Over the last several decades the indigenous architecture of Southeast Asia has drawn a degree of interest not present in Borneo at least since the latter half of the nineteenth century, when the great longhouses, mausoleums, and other built forms of the interior attracted the attention of many outsiders. Much of the renewed interest in these architectural forms has been focused on the rapidly vanishing or now extinct traditional versions known mainly from photos and illustrations of earlier periods or from a small number of surviving examples or re-creations. The present-day traveler who visits Borneo and sets out to see the marvelous buildings pictured, described, and analyzed in the recent literature is liable to think that he or she has ended up in the wrong place if careful use is not made of up-to-date guidebooks. Much of the architecture of Borneo and other areas of the humid tropics of Southeast Asia was never intended to last,
and, built as it was of wood and other organic materials, lasted it has not. This is especially so in areas where governments or others with power or influence over interior peoples have been hostile to traditional architectural practices. The abandonment or transformation of traditional built forms is also, however, a consequence of modern, national, and global processes and influences—technological, economic, cultural, and political. Logging and other processes of deforestation have also strongly affected building practices. And eventually there is also a loss of local knowledge so that those who may wish to perpetuate or revive architectural traditions are not able to do so.

While this book is about the architecture of Borneo, it is not intended to cover the built environment of all of the populations that are or should be regarded as “indigenous.” All that can be reasonably said in the way of identifying the indigenous or native groups of Borneo is that they can be differentiated from the Chinese, Indian, Javanese, Balinese, Madurese, Bugis, southern Filipino, and others (not to mention Europeans, who have been only transients) who readily identify themselves as such and who have arrived in the last two hundred years or so. The peoples on whom I focus in the present volume are those of the vast interior who, with a few exceptions, were more or less autonomous before the beginning of colonial rule.

These peoples of the interior have long identified themselves as ethnically separate from the Malays or Malayu and other Malay-speaking (but dialectically diverse) Muslims of the coastal and lower river areas. In contrast, however, to the recently arrived ethnic populations, the Malay peoples of Borneo are also indigenous in that most of them derive from local populations rather than ones from elsewhere. There are also important continuities between the indigenous Malays and the interior peoples, including architectural ones. All of the peoples of Borneo traditionally place their houses and most other buildings on piles; make extensive use of bamboo, palm thatch, wood, bark, and other organic building materials; and work with similar tools. At the same time, the coastal Muslim Malays belong to a civilization that is spread far beyond Borneo, around the Malayan Peninsula and the great islands of western Indonesia—a civilization that grew and flourished in relation to Indic and then Islamic influence and to trade and political control. While varying from one part of Borneo to another, the village houses (which are always single-family dwellings rather than longhouses), the palaces, mosques, and other built forms that comprise Malay architecture belong more to this larger tradition. When I first arrived in Sarawak, I was struck by the presence of the same sorts of beautiful old Malay houses with which I was already familiar from my previous stays in Kelantan in the northeastern part of peninsular Malaysia. The architecture of the interior peoples of Borneo, in contrast, while having common Austronesian roots with that of the inland or upland peoples of Sumatra, Sulawesi, and other areas, has clearly developed in its own ways, probably over a long period of time—although certainly not entirely without external influence or external material goods. In the present volume I consider Malay architecture mainly in relationship to its influence on that of the non-Muslim groups of the interior and in relation to processes of ethnic differentiation.

