Introduction

There are three different arguments about the issue of peasant impoverishment in the Principalities areas during the nineteenth century and early of this century. Firstly, the cash crop cultivation carried out in Vosemtsenden tended to impoverish the peasant who involved in the cultivation. Secondly, the implementation of the traditional agrarian system as represented by opmage-system is the most considerable factor, which had to be blamed for the peasant poverty. Thirdly, several kinds of maltreatment practiced by the rural elite has made peasant live in suffer. In the 1870s, European society in the Principalities disrupted by the issues of people rebellion. In the same time, the increasing of the criminality in this area became a strong reason for the European society to request security guarantee from the government that would make them running their business safely. In 1888 Broosbofs, carried out an investigation into this problem. He concluded that the only reason that could make this issue come into reality is the impoverishment of the society in the principality area. The people impoverishment in this area according to Broosbofs caused by five main reasons, namely: unhealthy culture, agricultural crisis, opium, security and the Chinese. Broosbofs did not specify what he meant about "unhealthy culture", but it seems that it refers to the implementation of the traditional agrarian system as represented in the opmage-system.¹

Some historians have explored the work of the opmage-system in this area, however the discussion is still generalized. Their discussion is also limited to the theoretical relationships between the subjects of this system in supra-village level, such as the relationship between the patih (land-holder) or the European land renter with the bekel and others rural elite. View of them focusing their study on the implementation of the bekel-system in the grass root level, such as the interaction between the bekel as tax colector and the peasant. Explicitly,

Brookehoff had described the behavior of _bekel_ that tended to exact the peasant. But he himself realized that his investigation was still far to come to the general conclusion, because of the complexity of the implementation of this system in every part of the principality area. In this paper I would like to discover the theory and the implementation of _apanage_-system in the Principalities of Central Java. I will stress my study on the changing policy on role of _bekel_ in the _apanage_-system in the village level, as I called as "_bekel_-system". Before embarking on the detailed examination of the implementation of this system in colonial Java, it is necessary describing general pattern of the work of _apanage_-system in Principalities of Central Java.

The _apanage_-system based on the idea of the Javanese conception of sovereignty, that ruler was "overlord" of all the lands in his kingdom. His overriding concern was for the upkeep of his court, his extensive family, his provincial administrator (bupati), official (abdi-Dalem) and the military. Before the Java War, the lands of the Central Javanese kingdoms were divided into two main sorts: Firstly, the core _apanage_ regions or _nagara agung_, situated close to the court and places where the king, family, and his official and military live. Secondly, the outlining territories or _muncanagara_, located at some distance from the royal capitals. Since this study is more focus on the period after the Java War, its concern more to the _apanage_ system in first sort of land. The sovereign distributed the land so called _gudhuhuan_-land (temporary grant-land) or _apanage_-land to their families, official and military to upkeep their life. The _apanage_-land holder called _pamah_. In general, the court-based apanage holders left the administration of the population assigned to them in the hands of local tax-collectors ( _bekel_), drawn from the village sphere, who gathered the land-rent tribute ( _pajeg_ ) and other levies due to them, and exercised some judicial authority in their localities. In this system, the _bekel_ was entitled to receive 20% of the produce, and the remainder was divided equally between _pamah_ (apanaige holder) 40% and _sikep_ (peasant who work the land) 40%.

The implementation of the _bekel_-system in the principality area is interesting subject to be explored because this system set out how did the economic system at the village level was organized. So far, the description concerning the work of this system in village level is still far of satisfaction because most of the historians only rely on his research to the colonial reports, whereas indigenous sources are still neglected. This paper is an effort to search more information about the _bekel_ and peasant societies by using indigenous sources - documentary remains of the activities of indigenous administrations at various levels of the Yogyakarta and Sukartas palaces as the main research material. The central issue emphasized in this paper more social than economy, that is the complexity of

---

1 Ibid., p. 10

2 I am grateful to Prof. Dr. Vincent J.H. Houbraken, who had guided me, was entering into these collections.
the implementation and the regulation of the bekel-system in the principalities of Central Java in the mid-nineteenth century until the abolishment of this system in 1912. To begin my paper, I will feature an interesting story from Jatipang, a small village located in the sub-District Grobong, Residency of Surakarta.

Sukorejo versus Kartosudiro

Kartosudiro had apprenticed as a panakawan (house servant) to Major Tonenggunung Aryadewara of Kraton Surakarta for doing time. For his obedience, in 2 November 1896, he promoted for bekel maru (old bekel) in Jatipang, filled in for former bekel, Tranasaudire. As a bekel maru he had 5 ½ jang sawangan-kind located in three separate villages; 3 ¾ jang in Pilang, 1 jang in Jati and 1 jang in Gelong. He controlled 11 bekel pucul, which each of them has shared sawangan-land between ¼ to ½ jang. In every Carebeg Besar and Pasa, Kartosudiro had to pay some kinds tax and tributes in the amount of 200 rupiah 75 duit, which consisting of;

1. pajeg bhandanggam 175 rupiah,
2. pumamu 9 rupiah 35 duit,
3. wola 2 rupiah per jang (2 X 5 ½ jang = 11 rupiah)
4. eres 7 rupiah 40 duit, and
5. panamem 2 rupiah per jang (2 X 5 ½ jang = 11 rupiah, it was paid only in Carebeg Pasa).

In addition, every Carebeg Besar he was also obligated to pay three other kind of taxes 12 rupiah 100 duit, which were consisting of;

1. wola 11 rupiah,
2. pangding 1 rupiah,
3. pataempeng and lava 22 ukel 100 duit

Kartosudiro was permitted to live in a big house ex-pustangraham in Jatipang as a kroyon (official house). He had an authority establishing the new bekel in the village with empty bekel (Komang) in his territory. In addition, as a bekel maru he had some obligations, such as: building a rumpon (fish trap) in every dry season, providing some work forces and their foods stuff (bahu suku samagre) for his panah and serving some foods for every government officials who visit his village. He also responsible for police duty in his village, and provided some other tributes such as: raker-turan, raja pandhur and passambang, which must be presented to the several ceremonies (usually for circumcision and wedding party) held by the King or his panah. Any disobedience to all or a part of
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obligations will lead him to get fired (kapocor) from his position without inheritance right (sinu'awangenc waris tanpa alip). Five years have run since Kartosudiro held bekel tawu, there was no extraordinary event happened in Jatipila. People live in peace and every village enjoyed their daily life like ever. This condition was no longer established when Beke1 Kartosudiro married again in 1902. The villagers of Jatipila experienced a number of Kartosudiro unfair treatments. One day, Sopawiro a villager from Pilang Lor was ordered by Kartosudiro to send 2 gedheung of paddy to his first wife. Unluckily, Sopawiro met Kartosudiro’s second wife. This little incident made Kartosudiro angry and he chased him away from the village after he beat him. The similar treatment experienced by Martopawiro from Kadiapan. He had been violated by Kartosudiro because he refused using his two couple of cow to plow Kartosudiro’s sawah. Surorojo, a sitop of Pilang Tengah, held 1 katok tegelan-land, which has been endowed from his ancestor, but since 1902 his land was taken over by Kartosudiro. Surorojo would like to hand his land over as far as he had a share to work the land in merelu-system but his excuse was ignored. One day, Beke1 Kartosudiro asked some work forces from the villagers to clean up the wild grass in his maize-field. There were 74 people involved in that work. Unintentionally, they dug up the kapok trees and made them ruined. Kartosudiro got angry and started mimiut (spelling the bad words out) and beating them. Three villagers from Pilang Lor and one from Kadiapan, Suromenggolo, Surodono, Wongodono, and Kartowikromo, were violated by Kartosudiro by a blade of bamboo. Trunoodongo from Kadiapan was taunted his hair and then strangled by Kartosudira. They work from twelve o’clock and only stop at six o’clock at the afternoon. Each of them was only feed by a parcel of rice (1 ½ sen) with a spoiled side dish (gereh wayu), that according to them was not proper and did not make them full.

