Edition Centaurus – Sozioökonomische
Prozesse in Asien, Afrika und Lateinamerika

Cathrin Arenz · Michaela Haug
Stefan Seitz · Oliver Venz *Editors*

Continuity under Change in Dayak Societies

Springer VS

Edition Centaurus – Sozioökonomische Prozesse in Asien, Afrika und Lateinamerika

Die Reihe, 1997 in Freiburg begründet, umfasst ein breites Spektrum aktueller Themen der Ethnologie mit interdisziplinärem Charakter. Im Mittelpunkt stehen kulturelle Transformationsprozesse und damit einhergehende Folgewirkungen von sozialem, ökonomischem, religiösem und politischem Wandel. Kennzeichnend ist hierbei die ethnographische Perspektive auf die regionalen Untersuchungsfelder Afrika, Asien und Lateinamerika und deren interdependente Vernetzung in einer globalen, transnationalen Welt.

Die Reihe ist ursprünglich mit dem Titel „Sozioökonomische Prozesse in Asien, Afrika und Lateinamerika" beim Centaurus Verlag erschienen.

Weitere Bände in dieser Reihe http://www.springer.com/series/13740

Cathrin Arenz · Michaela Haug
Stefan Seitz · Oliver Venz
(Eds.)

Continuity under Change in Dayak Societies

Springer VS

Editors
Cathrin Arenz
Freiburg, Germany

Prof. Dr. Stefan Seitz
Freiburg, Germany

Dr. Michaela Haug
Köln, Germany

Dr. Oliver Venz
Berlin, Germany

ISSN 2509-4904 ISSN 2509-4912 (electronic)
Edition Centaurus – Sozioökonomische Prozesse in Asien, Afrika und Lateinamerika
ISBN 978-3-658-18294-6 ISBN 978-3-658-18295-3 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-658-18295-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017940532

Springer VS

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer VS imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH
The registered company address is: Abraham-Lincoln-Str. 46, 65189 Wiesbaden, Germany

List of Content

Figures

Tables

Preface

Stefan Seitz

The dramatic and incredibly rapid changes in Borneo's natural environment and economic conditions in recent decades and the ongoing, profound transformations of its indigenous societies have provoked a growing interest in ethnological research.

However, comprehensive anthropological research on Borneo has primarily taken a general focus, embedded in interdisciplinary Borneo studies as part of the wider Southeast Asian area studies. In this sense this publication is presented within the framework of the "Grounding Area Studies in Social Practice: Southeast Asian Studies at Freiburg" program, supported by the BMBF (German Federal Ministry of Education and Research), in which political, anthropological, historical and economic disciplines cooperate. This anthology is the result of a workshop on "Change and Continuity in Dayak Societies," which was held from July 17-18 2015 at the Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Freiburg. The workshop provided an opportunity for the younger generation of anthropologists in Germany and beyond engaged in ethnological research in Borneo and actually involved in or having done such field research to come together to discuss recent processes of economic, political and social (dis)continuities in Dayak societies. Several presentations during the workshop illustrated vividly the close intertwinement of cultural continuity and change. We thus decided to emphasize this relatedness by changing the book's title slightly from that of the workshop to "Continuity under Change".

Whereas quite a number of publications document and analyze these transformations, continuity and persistence within Dayak cultures are less often examined. Therefore, the workshop and the contributions to this volume were not only aimed at analyzing the effects of discontinuities but also at specifically considering continuities within Dayak societies from various anthropological perspectives.

The contributions show how flexibility and cultural dynamics, considered key values among the Dayak, enable them to navigate and persist through

change, strengthening their identity and ethnicity at the same time. In this sense the anthology reflects the main focus of ethnological research on Dayak societies in the last two decades (see King 2013: 4).

The impetus of the workshop came from earlier research activities undertaken by Freiburg scholars on the Dayak Benuaq. As contributions on the Benuaq have received considerable attention, the original idea was to organize a conference specifically focused on Benuaq research in Kalimantan to bring together scholars from different countries and different disciplines working on the Benuaq. Unfortunately this initial idea could not be realized. Instead, however, a workshop was held with a smaller group of people but with a broadened scope from just the Benuaq to Dayak societies in general.