Things would be easier if I could simply say that this book is about the architecture or built environment of the “Dayaks,” who are relatively well known in both ethnological and popular terms and equated by many with the interior or tribal peoples of Borneo. This would have also relieved the need for many iterations of “indigenous,” “native,” or, more properly, “indigenous-interior” or “native-non-Malay” and the like or the also frequently used alternative, which is to list the specific groups—Bidayuh, Benua’, Iban, Kayan, Kenyah, Kajang, Melanau, Maloh, Ngaju, Rungus, Taman, and others—to which I
intend some generalization or other to apply. The term “Dayak” (in local languages daya, daya’, or dayuh) either originated with or was widely disseminated by Malays and then by colonial authorities. While perhaps originally used pejoratively by the Malays to refer to the wild tribal peoples of the interior, the term is perfectly acceptable in much of present-day Borneo and is officially and otherwise used by many groups themselves, as in such autonyms as Bidayuh and Lundayeh. The problem is that not all interior groups refer to themselves or are known by this term. Thanks apparently to the Dutch colonial regime, it is now applied to all the non-Malay indigenous peoples of Kalimantan or present-day Indonesian Borneo, as opposed to both the native Malay and the Chinese, Javanese, Bugis, Madurese, and other immigrant peoples. This is not the case in Malaysian Borneo or in the small nation of Brunei. In Sarawak, while the term “Dayak” is sometimes used in nationalistic contexts in which the various groups of the interior are seeking ways to refer to themselves collectively, it more properly refers only to the Bidayuh and the Iban (the Land and Sea Dayaks respectively of the colonial tradition). In Sabah or Brunei, a Dayak would most commonly be assumed to be a migrant Iban from Sarawak.

Fortunately the term “architecture” does not involve the sort of problems that “indigenous” or “Dayak” do. It means simply the built environment, built forms, or building traditions and practices, depending on the context. While formally trained architects and architectural historians may see a need to distinguish the sort of buildings and building practices found in the interior of Borneo from those in Western countries, I do not. Broad-minded and comparatively oriented experts on architecture sometimes speak of “architecture without architects” and note that the local building traditions of places like Borneo account for all but an infinitesimally small amount of all human architectural effort throughout history. Such building traditions are generally referred to in architectural circles by the special term of “vernacular” (as in Cambridge University Press’ admirable Encyclopedia of the Vernacular Architecture of the World, which includes various entries for Borneo). In this regard, perhaps, it is formal “architecture with architects” for which a special term should be used, not the more common variety. Nor would it be appropriate to refer to interior Borneo building traditions as “folk architecture.” This phrase is appropriately used in regard to Europe, India, or China, for example, in order to distinguish the buildings of local villagers from the monuments, palaces, civic buildings, cathedrals, and temples that form the urban or “great-tradition” architecture of these places. In Borneo a distinction between folk and great-tradition architecture might be made in the case of the Malays but not in that of the Dayaks or other interior peoples, for whom no such distinction exists.

**OUTSIDE VIEWS OF BORNEAN ARCHITECTURE: COLONIAL AND POSTCOLONIAL**

Whatever it should be called, until recently the architecture of the peoples of Borneo has been treated mainly in works devoted primarily to other matters. By the middle of the nineteenth century (and continuing well into the twentieth) descriptions of longhouses, mortuary structures, and other built forms had become common themes in the writings of explorers, scientific travelers, missionaries, colonial heroes, and administrators. River scenes showing longhouses—sometimes fortified—and other dwellings are especially common. Men’s houses, bridges, mausoleums, and other structures are also shown.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, ethnological accounts began to appear. These were works that focused on peoples, customs, and lifeways rather than the travels and adventures of the writer. The ethnological studies—including Henry Ling Roth’s The Natives of
FIG. 0.1 (facing top). Mid-nineteenth-century engraving of a Dayak village on the Barito River in southern Borneo.

FIG. 0.2 (facing bottom). Engraved illustration (originally in color) from C. A. L. M. Schwaner’s Borneo (published in 1853–1854) of Dayak longhouses surrounded by a high stockade (southern Borneo).