In 1902, Towikromo, from Gelang, was asked by Kartosudiro to pick him up at Gresogol Station. Towikromo had been waiting since seven o’clock at the morning, however up to 13.06 o’clock, Kartosudiro had not arrived yet. After waiting steadily for hours, Towikromo felt hungry. He left the station to have some food in the warung close to the station. In view minutes, Towikromo returned to the station after finished his lunch. When he arrived there he did not find Kartosudiro but his bag. Later, he knew that Kartosudiro had arrived home. Towikromo, left the station with the big bag in his hands. When he arrive, suddenly Kartosudiro came up and smangled him. In this critical situation, Towikromo succeeded to escape from Kartosudiro’s arms. It was not the end of Towikromo suffering because Kartosudiro sent his two brothers, Kartotinoyo and Kartosumin to chased him. In the edge of the village, Towikromo was violated.
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by the two of Kartosudiro’s brothers. Kartosudiro oppression was often trigger by trivial things. One night, Kartosudiro kindled Bok Kartopawiro, a widow from Pilang Tengah, by oak corridor (a perch made from dry coconut leaf) because he did not answer his words when he met her in guardroom (guarding post). Honigowikrono from Gelang was asked by Kartosudiro to heat the water in his house, but before he finishing his job, suddenly Kartosudiro beat him because he said that his work was too slow.

In every harvest time, Kartosudiro force people to present in amount of paddy. Each sleep of Pilang Tengah, who want to harvest his rice-fields, must present 4 geideng of paddy. They were forced to obey it otherwise they will not have a permit to harvest their field. There were 20 villagers who confessed that Kartosudiro has forced them to present 4 geideng of paddy every time they want to harvest their fields. Eight villagers of Pilang Tengah have been accused by Kartosudiro stealing Kartosudiro’s paddy. They have to pay 16, 5 sen for 5 geideng of paddy to Kartosudiro as compensation. In the harvest time 1906, Bok Martopawiro asked by Kartosudiro to harvest his sawah, but before she finished her job, her little boy who accompany her, fell a sleep in her back. She decided leaving her job for a moment, and carry her son home to take a rest, but she had forgotten to tell Kartoetnoyo (Kartosudiro’s brother) who supervised her job. When she return to the sawah, 6 geideng of paddy that she had picked before was missing. Kartoetnoyo, accused her stole the paddy.

In 1903, 5 villager from Pilang Lor, Sutokaryo, Sutowikrom, Sosemito, Martokaryo and Songosemito were forced by Kartosudiro to leave their houses. In the same time, Kartosudiro took over 5 bush of sawah of 20 people of Pilang Tengah. Kartosudiro also rob three pekanangan lands belong to Ikek Keladicromo, Ikek Lidadicromo, Ikek Singyumodo of Jatii, although they have already heard all of the sanging (work) and latadosan (serve) upon those land. Kartowikrono from Pilang Lor has been ten years working as a buli keceng for Kartosudiro, but he had never obtained a share of sawah as well as regatan but kaangkit (pekanangan-land).

In 1903, Sosemito from Pilang Lor drove away from his village because he was coming late to plow Kartosudiro’s field. The treatment experienced by Besowijoyo from Jatii Kulan and Kartowijoyo from Jatii Lor. Besowijoyo was expelled from his village because Kartosudiro’s swan missing and he accused to be responsible for it, whereas Kartowijoyo was throw from his village out because he would not gave Kartosudiro some seeds of paddy.

The two Kartosudiro brothers, Kartoetnoyo and Kartosemito were involved in some violations against the people of Jatunilang. In 1904, ten villagers from Pilang Lor, Pilang Tengah and Kadiipaten, Somudrono, Sutokaryo, Siradirokon, Sarudrono, Manguntosmito, Raja, Tranodongo, Kromodonong, Sukinin dan Suparman, were beaten by Kartosemito, because when they worked for Kartosudiro’s sawah to distribute and to tied the seeds of paddy up. In 1905,
Pandeyo from Pilang Lor violated by Kartosemito because he came late to the gogor gomang in Kartosudiro's dry field. The same experience faced by Sarman son of Sosadrie from Pilang Lor because he worked too slowly when he was asked to clear the wild grass up in Kartosudiro's tobacco fields. In 1903, Kartowijoyo from Jati Ler strangled his neck by Kartottihoyo, and immersed in the ditch. Five peoples from Jatiplang, Sutokroyo, Kartowijoyo, Trumodangga, Kartmodengga, and Sakemen were punished by Kartosudiro inside the house for two days because they escape from his work in Kartosudiro's house. People also complaining about the increasing of the work and service that had to be heard by people, such as sekitras (to guard belok house).

People in Jatiplang unable to accept all Kartosudiro treatments. In the first of July 1906, Suronojo on behalf of the people in Jatiplang reported Kartosudiro to the resident. Nine days later Resident instructed to the panewu district (police) to investigate this case. The result of the investigation was sending Kartosudiro into the court. He was prosecuted over 30 kinds of maltreatment. Finally, in the end of 1908, the court declared that Belok Kartosudiro was guilty for some kinds of maltreatment. He was not dismissed from his occupation as belok twos but he must pay the compensation the amount of £75.

The above case is one of so many cases that could be traced in the indigenous sources. Temporally, it could be pointed out that the above story is tended to support Broomhead's conclusion. To have more proportional judgment, however the next questions must be raised. Why did the belok tended to extort the peasant? How did indigenous authorities control the work of this system?

The oldest agrarian law that regulate the role of the belok in the apungke system is Anggor Sepudah produced by the government of Surakarta dan Yogakarta in 1818, and later Anggor Cunang (Village Police regulation). The both regulations are complementing each other. In 1863, the government of Kasunanan and Mangkunegaran Surakarta, produced Pronstaw Pahut (landholder regulation). The similar policy followed by the government of Kasitalman Yogakarta. In 8 October 1884, Parish Denarojo and Resident of Yogayakarta announced a new belok regulation (Pronstaw Belok). This regulation was a supplement (in certain case revision) of the previous regulation. Since the beginning, the implementation of this new regulation was to accommodate the establishment of the new regulation on the land-leasing practice in the principality area that announced in 22 February 1884 by Dutch colonial government. In subsequent period, three separate agrarian laws was launched by the government of Yogakarta, respectively in 1886 arranged by Pangeran Adipati Natarudjaja and Resident Roosemier, in 1897 by Oudemans, and Landbouw Reglement of 1900 by Gottmans. It must be noted that there was a similar development in Surakarta and Yogakarta, but brought typical consequences to each region.
Bellow, I will remark the changing policy toward the role of bekel particularly within the apongone system based on the main contents of several Pramatan Bekels (bekel regulations) and Pramatan Patuh (landholder regulation) that had been launched since the mid of nineteenth century until the beginning of this century. This remark refers more to those regulations implemented in Yogyakarta, Kasultanan and Pakualaman, and some exceptional suitable for Saktara will be slightly noted.

