdrawal of the SUPP. Of equal importance was the embittered attitude of its leaders toward the SUPP and its Chinese chiefs. A major consequence of the conviction of SNAP's executives that the SUPP leadership could not be relied upon was the re-emergence of ethnicity as the salient nationalism. It should be pointed out that although SNAP's multi-racialism was gradually de-emphasised, SNAP did not abandon its multi-racial membership. If anything, SNAP's antagonism to the SUPP greatly encouraged the party (SNAP) to woo supporters away from the SUPP. For instance, possible defections to SNAP from the SUPP were those party members who were opposed to their leaders for giving up the role as opposition party. As the only remaining opposition party, SNAP was in a good position to pick up those disgruntled voters--who were mainly Chinese--from the SUPP. If this were true, and SNAP was able to attract Chinese voters, then the party's performance in the 1964 general election would show an increase of Chinese supporters for SNAP.⁸

During the period following the 1970 general election, SNAP tried to modify its multi-racial approach. Up to 1970 the fundamental purpose of its nationalism was party-building, which was necessary if SNAP was to be a serious contender for political control. SNAP's leaders made adroit use of their differences with the federal government and the resulting acrimonious relationship

was interpreted by the party as defence of state rights and Dayak aspirations against the centripetal tendencies of the federal government. That is, before and during the 1970 general election SNAP had relied on Sarawak nationalism to attract support, and part of this nationalism was its anti-federal sentiment. However, this strategy had two negative consequences. It may have stimulated Sarawak nationalism and awakened Dayak self-identification and consciousness, but it also earned SNAP (particularly its leader, Datuk Ningkan) the hostility of the federal government. As the results of the events following the 1970 general election showed, federal disfavour ultimately worked against SNAP. Following the 1970 election, therefore, SNAP gradually sought to modify its anti-federal image in an attempt to gain acceptance. Further, the party broadened its attention from purely Sarawakian affairs to Malaysian concerns. In contrast to its virulent attacks on the federal government before or during the general elections, its criticisms after the polls were muted, even conciliatory. For instance, on September 9, 1970, the leaders of the party let it be known that SNAP supported the national ideology, the Rukunegara,⁹ an intimation which suggested that SNAP hoped to put to rest, however temporarily, the charge that it was a separatist party. The modification of its multi-racial approach also became evident in March 1971 during the passage of the Constitution (Amendment) Bill of 1971. From the Dayak perspective, the most important parts of

the legislation were the amendments to Articles 153 and 161A¹⁰ which made the natives of Borneo equal in status to the Malays. SNAP supported the Government when the vote was taken on the Constitution (Amendment) Bill.¹¹

Not all of SNAP's activities were apparently as deferential toward the Central Government. For instance, in a move which appeared to be directed against the Government, it sought closer contact with other opposition parties.¹² For a moment it was even willing to consider a "united front" in order to establish a common ground for co-operation between the opposition parties. The fact that SNAP considered such a "front" ought not be taken as a sign that SNAP was now more hostile to the Central Government than before. Rather, it should be seen as an attempt by the party to see whether such a collaboration could serve the Dayaks better. As it was, no policy agreements could be reached and the proposed "united front" failed to materialise.

The other consequence was the split among the Dayaks into SNAP and Pesaka supporters, which was largely the result of personal rivalries and policy disagreements. Basically, before 1970, while Pesaka favoured native unity based on Malay and Dayak solidarity with the support of the Central Government, SNAP wanted a multi-ethnic coalition under a single political party, namely SNAP itself. With their leaders unable to agree on this issue or work together, Dayak

disunity persisted. The implication of this split for SNAP is examined below.

State Politics

It was, not remarkably, in Sarawak that changing conditions had a more direct and immediate impact on the fortunes of the party. First, the ruling coalition government had begun to encourage defections from SNAP. As a result of government pressure and enticements, some defections did occur.¹³ The most notable were the politicians: in May 1971, two of SNAP's members in the Council Negri, Kundai Ngareng and Ngelambong Bangau, crossed the floor to join Pesaka; four months later an Iban Member of Parliament, Penghulu Abit, followed suit in the Dewan Ra'ayat.¹⁴ By the end of 1971 it appeared that Pesaka was successfully utilising its position as the Dayak party in government and was beginning to attract Dayak members--the actual number was never published--from SNAP, which saw little opportunities or rewards in continuing to support SNAP in opposition. The morale of SNAP's leaders at this time was so low, it was alleged, that they were prepared to "clutch at any straw"¹⁵ to prove that they merited the continuing support of party members. It would appear that beginning from 1971 the government had some success in causing defections from SNAP. Conceivably, ceteris paribus, this trend would likely have continued.

However, other variables did not remain constant, for by March 1972, the situation in Sarawak had begun to change, something which ultimately worked in SNAP's favour. In a move designed to forge native unity, Parti Bumiputera and Pesaka announced that they would merge into a single organisation. The concept of such a merger was first mooted in 1968, although the origin of Pesaka-Bumiputera alliance could be traced back to the 1965 abortive "Native Alliance". The prime movers apparently belonged to the Parti Bumiputera; but since in 1968 Pesaka was still considering some form of Dayak-based collaboration with SNAP,¹⁶ Parti-Bumiputera's overture made no progress. By 1970, in the period immediately after the general elections, Pesaka was in fact working toward an alliance with SNAP and SUPP and only moved back to the coalition government when this effort was undermined. Subsequently, the idea of a Pesaka-Bumiputera merger was again revived and by September 1972 Pesaka finally gave in.¹⁷ Early in 1973 the two parties merged to become the Pesaka-Bumiputera Bersatu (PBB).

The merger between the two parties was an important phase in the political development of the state: it represented a trend to align Sarawak parties along ethnic lines. In the case of the PBB the alignment meant the fusion of two native parties in the Sarawak State Government. The Iban-based Pesaka symbolised Dayak participation while the Parti Bumiputera represented the Malay-Melanau group. In

as far as the two communal parties were united to effect native solidarity, it could be said that ethnicity in this case was at the level above communalism. The rationale for the existence of the PBB was that the natives (Malays and Dayaks), or Bumiputeras, had certain aspirations and interests which required their common solidarity. Yet in reality there were important basic differences--language, religion, customs, and tradition--which the two parties sought to represent. Indeed, about the only areas on which the two groups could be expected to agree were the principle of native privileges, and their opposition to some Chinese traders and businessmen. Even here there was no total agreement.¹⁸ Clearly, for the Bumiputeras the parts were greater than the sum. In this sense, "native" solidarity was a contrived development--an example of ethnicity the objective of which for that time was to prop up a convenient union of two political leaderships.

The major point which should be made is that the merger consolidated the primacy of the Muslim (Malay-Melanau) group. Muslim pre-eminence in the PBB was evident from the very beginning. For instance, it was Parti Bumiputera which initiated the merger. Also in the elections of the PBB executive positions, the symbolic post of President was awarded to the congenial, but uneducated, Temenggong Jugah, while the important office of Secretary-General belong to Datuk Patinggi Abdul Rahman Yakub. His nephew, Datuk Amar Taib

Mahmud, was Vice-President.¹⁹ Datuk Patinggi Abdul Rahman Yakub's post and his Chief Ministership testified to the fact that the PBB and the administration was dominated by Muslims.

With the formation of PBB, the governing political parties were reduced to three: PBB, SUPP, and SCA. The latter two were predominantly Chinese and until July 1974 existed as separate organisations.²⁰ This formal division among the Chinese did not endure, however. Their common experience in the Coalition Government was convincing evidence that the two groups could work together. Indeed, the unification of the two parties would only be a formal recognition of existing Chinese co-operation. The immediate impetus for a move toward a single Chinese party was the coming of the 1974 general elections, scheduled for the month of August. As the date drew nearer, pressure increased to streamline the Chinese parties into one organisation. In July 1974, the much weaker SCA was dissolved.²¹ Party leaders of the now defunct SCA, however, were split on their new affiliations. The majority, including the most prominent men such as Datuk Ling Bing Siong and Datuk Chia Chin Shin, were admitted to the SUPP. Others, sensing greater opportunities in the Bumiputera camp, sought membership in the PBB. Prominent among these were Cheng Yew Kiew and Ting Ming Kiong, whose entry was facilitated by their conversion to the Islamic religion. With the breaking up of the SCA the Chinese were brought under a single organisation; The Sarawak Coalition

Government (SCG) and its successor the Sarawak State Government were thus dichotomised into native and non-native parties.

Until 1979 the new Chief Minister, Datuk Rahman Yakub, had a long and amicable personal relationship with the federal government. For instance, it was federal politicians who tried (and failed) to make him Chief Minister in 1963. Following his defeat at the polls during the same year he served at the federal level, holding such varied posts as Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development, Assistant Minister of Justice, and finally Minister of Education, before his resignation in 1970 to become Sarawak's Chief Minister. During his stint in federal politics, he was a major figure as an architect of Malay dominance and as the conduit of information on Sarawak.²²

Since his assumption of power in 1970, Abdul Rahman Yakub had made it clear that he intended to spearhead the integration of Sarawak into the federal framework. He explained that nationalism was an "ideology to unite us Malaysians. It transcend[ed] racial origins [and] religious beliefs.... Unless we regard ourselves first and foremost as Malaysians...this country will disintegrate."²³ Not surprisingly, his government approved of the effort by the Central Government to build Sarawak along its own federal nation-building programme. It co-operated with the Central Government when the latter, in the pursuit of national solidarity, called for the development

of a "native based" culture and of "national unity through Bahasa Malaysia", the National Language.²⁴ While the theme of national solidarity originated with the Central Government, and within Sarawak, it was the Rahman Yakub government which was charged with implementing it. The strong-willed Chief Minister, unlike Ningkan, enjoyed the full support of federal politicians, and he tended to overshadow his own state-cabinet ministers who, because they were in government, were regarded as communal representatives. To the degree that the Chief Minister was able to advocate and execute policies which were partial towards the Malays then, this would have demonstrated the lack of effectiveness on the part of the Dayak or Chinese cabinet ministers as ethnic representatives.

The Rahman Yakub government's partiality may be illustrated by a number of its activities. One instance of this policy innovation was the religious conversions to the Islam religion among the Dayaks and Chinese.²⁵ SNAP's concern for religious freedom dated back to the party's inception in 1961. But until 1970 there had been no cause for alarm, since both the Ningkan and Tawi Sli governments adopted a tolerant attitude toward religious practices. In 1970, however, the new government began to encourage Muslim proselytising in Sarawak. In response, SNAP largely advocated a more tolerant approach. It insisted that in Sarawak there should be religious freedom, and it protested what it saw as maltreatment by the authorities of

Christian missionaries in the Borneo states of Sabah and Sarawak.²⁶
On religion, then, SNAP's position was based on the principle of religious toleration. Here its platform stood as an alternative²⁷ to the fire-and-brimstone evangelism of the Muslim-led SCG.

Another example of a measure which favoured the Malays and which elicited communal reaction was the government's attempt to foster youth unity in Sarawak. In order to achieve this objective, an organisation called Sabrekas was formed. Existing youth organisations, some five hundred in total number, were invited to "merge their respective organisations"²⁸ into Sabrekas, apparently after they had conducted or imposed their own dissolution. Several youth organisations, notably the Sarawak Youth Council, the Gabungan Kelab Malayu Sarawak, and the Bidayuh Youth Club did merge with Sabrekas. But the only major Dayak youth body, the Sarawak Dayak Youth Association (SDYA) pointedly refused. The SDYA is an organisation for young Dayaks and most of its members are civil servants. Its refusal to join Sabrekas was symptomatic of the feeling of distrust which its members felt toward the government. In this prevailing mood of suspicion the SCG (and its successor, the Sarawak Barisan Nasional [SBN]) increased Dayak anxiety by instituting further changes.²⁹ When these policies are taken together it becomes obvious that like the Razak government at the federal level, the Rahman Yakub government favoured the Malays.

Where the government acted to look after Dayak interests, the

actual execution elicited more apprehension than satisfaction. For instance, the Majlis Adat Istiadat (MAI), was a government body created at the suggestion of Temenggong Jugah in order to modernise Dayak customs and laws.³⁰ But when it was finally formed, MAI was led by Temenggong Jugah himself, who, since he was preliterate, was clearly unable to understand the complexities involved in the codification and standardisation of native laws. Further, since he had earlier announced his intention to retire from politics, his appointment suggested a form of political patronage and the office seemed to be a sinecure. Furthermore, the body's jurisdiction extended to the Malays and there was suspicion in SNAP that the old Temenggong would be unable to prevent the infusion of Malay customs and laws into the Dayak arena. That is, there was concern that Temenggong Jugah would really be presiding over the beginning of the assimilation or "Bumiputerisation" of the Dayaks. Under the prevailing mood of Dayak skepticism, public complaints by the Pesaka wing of the PBB only demonstrated their diminishing role and helplessness. Thus when Datuk Tawi Sli, the last Dayak Chief Minister and an important PBB personality, openly complained that the Second Division was lagging behind other areas in development allocations, he was probably correct.³¹ But the irony of the situation was that he corroborated SNAP's contention that Dayak leadership in the BN was ineffectual. Amid mounting criticism, Dayak leaders in the government tried to defend the record of the administration. Datuk Alfred Jabu,

the government leader in the Second Division and Deputy Chief Minister, attempted to dispel criticisms directed at Sabrekas. Temenggong Jugah, in the middle of 1973, insisted that the government was fair, a theme which his son, Leonard Linggi, the Minister with Special Functions, was to repeat at a later date.³² The net result was that the Dayak group in the government appeared more as apologists for the Yakub administration and less as effective communal representatives.

If this were so, the dissatisfaction of the Dayaks (and Chinese) at the performance of the Coalition Government should have manifested itself in an increase of support for SNAP in the next general election (1974). Before discussing this election, two features need to be pointed out. Within SNAP the immediate impact of Dayak discontent was felt in two ways. First, after the debacle of 1970, Ningkan's personal grip on the party began to loosen. It was not that he was totally autocratic, for in addition to Ningkan himself, others such as Dato James Wong and Edmund Langgu who, as Vice-Chairman and Secretary-General of the party respectively, also shared power. But beginning from 1970, other figures were drawn into the inner circle. Two of these were Datuk Dunstan Endawie and Joseph Balan Seling. Datuk Endawie is a veteran politician whose attachment to Dayak unity is well known. Balan Seling is a Kenyah from the Baram area of the Fourth Division. He is a cleric who received his training in

Australia. In 1967 he resigned his position within the Borneo Evangelical Church in order to help to set up SNAP's branch apparatus in the Baram, and in 1970 was elected to the Council Negri.³³ The other consequence of Dayak discontent which worked to SNAP's advantage was the influx of the Dayak intelligentsia into the party. SNAP certainly did not monopolise the allegiance of all educated Dayaks. Those who ultimately joined the PBB were Alfred Jabu, Stephen Wan Ullok and Leonard Linggi, all university graduates. What was important here was that SNAP itself, because or in spite of being in the opposition, was able to attract promising figures. Two of the most famous were Daniel Tajem and Leo Moggie. Daniel Tajem is an Iban from Sebuyau, Second Division. He received his legal training in New Zealand and presently serves as the President of the Sarawak Dayak National Union. Leo Moggie is a Third Division Iban who joined SNAP on the eve of the 1974 general elections. Well-educated, he obtained his M.A. degree from the University of New Zealand. In the early 1970's he studied in the United States where he received his M.B.A. in Management. His work in the Sarawak Civil Service included a stint as a District Officer, and later as the Director of the Borneo literature Bureau. He also worked in the Chief Minister's Office in Kuching. Prior to his resignation in 1974, he had been the Deputy General Manager of the Borneo Development Corporation.³⁴ Leo Moggie was therefore an "insider" in the corridor of government bureaucracy.

In explaining his resignation from a promising career in the Civil Service, he made two observations which SNAP was to use in its election campaign. First, the Dayaks (the "rural people") had gained very little from the implementation of the New Economic Policy. Further, in a statement which seemed to typify the Dayaks' anti-assimilation mood of the time, Moggie added that: "Malaysia is a multi-racial nation, Sarawak is a multi-racial state. No race should dominate or attempt to dominate any other race, if the aim is to unite the people."³⁵ Moggie's attack on the government's economic and cultural policies was only a prelude to those which party workers mounted later during the election campaign.

Election Manifesto, 1974

From its Manifesto³⁶ of August 14, 1974, it was clear that SNAP in presenting its view was striving for consistency. Several major points were contentious and with which the party was identified were reiterated by SNAP. First, there was the "conditions" of Sarawak's entry into the federation, the terms of which, SNAP stressed, should be followed. SNAP believed in

honouring the spirit and the letter of the London Agreement which brought about by the Recommendations the Inter-Governmental Committee Report, whereby Sarawak achieved its independence in Malaysia from Britain

Second, SNAP repeated its stand on the Constitution of Sarawak and that

of Malaysia as well. The party said that

SNAP has been the champion of the constitutional fighter (sic). We stand to uphold and defend the constitutional rights of the people of Sarawak and Malaysia. We believe that the constitutional umbrella of our State and Nation must be inviolable and sacred and that any changes in the provisions of our Constitution must have the consent of our people [through a] referendum.

Third, SNAP remained unrepentant in its advocacy of "Sarawak for Sarawakians." It maintained that

the policy of Sarawak for Sarawakians, particularly in respect to priorities for both State and Federal posts, and promotion in the civil service, and also in other fields as enshrined in the London Agreement when Sarawak became independent within Malaysia. SNAP also believed in Malaysia for all Malaysians.

Lastly, the party stood steadfast on its policy of multi-racialism.

It argued that "Sarawak can only survive in Malaysia if the people subscribe to our traditional racial harmony, right down to the grass-root level."

SNAP, then, was consistent in its advocacy of constitutional positions in order to delimit the federal capacity to meddle in Sarawak's politics. It also retained its multi-racial policies. Ostensibly at least, SNAP's Sarawak's nationalism remained unmodified; but in 1974 there were additions which in effect altered the emphasis of SNAP's nationalism. Unlike 1970, when these constitutional and policy issues (which are listed above) dominated SNAP's election platform, in 1974 the party resurrected other aspects of its policies

which indicate a revival of ethnic nationalism. The most notable of these were native rights and religious freedom; the government was considered vulnerable here in that its records were characterised, respectively, by neglect of the Dayak community relative to other communal groups, and the proliferation of Muslim missionary activities: The former put the Dayaks at a disadvantage and the latter threatened both the Dayaks and the Chinese. Also, in repudiation of its position in 1970, SNAP accepted the principle of privileges for Bumiputeras, thus making the party more acceptable to Dayaks, Malays, and the federal government. It said that "although SNAP was committed to a multi-facial policy", it would "subscribe to the constitutional provision whereby the special privileges of the natives were enshrined in order to help the under-privileged natives."³⁷ If in 1970 SNAP had de-emphasised these subjects during the general election, it was also hampered by the problem of providing convincing evidence--largely because the government programmes (or their absence) were yet to be noticed and felt directly by the populace. By 1974 the situation had changed, hence the elevation of these two issues.

