Malaysian Journal of Chinese Studies, 2024, *13*(1): 37–59

The Hakkas of Malaysia to 1970: Population, Livelihood, and Culture

Phin-Keong Voon*

To cite this article: Phin-Keong Voon (2024). The Hakkas of Malaysia to 1970: Population, Livelihood, and Culture. *Malaysian Journal of Chinese Studies 13*(1): 37–59. http://doi.org/10.6993/MJCS.202406_13(1).0003
To link to this article: http://doi.org/10.6993/MJCS.202406_13(1).0003

Abstract

In 1970, the Chinese comprised close to a third of the total population of 10.45 million in multi-ethnic Malaysia. The Chinese themselves were composed of several dialect communities varying in number, distribution, occupation, culture, and identity. One of the dialect groups were the Hakkas which formed a fifth of the Chinese. This study will discuss three broad themes relating to the Hakkas in terms of their distribution and settlement location; their occupational preferences and characteristics; and their cultural affinities and identity. The discussion of the population and distribution of the Hakkas is based mainly on data drawn from selected pre-war censuses. Aspects of settlement and livelihood are studied with special reference to considerations of location in the context of the rural-urban divide; and aspects of culture and identity are examined in terms of the traditional practices and perceptions of this community. The entire study is focused on the older generations born before independence. This is to provide a central thread to the discussion as well as to recognise the influence of the generational gap on preferences and perceptions among members of the community.

Keywords: Hakka community, population, distribution, livelihood, culture and identity

Introduction

The Federation of Malaya gained its independence in 1957 and Malaysia was formed in 1963. In 1970, the Chinese made up 3.56 million or 34% of the total population of 10.45 million (Department of Statistics, 1972). The Chinese were composed of Hokkiens (Fujian), Hakkas (Kejia), Cantonese (Guangfu), Teochew (Chaozhou), Foochow (Fuzhou), Hainanese (Hainan), Kwongsai (Guangxi) and other smaller groups.[1] Dialect identity was based on the self-identification of households at the time of census taking. Dialect diversity among Malaysian Chinese is in marked contrast to the more homogenous character of the Chinese in Indonesia or the Philippines which are dominated by the Hokkiens, or in Thailand where the Teochews form the majority. Of the Malaysian Chinese population of 5.68 million in 2000, the Hokkiens formed the largest group with 38.5%, while the Hakkas and Cantonese were next with 20.4% and 19.9% respectively. Smaller groups were the Teochews with 9.3%, Foochow 4.7%, Hainanese 2.6%, and Kwongsai 1.0% (Department of Statistics, 2005). These groups varied in distribution, occupation, and cultural identity, but united by a common spoken language, a written script, and traditional culture.

In the 18th century during the Industrial Revolution, different European powers were scrambling to extend their influence through colonial seizure and expansion of trade. Between 1786 and 1824, the British occupied Penang, Singapore, and Melaka. At the same time China was devastated by the Taiping Rebellion, the Opium Wars and repeated Western imperialist oppression. Singapore became the principal point of entry for Chinese immigrants trying to escape hardships in search of a better future overseas. Waves of Chinese moved into the tin-mining areas that were being opened up in the Malay States of Perak and Selangor from the 1840s. In 1895, the Federated Malay States (FMS) comprising Perak, Selangor, Negeri Sembilan and Pahang was established. The Chinese population doubled from 420,000 in 1901 to 860,000 in 1921 and doubled again to 1.88 million in 1947 (Hare, 1902; del Tufo, 1949).

To consolidate control, the British compiled detailed information on natural resources, populations, dialects and the distribution of different ethnic communities. Penang and Singapore began to conduct their population census in 1812 and 1824, and that of the FMS in 1891. The first unified census for all the states of Malaya took place in 1921. The first census of North Borneo (Sabah) took place in 1891 and that of Sarawak in 1939. The census was discontinued during the Japanese Occupation and was resumed in Malaya only in 1947 and North Borneo and Sarawak in 1950. The first pan-Malaysian censuses was held in 1970 and every ten years thereafter. Since some households were not absolutely certain of their dialect affiliation and that census officers were not familiar with these dialects, the accuracy of dialect statistics could be subjected to some margins of error. These statistics can only be relied upon to indicate broad patterns and trends.

Research on the Hakkas has increased in recent years. The literature on the Hakkas and other dialect communities has shown a lack of attention to themes that make use of reliable statistics and

factual sources to support claims and conclusions relating to specific issues. There is also a general scarcity of studies on population issues or local studies that make full use of official censuses or archival records.

The focus of this study is centred on three themes. The first is concerned with issues of population and its distribution; the next deals with the distinctive features of Hakka settlements and livelihood; and the last is an attempt to decode Hakka perceptions on their culture and identity. The purpose is to examine the relationships and characteristics of these broad features and to detect the nature and extent of changes over time and space. The study is confined to the period up to 1970 to acknowledge the fact that the Hakkas, like other communities, are not a monolithic social and cultural entity but display significant differences in the background, preferences, and perceptions between the older and younger generations born before and after independence. The focus on the older generation serves as a common thread to integrate the discussion.

Literature Review

The Chinese community emphasises the importance of education but not research. It was only in 1985 that the first research centre on the Malaysian Chinese community was established in Kuala Lumpur (see Voon, 2002). Studies on Chinese dialect groups are relatively scarce. This may be attributed to the lack of familiarity with research and with relevant reference materials and the difficulties of accessing these materials and statistics. Population census reports, for example, are not easily available to the public. Research on the Hakkas will broaden the general and theoretical knowledge about the community and their role and contributions to the development of multi-ethnic Malaysia. Also, in the trend towards the cultural homogenisation of the Chinese as a whole, there is a need to appreciate the finer aspects of the preferences and cultural practices of the Hakkas and other dialect groups.

The study of the Chinese community in Malaya began in the 18th century with the works of Western and local writers (see Voon, 2018). An early attempt was initiated by Lim Boon Keng who co-founded and edited the *The Straits Chinese Magazine* in Singapore. Published between 1897 and 1907, it was meant as a platform to debate issues concerning social reform, politics, education, and culture (B. Tan, 2016). In the Malay States, there was an early study by Middlesbrook on the Hakka settlement of Pulai in Kelantan in 1933. He also brought out the first study in 1951 on Yap Ah Loy, the pioneer in the early development of Kuala Lumpur (Middlesbrook, 1933 & 1955). Studies on Pulai were also carried out by American scholar Sharon Carstens in the 1980s and later (1980; 1983; 2022) and S. B. Lew, (2012, 2018 & 2020). A special study of the Hakka village of Titi in Negeri Sembilan was published in 1983 (Siaw, 1983). Many more studies have appeared in the proceedings of local and international conferences on the Hakkas. The World Hakka Association has organised international conferences on 30 occasions in different countries including China/

Taiwan/Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Japan, the United States and Mauritius, of which those of 1990, 1999 and 2019 were held in Malaysia. The Combined Hakka Association of Malaysia too organised conferences in 2004 and 2006 (see J. S. Lim, 2004 & 2006).

Recent publications on the Chinese in general deal with a variety of topics in pioneering efforts, selected personalities, clan associations, education, population, customs, beliefs, cuisine, and many others (see Chong, 2002; Lai, 1999 & 2019; J. S. Lim, 2004 & 2006; Zhang, 2022). The Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies organised conferences on the Chinese population and their economic contributions in 2004 and 2007 respectively (Voon, 2004; Voon & Khor, 2009). It also produced a two-volume publication on the Chinese contributions to nation building (Voon, 2007 & 2008). The Centre's more recent publications include a pictorial record of Selangor (Ser, 2012). There has been a broadening of the range of themes in research thanks to the involvement of an increasing number of local researchers and post-graduate students in local universities.