The establishment of the new bekel
Panh or landholder who had gadthahan-land in the village with the empty bekel (komplang = lowkey) without heir (pejat waris) had an authority to establish new bekel, that must be elected from the villagers themselves. Since there were no villagers who met the conditions required for bekel, the nominator can be derived from the other village, but must be previously consulted to the police and the government. The authority to establish a new bekel in kejawen area rested to the patuh, whereas in the kabuhayan land (leasing area) laid on the land-renter hands.  

The establishment of the new bekel is important for economy as well as security reasons. In the pramatan (regulation) stated the vacuum for bekel positions must less than 100 days, but in practice police district was often reporting that those vacuum sometimes more than six months. This case is usually occurred in the land-leasing area. As reported by Resident to Patih Damarejo, in Yogyakarta there was a bekel who died but he had no son but some brothers, who live in another village. The former bekel’s brothers protest when

7 Some of them have been compiled by J.D. Hunger when he held as a Counsellor in Yogyakarta in the 1910-s, Set, J.D. Hunger (ed.), Serat degger-aggeran sawar pramatan wuwun supananggulanggu inngan manggoakan bah prakawari sini lan patubuhan (Laws and regulation related in the land and village affairs), Vol 1-3 (Yogyakarta: H. Buning, 1910-1911). Copy from the original document by R.Ng. Hardjo Pradja, A Panenu Puluy (The Vice Police Chief) of the District of Klaten, in 1889, KITLV 262, no. 14.
8 Dhawaw-haping 10 Sao Tahun je 1822 angka 431 (Instruction of 4 August 1892, No. 431), see also Dhawaw haping 21 Ranggulali, Tahun Dal 1823 angka 850/1 (Instruction of 3 November 1893 No. 850/1). This new regulation is continuation of the previous regulation launched in 4 Besar, Tahun je 1822 angka 3533 (22 June 1893 No. 3533), Dhawaw haping 21 Ranggulali, Tahun Dal 1823 angka 850/1 (Instruction of 3 November 1893 No. 850/1). As stated in the pramatan bekel, people who apply for bekel must meet some conditions, such as; healthy, or has no physical problems such as handicaps that make bekel could not carry out his duties. For the people, who has involved in the criminality (bushromali) is forbidden to apply for bekel, see article 1-3 of Pramatan Bekel, KITLV, ibid.
9 Serviteun Resident Yogyakarta keaying 22 Sawal Tahun je 1822 angka 283/T.B. (The letter of Resident of Yogyakarta 27 April 1893 No. 383/T.B.), see bapurya (appendix) 1 of Pramatan Bekel.
The land-tenant decided to offer the new bekel position to the other villagers (bekel waris sawa). This problem had never regulated before, therefore the district police forwarded this case to the court (Balemangku). More than six months this case had not solved by the Balemangku. To solve this problem, Resident ordered Raden Tunenggung Suradiningrat to complete the previous pronation. In his letter to Raden Tunenggung Suradiningrat, the resident instructed that since the police and patuh could not solve such problem, the police chief had an authority finishing the problem by appointed the new bekel by his own choice. If the land-tenant disagree against his decision, Balemangku will finish the problem. This rule was only met in the kejawen area. In the land-leasing area, since the police failed to make a deal with the land-tenant to appoint the new bekel, the decision handed over to the Residens. In practice, this regulation is difficult to be obeyed because the piyogem for bekel must be signed by patuh and must representing an agreement between the landholder and bekel. Another alternative to solve the problems of vacuum is by joining the acting bekel or vice bekel. In the kejawen areas the vice bekel must be elected from the former bekel family, whereas in the land-leasing area conditionally on the land-tenant decision. Since there were no one who willing to become a vice bekel, the village with empty bekel will be merged (kagamblakake) to other village under the same bekel sawa.

Piyogem (Letter of contract)
The promoted bekel certified by piyogem (letter of contract) in which bekel rights and obligations were listed. In kejawen area, application for piyogem was only possible through the patuh. Later, patuh will forward the concept of piyogem to the district police. Since the patuh as well as bekel have agreed about the content of the piyogem, the police will complete the concept of piyogem and

---
10 The term ‘sawa = thousand’ refers to the villagers as a whole, see Pramanan Bekel, article 1 & 5.
11 Dwawuhas haping 27 Maret 1898 ongka 57/10, Seratpin Residen Yogjakarta dalamang Raden Tunenggung Suradiningrat, 24 Maret 1898 (Instruction of 27 March 1898, No 57/10, The letter of Resident of Yogjakarta to Raden Tunenggung Suradiningrat, 24 March 1898), see kupiwa 2 of Pramanan Bekel.
12 Dwawuhas haping 10 Oktober 1894 ongka 965/1, Seratpin Residen Yogjakarta dihumang Raden Tunenggung Suradiningrat 22 September 1894 ongka 571 T.B. (Instruction of 10 October 1894 No. 965/11 the letter of Resident of Yogjakarta to Raden Tunenggung Suradiningrat 22 September 1894 No. 571/T.B.), see kupiwa 3 of Pramanan Bekel.
13 In Kejawen area the official in charge to give bekel piyogem is the police, whereas in the kabudayaan area by the plantation administrator witnessed by Police. See, Seratpin Residen Yogjakarta 24 September:910/No. 964-14. (The letter of Resident of Yogjakarta, 24 September 1910), see kupiwa 4 of Pramanan Bekel.
fill it into the original piyagam form. Bebek, pathu as well as police as a witness must sign three copies of piyagam. They held one copy of piyagam respectively. For the arrangement of piyagam, bebek had to expense f 1.14

The procedure of application for piyagam in Kulon Progo regency was different to the metewisan area. In the pemajegan-land of Kulon Progo, piyagam-form can be obtained from the abdi dalam pemajegan (an office responsible for the tax) through the police district chief. Abdi-dalem pemajegan provide the piyagam-form and also had a duty to complete it. The cost for piyagam was the same, and to be paid to the abdi dalam pemajegan (tax officer). Piyagam, which had been signed by bebek and abdi dalam pemajegan, forwarded to the Bupati Pulis in Kulon Progo to be approved. In the areas of pemajegan-land and apanage-land of the court family in Gunung Kidul, piyagam made by pathu and signed by Bupati Pulis. In the land-leasing area, piyagam obtained through the planter.13

The different procedure prevailed to the land, which categorized as pamaowan dalam of Sultan or Pangeneri Adipati Anom. Either Sultan or Pangeneri Adipati Anom did not involved to arrange those piyagam. They hand over their authority to the people called pathu godhiah (vice pathu), who had an authority to sign the piyagam. Therefore, in the piyagam of those areas were closely states the occupation of the people who signing it, whether as the real pathu or as a pathu godhiah. People who appointed to become pathu godhiah in the godhiah-land of Kanjeng Gusti Pangeneri Adipati Anom was Bupati Pathu of Sadipati, whereas pathu godhiah in other godhiah-land of the court high officials, was called kumisemph. Pathu godhiah had a duty earning the tax and panampu. Pathu godhiah only seeded by the high officials, from mantri upward. In pemajegan-land of Kulon Progo, the official who had a duty to arrange the piyagam was kifwon pemajegan with the permit of Kanjeng Gusti Pangeneri Adipati Mangkushumi, whereas in Gunung Kidul was kifwon pemajegan by the permit of Kanjeng Raden Adipati Dasurejo.