Lastly, during the last general elections, SNAP did not attack the communist menace in the state in 1974. Since most of the communist terrorists in Sarawak were Chinese, the absence of statements critical of the communists was bound to elicit favourable response from the Chinese voters; While SNAP was by no means pro-communist,

the new approach indicated a willingness to accommodate the terrorists, probably in the form of an amnesty arrangement.³⁸

Barisan Nasional

In addition to the anti-SUPP mood of party leaders and the lack of effective Dayak representation in government, the third factor which facilitated SNAP's re-emphasis on native nationalism in the second half of the 1970's was a policy initiative of the federal government. Specifically this was the coalitions which led to the formation of Barisan Nasional (BN) or National Front governments at the state and federal levels.³⁹

In order to explain the concept of the BN government and the consequence which it had on SNAP, it is necessary to review briefly Malaysia's national politics after the general elections of 1969.

Whereas in Sarawak and Sabah voting took weeks to conduct, in West Malaysia the procedure was completed in one day. Following the counting of votes in 1969 it was clear that although the ruling Alliance--which then consisted of UMNO, MCA, and the Malaysian Indian Congress (MIC)--had maintained its dominance, it had also suffered severe losses.⁴⁰ Victory marches held on May 12 in Kuala Lumpur by the opposition parties led to a retaliatory procession being scheduled for the 13th by UMNO leaders and their Malay supporters. Would-be marchers were attacked, allegedly by Chinese crowds, and racial

rioting ensued.⁴¹

The Yang Dipertuan Agung (the Paramount Ruler of Malaysia) declared a state of national emergency and Parliament was suspended. The nation was ruled by an eight-man National Operations Council (NOC) for the duration of the emergency.⁴² Convinced of the need to create a national consensus, the NOC initiated a few measures designed to achieve peace and order. One of these was the adoption of the national ideology, the Rukunegara;⁴³ another was the proposals to ban discussions on sensitive issues and to redress the racial imbalance in the economic sectors of the nation. The intent of these proposals was to perpetuate Malay political control in Malaysia.

The NOC's life was terminated on February 20, 1971 and Malaysia returned to parliamentary democracy.⁴⁴ Under Tun Razak as Prime Minister, UMNO continued to dominate the federal government. Following the NOC's recommendations, the Constitutional Amendments and Sedition Acts were passed in 1971 and public as well as parliamentary discussions on the following were prohibited: "(1) the special position of the Malays and other indigenous groups, (2) Malay as the official language, (3) the sovereignty of the Malay sultans and the King, and (4) the citizenship rights of the immigrant communities."⁴⁵ For the Dayaks of Sarawak the Constitutional Amendment was a turning point in that as natives there were granted the same status and privileges as the Malays of Malaysia. In theory at least the opportunities

which were now opened to them in the civil service, development projects, and business were greatly enhanced. The problem which persisted was how to translate these opportunities into reality. One way of looking at the federal overture to SNAP after 1974 was that, following the Dayak rejection of the PBB as their representatives, since the Dayaks showed preference for SNAP as their party, it was only right that the party should be afforded the opportunity to operate within the BN framework.

In addition to promoting legislative changes, the Razak government was also rebuilding the ruling coalition. That is, in addition to fostering Malay control of the country, the Razak administration was also intent on expanding inter-ethnic co-operation beyond the pre-1969 level. Thus, in addition to UMNO's previous partners, the fractious MCA and MIC, other parties were invited to form a wider coalition government, the Barisan Nasional. Initially, BN governments were established at the state level: Penang was the first state, where the new coalition government formed in February 1971 involved the ruling Gerakan Rakyat Malaysia; in Perak the BN government was established in May with the opposition People's Progressive Party (PPP). Several months later the Malay extremist Partai Islam which governed Kelantan and which had members in the states of Trengganu, Kedah, and Perak, agreed in principle to form BN governments at both the state and federal levels.⁴⁶

Before 1975 SNAP remained ignored and isolated while the various governments (both federal and state) of Malaysia were restructured under the B.N.: at that time the newly-found principle of coalition-making at the broadest possible level did not apply to SNAP, as apparently neither the state nor the federal government considered SNAP a necessary partner. There were two possible reasons for this. One was that both governments found SNAP's leadership objectionable. The antipathy between Ningkan on one side and Tun Razak, the Prime Minister of Malaysia, and Datuk Patinggi Abdul Rahman Yakub, the Chief Minister of Sarawak on the other, was well known. The other reason was that the BN may have sought another election opportunity in which to challenge and demolish SNAP. But if SNAP was not an acceptable candidate for government before the general election of 1974, the situation was reversed after that time. The exact date of the first federal overture to SNAP may never be known. What is clear was that it was the federal government which initiated the move and the state government which acquiesced. Soon after the general election in 1974 the federal government put out feelers to the party to join the coalition.⁴⁷ Thus, the concept of the BN ultimately worked in SNAP's favour.

What prompted the change in federal outlook? Although this question is not central to the subject of this thesis it is necessary to speculate on three factors. The first was the results of the 1974

general elections themselves. Contrary to what the BN may have expected SNAP did not disintegrate at the polls in 1974; it won 18 out of 48 seats in the Council Negri, six more than its previous performance in 1970. The significance of the growth in the party's strength was not lost on the federal politicians who regarded the rise in SNAP's strength with apprehension. Such show of support must have been startling to the government observers since they had openly commented that SNAP would win only five seats at the most. In total votes SNAP had 109,092 compared to 142,348 for the PBB-SUPP front. Clearly SNAP had become too important a factor in state politics to be ignored. In addition to this impressive total of votes, SNAP was clearly the party which most Dayaks, and a large minority of Chinese, preferred to support. What this meant was that the Pesaka wing of the PBB could no longer pretend to represent the Dayaks. If this speculation is valid, then it could be said that the inclusion of SNAP in the BN was to afford the Dayaks their meaningful representation. In the light of rationale for the BN's own existence--it hoped to include all major groups in the country--to deny representation from the Dayaks would have been an inconsistent act.

An added reason for the federal show of concern was the growing division between the two major groups in Sarawak. The numerically inferior Malays, as the general elections of 1970 and 1974 both confirmed, chose to support Parti Bumiputera and its successor,

the PBB, while the Dayaks largely voted for SNAP. "By the end of 1974 the differences between the Malays and Dayaks were serious enough to warrant a major effort by Razak to salve the apprehensions of the Dayaks."⁴⁸ In short, the decision to invite SNAP in 1974 should be seen as an effort to stem further cleavage between the two groups by having them share power in the BN.

The last factor was the problem of security for Sarawak and the possibility that should SNAP be left languishing in the opposition, its extremist elements might indulge in anti-state activities. Publicly and privately SNAP's leaders eschew violence, but prolonged isolation in the role of the opposition might encourage SNAP's extremists to abandon established party principles and (tacitly or actively) to support Sarawak's own communist group, the Pasokan Rakyat Guerilla Kalimantan Utara (PARAKU).⁴⁹ It should be stated that there was no tangible evidence of actual anti-government activities conducted by SNAP's members. From the point of security, therefore, SNAP's participation in the BN should be seen as a way of forestalling this possibility. The advantage of the party being in the BN was that their leaders would be in a position to employ Malaysia's resources (for instance, in development and business allocations) as incentives to retain the loyalty of party members to the state-nation.

Ethnic Nationalism

On March 31, 1976, Datuk Dunstan Endawie in a radio speech informed the state that, following the unanimous decision of SNAP's National Council of March 21, 1976 the party

has decided in principle to be one of the component parties within the Barisan Nasional both at the state and federal levels of government.⁵⁰

Why did SNAP agree to join the government? The obvious answer was provided by Datuk Endawie himself. "The decision" he said, "is in line with the historical background of the Sarawak National Party as a political organisation," in that like any other political party, SNAP's major goal was "to form the government of the country...on its own or ...[as] a part of a government alliance...."⁵¹ Datuk Endawie's announcement did not come easily for the party since the federal invitation for SNAP to enter the BN generated a party-wide discussion. SNAP's leadership was divided into two groups on the issue: those centered around Ningkan and who were opposed to joining the BN, and those who coalesced around Datuk Endawie and Leo Moggie were in favour of it. The seriousness of this division was such that the party's Annual General Meeting, normally held in January of each year, was deferred in 1975 to July.⁵² This time Ningkan was virtually alone in his position, at least in the party's Central Executive Committee. Other party leaders, dismayed at his intransigence and aware of his difficult relationship with the BN's leadership, were

convinced that it was time for him to retire as party president.

On July 28, during the annual general meeting of SNAP's General Assembly, he was voted out of office.⁵³ With his ouster the major hurdle to SNAP's entry was cleared. Less obvious than Datuk Endawie's public explanation were several other reasons.⁵⁴ The first was SNAP's desire to ensure effective Dayak representation. By 1976 it had been out of the policy-making-arena for over ten years; within that period it had witnessed the progressive decay and finally the disappearance by merger of the only other Dayak party in Sarawak, the Party Pesaka.

SNAP's forced absence from the government meant that the Dayak community had been represented by Party Pesaka; as long as Pesaka remained in government, therefore, there was the possibility that it (not SNAP) could work effectively for the Dayaks. However, Pesaka lacked the leadership and cohesion to dominate the Sarawak government and to pursue Dayak causes. This was true even when Pesaka had numerical strength, as had been the case under the Tawi Sli government (1966-70). Since it held fifteen out of twenty-five seats in the Alliance, it could have been expected that Pesaka would have pushed for Dayak interests. Certainly the opportunity for this purpose seemed right. For one thing, it was in the government and with its numerical strength it was expected to implement policies in language, culture, and development which could benefit the Dayaks. For another,

Pesaka was now in competition with SNAP for Dayak support--a fact which should have been sufficient incentive for it to push for Dayak causes. Pesaka was not able to do this, however. Its leaders were either unwilling or unable to take the initiative. The Tawi Sli government simply wallowed in general inertia and almost by default the much smaller Parti Bumiputera actually led the Sarawak Alliance. Worse, after Datuk Patinggi Abdul Rahman Yakub became Chief Minister, Pesaka's influence declined even further. After January 21, 1973, Pesaka simply ceased to function as a separate entity when it merged with Parti Bumiputera. From SNAP's viewpoint the occasion was merely a formal recognition of Parti Bumiputera's dominance. With the fusion of the two parties, even the symbol of Dayak representation had disappeared. By joining the government SNAP was trying to re-assert Dayak presence and to exploit the opportunities offered. In the long run, there might even be the possibility that SNAP might promote Dayak unit. In 1976, not willing to provoke the sensibilities of Malay and Chinese leaders in the BN, SNAP leaders explained that the purpose for joining the BN was to work for native unity. This may have been true: The Dayak and the Malays had interests in common which required their solidarity. But it should also be noted that the unity of the Dayak communities has always been a primary target of SNAP. Being in the BN enhanced the prospect of finding common ground with other Dayaks, who, for the time being, were still in either the SUPP or

55

the PBB.

The third motive was the desire by SNAP's leaders to undercut, or at least to moderate, what they considered as extremism in the state government. The zeal with which the Muslim leaders of the state government had favoured the Malay community was obvious even to Temenggong Jugah from as far back as 1967. Such bias persisted into the early 1970's, with the Chief Minister increasingly preferring his Malay advisers⁵⁶ to, for instance, Dayak ones. Such practices contributed to the image that Dayak leaders within the government were ineffectual and the Dayak community neglected. By joining the government SNAP leaders thought that they could fight more effectively on behalf of the Dayaks for development allocations, education benefits, and other projects which they would now have the right to dispense.

The fourth motive concerns the survival of the party itself. Not only did the thrust of the state Barisan Nasional hurt the Dayaks, it was beginning to hamper SNAP as well. First, there was concern that the funds of the party might become exhausted. In the past, businessmen such as Datuk Wee Hood Teck and Datuk James Wong had been instrumental in financing the party. The Alliance government and its successor, the Barisan Nasional, therefore sought to dry up these sources of funds. In the case of Datuk Wee, pressure was exerted by the Alliance leaders on him to leave SNAP. The federal Minister of Finance, Tan Siew Sin, for instance, advised that he should not only leave SNAP but join the SCA as well. Evidently under pressure

Datuk Wee withdrew his membership on October 15, 1968. As a consequence, SNAP "lost most of its financial underpinning."⁵⁷ That virtually left Datuk James Wong as the major financier of the party. Unlike Datuk Wee, whose open dalliance with SNAP lasted some twenty-eight months, Datuk James Wong's involvement was as early as it was prominent. At the time of the 1963 elections, James Wong was an Independent; but following his nomination to the Ningkan cabinet, he joined SNAP. Thereafter he remained entrenched as a Vice-Chairman of the party. Until the takeover in 1975 of the new leadership, he was always in the inner decision-making group.

Datuk James Wong's deep involvement meant that, unlike Datuk Wee, who seemed to consider his participation as a business gamble, he was virtually impervious to the pressure of political patronage. As a result, the method employed to "neutralise" him was different: he was charged with a breach of security regulations. On October 30, 1974, Datuk James Wong, along with five other party functionaries, was arrested under the "preservation of Public Security (Detention) Regulation (1962)" for his alleged involvement in activities against the national interest. In February 1975, legal proceedings were initiated to free him and on March 7, the High Court in Kuching, ruling that his detention was unlawful, ordered him released. Moments later, however, he was re-arrested under the "Internal Security Act (1967)". Datuk James Wong was to remain in detention until January 1976,

several weeks before SNAP was to announce publicly its decision to join the government.⁵⁸

The possible removal of Datuk James Wong as financier and party leader by means of indefinite detention was a serious threat to SNAP. In the first place the spectre of acute financial shortage was now distinctly visible, for as long as he was in custody he could not direct the financing of the party. In the second place, continued detention was viewed as bad for the morale of party workers. For these reasons party leaders were concerned. Thus protested Patrick Anek Uren, a Bidayuh M.P. from Bau: "If the detention of Datuk James Wong is [intended] to cripple SNAP, surely that is the wrong way to go about it."⁵⁹ Partick Anek was correct in identifying the government's motive for holding Datuk James Wong in custody, but his prediction that the party would not succumb was a public show of false bravado.

Of immediate importance, however, was that the continued detention of Datuk James Wong was a factor in convincing SNAP's leaders to soften their opposition and to join the Barisan Nasional. The party did not admit to this factor directly, probably because to have done so would have smacked of capitulation. However, it did hint that the Datuk James Wong Affair was a factor when it admitted that "Various steps were taken by SNAP to secure the release of Datuk Wong and other SNAP members detained under the same charge."⁶⁰ Given the fact that the federal government was inviting SNAP to join the Barisan

Nasional, the detention was to demonstrate to party leaders that Datuk James Wong could be held indefinitely and to show that SNAP could be bled dry of funds as a result. In other words, the significance of the James Wong arrest and detention was a display of coercive persuasion by the federal government. If this were indeed the case, then SNAP probably demanded Datuk James Wong's release as a condition for joining the Barisan Nasional.

If SNAP's decision to join the Barisan Nasional was influenced by the fear among its leaders that its financial lifeline (in the person of James Wong) was threatened, there was also concern about what the federal government might do next. For instance, the government might postpone future elections indefinitely, either by invoking the Internal Security Act or by intervening militarily. In such a situation, SNAP would eventually be damaged as a functioning party without any immediate prospect of returning to power. In short, out of power SNAP was exposed to further politically motivated harrassments, and indefinite stay in the political cold, both of which it could remedy should it join the government.

One of SNAP's major concerns was in the economic field: it centered on the party's belief that they could do much more for the rural people, who formed the bulk of its supporters, should they join the government. The party felt that it could influence the policy decisions much more effectively as a component of the government.

Of immediate concern in this area was the Third Malaysia Plan, the purpose of which was, among other things to

reduce the incidence of poverty in the rural areas throughout the country...among padi cultivators, rubber small holders....⁶¹

Since the Third Malaysia Plan was due to be launched in July, the party felt that SNAP should time its entry to ensure that it had a voice in the allocation of projects and development. At the core of this economic motive was the belief that the Dayaks had been discriminated against--although perhaps not deliberately--when it came to such allocations. As Leo Moggie pointed out,

The interest of the Dayak community has not been sufficiently considered in the implementation of policy in the State of Sarawak.⁶²

Thus, when SNAP was invited to join the Barisan Nasional, party leaders sought to ensure more funds for rural development. In part, their insistence stemmed from their conviction that these areas were neglected. In part also, they recognised that these were the areas which had consistently supported SNAP; increased development allocations in this case were immediate and tangible rewards for past (and future) support. As it was, one of the reasons that negotiation of SNAP's entry was so protracted was that the party insisted on greater concessions for rural development. The party apparently successfully demanded from the Members of Parliament the authority to award annual grants for rural development.⁶³

It has been suggested above that SNAP's conditions for joining the BN were the release of Datuk James Wong and other party members from detention and the authority of Malaysia's Members of Parliament to award certain annual grants for development purposes in their constituencies. Another condition of entry was that SNAP would retain its identity and multi-racial membership.⁶⁴ To do otherwise was to become uni-racial, which would have meant that SNAP would have existed as a totally Dayak organisation. This was clearly unacceptable to SNAP. True, the party was eager to emphasise and to articulate Dayak interests, but this did not necessarily mean the abandonment of its hard-won multi-racial following. In other words, the salience of its nationalism need not be made at the expense of its political strength. As the general elections of 1974 showed, SNAP was able to attract the support of a sizeable Chinese minority. The party leaders were unwilling to "parcel off" its Chinese members to, say the Chinese-based SUPP. Further, it did not wish to merge with the PBB. By retaining its multi-racial membership the party would be in a good position to resist any proposal for such a merger.