Population Growth and Distribution

Large-scale immigration of Chinese into the newly discovered tin fields of Perak and Selangor states began from the mid-19th century. Among these immigrants were substantial numbers of Hakkas. In 1891, of the 50,844 Chinese in Selangor, 28,125 were in the tin mines and 64% were Hakkas (Merewether, 1892). In 1911, the 58,316 Hakkas in Selangor made up 46% of the Chinese population and 39% of the entire state population. In the same year, there were 143,648 Hakkas in the FMS, accounting for 33% of all the Chinese (Pountney, 1911). The appeal of the tin mines in Perak and Selangor was such that 70% of the Hakkas in the Malay Peninsula were concentrated in the FMS in 1921 and 57% in 1947 (Nathan, 1922; del Tufo, 1949).

From the mid-19th century, Hakkas from West Borneo migrated to the gold mines in the Bau area of western Sarawak to escape persecution by the Dutch. By 1885, the Chinese population in Bau had increased to 4,000. In the early 20th century, the Brook authority encouraged Chinese immigration to boost agricultural production in Sarawak. In 1947, Hakkas and Foochows became the largest dialect groups with 45,409 and 41,948 persons respectively. A similar policy was adopted by the Chartered Company of North Borneo which engaged Christian missionaries in 1881 to recruit Chinese to open up agricultural land (Han, 1975). Each adult was granted 0.4 hectare (1 acre) of land and the young received 0.2 hectare (0.5 acre). The land enjoyed permanent tenure on a quit rent of 10 cents per 0.4 hectare.

In 1960, more than half the Chinese of Sabah and 30% of Sarawak were Hakkas. They were rather widely dispersed while the Foochows were clustered in the Sibu area. The initial recruitment of the Foochows was undertaken by Wong Nai Shiong (1849–1924) and later by the Methodist Missionary while the Basel Missionary was largely responsible for bringing in the Hakkas into Sabah (Chew, 2004; Jones, 2007; Ling & Thock, 2015).

Between 1901 and 1947, the Chinese of FMS rose by 3.5 times from 420,000 to 1.89 million. The relative share of the Hakkas remained constant at 20% but that of the more rapidly increasing Hokkien population eventually raised its share to 31%. On the other hand, the Cantonese share witnessed a drop from 31% to 22%. The Teochews and Hainanese also increased in number but on a smaller scale (Table 1).

Table 1

Population of Chinese Dialect Group in the Federated Malay States, 1901–1947 ('000)

	Dialect Group												Total	
	Hokkien		Cantonese		Hakka		Teochew		Hainanese		Others			
	Pop.*	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%
1901	100	23.9	129	30.8	94	22.4	36	8.6	20	4.8	40	9.5	419	100
1911	178	25.6	182	26.3	175	25.3	69	10.0	52	7.5	36	5.2	692	100
1921	253	29.4	253	29.4	203	23.7	77	9.0	54	6.3	19	2.2	859	100
1931	390	30.4	323	25.1	298	23.2	126	9.8	78	6.1	69	5.4	1,285	100
1947	593	31.5	484	25.7	397	21.1	207	11.0	105	5.6	98	5.2	1,885	100

Pop. - Population

Sources: Nathan, 1922; del Tufo, 1949

After independence, compilation of statistics on dialect groups is no longer available. The latest statistics from the Department of Statistics are unpublished figures for the year 2000. Table 2 shows the absolute and relative distribution of seven major Chinese dialect groups in each state. These statistics are probably the most reliable source of reference that is available. They may be considered broad estimates of the situation in 2000. [2]

Table 2

Population and Percentage Share of Seven Major Dialect Groups by State, 2000
(Population in 10,000)

State	Hakka	%	Hokkien	%	Cantonese	%	Teo-chew	%	Hainan	%	Foo-chow	%	Kwong -sai	%
Selangor	20.4	17.6	50.6	43.5	28.9	24.9	5.8	5.0	2.7	2.3	0.9	0.8	0.4	0.4
Johor	14.0	16.9	41.5	50.3	9.7	11.8	9.1	11.0	2.8	3.4	1.1	1.4	0.8	1.0
Pulau Pinang	4.0	7.2	29.8	54.2	6.5	11.7	12.3	22.3	1.1	2.0	0.3	0.6	0.1	0.1
Kuala Lumpur	10.9	18.5	19.0	34.7	18.4	33.7	2.3	4.1	1.5	2.8	0.5	0.9	0.2	0.4
Perak	13.4	21.6	15.4	24.9	20.2	32.6	6.0	9.7	1.0	1.6	2.8	4.6	1.2	1.9
Kedah	2.4	10.6	10.1	45.1	2.5	11.0	6.2	27.4	0.4	1.6	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.3
Melaka	3.2	19.0	8.1	47.7	1.7	10.0	1.1	6.5	1.1	6.5	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.3
Sarawak	16.2	31.5	6.9	13.5	2.9	5.7	3.8	7.4	0.8	1.5	17.8	34.8	0.04	0.1
Negeri Sembilan	6.2	30.1	6.4	30.8	5.5	26.7	0.4	2.1	0.8	3.8	0.5	2.6	0.2	1.1
Pahang	3.8	18.1	5.9	28.5	6.2	29.9	1.1	5.2	0.8	3.6	0.3	1.5	2.0	9.5
Sabah	14.8	58.0	3.4	13.3	3.1	12.3	1.2	4.5	0.7	2.6	0.5	2.0	0.05	0.2
Kelantan	0.4	8.0	3.0	67.0	0.6	12.5	0.1	2.2	0.2	3.5	0.01	0.3	0.02	0.5
Treng ganu	0.2	9.1	1.1	47.6	0.4	17.0	0.1	4.2	0.3	13.0	0.01	0.6	0.01	0.6
Perlis	0.4	21.0	0.9	48.0	0.2	9.5	0.3	14.7	0.04	2.3	0.01	0.3	0.03	1.7
Total	109.3		202.1		106.8		49.7		14.1		25.2		5.2	

The ancestral homeland of the Hakkas was the uplands of the Guangdong-Fujian-Jiangxi border region. [3] Hence the popular saying of "no Hakkas without uplands and no uplands without the Hakkas" (Y. H. Tan, 2019). In these mountainous environments the Hakkas eked out a living on mining and agriculture (Luo, 1976). From this ancestral heartland, the Hakkas spread to other parts of south China to form sub-groups such as the Jiaying, Huizhou, Dapu, Hepo, Fengshun and even "Teochew Kheh." [4] The Hakkas were attracted to the mining areas of West Borneo, the tin mining islands of Bangka and Billiton of the Netherlands East East and the tin fields of Perak and Selangor in Malaya. When rubber planting spread across the west coast of Malaya, these areas were similarly appealing to the Hakkas. The Hakka arrivals were unfamiliar with Malaya and tended to enter areas where similar dialect groups were well-established. This in turn influenced their livelihood and identity and enhanced their ties based on dialect affinities. In contrast, the Hokkiens and Teochews who lived along the coast of Fujian and parts of Guangdong provinces moved into

the ports and coastal locations to engage in maritime trade and related businesses. Initially, the Hakkas and Cantonese entered the FMS while the Hokkiens and Teochews were inclined to move into the Straits Settlements, Johor, and Kedah. In Sarawak, the Hakkas were dominant in the gold mining area of Bau. In other parts of the state and in Sabah, the Hakkas were more dispersed in areas surrounding the emerging towns to engage in rubber planting and agricultural production.