FIG. 0.3 (above). Originally colored engraving of a Murut bridge from Spenser St. John’s Life in the Forests of the Far East, published in 1862.
Sarawak and British North Borneo, Alfred Haddon’s *Head-Hunters: Black, White and Brown*, and Charles Hose and William McDougall’s *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*—were often explicitly comparative and sometimes synthesized information from different published sources. Houses in Hose and McDougall are discussed under material conditions, along with clothing, tools, pottery, and the like, and house building is treated as a handicraft, along with boat building, weaving, iron forging, and other manufacturing processes. Collecting went along with ethnology, and while entire buildings were not collected, carved posts, finials, and doors could be and were, in addition to statuary, mortuary posts, mausoleums, and an array of other objects. The Sarawak Museum, a vast repository of the material culture and ethnology of the peoples of Borneo, was founded at this time.

Both the early accounts and the later ethnological literature are often illustrated, first with drawings and later with photographs. In contrast to the early photographs, the older drawings are often very good. Those in A.W. Nieuwenhuis’ account of the Apo Kayan area in East Kalimantan include technical drawings of a Kayan longhouse that remain unsurpassed. As photography improved, the use of drawings declined.

After World War II the study of Bornean societies came to be dominated increasingly by social anthropologists, whose agenda, as established especially by Edmund Leach in Sarawak, was very different from that of earlier ethnologists. The interest shifted toward matters of social structure, development and change, and ritual and belief. In terms of living arrangements, it was the village and household rather than the physical house
mattered. While social anthropologists needed to say something about the material structure of the dwellings of the group in question, this was done as a prelude to the central discussion of family organization, kinship, marriage customs, community integration, political leadership, social stratification, and to some extent religious ideas and ritual practices. Material culture, whether of buildings, tools and weapons, or heirloom property, was mainly of interest in relation to social organization, not in and of itself, as it had been to earlier observers, who themselves were, conversely, seldom in a position to understand symbolic culture and social organization very well but could often competently enough describe a Dayak house, basket, sword, or tattoo design.

There were, however, some differences among the early social anthropologists. William Geddes, in his notable description of the Bidayuh men’s house in the upper Sadong area, wanted to convey the feeling of its height—both its roof in relation to the floor and its floor in relation to the ground—and he was able to do so in a very graphic way. But he did not know how high men’s houses were in either respect, for he had never obtained measurements of any kind (he explained) and could only guess. This acknowledgment was not offered as an admission of something that he should have done. All that really mattered about how high a men’s house was (unless perhaps it happened to fall down when people were in it) was how high it seemed to be—which was very high, especially if it was built on a hillside.

What Geddes did and did not do regarding men’s houses was also true of his treatment of longhouses. While these were discussed frequently in his scholarly
monograph and form the topic of an entire chapter of his more popular *Nine Dayak Nights,* Geddes’ descriptions of longhouses contain less information on their physical features than do his accounts of men’s houses. The height, width, and length of longhouses or the numbers of apartments comprising them were left unreported, as were also the methods of construction or materials. Entrance ladders, an unceasing matter of interest and trepidation for European visitors to longhouses, were an exception. Geddes discusses these at some length, partly as a matter of humor for the natives (who welcomed visitors with rice wine as they approached the longhouse and who at the time of his fieldwork had an amusing song about a ladder that breaks beneath the weight of an honored guest), but mainly to make a sociological point. This point was that entrance ladders were the only publicly owned part of a Land Dayak longhouse and therefore once built were hardly maintained, a reflection of the generally low level of civic cooperation in the village.

Derek Freeman, another of the first group of social anthropologists in Sarawak, took architecture more seriously in ways other than purely sociological. His classic *Report on the Iban* includes a description of the Iban longhouse as a physical structure. This description, which includes valuable information on several matters (including the size and number of apartments in longhouses in the Baleh River area), appears in the opening pages of a long chapter on the *bilik* (apartment-household) family and itself focuses on the social uses of longhouse space. Freeman also noted that entrance ladders were the only publicly owned parts of Iban longhouses and that, as such, were not looked after with much diligence once they had been carved from a log, set up, and ritually consecrated.

