

THE MALAY WORLD POLITY SYSTEM: A BRIEF INTRODUCTION

Nasrudin Mohammed

Introduction

Apart from the local ethnic, the Malays and aborigines (orang asli), Malaysia is a fairly small country with a population of Chinese and Indians whose ancestors, during end of 1700s, came to this country as immigrants from China and South and North India.^[1] As such, Malaysia identifies itself as being a multi-cultural, multi-religious, and multi-linguistic society.

Before the arrival of the Europeans, the Malay had established settlements along the coasts and riverine estuaries of the Malay peninsular. These were to become important trading posts and later the genesis of small kingdoms (INTAN, 1991). Beginning in the 2nd century BC the Malay peninsula experienced over 1000 years of Indian or Indianized influence, and in the thirteenth century AD Arab and Indian Muslims brought Islamic and Arabic influence to the peninsula. The Portuguese were the first Europeans to arrive in 1511 when they conquer the trading port of Melaka from a Malay ruler. The Dutch, who had a foothold across the Straits of Melaka on the island of Java, laid siege to Melaka and succeeded in capturing it in 1641. The British later came to take control over Melaka. Their first beachhead was Penang that was leased to the British East India Company by the Sultan of Kedah in 1786. By 1867 Penang had joined with Melaka and Singapore to form the Straits Settlements, thus a new British Crown Colony was formed.

Some Malay states accepted British ‘advisers’ under the guise of British Residents and in 1895 these became the Federal Malay States consisting of Perak, Selangor, Negeri Sembilan, and

Pahang. The remaining states, described as the Unfederated Malay States, included Kelantan, Terengganu, Kedah, and Perlis, which had been extricated from the Siamese sphere of influence in 1909. Together with Johor, these were later brought into the British sphere. British political control over the whole peninsula radically transformed Malaya socially and economically and brought about stability that lasted until the Japanese invasion in the Second World War.

Today (2006), Malaysia has a population of more than 26.64 million. The outstanding characteristic of Malaysia's population today is its highly variegated ethnic mix that makes it one of the prime examples of a multi-racial society in the whole world. Consisting of the Malays, Chinese, Indians and other indigenous groups, with its multiethnic composition of the population, Malaysia's culture and religious practices are very diverse. Bahasa Malaysia is the national language while English is widely spoken and considered the second language. The constitution lays down that Islam is the religion of the Federation. Even though different cultures and religions exist, except for the multiracial conflict in 1969, they have put up with each other and developed a very tolerant society (Gullick & Gale, 1986; Mohamad, 1995).

It is imperative that any attempt at studying Malaysian polity must, first of all, take into account the Malay-Muslim polity that has governed and boundering the political and social landscape and environment of this piece of land which is now known as Malaysia. Likewise, it is also almost impossible for anyone to fully understand and appreciate a country's system of government by looking just at the existing governmental institutions. The reason being is that there was a strong interconnection among elements that has shaped up the entire political system ever since the earliest formalised structure of government was recorded in the history of Malaysia that goes back to the Malacca Sultanate era. Elements such as the values and beliefs

system of the early society – the Malays and aborigines – helped one to understand the role of modern social institutions and the current political system.

Malaysian political system is strongly related to its traditional and modern Malay-Muslim socio-culture and socio-politics. It is well reflected in the current Malaysian political system. Therefore, to have a better grasp of understanding of the Malay polity, basic knowledge of the history of Malay world – especially during the glorious Malacca Sultanate era – is very much helpful.^[ii]

In his observation on the progress and development of Malaya, Gullick (1998:186) concludes that it has been a distinct feature of the Malay world that ownership and total control of economic resources has always been the source of political power. In fact this is the trend that was continuously recorded since the Malacca tradition (1400s). Further, it is at this juncture that Khoo (1992:44) acknowledges the linkages of economic power and Malay polity by relating those two elements of power with the changes that have been impacting the Malay world. With this in mind, it is worth noting that apparently there has not been any tragedy or glimpses of extreme historical episode recorded – what more to mention about the possibility of anarchism – of Malay community aggression against other races, other than actions which were undertaken with the intentions of safeguarding and protecting the well-being of the Malay world.^[iii]