14 The amount of 1 rupiah, split into two parta, sanir (25 sen) for the form and the rest, 75 sen was for government. This rule was only effective in Kulon Progo in 1892. Previously, number of money derive for piyagam was much higher. See, Dhanawr karyage 7 January 1892, omada 156/1, (Registration of 7 January 1892, No. 156/1). Previously, Bupati, wadana District and Panji District, each of them has share 5 rupiah for wing cip (for stamp), whereas punggawa (other officers) has 2 rupiah 50 sen, as called pameung. This rule has not work in Gunung Kidul. In this area, the new bebek must pay 5 rupiah for the piyagam form, and 2 rupiah 50 sen for Wadana District, and 2 rupiah 50 sen for Panji or District Chief, see karya 74-85 of Pramanam Bebek.

13 By Kasuhan, the arrangement of bebek piyagam of sri damel (apangement land of abdi dalam of Jeganganari), either those or have not leased to the European, piyagam signed by wadana ngarep, except to those given to abdi dalam nagel, pasanduh, sanman and sanir, ibid.
The all bekel obligations mentioned in the piyagam. Since there was a demand for the tax and service from the patuh, which were not mentioned in the piyagam, bekel had a right to refuse it. In practice, there were a lot of obligations which had to be paid by bekel that was not listed in bekel regulation but in patuh regulation (Pranaan Patuh), such as, aduduk lumpur, kesrek, cecak etc.

**Bekel and Tax**

In the Pranaan Bekel explained that every people who want to apply for bekel, they have to pay the amount of money called bekti. Number of bekti that must be paid stated in the pranaan bekel. Even though, there was a haggle between patuh and the applicant about the number of bekti. Therefore, patuh will nominate some applicants. The applicant who offer highest bekti will be more considered compare to the lower one. Although police knew that the applicant had paid more bekti for the patuh, but he could not refuse the application as long as the applicants completing all of the requirements, as listed in the pranaan. Although patuh who earn bekti much higher compare to those listed in the piyagam, but in the piyagam only listed number of bekti as appropriate with the regulation.

As stated in the pranaan, number of bekti was variety depend on the level of inheritance. If the former bekel endow his occupation to his son, number of bekti, which had to be pay was one year of tax. If it bequested to his grand son, brother or son in law was 1.5 years of tax (in the previous regulation stated 2 years of tax). Whereas, If it endowed to the people other than family member, number of bekti that to be pay was 2 years of tax. This regulation was also prevailed for those endowed to wrong prapat (people who live in other village but still in the same bekel new territory).

Number of bekti that must be paid by the new bekel was also different from one to another Kadipaten. In Kulon Progo, for instance, if bekel endowed to the son, number of bekti is 1/2 year of tax, (in Kulon Progo there was no tax which paid monthly), whereas for the people other than his family, number of bekti is 1 year of tax.

In the land of pamaasan dalem, bekti divided into three parts, namely for patuh, bpapi and his assistants (divided into praneman-system), and for district police and demang patuh, (1/6 bekti for district police and his assistant according to praneman-system). In the apanye land of abdi dalem, the division of bekti was; 5/6 for patuh, and the rest, 1/6 for the police. The same ruler prevailed for the Mentinawan and land-leasing area.

Number of bekti that must be paid by the new bekel was also depend on the status of inheritance, that was whether mawi wars (without inheritance), getung wars (with inheritance) or other reasons. If the former bekel was fired because unable to pay the tax, (kether) be still had a right to appoint his substitute. In this

---

56 Concerning the praneman-system see appendix 2.
case, number of bekel was the same with those paid by wang bishog (villager other than family member), namely 2 years of tax. Another case, which was often occurred, was bekel escape from his village because he unable to pay the tax. In such case, his heir was still had a right to apply for bekel, however number of bekel was 2 years of tax, the same with those paid by wang bishog. In the landholding area, bekel was free from such obligation, because all the kind of vadoans (service), either in cash or wudu weto (crop tax) were abolished, and the police who took role as a witness had no longer had share of promenain.17

Beside bekei and promenain, bekel also must pay in amount of money called pangyoom-aryar and sahik kaypar. Pangyoom-aryar paid for his paathi when bekel obtain the new sawah sanggan. Number of pangyoom-aryar was depend on the large of sawah he obtained (6 royal pay tunj), Number of sahik kaypar was 1 2. 50, and divide into two parts; 50 sen for paathi delegation, and 1,50 sen for police. The last part was divided again among the member of paathi, which has been pointed as a witness of the promotion of bekel.18

There were some village in the Principalities, that usually providing special goods for the King called pangyoom-land. The village of Kabonongan or Gading in Bantul, for instance, was the big village with the densely populated, provide fisik kemuk (palm oil) for the king. A lot of coconut trees could be met in this village. Besides as a peasant, most of the villager held a profession as a palm oil maker. The village in this village obligated to present number of palm oil to the king through Demag Bonong, which called as wadelan. For his duty to collect wadelan, Demag Bonong had a share 1/6 of the number of oil palm that presented by the village. Number of wadelan stated in the papayoung and must be presented in every two months or six times per year in certain times, namely in the first ten days of the month of Suro, Mulas, Jumadilwwal, Reje, Pusur, and Dukung-duduk. Bekel who late presenting wadelan, must pay double wadelan as compensation, and they will be fired if he unable to present wadelan more than two times. Number of wadelan was depended on the number of land he beared.

In addition, bekel had to pay seteng (1 teng) per 1 bekong 17 oil, as the

---

17 Dwewuh kaping 24 Desember 1890 Ungku 386/4 (Instruction of 24 December 1890, No. 980/4), Dwewuh kaping 25 Besar Jumadilwwal 1821 Ungku 3246/1 (Instruction of 19 July 1821 No 3246/1), Jumadilwwal 1821 Angku 337/3, (Instruction of 27 April 1820 No 3313), see also Dwewuh kaping 7 Ramalan Alip 1819 angku 337/3 (Instruction of 27 April 1811), see article 11 of Pramatan Bekel, KITLV, ibid.

18 Dwewuh kaping 22 Saror Je 1830 angku 483/1 (Instruction of 21 June 1900 No 483/1), Dwewuh kaping 50 Jumadilwwal Janwawal 1821 angku 1604/1 (Instruction of 1 January 1892), see also, Dwewuh kaping 15 Jumadilwwal Janwawal 1821 angku 556/1, (Instruction of 16 January 1820 No 1556/1), see article 1 – 6 of Pramatan Bekel, KITLV, ibid.

19 Seteng = 1/2 wangg. Bekong = a piece of coconut shell.
transportation cost, from the village to the Kutox. Besides the number wadeum, which must be paid annually, bekel was still obligated to present pasumbang in the kind of oil, when the king held a circumcision or wedding party. Number of pasumbang was half of the wadeum. Because of the characteristic of this village as palm oil producer, in the bekel piyagem of this village confirm that bekel was strictly forbidden to cut the coconuts tree that grow in his village.