One of the initiators of the idea was Christian Gönner (GIZ Tiflis), the first student from the Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology in Freiburg to graduate through studying the Benuaq in 2000 and later one of the organizers of the CIFOR (Centre for International Forestry Research) program in East Kalimantan on "Poverty and Decentralization" as part of an interdisciplinary project at the University of Freiburg on the impact of decentralization reforms in Indonesia. With his experience of more than a quarter of a century continuously observing the economic and political trends in East Kalimantan and especially in Benuaq communities, he stimulated further fieldwork on the Benuaq among students of the Institute, with Michaela Haug (University of Cologne) and Oliver Venz (University Malaysia Sarawak) conducting research on the Benuaq since the early 2000s, and with Cathrin Arenz (University of Freiburg) doing the same between 2004 and 2007. These three were the main actors involved in preparing the workshop and the present volume. I extend very special thanks to all of them.

Thus a certain concentration of Benuaq research was undertaken here in Freiburg. Further fieldwork in Kalimantan by students from Freiburg was done by Viola Schreer (University of Kent) and Anna Fünfgeld (University of Freiburg), who were also participants in the workshop. Further contributions came from Timo Duile (University of Bonn), Kristina Großmann (University of Passau), Andrea Höing (BRINCC), Christian Oesterheld (Mahidol University International College), Richard Payne (Yale University) and Irendra Radjawali (University of Bonn). I am very grateful for their active participation and extend my thanks to Jürgen Rüland and Judith Schlehe as leaders of the BMBF project for their strong support of the workshop, and Lothar Käser for his scientific advice. Unfortunately not all participants could – for various reasons – contribute to this edited volume. I thank all for inspiring contributions and fruitful discussions. I also want to express my thanks to Isabell Herrmans and Anu Lounela (both University of Helsinki), who contributed to the edited volume but could not attend the workshop.

References

King, V.T. (2013). Borneo and Beyond: Reflections on Borneo Studies, Anthropology and the Social Sciences. Working Paper Series No 3. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. http://ias.ubd.edu.bn/assets/Files/WORKING.PAPER.SERIES.3.pdf

1. Dayak Societies in Transition - Balancing Continuity and Change

Cathrin Arenz, Michaela Haug, Stefan Seitz and Oliver Venz

1.1 Introduction

"Any book about the peoples and forests of late twentieth-century Borneo must be about change" (Padoch & Peluso 1996: 1). With this sentence, Christine Padoch and Nancy Lee Peluso mark the beginning of their edited volume "Borneo in Transition," published in 1996. Their statement reflects the amazement and concern with which researchers started to witness the pervasive presence of change all over the island of Borneo from the 1970s and the resulting exigency to pay scholarly attention to processes of environmental, economic and social transformations.

As a consequence, research on Borneo, which had been predominantly focused on social structures, kinship and descent during the 1950s, 1960s and well into the 1970s, made a "turn towards development and practice" (King 2013b: 41) from the late 1970s onwards. At that time it was mainly the rapid expansion of commercial logging and the obvious impacts of deforestation on local communities which provoked growing scholarly attention. Thus, during the 1980s and 1990s a fast-growing body of literature emerged which explored an expanding diversity of development trajectories (cf. Ave & King 1986, Colfer 2008[1], De Jong 1997, Dove 1982, 1985, 1986, 1993) and the (often marginalized) position of the indigenous population within these processes (e.g. Tsing 1993, Fried 2003).

Looking at very recent publications on Borneo and Dayak societies, 'change' continues to be omnipresent, as nicely demonstrated by the title of the edited volume "Borneo Transformed" by DeKoninck et al. (2011). And this is no wonder, as life in Borneo has been characterized by rapid and far-reaching ecological, economic and social transformations since the turn of the century.

1 This publication compiles several publications by Carol J. Pierce Colfer written during the 1980s, 1990s and the 21st century.

C. Arenz et al. (Hrsg.), *Continuity under Change in Dayak Societies*, Edition Centaurus – Sozioökonomische Prozesse in Asien, Afrika und Lateinamerika, DOI 10.1007/978-3-658-18295-3_1

The Indonesian part of Borneo has experienced particularly far-reaching political transformations, arising when the previously highly centralistic system of the *Orde Baru* (New Order) was replaced by one of Southeast Asia's most rigorous decentralization reforms in 2001. Regional autonomy has transferred much authority to the regions and significantly altered power relations which previously construed Kalimantan and the other so-called 'Outer Islands' as the state's margins (Haug et al. 2016).