The distribution of the Hakkas then showed three main characteristics: an inclination to move away from the coast towards inland areas; a preference for areas on the outskirts of towns and rural areas; and a tendency to congregate among settlers from the same ancestral villages and sub-dialect affiliations.

Traditionally, the Hakkas "emphasise righteousness and look lightly on profits; emphasise agriculture and look lightly on business" (Y. H. Tan, 1997). In the Malay States they worked in the tin mines or engaged in rubber planting. They were not attracted to business and were rarely found along the coast and the larger inland towns. A source claimed that the Hakkas were founders of towns or "*bu*" (埠) (Ong, 2019). "*Bu*" refers to a pier or a town with a pier. In the local context, it is used to refer to a town in general with no direct allusion to its function. Unlike the Hokkiens and Teochows, there are no definite evidence to show that the Hakkas were inclined to engage in maritime trade or to settle along the coast. In fact, the Hakkas played a prominent role in opening up the "*fu*" (阜). [5] According to the authoritative *Kangxi Dictionary*, *fu* refers to hills or places with resources. Hence the Hakkas were the pioneers who founded settlements in the uplands or places rich in mineral resources.

Historically, the Hakkas were disposed to open up inland more than coastal areas. In 1931, the Hakkas were the smallest of the five major dialect communities in the port city Singapore, making up 4.7% of the Chinese population, compared with 43%, 22.5%, 19.6% and 4,8% respectively for the Hokkiens, Cantonese, Teochews, and Hainanese (Vlieland,1932). In Penang, the major dialect groups were the Hokkiens, Teochews, and Cantonese. They were settled in the urban centre of Georgetown to engage in business and maritime trade. The Hakkas made up a tenth of the Chinese population and they were largely concentrated in the hill district of Balik Pulau or "the back of the hills" as rubber and agricultural producers (Vlieland,1932). In Sarawak, the Hakkas in the Kuching district were known as *shanding* or "hill-top" people (Chai, 2007).

The Hakkas were indeed the founders of many towns in the inland areas of Perak, Selangor, Negeri Sembilan and other states. The most significant was the development of Kuala Lumpur under the leadership of Yap Ah Loy and his Huizhou compatriots and working with the colonial authorities and Malay partners (Gullick, 2000). Other towns where early Hakka footprints were conspicuous were Taiping, Ipoh, Kampar, Kubu Baru, Rawang, Kepong, Kajang, Seremban, and several smaller towns. As the number of Hokkiens and Cantonese increased, the less business minded Hakkas tended to disperse to the outskirts and rural areas. In 1911, the Hakkas made up

46% of the 91,000 Chinese of the Kuala Lumpur district, but only 25% of the town population (Pountney, 1911). Even in the towns their presence was rather subdued as they engaged in a few small businesses. The Hakka dialect too was "submerged" by more dominant dialect groups such as Cantonese in inland towns or Hokkien in the ports and coastal areas. In 1948, the Chinese in the outskirts of Kuala Lumpur, as in other district capitals and towns, were resettled into several compact New Villages located along the margins of towns. The New Villages on the outskirts of Kuala Lumpur are largely those of the Hakkas.

The Hakkas tended to settle down among groups from the same native villages or surname groups. In the 1740s, the Hakkas from Chaoyang, Jieyang, Haifeng, Lufeng, Jiaying and Huizhou were engaged in gold mining in West Borneo (Jackson, 1970; F. B. Wu, 1993). More than 200 years ago, Hakkas mainly from Jiaying and Dapu entered Pulai in the upper Kelantan in search of gold (Middlebrook, 1933). The tin mine workers of the Kuala Lumpur area were mainly from Huizhou and Jiaying. The Hakkas who arrived in Singapore or Melaka were largely from Dapu, while those to Johor were from the Hepo sub-dialect group from Jieyang county. In the Kuching district along the Kuching-Bau and Kuching-Serian roads, the Hepo Hakkas were spread along these roads, the Lufeng Hakkas were concentrated near Bau, the Huizhou near Kuching, and the Jiaying in the Serian area (T'ien, 1997). In the rubber trade, Hakka dealers operated in rural areas to supply the Hokkien dealers in Kuching. These urban dealers in turn supplied the Hokkien rubber exporters of Singapore. It was this supply chain built up through dialect-cum-business connections between the local-level dealers and the exporters in Singapore that consolidated the dominance of the Hokkiens in the rubber trade (T'ien, 1997).

Livelihood and Settlement

In the days when livelihood was closely related to the environment, the Chinese believed that a particular place tended to serve the needs of a particular group of people, in a way that those who lived in mountainous areas would depend on the mountains. With limited skills and employment opportunities, it was natural that early migrants were likely to engage in occupations that they were familiar with and lived among settlers from the same clan and in a physical environment reminiscent of their habitat.

The prospects of wealth in tin mining in the early 19th century prompted an influx of Chinese migrants to the Malay States. The discovery of the Larut tin fields in the 1840s attracted the entry of Hakkas. By 1862, their number had reached 20,000 and ten years later to between 30,000 and 40,000 (L. K. Wong, 1965). Their mine workers were largely Zengcheng Hakkas belonging to the Haishan secret society under the leadership of Chung Keng Kwee. There were also Huizhou Hakkas (also claimed to be Cantonese) of the Ghee Hing secret society (Khoo, 2003).

Farther south in the Klang Valley of Selangor, Huizhou Hakkas began to enter the newly discovered tin mining areas around Kuala Lumpur in the 1840s. In 1857, two Hakka traders started a retail shop in the emerging town to serve the mining camps (Middlesbrook & Gullick, 1983). Kuala Lumpur quickly emerged as the largest town in the Malay States and was made the capital of the newly established FMS in 1896 (Middlesbrook & Gullick, 1983). In the 1870s, the richest tin deposits were discovered in the Kinta Valley. By 1889 it had become the centre of the mining industry. In 1895, it produced 320,000 piculs of tin ore or 80% of the state's output (L. K. Wong, 1965).[6] A series of smaller mining centres also emerged along the tin belt stretching between the Kinta and Klang valleys.