History shows that the Malays – whether they are Bugis, Minang, Sumatran, Javanese, and aborigines – treated people of other communities well. The fact that non-Malay communities were patronised and their interests protected by Malay chieftains especially in the 1880s and beyond was clearly observed and acknowledged by many historians. Among the earliest Chinese community in the Malay world were miners who were concentrating in the tin and gold mines in Titian Akar, near Bandar Melaka since 1793. Sungai Ujong and Lukut were two of the main

mining areas developed by a combination of efforts of Malay chieftains and Chinese workers. Thus by 1880s, the policy of 'welcoming, accepting and accomodating' community of other ethnics were already became a norm and put into practise by Malay chiefs and administrators.^[iv]

It must be acknowleged, however, that in some instances, the ethnic relations in the Malay world have fitted uneasily into the running of administrative aspect of the states by the colonial administrators. The uneasy relationship partly derives from problems such as differences in terms of values and practices of the people which are multi-ethnic. Undeniably, there have been some black spots and unpleasant dents observed and recorded in the past history of the nation. However, as history shows, most of the black spots and dents were mainly in the forms of disputes, conflicts and internal crisis not only between the Malays and other races, but also among the Malays themselves. In 1828 and 1834 for instance, two conflicts, involving direct clashes of Malay and Chinese communities, shocked the Malay world. The 1828 clash, reported to be driven by economic and social factors, claimed 1,000 Chinese lives in Rasah. Six years later, in September 1834, another clash, also said to be economic and social-related, involved 300-400 Chinese miners who attacked and burned down the house of Lukut administrator, Raja Busu. Several other Malay employers were also attacked while their houses destroyed. Raja Busu, the Malay chief who brought the Chinese miners to Lukut, was killed in that incident. In retaliation, the Malays attacked and killed the Chinese miners while trying to escape to Melaka.^[v]

Malay world attributes are unique. As most historians agree, Malay world provides an ideal learning platform especially for the people of this country to learn and appreciate each others' values, norms, customs and traditions. This part of the world has been providing space and opportunities for all communities for more than 210 years. If the *Sejarah Melayu* classical

text could be ascertained its originality in terms of historical facts as a whole, then events such as the marriage of the Sultan of Melaka to the princess of China – as evident by the artifacts that can be seen today in certain locations such as the China Hill – should very well be appreciated as a meaningful significant event in the history of Malaysian polity.

The foundation of Malay world was established as early as the history of Melaka was noted by various historians. What is seen today – showed by the amazing progress of Selangor and Kuala Lumpur in particular – is a reflection of Malay chieftains economic and political policies in the likes of Raja Jumaat and Raja Abdullah. Together with a few other Malay chiefs, opportunities were widely opened for the non-Malay community to work and live alongside the Malays, who, during the early times, were already working and established settlements in areas such as Kuala Lumpur. Today, Kuala Lumpur for instance has not only sealed its name as one of the busiest business centre in the Malay-Muslim world, but also appeared to be a dominant non-Malay business and political centre. This is quite ironic in the sense that it has been a long tradition that in the Malay-Muslim world the concentration of political powers was seen mainly on the Malay Sultanate institution, the reason why Kuala Selangor was functioning as the government administrative centre.