The increasing integration of even small communities and rather remote "out-of-the-way places" (Tsing 1993) into the global capitalist economy, as well as the ambitious plans of local governments to generate income through natural resource extraction, have accelerated environmental change and related processes of sedentarization, urbanization and modernization all over Borneo. Deforestation, increasing pollution and the inexorable expansion of oil palm monocultures and mining are challenging local communities' ways of life – their natural resource management practices, their rights to the forest, their knowledge and their views of the future. This is not to argue that they are passive victims of change. The Dayak (individuals as well as collective actors) are very much engaged in governing, shaping, manipulating and resisting the processes that transform the landscapes of Borneo and their societies alike. It is, however, true to say that it is nearly impossible to live in Borneo nowadays and not talk about change and the question of what life will look like if this path of development is followed further.

We argue that due to this dominant presence of change, recent research on Borneo and Dayak societies has tended to unilaterally emphasize aspects of cultural change while paying relatively little attention to the broad variety of continuities. We have thus invited the contributors to this volume to look at recent transformation processes by paying special attention to the manifold continuities that can be observed within the context of change. As most authors work in Indonesian Borneo, this book explores a broad variety of topics including political and environmental change and related changes in natural resource management, religion and ritual performance, social transformations and (re)formation of ethnic identities in Kalimantan. Paying attention to discontinuities as well as to continuities within Dayak societies, this volume seeks to generate a balanced picture of continuity and change from anthropological perspectives.

1.2 Empowered Dayak Communities: Democratization, Decentralization and the Rise of the "Local"

The downfall of former president Suharto, democratization and the implementation of regional autonomy in 2001 have significantly altered the political landscape of Indonesian Borneo (Aspinall & Mietzner 2010). Through regional autonomy, regencies (*kabupaten*) have become the main recipients of new authority and are now responsible for such important areas as education, health, labor, public works, and environmental and natural resource management. Decentralization further abolished the previously highly standardized village structures and instead encouraged the revival of customary forms of village government (cf. von Benda-Beckmann 2001). In addition, new regulations on fiscal balance further set out a new system of fiscal arrangements between the center and the regions, under which regencies receive a much larger share of the revenues generated within their borders and additionally are allowed to generate their own revenues.

An important consequence of decentralization has been the 'blossoming' of new administrative and budgetary units, commonly referred to as *pemekaran* (McWilliam 2011). Although this phenomenon emerged all over Indonesia, it has been quite extreme in Kalimantan. While between 1996 and 2007 the number of regencies increased by 7.8 percent in Java and Bali, it rose by 82 percent in Kalimantan (Brata 2008: 1). Through this excessive *pemekaran* process many new political and administrative centers have been created all over Kalimantan, endowed with new political authority and new economic opportunities. The resource rich regions of Kalimantan, and especially East Kalimantan, profited fairly well from the new fiscal arrangements: Kutai Kartanegara, Kutai Timur, Kutai Barat, Berau and Pasir are among the wealthiest regencies of Indonesia.

After having experienced systematic economic, political and social marginalization and various assimilation policies during the *Orde Baru* 1966-1998 (cf. Duncan 2004; Duile, this volume), the Dayak have on the whole been empowered by regional autonomy. Their political self-determination has increased and in several regencies the Dayak have become ruling majorities (cf. Haug 2010). Like other regions of Indonesia, Kalimantan experienced what Davidson and Henley have called a "Revival of Tradition" (2007) and manifold (re)constructions of Dayak identities (Widen 2002). Dayak people all over Kalimantan possess a new pride in their indigenous identity after having experienced the devaluation of their culture under colonial and post-colonial rule. In many regions this new self-consciousness has been outwardly expressed through a revitalization and folklorization of *adat* dances, costumes and art.

However, this new pride and (sometimes rather rhetorical) reorientation towards an autochthonous culture has also taken on threatening forms. The politically powerful category of *putra daerah* ("children of the region" or "local sons") which recently became important in Kalimantan has often been aimed against claims and demands of (trans-)migrants from other parts of Indonesia and has fueled violent conflicts in West and Central Kalimantan (cf. Davidson 2003; Peluso 2003; van Klinken 2002; Widen 2002; Österheld, this volume).