In 1901, half the 300,000 Chinese in the Malay States were engaged in the tin mining industry and related employment. The Chinese population increased to 430,000 in 1911, of whom 150,000 were working in the tin mines (Pountney, 1911). Hakka women also played a special role in mining. These women, unlike their counterparts of other dialect groups, did not practise foot binding. Considerable numbers among them were able to work as "dulang washers". This was a physically demanding work which required standing in water for hours panning for tin ore. [7]

The environmental and economic background of Hakkas was not favourable to exposure to business practices and did not facilitate capital accumulation or building of business ties. Traditionally, Hakkas tended to engage in businesses dealing with Chinese medicine, textiles, and pawnbroking. [8] These businesses were stimulated by the demand of the large mining labour force dominated by the Hakkas. In the case of pawnbroking, the Hakkas began to dominate the trade in Singapore from the 1920s. In the Malay States, the principal pawnbrokers were the Hakkas and Cantonese and this was attributed to close association with tin mining (Tai, 2013). In contrast, the Hokkiens and Teochews specialised in gambier and pepper cultivation, maritime-related occupations such as fishing, dock workers, boat building, charcoal production (Anon, 1855). The earliest Chinese medicine shop was established in Penang in 1796. The founder's grandchildren also started a similar business in the tin-mining town of Kampar in Perak (Y. T. Wong, 2018). Among the early merchants of Selangor and Perak were Hakkas a few of whom later rose to prominence. These included Yap Ah Loy, Chung Keng Kwee (1821–1901), Yap Kwan Seng (1846–1902), Yao Tet Shin (1859–1915), Yong Koon (1871–1952), Aw Boon Haw (1882–1954) and others. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Cheong Fatt Tze (1841–1916) was known to be the richest man in Nanyang or Southeast Asia (Suryadinata, 2012; Ho, 2014). Some of these merchants were pioneers in the internalisation of business by spreading into selected Southeast Asian countries and to Hong Kong and mainland China. Hakka entrepreneur Cheong Fatt Tze built a business empire straddling British Malaya, Java, and China; Aw Boon Haw extended his reach into Nanyang and Hong Kong. Yong Koon's Royal Selangor Pewter built up a high-profile international presence (Chen, 2003).

Migrants and Settlers

It was generally assumed that Chinese migrants left their homes temporarily to make a fortune before returning to their villages. This assertion assumed that these immigrants were "birds of passage." The idea of temporary migration has not been supported by reality. While there were chances of striking it rich in mining, the reality was that few ever realised their dream. Although business offered prospects of success, few had the capital to embark on this venture. Instead, most of the migrants could only exchange their labour for meagre wages. Those who triumphantly returned to their ancestral villages were indeed few and far between.

There were convincing reasons to induce permanent settlement among the migrants. Many had left their ancestral villages by bearing the heavy cost of travel or entered their destinations as "piglets" to offer their labour in exchange for wages or as indentured labourers. A small proportion of Chinese arrivals was officially recruited as "settlers." The recruitment exercise was a deliberate attempt to expand the labour resources, populate the land, accelerate development, and hence to boost the revenue of the colonial territories.

Malaya soon turned out to be a highly paying colonial possession of the British. During the 20th century, Malaya yielded the highest per capita revenue in the British empire (Li, 1955). [9] In view of the tropical location of Malaya and the Borneo states and assumed insalubrious climate, these territories were not considered suitable for settlement by white settlers. [10] The authorities had to rely on immigrants to open up the vast expanses of virgin land. Considered the most suitable labour were the Chinese, Indians, and the peoples from the Netherlands East Indies. The colonial rulers of Sarawak and North Borneo offered attractive conditions to recruit Chinese settlers to perform the physical work of development. Between 1898 and 1911, the Rajah Brook administration of Sarawak brought in Hakkas, Foochows, Cantonese, and Henghuas to open up four different areas between the Kuching and the Rejang rivers. Although the actual numbers were small, the official plan was to "bring in thousands of future Chinese migrants" as Sarawak was regarded as capable of accommodating 5 to 10 million people (Lockard, 2003). In North Borneo, the Chartered Company in 1882 recruited the first batch of 1,000 settlers and subsequently turned their attention to recruiting Hakka Christians. From 1910 onwards, Hakkas and Shandong settlers were recruited to open up areas along the west coast (D. L. Chong, 2002). In the Malay States, the Methodist Missionary brough in Foochews into Sitiawan in Perak to pioneer agricultural development (Khoo, et al., 1972; Koay, 2018). In the inland area of Titi of Jelebu in the state of Negeri Sembilan, the Hakka miner Siaw Guan Jie recruited compatriots from his home village in the early 1910s to pioneer agricultural development (Siaw, 1983; Zhou, 2017). [11] These recruitment schemes of official authorities were designed specifically to bring in Chinese as settlers. They brought their families with them to put down roots in the new homeland on a permanent basis.

Town and Rural Development

Chinese migrants helped to convert large tracts of forests into productive land. The rich tin mines stimulated the growth of towns, settlements, and commercial activities. Whether it was the port towns of Penang and Singapore or the inland towns of Kuala Lumpur, Ipoh or Taiping, the pioneering efforts of the Chinese, often in co-ordination with local Malay inhabitants, made possible the dramatic transformation of the rainforests into bustling centres of commerce and administration.

The rise of Kuala Lumpur was inseparable from the contributions of Yap Ah Loy. In 1873, the town was practically destroyed during the Selangor war. The Chinese did not abandon the place but stayed on to re-build the town. In 1880, there were 220 wooden structures in the town of which 64 were owned by Yap Ah Loy. In 1881, a devastating fire in January and floods in December resulted in severe destructions. These setbacks did not dampen the spirit of the inhabitants. In 1884, 234 new structures with bricks and tiles were added. Yap Ah Loy began to invest in brick and cement factories, built an abattoir, a market, and piers along the Klang River to facilitate transport to the port of Klang (Middlesbrook, 1951; Gullick, 2000).

In Perak, Klian Pauh (later to become Taiping) witnessed the construction of 90 to 100 shops in 1865. Of these, 70 to 80 were owned by Haishan Hakkas, 11 by Huizhou Hakkas, and 2 by Hainanese. In nearby Klian Bahru, all 40 shophouses were owned by Huizhou Hakkas (Khoo, 2003). The new mining centre in the Kinta Valley saw the rise of Ipoh in the latter half of the 19th century. Ipoh soon became second only to Kuala Lumpur in size and importance in the Malay States. Following the big fire of 1892, a "new town" was built on the bank of the Kinta River. In 1908, Hakka merchant Yau Tet Shin built 260 structures here as well as a cinema and a public market (Huang, 1967). Along the tin belt in the inland districts of Perak and Selangor, several small towns such as Kampar, Bidor, Serendah, Rawang and others began to appear. The founding of these towns was closely connected with the initiatives of the local mining"towkays"or business headmen.

By 1901, there were 30 settlements with more than 400 inhabitants in the FMS, with 12 in Perak, 10 in Selangor, 5 in Negeri Sembilan and 3 in Pahang. Most of the inhabitants of these townships were Chinese (Hare, 1902). [12] These towns acquired a strong Chinese character which remains until today. The shops were arranged in rows connected by a covered corridor popularly known as a five-foot way. These shops were generally long and narrow two-storey structures where the ground level served as business space and the back as the working quarter with a kitchen and often with a water well under an open air well. In the days before the installation of piped water supply, the well was a crucial source of water to satisfy all domestic needs. The upper floor of the shop was partitioned into individual rooms to serve as living and private quarters. The shop front often displayed signboards in bold Chinese characters. Overall, the appearance of these towns took on a typically Chinese atmosphere. Towns of similar character also appeared in the tin-mining areas

of the Netherlands Indies such as Bangka, Billiton and West Borneo. [13]