Like other villages in the Principalities, the village of Kabonongan, was also functioned as apangage-land for abdi-dalem, therefore, in this village founded double piyagem. The first piyagem states the agreement between bekel and the kraton about the special kind of tax required by the king, and the second one was an ordinary piyagem as met in other apangage-land. Another special treatment for this village was that the European entrepreneurs did not allow renting the land in this area, because people in this village have bear heavy burden, more than other land. People whom willing to apply for bekel in this village, they have to pay double bekel, namely wadeum and bekel for panih, which was usual in the apangage area. There is a different rule for the other pangrebme-lands required special goods, such as oil, rice, grass etc. Number of bekti was depended on the level of inheritance. If bekel bequeathed his position to the son, number of bekti was 6 month of tax; to the grandson was 6 months of tax; to the son in law, brother or someone else of the village is 12 months of tax. The similar rule prevails for the pamajegan-land of Kulon Progo and Granang Kidul.28 It seems that number of bekti which must be paid every three or six month were less heavy compare to other kind of bekti, which paid annually but as a whole number of tax and other burden beared by people in this village was much heavier.

Bekel Tawo (Old bekel)

Bekel tawo (old bekel)27 was also called bekel ngarep (front bekel), whereas bekel enon (young bekel) was also called bekel fajor or bekel buri (behind bekel, in Surakarta called also bekel pacii). The term of “bekel tawo” was only established in 1894 based on the Resident instruction of 13 June 1891 No. 1827. The establishment of bekel tawo was to help the police duties in village level under wani onder district. In the beginning, such obligation rared to the bekel enon with less burden but Resident regard that such obligation could not be heard all together by bekel enon because they have bear heavy burden,

28 Dhawan kaping 8 Supar Je 1830 (Instruction of 7 June 1900). This rule is to replace the previous rule that state the obligation of the new bekel to hear the former bekel burden to pay wadeum that has not fulfilled by him. Grass tax is very heavy because it must be presented everyday and wadu weta (vegetable, and fruit) must be paid in cash. Dhawan kaping 4 Besar Je 1822 (Instruction of 22 June 1893), see article 5 & 6 of Pamattu Bekel, KITLV, ibid.

27 The term ‘old’ is not refers to the age of bekel.
especially in the land-lease area. The beskel tawa duties were carried out by the police to establish security and peace, recording the number of population and village property. Since the beskel tawa were generally illiterate, therefore, these jobs taken over by irantri under district. For all of those duties, beskel tawa, especially in the land-lease area, was denied from the irantri (to guard factory buildings). Beskel tawa had a share of prusmenan. When he establishing a new beskel and shruti praharu (see for case) and when he reported a case occurred in his village. Beskel tawa had also a right to become beskel enom all together when there was an empty beskel in his village. If beskel tawa sent to the jail because the crime matter, but only nishak zam (rang the time bell).

Piyagam for Beskel tawa set out in 1925. To obtain this piyagam, beskel tawa express 50 sen, one forth for piyagam-form and the rest for the government. Beskel tawa piyagam was only made one copy, for beskel himself. 22 Beskel tawa established in kejawen as well as kabulayuran areas and the type of piyagam was similar.

In the pruanan beskel stated that the Bupati Polisi responsible for the election, establishment, dismissal, the determination of cacoh (household), and piyagam of beskel tawa. Pahau and land renter had no right interfere Bupati affairs. In 1909, this article was corrected because of the land renter objections. Especially in the land-lease area, European land-tenant had interest to the election of the new beskel. Later, Resident suggested that the election of beskel tawa in the land-lease area must be previously consulted to the European land renter. 23 Ideally, the function of the beskel tawa was a mediator between district police and beskel enom, therefore, he was obligated to pay ayerman and kapulisan tax (tax for security) as which obligated to the beskel enom. The only expense spent by beskel tawa was beskel prusmenan and wang puccokin. Beskel tawa was always involved in the discussion about the village security at which occasionally held is the Kenastraan. 24 In reality, beskel tawa also carry out beskel enom function, because he controlled some villages, especially those with empty beskel.

22 Dhawuh kaping 3 Dahukangudah. Ete 1820 angka 3347 (Instruction of 16 June 1891, No. 3347). Dhawuh kaping 11 Besar Je 1827 angka 72 10 (Instruction of 26 June 1893 No. 72/10), see article 1 – 5 of Pruanan Beskel, KITLV, iind

23 Dhawuh kaping 11 Besar Je 1827 angka 72 10 (Instruction of 26 June 1903 No. 72/10), ibid.

24 Seratnaya Kaping Tawon Residen kaping 2 Jull 1892, angka 1891 (The letter of Resident, 2 July 1892, No. 1892) as reported that tere wa a beskel tawa paid by Plantation administrator, see also, Seratnaya Kaping Tawon Residen kaping 1 September 1909, No. 10056/35 (The letter of Resident, 1 September 1909, No. 10056/35), see article 1-5 of Pruanan Beskel, KITLV, ibid.

25 In practice, the tax of ayerman and kapulisan beard by passam (biak kecceng). In Kusultan, each biak kecceng must pay 15 sen per month for ayerman, whereas in
In some case there were villages being unified to the other village under the same bekel tuo because there was no candidate who willing to become bekel enom. Therefore, bekel tuo bead a songgan-land as consequences of his position as a bekel enom.

Under age Bekel

As mentioned above that the formation of bekel could be bequeathed to his heir, therefore, there always a possibility that the heir was still under ages. In the pranatan bekel stated that people who promoted for bekel must no less than 7 years old. Bekel who is still under 20 year old, must have an emban (acting bekel) who will responsible for all of bekel obligations. In 1895, this regulation had been connect. In this new regulation stated that, even the heir just born, he could be promoted for bekel and had a right to have an emban. Emban was the one who will carry out all the bekel jobs, such as providing the work force for ayeron, completing number of kali in his village, in other words, he also act as kali altogether. He also responsible for all the abuse done by bekel, for instance if bekel involved in the criminality, emban must replace him to be punish in the jail or workforce. All the rules listed in the pranatan bekel prevailed for emban bekel as well, including the inheritance rule.

If bekel escape from his village, he could not be fired as far as he was still less than 20 years old. On the contrary, if he had 20 years old, he will be fired although he had not carry out all his duties as a bekel yet. Bekel who had 15 years old and had been recognized his panah, wants to carry out all his duties by himself will be admitted, as far as it previously consultated to the district police. However, if he break the rule, he will be punished regardless his age. Since bekel able to bear all his duties by himself, there was no longer emban beside him. In the pranatan stated that all the bekel who has 20 years old must carry out all his duties. The district police must have a book registration to record all the bekel private data, so he will know exactly the age of the bekel. But, since 1895, this

Pakualaman 25 sen. The tax of kepulason was only implemented in Mentawais area. See, Undang-undang kapung 8 Desember 1905. Another tax in connection with the police tax is prabaya radum (street tax) that beared by kali kenceng as well; 5 sen per month. This tax is also implemented in Mentawais area, see Undang-undang kapung 11 Desember 1905; Undang-undang kapung 29 Juni 1906; Undang-undang kapung 27 Juni 1906, for Pakualaman area see, Undang-undang kapung 17 September 1907 dan Undang-undang kapung 20 Desember 1906. See article 1 - 6 of Pranatan Bekel, KITLV, ibid. 26 Dhawuh kapung 24 Desember 1896 Ongka 9864; Dhawuh kapung 15 Besar Be 1824 angka 3025/1 (Instruction of 9 June 1895 No. 3025/1), Dhawuh kapung 24 Desember 1895 Ongka 1332/1, see article 1 & - 5 of Pranatan Bekel, KITLV, ibid.
book had no longer needed when government saw that the bekel could be promoted since he just born.27