Although regional autonomy improved the position of the Dayak as a whole, it has also led to new inequalities among the rich and the poor, the powerful and the powerless, and the old and the young as the newly gained economic wealth is not equally enjoyed by all (Haug 2016). Furthermore, new inter-ethnic rivalry has emerged. On the one hand we have witnessed the emergence of an inclusive Dayak identity which has united the various Dayak groups in their struggles against state policies, marginalization and pressure from outside (cf. Duile, this volume). On the other hand, inter-ethnic rivalry has increased within the context of decentralization as ethnic and even sub-ethnic identities start to play an increasingly important role in gaining access to political positions, economic resources and (higher) education.

1.3 Challenged Dayak Communities: Changes in Nature, Environment and Natural Resource Exploitation

Despite a long and interwoven history of environmental and cultural change, societies and nature on Borneo have often been depicted as unchanging: "Much, though not all, early research on the ecology and human-ecology of Borneo focused on two intertwined constants: the supposedly traditional and exotic in culture, and the presumably pristine in nature" (Padoch & Peluso 1996: 1). Whether this lack of change was seen in a derogatory sense as "backward" or more positively as "traditional" varied depending on the perspective of the respective author. As a consequence, various publications during the 1980s, 1990s and beyond have argued against these static depictions (e.g. Cleary & Eaton 1992, King 1993, Brookfield, Potter & Byron 1995, Padoch & Peluso 1996, Wadley 2005) and instead demonstrated that Bornean landscapes as well as societies have undergone manifold transformations over recent centuries and that the rainforests today do not resemble the image of "untouched nature," but rather are a result of human-forest interactions. Dayak societies have participated for millennia in long-distance trade in forest products, cash crop production and mining, and have experienced various changes in response to migration, the

introduction of new species and shifts in levels of resource exploitation and trade (Padoch & Peluso 1996: 2).

However, the current environmental change, which began during the *Orde Baru*, is unprecedented in its rate and reach. During the *Orde Baru*, the state intensified its control over land and natural resources as well as the people who use them. Sectoral laws on forestry, mining, oil and natural gas, irrigation, and fisheries and various forms of "internal territorialization" (Vandergeest & Peluso 1995: 385) increased state control over natural resources and facilitated their exploitation by private interests (Thorburn 2004a: 37; Thorburn 2004b; Lucas and Warren 2000: 222). Customary *adat* rights to land and forests, on the other hand, were increasingly limited, and millions of hectares of communally and individually owned forests, fallow land and forest gardens were given to logging companies or converted to commercial agriculture. As a result of this policy, monospecific plantations of rubber, oil palm and fast growing pulp and paper have replaced species-rich forests in many areas of Kalimantan. "Something shocking began to happen in Indonesia's rainforests during the last decades of the twentieth century: Species diversities that had taken millions of years to assemble were cleared, burned, and sacrificed to erosion. The speed of landscape transformation took observers by surprise" (Tsing 2005: 2). Through the expansion of logging, mining, oil palm plantations and other industries, Dayak livelihoods have become increasingly integrated into the nation state and the global capitalist economy: "few forest and agricultural products, and few of the social arrangements for producing or extracting them, have been left untouched by commercialization" (Padoch & Peluso 1996: 3).

Regional Autonomy did not automatically reverse the ecologically destructive and socially unjust practices of natural resource exploitation that emerged during the *Orde Baru*. While there are some optimistic examples of inclusive and forward-thinking resource management as demonstrated, for example, by Bakker (2009), decentralisation in Kalimantan has more often been accompanied by an acceleration of environmental decline. The early phase of decentralisation has been characterised by an increased extraction of natural resources and the rise of new inequalities (see e.g. Rhee 2000, Barr et al. 2001, Warren & McCarthy 2002, McCarthy 2004, Bullinger & Haug 2012). Mining, pushed by the Indonesian coal boom, has lately gained in importance as a driver of deforestation and environmental change. Kalimantan represents the centre of Indonesian coal mining – 83 percent of Indonesia's proven coal reserves are located there (Lucarelli 2010: 40). The masterplan for acceleration and expansion of Indonesia's economic development (MP3EI) for the period 2011-2025 designates Kalimantan as the centre of the production and processing of national mining and energy reserves (Government of Indonesia 2011). It is thus

very likely that forest loss will continue at alarming speed. Between 1985 and 2005 Borneo lost an average of 850,000 hectares of forest every year and it is prognosticated that if this trend continues, forest cover will be reduced to less than a third by 2020 (WWF 2007).