The advent of the rubber-planting industry in the early 20th century provided a stimulus for the development of rural areas. The colonial authorities introduced land laws to manage and control land alienation based on cadastral survey and boundary demarcation, and the registration of land titles at the state and district levels. These procedures brought about an efficient system of land administration to ensure security of ownership free of disputes and litigation. Large volumes of Western capital flowed into the rubber industry. Malays and Chinese saw new economic opportunities and began to submit applications for land to take up rubber planting on a small scale. As the smallholders, especially Chinese, spread inland away from the Western plantations, homesteads appeared on individual parcels of land to form dispersed settlements. Again, the role of the well was instrumental in enabling the pioneering of land away from riverine areas which had hitherto been the preferred site for settlement among the indigenous populations. The Chinese brought with them the ancient well culture as a practical and effective means to overcome the problem of water supply. It was common among the well-to-do to install a well under an open air well in the house while the common settlers resorted to building communal wells to supply domestic needs (see Wu, Y. C., 2010). Unlike the dwellings of the indigenous population that stood on stilts, Chinese houses were built on the ground level, some laid out according to traditional *fengshui* or geomantic principles. The dispersed settlements amidst rubber smallholdings became a new feature on the cultural landscape in addition to the linear riverine *kampungs* or traditional Malay settlements. However, between 1948 and the early 1950s, to combat anti-British insurgency, the colonial administration hastily implemented the re-settlement of rural Chinese in the Malay States. The result was the re-location of half a million Chinese into more than 500 compact "New Villages." For strategic reasons, these villages were located on the outskirts of district capitals or larger towns. This hasty attempt was to erase dispersed Chinese settlements in the rural areas. The effect was the almost disappearance of the Chinese in rural areas and the creation of a new semi-urban class of Chinese residents. [14]

Culture and Identity

The Chinese way of life is tied to their culture and ethnic identity. The core features of dialect affinities include one's dialect, native place or ancestry (jiguan - 籍贯), and cultural practices. Older generations of Chinese were mainly born in China, making up 78% of the Chinese of British Malaya in 1921 and 69% in 1931 (Vlieland, 1932). The place of birth and personal experience of having lived in one's native village underpinned the maintenance of cultural attributes and preferences associated with known practices and traditions of their forefathers.

Dialect affiliation was a key identity of the Chinese. This identity was manifested in the existence of clan associations according to dialect origin. It is reported that there are now 156 Hakka clan associations distributed through the country (Shi, 2005). [15] The family as the basic social unit

of society ensures solid ties to traditional practices and folk culture. The unifying factor of family solidarity was the moral value of filial piety. Filial obligations to parents and children and respect for cordial kinship ties were a moral and cultural imperative. In the days when mobility was limited by the lack of employment opportunities, the average family was large. The extended families comprising three generations were common.

There was intense maintenance of cultural practices and beliefs among the older generations. In the early settlement of Pulai, though having been spatially and socially segregated from mainstream Chinese society and having maintained close contact with local Malay communities or inter-married with native or non-Chinese females, the settlers have maintained their traditional Hakka identity. They had retained their dialect, beliefs, and traditions, celebrated traditional Chinese festivals, and followed social practices (Middlesbrook, 1933; Carsten, 1983; S. B. Lew, 2012, 2018 & 2020). Different subdialect groups also promoted cultural development by setting up temples, schools, clan associations, newspapers, hospitals, and other charitable organisations.

In general, the Hakkas of the pre-independence period have kept alive their cultural heritage. The Chinese New Year, Dragon Boat and Mid-Autumn Festivals were occasions to perform traditional customs and practices. It was common for houses in New Villages to display auspicious couplets on both sides of the front door and the surname or ancestral identity on top. The preparation of special dishes according to the traditional cuisine of different subdialect groups was a mandatory practice. Their womenfolk would bake traditional cakes and snacks. *Qing Ming* was a day devoted to the remembrance of the dead with visits to cemeteries to clean up burial sites of the departed.

Hakka women did not practise foot-binding but engaged in performing heavy work such as rubber tapping, vegetable cultivation, construction work, *dulang* washing and household chores. Like their counterparts in other dialect communities, Hakka women were strict observers of traditional values. Marriage was a sacred and lifelong vow of allegiance to the husband and his family. Divorces were rare (del Tufo, 1949) and re-marriage was almost taboo. Widows would remain single to take care of their children and family. Being faithful to the tradition of upholding family values, fidelity to the oaths of marriage, and the obligation of nurturing the children were unspoken moral duties. Over time, social trends and attitudes towards marriage and birth had changed. The crude birth rate of the Chinese had dropped from 36.6 per 1,000 in 1963 to 21.4 in 1990 (Tey, 2007). The average number of children born to Chinese women in the 1925–1929 birth cohort was 6.7, but among women in the 1950–1954 age group, the rate had fallen to 3.5 (Tey, 2004; also Niew, 2004).

Having been born or lived in one's native village before, the adherence to one's dialect affinity and identity was strong. The older generations have a loose sense of nation and nationality and tend to maintain different layers of identity. The older Hakkas acknowledged their origin popularly known as "Tang people" in a reflection of being the descendants of the great Tang Dynasty, or as

Huaqiao or "Overseas Chinese." The next level of identity would be as Hakkas, or even according to their village ancestry or *jiguan* origins such as Dapu, Hepo or Huizhou. The original intention of being absent from the native village temporarily and to "return to one's roots" eventually was to weaken any meaningful sense of identity with the new "home."

Like other major dialect groups, the Hakkas invested in education as a means of sustaining their identity. One of the functions of the school was to infuse a subconscious awareness of the concept of *jiguan* or ancestry as one of the personal details of students at the time of registration. [16] Yap Ah Loy set up the first Chinese school in Kuala Lumpur. In 1904 and 1905 Cheong Fatt Tze were involved in setting up modern-style Chinese schools in Penang and Singapore (Middlesbrook, 1933; S. W. Chong, 2019). In 1911 the Huizhou Association of Selangor established the Tsun Jin Chinese School which is today one of the four privately-run Chinese secondary schools in Kuala Lumpur, followed by two more established respectively by the Jiaying and Chayang Associations in 1917 and 1949 (W. B. Wong, 2006). In North Borneo, the Hakkas contributed significantly to educational development by establishing a school in every town. In Sarawak, the Hakkas established Chinese schools in several small towns, the first one being in Bau in 1870 (D. L. Chong, 2002; Lockard, 2003).

Hakka cultural practices also involved the provision of specific public goods for the benefit of the community. One was the building of temples to satisfy the search for spiritual peace. Indeed, the Hakka pioneers Sheng Ming Lee of Sungei Ujong (present-day Negeri Sembilan) was deified and worshipped in the Xian Sheya Temple of Kuala Lumpur (see Voon et al., 2014). Another cultural imperative was the establishment of public cemeteries to take care of the after-life arrangements of the people. There was a shared responsibility to ensure that all deserved the right to a proper burial. In the larger towns, major Chinese dialect groups established their own community cemeteries. In general, the local Kwangtung (Guangdong) Public Cemetery would cater to the needs of the Hakkas, Cantonese and other groups from Guangdong province while the Hokkiens would generally have their separate burial sites. The Kwangsai (Guangxi) community could set up their own cemeteries or be buried in the Twin-Guang (Guangdong and Guangxi provinces) cemeteries (see Fan et al., 2014). In Kuala Lumpur, the Kwangtung Cemetery was jointly established in 1895 by six clan associations of which the Huizhou, Jiaying, and Chayang were Hakkas (Kwangtung Cemetery Board of Directors, 2014). Today this cemetery has become a heritage site of the Chinese community in which symbolic rituals and ceremonies are held to commemorate specific dates or events.

Conclusion

Like other dialect groups, the older generations of Hakkas were proud of their ancestral heritage. This is largely reflected in their cultural practices as well as in their thoughts, preferences, and perceptions. Living in extended families consisting of two to three generations, the Hakkas would converse in their native dialects at home or among themselves. Family ancestry was jealously

guarded and publicly displayed in the form of exclusive clan associations. Affiliation loyalties also tended to persuade settlers of the same dialect or surnames to congregate together. Similarly, the settlement, livelihood, and culture of the older-generation Hakkas were to a significant extent related to or inseparable from their association or from their village origins and environmental background and way of life, traditions, and cultural practices.