Footnotes to Chapter VII

1. When this failed and the new government was announced on July 7 without SNAP being included, the party nominated one of its members as a minister in the Coalition Government (Sarawak Tribune, December 19, 1970).
2. They had met all day on July 6 to discuss the formation of a government.
3. R.S. Milne and K.J. Ratnam, Malaysia--New States in a New Nation (London: Frank Cass, 1974), p.238. They also expressed the point that the Federal Government had threatened not to lift the state of emergency in Sarawak if SUPP had chosen SNAP as opposed to Bumiputera as a partner (*ibid.*). See also, Stanley Bedlington, Malaysia and Singapore: the Building of New States (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978), p.58.
4. This was Syed Kechik, a lawyer and emissary of the Federal Government. His base was Kota Kinabalu, the capital of Sabah. But during the period immediately after the 1970 general election he was in Sarawak where he worked to ensure that Ningkan did not become chief minister (Bruce Ross-Larsen, The Politics of Federalism: Syed Kechik in East Malaysia [Singapore: by the author, 195-b Penang Road, Singapore 9, 1976]).
5. He was made Minister of Youth and Culture. The ministry was clearly one of the less important ministries.
6. Sarawak Tribune, July 9, 1970.
7. Bob Reece, "Unlikely Alliance," Far Eastern Economic Review, July 16, 1970, p.7.
8. See pages 174-194.
9. The Rukunegara was a document which incorporated the underlying elements of the nation's political philosophy. Written as it was after West Malaysia's disastrous riots which followed the general elections of 1970, the document defined the framework within which Malaysian politics were to be conducted.
10. Although it was recognised that the natives of Borneo were to enjoy special rights there had never been any successful attempt to specify what they were.
11. Karl von Vorys, Democracy without Consensus (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press), p. 422.

12. In part this involved closer co-operation with Sabah politicians who shared SNAP's apprehension at the growth of Muslim influence and federal penetration in their respective state. Initial attempts by SNAP to establish a common front with these Sabah politicians dated as far back as 1967. At that time the party contacted Donald Stephens, Sabah's first Chief Minister, and Peter Mojuntin, a young Kadazan catholic. In 1967 SNAP's effort came to naught, but during the post-1970 period it renewed its effort once again. Peter Mojuntin, in particular, was anxious that a united front be presented to stem the tide of Muslim conversion in both states. For SNAP's call for a united opposition see Sarawak Tribune, February 19, 1971; for Mojuntin's reaction see Bedlington, Malaysia and Singapore, op. cit., p.161.

In part also, SNAP sought to assert its presence at the federal level. It agreed in principle to a common minimum programme for the opposition parties, for instance. Meetings were held with Pekemas, Democratic Action Party (DAP), and Marhaen which were from West Malaysia, and the Union of Sabah Peoples' Party (USAP), led by Peter Mojuntin. However, by July, 1973, negotiations had run aground as a result of disagreements over what language policy was to be adopted (Sarawak Tribune, July 27, 1973).

13. In September, 1971, eighty-three members of the party from Engkilili defected to Pesaka. This was the largest group known who had left SNAP during this time. Their change of allegiance was probably the result of work done by Pesaka's local representative, Simon Dembab Maja, who served at this time as the member of Council Negri and as Deputy Chief Minister (ibid., September 15, 1971).
14. When asked why he had left SNAP, Kundai Ngareng explained that in the past his community (Bidayuh) had been neglected and its aspirations and needs unrealised. With this participation in the government the "benefits due to us [Bidayuhs]" could be procured, he said (Sarawak Tribune, May 27, 1971). Penghulu Abit was a Member of Parliament from Kapit in the Rejang basin. The same month that he resigned from SNAP (June 1971), an important SNAP functionary in the Rejang area, Ajan Nabau, followed him into Pesaka.
15. Ibid., November 16, 1971.
16. The idea of a merger between SNAP and Pesaka had been discussed intermittently when both parties were in government and even following SNAP's ouster in 1966. But until 1970 there was apparently no real impetus for both parties to co-operate. When they finally did agree to collaborate and formed the foundation of a Sarawak government, the initiative had fallen to Parti Bumiputera, SUPP, and the Central Government. Representatives from these parties engineered the formation of the Abdul Rahman Yakub government which Pesaka joined later. With Pesaka's departure, Iban solidarity was formally broken for the second time around.
17. Negotiations were completed at this time, although the formal act of merger was not announced (ibid., September 3, 1972).
18. There is no organisation which deals specifically with the implementa-

tion of native privileges in such areas as the Sarawak civil service and the state's economy. More importantly, there is no governmental body that defines and distinguishes the privileges of the Malays and Dayaks. The only governmental body which may yet play this role is the Majlis Adat Istiadat, but at the present it is charged with the standardisation of native laws and customs, not to delineate, implement, or interpret Dayak and Malay privileges.

19. Sarawak Tribune, July 9, 1973.
20. The existence of the two parties reflected the basic division within the Chinese community. The SUPP is Kuching-based and is led by powerful Chinese families from the Hokkein group. The SCA was Sibu-based and was supported by Foochow and Teochew communities. For an account of intra-communal politics in Sarawak's Chinese community in the 1960's, see Craig A. Lockhard, "Leadership and Power within the Chinese Community of Sarawak," Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, Vol. 2, No. 2 (September, 1970), pp.210-217.
21. Sarawak Tribune, July 9, 1974. The creation of one Chinese party for Sarawak did not prevent internal squabbling in the SUPP's leadership. Following the 1978 parliamentary general election, Datuk Ling Being Siong who had led the SCA at the time of its dissolution and who had joined the SUPP, was expelled by SUPP's Central Committee for unspecified reasons. He himself resigned from the SUPP on July 25, 1978, after explaining that he had originally joined the SUPP only at the behest of the Chief Minister, Datuk Rahman Yakub. He added that he was leaving the party because its leadership was "unable to exert itself sufficiently to repair a breach of party discipline by committing itself wholeheartedly to the cause of Malaysian Chinese unity within the framework of national unity and independence." (Sarawak Herald, July 29, 1978; Borneo Post, July 29, 1978). Datuk Ling did not explain what he meant by the breach of discipline.
22. In 1967 he had supported the National Language Bill. On July 10, 1969, as Federal Minister of Education, he announced a new education policy in which the medium of instruction was to be Malay, the National Language. This was an important change of policy and the abrupt and strong-willed manner in which the minister had instituted the change annoyed even his cabinet colleagues (Karl von Vorys, Democracy Without Consensus (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), pp.396-398).
23. Sarawak Tribune, April 25, 1972.
24. Speaking at the opening of the Malaysian Parliament on February 22, 1971, the Yang Dipertuan Agung (Paramount Ruler) outlined the government's programme for the 1970's. High on the list of priorities was what was termed as "national harmony". What this entailed became clear the next day when the government tabled the Constitutional Amendment Bill in which the entrenchment of Malay dominance was proposed as a pre-requisite for the National Alliance leadership in ensuring national unity. In Sarawak the major thrust of the Sarawak Coalition Government was to integrate Sarawak into Malaysia. See, for instance, Sarawak Tribune, January 24, 1971.

25. Under the Federal Constitution, Islam is the national religion but the states of Sarawak and Sabah were to enjoy freedom of religion. This proviso did not prevent Muslim chief ministers in the Borneo states from actively working to convert non-Muslims to Islam, however. In Sabah while Tun Mustapha was Chief Minister such conversions occurred en masse. In addition, many Christian missionaries were expelled from the state. (Stanley Bedlington, Malaysia and Singapore, op. cit., pp.138-139.)
26. Late in 1970 SNAP called for a Commission of Inquiry on religious prosecutions in Sarawak (Sarawak Tribune, December 20, 1970).
27. There is evidence to indicate that SNAP struck a sympathetic chord among Sarawakians here. Early in January 1973, evidently not satisfied with the progress of religion in the state, the Sarawak Coalition Government (or the Sarawak State Government) announced that it would co-ordinate the dakwah (missionary) activities of Muslim workers. However, enough communal resentment had surfaced that by September the government had to back-track and deny that it was practicing religious discrimination against non-Muslim organisations.
28. Malay control was evident from the start. The Chief Minister was made President of Sabrekas, and another Malay, Safri Awang Zaidell, and executive in the Chief Minister's Office, was the Secretary-General. The purpose of Sabrekas was to "instill in its members a sense of devotion and undivided loyalty to Malaysia" (Sarawak Tribune, April 1, 1973).
29. For instance, the Red Cross was changed to Red Crescent. The crescent is a symbol of Islam. Further, as part of Sarawak's celebration to mark its tenth year of independence, the well-known state flag was replaced by another, which, except for the order in colours, resembled the Czechoslovakian flag. Cynics at the time remarked quite unfairly that the "Y" pattern of the flag stood for Yakub, the name of the Chief Minister. For an account of Sarawak's tenth anniversary celebrations, see ibid., August 31, 1973.
30. Its purpose was to "promote the local adat law, customs, traditions, and culture of the Natives of Sarawak" with the view to reduce these into a uniformed and standardised code form and become Native Customary Laws and Customs. Sarawak Majlis Adat Istiadat "Information on the Establishment and Functions of the Majlis Adat Istiadat," Kuching, Sarawak: typewritten, undated p.3.
31. Sarawak Tribune, June 11, 1973.
32. Ibid., April 10, 1974.
33. He is still an ordained minister (The Vanguard, November 2, 1976). In the parliamentary election of 1974 Balan Seling defeated Stephen Wan Ullok, a lawyer, in the Baram constituency.
34. Ibid.
35. Sarawak Tribune, July 18, 1974.

36. The information for this and the following pages was provided by SNAP's Headquarters, Juching. During the election period in 1974 SNAP circulated its Manifesto in the form of a leaflet. For a full text, ibid., August 14, 1974
37. Ibid.
38. Most of Sarawak communist elements came from the Chinese community. The presence of communist terrorists has always been interpreted by some party leaders as signs of Chinese discontent, not so much as a true front of national liberation.
39. See, for instance, Syed Hussein Alatas "The Politics of Coalition in Malaysia," Current History Vol. 63 (July-December 1972), pp. 271-277. See also R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, "Malaysia Today," Current History, Vol. 65 (July-December, 1972), pp. 262-275; R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Politics and Government in Malaysia, op. cit., pp. 185-228.
40. In West Malaysia the ruling Alliance could only obtain 66 parliamentary seats out of 103, whereas previously (in 1964) it had captured 89 out of 104 seats. In percentage terms, the Alliance received 48.5% of the total votes in 1969, while the opposition had a total of 51.6%. See K.J. Ratnam and R.S. Milne, "The 1969 Parliamentary Election in West Malaysia," Pacific Affairs, Vol. XLIII, No. 2 (Summer 1970) p.220; R.K. Vasil, The Malaysian General Elections of 1969 (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1972); Karl von Vorvys, Democracy Without Consensus, op. cit., pp.249-308.
41. In addition to Selangor [where Kuala Lumpur was situated before the creation of the Federal Territory] disturbances also ensued in the following states: Penang, Perak, Nengri Sembilan, Malacca, Johore, and Trengganu. By the government's own admission there were a total of 196 deaths and 259 injured. Government of Malaysia, The May 13th Tragedy, a Report (Kuala Lumpur: National Operations Council, 1969) pp.88-90. For other accounts of the riots, see John Slimming, Malaysia: Death of a Democracy (London: John Murray, 1963); Goh Cheng Taik, The May Thirteenth Incident and Democracy in Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1971).
42. The Chief of the NOC was Tun Abdul Razak, then Malaysia's Deputy Prime Minister. Until his resignation on September 22, 1970, the Prime Minister was still Tenku Abdul Rahman, but following his departure, Tun Abdul Razak was appointed by the Yang Dipertuan Agung in his stead.
43. See, for example: R.S. Milne, "National Ideology and Nation-Building in Malaysia," Asian Survey, Vol. 10, No. 7 (July, 1970) pp.563-573; Syed Hussein Alatas, "The Rukunegara and the Return of Democracy" Pacific Community (Tokyo), Vol. 2, No. 4 (July, 1971) pp.800-808.

44. The Malaysian Parliament met on February 23, 1970, some twenty months after the declaration of emergency. The return to democracy was somewhat tempered by the fact that as the price of the return to democracy, the Alliance demanded restrictions on the discussion of certain sensitive subjects.
45. Marvin L. Rogers, "Malaysia and Singapore: 1971 Developments," op. cit., p. 169. See also Karl von Vorys, Democracy Without Consensus, op. cit., pp. 386-438.
46. On the formation of the Barisan Nasional governments see: Syed Hussein Alatas, "The Politics of Coalition in Malaysia," op. cit., pp. 271-277; M.G.G. Pillai, "A Wider Alliance," Far Eastern Economic Review, June 3, 1972, p. 13; M.G.G. Pillai, "A National Front", ibid., December 30, 1972, pp. 22-23; Harvey Stockwin, "Variations on the Status Quo," ibid., August 16, 1974, pp. 28-29. The best analysis of the Barisan Nasional is by R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Politics and Government in Malaysia, op. cit., pp. 123-228.
47. So circumspect was the approach to SNAP that it is not known who was contacted first. The reason for such care may have been because the federal politicians were only too aware of Datuk Ningkan's volatility. True, since 1969 Ningkan had shown certain willingness for a rapprochement with federal politicians, but there was no certainty that he would have supported the overture to join the BN.

Based on the proximity of SNAP's Members of Parliament to the federal politicians, it seemed likely that the members of SNAP's parliamentary caucus were approached first. Regardless of who was first, contact among the most ardent supporters of the idea that SNAP join the BN was Leo Moggie and, from the state level, Datuk Dunstan Endawie. They are SNAP's Secretary-General and President respectively. From the government's side the proponents were Ghazali Shafie, Minister of Home Affairs, Ghafar Baba, NB's Secretary General, and UMNO's Vice-President, and Taib Mahmud, the present Minister of Defence. Both men held discussions with SNAP's leaders in Sarawak.

That Taib Mahmud was a major figure in arranging for SNAP to join the BN might appear as a surprise to those who were aware of the blood relationship between him and the Chief Minister. Taib Mahmud is a nephew of Datuk Rahman Yakub. He was known to be distressed at the strong-willed manner in which the Chief Minister was governing the state. Indeed, after the 1974 general elections it was rumoured that Taib Mahmud was willing to challenge Datuk Rahman Yakub for the position of Chief Minister in the state. The Federal Government and SNAP were reportedly willing to support Taib Mahmud. However, nothing came out of this alleged plot.

48. M.G.G. Pillai, "Malaysia," Asia 1965 Year Book, (Hong Kong: Far Eastern Economic Review, 1975), p. 215.
49. Composed mostly of Sarawakian Chinese, PARAKU owes its origin to the communist guerillas of the early 1960's. Allied with Indonesian armed forces regulars and "volunteers" the communists formed a field force named the Tentara Nasional Kalimantan Utara (TNKU). It was the TNKU which coordinated and executed the Borneo operations of President Sukarno (of Indonesia) policy of "Confrontation", the name given for his armed campaign to destroy Malaysia. Following Sukarno's downfall, General Suharto took over power in Indonesia and by 1966 "Confrontation" had been terminated. With the advent of peace between Malaysia and Indonesia, the Indonesian armed forces turned against their former ally, who by now had reformed itself into PARAKU. Thus by 1967 PARAKU had found itself attacked from both sides of the border in Borneo. However, it was not until 1974 that they agreed to an amnesty; and even then only just over 500 guerillas took the opportunity to return home. Although estimates vary, at least that many may still prefer to wage war from the jungle. The literature on "Confrontation" is voluminous. The best work is by J.A.C. Mackie, Kronfrontasi: the Indonesia-Malaysia Dispute 1963-1966 (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1974; other works include R. Snow Jr., "A Comparative Analysis of Confrontation as an Instrument of Indonesian Foreign Policy" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1973); H. Warhowsky, "From Confrontation to Cooperation" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arizona, 1974). On communist and guerilla activities in Sarawak see, for instance: J. van der Kroef, "Communist guerilla war in Sarawak," World Today, Vol. 20 (January-December, 1964), pp. 50-60; M.G.G.Pillai, "Sarawak: Putting Trust to Test," Far Eastern Economic Review, March 25, 1974, pp. 28-29.
50. Excerpts from the transcript of a speech given by Datuk Endawie over Radio Malaysia, Sarawak, March 31, 1976. See also Sarawak Vanguard, April 1, 1976.
51. Ibid.
52. Tra Zehnder, a member of SNAP's Central Executive Committee, who served at one time as a member of the Council Negri, informed this student that another reason for the delay of the meeting was that SNAP had difficulty in getting enough funds for the purpose.

53. Edmund Langgu, who had served as Secretary General from 1963 agreed to step down as SNAP's Secretary General. He also tried to convince Datuk Ningkan to relinquish his position as the party's Chairman, but the crusty party leader refused. When the results of the competition for the post of SNAP's President came out, Ningkan received only 39 votes while his challenger, Datuk Endawie, had 96.
54. The information for this section was provided by Edmund Langgu, who remained as a member of SNAP's Executive Committee after stepping down as its Secretary General. In 1975 when SNAP was considering the federal invitation to join the BN, he was serving as Leader of the Opposition in the Malaysian Parliament.
55. How quickly this could happen, of course, depends partly on the activities of the SUPP and PBB. For instance, in July, 1978, the Chief Minister, Datuk Rahman Yakub, let it be known that he intended to apply for the PBB's admission to UMKO, the dominant Malay political organisation in Malaysia. It was rumoured that Datuk Rahman was keenly aware of support which the federal government was giving to Pajar, a new native based party formed in 1977. By moving closer to UMNO, it was reported that Datuk Rahman thought that he could re-establish good relations with the Central Government once again.

Many PBB Dayal leaders were rumoured to be against this move. Those in Engkilili and Simanggang threatened to resign from the PBB and join SNAP.
56. Datuk Abdul Rahman Yakub's strong-willed attitude irked even federal politicians. See, for instance, K. Das, "Reconciliation of Sorts," Far Eastern Economic Review, November 26, 1977; K. Das, "The Resignation that Never Was," Ibid., October 27, 1978.
57. Michael B. Leigh, The Rising Moon, op. cit., p. 118.
58. The charges against Datuk James Wong and his fellow detainees were never made public. According to some sources, the allegations against him centered on his position regarding Brunei's claim to the Fifth Division of Sarawak. Datuk James Wong, who has extensive business connections with the British protectorate of Brunei, had refused to condemn the Brunei claim, an act which the Chief Minister, Datuk Rahman Yakub, brought into the open frequently prior to the general elections of 1974. Based on Datuk Rahman's allegations then, the charge against Datuk James Wong was that he was working against the national interest since he has refused to condemn the Brunei claim. On Datuk Rahman Yakub's allegations, see Sarawak Tribune, April 1, 1976.