Embar (Acting Bekel)

As mentioned above that embar responsible for bekel duties. In the land-leasing area, embar was appointed by the land owner, whereas in the kota area by patuh with the agreement of the district police. Since the patuh fail to choose embar, his job will be taken over by police district. Patuh or land-tenant had the right to argue against the police decision. If the police also fail appointing embar, therefore bekel was fail to be promoted, in other words, the status of village will be declared as kompating (vacant) and there an opportunity to choose the new bekel.28 People who had a right to apply for embar was bekel closest family or some else of the village (wong belang or wong muncop / moncolim), since there was no family in that village.29 All the conditions required for people who want to apply for bekel was also appropriate with those who will apply for embar. For instance, bekel who had been fired or involved in the criminality had no right to apply for embar.30 For a certain case, Resident allowing the people to propose for embar, as far as they have never involved in the big criminality. It was could be seen from how long he was arrested, or how much money in paid for compensation over the law he abused.31

27 Dihanurah kaping 10 April 1898 Ongko 2454/1; Dihanurah kaping 16 Surat Dal 1823 atas 31 Juli 1895 Ongko 129/1; Dihanurah kaping 5 februari 1896 Ongko 1605/1; Dihanurah kaping 15 Januari 1820 Ongko 806/1 (Instruction of 24 December 1896 No. 9651); Dihanurah kaping 15 Besar Be 1824 Ongko 3623/1 (Instruction of 9 June 1895 No. 3025/1); see also, Dihanurah kaping 13 Sawal Dal 1823 Ongko 2248/1 (Instruction of 25 April 1894 No. 2248/1), see article 1-5 of Prunuum Bekel, KITLV, ibid.

28 Dihanurah kaping 16 Surat Dal 1823 Ongko 129/1, Construction of 31 July 1893 No. 129/1; Dihanurah kaping 20 Sawal Warna 1825 Ongko 1608/1 (Instruction of 5 February 1896 No. 1608/1).

29 One of the closest villages of four villages surrounds it. Whereas, moncolim is wewuh (addition) one more village. The use of moncolim as an extension of muncop, for instance if there is a problem that could not be solved by moncop, then will be forwarding to moncolim. The role of moncop and moncolim has no longer effective since the early twentieth century. Its function is replaced by patuh.

30 In Anton-vanriper law, the abuse of law called kidrasanen or kadeulis. See, Dihanurah kaping 24 Desember 1899 No. 986/4 (Instruction of 24 December 1899, No. 986/4) and Dihanurah kaping 16 Januari, 1937 No. 62/2, (Instruction of 16 January 1937, No. 62/2), see article 4 of Prunuum Bekel, KITLV, ibid.

31 As stated in his letter to Patuh, Dihanurah, then was a bekel in the land-leasing area who has been fired because of corruption ayen-wa-tax, and his heir has not grown up. Later the land-tenant appointed an embar, but the district police did not agree because the people that appointed for embar has been arrested before because stealing jati wood it
In the prononun explained that all the malreatment done by embun should be heard by himself and could not be blamed to the bekel. Embun could be fined if he abuse all the bekel rules or prosecuased by patuh or land reenter as well as police. As reported by Resident of Yogyakarta, Ament to 78th Danurejda, that there was a bekel who had involved in the criminality and force his people for some work and tribute which were not listed in the prononun. Resident suggesting to fire that bekel. Later, he was fired but he still had right to bequest his occupation to his family (gesong waris). Because of his heir was still young, therefore it was suggested to find an embun. There was an objection from Resident because people who apply for embun were the former bekel himself who had involved in the criminality and malreatment.

Since 1891, there was an obligation for bekel to live in the kroyan (official house). This rule was also addressed to embun, but since embun in the status ngara (in the same time act as bekel in another village), he allowed staying in his own house as far as it was still under the same Komaen or Kademangan (district). With regard to the store of kroyan crop yield (alip), embun must make an agreement with the bekel family, or police will decide if they were failed to make a deal. In this share, embun must obtain half of the alip.

Kroyan (Official House)

Before 1891, as listed in article 10 of Prononun Patuh, bekel was only obligated to live in his village. In 1891, this article explained more clearly in the Prononun bekel, that bekel should live in the special house called kroyan. The houses that must be functioned, as bekel kroyan is the house belongs to the previous bekel. Every new bekel had six months to move from his house to the kroyan. Since he would never move to the kroyan more than six months he will be fired. Befo

sen). Resident allow to that people to become embun because he regard that it was a light punishment. Seratunun Kangieng Tawan Besiden kaping 9 November 1897 Unghu 653/7B (The letter of Resident 9 November 1897). See also, Dhewah kaping 21 January/14 July 1873 ang 1366 (Instruction of 17 November 1897 No. 1360), see kupon 39, 43,44, 46,8 of Prononun bekel.

Dhewah kaping 17 Rwah Je 1938 onghu 2908/1 (Instruction of 10 December 1900 No. 2908/1), ibid.

That bekel has required heavy pamanh (½ wadelan) to the villager in the kind of oil palm with the bigger cutting and bebong. 2½ sen. He also required ambenere (rice for traditional ceremony) in every Mulus, Piwana and Rwah four times than ever, 75 sen. Seratunun Kangieng Tawan Besiden kaping 4 December 1900 No. 10122/P (The letter of Resident of 4 December 1900, No. 10122/P), ibid.

Dhewah kaping 16 So/io. DMI 1823 (Instruction of 31 July 1893), ibid.

The bekel could be fired, if he would not moving to his kroyan within 60 days since he had promoted, although he had paid tambon rwah or alip, and he did not allowed again to apply for bekel, but the belsi will be returned to him. See, Dhewah kaping ?
who had been firing loosing his right to defend his private, the only property he
could own was alip or saman sari (stems of crops grew in his garden, such as,
Khyena kooreh (coconut), pargh panrara (bamboo), and other shrubs
depending on fruit and palmyra). There is an exception for some plants that
could not be categorized into alip, such as, dahl (Araritum dissematium), sana
(sheepgrass), and sarni akbar (aluminum wood). It beheld want the alip too, he must purchase it. In order to estimate the value of alip in the behel
private, he should consulting to the main grove or district police will calculate
since they failed to reach an agreement. in the discussion to determine the
value of private property must be involved as a witness. For this purpose, he had a
share 5% of the alip value.11

According to the Resident instructions, No. 86/1, and No. 95/1, 24
October 1899,12 government allowed behel to plant some kind of crops in the
peasant lands. When behel rent, those crops could not be classified as alip, and
the former behel was allowed to hold it. In some cases the former behel could not
hold these plant since those lands fall into other alip. It was very common, that
the new behel would settle the new alip (peasant) in his village. To deny such
case, therefore, in 24 October 1902 Resident instructed to forbid these practice
because actually it favours very against the Pratistan Pahar (Landholder
Regulations). In that article explained that all the kind of plant grew in the alip
land was owned by the peasant himself, except to some kind of plant that
been categorized as private property.13 in other words, since the instruction
implemented, behel losing his right to owned crops, which were planted in the
peasant land.