Three conclusions may be drawn from this study. The first is that research on themes relating to the populations of dialect or ethnic communities cannot dispense with the use of official census reports. These reports are not only reliable and indispensable sources of comprehensive data on a variety of demographic issues such as population growth, composition, distribution, occupations, and many related themes but are not available in other forms. Census data are the basis of accurate and scientific evidence on aspects of the population over time and space. It is therefore necessary to avoid making claims and conclusions based on statistics derived from unauthoritative sources or fragmentary and unconfirmed estimates.

Secondly, up to the 1980s the livelihood of many Hakkas was largely rural-based and connected with the tin and rubber industries. The small number involved in commercial activities in the towns were found in a narrow range of trades and few were engaged in large-scale business operations. Over time and like other dialect groups, the Hakkas had become permanent settlers and not "birds of passage" as often assumed. In their pioneering efforts, these settlers fell back on the age-old tradition of constructing wells as a core cultural practice to push back the frontier of settlement away from the rivers and into the foothill zones. On the founding of settlements, census statistics showed no evidence of close association between the Hakkas and the ports and maritime trade. Hakka pioneers were indeed involved in the founding of towns in inland areas but there is no clear evidence of this in the case of port towns.

Thirdly, the older generations followed strictly their traditions and cultural practices both as Chinese and as Hakkas. Adherence to cultural practices was as much a way of life as a nostalgic reminder of their ancestral home. The identity with the dialect was strong and the sense of pride and belonging as Hakkas was real.

It is necessary to note that ancestral or dialect affiliations have a strong influence on the preferences and cultural practices of the Hakkas but were not deterministic. It is incorrect to claim that the Hakkas would behave in a certain manner because of their dialect affiliations. Instead, the behaviour and preferences of the Hakkas differ from those of other dialect groups only in a matter of degree. More important is to recognise the significant discrepancies in the acceptance of cultural practices and identity between the older and younger generations. No dialect group would behave as a monolithic entity. Differences between the older and younger generations in behaviour and preferences are becoming more acute through the passage of time. The influence of changing social

changes and trends including the prevalence of education and the widespread use of Mandarin in place of dialects and the impact of Western influence were shaping new attitudes and weakening the strict adherence to traditional practices. Over time, attitudes to symbols of Hakka culture and identity, whether physical or intangible, point clearly to a gradual dilution of interests caused by the generation gap. The study of the post-independent Hakka community will have to consider the radically different attitudes and perceptions of the new generations of Hakkas. Investigating the types and nature of cross-generational changes will provide opportunities for fruitful research in the future.

* Dr. Phin-Keong Voon [文平强] is Professor, New Era University College, Malaysia. E-mail: phinkeong.voon@newera.edu.my

Notes

1 "Community" is used in the same sense as the population census to describe "a group of persons who are bound together by common interests that is to say language or dialect, religion and customs." (Dept of Statistics, 1972. 1970 Population and Housing Census of Malaysia, KL: p.22).

2 The 2000 sources are derived from unpublished data of the Department of Statistics. It is noted that there is a discrepancy of 330,000 or 5.7% between the total population of the Chinese in published reports and the total based on unpublished sources tabulated according to Chinese dialect groups.]

3 This border region was far removed from the coast and was rich in a number of minerals including coal, iron, tin, lead, tungsten, manganese, and antimony. The local people were familiar farming and mining activities (Luo, 1976).

4 The dialects are identified according to different spellings based on the preferences of individuals or organisations. This study will adopt the Pinyin versions of the Hakka dialects such as Jiaying, Huizhou, Dapu, Hepo, Fengshun and others.

5 "Fu" refers to hills or places rich in resources.

6 A picul is equivalent to 60.5 kg

7 The "dulang" is a wooden pan that a woman used to scope out silt from the bottom of abandoned mining ponds, channels, streams and rivers. By continuously rotating the pan, sand and other impurities would be "washed" to leave a residue of tin ore. Dulang licences were first given out in 1907. In the pre-war period close to 10,000 licences were issued. Between 1947 and 1950, more than 13,000 licences were issued each year. At its peak of development, dulang licences provided employment to between 20,000 and 30,000 women. These were overwhelmingly Hakka women who would soak themselves in water throughout the day in search of tin ore. From 1946, the

annual output ranged from 1,000 to 3,000 tons and in good years exceeding 4,000 tons. By 1994, output dropped to less than 1,000 tons or about 5-6% of national production (Malaysian Chinese Mining Association, 2002).

8 The Chinese have a long history in pawnbroking. The famous Tang Dynasty poet Tu Fu was known to pawn his belongings to support his wine-drinking habits. Customers offered their material items for instant cash based on the evaluation of the pawnbroker. It was a practical way by which the poor and needy might have access to ready cash. The items could be redeemed on a future date).

9 In 1900, the Federated Malay States and Straits Settlements, with a population of 1.2 million, contributed 2.1 million pounds sterling to the British empire. Its nearest rival was Ceylon which accounted for 1.7 million pounds. In the early half of the 20th century, Malaya was the world's largest producer of tin and rubber. In 1936, the FMS yielded a total revenue of $68 million or $33.17 per capita, while the per capita revenue of India and Kenya were $4.30 and $8.99 respectively. (See Li, 1982).

10 To deal with the supposedly unhealthy environment of their colonial possessions, Western authorities resorted to creating "hill stations" and "summer resorts" to serve as sanitoriums for administrators, planters and others to spend short breaks to escape the heat of the lowlands. Of the major hill stations in British Malaya, three bear the names of colonial administrators or adventurers, Mexwell Hill, Frasers' Hill and Camerson Highlands. The fourth is Penang Hill. Although the altitude of these stations are below 2,000 metres, they were relatively cooler than the lowlands and provided a "change of air" to the visitors (Voon & Khoo, 1980).

11 Siaw Guan Jie (1864-1929) arrived at Titi in 1893. As a government clerk and a Christian, he obtained land to embark on agricultural production and mining. In the early 1910s, he recruited clansmen from Lan Ling village in Guangdong province and allocated 5 acres of land to each Christian family. In time, the settlement became known as "Siaw family village". In 1905, Siaw Guan Jie donated 2 acres of land to erect a church. The initial congregation of 43 soon increased to 310 in 1912. A school and an old folks home were also built. Titi is now identified as a Hakka village where the majority of the people bear the Siaw surname (Siaw, 1983; Zhou, 2017).

12 In 1901, among the towns in the FMS with populations of 500 or more persons, the proportion of the Chinese ranged from 49.9% of the population of Seremban to 97.2% of Menglembu. The largest towns were Kuala Lumpur (total population of 32,381), Taiping (13,331), Ipoh (12,791), Kampar (5,907), and Serendah (5,358). The Chinese in these towns ranged from 59.8% in Taiping to 85.6% in Kampar (Hare, 1902).

13 In 1930, among the towns in the Netherlands East Indies, there were several towns in which the Chinese exceeded 50% of the population. Those in West Kalimantan included Pontianak, Singkawang and Pemangkat; those in Sumatra included Medan, Bangka, and Billiton (see Tai,

2014).

14 Re-settlement into New Villages was tantamount to a "social revolution" by which half a million widely dispersed rural Chinese were re-located to settlements on the outskirts of towns. The concentration of people made possible the provision of basic facilities especially the primary schools, water and electricity supplies. The outcome was the full or semi-urbanisation of the Chinese community and integration with the urban economy. Under normal circumstances, this process would have raised legal, economic and social problems.