59. Sarawakian Digest, Vol. 2, No. 1 (March, 1976), p. 6. The Sarawakian Digest is the publicity organ of the Sarawak National Party.
60. Ibid.
61. See, for instance, Philip Bowring, "Malaysia: No Time for Socialism," Far Eastern Economic Review, July 30, 1976.
62. Sarawakian Digest, Vol. 2, No. 1 (March, 1976), p. 5. See also, Sarawak Tribune, July 18, 1974.
63. According to one source, a Member of Parliament has the authority to dispense up to \$50,000 annually for development projects within his own constituency; members with ministerial rank may award up to \$100,000.
64. Datuk Endawie hinted that this was an issue during the talks about SNAP joining the BN. Upon announcing SNAP's acceptance, he made it clear that SNAP would remain as a separate multi-racial organisation. (Excerpt from a speech over Radio Malaysia, Sarawak, on March 31, 1976).

CHAPTER VIII

BASES OF SUPPORTBases of Support 1961-1965

SNAP's bases of sources of support lie in the appeal and popularity of the party and the ethnic composition of its leaders, members, and representatives. To arrive at a sound conclusion, what should be examined are the party's membership, the development of its branch organisation, and its performance during elections. The information from these three categories should provide a reliable indication of SNAP's ethnic and regional sources of support.

In researching the information on SNAP's membership, it has not been possible to arrive at an exact figure. The reason for this is because the concept of party membership in Sarawak is nebulous; that is, it is not uncommon for voters to join more than one party. In short, the practice of multiple party membership is quite widespread. The direct implication of this sort of practice on data gathering is that membership lists provided by political parties, including SNAP, are invariably unreliable. In addition, SNAP itself has published from time to time only the totals of its claimed membership. At no point has it offered for scrutiny any ethnic breakdown of its party membership.

In examining the development of party branches throughout Sarawak, the aim is to establish a pattern which would suggest that SNAP was organising in, say, Dayak areas more than anywhere else. The last two sets of evidence (on membership and branch development) are useful to indicate SNAP's ethnic and regional sources of support. The other set of evidence is SNAP's electoral performance. During this period there was only one state-wide election in Sarawak. A finding from the electoral results which shows that SNAP received the bulk of its support from the Iban community of the Dayak group points to the conclusion that, judged solely by its performance, SNAP was not so much an ethnic party, as a sub-communal or an Iban one. Obviously at this stage it had yet to become an all-Sarawak party.

Evidence of Size

As a party SNAP only rarely published its total membership. The earliest known instance was on March 27, 1962, a year after its inauguration, when its leaders, appearing before the Cobbold Commission gave the party's membership at 46,000.¹ In its turn the Commission questioned the accuracy of the figure, saying that "based on information from reliable sources... the active membership probably falls substantially short of this figure."² Regardless of

whether the figure was inflated or not, SNAP released another one three months later, this time elevating it to 50,818.³ By September 1962 it claimed that its following had risen to 62,000.⁴ Since the figure was probably inflated, it is of little use for the purpose of analysis. Furthermore, the party did not indicate any ethnic breakdown of its members. This may have been the policy of the party; that SNAP refused to furnish any ethnic breakdown of its members is understandable, given the discrepancy between its goal of multi-racial membership--confirmed by its Constitution--and the reality at the time of the well-known Dayak preponderance amongst its membership. To supply an ethnic breakdown of its members was to give documentation to this discrepancy, something its leaders were loath to do. Thus, when a newspaper alleged that SNAP was actually an Iban party, Ningkan angrily retorted that it was multi-racial.⁵

Another indicator of the basis of party support is derived from the growth of party branches. The validity of this evidence is based on the premise that as a party SNAP would organise in areas which it wished to represent and where it hoped to receive support most easily.

Based on the presumption that in a plural society a party would organise first in its own terminal community where ethnic political leaders (Iban in this case) could expect the primordial sentiments of the Iban to be translated into political support, then SNAP could

be expected to establish branches first in Iban areas. In this way the formation of a branch in a particular area may be seen as part of a consistent political strategy of mobilizing political support where it would most likely arise. The table below seeks to establish the evidence that SNAP consistently sought support from Dayak areas, particularly Iban and to a lesser extent, Bidayuh ones. From the table below two conclusions may be drawn. First, the spread of SNAP's branches began in the Second Division, centering around the Saribas region, homeland of its founders, then on to parts of the First, Fourth and Fifth Divisions. Second, and more important, these branches were established in Dayak areas, particularly in the Iban-Dayak and rural territories. Clearly for the first half of the 1960's SNAP avoided the coast, predominated by the Malays, and the urban centres populated by the Chinese. Obviously SNAP preferred to organise in Iban and Bidayuh areas. In certain places SNAP was in clear competition with the other two political parties. For instance, by 1962 both the SUPP and PANAS had created their respective enclaves of support within the Bidayuh community. What is indicated by the Table below is that SNAP attached a real importance to the necessity of attracting Bidayuh's support. Among the first two branches, two were in Bidayuh areas. In 1965, of the four branches established that year, two were Bidayuh ones.

If SNAP's objective at the time was to popularize itself in the

SNAP's branches established from 1961 to 1965 by Divisions and Ethnic Areas

<u>Branch</u>	<u>Division</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Ethnic area</u>
Saka	Second	Apr. 10, 1961	Iban
Lower Paku	Second	May 15, 1961	Iban
Debak	Second	June 20, 1961	Iban
Stunggang	First	Aug. 30, 1961	Bidayuh
Piching	First	Aug. 21, 1961	Bidayuh
Ulu Undop	Second	Aug. 3, 1961	Iban
Samu, Paku	Second	Sep. 2, 1961	Iban
Dau	Second	Sep. 21, 1961	Iban
Tarat	First	Sep. 21, 1961	Iban
Serupai, Tatau	Fourth	Oct. 8, 1961	Iban
Tap, Bintulu	Fourth	Oct. 6, 1961	Iban
Pendan	Fourth	Oct. 11, 1961	Iban
Sebangat	Fourth	Oct. 14, 1961	Iban
Lutong	Fifth	Oct. 29, 1961	Iban
Merdang	First	Oct. 27, 1961	Iban
Tebedu	First	Oct. 24, 1961	Bidayuh
Sg. Tenggara	First	Oct. 6, 1961	Iban
Batu Empat	Second	Oct. 14, 1961	Iban
Upper Limbang	Fifth	Dec. 14, 1961	Iban
Lower Limbang	Fifth	Dec. 5, 1961	Iban
Padeh	Second	Feb. 12, 1962	Iban
Brit/Nibong	Fifth	Mar. 30, 1962	Iban
Sematong	First	Mar. 27, 1962	Iban
Sabelak	Second	Mar. 25, 1962	Iban
L. Sebuyau	Second	Mar. 28, 1962	Iban
L. Rimbas	Second	May 5, 1962	Iban
Pantu	Second	May 25, 1962	Iban
U. Rimbas	Second	May 24, 1962	Iban
U. Sebuyau	Second	May 22, 1962	Iban
U. Mukah	Fourth	July 27, 1962	Iban
Sebuti	Fourth	July 20, 1962	Iban
U. Oya	Fourth	Aug. 14, 1962	Iban
Ng. Tamin	Fourth	Aug. 16, 1962	Iban
L. Balingian	Fourth	Aug. 7, 1962	Iban
M. Balingian	Fourth	Aug. 5, 1962	Iban
U. Balingian	Fourth	Aug. 1, 1962	Iban
Sg. Telian	Fourth	Aug. 9, 1962	Iban
U. Anap	Fourth	Sep. 8, 1962	Iban
Ng. Drau	Second	Sep. 9, 1962	Iban
Mukah	Fourth	Dec. 15, 1962	Iban
Awek	Second	Dec. 12, 1962	Iban
Tinjar	Fourth	Dec. 22, 1962	Iban
Klua	Second	Dec. 12, 1962	Iban
M. Telian	Fourth	Dec. 15, 1962	Iban
Spak	Second	Jan. 1, 1962	Iban
L. Skrang	Second	Jan. 18, 1962	Iban
Simanggang	Second	Feb. 1, 1963	Iban
M. Embawang	Second	Feb. 1, 1963	Iban
Melupa	Second	Feb. 3, 1963	Iban
U. Krian	Second	Feb. 8, 1963	Iban
Ng. Drau	Second	Feb. 3, 1963	Iban
Tungkah Dayak	First	Feb. 15, 1965	Bidayuh
Skudup Chupak	First	Feb. 24, 1965	Bidayuh
Lundu	First	Oct. 30, 1965	Iban
Lubok Antu	First	Nov. 5, 1965	Iban

Dayak communities, as the case appears to be, its effort had mixed results. SNAP was only successful in certain Iban and Bidayuh communities. In accordance with the Ningkan-Jugah understanding, which established the spheres of influence for SNAP and Pesaka, SNAP was forbidden to expand into the Rejang Basin of the Third Division, where most Dayaks resided. This was a serious shortcoming in that as long as the Rejang remained impenetrable, SNAP's dream of communal solidarity remained unrealized.

Electoral Performance

The third evidence of support for SNAP was in its electoral performance. This will give an indication of support which SNAP received from the different ethnic groups, particularly the Dayaks and their sub-communal parts. The aim here is to identify the ethnic background of SNAP's elected representatives.

The general elections of 1963 were made possible through an accelerated programme of electoral and constitutional changes designed to equip Sarawak for self-government. The constitutional document was the Sessional Paper No. 2 of 1961, Electoral and Constitutional Advance, which was introduced before the Council Negri on November 1, 1961. It was this paper which extended universal franchise to all persons over the age of twenty-one. With the advent of the Malaysia proposal an Order-in-Council was published in

May 1963 increasing to thirty-six the number of elected representatives, as well as providing for a ministerial government. The election, however, was not a direct one. The procedure used was the "three tier system of election in Council Negri through District Councils and Divisional Advisory Councils."⁷

The actual polling was staggered, a necessary measure, given the difficulties created by rough terrain and inadequate facilities. It began in the middle of June and ended in mid-July. The overall result of the election was encouraging for the Alliance, if only because it attracted 137 out of 429 seats. Within the Alliance itself the distribution of elected councillors is shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Divisional Advisory
Councillors Classified According to
Party Allegiance, July, 1963

<u>Division</u>	<u>Parties</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>BARJASA</u>	<u>PESAKA</u>	<u>SNAP</u>	<u>SCA</u>	
First	8	2	8	1	19
Second	8	1	31	0	40
Third	10	43	0	3	56
Fourth	4	1	10	0	15
Fifth	5	0	2	0	7
Total	35	47	51	2	137

From the table above, SNAP's leading position--it had a total of fifty-

one councillor out of a total of 137 for the Alliance--is quite clear.

The election of these councillors was a prelude to the struggle for control of each district council which were scheduled to meet early in July to elect among themselves members to the Divisional Advisory Council (DAC). The DAC formed the second of three tiers of the elective government in the state; and a party which gained control of a DAC had the right to nominate the allotted members to the Council Negri, the uppermost tier in the elective government. Since the state-legislators were thus selected from each of the five DACs, having actual control over a DAC became critical to all parties. A fight soon arose over the control for the DAC's, and, since only half of the District Councils were dominated by any one of the parties, the other half remained contested ridings in which independents could tip the balance. SNAP gained thirty-three District Council seats, independents who had switched bringing its total to eighty-five. For the purpose of this paper the composition of this group becomes important, for it indicates what type of support SNAP was receiving at the time. Two important points should be noted at this stage. The first is among SNAP supporters were a sprinkling of non-Dayaks, a fact which proves that it was not a uni-ethnic organisation. The second point concerns the preponderance of Dayaks within SNAP. The table following lists the number of Dayak

councillors and those aligned with SNAP and the Pesaka, SNAP's only serious rival for the allegiance of the Dayaks.

Table 5⁸

Alignment of Dayak and Non-Dayak District Councillors by Political Parties (July 1963)

<u>Parties</u>	<u>Ethnic Groups</u>	
	<u>Dayak</u>	<u>Non-Dayak</u>
SNAP	78 (43.8)	7 (2.8)
Pesaka	63 (35.4)	2 (0.8)
Other Parties and Independents	37 (20.8)	242 (96.4)
Total	178 (100)	251 (100)

Note: All percentages in the table are rounded to the nearest decimal point.

From the above table it can be seen that, although SNAP was openly multi-racial in membership, it was able to attract only less than half of Dayak district councillors. Slightly more than a third of Dayak councillors supported Pesaka, the rest being divided among other parties (SUPP, PANAS, BARJASA and Independents). By Divisions SNAP's strength in August 1963 was as follows:⁹

<u>Division</u>	<u>Councillors</u>
First	10
Second	37
Third	13
Fourth	19
Fifth	6

Also of note is the source of its support within the Dayak community itself. This is not immediately discernible from the table, but the fact is that in all Divisions except the First, SNAP's councillors were mostly Ibans. If SNAP was ever to create a truly Dayak base, the support of non-Ibans would be critical, for within the Dayak community the largest sub-units after the Ibans were the Bidayuhs, Kenyahs, and Kayans. Altogether they accounted for 29 per cent of the Dayak population, their support was therefore necessary for a party which aspired to represent the Dayaks. In 1963 those Dayaks who did not support SNAP originated from two distinctive clusters of Ibans and non-Ibans. Included in the latter category were the majority of the Bidayuhs of the First Division and the Kenyahs and Kayans of the Third and Fourth Divisions. That is, most non-Iban Dayaks did not support SNAP in 1963. Based on this finding, SNAP's claim to be a Dayak party, let alone a Sarawak national party with support from all ethnic groups, had little foundation in fact.

The table also suggests the extent to which SNAP received Iban support. If the Ibans were significantly split for whatever reason, then this would indicate that SNAP's appeal was narrow indeed. In 1963 the Ibans were divided in their loyalties. Those who withheld their support from SNAP were from the Ulu Ai and the Rejang River basins. Their evident reluctance to support SNAP may have been a

carry-over from the time in the 19th Century when their ancestors had engaged in wars against the Saribas Ibans, the ancestors of SNAP founders. By 1963 the concomitant bad blood was reduced to mere mutual suspicion, but that was evidently sufficient to prevent the Ibans from uniting under one political organisation. Thus, while the Ibans of the Ulu Ai joined the Malay-led BARJASA, the Rejang Ibans followed their leaders into Pesaka. With such paucity of support from the two Iban regions, SNAP's strength was limited to the Batang Lupar and Kalaka Districts of the Second Division and, to some extent, to Mukah of the Third and Bintulu and Subis of the Fourth Division. Significantly, these areas had previously received an influx of Iban emigrants from the Second Division.¹⁰

The conclusion which should be made from the electoral results is that in 1963 less than half of Dayak support was given to SNAP. As well the party's basis of support was narrow since it was largely confined to the Ibans--and even here it was by no means unanimous. In 1963 SNAP was primarily a Second Division Iban party; as indicated by the narration above, it failed to win the confidence of the Ulu Ai and the Rejang Ibans as well as the majority of other Dayak groups such as the Bidayuhs, Kayans, and Kenyahs.

Expansion

Significantly, from 1963 to 1965 the expansion of SNAP's branches was almost at a standstill. Only six branches--Kuching,

Engkilili, Lubok, Antu, Mukah, and Skedup Chupak were opened during that period. One reason for this lack of activity was the fact that the official jobs of SNAP's party leaders fully preoccupied their time and afforded them little opportunity for partisan party affairs. More important, however, was the fact that SNAP was circumscribed in its expansion possibilities by the Pesaka-SNAP agreement not to encroach on each other's territories. As long as that agreement lasted, therefore, SNAP was mainly confined to the First and Second Divisions while Pesaka was free to operate in the Third Division with its large Dayak population. The problem for SNAP was that within its allotted area, the establishment of its branches among the Dayak communities was mostly completed by 1963. At that time thirty branches out of the grand total of forty-eight were concentrated in the Second Division. Thus, by 1963 SNAP had almost reached the territorial limit prescribed by its agreement with Pesaka. What made this situation unsatisfactory from SNAP's point of view was that it only had six Council Negri members. Moreover, so long as the agreement with Pesaka was in force, in the next elections SNAP had little prospect of increasing its share of elected representatives.

The assumption which this paper makes is that SNAP being a political party, its desire to build and to maintain electoral support was an ever pressing need. Since the general elections were

expected for 1967 or 1968, as the date came nearer, politicians and parties increasingly sought to improve and expand their electoral machinery. As the expected date came closer co-operation within the ruling alliance became more and more strained as parties began to compete and to improve their respective performance. This objective was a significant underlying consideration, but alone that pressure could not have accounted for the apparent haste with which SNAP undertook to add new branches. At the end of 1965, while SNAP was in government, the party abruptly resumed its expansion activities. The immediate impetus for SNAP's sudden interest in party-building was that it was forced to respond to an intra-Alliance challenge, namely BARJASA's and Pesaka's recruitments of the Bidayuhs in the First Division. Since SNAP regarded BARJASA as a Malay party and Pesaka as an interloper which was defying the Ningkan-Jugah understanding, its intervention at this time clearly indicates that it (SNAP) regarded BARJASA and Pesaka's initiatives as an intrusion into its preserve. The occasion of SNAP's intervention deserves mention, for it indicates the extent of SNAP's nationalism at the time.

In an unofficial visit to the Bidayuhs kampongs (villages) along the Simanggang-Serian Road (Maong, Skedup, Chupak, Tijirak, and Sidanau), Datuk Endawie, the Minister for Local Government and the party's Vice-Chairman urged the Bidayuhs to join SNAP. While he reiterated that SNAP was a multi-racial party which was not

assimilationist in its policy, and which stood for the separate existence, i.e., the "entity of all races,"¹¹ Datuk Endawie also introduced another element of SNAP's policy--that it would protect minority interests and condemn racial domination. The theme of this message was clear: the minority interests belong to the Dayaks. As far as Datuk Endawie was concerned, the Dayak peoples were one and therefore indivisible. The Land (Bidayuhs) and Sea (Ibans) Dayaks, he said,

resemble a fruit tree which has many roots but one trunk which produces the same leaves and fruit.¹²

If the minority interests belonged to the Dayak people, from what direction, then, did the dominant threat emanate? To SNAP there were two sources: the challenge from within Sarawak, particularly from those opposed to the party's policy of multi-racialism, and from outside the state, especially the federal government with whom the party has had some policy differences.

Datuk Endawie's response was a significant step in that for the first time since SNAP had become a member of the government a party spokesman came out in support of ethnic solidarity, now defined as the unity and political assertions of Dayaks. On the surface, the feature of ethnic unity amongst the Dayaks seemed to contradict the party's policy of multi-racialism. This was not the case, however, since a unified and dominant ethnic community could espouse its

version of the "national" Sarawakian policies. That is, Datuk Endawie's approach fell within the confines of SNAP's multi-racialism. The other point which should be made here is that with SNAP pushing to compete for support amongst the Bidayuh people, the party had served notice that it would no longer tolerate any effort by non-Dayaks (Chinese or Malays) to "poach" on Dayak territories as a means of bolstering their respective party membership.