Resor Ser 1820 angna 1197-3 (Construction of 17 April 1820, No. 1197/3, see also,
Dawarh Kapung 39 Siyam, Sr. 1822 angna 2931/1 (Instruction of 17 April 1823
No. 2931/1) see kayng 60-72 of Pratistan Pahar.

10 Concerning the range of payment of the alip or saran sari in behel kroag, the
new behel had 30 days range since the former saran value stated by propiet and had been
approved by both sides. After the alip payment, the propiet was given to the new behel.
His permission could be canceled since he unable to pay it within 30 days. See, Dawarh
Kapung 39 Siyam, Sr. 1822 (Instruction of 17 April 1823 No. 2931/1), ibid.

It was appropriate with the Dwarah Kapung Karyung Bhawat for paying kapung 22 Siwach, 
Sr. 1822, (Resident Instruction of 1 March 1822, No. 2935/1). As stated in the
instruction that for his sake as a witness police had a share 1 repacht 3 seep. see, Dawarh
Kapung 4 Jarnabhakh, Dal 1223, (construction of 13 December 1863 No. 12481/1), ibid.

11 Dawarh Kapung 23 Khorisubalak, Wawa 1225 (Instruction of 13 October 1895, No. 86/1), see also, Dawarh Kapung 5 Jarnabhakh, Wawa 1225 (Instruction of 24
October 1895 No. 9581/1), ibid.

12 See Dawarh Kapung 24 January 1992 No. 256/14 This Instruction launched to
solve a case occurred in Yojobalata. There was a former behel that feared the new behel
to pay kroag-wave that he planted in the three manamang belongs to his kroag when he
occupied behel's portion, ibid.
With regard to the belak house itself was never mentioned in the pronnurt. Since the former bekel could reach an agreement with the new bekel, it was possible for the new bekel to purchase the house as well, but if they fail, the former bekel allowed to discharge (kabsah) the house. There was an exception for the house equipment outside the house such as; sumur (well), pagar (fence). Since those were built by people workforce, the former bekel must leave it stand, and the new bekel should not to buy it. In the contrary, if those were built by the former bekel, the new bekel must purchase it as well. In some cases, the former bekel would not to leave his house. In this case, Resident had an authority to finish it. In the previous regulation stated that if the former bekel would not to leave his house he will regarded as a kail leneng, so the new bekel could force him to leave his house, or if he refuse the new bekel was allowed to break the house. In 1895, this article was corrected, since the former bekel would not leave the house he will be send to the jail. This new regulation, however, brought some problems for police. The police could not arrest the people it just because they would not leaving their own house because this case will never regulated in the law. Therefore, Resident instructed to add the regulation with “police has authority to force”. Finally in 1899, Resident instructed again to imposed previous regulation launched in 12 October 1892 since those addition was not effective to solve the case.66

The dismissal of Bekel

Bekel had a big role but a weak position in the apanage-system. In the pronnurt bekel is clearly explained that the dismissal oh bekel was only possible if he unable to pay the tax, but in many cases, the dismissal of bekel caused by some other reasons. All articles listed in the bekel pujongem as well as in the Pronnurt Bekel were not the only regulation that bind bekel within such system. However, in many articles as stated in Pronnurt Patah as well as other separate regulations stated that police and patah have an authority to give an advise and suggestion concerning the dismissal of bekel although bekel had never break the agreement as stated in the pujongem itself. In some cases, there were many bekels have been fired for some trivial blunder. It happened because there was no article in some

66 Dhanuw kaping 7 Supar, Jimneal 1823 (Instruction 12 September 1891), recopier in Dhanuw kaping 13. Jawawatin 1224 angka 1265/1(Instruction of 15 December 1891 No. 1265/1). Dhanuw kaping 20 Mulhid, Je 1822 angka 1032/1 (Instruction of 12 October 1892 No. 1032/1). Dhanuw kaping 22 Ruhungakahir, Wina, 1823 (Instruction of 12 October 1895). Dhanuw kaping 8 Sesar, Ebe 1828 angka 2712/1 (Instruction of 19 April 1899, No. 2712/1), see also Resident Amanu to Raden Adipati Danureja, 12 April 1899, No. 1516/D Dhanuw kaping 15 Binar, Dil 1839 angka 1941/1 (Instruction of 28 December 1899 No. 1941/1), see also Resident van Andel to Raden Adipati Danureja, 20 December 1909 No. 11119/33), see article 4 of Pronnurt Bekel, KITLV, ibid.
regulation that restricted patuh to collect bekel and other tributes as much as possible from the new bekel.

The dismissal of bekel was regulated in both Pranatan Bekel as well as Pranatan Patuh. The dismissal submitted by patuh to the district police chief. Before approved it, the district police will previously invite bekel to hear bekel statements whether he agree or not with that insistence. Since there was no objection from bekel about the charge, police will approved the dismissal. In the contrary, if bekel refuse it, he had a right to state his objections, and police will investigate the case. Later, police will forward the case to the court. Bekel who has been fired should return the property.

In many cases, the dismissal of bekel was usually caused by the criminality, especially since 1891, when the new regulation launched by government. In this new regulation stated that bekel had been arrested because of the criminality must be tried without inheritance right. The Lembrau was the only institution which had authority to fire bekel who involved in the criminality. 44 There were many bekels who break the law but they were not arrested, but only be obligated to pay for compensation. In such case, bekel will not be fired as far as he could pay the compensation.

Since this regulation came into effect, there were many bekels been fired because involved in the little criminality, such as; main (gambling), madas (smoking the opium), remenan (sleep with the other woman).

The resident complaining against the increasing of the bekel dismissal since the implementation of that law. Therefore in 1903, suggested to Patih Danurejo to abolish the law and replace it with the new regulation.

In the new regulation launched in November 1903 stated that the problem of bekel dismissal rested in the Patih Danurejo authority. If the bekel arrested because of criminality (лангун бракат), the district police had no more authority to dismiss him, but his case will be forwarded to the Patih Danurejo. In this new regulation, listed number of kinds of criminality such as; stealing, corruption, dishonest, the lack of tax payment that will not cause bekel dismissal. 45 In the

43 Dhewuh kaping 6, 15 Jamadilakhir, Tahun Jumadil 1211 ungka 1556/1 (Instruction of 7 and 16 January 1892), see also, Seratap was Raden Tumenggung Sunanadhiyana kaping 1, Muhid Tahun 28, 1822 (The letter of Raden Tumenggung Sunandhingrat 25 September 1892) to the district police chief, that reporting about bekel who was arrested because of gambling and unable to pay the compensation, ibid.

44 For instance, there was a bekel that had been arrested because slept with another woman, was released since the implementation of this regulation. See Dhewuh kaping 10 Supar Tahun Dal 1822 (Instruction of 24 Agustus 1893), see, Dhewuh kaping 10 Supar Tahun Dal 1823 (Instruction of 24 August 1893), ibid.