15 There is no complete record of the exact number of Chinese clan associations in Malaysia. A report stated an estimated 816 clan associations in the country in 1993 (Lew, B. K., 2016). An incomplete compilation by the Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies in 2005 counted a total of 740 (Voon, 2005). Based on the compilation of a 2005 publication, the earliest Hakka clan association was set up in Penang in 1801. In the 1850s Hakkas in Penang and Kuala Lumpur established Huizhou, Yiajing, Dapu and Zenglong clan associations. These were followed by those of Hailufeng, Toishan, Dingzhou, Yongding, Jiaoling, Luizhou, Heshan, Hepo, and Longchuan associations. In 2005, there was an estimated total of 156 Hakka clan associations in Malayia (Shi, 2005).

16 Today students are required to state their local places of birth. Consequently, students are generally ignorant of the traditional concept and importance of jiguan.

References

Anon (1855). Notes on the Chinese in the Straits. *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia, 9*, 109–124.

Carstens, Sharon A. (1983). Pulai: memories of a gold mining settlement in Ulu Kelantan, *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society,* 1980. Vol. 53, Part 1, 50– ??.

Carsten, Sharon A. (1983). Pulai Hakka Chinese Malaysian: a labyrinth of cultural identities. In *The Chinese in Southeast Asia, Volume 2*: *Identity, culture & politic*, edited by Linda C.Y. Lim and Peter Gosling, Singapore: Maruzen Asia, 1983: 80–98.

Carsten, Sharon A. (2022). Musing on the Sinophone: From Pulai to Portland and beyond. *Malaysian Journal of Chinese Studies 11*(2): 1–24.

Chai, Elena C.-F. (2007). Better off not working: A case study of Hakka women in Tapah village, Sarawak. *Journal of Malaysian Chinese Studies 10*: 71–82.

Chen, M.-Y. (2003). *The Royal Selangor story: Born and bred in pewter dust.* Brooklyn, NY: Archipelago Press.

Chew, D. (2004). *Chinese pioneers on the Sarawak frontier 1847-1947.* Kuala Lumpur: Oxford in Asia.

Chong, S.-W. [张晓威] (2019). Hakka Confucianist merchants and the establishment of new-style

Chinese schools in Malaysia [客家儒商与马来西亚中文新式学校的创建]. *Proceedings of the 30th World Hakka Conference*. Edited by Lai Kuan Fook, Kuala Lumpur, pp. 205–220.

Chong, T.-L. [张德来] (2002). *The Hakkas of Sabah: Contribution of the Hakkas to the modernization of Sabah* [沙巴的客家人——客家华人贡献沙巴州现代化之探讨]. Kota Kinabalu: Sabah Seminary.

del Tufo, M.V. (1949). *Malaya comprising the Federation of Malaya and the Colony of Singapore: A Report on the 1947 census of population*. London: Crown Agents for the Colonies.

Department of Statistics Malaysia (1972). *1970 population and housing census of Malaysia: Community groups*. Putrajaya: Jabatan Perangkaan Malaysia, 2011.

Department of Statistics Malaysia (2005). *Population of Chinese dialect groups, 2000*. Unpublished data. Putrajaya.

Fan, P.-W., Voon, P.-K., Wong, S.-K. & Wu, F.-G. (2014). Chinese cemeteries and environmental ethics: some insights from Malaysia. *UNIVERSITAS: Monthly Review of Philosophy and Culture, 47*(7): 85–105.

Fell, H. (1960). *1957 Population census of the Federation of Malaya, Report No. 14*. Kuala Lumpur: Department of Statistics.

Gullick, J. M. (2000). *A History of Kuala Lumpur, 1856-1939*. Kuala Lumpur: MBRAS.

Han, S.-F. (1975). *The Chinese in Sabah, East Malaysia*. Taipei: The Orient Cultural Service.

Hare, G. T. (1902). *Census of the Population, Federated Malay States*. Kuala Lumpur: Government Printer.

Ho, K.-L. [何启良] (Ed.) (2014). *Malaysian Chinese historical personalities* [马来西亚华人人物志]. Kuala Lumpur: Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies. 4 Volumes.

Huang, R. [黄尧] (1967). *History of Singapore and Malayan Chinese* [星马华人志]. Hong Kong.

Jackson, J. C. (1970). *Chinese in the West Borneo goldfields: A study in Cultural Geography*. University of Hull Occasional Papers in Geography No. 15.

Jones, L. W. (2007). *The population of Borneo: A study of the peoples of Sarawak, Sabah and Brunei*, Kota Kinabalu: Opus Publications.

Khoo, K.-K. (2003). Taiping: *The vibrant years*, Kuala Lumpur: OFA Desnye.

Khoo, S.-K., Cho, G. and Chan, K.-E. (1972). Spatial aspects of Foochow settlements in West Malaysia with special reference to Sitiawan, Perak, since 1902. *Asian Studies, 10*(1), 77–94.

Koay, S.-L. (2018). The promised land of the Foochows, *Penang Monthly*, Issue 18, March: 16–19.

Kwang Cemetery Board of Directors (2014). *Kuala Lumpur Kwangtung cemetery historical site park 119 anniversary commemorative publication* [吉隆坡广东义山古迹公园成立119周年纪念文集]. Kuala Lumpur.

Lai, K.-F. [赖观福] (Ed.) (1999). *The Hakkas: Ancient beginnings and lengthy flows* [客家源远流

长]. Kuala Lumpur: The Federation of Hakka Associations of Malaysia.

Lai, K.-F. [赖观福] (Ed.) (2019). *Proceedings of Hakka forum* [客家论坛论文集]. Kuala Lumpur: The Federation of Hakka Associations of Malaysia.

Lew B.-K. [刘崇汉] (2016). *Malaysian Chinese social organisations* [马来西亚华人社团]. Penang. Federation of Ka Yin Chu Association of Malaysia.

Lew, S.-B. (2012). Field study on procession of deities in Pulai village, Kelantan Malaysia. In *Folk culture research and conservation (second series) – Festive ceremony volume*. Edited by Xing Li. Beijing: World Publishing Corporation pp. 279–295.

Lew, S.-B. (2018). The spiritual world of the village of Pulai in Kelantan - from the perspective of oral history. In *China and Southeast Asia: Cross-regional field work and essays*. Edited by Wong Sin Kiong, et al. Singapore: NUS Department of Chinese Studies, Char Yong Association, Global Publishing, pp. 161–182.

Lew, S.-B. (2020). *Discovering the Goddess of Mercy in Swee Nyet Temple of Pulai, Kelantan*. Kajang: New Era University College, Society of conservation of cultural heritage.

Li, D.-J. (1982). *British Malaya: An economic analysis*, Kuala Lumpur: Institut Analisa Sosial, 1982 (first published in 1955).

Lim, K.-S. [林金树] (Ed.) (2004) *Chinese heart, Hakka love* [中华心客家情]. Hakka Studies series 1. Kuala Lumpur.

Lim, K.-S. [林金树] (Ed.) (2006). *From Hakkas to Malaysian Hakkas* [从‘客家’到马来西亚客家人] Hakka Studies series 2. Kuala Lumpur.

Ling, H.-Y., & Thock, K.-P. (2015). The economic activities of Foochow in Sibu: Development and transformation. *Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture, 3*(2): 20–31.