That scenario however, was not applicable in the Malay-Muslim world in the context of the development of Kuala Lumpur. In 1875 Swettenham reported that the layout of Kuala Lumpur was clearly separating the settlement and administrative patterns based on ethnic consideration. Malays, Chinese and Europeans were located in their own respective boundaries. A Kuala Lumpur map, sketched by Swettenham illustrated the boundaries of the Malays, Chinese and Europeans settlements in Kuala Lumpur.^[vi] The boundaries were strategically set to avoid any potential disputes especially between the Malays and Chinese. Likewise, Gullick

(1998: 122) for example illustrates the uniqueness of the norms and regulations that governed the community. He reported that in Kuala Lumpur, for so many years the Malays and Chinese were separated from each other and lived within the boundaries of their respective zones. This, according to him, was done mainly to avoid any potential misunderstandings over the issue of pig rearings. This, as an example of the approaches employed by the British administrators – meanwhile, Yap Ah Loy was the administrator for the Chinese community – served as the basic foundation or rather requirement for the communities of multi-ethnic to live together peacefully and harmoniously in the Malay-Muslim world.

It is clear, as Swettenham and Gullick's have pointed out, that the political landscape of the Malay-Muslim world has been harmonised by the integration of multi-ethnic social and political values that has nevertheless promoted awareness and understanding of each other's sensitivity. Such an understanding has not only brought about peace and order in the Malay-Muslim world, but also sowed and nurtured seeds of tolerance among the community. As such, sensitivities of people of all races were observed, noted and recognised. An understanding of each others sensitivities then, served as an invaluable recipe in safeguarding and preserving the foundation of the Malay-Muslim world polity. Perhaps, this is one of the critical ingredients that led the nation to independent. At times where uncertainties seemed to be the main issues in the political landscape of the nation, the policy of 'accepting and accomodating' remained to be practically adopted by the Malays. In other words, it is 'the Malay way' – i.e. 'accepting and accomodating' – that has been observed functioning as a precious mechanism in maintaining the country's stability and peace. Today, it is the same policy that governs the country's political system. As such, there should not be even one individual, who understands the history of the

Malay-Muslim world, ever question its relevancy, as Mauzy (1988:213) concludes it exceedingly well,

”While the formal processes of politics, namely elections and parliamentary rule, are based on the Western democratic model of majority rule, the informal processes have always been guided by the ”Malay way”. This has been so within the dominant party, the United Malays National Organization (UMNO) and its relations with its predominantly non-Malay coalition partners. It has served to soften the steely aspects of the real world of political fights, and has made ethnic accomodation, under the dominance of the Malays, possible.”

There was a report that, on one occasion – during the sitting of Federal Legislative Council – Tunku Abdul Rahman was quoted saying that citizenship is the right that the Malays worried so much of losing it.^[vii] However, as Tunku Abdul Rahman said, the burning desire of the Malays for a free and independent nation had driven the Malays to extend the right to other ethnics. Of note, before that, Tunku Abdul Rahman was also reported to had calmed down the Malays by saying that the Malays will not be losing anything once the country is granted its freedom.

In political science perspective, the reality and processes of ethnic relations can be seen at several approaches. Segregation – the ’break and rule’ – was one of the bureaucratic approaches used by the British colonial. The British policy of segregating the people by dividing them according to sectoral activities had nevertheless affected the composition and social structure of the society. The Malays were deliberately left out, thus forcing them to confine and concentrate their daily activites primarily on agricultural activities in rural and sub-urban areas. Further, the

policy of bringing in foreign workers – especially the Chinese and Indians – made situation worst. In general, the segregating approach focused on at least three aspects or rather strategies:

- (1) Generating income especially from European, Chinese and other investors;
- (2) Bringing in foreign workers – the Chinese and indians - into this country,
- (3) Exploring more agricultural and mineral resources.

The fact that colonial's policy of segregating the population of the Malay world was evident for instance by Tilman's (1964) report where he quoted the Resident-General of Malay States stating that:

"The general policy of the British advisers has been to interfere as little as possible with the manners, customs, methods and prejudices of the different nationalities composing the population of the States; to interfere not at all in matters touching the Mohammadan religion - the religion of the Malays; to attract capital - European, Chinese and other; to encourage the immigration of Chinese, Indian and other labourers; to assist the development of the mineral and agricultural resources of the States..."