The other stimulus for SNAP's party building came from within the Dayak community--namely the threat of Party Pesaka. Early in 1965 active leadership of the party was transferred from Temenggong Jugah to Thomas Kana who, like Ningkan, had spent considerable time in Brunei as a medical dresser. Kana embarked upon an aggressive expansion programme for Pesaka, obviously in anticipation of the general elections believed scheduled for 1967 or 1968. Pesaka's initiative created difficulties for SNAP in that Pesaka's emissaries, led by Penghulu (later Pengarah) Jinggut and Alfred Mason, were directed to promote Pesaka's cause into the Second Division, which did not encroach on SNAP's territory, since Penghulu Jinggut's delegation concentrated their effort in the Lubok Antu area which, although it had an Iban preponderance, gave support to BARJASA in 1963. In Lubok Antu, which was yet to have a SNAP branch, Pesaka started its own with the assistance of Tutong anak Ningkan who, like Mason, had just defected from BARJASA. Encouraged by this

success Pesaka next established a branch in Roban of the Kalaka District, in the area within SNAP's heartland. Clearly the Ningkan-Jugah agreement of non-intervention was being unilaterally violated by Pesaka. With the pact no longer binding, SNAP considered itself free to retaliate.

Starting from late 1966 SNAP was to expand the Rejang Basin, Pesaka's country.¹³ Datuk Ningkan himself contacted SNAP sympathizers from the Iban area; they had come to Kuching when he had been ousted early in the same year. But the person who was responsible for much of SNAP's success in the Rejang was Edmund Langgu, the M.P. for Saratok, who was then SNAP's secretary-general. It was his constituency which Pesaka directly threatened when it formed a branch in Roban. As early as 1964, Edmund Langgu had made surreptitious contacts with the Dayaks in the Mukah and Balingian areas of the Fourth Division as a contingency lest SNAP should expand there. After the crisis of 1966 these people were sought out again in order to build up support. In the Rejang Basin itself, Langgu helped to establish the Kapit branch where Kenneth Kanyan Koh was being groomed as a possible contender for leadership in the region. Kenneth Kanyan comes from a prominent Iban family: his father, Temenggong Koh, was Temenggong Jugah's predecessor as the paramount-chief of the Ibans. In Song, Edmund Langgu contacted Ngelambong Bangau, a charter member of the party from his Seria days, and in Kanowit the

local supporter was Councillor Matthew Simon. SNAP branches were established in both areas. The ease with which SNAP expanded into the Third Division may be explained by the fact that the party's secretary-general was given carte blanche to operate in the region and, untrammelled by directives, he deliberately sought reliable Ibans as local party workers.¹⁴

In summary, then, SNAP's expansion, which began in 1965, took place as a reaction to an intra-Alliance competition in party-building which itself had been precipitated by the prospect of the general elections believed scheduled for 1967 or 1968. Reacting to this challenge, the parties had scrambled to improve their respective electoral machines.¹⁵ In 1965 most of SNAP's efforts had been directed at winning the support of the Ibans and Bidayus in retaliation against BARJASA's initiatives. Of the four branches established that year, three were in the Bidayuh region. The fourth branch, opened after Pesaka's foray into the area, was in the Lubok Antu District.

The year which was momentous for SNAP, then, was 1965. This was the year in which its uneasy collaboration with Pesaka finally gave way to competition as both parties expanded themselves. The next year, remarkable because of another cabinet crisis or, more precisely, a recrudescence of the crisis which began in 1965, should be considered as part of this intra-Alliance competition. SNAP was ousted

by a native alliance between BARJASA and Pesaka with additional support wooed from a splinter group in PANAS.

In late 1965 SNAP began to seek support from all Sarawakians with the object of creating a genuinely multi-racial party. By the next year it had established a total of nineteen branches, ten of which were in non-Dayak areas. The year 1965 saw a new trend in SNAP's party building: the party had not only increased the number of its branches but it had also instituted a major shift by directing its effort for the first time to Chinese and Malay areas.¹⁷

Two points emerge from Table 6. The first is that from 1966 the party accelerated the party-building programme begun in 1965. The year 1966 saw the establishment of Chinese and Malay branches. The second point is that by the end of 1968 SNAP had established the last of its branches. Out of a total of 103 branches, 82 had been found in predominantly Dayak areas. SNAP had 11 branches in Malay-dominated territories and a total of ten in Chinese sections. Part of the reason for the predominance of branches in Dayak areas was the fact that, being inhabitants of Sarawak's rural areas, they had a poor system of communication and SNAP had to establish more branches in their areas (fewer in Chinese and Malay sections) in order to remain in contact with Dayak party members. But this aside, the major factor for the concentration of branches was that the Dayaks formed SNAP's terminal community.

SNAP's Branches established from 1966
to 1968 by Divisions and Ethnic Areas

<u>Branch</u>	<u>Division</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Ethnic Area</u>
Engkilili	Second	Mar. 7, 1966	Iban
Kuching	First	May 27, 1966	Chinese
Lubok Antu	Second	July 22, 1966	Iban
Limbang Proper	Fifth	July 25, 1966	Chinese
Upper Limbang	Fifth	Aug. 8, 1966	Murut/Bisayah
Bintulu Proper	Fourth	Oct. 24, 1966	Chinese
Kg. Gita	First	Nov. 1, 1966	Malay
Tatau	Fourth	Nov. 8, 1966	Iban
Upper Tatau	Fourth	Nov. 10, 1966	Iban
Kapit	Third	Dec. 5, 1966	Iban
Kanawit	Third	Dec. 11, 1966	Iban
Mekir, Sarekei	Third	Dec. 19, 1966	Iban
Sarekei Proper	Third	Dec. 19, 1966	Chinese
Ikatan Tujoh	First	Dec. 21, 1966	Malay
Kg. Datu, Sibul	Third	Dec. 21, 1966	Malay
Julau (Wak)	Third	Dec. 29, 1966	Iban
Binatang	Third	Dec. 5, 1966	Chinese
Sibu	Third	Dec. 11, 1966	Chinese
Song	Third	Dec. 15, 1966	Chinese
Siol Kandis	First	Jan. 1, 1967	Chinese
Pakan	Third	Feb. 1, 1967	Iban
Entanggor	First	Feb. 1, 1967	Iban
Saberang Ulu	First	Feb. 27, 1967	Malay
Kedap, Upper	First	Mar. 17, 1967	Bidayuh
Riih Tabekang	First	Mar. 17, 1967	Bidayuh
Daro	Third	Apr. 19, 1967	Malay
Lawas	Fifth	Apr. 19, 1967	Kenyah/Kayan
Tj. Bundong	First	May 10, 1967	Malay
Sg. Anap	Fourth	June 5, 1967	Iban
Kg. Murut	First	June 7, 1967	Bidayuh
Miri	Fourth	June 22, 1967	Chinese
Kg. Beladin	Second	July 3, 1967	Malay
Kg. Benuk	First	July 5, 1967	Bidayuh
Spaoh Melayu	Second	Aug. 10, 1967	Malay
Jagoi	First	Aug. 15, 1967	Bidayuh
Balai Ringgin	First	Sep. 14, 1967	Iban
Kg. Baru, Serian	First	Sep. 21, 1967	Bidayuh
Machan	Third	Oct. 19, 1967	Iban
Batu Danau	Fifth	Nov. 7, 1967	Iban
Marudi	Fourth	Aug. 5, 1967	Kenyah
Debak Proper	Second	Dec. 16, 1967	Chinese
Bario	Fourth	Feb. 6, 1968	Kelabit
Pusa	Second	Feb. 7, 1968	Malay
Kg. Buntal	First	May 14, 1968	Malay
Kabong	Second	July 15, 1968	Malay
Sampun/Grungang	First	Oct. 17, 1968	Bidayuh
Tinjar, Baram	Fourth	Dec. 12, 1968	Iban

Leadership

Another useful indicator of SNAP's support at different times is suggested by the composition of its Central Executive Committee (CEC).¹⁸ Initially the CEC was wholly Iban, but in the second year of its existence an Indian who had married an Iban from Betong was inducted as Publicity Officer. In the next couple of years the leadership remained very much the same, but by 1964 two Chinese were added to the CEC and the following year yet another. Thus by 1965, though SNAP's CEC was still an Iban preserve it had an influential Chinese component. In 1966, in a change that was also reflected in the growth of its branches, SNAP increased the number of CEC non-Ibans to two Malays and five Chinese. By 1969, the year that the general election was suspended, the constitution of the CEC was 62% Dayak, 17% Malays, 19% Chinese, and 2% "Others".

After the 1970 general elections, the party acted to streamline its organisation. In particular, its too-heavy CEC was drastically cut from the official figure of 77 to 12. The reduction in the size of the CEC was instituted to make it more manageable than previous ones. Since the new body was to be elected for a period of three years instead of a one-year period as with previous CECs, the costly practice of holding annual general meetings was

also avoided. In a sense, apart from the numerical reduction in the composition of the CEC and the introduction of the National Council, little else appeared to have changed. Dayaks still predominated, and Chinese and Malays were represented in both bodies.

Table 7¹⁹

Racial Breakdown of SNAP's CEC
Members from 1965 to 1978

<u>Period</u>	<u>Ethnic Groups</u>				<u>Total</u>
	<u>Dayaks</u>	<u>Malays</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Others</u>	
1965-66	15 (83.3)	- -	3 (16.7)	- -	18 (100)
1966-67	21 (70.0)	2 (6.7)	7 (23.3)	- -	30 (100)
1967-68	32 (64.0)	7 (14.0)	11 (22.0)	- -	50 (100)
1968-69	29 (61.7)	8 (17.0)	9 (19.2)	1 (2.1)	47 (100)
1969-70	44 (57.1)	11 (14.3)	21 (27.3)	1 (1.3)	77 (100)
1970-71	41 (56.9)	11 (15.3)	19 (26.4)	1 (1.4)	72 (100)
1971-72	41 (58.6)	11 (15.7)	17 (24.3)	1 (1.4)	70 (100)
1972-75	7 (58.3)	2 (16.7)	2 (16.7)	1 (8.3)	12 (100)
1975-78	10 (83.4)	1 (8.3)	1 (8.3)	- -	12 (100)

Note: The figures in brackets denote percentages.

Below the CEC was the National Council which was created in 1972 as part of SNAP's reorganisation.²⁰

Table 8²⁰

Racial Breakdown of SNAP's National
Council from 1972 to 1978

<u>Period</u>	<u>Ethnic Groups</u>				<u>Total</u>
	<u>Dayaks</u>	<u>Malays</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Others</u>	
1972-75	25 (64.1)	7 (17.9)	6 (15.4)	1 (2.6)	39 (100)
1975-78	26 (66.6)	3 (7.7)	9 (23.1)	1 (2.6)	39 (100)

In another sense there were important changes, particularly in the fluctuations of ethnic strengths in the CEC. For two reasons, the pivotal year was 1970. First, it marked the general elections which resulted in the "1970 Debacle" and which, in its turn, led to the hostility of SNAP's leaders against their counterparts in the SUPP. Second, it appeared that after 1970 the antagonism of party leaders permeated even to the delegates of SNAP's general assemblies--at least when it came to the election of CEC members. This "spill-over" effect manifested itself in the diminishing proportions of Chinese members being elected to the CEC. This trend is evident in Table 7. For instance in 1969, before the general elections, Chinese members had reached a high of 27.3 per cent of SNAP CEC for the period 1969 to 1970. After the elections the Chinese proportion declined steadily so that by 1978 it was at its lowest point, 8.3 per cent, since the active recruitment of Chinese membership began in the middle of the 1960's. In contrast Dayak and Malay members rose gradually, although the proportion of the latter declined during the period 1975 to 1978--that is, the period

after the 1974 general elections.

The data for SNAP's National Council also revealed a decline in the Malay sector for the period 1975 to 1978. In contrast to the decline in the number of Chinese members of the CEC, there was a rise in the Chinese percentage from the ethnic breakdown of the National Council: in the 1972-1975 period the Chinese proportion was 15.4% but for the succeeding period (1975 to 1978) the figure was 23.1%. What the rise seems to indicate was that although SNAP's antagonism to the SUPP resulted in the reduction of the Chinese proportion in the all-important CEC, the party was willing to accommodate its Chinese supporters--albeit, by concentrating their representatives in the less powerful National Council. Further, it should be pointed out that the Dayak group retained its preponderance in both the CEC and the National Council.

In addition to SNAP's Central Executive Committee, another tier of SNAP's leadership was its branch organisation. In contrast to the CEC, elections to the executive committees of party branches were not on an annual basis. For the year 1974 the ethnic composition of SNAP's branch executives was as follows:

Dayak	1532 (81.7%)
Malay-Melanau	274 (14.6%)
Chinese	69 (3.7%)

In addition, from a total of 1532 Dayak members, only 178 (11.3%)

possessed the traditional leadership status of Tuai Rumah or Penghulu. The information here indicates not only the preponderance of Dayak members in its branch organisation, but also the dominance of non-traditional Dayak leaders as branch executives.

Several points emerged from the survey of SNAP's leadership. First, there was the persistence of Dayak dominance. In the periods when SNAP emphasised Dayak solidarity, which were before 1966 and after 1975, the proportions of Dayaks in the CEC was very high, at over 83 percent. In the intervening years, when SNAP advocated multi-racialism, there was an infusion of Malays and Chinese into its organisation. The influx of non-Dayaks into SNAP was reflected by the composition of its CEC where, in 1970 to 1971 for instance, the Dayak proportion dropped to its lowest level ever, at 56.9 percent. The rest of the CEC was composed of Chinese and Malay members. Secondly, after 1975 the control of the party shifted from the Saribas Ibans to those from the Krian and the Rejang areas. Concurrent with the transfer of power was the renewed emphasis on Dayak solidarity. Lastly, it should be noted that the ascendancy of the new group did not lead to a rejection of SNAP's multi-racial membership. Indeed, as was evident in the negotiations for SNAP's entry into the BN, the party was determined to retain its non-Dayak support. To this end, the disenchantment of SNAP's leaders with the Chinese-based SUPP after 1970 only contributed to their determination to keep, not to abandon, SNAP's existing Chinese and Malay members.

Electoral Performance 1970 and 1974

SNAP's clamour for a general election began in 1966 at a time when the Ningkan administration was faced with a constitutional crisis. After its withdrawal from the Sarawak Alliance SNAP repeatedly demanded an election. In Sabah, which entered Malaysia at the same time as Sarawak, just such an election was held in April of 1967. But in Sarawak, the election date was delayed to a point where a constitutional amendment had to be passed in the Dewan Raayat in order that the state elections be held at the same time as the parliamentary ones.²¹ The ostensible reason for the delay was a bureaucratic one in that the Malaysian Election Commission Report took time to prepare and was not presented to Parliament until May 1968. The leaders of SNAP, however, were convinced that the delay was an attempt to afford the badly-divided Sarawak Alliance time to shore up its own support.²²

As had been the case in 1963, the difficult terrain meant that the elections had to be staggered over a period of several weeks, whereas in West Malaysia they took place in one day. Thus when festering dissatisfaction with the electoral results in West Malaysia broke out into racial riots,²³ the elections in Sarawak had hardly begun. The aftermath of the riots was that an "Emergency" was declared and executive control of government assumed by a National Operations Council (NOC), which had civil and military members. One of the first

acts of the NOC was to suspend the elections in Sarawak and Sabah.

The suspension was a financial strain to SNAP, which had to rely on private donations to run its organisation;²⁴ in addition, it was probably politically damaging since the delay also meant that the Sarawak Alliance was given even more time to reorganise. Moreover, since the suspension of elections also brought a ban on campaigning, SNAP was robbed of a potent vehicle by which the party had disseminated its ideas. By contrast, the Sarawak Alliance, being assisted by the federal government, was neither short of funds nor affected unduly by the suspension. Indeed, for Sarawak electors the very act of suspending the elections demonstrated the superiority of the federal government, an act which undoubtedly caused many voters to reappraise their support for SNAP. The general elections were finally reset for June 1970, but the ban on campaigning remained.

SNAP's electoral performance in the state elections was disappointing in that it failed to achieve even a simple majority-- with its twelve seats it needed thirteen more to do so. Moreover, the party's total vote was much smaller than its publicized membership. In 1970 SNAP claimed that it had 105,000 members, but in the general elections for that year it attracted a total of 61,210 votes for the state legislature, a difference of nearly 43,790. Not all of the difference could be attributed to SNAP's notorious proclivity to inflate its membership, although without doubt this was a factor. At

the same time, however, it should be remembered that the ban on campaigning and the party's problems with funding were also factors which, though they could not be measured, undoubtedly led to some withdrawal of support from SNAP.

Compared with its performance in 1963, SNAP had developed from being an Iban-based party whose foundation was the Second Division to a multi-ethnic organisation having support in all five divisions. The first evidence of this broad appeal could be seen in its slate of candidates.

Table 9²⁵

Sarawak General Elections, 1970; State and Parliamentary
Candidates in SNAP by Ethnic Groupings

<u>Ethnic Group</u>	<u>Elections</u>			
	<u>State</u>		<u>Parliamentary</u>	
	Contested	Elected	Contested	Elected
Iban)	22 (47)	8 (67)	11 (48)	5 (56)
Bidayuh)	4 (8)	2 (17)	1 (4)	1 (11)
Kayan) Dayak 61%	1 (2)	- -	1 (4)	1 (11)
Kenyah)	1 (2)	1 (8)	- -	- -
Murut)	1 (2)	- -	- -	- -
Malay/Melanau	6 (13)	- -	3 (13)	1 (11)
Chinese	12 (26)	1 (8)	6 (27)	1 (11)
Other	- -	- -	1 (4)	- -
Total	47 (100)	12 (100)	23 (100)	9 (100)

The majority of SNAP's candidates, some 53 per cent for both state and parliamentary elections, were non-Ibans. The preponderance of non-Iban candidates in 1970 indicates that SNAP was successful in attracting a multiracial list of candidates. True, not all of its candidates had been elected, but the point is that unlike during the 1963 general elections SNAP's list of candidates included all of Sarawak's major communal groups.