Luo, X.-L.[罗香林] (1976). The distribution of the Hakkas and their environment [客家的分布及其自然环境]. In *Malaysian Jiaying Combined Association Silver Jubilee Anniversary Commemorative Publication*. Kuala Lumpur.

Lockard, Craig A. (2003). *Chinese immigration and society in Sarawak 1868–1917*, Sibu: Sarawak Chinese Cultural Association.

Malaysian Chinese Mining Association (Ed.) [马来西亚马来亚华人矿务总会] (2002). *The development and decline of Malaysian Chinese mining industry* [马来西亚华人锡矿工业的发展与没落]. Ipoh, Malaysian Chinese Mining Association.

Merewether, E.M. (1892). *Report on the census of the Straits Settlements taken on the 5th April, 1891*, Singapore: Government Printing Office.

Middlesbrook, S. M. (1933). Pulai: an early Chinese settlement. In *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society,* 1933. 11, Part 2: 151–156.

Middlesbrook, S. M., & Gullick, J. M. (1983). *Yap Ah Loy 1837–1885*. In *JMBRAS* Reprint No.

9 (first published in 1951).

Mitchell, N. (1972). *The Indian hill-station*. University of Chicago Department of Geography, Research Paper No. 141.

Nathan, J. E. (1922). *The census of British Malaya*, London: Waterloo,

Niew, S.-T. [饶尚东] (2004). Re-examining the declining birth rate of the Chinese in Malaysia [马来西亚华族人口生育率下降之再分析]. In *The Chinese population in Malaysia: Trends and issues*. Edited by Phin-Keong Voon. Kuala Lumpur: Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies. 49–57.

Ong, S.-H. [王深发] (2019). A re-examination of the maritime network of south-migrating Hakkas since the 17th century [世纪以来南海客家人海上网络的再思考]. In *Proceedings of Hakka Forum* [客家论坛文集]. Edited by Kuan-Fook Lai. Kuala Lumpur. The Federation of Hakka Associations of Malaysia. pp. 56-68.

Pountney, A. M. (1911). *The census of the Federated Malay States*, London: Darling & Son Ltd.

Ser, W.-H. (2012). *Moving mountains: A pictorial history of the Chinese in Selangor and Kuala Lumpur*. Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies. Volumes I & II.

Shi, C.-J. [石滄金] (2005). *Chinese organisations of Malaysia* [马来西亚华人社团研究]. Beijing: China Huaqiao Press.

Siaw, Laurence K.-L. (1983). *Chinese Society in Rural Malaysia: A Local History of the Chinese in Titi, Jelebu*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

Spencer, J. E. & Thomas, W. L. (1948). The hill stations and summer resorts of the Orient. In *Geographical Review. 38*(4): 637–651.

Suryadinata, L. (Ed.) (2012). *Southeast Asian personalities of Chinese descent: A biographical dictionary*. Singapore: Chinese Heritage Centre and Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Tai, W.-Y. (2013). *Chinese capitalism in colonial Malaya, 1900–1941*. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Tai, W.-Y. (2014). The Chinese community in Dutch Indonesia: Population and socio-economic characteristics. In *Malaysian Journal of Chinese Studies. 3*(2), 41–66.

Tan, B. (2016). A magazine for the Straits Chinese. https://biblioasia.nlb.gov.sg/vol-11/issue-4/jan-mar-2016/straits-chinese-magazine/

Tan, Y.-H. [谭元亨] (2019). The Hakkas as founders of towns [客家开埠]. In *Proceedings of 30th World Hakka Conference*. Edited by Lai Kuan Fook. Kuala Lumpur, 82–92.

Tey, N.-P. (2004). Causes and consequences of demographic change in the Chinese community in Malaysia. In *The Chinese population in Malaysia: Trends and issues*. Edited by Phin-Keong Voon. Kuala Lumpur: Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies. 15–48.

Tey, N.-P. (2007). Demographic trends and human capital: the case of Malaysian Chinese. In

Malaysian Chinese and Nation-building, edited by Phin-Keong Voon, Kuala Lumpur: Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies, 2007, 307–338.

T'ien, J.-K. (1997). *The Chinese of Sarawak*, London: London School of Economics Monograph on Social anthropology, No. 12 (first published in 1953).

Vlieland, C. A. (1932). *British Malaya: A Report on the 1931 Census and certain problems of vital statistics*. London.

Voon, P.-K. (2002). *Chinese Studies in Malaysia: Review and Prognosis*. Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies Research Series No. 1, Kuala Lumpur.

Voon, P.-K. (Ed.) (2004). *The Chinese population in Malaysia: Trends and issues*. Kuala Lumpur: Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies.

Voon, P.-K. [文平强] (2005). Malaysian Chinese organisations: Role, functions and characteristics [马来西亚华人社团的角色、功能与特征]. In *National directory of Chinese organisations* [全国华团总名册]. Kuala Lumpur. 15–21.

Voon, P.-K. (Ed.) (2007). *Malaysian Chinese and nation-building: Before Merdeka and fifty years after*, Volume 1, Kuala Lumpur: Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies.

Voon, P.-K. (Ed.) (2008). *Malaysian Chinese and nation-building: Before Merdeka and fifty years after*, Volume 2, Kuala Lumpur: Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies.

Voon, P.-K. [文平强] (2018). *Calling Malaysia home: Studies on the Malaysian Chinese community* [聚族于斯——马来西亚华人研究]. Chapter 1: Malaysian Chinese Studies and Source materials and resources [第一章：马来西亚华人研究与参考资料资源]. Kuala Lumpur and Kajang: Soka Gokkai Malaysia and New Era University College, 1–20.

Voon, P.-K., & Khoo, S.-H. (1980). Upland development and settlement in Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Tropical Geography 1*: 43–56.

Voon, P.-K. [文平强] & Khor, T.-H. [许德发] (Eds.) (2009). *Prosper the nation through thrift and hard work* [勤俭兴邦：马来西亚华人的贡献]. Kuala Lumpur: Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies.

Voon, P.-K., Ee, C.-H. & Lee, K.-S. (2014). The deification of Sheng Ming Li as Xian Shi Ye: Process and cultural significance, *Malaysian Journal of Chinese Studies, 3* (1): 37–59.

Wong, L.-K. (1965). *The Malayan tin industry to 1914*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

Wong, W.-B. [黄文斌] (2006). *The formation of the KL Chinese society and the role of the Hakkas 1859–1920* [论析吉隆坡华人社区的形成与客家人的参与（1859–1920）]. Paper presented at the Conference on Malaysia Hakkas organised by the Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies, Kuala Lumpur.

Wong, Y.-T. (2018). *Kampar: A town built on tin. In Penang Monthly*, Issue 18, August: 54–57.

Wu, F.-B. [吴凤斌] (Ed.) (1993). *General history of the Chinese of Southeast Asia* [东南亚华侨通史]. Fuzhou: Fujian People's Press.

Wu, Y.-C. [吴裕成] (2010). *China's well culture* [中国的井文化]. Tianjing People's Press.

Zhang, Q.-R. [张箐蓉] (2022). *Hepo food heritage and Hakka identity: A study of Lei Chia in Malaysia* [马来西亚擂茶研究——以河婆饮食看客家认同]. Kajang: New Era University College.

Zhou, H.-R. [周厚荣] (2017). *The history of Titi 1838-2016* [知知钢开埠史料回忆录2]. Titi: Kiong Chung Trading Co.