Likewise, Mills (2003: 23)) confirms British's policy in the Malay States – which was mainly economic – driven by saying that,

“It was not surprising that the English Company should seek to obtain tin in its occasional ventures to the west coast of Malaya, for this metal was the only important commodity offered by those states.”

One direct implication of the policy was quickly observed. Rural and villages areas were left undeveloped. The participation and involvement of the Malays in economic and political

activities were limited at a very minimal stage for fear of Malay political awareness. Their experience in India – British's former colony – made the British very much aware of the consequences of providing education to the locals. As suggested by some British officers in the Malay States, the Malays were left confining their activities in agro and handcrafts activities while the Chinese and Indians were brought in to help develop the economic sector.

Secondly, another strategy which was used by the British in relations to ethnic interaction was accommodation, i.e the willingness to provide opportunity and eventually granting rights and privileges to foreigners. Basically, the process involves sort of 'bargaining and tolerating' policy on the part of the locals. A 'social contract' is expected to be agreed upon series of negotiations between the locals and foreigners.^[viii] Granting citizenship is perhaps one interesting example of issues brought up in a social contract. In general, apart from citizenship, there were a few other conditions debated at various levels. Once the conditions are agreed by all parties – especially the colonial – the agreement will be considered as part and parcel of the state's Constitution.

A third feature of ethnic relations in the Malay world is the acculturation process. Acculturation is a process which involves the adoption and acceptance of ideas, beliefs, and symbols of another society. This may occur by immigration, when incoming members of a society adopt its culture, or by emulation, when one society takes on cultural features from another, such as happened in colonial contexts (Crystal, 1994: 29).

The Malays

It is perhaps useful to begin this section by giving a fairly comprehensive definition of a Malay, i.e.

“The Malay is a practising Muslim, residing in Malaysia, whose roots go back to his ancestors of the Old Malacca Empire and of those who were sons of the soil in the other parts of the Malay archipelago, stretching as far back in history as 3000BC. The Malay is endowed with a cultural heritage that has made him known throughout as the “gentleman of the world”. The Malay lives in a sanguine environment that is free from the vagaries of the weather and the harshness of natural calamities. The grace that God Almighty has bestowed upon the Malay has moulded him into a person who follows the path of temperance, making him a gentle and considerate person. His attributes and personality are clearly reflected even in the fine art of Malay cultural dance, which is expressed in slow and graceful movements depicting his affinity with the peaceful surroundings. The Malay is also a wonderful and gracious host to his guests, and this has been depicted in the writings of not a few Westerners, at times putting him at a disadvantageous position when dealing with others. But over time, he has also learned to manage his boundaries, be they physical or psychological, well. The modern Malay is suave, savvy, enterprising and values-driven. The globalised world will be his next battleground.” [ix]

There are several different lines of approach in discussing the Malay society. First, one could see the structure in terms of Malay classical literature. For example, the customs and traditions of the Malays can be understood by studying their traditional text resources such as *The Malay Annals*, *Melaka Digest* and *Maritime Laws*, to mention a few. By doing so, the ritualistic, symbolism and aesthetic values of Malay beliefs, values and practices will be clearly portrayed. [x]

Secondly, one can also read journals and books written by historians and anthropologists-sociologists. There are many available online and in the form of hardcopies. Journals that are published by highly recognised associations such as the Council of Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (MBRAS) and Malaysian Historical Association (MHA) are

commendable. There are also articles and books written by authors who are widely reknown for their authority in the field. As such, articles and books authored by Aminudin (1996); Buyong Adil (1991); Mohamed Amin (1966; 1967); Mohamed Ibrahim Abdullah Munshi (1075); Sheppard (1985); Swettenham, (1880; 1890; 1900; 1942); Burns & Cowan (1975); Khoo (1972; 1974; 1991) Gullick (1958; 1987; 1992; 1998), and many more, including recent publications written by scholar such as Ismail & Muhammad (2000).