In bringing issues of social organization of longhouses to the fore, the early social anthropologists were especially concerned with correcting what they regarded as mistaken impressions, with the result that much of
what they stressed was negative—that is, they tended to emphasize what longhouses were not. Perhaps in part reflecting the 1950s cold war reaction to the spread of communism, the main impression to be corrected was the notion that the longhouse was a communal organization—that is, one that acted collectively and subordinated the property rights and other interests of individuals and families to those of the larger group. Geddes went the furthest and described Land Dayak (Bidayuh) longhouse society as verging on anarchy. Freeman emphasized the cohesion of the Iban longhouse community in some respects but argued that it was based on important but limited ritual concerns. George Appell, a student of Freeman, found a rather similar pattern among the Rungus of Sabah.11 Stephen Morris, who had studied the coastal Melanau as another researcher in

**FIG. 6.7.** A.W. Nieuwenhuis’s (1907) detailed scale drawings (originally in color) include this longitudinal cutaway of the house of the Kayan chief Kwing Irang, circa 1900, upper Mahakam River, East Kalimantan.
Leach’s early group, encountered a different form of social organization, one involving authority and hierarchy, but since his initial focus was on the economics of sago production, this did not become evident until later.  

As subsequent social anthropological studies were carried out among a wider range of longhouse societies, including ones more like the Melanau, a different set of sociological issues emerged. While the earlier studies were concerned with matters of autonomy and integration, the later ones were especially concerned with hierarchy. The Melanau, Kayan, Kenyah, Kajang, and Maloh were variously described in these studies as being strongly, if not always rigidly, stratified into hereditary sectors of nobles or aristocrats, commoners, and slaves. Some, perhaps most, anthropologists have concluded that these groups and others are basically very different kinds of societies than the Iban, Bidayuh, and Rungus. Others have argued that such differences have been overemphasized—that, on the one hand, no longhouse-dwelling peoples are entirely egalitarian and, on the other, hierarchy varies among the formally stratified groups. Jérôme Rousseau, in particular, challenged Freeman’s characterization of the Iban as classless, and Freeman responded sharply that they were and delineated in detail the fundamental differences between the egalitarian Iban and the hierarchical Kayan. While the issue of hierarchy has not been mainly about architecture, it does concern it, for the Melanau, Kayan, Kenyah, Maloh, and other hierarchically organized groups customarily tend to build different sorts of longhouses than do the Iban, Bidayuh, and Rungus—or so it has often been claimed. The expression of hierarchy in longhouse design and in other architectural forms is a significant issue with which I will deal in several chapters.

While social anthropologists in Borneo have generally approached domestic architecture from the perspective of social structure, those focusing on the built forms of other islands in the region (especially of eastern Indonesia) have been more concerned with meaning, symbol, and cosmology. In these studies, which began in the 1960s, the house has been taken to be a map or template of the culture. The impetus has been, in part, the influence of Lévi-Strauss, as well as of the work of earlier Dutch structural ethnologists in the region on indigenous cosmologies and exchange practices. The issues and perspectives have been drawn together and discussed especially in Roxana Waterson’s wide-ranging The Living House, the most comprehensive treatment of the indigenous nonmonumental architecture of Southeast Asia yet produced.

In Southeast Asia, as elsewhere, symbolic approaches to architecture have tended to focus on the metaphorical characteristics of buildings—on how the houses in particular have been used to represent central cultural ideas or are thought to have the attributes of other things, including living creatures. The pioneering work on architectural symbolism in Borneo was done in the early twentieth century by the missionary-ethnologist Hans Schärer (known mainly through the translation of Rodney Needham) on the rituals and beliefs of the Ngaju of the far south of the island. Schärer described Ngaju architecture and other traditions (most famously mortuary practices and beliefs) in terms of several pervasive structural distinctions—male and female, upperworld and underworld, upriver and downriver, hornbill and water serpent. Although scholars have mainly followed up on Schärer’s work on Ngaju mortuary ritual ideas and practices, the general cosmic distinctions he identified are important regarding architecture throughout the interior of Borneo. Of course, the linking of the house and the local landscape with the cosmos works both ways. That is, Bornean notions of divinities and the afterlife are also a refraction of the visible, lived-in world—the gods have human characteristics and may appear in the guise of animals (especially birds), and heaven has rivers, forests, rice fields, and longhouses. And Bornean peo-
People tend to think symbolically of houses and villages in other ways as well, as having some of the same characteristics of human bodies—that is, in humoral terms of hot and cold.