Rapid deforestation, forest conversion and related environmental degradation seriously challenge the continuity of forest tenure, forest ownership and guardianship, which supported sustainable resource management practices (Sellato 2007) as well as the continuity of the highly flexible and resilient combinations of swidden agriculture, trading of (agro-)forest products and non-farming activities found throughout Bornean societies (see Gönner as well as Höing & Radjawali, this volume). Losing access to land and natural resources does erode livelihood choices and finally leads to comprehensive livelihood transformations. For many villagers this creates a serious dilemma. They become increasingly dependent on working for the very industries that destroy their environment and the basis of their livelihoods. This raises important questions about the future, especially for the younger generation. Environmentalist visions of customary practices and visions of living "close to nature" often seem to stand in contrast to the desire for a modern lifestyle, education and "development" – however individually diverse conceptions of this might be (Schreer 2016). On the other hand, it is obvious that despite far-reaching changes, the rainforest remains important to former forest dwellers and is still considered "a home with which they associate closely" (Sercombe 2007: 250). Opinions, reactions and the anticipation of these changes are accordingly very heterogeneous (cf. Meijaard et al. 2013). While the expansion of logging, mining, oil palm plantations and other industries is desired by some as the realization of development, it is rejected outright or even violently resisted by others (cf. Potter 2009, Haug 2014). However, many villagers do not oppose resource exploitation or forest conversion per se, but rather the specific forms and structures in which these processes currently take place.

Looking at the enormous speed with which forests in Borneo continue to disappear, environmentalist efforts can seem unwinnable and frustrating. A major recent attempt to protect Bornean rainforest is the "Heart of Borneo" initiative, a government-led and NGO-supported program initiated jointly by Brunei, Indonesia and Malaysia to sustainably manage the mountainous area running through the center of the island from Mount Kinabalu in the northeast, down to the Schwaner Range in the southwest.[2] However, the initiative seems to be of dubious value as coal mining (Großmann & Tijaja 2015) and palm oil plantations are allowed within the area. The WWF, the major NGO involved, has

2 http://www.heartofborneo.org/ (accessed 08.06.2016).

been especially heavily criticized for promoting a green economy which something of a wolf in sheep's clothing (Eilenberg 2015). Another ray of hope, for some at least, has been the approach to mitigate global climate change through "Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation" (REDD+). By creating a financial value for the carbon stored in trees, REDD+ makes forests more valuable. While proponents of the mechanism view this enhancement of forest value as a necessary and important precondition for including forests in a future carbon trading system, REDD+ critics warn that such a conception will have largely negative impacts for forest dependent communities and cast doubt on the effectiveness of this model (for critical discussions of REDD+ see Bumpus & Liverman 2011, Corbera & Schroeder 2011, Griffiths 2009, McGregor et al. 2015). Lounela (this volume) shows how a climate change mitigation program in Central Kalimantan contributes to conflicting value orientations as the rubber economy promoted by the program is associated with values and economic behavior that stand in sharp contrast to those associated with swidden cultivation. But despite increasing anonymity and accumulation, villagers continue to uphold the values of sharing and solidarity.

In 1993 Victor King wrote: "Unless something is done to halt or considerably reduce rainforest clearance, then the prospects for the Dayaks must be bleak indeed. The very resources upon which they have depended for centuries – the land, forests and rivers – will no longer be able to sustain them. […] [The Dayak] who, over the course of four thousand years or so, have adapted to the natural environment, used it and protected it, will have been transformed into marginal peasants, estate workers and urban wage laborers, in the space of about 40 years" (King 1993: 302). At the time of writing, the year 2033 is still 17 years away. However, for some Dayak this dark prophecy has already come to pass, while others are pushing it forward, gaining huge profits from resource exploitation. Others still struggle against this bleak forecast, eager to create a brighter future.

A major step forward can be identified in the announcement by the Indonesian Constitutional Court on May 16, 2013 that customary forests are no longer considered to be state forest. This case was based on a petition by the Indonesian indigenous peoples' movement (*Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara*, AMAN) and two indigenous communities, and was filed in March 2012.[3] The new legislation is perceived as a critical breakthrough in the struggle for indigenous rights and although the results remain to be seen (Butt 2014), communities have been motivated by it to engage in new creative ways to protest

3 http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/rights-land-natural-resources/news/2013/05/constitutional-court-ruling-restores-indigenous-pe

against non-transparent development practices and to demand the acknowledgement of their customary rights. An innovative example is the usage of unmanned aerial vehicles (drones) to generate high-quality community controlled maps to challenge spatial planning processes as described by Radjawali and Pye (2015).