This part deals specifically with the traditional Malay socio-political aspects. Dated back to the Melaka Tradition or as early as 1400s, components such as social structure and the activities of the early Malay society will be briefly visited and reviewed. This is felt necessary because one would find it difficult to understand the uniqueness of the Malay political system and social values without first looking at the social aspect of the society as a whole.

The existing political culture of the Malay society is deeply rooted in its traditional setting, i.e during the Melaka tradition since 1400s. It was the Sultanate institution that had laid down the basic foundation of today's Malay political system. So much so, the Melaka tradition has not only provided the foundation for Malaysian political setup via the Sultanate institution, which include the Rulers and their higher dignitaries, but also leaves behind the practices of administration pertaining to the governing of a nation.

With this in mind, careful considerations were made before some events of the Malay society with respect to the socio-political characteristics were chosen to be included in this section.

Historically, the basis of Peninsular Malay political culture was formulated based on the Melaka Sultanate in the 1400s. According to Sejarah Melayu, it was during the Melaka Sultanate

tradition that the political structure of the Malay society was formally established under the third ruler, Seri Maharaja (Sultan Muhammad Shah). It has been asserted that it was during the reign of Sultan Muhammad Shah that an elaborate code of conduct as well as a set of legal procedures were drawn up for the state (Khoo, 1995:8).

During its remarkable era, apart from being a centre for political, administrative and commerce, Melaka was also functioning as a centre for the spread of Islam. One of the rulers that have been given particular attention is Sultan Mansur Shah (1459-1477) who is noted as being interested in Islam and who established law and order in the city. The basic structure of government administrative system which were introduced by the Melaka Rulers and their high dignitaries, especially the Bendahara since 1420s is still exist and put into practice until today though with different titles and authority. The *Bendahara* for example, is now known as the Prime Minister while the Inspector General of Police today is referred to the *Temenggung* during Melaka times. The source of legal references for the Melaka Sultanate's administrative purposes were derived mainly from three historical documents, namely, the *Sejarah Melayu* (Malay Annals), the *Undang-Undang Melaka* (Melaka Digest), and *Undang-Undang Laut* (Maritime Laws).

The Malay ruler, the Sultan, or much later, in Perlis where the title "Raja" has been used since its came into existance in 1841 or later, which remains as the apex of the current monarchy system in Malaysia, has been the central authority and power-axis in the Malay political structure. It is equally important, however, to note that the discussion on the Malay political system since Melaka tradition can be divided into four phases of domination, i.e traditional Malay socio-political tradition; Arabic-Islam tradition; Hinduism; and Western beaureaucracy. Likewise, at each phase, different characteristics are observed which are closely-associated with

either the indigenous Malay socio-political, Arabic-Islamic tradition, Hinduism or the Western beaureaucracy characteristics and values.

The Making of Modern Malaysia

This section will look into the social, political and economy background of Malaysia. It will begin with a brief look at Malaysian history, its geographical location and society. The section will proceed to the coming of the European who introduces western economy and development. This section will then look into the economic and industrial situation and its vision of becoming a developed country by the year 2020.

In any discussion of changes in orientation and the development of a country's polity, it is necessary to look at the various elements that the country has. Given the fact that Malaysia is a federal state, how far are the economic and political processes largely autonomous of one another? Are there frequent 'disturbances' in political relations, considering the fact that Malaysia is a multi-ethnic country? Similarly, do cultural questions spill over into political processes?^[xi]

The course of Malaysian history has been determined by its strategic position at one of the world's major cross-roads, its tropical climate, the surrounding environment and the regime of the north-east and south-west monsoons.^[xii] Its position and other geographical circumstances made the country a natural meeting place for traders from all over the globe, especially the East and the west. The growth in the East-West trade was recorded especially during the first century BC with the establishment of regular trading contacts with the world beyond Southeast Asia.