45Those main rules are, bekel who involved in the criminality should not be fired, even he also unable to pay the compensation. Beken who involved in coklong rupiah and teiu (stealing teiu and teiu leaf) should be fired but still hold the inheritance right. The
land-tening area, the decision for bekel dismissal rested to the police authority and by Resident or Patih Damareja recommendation. The dismissal of bekel usually caused by two main reasons. Firstly, bekel who escape from his village because of certain reasons. In the promanai stated that if bekel leaving his village more than 15 days without asking permission to the parahi or police, he could be fired but he still had inheritance right. In such case, number of beksi must be paid by his heir was 2 years off tax, as compensation. His inheritance right will be abolished if bekel run away from his village because involved in the criminality. In the case of bekel escape, the authority to fired bekel rested in the Bupati Pulai authority. Secondly, bekel who hire his sanggan-land. In the promanai stated that bekel is allowed to hire his sanggan-land but no more than one year, or allowed up to three years as far as number of land he hired no more than a half of his whole sanggan-land. Bekel who want to hire his sanggan-land must involve police as a witness. For his possession as a witness, police has share 5 rupiah, if the value of the land hired by bekel more than 50 rupiah.

Since 1903 number of little criminality as mentioned above will have no cause bekel dismissal but this regulation was not prevail to those who had been arrested more than three times in one year. This rule did not explicitly mention in the promanai, but Balemanungu was often taken this kind of judge. What Balemanungu decided based on the Patih Damareja instruction, 31 March 1890. In this instruction stated that bekel who will not come to the payil (marupati), he could be send to the prison. Since bekel has been arrested more than three times because of the same reason he could be fired. This ordered appropriate with some cases reported by Resident in 3 January 1898. Resident reported that in 1897 there are two bekel who have arrested more than three times. The first bekel has been arrested for three time, firstly, he has arrested for 3 days because disobeyed the color, secondly he arrested for 3 days because did not come to the workforce, and 5 thirdly he arrested for 5 days for the same reason. Whereas the second bekel has been arrested for five times. Finally, he was arrested for 3 days because of kether to guard the parahi. Secondly he was arrested for 3 days because he did not want to works his land. Thirdly he arrested because ignored the workforce. Fourthly he arrested for 3 days because he chased his ukep away from his village, and lastly he was arrested for 5 days because neglected the similar rules were prevail for bekel who unable to pay the tax (kether) but the number of beksi must be the same with those paid to the tiyang blahag (villager) or tiyang sewa (thousand people or villager = 2 years of tax). The beksi was paid to the parahi to replace number of tax and other tributes, that could not be fulfilled. Bekel who had cheating the people and corrupting officer (security tax) should be fired without inheritance right. Bekel who corrupting less than selama gulo (if 25 - ) should be fired, but still hold the inheritance rights. Bekel who saw the criminality but he did not reporting to the police he could be arrested or fired, article 1 of Promanai Bekel, KITLV, ibid.
workforce. Both bekeis occupy double formation, as bekel tuwo and bekel enum altogether. It is meant that both of them bear bekel tuwo and bekel enum duties altogether. As bekel tuwo, they denied from the duties mentioned above, so he was arrested because they ignored bekel enum duties. Resident decided to dismiss them as bekel enum. Later, they also suggested to be fired also as bekel tuwo, because the patu has never trusted them anymore.

The unification of the village

The gamblokan (unification) of two villages or more occurred since there was an empty village without bekel and heir. However, such unification only possible as far as they are still under the same bekel tuwo as well as patu. And the bekel tuwo agree to bear all bekel enum duties altogether. Since there were more bekel tuwo who wants to receive the unification, pata will chase one of them, but must previously be consulted to the police. The unification of the village stated in the special pygogens, which declared clearly it status as a gamblokan village. The unification of two or more villages to become one bekel tuwo territory is also possible to those villages with different pata, so called gamblokan pakakan. In this case, bekel tuwo also occupy bekel enum formation, but the separation of village arrangement between bekel tuwo and bekel enum must be clearly declared in the pygogens. The problems were often appeared, especially in the case of unification between the village of kejawan with those of the land-leasing area, in which before it leased to the European land-sentor had been controlled by one patu. In many cases the old patu (landholder in the kejawan area) took an initiative to unify the village without previously consulted with the new patu (European land rosette). Resident was often received some objections from European planters about this case. The gamblokan village could be endowed to the bekel heirs, as far as the heir will bear all the bekel tuwo obligations. Since the bekel heirs would not to become bekel nuwe, the village will be declared as kompat. In some cases, since the bekel tuwo brother, bupati will send a papan pura (warning). If he ignore it, the district police will submit a proposal for dismissal to the Bupati, and the bupati that had been paid unable to ask back. Lihat, Dhoruw kaping 10 Suro, Tahun 1822 (Instruction of 4 August 1892), see bupati (appendix) 8.54, 99-61 of Prapatan Bikel. In the provatian stated that since the wide of gamblokan-village less than 1 jang, it was only been required one pygogen. But this article is blur, because each of the gamblokan villagers had own pygogen. Probably, this article was only prevail to the gamblokan-village of the main village (bekel tuwo territory). See, Dhoruw kaping 21 Radugasikri, Tahun Dal 1823 anika 850/1, (Instruction of 3 November 1892, No. 850/1), ibid. See Resident Ameu to Rader, Adipati Dwiwataja, 24 March 1938, See also Dhoruw Raden Tunenggeng Suradiningrat kaping 4 Dalhangyadi, Tahun Alih 1827 (Instruction of 27 March 1938), ibid.
there were some villages with empty bekel fail to be unified because there was no one who agree about the unification. In the pramanis explained that since there is no one who willing to become bekel or the unification plan, panah allowed to find another applicant from the another village. The heavy burden that must be bear by the new bekel, sometimes, was the true reason why people from another village would not apply for bekel too. In this case the village will be divide into two or more villages, as far as the range of each village no less than 1 bahu. It is important to be noted that the term “bahu” could not be simply perceived as larva or 1/4 jung. Therefore, although in the pramanis stated that the minimum wide of the village for bekel enom so less than 1 bahu, this statement was not prevail to the village with the big jung, wide bahu, rich tax as well as many sikep. For instance the villages in Tempel, Wringin and Pakeh has more than 1 jung but regarded as 1 jung.

Conclusion
The existence of bekel as a tax collector was surely originated from the Javanese feudal system, however once the second decade of the nineteenth century, there was no regulation about bekel-system produced by indigenous ruler regnant-less from the Dutch colonial ruler opinion. Those intervention could not only be viewed from the eyes of economic and political interest of the colonial government, but should be lied down on the social and economic development of the village society in the principality area as a whole. The presence of the European plantations gave rise a social and economic encounter between traditional agrarian system and modern sector. The adjustments must be done either by European and indigenous sector in order to accommodate any social and economic development occurred in this area. Those adjustments itself has taken more than hundreds years since the announcement of the Angger-angger Sepuluh until the abolishment of the apamange-system in 1912. It could be pointed out, that the process of adaptation has resulting, at least a positive development, namely the more proper recognition toward the peasant rights and the worse violation done by bekel could be prevented. There are a lot of evidence could be traced in the indigenous archive about the behavior of bekel that tend to extorting the peasant, either in Surakarta or in Yogyakarta. But rebellion is not the only alternative taken by peasant to struggle for their right. From the above story, Sarorejo has taken a rational step by dragging Bekel Kartosadire into the Court. In Pakualaman area, for instance, there are hundreds prosecution has taken by the court based on the reports submitted by the petitioners. It seems that the peasant consciousness toward the law has rise up and the law guarantee toward the peasant has more proportionally recognized by the authorities.
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