1.4 Debated Ethnic Categories: Identity, Ethnicity and Ethnic Violence

Borneo is an island of extreme social, cultural and linguistic mobility. From prehistoric times, Borneo has been vital to Austronesian migrations due to its location at the center of Southeast Asia and today it presents us with "an amalgamation of ethnic groups with often very different origins" (Adelaar 1996: 81). In its subsequent history, Borneo became a crossroads for virtually all major civilizations − Chinese, Indic, Islamic, European − and the world religions based upon them. In more recent times, colonialism, Borneo's division among the three nation states of Indonesia, Malaysia and Brunei, and its embedding in the wider global arena brought about still more transformations. The island is a melting pot of diverse influences and, therefore, a challenge for systematic approaches to "ethnicity," "comparative religion," and, more generally, for theorizing "change" as well as "continuity."

It was with Fredrik Barth's (1969) influential book on "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries" that the term "ethnic(ity)" gained currency in social anthropology and began to replace what had previously been referred to as "races," "tribes" or "cultures" (see Despres 1975, Cohen 1978). Not long after, King and Wilder (1982) presented their focus volume "Southeast Asia and the Concept of Ethnicity," the goal of which was to present a corrective against the prevalent Western "xeno-ethnocentrism" (King & Wilder 1982: 1) based on notions of "tribal cultures in isolation" and "tribal homogeneity" and to help ethnicity take its place as "a central rather than a special problem of social structure" (King & Wilder 1982: 5). Most importantly, in that focus volume King also presented his "Ethnicity in Borneo: An Anthropological Problem," which is considered a key summary of the difficulties which scholars face in studying ethnicity in the context of Borneo. Since then, there has been a multitude of publications on ethnic identity in Borneo studies and it is especially during the last two decades that "the theme of identity and more specifically ethnicity and ethnic relations [has become] one of increasing and significant interest in the literature, and one which has resonance in other parts of Southeast Asia as well" (King 2013b: 4). The most recent initiative on Dayak ethnicity is Sillander and Alexander's (eds., 2016) "Belonging in Borneo: Refiguring Dayak Ethnicity in Indonesia."

When talking about ethnicity, identity and culture, King's statement that "[o]ne of the first and most important tasks for a field anthropologist is to define his units of analysis" (King 1982: 23) is undoubtedly correct. However, at the same time, King problematizes the search for clear analytical units for Borneo: "with a few noticeable exceptions, the delimitation of ethnic categories and groupings and the examination of inter-ethnic relations have met with numerous difficulties" (King 1982: 23). Indeed, the complex history of Borneo produced a plethora of names for a great number of diverse communities, which posed a significant challenge to "ethnic identification" and ultimately led to various schemes of "classification" and concomitant underlying criteria[4] (see Needham 1975 and Großmann, this volume, on polythetic classification).

Clearly, the task of classifying 'ethnic units' is an example par excellence of the methodological and theoretical difficulties of anthropology, that is to avoid terminological 'ethnocentrism'. Are the Western 'cultural constructs' of 'ethnicity', 'culture' (see e.g. Fishman 1985, Rousseau 1990: 44, Metcalf 2010: 4) and 'identity' (Fearon 1999: 2, Buckingham 2008: 1) transhistorically and transculturally applicable? And if, then, how to adapt them to the Borneo context? Obviously, the relation between identity, ethnicity and culture remains a difficult one. Some scholars consider the latter concept to be central to the former ones, treating ethnicity as synonymous with cultural identity (King 2013a: 18), while others consider it a special kind of identity. Still others argue that "'ethnicity' and 'identity' are not necessarily inseparable" (see Chua 2007: 282). And, finally, Sillander and Alexander (2016: 98), in their recent discussion of Dayak ethnicity (as regards pre-colonial localized groups), concluded that "association with a locality, political unity, kinship and to some extent descent, were the key factors − the sources of consciousness of kind − while culture was notably insignificant."