Beyond its connections to social structure and to symbolism, cosmology, and artistry, Bornean architecture has drawn interest in relation to ecological issues and environmental studies. Early descriptions of building practices tended to make only minimal observations about such matters. In the past it was commonly assumed that the availability of building material was unlimited. It was sometimes noted that where possible, house posts, beams, floorboards, and shingles were reused when constructing a new building. Beyond this, getting materials was seen as a matter of going into the forest and cutting down trees and turning them into whatever was needed. Even in the past, however, large villages built in new areas required large amounts of timber.

Perhaps in part in relation to the emergence of environmental studies, more recent scholars have looked more closely at such matters. Several anthropologists have linked the abandonment or absence of longhouses to the disappearance of ironwood trees. Other recent research on building practices and forest resources, including Timothy Jessup’s studies in the Apo Kayan plateau of east central Borneo in present-day East Kalimantan, show that interior builders are flexible and make use of a considerable variety of tree species while using their favorites for various purposes. In many areas, however, access to forests of the sort on which builders formerly relied is now a thing of the past, with the result that houses are being built mainly with purchased materials, including bricks or concrete blocks, as well as the more widely used corrugated metal sheets. This was one of the topics on which I worked during my last period of fieldwork in 1998–1999 in Sarawak. Here the Bidayuh, as well as some of the Iban, have been strongly affected by the reduction of the availability of lumber from forests due to rural agricultural development projects and commercial logging, as well as by the expansion of traditional swidden practices and population growth.

My Own Interests and Biases

My entry into the study of Bornean architecture was by the back door, as it were. Beyond some personal involvement with woodworking and carpentry, my interests in architecture were initially with its relationship to ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of culture. I was aware that the practice of living in multifamily longhouses has long had important implications for ethnic boundaries along two lines. The first is that in the deep interior areas, where nomadic hunter-gatherers (commonly known as Penan in Sarawak and Punan in Kalimantan) have comprised up to 25 percent of the population, longhouses traditionally form a boundary marker with the more numerous, settled swidden cultivators—that is, the nomads customarily live in small, separate family shelters while the cultivators have longhouses. Over the last several decades or so this pattern has broken down, but in a way that continues to illustrate the association of longhouses with sedentariness and cultivation. That is, at least in Sarawak (and apparently also in some cases in earlier periods in Kalimantan), as nomads have settled into more permanent villages and begun to practice farming, with the encouragement and help of either the longhouse dwellers (with whom they have been affiliated through trade in forest products) or the government, they have commonly moved into longhouses, where many of them are today.

The second ethnic boundary involving longhouses is that between the swidden cultivators of the interior and the Malays, Chinese, and other downriver groups. Except perhaps for the Chinese, whose blocks of shop houses are built in a connected row like longhouses (and appear to have been a model for some of the innovations in long-
In the past, this ethnic interface occurred mainly along the coasts and inland along a few of the larger rivers of Borneo. These were the locations of the sultanates and other Malay and Chinese trading towns that became the focal points of colonial administration and that today are the main centers of government, commerce, education, and development. As noted above, the Malay and other coastal Muslim populations of these regions are probably mainly of local origin, formed as the interior peoples moved toward the coast and altered their identity. This usually involved a shift in religious affiliation (to Islam), in language (to
the local dialect of Malay), and in architecture (to single-family houses), all of which are taken to be part and parcel of a Malay way of life.