Table 10²⁶

Sarawak General Elections, 1970; Elected State
Representatives by Parties and Ethnic Groupings

<u>Communal Groups</u>	<u>Parties</u>					
	SNAP	Pesaka	Bumi*	SUPP	SCA	Independent
Iban)	8	7	-	-	-	1
Bidayuh)	2	-	-	-	-	-
Kayan } Dayak	-	-	-	1	-	-
Kenyah)	1	-	-	-	-	-
Murut)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malay/Melanau	-	1	12	-	-	-
Chinese	1	-	-	11	3	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	12	8	12	12	3	1

* Partai Bumiputera

From the composition of its successful candidates it is clear that in 1970 SNAP was substantially multi-ethnic.²⁷ In contrast, the other

political parties were uni-ethnic except for two instances--one in which Pesaka had one Malay representative, another in which the SUPP had a Kayan. These two members, however, were exceptions to the rule, and the operating factor in their party affiliations was personal. Therefore, other than SNAP, no other party had a genuine mix of elected representatives.

In addition to SNAP's list of successful candidates, then, the evidence of party support could be taken from its electoral success, namely the support which it received from each of Sarawak's ethnic groups. An indication is the coefficient of correlation between each party and ethnic votes. In this paper what has been used is the Pearsonian (product moment) measurement which finds the strength of association between two variables. The range is from +1.00 for perfect positive correlation to -1.00 for perfect negative correlation.

The data for the 1970 state general elections have been computed by Michael Leigh.²⁸ His findings for that year are reproduced below in order that they may be compared with the results of the 1974 state general elections.

Table 11

Coefficient of Correlation of Ethnic Composition of State
Constituencies with Votes Cast for Each Political Party:
1970

Ethnic Composition of Constituencies	1970				
	SNAP	PESAKA	BUMIPUTERA	SCA	SUPP
Malay/Melanau	-0.23	-0.39	0.91	0.52	-0.40
Dayak	0.53	0.44	-0.91	0.06	-0.36
Chinese	-0.47	-0.19	-0.08	-0.40	0.87

In this paper the primary focus is on SNAP and its association with each of the ethnic groups. At -0.23 its association with the Malay/Melanau group is not considered significant. What in effect it means is a lack of trend, an indication that Malays were split in their support for SNAP. A strong negative correlation at -0.47 existed between SNAP and the Chinese in 1970. During this election the Chinese preferred the SUPP, but in some urban constituencies where SNAP had Chinese candidates, many Chinese supported SNAP.

SNAP had a strong positive correlation with Dayak voters. At 0.53 its association with the Dayaks was better than that of Pesaka, which was at 0.44 . What this means roughly, is that in 1970 Dayaks preferred SNAP to Pesaka. In addition, Dayaks disliked Partai Bumiputera the most; at -0.91 there was an almost perfect negative correlation. In contrast to Pesaka, SNAP won seats in all the five divisions of Sarawak. As Leigh concluded: "In terms of pan-ethnic support SNAP was truly a Sarawak national party."²⁹

The General Elections of 1974

Nominations for Parliamentary and State Constituencies were slated for August 8, 1974. As was the case with the 1963 and 1970 elections, the difficult terrain and shortage of election personal meant that polling had to be staggered, this time throughout three weeks, from August 24 to September 7.

Presuming that SNAP was a Dayak based party, it is reasonable to assume that it would have fielded more Dayaks than Chinese or Malay candidates. This was indeed the case in both the State and Parliamentary Elections.

Table 12
Sarawak General Elections, 1970 and 1974;
Ethnic Breakdown of SNAP's Candidates

<u>Ethnic Group</u>	<u>State</u>		<u>Parliamentary</u>	
	1970	1974	1970	1974
Iban)	22	19	11	11
Bidayuh)	4	3	1	2
Kayan)	1	1	1	11
Kenyah)	1	1	-	-
Murut)	1	1	-	-
Malay/Melanau	6	8	3	2
Chinese	12	14	6	7
Others	-	-	1	1
Total	47	47	23	24

As the table above indicates, the Dayaks constituted the majority of SNAP's candidates for both elections. As well, both the Malays and Chinese had significant representation. In 1974 nearly one-third of the candidates were Chinese while only one-seventh were Malays.

In 1970 the slate of candidates was a national one in the sense that all the major ethnic groups were represented. The problem was that their percentage in SNAP's line-up was not in proportion to their

ethnic voting strength. In particular the Dayaks were over-represented. The figures for 1974 in this respect were only a marginal improvement since the proportion of Dayak candidates dropped from 61.7% in 1970 to 53.1% in 1974, a net reduction of 8.6%, while the Malay group had an increase of 5.7%, and the Chinese by 4.2% for the same period. The reduction in the Dayak sector made the 1974 slate of candidates a bit more proportional to the ethnic composition of electors. If SNAP was a national party in 1970, its list of candidates suggests that it was even more so in 1974. SNAP's hostility toward the SUPP did not result in a withdrawal of Chinese support. Additional evidence to support the argument of SNAP's cross-ethnic appeal was in the fact that several of its candidates ran in constituencies other than those dominated by their own respective ethnic group. Although no Malays ran in either Chinese or Dayak areas, four Chinese and one Dayak stood in Malay areas, while four Chinese contested the elections in Dayak ones.

Table 13³⁰

Sarawak State Elections, 1974; Votes Cast
and Members Elected by Parties

Political Party	Total Number of votes Received	Proportion of Votes Cast (in %)	Number of Members Elected
SNAP	111,438	42.8	18
B. Nasional	144,429	55.4	30
Independent	4,800	1.8	0
Total	260,730	100.0	48

The 1974 figure represents a very strong showing by SNAP. Compared with its performance in 1970, SNAP had increased its proportion of votes from 24.5% of the votes cast to 42.8%. It had a net gain of 50,228 votes in 1974 compared with its total votes in 1970.

SNAP failed to gain any seats in Malay areas, while the Barisan Nasional had 13, and SNAP won only one from Chinese dominated constituencies as opposed to seven for the Barisan Nasional. From its list of successful candidates it could be said that SNAP was more successful than the Barisan Nasional in attracting Dayak votes. In 18 constituencies where Dayaks predominated and where both sides fielded Dayak candidates, SNAP won 12 seats while the Barisan Nasional won six. It should be noted that 17 of SNAP's elected representatives were from Dayak areas compared to 10 for the Barisan Nasional. Clearly Dayaks preferred SNAP to Barisan Nasional. The importance of Dayak support is evident from the table below.

Table 14³¹

Coefficient of Correlation of Ethnic Composition of State Constituencies with Votes Cast for Each Political Party: 1974

Ethnic Composition of Constituencies	SNAP	BN
Malay/Melanau	-0.73	0.40
Dayak	0.66	-0.23
Chinese	-0.07	-0.06

In contrast to the data from the 1970 state elections, which showed a significant negative correlation (at $-.47$) between SNAP and Chinese voters, the data for 1974 revealed a lack of association (at $-.07$). Further, the correlation between the BN and the Chinese also showed a negative correlation at $-.06$. In short, compared to the findings for 1970 it appeared that the Chinese of Sarawak were split in their support for SNAP and the BN in 1974. In contrast to 1970, when Malay support for SNAP was statistically insignificant, the finding for 1974 showed a significant rise to a negative 0.73 . More important, there was a rise in Dayak support for SNAP over the 1970 figure. When the findings of Malays and Dayaks are compared it becomes obvious that there existed a deep cleavage between the two native groups. In general, Dayaks supported SNAP while Malays supported the BN.

The association between Dayaks and the BN showed a negative correlation, but at -0.23 the figure cannot be considered significant. In so far as the Pesaka-Bumiputera merger was designed to effect native unity it becomes obvious that the negative correlation --even a weak one--demonstrated the failure of Pesaka to "deliver" Dayak votes to the PBB. The real drama came in the actual winners and losers: in 1974 Sarawak's electors were faced with two contending elites from the Dayak community. When the results came out it became obvious that Sarawak's electors generally favoured

SNAP's Dayak candidates. Among those who ran on the BN slate and lost were Iban leaders such as Thomas Kana, Leonard Linggi Jugah, and Kenneth Kanyan Koh. There were also aspiring leaders such as Paul Anding and Douglas Sullang; both men had senior civil service posts before their resignations to take up politics. In the Bidayuh group, Michael Ben of SNAP defeated Dagok anak Raden, who had long been groomed by the BN as the leader of the Bidayuh community. Further, in the Kenyah/Kayan group, Balan Seiling of SNAP defeated Stephen Wan Ullok, a lawyer who originally came from the Baram District.

SNAP suffered the loss of Ningkan, who was defeated in his bids for the Layar state constituency and the Betong parliamentary seat. In addition, Datuk James Wong lost his parliamentary seat in the Miri-Subis constituency, although he managed to hang on to his state seat. The SUPP lost many of its traditional votes to SNAP. For instance, in the state constituency of Kuching Timor, SUPP's Secretary General, Stephen Yong, lost his bid for re-election to Lo Foot Kee of SNAP.

The party was eager to hold on to its gains after 1974; it insisted that it be allowed to retain the same number of seats in the next state elections. This insistence was a major irritant to both the SUPP and PBB and was the major contributing factor in the delay of several months before SNAP was finally admitted into the

Sarawak State Government.³³ In stark contrast to the difficulties which SNAP encountered at the state level, once SNAP had decided to join the government its entry into the BN at the federal level was a smooth and quick affair. Following a meeting of the party's National Council on March 21, 1976, a list of representatives was submitted to the Federal Government. These were Edmund Langgu, an Iban, and SNAP's senior Vice President; Luhah Wan, a Kayan and a member of its Central Executive Committee (CEC); and Patrick Anek Uren, a Bidayuh, and also a member of the CEC. On June 21, a Federal Cabinet reshuffle was brought about; Edmund Langgu was appointed to the post of Deputy Minister of Agriculture while Luhah Wan and Patrick Anek were appointed as Parliamentary Secretaries. In addition, SNAP also offered Wong Kee Nai, a young and wealthy timber merchant from Sibu as a senator. Thus, the recipients of SNAP's rewards were a multi-racial group of supporters, a fact which is consistent with the party's multi-racial image.

At the state level there was a delay of some six months from the time when SNAP had joined the BN, in June 1976, to the point when SNAP finally became a member of the Sarawak State Government. The Chief Minister had a ready explanation for the time gap. The delay, he said, was made necessary by the death of a state cabinet minister, Datuk Ajibah Abol.³⁴ According to him a mourning period for the late minister had to be observed in accordance with Malay

Table 15³²

Percentage Ethnic Composition of Each Constituency and Percentage
of Votes Cast in the 1974 Elections for Each Constituency

CONSTITUENCY	ETHNIC GROUPS				PARTIES		
	DAYAKS	MALAY	CHIN.	OTHERS	B.N.	SNAP	INDP.
1 Lundu	43.3	38.1	18.6	-	59.3	40.7	-
2 Bau	63.4	7.7	28.8	-	44.1	55.9	-
3 Kuching Barat	1.5	4.5	92	1	12.2	37.8	-
4 Kuching Timor	4.5	17	97.7	.7	42.7	57.3	-
5 Semariang	9.2	73.4	17.1	.3	78.8	18.4	18.4
6 Sekama	2.9	60.3	35.2	1.6	57	43	-
7 Sebandi	11.4	70.8	17.7	-	77.9	22.1	-
8 Muara Tuang	12	77.3	10.7	-	67	31.1	1.9
9 Batu Kawah	26.1	16.4	57.1	-	59.4	38.6	2
10 Bengoh	85	-	15	-	52.5	42.9	4.6
11 Tarat	60.5	12.3	27.2	-	49.7	39.9	10
12 Tebakang	90.2	5	4.8	-	44.3	47.7	7.9
13 Semera	19.7	71.2	9	-	68.1	31.9	-
14 Gedong	40.3	48.5	11.2	-	50.3	49.7	-
15 Lingga-Sebuyau	70.3	21.7	8	-	44	56	-
16 Simanggang	64.8	16.9	18.3	-	53.9	46.1	-
17 Engkilili-Skrang	84	1.3	14.7	-	42.3	57.7	-
18 Ulu Ai	97.8	4	1.8	-	46.4	53.6	-
19 Saribas	27.4	69.6	5	-	59.9	40.1	-
20 Layar	74.3	16.9	8.8	-	54.8	45.2	-
21 Kalaka	36.1	57.7	7.1	-	62.7	37.3	-
22 Krian	83.3	9.1	7.6	-	32	67.4	-
23 Kuala Rajang	22.8	70.5	6.7	-	78.1	21.9	-
24 Repok	24.6	1.9	73.7	-	59.1	40.9	-
25 Matu-Daro	16.4	79.1	4.5	-	89.2	10.8	-
26 Binatang	36	12.7	51.3	-	63	37	-
27 Sibu Tengah	2.2	9.3	88.5	-	55	44.5	-
28 Sibu Luar	6.6	20.7	72.7	-	64.1	35.9	-
29 Igan	44.7	19	36.3	-	66	34	-
30 Dudong	77.8	1.8	20.4	-	47	50.4	2.6
31 Balingian	37.8	52	10.2	-	76.2	23.8	-
32 Oya	27.5	64.2	8.3	-	61.5	38.5	-
33 Pakan	97.7	-	2.3	-	37.3	62.7	-
34 Meluan	94.2	-	5.8	-	32.9	67.1	-
35 Machan	69.4	3.7	26.9	-	46.7	53.3	-
36 Ngemah	95.7	-	4.3	-	32.9	46.5	20.6
37 Song	94.2	1.5	4.3	-	53.1	46.9	-
38 Pelagus	80.6	3.2	16.2	-	48.7	51.3	-
39 Baleh	99.9	-	-	-	44	56	-
40 Belaga	95.6	2.7	1.7	-	50.7	-	49.3
41 Tatau	71.5	23.4	5.1	-	47.4	55.3	-
42 Kemena	59.3	23.5	17.2	-	46.3	40.8	12.9
43 Subis	46.2	36.5	17.3	-	57.2	42.8	-
44 Miri	8.8	24.9	65.6	-	59.9	40.1	-
45 Marudi	72.9	10.2	16.9	-	39.4	60.8	-
46 Telang Usan	97.6	-	2.4	-	44.6	55.4	-
47 Limbang	44.4	35.4	20.2	-	39.7	57.5	2.8
48 Lawas	37.4	50.8	11.8	-	70.2	28.9	-

custom. In other words, instead of prompting a cabinet reshuffle at which time SNAP could have been admitted, the death of the minister was taken as an excuse to delay SNAP's entry.

Regardless of whether the mourning period had any consequence or not on the delay of SNAP's entry at the state level, it is necessary to offer an explanation for the six-months-gap. For one thing, the PBB, particularly the Iban faction, was fearful that SNAP's Dayak leaders would supplant them as the preferred Dayak representatives in the eyes of Sarawakians and the Federal Government. For another, there was the issue of seat distribution; the SUPP's lack of enthusiasm about SNAP's joining the Sarawak State Government came about because SUPP wanted a few seats which it regarded as its own but which had been captured by SNAP in 1974. In short, the delay in SNAP's entry at the state level was caused by resistance from within the PBB and the SUPP.

The 1978 Parliamentary General Election in Sarawak

After months of speculation the Prime Minister, Datuk Hussein Onn, finally called for a general election on July 8, 1978. With the exceptions of Sabah, Kelantan, and Sarawak, the legislative assemblies of the remaining states were dissolved so that state general elections could be held concurrently with the parliamentary ones. Sabah and Kelantan were excluded on the grounds that their

existing state legislatures had been only recently constituted: in the case of Sabah the election process was completed in April 1976, and in Kelantan only in March, 1978.³⁵ In Sarawak, however, this was not the case. The existing Council Negri was elected in August 1974 which meant that it was as old as the state assemblies which were being dissolved. Nonetheless, the Sarawak State Government managed to persuade the BN to defer the state elections. Thus in July, 1978, Sarawak held only a parliamentary general election.

The reason for the delay stemmed from the unresolved issue of seat distribution. In particular, the SUPP was still intent on persuading its coalition partners to relinquish a few seats-- reportedly two seats each from SNAP and the PBB. The views of the PBB are not known, but SNAP was adamant about not giving away any seats which it had won. The SUPP was also rumoured to have demanded a "free for all", which would have meant that there would be no inter-party co-operation between the members of the Sarawak State Government. Suspecting that the SUPP was plotting to "draw" SNAP out of the BN, SNAP's leaders refused to accede to SUPP's demand.³⁶ With the issue of seat redistribution unresolved, the Sarawak State Government had little choice but to request a deferment of the state general elections. This was granted.

In addition to SNAP, SUPP, and PBB, four minor political parties contested the parliamentary general elections of 1978. The

first was the Sarawak Natives People's Party (Pajar). It had been founded by Alli Kawi, a Malay from the First Division, who was at one time a senior police officer. Before he obtained his law degree from England he had been in charge of the Special Branch, the intelligence arm of the country's police force in Sarawak. At the time of his resignation he was serving his duties in Kuala Lumpur, the nation's capital. Pajar had some Dayak support, including that of Charles Ingka, who was once active in SNAP. Of the minor parties, only Pajar could have been considered a threat to any of the parties in the state government. The other three parties were the Sarawak People's Organisation (SAPO), led by Raymond Szetu, an executive member of SNAP's Miri branch before his resignation to protest the party's entry into the BN in 1976; the United Malaysia Timor (UMAT), founded by Nelson Kundai Ngareng, also an ex-supporter of SNAP; and Party Peace, a miniscule Malay-based party which consisted of only four candidates.

The three governing parties fielded their respective candidates in areas where they had won in 1974. With its nine seats, SNAP decided to allow the same Members of Parliament to stand for re-election. The SUPP and the PBB introduced a total of five "new" faces as parliamentary candidates. With the exception of P. 137, in which the BN candidate had never contested an election, in the other four constituencies the "new candidates had been Council Negri members at one time or another.

37

Table 16

Sarawak Parliamentary Elections, 1978; Votes
Cast and Members Elected by Parties

Political Party	Total Number of Votes received	Proportion of votes Cast (in %)	Number of Members Elected
SNAP)	45,218	17.6)	9
PBB } BN	52,222	20.4)	8
SUPP)	64,119	25.0	6
Pajar	28,666	11.2	0
UMAT	3,430	1.3	0
SAPO	10,150	4.0	1
Peace	3,490	1.4	0
Independent	49,012	19.1	0
Total	256,309	100.0	24

Of SNAP's nine candidates, only eight actually had to run for their re-elections; the ninth, Luhut Wan was returned unopposed in P. 153 in Baram--as were Stephen Yong of the SUPP in P. 135 Padawan and Racha Umong of the PBB in P.154 Bukit Mas.