In pre-colonial Borneo, Rousseau (1990: 11) explains, "groups have not defined themselves primarily in ethnic terms." Indeed, most of the current ethnonyms of Dayak societies are exonyms of recent origin (e.g. Iban, Ngaju), while traditionally, locality, and more specifically the stretch of the river where

4 It should also be noted here that Austronesian historical linguistics has made much progress in the study of Bornean languages and ethnic classifications over the last five or six decades. Linguistic subgrouping hypotheses are based on sound methodologies which produce reliable results, provided the necessary language data are available. See, for example, Dahl's (1951) relating of Malagasy to Ma'anyan of southeast Kalimantan, Adelaar's (1994) sub-grouping of Tamanic with the South Sulawesi languages, Blust's (2007b) analysis of Sama-Bajaw as belonging to a Greater Barito grouping or Smith's (2015) recent look at the classification of Kayanic and Kenyah (as well as Penan and Sebop). However, it needs to be stressed that historical linguistics is primarily concerned with classifying languages, rather than ethnicities.

settlements are located, has been the major criterion for self-identification, even if group members do not share a common origin or language (see also Sillander's recent introduction of the concept of "microethnicity," 2016: 102-120). It was only with the onset of the colonial period and in the context of modernity that a limited number of major ethnic categories crystallized and ethnic identity (in the Western sense) emerged (Rousseau 1990: 11, 74, King & Wilder 2003: 203-204).

Of tremendous importance was the early division of Borneo societies into the two major categories of Dayak and Malay. Starting out as a derogatory term used by coastal dwellers, Dayak came to be used by the British and Dutch colonial administrations as a general term for all non-Muslim natives of the interior. In British North Borneo, on a subordinate level, it also served to differentiate between Sea-Dayak (Iban) and Land-Dayak (Bidayuh). After European colonialism, the label Dayak became, so to speak, officially latent. In Malaysian Borneo, a fixed system of ethnically based categories (Chua 2007: 271) developed consisting of a four-fold classification of Dayak societies into Bidayuh, Iban, Melanau and Orang Ulu (in addition to Malay, Chinese and Indian), while in Indonesian Borneo, Dayak ethnicity was largely suppressed by Suharto's *Orde Baru* regime. However, following the collapse of the *Orde Baru* in Indonesia (and, if less overtly, increasingly also in Sarawak), the term Dayak re-emerged as a positive term in the development of a specific *identitas* of Borneo's (non-Malay) natives below the level of national identity, even to the point of what is now often referred to as pan-Dayak identity (e.g. Maunati 2012). Thus, as Sillander and Alexander (2016: 96) recently expressed it: "In the process, ethnicity itself, along with identity, has become an important concept and political problem for the Dayaks, from having formerly been of limited concern and mainly an administrative and ethnographic problem." In this volume, Duile, focusing on West Kalimantan, gives an overview of the process of Dayak identity construction from colonial times until the present and analyses the changing 'constitutive outsides' (Laclau 1990, Thomassen 2005) pivotal in shaping Dayakness as a collective identity over time. The transmigrant's ethnic identities, he argues, emerged as the 'constitutive outside' for pan-Dayak identity. Duile further shows that the development of Dayak identity is a complex history of both continuity and ruptures in discourses and practices.

Classifications of ethnicity and identity remain the objects of intense anthropological debate. The study of ethnicity and identity in Borneo and beyond has been shaped primarily by two different sorts of approaches commonly referred to as "primordialist" or "essentialist" on the one hand, and "constructivist" or "instrumentalist" on the other (see Großmann, this volume, for an overview). That is, borrowing Chua's (2007) terms, scholars have focused

on either 'fixity' or 'flux' (which is, as King 2013a: 25 notes, also true of debates in relation to the concept of culture and, we might add, the current ontology versus ontogeny debate in new animism studies). While ethnicity has long been equated with "primordialism" (King & Wilder 2003: 196), it is the dynamic, negotiated and relational character of ethnicity and identity that has enjoyed wide consensus among scholars (e.g. Boulanger 2009: 19). "Nevertheless," says King (2013a: 25-26), "we should not lose sight of the fact that however fluid and contingent 'identities' are, they take on a real and more solid and fixed quality, for most if not all of us (...) and language (...) is a vital element in claims for distinctiveness and difference or alternatively sameness and shared identity/ethnicity" (ibid.: 216-217). Taking up many of these threads, Großmann, in this volume, offers an interesting micro-study of the (Kaharingan practicing) Punan Murung and (Muslim) Bakumpai of Tumbang Tujang in Central Kalimantan and presents an example of the emergence of a new shared "relational ethnic identity," which she terms "content, close to nature, half-nomadic indigenes." Language, marriage and food, she says, are the only realms in which ethnic difference is enforced. Großmann further identifies continuities within the ethnification of resource and rights politics, when ethnic groups continue to be treated as "static and clearly demarcated" by cultural rights and development programs, which therefore "empower members of certain ethnic groups but exclude members of other ethnic groups."