In the more recent period, architecture and ethnicity have become more complicated, with some interior groups in Sarawak and most of those in Kalimantan having abandoned longhouses while retaining a Dayak or other local ethnic identity. In Sarawak many members of interior, longhouse-dwelling groups have moved to coastal or downriver urban areas while maintaining family apartments in longhouses in the interior, to which they return for festivals and other visits. The association of longhouses with upriver backwardness notwithstanding, maintaining a residence in one is something of which urban dwellers are proud, and it is an advantage to indigenous political leaders.

Unlike many anthropologists in recent decades, I did not start out doing research in Borneo by living at length

FIG. 0.9. Map showing locations of groups mentioned in the book.
among a particular group and focusing on issues of social organization. My initial inquiries in Sarawak were an extension of earlier studies in Kelantan in northeastern peninsular Malaysia on latah, a famous culture-bound syndrome. I had wanted to find out about the occurrence of latah among some of the main ethnic groups of Sarawak and did surveys among the Selako Bidayuh and Sebuyau Iban in Lundu, the Melanau of Dalat on the Oya River, and the Saribas Iban and Malays of Betong on the Layar River. I also made more limited inquiries in various other areas, especially among the Iban on the middle Rajang and Baleh Rivers. The six months that I initially spent traveling and living in these places were very fruitful in terms of my original purposes, and I continued to return over the next several years to some of the same places and to new areas. More important from the perspective of the present inquiry, my experiences focused my attention on houses and the different patterns of architectural change that had occurred throughout central and western Sarawak. With the exception of the Malays, the various groups of this region had previously lived in longhouses, but by 1985 only some of them continued to do so. All of the Sebuyau Iban of Lundu and the Melanau of the Oya River had abandoned longhouses for Malay-style single dwellings. Most of the Selako and many of the other Bidayuh had also by then moved out of longhouses, while most of the Saribas Iban and nearly all of the other Iban outside of town areas were still living in them and continue to do so at present.

Equally important, the longhouses I saw varied greatly. Aside from the ethnic differences of the sort noted in the literature and discussed below in this book, they varied in terms of change; some were very similar to those discussed and illustrated in nineteenth-century accounts, while others were very modern, two-story, built-on-the-ground brick-and-mortar affairs. The Bidayuh, who had widely abandoned longhouses, had kept those they still had in a fairly traditional form. The Iban, in contrast, who had mainly retained longhouses, tended to favor modern types. While still often living in older, traditional longhouses, the Iban, when replacing older longhouses, were commonly building modernized new ones. While this pattern may seem odd, it was one I subsequently found to be common throughout Sarawak—the Kenyah, Kajang, and Kayan groups had also, to a considerable extent, stayed in longhouses but generally were building very modern versions.

Once I had finished my research on latah, I decided to continue to work on projects in Sarawak, to concentrate on the Bidayuh and on matters of ethnicity and change. I was attracted to the Bidayuh for several reasons. They were mainly known from the early social anthropological accounts of Geddes, who had chosen—somewhat contrary to the instructions of Leach to find a village undergoing substantial modern change—a remote and rather traditional community in the deep interior of Bidayuh country. It was also apparent that in ethnological terms there were notable differences among the various Bidayuh groups, specifically between those of the Sadorng area in the east and those of the Bau and Lundu areas to the west.

Although Bidayuh longhouses were often not much to begin with (compared to those of some of the other groups) and were gone from many areas, Bidayuh architecture was notable in several respects. The first was that Bidayuh villages had previously been located on ridge tops and steep mountainsides, and a few are still in these locations. Part of the change that the Bidayuh had undergone was to relocate to lower and more open settings, usually at the base of the mountain on which they had formerly lived. While this mountain orientation was formerly common among interior tribal groups of other areas of Southeast Asia, many of the other longhouse dwellers in Sarawak and throughout Borneo generally
had primarily been riverside peoples. The architectural changes and continuities involved in the shift also seemed interesting.