The fact that SNAP had the same candidates for 1974 and 1978 makes it easier to compare the performance of the party for the two periods since the variable of personality remained constant. In a real sense the results of the 1974 and 1978 elections in these constituencies indicate the reaction of the voters from these constituencies to SNAP's decision to enter the BN. After all, the

Table 17

Sarawak Parliamentary Elections, 1974 and 1978;
SNAP's Votes in Nine Selected Constituencies

Constituency	Elections		Net Change 1974-1978
	1974	1978	
P. 131	6849	7883	+ 936
P. 138	6929	7365	+ 436
P. 139	3266	2789	- 477
P. 141	5258	7260	+ 2002
P. 147	3933	3637	- 296
P. 148	3925	4973	+ 1048
P. 150	3031	3983	+ 952
P. 151	5657	7328	+ 1671
P. 153	6050	unopposed	
Total	38948	45218	+ 6272

Note: In calculating the totals, P. 153 has been excluded.

1974 general elections took place before SNAP joined the BN and that of 1978 occurred after that event. All of SNAP's candidates were returned in 1978. Except for P. 139 and P. 147 there was an increase of votes in all constituencies. Compared to the figures for 1974, the results for 1978 saw a rise in its average votes per constituency by 783. In other words, from the returns of its votes, it would appear that SNAP generally retained and improved its appeal in 1978.

Summary

The re-emergence of Dayak ethnic nationalism as the dominant strategy in SNAP was stimulated by a number of factors. The first was the generally anti-SUPP disposition party leaders who, after the 1970 general election, found themselves shunted aside once again into the opposition. SNAP's leaders blamed their failure to form part of the government on the duplicity of the SUPP's Chinese leadership. The object of SUPP's peculiar action, they reasoned, was to deny the Dayaks any effective representation since only SNAP was capable of delivering it.

The re-appearance of Dayak nationalism was also a reaction on the part of SNAP to the merger between Pesaka and Bumiputera. SNAP interpreted the union as the end of meaningful Dayak representation. If the first factor prompted SNAP's leaders to re-evaluate their willingness to work with the SUPP, the second demonstrated the need for effective Dayak presence in government. Thus conditions in Sarawak made the emphasis on ethnic nationalism possible. At this point it should be noted that the party did not abandon its multi-racialism; SNAP merely de-emphasised it.

What made the salience of SNAP's Dayak/native nationalism possible was the fact that this line was directly beneficial to SNAP. Indeed, in the general election of 1974, the surge of Dayak

support for SNAP was partly the result of SNAP's emphasis on native rights. And it could be said that it was indirectly as a result of this show of support that the federal government (which itself was committed to include as many parties as possible in the ruling Barisan Nasional) invited SNAP to join the government at both the state and federal levels.

Footnotes to Chapter VIII

1. There is no record available which will confirm this figure. It may have been inflated - in this instance, in order to impress the Cobbold Commission. It should be pointed out, however, the concept of party membership was a new idea to the rural folks to which SNAP directed its recruitment at this time. Their participation did not go beyond the simple act of registering their names as party members, something which they could have done en masse in their respective longhouses. Thus, in presenting the membership of 46,000, Ningkan may have thought that he was offering the correct figure.
2. Report of the Commission of Inquiry, North Borneo and Sarawak, by Lord Cobbold, Chairman (Kuching: Government Printing Office, 1962), p.18.
3. Sarawak Tribune, June 12, 1962.
4. At this time Ningkan proposed that SNAP and Pesaka merge to form a single Dayak political organization. He added that the total SNAP-Pesaka membership would be about 100,000 strong. Since SNAP had claimed 62,000 members, the remainder, some 38,000, must have belonged to Pesaka. If this figure for Pesaka was true, a merger of the two parties would mean that based on the strength of its claimed membership, SNAP would have been the senior partner.
5. Sarawak Tribune, January 11, 1963.
6. The information for this table was provided by SNAP Headquarters and the Office of the Registrar of Societies, both of Kuching.
7. Sarawak Gazette, Vol. LXXXIX, No. 1266, August 31, 1963, p.174.
8. Only 2.8 percent of its councilors were non-Dayaks. The information here is based on the Sarawak Gazette, Vol. LXXXIX, No. 1266, August 31, 1963, pp.174-192. For accounts of the 1963 general elections see: K.J. Ratnam and R.S. Milne, The Malayan Parliamentary Election of 1964 (Singapore: University of Malaya Press, 1967), pp.266-311; Robert O. Tilman, "Elections in Sarawak," Asian Survey, Vol. III (October, 1963), pp.507-517.
9. K.J. Ratnam and R.S. Milne, The Malayan Parliamentary Election of 1964 (Singapore: University of Malaya Press, 1967), p.290.
10. Datuk Ningkan himself informed the writer that in expanding the party he had partly relied on his kaban or relatives as local contacts. Thus in the Bintulu area, among SNAP's earliest supporters were his wife's own relatives. Succeeding party workers initiated their own contacts. See also Nelson Kudu, Sarawak National Party: Its Organization and Leadership (Kuching: Sarawak National Party, p.196), p.1.
11. Sarawak Tribune, February 24, 1965.

12. Ibid.
13. The haste with which the campaign to the Rejang basin was mounted was such that SNAP's Central Executive Committee was not able to give its prior approval as required by the Constitution of the party.
14. In contrast, Thomas Kana's continuation of Party Pesaka's foray in the Second Division was inept. The man chosen for the task was Tuai Rumah Umbol of Ulu Sabetan. He was an obscure longhouse chief. Although he came from the Second Division himself he was overawed by the task and intimidated by local oppositions to his overtures.
15. From this point of view, electoral competition (and with it, party building) was the major focus of schism in the Sarawak Alliance.
16. The information from this table was provided by SNAP Headquarters, Kuching.
17. This shift was to broaden the base of the party. In contrast Pesaka and BARJASA remained largely uni-ethnic.
18. The information on SNAP's CEC was compiled from lists provided by SNAP Headquarters, Kuching.
19. The information for this table was provided by SNAP Headquarters, Kuching. The figures in brackets denote percentages. They have been reduced to the nearest decimal point.
20. Sarawak National Party, Sarawak National Party's Constitution and Rules (Kuching: Sarawak National Party, 1972), p.6.
21. See, for instance, R.S. Milne and K.J. Ratnam, "The Sarawak Elections of 1970: An Analysis of the Vote," Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1972), p.111.
22. One issue which was unresolved was the row between Pesaka and Bumiputera over the allocation of seats. Convinced that more time was needed, Pesaka's leaders wanted the suspension of elections lengthened.
23. For an official account of the riots see The National Operations Council, The May 13 Tragedy: A Report (Kuala Lumpur: The National Operations Council, 1969).
24. The actual sources of funds are not all identified. Within Sarawak there were Chinese Tycoons who were willing to sustain the party financially; but there were other sources as well, including Brunei and Singapore.
25. The percentages, which are in brackets, have been reduced to the nearest whole number. The information for this table has been obtained from Government of Malaysia, Report on the Parliamentary (Dewan Ra'ayat) and State Legislative Assembly General Elections 1969 of the States of Malaya, Sabah and Sarawak (Kuala Lumpur: Di-Jabatan Cetak Kerajaan, 1972).

26. Ibid.
27. These candidates need not contest the elections in their "own" ethnic area. See page
28. Michael B. Leigh, The Rising Moon: Political Change in Sarawak (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1974), p.138.
29. Ibid., p.140.
30. Compiled from figures in Government of Malaysia, Report on the Parliamentary (Dewan Rakyat) and State Legislative Assembly General Elections 1974 of the States of Malaya and Sarawak (Kuala Lumpur: Di-Jabatan Cetak Kerajaan, 1975).
31. The ethnic composition of the voters were taken from figures tabulated by the PBB Headquarters, Kuching. My thanks to Alan Fry of the Physics Department, University of Victoria, for his assistance in computing this table.
32. Government of Malaysia, Report on the Parliamentary (Dewan Rakyat) and State Legislative Assembly Elections 1974 of the States of Malaya and Sarawak, op. cit.; Pesaka Bumiputera Bersatu, Ethnic Breakdown of Sarawak, 1976 (Kuching, undated, mimeographed).
33. See, for instance, R.S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Politics and Government in Malaysia (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1978), pp.210-211.
34. She was the Minister of Welfare.
35. On the elections in Sabah see Harvey Stockwin, "Bulldozing the Tun Mustapha Legend," Far Eastern Economic Review, April 30, 1976, pp.8-9. On Kelantan see K. Das, "Introducing the multilogue," ibid., March 31, 1978, pp.12-13; K. Das, "The man who reigned the mavericks," ibid., March 31, 1978, pp.16-19.
36. The leaders of SNAP feared that once they had agreed to a "free for all" the SUPP would align itself with the PBB. In such a situation SNAP would have to contest the elections on its own. This it was reluctant to do since it had no idea if as a result of its entry into the BN, its traditional support would continue to go in its favour. Anticipating some loss of votes from this group, SNAP was eager to "compensate" for it from those who had supported SUPP and PBB.
37. Compiled from Sarawak, Sarawak Information Service, Parliamentary Elections Score Book - Sarawak July 9-22, 1978 (Kuching: Sarawak Information Service, 1978).

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

This paper has tried to examine the Sarawak National Party, particularly its nationalisms. The method used which was through the examination of the party's principles, objectives, and activities; interviews with politicians in Sarawak; and data from elections. The general question to which this paper has directed itself is how a political party copes with changing political conditions. The particular hypothesis, which is found in the Introduction, asserts that SNAP changed its "nationalism" to meet changing conditions.

It has been recognised that SNAP operated in a plural society which contained varied and often contending nationalisms. The central problem which this paper has tried to focus on was how SNAP utilised not one but a variety of nationalisms. This problem was based on the assumption that, being in a plural society, Sarawak produced or had the potential to produce several sources of nationalism. For the purpose of this paper the nationalisms which were considered relevant have been divided into those which were territorially based, namely Sarawak and Malaysia nationalisms, and those which were ethnically based. Within this second group not all the ethnic nationalisms were developed. The realisation or development of these patterns or nationalism was seen to be stimulated by issues which intrinsically involve communal interests. In the case of the Chinese,

for instance, the base of their communal solidarity was largely their cultural similarities. Further, the vehicles for their unity have been merchant guilds and communal associations. That is, although ethnicity may owe its origin to the so-called primordial sentiments, the development of ethnicity or ethnic nationalism is a feature which must be nurtured by interested organisations or parties.

This brings us to the second assumption of this paper. As a political party whose primary objective had been the pursuit of political power, SNAP had been exposed to communal demands and needs--the choice of which communal interests it was to represent was seen to have been made rationally; in the case of SNAP, the assertion of Dayak aspirations was consistent with the party's objective of attracting Dayak support. Since SNAP was (and is) a party led by Dayaks, it was presumed that it would have expanded in areas where its leaders would make the most positive impact--in Dayak areas. However, having said this, it is important to be reminded that Sarawak has never been a uni-ethnic state; it has been a plural one, which meant that in addition to Dayak demands, SNAP had been faced with Chinese and Malay assertions as well. To the extent that it was able to articulate and to aggregate Chinese and Malay interests, it would have received their respective support as well.

The major observation which this paper has made is that the

communal group which has been the major beneficiary of SNAP's activities has been the Dayaks in general and Ibans in particular. To this end it may be said that SNAP's ethnic nationalism was salient. Such preference has not always been the case, however, as another variety of nationalism, the territorial one, had received emphasis by the party. The summary and conclusion noted below seek to divide party activities into phases and to identify which particular nationalism was salient during which period. Further, they seek to establish conditions which influenced the salience of one nationalism over another.

In the first phase of SNAP's development, which included the first few months before the Malaysia Plan was proposed, the party showed two sides of its nationalism. On the ethnic side, it showed a preference for the Dayaks, the group which was regarded by the party as its own terminal community, that is, as the strategic one within the state. This is not to assert that SNAP was a chauvinistic party for, as noted in Chapter III, it was prepared to accord non-Dayaks what it regarded as their fundamental freedom. That is to say, although SNAP clearly emphasised Iban nationalism and sought to elicit Iban support as the corner-stone of its strategy to form the government, it was also pursuing a policy of ethnic tolerance and multiculturalism. The last aspect of its policy is important, for it indicates that, based on the assumption of Sarawak as an independent

state, SNAP was not unprepared to tolerate and even to foster the development of ethnic groups other than that of the Ibans. How well such a policy would have worked for SNAP's popularity will never be known, for several months after SNAP was formed, the then Malayan Prime Minister, Tengku Abdul Rahman, came up with his proposal for Malaysia.

Malaysia ushered in a new phase in the development of SNAP's nationalism. The onset of the Malaysia Plan forced a shift in the expectations or goals of its territorial nationalism in that the object of full independence gave way to a mere membership within a federation. On the ethnic dimension, Malaysia meant that the Dayaks--Iban and other tribes--would lose the majority position which they would have held had Sarawak remained outside Malaysia. These two factors, derived from SNAP's territorial and ethnic sentiments lay behind its opposition to Malaysia. SNAP's subsequent acceptance of Malaysia was made under a situation of duress, when all opposition appeared to be hopeless.

Faced with the inevitable formation of Malaysia, SNAP argued for a strong state constitution; if Sarawak could not be fully independent, then the next choice was for the state to have as much power as possible. That is, although acceptance of Malaysia involved a modification of its territorial nationalism in the sense that it recognised the need for the state to share power with the federal

government, the focus of SNAP's loyalty was still Sarawak, not Malaysia. In agreeing to accept Malaysia, SNAP, as well as other parties, submitted a list of safeguards for Sarawak and its people. The majority of these safeguards were incorporated into the IGC Report, which provided the constitutional basis for the new federation.

Sarawak's territorial sentiments which were manifested by the party's demands for safeguards represented one side of its nationalism. In the three years following Malaysia this variety of nationalism complemented its ethnic nationalism. In order to explain the ascendancy of ethnic nationalism it is necessary to review party activities following the Malaysia proposal.

First, SNAP was one of the most bitter and stubborn opponents of the Malaysia Plan. It argued that Sarawak should have had at least several years of independence before it could consider the Malaysia proposal. It reluctantly accepted the proposal only when this position became untenable because the momentum of Malaysia threatened to isolate the party.

Second, concurrent with these expressions of territorial nationalism was SNAP's aggregation of Dayak communal demands. While the very acts of opposing Malaysia and demanding a constitutionally strong state government could properly be seen as attempts to isolate Sarawak, they could also be viewed as steps to protect

the Dayaks from the encroachments of the Malay-led federal government. If this motive was correct, then subsequent party activities should bear this out. By the end of 1963 SNAP had been ensconced as the most influential party in the Sarawak Alliance and was soon embroiled in two major issues: as Chapter V reveals, these were Borneonisation and National Language. In both areas SNAP sought to protect Dayak interests, using as its arguments the constitutional underpinnings provided by the IGC Report and the Sarawak Constitution--documents which it regarded as conditions of entry into Malaysia. On Borneonisation, for instance, SNAP favoured a gradual approach, a slow rate of departure for British expatriates. Ostensibly, the Ningkan government was merely following the IGC Report when it pursued this approach, but when Borneonisation was examined from the ethnic perspective, the real reason became clear: there was no pool of available Dayaks to replace departing expatriates. Similarly, on the issue of the National Language, Ningkan again relied on constitutional argument; but from the perspective of its ethnic sentiment, SNAP's resistance was partly a public show to placate the Dayaks, who feared the infusion of Malay language and culture into their community and partly an attempt to find a place for the perpetuation of Dayak languages, particularly Iban, in Malaysia. It could be said, therefore, that from 1961 to 1965 it was ethnic nationalism which was salient.

Chapter V analyses the turn to multi-racialism and marks the emergence of the second stage of its nationalism. By early 1965 SNAP was faced with challenges from within the ranks of the Sarawak Alliance. Anticipating a general election in 1967, Pesaka and BARJASA initiated their own party-building programmes, which threatened to spread into SNAP's areas. In reaction, SNAP tried to repulse these challenges, which occurred in the First and Second Divisions. Thus, even before other substantial issues became factors in causing the irreversible split in the Sarawak Alliance, the organisation was faced with divisions caused by party-building competitions. By mid-1965 the Sarawak Alliance was embroiled again in another controversy, this time involving the proposed land legislation. At the core of the issue was the treatment of the Chinese in the state. SNAP had argued that the Chinese of Sarawak should not be treated differently--even over land--from natives, while its partners, namely Pesaka and BARJASA, demanded that the natives of Sarawak enjoy special privileges and status. BARJASA and Pesaka representatives, with the surreptitious help of federal politicians, tried in the middle of 1965 to oust Ningkan from power. Only the eleventh-hour withdrawal of the proposed legislation and the consequent refusal of Temenggong Jugah to support the rebels prevented Ningkan's downfall. The

The significance of this episode was that changing conditions again threatened to isolate SNAP.

The controversy over land was important in that it indicated a new orientation in the development of SNAP's nationalism. Prior to the competition in party-building, SNAP had kept to Dayak areas. Faced with the challenges from Pesaka and BARJASA, it had approached the Chinese as prospective members. From this perspective, the land legislation was merely an enticement to attract Chinese members. The contention that SNAP had been actively wooing Chinese members was indicated by another issue: the position of Bumiputeras. In 1965 SNAP had flatly rejected the assertion that native Bumiputeras should have privileges. The Chinese of Sarawak, it insisted, should enjoy the same rights as the Dayaks and Malays. Its opponents in BARJASA and Pesaka, of course, insisted on the opposite view. Finally, an examination of SNAP's branches for the period of 1965 to 1966 reveals that the party had indeed recruited Chinese members just when its relations with BARJASA and Pesaka began to deteriorate. Ultimately, in June 1966, an alliance between Pesaka, BARJASA and the federal politicians succeeded in ousting Ningkan and SNAP from the Sarawak Alliance. By this time SNAP had made the point that, of the native parties, it alone stood for multi-racialism.

The otherpoint which emerged at this time was SNAP's strong stand on the sanctity of the Sarawak Constitution and the London

Agreement which established Malaysia. It vehemently protested when the federal government abrogated the Sarawak Constitution and declared a State of Emergency in September 1966.