Quite naturally, most of this recent literature on Dayak ethnicity has been concerned with changing conditions rather than with aspects of continuity. Indeed, especially in the nascent anthropology of Christianity, a dominant, albeit contested, view developed "that cultural anthropology has generally been a science of continuity" (Robbins 2003: 221). It is probably Chua, in her work on religious conversion, who has argued most fervently "that if Robbins's ambition to align anthropological analysis and native exegesis is to be followed through, then it behooves us to take those continuity centered discourses as seriously as we do those on discontinuity" (2012a: 513). In her ethnography of a Bidayuh village in Malaysian Borneo, Chua (2012 a, b) "reveals how conversion can also foster modes of thinking and speaking about continuity between Christianity and 'the old ways'" (2012a: 511). In his contribution to the present volume, Oesterheld takes up this focus with respect to anti-Madurese violence in Kalimantan. Current analyses on the issue, he says, have largely ignored "Dayak people's insistence on tradition and 'continuity speaking.'" In his genealogical approach, he explores the significance of a more distant past (reaching back to the mid-19th century) for the understanding of contemporary anti-Madurese violence by focusing on the local narratives, which lead him to discern "continuities of both form and function of 'justified' violence in Kalimantan."

1.5 New Approaches in Religious Studies: Animism, Ritual Practice and Language

While Western contact with Borneo probably reaches back as far as 500 years,[5] the bulk of our early knowledge about the island's religious life only began to form in the second half of the 19th century through adventurers, colonial officials and missionaries. Precious as most of these early accounts are, this first period of engagement with Borneo was dominated by non-professional observers and is, therefore, often described as pre-scientific. The scientific period only began around 150 years ago, after Wilken's (1884-85) reception of Tylor's (1871, 2 vol.) epoch-defining theory of animism, followed by Kruyt's (1906) major study on Indonesian animism and the works of such eminent Borneo scholars as McDougall (1911) and Nieuwenhuis (1911, 1917). Evolutionist theories, that is animism and its later rival pre-animism (e.g. Ossenbruggen 1916, Kruyt 1918, van der Leeuw 1928), as well as diffusionism (e.g. Heine-Geldern 1928, 1932) were primarily concerned with processes of historical change, and were later dismissed as conjectural history in academia. However, while animism became obsolete as a theory of the origin of religion, it persisted as a general label for the Dayak religions.

A third period in religious scholarship began in the 1940s with de Josselin de Jong's (1935) 'Leidener School' (e.g. Schärer 1946) and ended with Needham's 'Oxford School' (e.g. Jensen 1974) in the 1980s. It was the period of structuralist approaches, which were primarily concerned with principles of social and symbolic classification rather than socio-cultural change (King and Wilder 2003: 63, 135) and, as regards Borneo, developed a strong focus on the so-called 'dualistic principle' as a core structural element in Dayak religious systems. With the turn towards development and practice in the 1980s, reinforced by rapid transformations during the last two decades, a fourth period can be recognized: "Following Conley (...) (1973), we have enjoyed a spate of studies, mainly examining processes of conversion (...) as well as the continuities and discontinuities which result from changes in religious belief and practice" (King 2013: 41). Also, scholars began to develop a stronger interest in rituals, i.e. ritual symbolism, ritual language, conceptualizations of health, illness and death (e.g. Wilder 2003, Couderc & Sillander 2012, Herrmans 2015). More recently, and reinforced by ontological anthropology, Borneo scholars have finally begun to focus on developments in so-called 'New animism' studies (e.g. Béguet 2006, 2012, Appleton 2012, Couderc 2012, Uchibori 2014, Herrmans 2015, Sillander 2016).

5 Trusting in claims of Varthema's arrival in 1504-1507.