The second feature of Bidayuh architecture was the men's houses, which had frequently been referred to in the older literature and which had more recently been engagingly described by Geddes. Although some groups on the other side of the island in East Kalimantan also have men's houses, they are unique to the Bidayuh in Sarawak and to the Bidayuh and related groups in West Kalimantan. By the late 1980s the older men's houses were gone from most Bidayuh villages in Sarawak, and of those that remained none that I learned of were being used as sleeping quarters for unmarried men. In a few villages, however, the adherents of the old or adat (traditional) religion were still actively caring for the skulls kept in the remaining men's houses and were once in a while holding major festivals for them. More important from the perspective of my interests in ethnicity and the politics of culture, men's houses were being revived as ethnic cultural symbols at the urging of modern, mostly Christian, Bidayuh intellectuals and nationalists, as well as more traditional adherents of the old religion. Some older men's houses were being refurbished, and many new ones were being built to serve new purposes; the results of these efforts can be readily seen in and around Kuching. Over the years I wrote several papers on these developments.22

Between 1994 and 1997 I made several trips to West Kalimantan and East Kalimantan, then again in 1998 to West Kalimantan. These trips enabled me to make comparisons between Sarawak and several regions of Indonesian Borneo, including the upper Sambas area and the upper Kapuas and Mendalam Rivers in the interior of West Kalimantan and the middle Mahakam region in East Kalimantan. These forays, along with the accounts of various colleagues, tended to confirm what had occurred to me earlier regarding architectural change in Sarawak.23 In Indonesian Borneo few or no longhouses exist in many areas. Those that do tend to be of an older, more traditional style in terms of both design and materials than do those in the areas of Sarawak where longhouses remain the most common form of dwelling. Indeed the contrast was striking. The persistence of more traditional styles of longhouses in Kalimantan is due in some instances to the Indonesian government's attempts to counter the effects of its earlier efforts to have longhouses abandoned and destroyed as backward and otherwise undesirable living arrangements and to preserve the few remaining older ones as museum pieces and tourist attractions. But it could also be seen in the areas where new longhouses were being built or older ones rebuilt in the traditional style, as in some of the Taman villages above Putissibau on the Kapuas and Mendalam Rivers of the interior of West Kalimantan.

There were other interesting developments to be seen. In both Kalimantan and Sarawak various modern political and cultural uses have been made of interior architecture. In Kalimantan, provincial governments and some Christian churches have recently incorporated Dayak built forms and artistry into their architecture. In the case of government efforts, the purpose has been to use local art and architecture to help foster provincial identities. This has included the use of local motifs in modern government buildings, monuments, and other structures, as well as the erection of rather freely interpreted model longhouses in some provincial capitals. In the case of Catholic churches, indigenous carving and painting are now sometimes added to church buildings, a reversal of earlier efforts at extinguishing interior cultural forms in association with conversion. In Sarawak, while Christian religious architecture shows fewer efforts to incorporate native forms than in some regions of Kalimantan, spectacular examples can be found. In addition,
perhaps partly in response to the popularity of longhouse tourism, internationally oriented hotels, resorts, and other tourist operations in Sarawak have incorporated interior architectural designs to a greater extent than in Kalimantan.

This book, then, is about the longhouses and other architectural forms of the interior peoples of Borneo, especially those of Sarawak (Malaysian Borneo) and the northern region of Kalimantan (Indonesian Borneo), with occasional reference to other areas, including Sabah (also Malaysian Borneo) and the southern part of Kalimantan. My aim has been to both document traditional architecture and note and analyze patterns of change and recent developments. These two concerns are reflected in the general organization of the book, the first in part 1, the second mainly in part 2. In chapter 1 I offer an overview of interior Bornean architecture and building practices, in chapter 2 I deal with longhouses, and in chapter 3 I offer a description and analysis of architectural symbolism. In dealing with change and present-day developments, I turn first in chapter 4 to the Bidayuh in particular and then in chapter 5 to broader changes involving longhouses. Chapter 6 is concerned with the present uses and (uncertain) future of indigenous Bornean architecture.