While SNAP was in the opposition, two features became the major pillars of its nationalism at the time. These were multi-racialism and the belief in the inviolability of the terms of entry into Malaysia, which the party asserted were contained in the Sarawak Constitution and the London Agreement. These points formed the two themes of its slogan "Sarawak for Sarawakians". In terms of its nationalism, it could be said that at this time SNAP was attempting a fusion of a distinct Sarawakian citizenship with the territory, Sarawak. This was the positive element of its nationalism; its negative aspect with its anti-federal outlook which the controversies surrounding the suspension of the Sarawak Constitution, Ningkan's ouster, and the declaration of an emergency all helped to generate. How effective was the emphasis in its "territorial nationalism" in generating political support? In the building of its branch organisation, SNAP was very successful. As pointed out in Chapter VIII, by late 1968 it had established a total of 103 branches, with an average of over two branches per state constituency, and over four for each parliamentary one. By 1968 SNAP had expanded to the whole of Sarawak, an achievement which it would not have been able to effect had the Chinese and their funds not come to the support

of the party. In terms of its elected representatives, SNAP has had a mixed record. It has failed to capture the majority of seats, but through successive elections it managed to increase its total of elected members at the state level to six for 1963, twelve for 1970, and 18 for 1974. Moreover, by 1974 the Dayaks of Sarawak had overwhelmingly supported SNAP.

The problem with its territorial nationalism and the concomitant policy of multi-racialism was that although it had enabled SNAP to increase its political support, it also earned SNAP the enmity of the Central Government. Until 1974 the federal politicians had consented to SNAP being kept out of the government (at the state and the federal levels). Its impressive performance in 1974, when it won 18 out of 48 state seats and received 43 per cent of the total votes, finally convinced the Central Government that SNAP should be a part of the ruling Barisan Nasional. Clearly this invitation was a major change in the political environment. It took the party over one and a half years to consider it, and by the time the party decided to accept (in May 1976) the shift to its ethnic nationalism had become evident. Among the major reasons offered to explain the move was that the act of joining the BN was a tactical one, designed to facilitate the development of the rural areas, where most Dayaks reside. SNAP's leaders were also tired of being in the opposition. How successful was this move? If the party's performance during the

1978 Parliamentary general election can be taken as evidence, SNAP's move was successful indeed. At that time, all of its candidates were returned as winners with an average increase of over 700 in votes per candidate.

In addition, it should be noted that for the moment at least, SNAP's territorial nationalism has been de-emphasised. It has not recanted its principle of multi-racialism. SNAP has not rejected its slogan "Sarawak for Sarawakians"; rather has merely shelved it. Further, what SNAP did not do was to abandon its multi-racial organisation. Nor, evidently, did it relinquish its Chinese dominated seats. As the elections of 1978 demonstrated, its lone Chinese Member of Parliament, Ting Ling Kiew, easily won re-election in Bintulu. Ting's particular success seems to indicate that the emphasis of SNAP on Dayak nationalism after 1974 did not alienate the Chinese. If so, the consequence has yet to manifest itself. Indeed, had there been a "free for all" and SNAP was allowed to contest any seats it wished to, it seems probable that SNAP would have recaptured the Miri-Subis (renamed Lambir) constituency which it lost to the BN in 1974. As it was, the seat was won by Raymond Szetu, the leader of SAPO. Szetu is a 28 year-old lawyer who until 1976 was the secretary of SNAP's Miri branch. His victory over the highly regarded SUPP candidate, Datuk Chia Chih Shin, seems to indicate that the Chinese were dissatisfied with SUPP. Had SNAP contested

against SUPP in Chinese areas in 1978 it might have been the major beneficiary of this dissatisfication.

The second part of the observations which this paper has made was SNAP's role in the development of Dayak nationalism. In the beginning SNAP was supported by the Ibans, mainly Second Division Ibans at that. While it was in the government in the early 1960's, it tried several times to forge Iban unity through a merger with Pesaka. However, due to mistrust between the leaders of the two parties each attempt ultimately failed. When SNAP moved into the opposition in 1966, it was partly to direct attention to federal incursion into the state. To the Ibans and the rest of the Dayak collectively, the threat was not merely the federal government, but Malay domination as well. The consequence of its campaign was a rise of Dayak support which was evident in the election results of 1970. As shown in Chapter VII, by 1973 its campaign to elicit Iban support had received an unexpected impetus when Pesaka merged with Parti Bumiputera. The result of this was the loss of even formal Dayak representation in the government, an event which benefitted SNAP in the general election of 1974, when the majority of BN's Iban leaders in the government lost their seats to SNAP candidates. That is, with the demise of Pesaka through merger, SNAP appeared to be the dominant Iban party.

To recapitulate, in the past two decades SNAP has pursued the twin strategy of (a) the alternation between ethnic and territorial

nationalism and (b) the development of Dayak nationalism. Thus, from 1961 to 1965, the emphasis was on ethnicity, particularly Iban nationalism. At the end of 1965, the party switched its strategy to territorial nationalism which was identified by multi-racialism and anti-federal outlook. The last stage emerged after the general elections of 1974 when SNAP began to emphasise not merely Iban but Dayak nationalism as well. By 1974 it appeared that its objective of articulating Dayak interests and gaining Dayak support was achieved for most of the Dayak elected representatives came from SNAP.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Government Publications

- Great Britain, Colonial Office. Malaysia: Agreement Concluded between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Federation of Malaya, North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore. London: H.M.S.O., 1963 (London Agreement, 1963).
- Great Britain, Colonial Office. Sarawak Report for the Year 1962. London: H.M.S.O., 1963.
- Jones, L.W. Sarawak: Report on the Census of Population 15th June 1960. Kuching: Government Printing Office, 1962.
- Malaysia. Report on the Parliamentary (Dewan Ra'ayat) and State Legislative Assembly General Elections 1969 of the States of Malaya, Sabah and Sarawak. Kuala Lumpur: Di Chetak Di-Jabatan Chetak Kerajaan, 1972.
- Malaysia. Report on the Parliamentary (Dewan Rakyat) and State Legislative Assembly General Elections 1974 of the States of Malaya and Sarawak. Kuala Lumpur: Di Chetak Di-Jabatan Chetak Kerajaan, 1975.
- Report of the Inter-Governmental Committee. Lord Lansdowne, chairman. Kuching: Government Printing Office, 1963. (IGC Report.)
- Report of the Commission of Enquiry, North Borneo and Sarawak. Lord Cobbold, chairman. Kuching: Government Printing Office, 1962. (Cobbold Report.)
- Sarawak Government, Council Negri, Council Negri Centenary, 1863-1967. Kuching: Government Printing Office, undated.
- Sarawak Government, Information Service, Parliamentary Elections Score Book July 8-22, 1978. Kuching: Jabatan Penerangan, 1978.
- Sarawak Government, Sarawak Yearbook, 1962. Kuching: Government Printing Office, 1962.
- Sarawak Government, Information Service. Sarawak by the Week. Published weekly from 1956 to 1967.

Books and Theses

- Alatas, Syed Hussein. The Second Malaysia Plan 1871-1975: A Critique. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1971.
- Anderson, Charles W., Von der Mehden, Fred R., and Young, Crawford. Issues of Political Development. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc., 1967.
- Boyce, Peter. Malaysia and Singapore in International Diplomacy; Documents and Commentaries. Sydney, 1968.
- Duverger, Maurice. Political Parties, Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State. London: Methuen and Co., 1955.
- Emerson, Rupert. From Empire to Nation. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Enloe, Cynthia H. Ethnic Conflict and Political Development. Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1973.
- Esman, Milton J. Administration and Development in Malaysia. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972.
- Fletcher, Nancy. The Separation of Singapore from Malaysia. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969.
- Freeman, Derek. Report on the Iban. London: The Athlone Press, 1970.
- Geertz, Clifford. Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Asia and Africa. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
- Glazer, N., and Moynihan, D. Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Graves, Harry E. The Constitution of Malaysia. Singapore: Malaysia Publications Ltd., 1964.
- Gullick, J.M. Malaysia and Its Neighbours. London: Routledge, 1967.
- Hanna, Willard. The Formation of Malaysia: New Factor in World Politics. New York: American Universities Field Staff, Inc., 1964.
- Hayes, Carlton J.H. Essays on Nationalism. New York: Macmillan, 1926.
- Kilson, M. ed. New States in the Modern World. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Kudu, Nelson. Sarawak National Party: Its History, Organization and Leadership. Kuching: Sarawak National Party, 1973.

- Leifer, Michael. Dilemmas of Statehood in Southeast Asia. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1972.
- Leigh, Michael B. The Rising Moon: Political Change in Sarawak. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1971.
- _____. "The Development of Political Organization and Leadership in Sarawak, East Malaysia." Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1971.
- Mackie, J.A.C. Konfrontasi: The Indonesian-Malaysia Dispute 1963-1966. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Means, Gordon P. Malaysian Politics. London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1976.
- Milne, R.S. and Mauzy, Diane K. Politics and Government of Malaysia. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1978.
- Milne, R.S. and Ratnam, K.J. Malaysia - New States in a New Nation: Political Development in Sarawak and Sabah in Malaysia. London: Frank Cass, 1974.
- Ongkili, James. Modernization in East Malaysia. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- _____. The Borneo Response to Malaysia 1961-1963. Singapore: Donald Moore Press Ltd., 1967.
- Plano, J., and Olson, R. The International Relations Dictionary. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Pringle, Robert. Rajahs and Rebels: The Ibans of Sarawak Under Brooke Rule 1841-1941. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970.
- Rabushka, A., and Shepsle, K.A. Politics in Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1972.
- Ratnam, K.J., and Milne, R.S. The Malayan Parliamentary Election of 1964. Singapore: University of Malaya Press, 1967.
- Richards, A.J.N. comp. The Sea Dayaks and Other Races of Sarawak - Contributions to the Sarawak Gazette between 1888 and 1930. Kuching: Borneo Literature Bureau, 1963.
- Roff, Margaret. The Politics of Belonging: Political Change in Sarawak and Sabah. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Ross-Larsen, Bruce. The Politics of Federalism: Syed Kechik in East Malaysia. Singapore: By the Author, 195-B Penang Road, 1976.
- Royal Institute of International Affairs. Nationalism. London: Frank Cass and Co., 1963.

- Runciman, Steven. The White Rajahs - A History of Sarawak from 1941 to 1946. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Shafer, Boyd C. Nationalism: Myth and Reality. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1955.
- Sheridan, L.A., and Groves, Harry E. The Constitution of Malaysia. Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1967.
- Slimming, John. Malaysia: Death of a Democracy. London: John Murray, 1963.
- Smith, A.D. Theories of Nationalism. London: Duckworth, 1971.
- _____. ed. Nationalist Movements. London: Macmillan Press, 1976.
- Smith, R.M. ed. Documents of Political Development and Change in Southeast Asia. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974.
- Snow, Roger Jr. "A Comparative Analysis of Confrontation as an Instrument of Indonesian Foreign Policy." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1973.
- Snyder, Louis. The Dynamics of Nationalism. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1964.
- _____. The Meaning of Nationalism. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.
- _____. Varieties of Nationalism. A Comparative Study. Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press, 1976.
- Sutlive, V.H. "From Longhouse to Pasar: Urbanization in Sarawak, East Malaysia." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1972.
- Vasil, R.K. The Malaysian General Election of 1969. Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1975.
- Von der Mehden, Fred R. Politics of the Developing Nations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Von Vorys, Karl. Democracy without Consensus. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- Weinstein, Franklin B. Indonesia Abandons Confrontation: an Inquiry into the Functions of Indonesian Foreign Policy. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969.
- Wolf, Eric R. Peasants. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966.
- Young, Crawford. Politics in the Congo. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Periodicals

- Alatas, Syed, Hussein. "The Politics of Coalition in Malaysia." Current History, Vol. 63 (July-December, 1972), 271-277.
- _____. "The Rukunegara and the Return to Democracy." Pacific Community, Vol. 2, No. 4 (July, 1971), 800-808.
- Armstrong, H.F. "The Troubled Birth of Malaysia." Foreign Affairs, Vol. 41, No. 4 (July, 1953), 672-693.
- Babcock, Tim. "Indigenous Ethnicity in Sarawak." Sarawak Museum Journal, Vol. XXII, No. 43 (December, 1974), 191-202.
- Birch, Anthony D. "Minority Nationalist Movements and Theories of Political Integration." World Politics, Vol. XXX, No. 3 (April, 1978), 326-343.
- Chee, Stephen. "Malaysia and Singapore: Separate Identities, Different Priorities." Asian Survey, Vol. 13, No. 2 (January-June, 1973), 151-161.
- Connor, Walter. "Ethnic Nationalism as a Political Force." World Affairs, Vol. 133, No. 2 (September, 1970), 91-97.
- _____. "Self-Determination--A New Phase." World Politics, Vol. XX, No. 1 (October, 1967), 30-53.
- _____. "Nation-Building or Nation-Destroying?" World Politics, Vol. XXIV, No. 3 (April, 1972), 319-355.
- _____. "The Politics of Ethnonationalism." Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 27, No. 1 (1973), 1-21.
- Drummond, Stuart. "Towards a New Order in Malaysia." The World Today, Vol. 29, No. 10 (October, 1973), 440-448.
- Emerson, Rupert. "Post-Independence Nationalism in South and Southeast Asia: A Reconsideration." Pacific Affairs, Vol. XLIV, No. 2 (Summer, 1971), 173-192.
- Glick, Henry Robert. "Political Recruitment in Sarawak: A Case Study of Leadership in a New State." The Journal of Politics, Vol. 28, No. (February, 1966), 81-99.
- Leigh, Michael B. "Party Formation in Sarawak." Indonesia, No. 9 (April, 1970), 189-224.
- _____. "Sarawak--Focus on Federation." The Australian Quarterly, Vol. 35, No. 2 (June, 1963), 39-50.

- Lightbody, James. "Nationalism as a Function of Ethnic Demands." Canadian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 2, No. 3 (September, 1969), 327-337.
- Lockhard, Craig. "Parties, Personalities and Crisis Politics in Sarawak." Journal of Southeast Asian History, Vol. 8, No. 1 (March, 1967), 110-121.
- _____. "Leadership and Power within the Chinese Community of Sarawak: A Historical Survey." Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, Vol. 2, No. 2 (September, 1970), 195-217.
- Means, Gordon P. "Eastern Malaysia: The Politics of Federalism." Asian Survey, Vol. 8, No. 4 (April, 1978), 289-308.
- _____. "Special Rights as a Strategy for Development." Comparative Politics, Vol. 5, No. 1 (October, 1973), 29-61.
- Melson, Robert and Wolpe, Howard. "Modernisation and the Politics of Communalism: A Theoretical Perspective." American Political Science Review, Vol. LXIV, No. 4 (December, 1970), 1112-1130.
- Milne, R.S. and Mauzy, Diane K. "Malaysia Today." Current History. Vol. 65, (December, 1973), 262-275.
- Milne, R.S. "National Ideology and Nation Building in Malaysia." Asian Survey, Vol. 10, No. 7 (July, 1970), 563-573.
- _____. "The Politics of Malaysia's New Economic Policy." Pacific Affairs, Vol. 49, No. 2.
- Pillai, M.G.G. "Malaysia." Asia 1975 Yearbook. Hong Kong: Far Eastern Economic Review, 1975.
- _____. "Sarawak: Putting Trust to the Test." Far Eastern Economic Review, March 25, 1974, 28-29.
- Ratnam, K.J. and Milne, R.S. "The 1969 Parliamentary Election in West Malaysia." Pacific Affairs, Vol. XLIII, No. 2 (Summer, 1970), 203-226.
- Reece, Bob. "Unlikely Alliance." Far Eastern Economic Review (July 16, 1970), 7.
- Roff, Margaret. "The Rise and Demise of Kadazan Nationalism." Journal of Southeast Asian History, Vol. 10, No. 2 (September, 1969), 327-343.
- Rogers, Marvin L. "Malaysia and Singapore." Asian Survey, Vol. XII, No. 2 (February, 1972), 168-176.
- Rousseau, Jerome. "Ethnic Identity and Social Relations in Central Borneo." Contributions to Asian Studies, Vol. VII (1975), 32-49.

- Sandin, Benedict. "Iban Leaders." Sarawak Museum Journal Vol. XVIII, No. 37 (December, 1970), 89-161.
- Smith, Anthony D. "Nationalism: a Trend Report and Bibliography." Current Sociology. Vol. XXI (1973), 1-176.
- Smith, T.E. "Proposals for Malaysia." The World Today, Vol. XVIII, No. 5 (May, 1962), 192-199.
- Snider, Nancy L. "Is National Integration Necessary? The Malaysian Case." Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 27, No. 1 (1975), 80-89.
- Sopiee, M.N. "The Advocacy of Malaysia before 1961." in Modern Asian Studies, Vol. 7, No. 4 (1973), 717-723.
- Symmons-Symonolewicz, K. "Nationalist Movements: an attempt at a comparative typology." Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol. 7, No. (, 1964), 221-230.
- Tilman, Robert O. "Elections in Sarawak." Asian Survey, Vol. III, No. 10 (October, 1963), 507-517.
- _____. "The Alliance Pattern in Malaysian Politics: Bornean Variations on a Theme." The South Atlantic Quarterly, Vol. 63, No. 1 (1964), 61-73.
- _____. "The Sarawak Political Scene." Pacific Affairs, Vol. XXXVII, No. 4 (Winter, 1964-65), 412-425.
- Van der Kroef, J. "Communist Geurilla War in Sarawak." World Today, Vol. 20 (January-December, 1964), 50-60.
- Von der Mehden, Fred R. "Some Aspects of Political Ideology in Malaysia." Studies on Asia, (1964), 95-103.
- Wallerstein, I. "Ethnicity and National Integration." Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines, Vol. 1, No. 3 (July, 1960), 129-139.

Newspapers

Borneo Post, Kuching.

Sarawakian Digest, Kuching.

Sarawak Herald, Sibul.

Straits Times, Kuala Lumpur.

Sarawak Tribune, Kuching.

Sarawak Vangurad, Kuching.

Interviews

Anek, Patrick, Member of Parliament; member of SNAP's Central Executive Committee; Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Welfare, Malaysia.

Endawie, Datuk Dunstan, Deputy Chief Minister, Sarawak; President of Sarawak National Party from 1975 to present.

Jugah, Temenggong, President of Pesaka from 1962 to 1973; President of PBB, Minister for Sarawak Affairs 1963-974; Head of Majlis Adat Istiadat.

Kana, Thomas, Secretary General, Pesaka 1965 to 1973; member of PBB Central Executive Committee.

Langgu, Edmund; Secretary General, SNAP 1963 to 1975; member of SNAP's Central Executive Committee; Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Malaysia.

Moggie, Leo, Secretary General, SNAP 1975 to present; member of SNAP's Central Executive Committee, Federal Minister of Energy, Communications and Posts.

Ningkan, Datuk Stephen, Chairman, Sarawak National Party 1961 to 1975; Chief Minister, Sarawak, from 1963 to 1966.

Tangkun, Datuk Edwin, Member of Parliament from 1963 to present.

Zehnder, Tra, Member of Council Negri, Sarawak, 1963; member of SNAP's Central Executive Committee.