After 1400, Islam became a major influence not only in the whole areas of the Malay Peninsula, but also throughout the Indonesian archipelago and Brunei. In 1511, Empire of Melaka was shattered by the Portuguese, followed by the Dutch in 1641. Malacca, by then, were remained colonialised by the European power with the British intrusion at the end of the eighteenth century. From their new bases of Pulau Pinang (Penang, or ‘Pearl of the Orient’) established in 1786, Singapore (1819) and Melaka (1824) which were better known as the Straits Settlements, the British power and influence spread into the Malay Peninsula and the process of political integration of the Malay States of the Peninsula into a modern nation-state began.

By 1914, the political organisation of the present-day states of Malaysia was made up of at least five types of government, i.e.

- (1) The Straits Settlements: It was a British crown colony headed by a British governor, consisting of Singapore, Melaka, Pulau Pinang, Labuan, the Cocos Isles and Christmas Isle. The capital state was Singapore;
- (2) The Federated Malay States: Consisting of the States of Negeri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak and Selangor, the Federated Malay States were British protectorate headed by a British High Commissioner (Governor of the Straits Settlements) with Kuala Lumpur as the administrative centre (capital state).
- (3) The Unfederated Malay States: A British protectorate consisted of Johor, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis and Terengganu, each of the states were administered by a British Adviser. The Adviser were responsible to the British Commissioner,;
- (4) Sarawak: British protectorate ruled by the Brooke family. The capital state was: Kuching; and

- (5) Sabah: Also a British protectorate, ruled by the Chartered Company of the British North Borneo with Jesselton (Kota Kinabalu) as the capital state.

Political awareness of the local community in the Malay States was somehow or rather took some time before the Malays created their very first political organisation in 1946. In that year the United Malay Organisation (UMNO) was created under the leadership of Dato Onn Jaafar. Two years later, in 1948, a federation uniting all the states in the Malay peninsular, Penang, and Melaka was formed. In the meantime, the Malayan Communist Party (MCP) immediately rose in armed revolt and attacked the British by employing guerrilla tactics. An 'emergency' was then proclaimed in 1948. British attempted to crush the revolt by military action as well as removing its political causes. This was achieved by encouraging the attainment of independence through political co-operation of the two major races in the country (Miller, 1965; Ryan, 1976).

Further, under the leadership of Tunku Abdul Rahman, UMNO formed a pact – an alliance – with the Malayan Chinese Association (MCA) and the Malayan Indian Congress (MIC) and secured victory in the 1955 general election. It was a complete victory for the Alliance. The election, held on July 27, 1955 was the first election to the legislative Council of the Federation. It was reported that over 1.2 million people were registered as voters, of whom 84.2 per cent were Malays, 11.2 were Chinese and 4.6 per cent Indians.^[xiii] The 52 constituencies were contested by 129 candidates who were from the Alliance Party (52); Party Negara (30); Pan-Malayan Islamic Party (11); National Association of Perak (9); Labour Party of Malaya (4); Perak Malay League (3), and Perak Progressive Party (2). There were 18 independent candidates. The Alliance won 51 out of the 52 seats. Pan-Islamic Party candidate from the Krian Constituency won the remaining one.

Britain responded to this mandate of the people by relinquishing its powers in Malaya. By that time Malaya was all well on its course to a self-governed state. The historic moment was realised and sealed on August 31, 1957 when Malaya secured its independence.

By 1959, Singapore, under Lee Kuan Yew, had secured full self government. Later, Singapore pressed for independence through merger with Malaya. A merger was then agreed in order to forestall the growth of communist influence among the Singapore's Chinese population (Mohamed Nordin, 1974). However, to offset the inclusion of millions of Chinese to Singapore, Malaya suggested in 1961 that Brunei, Sabah and Sarawak join in the merger (Eing, 1972; Gullick, 1981). After considerable discussion and amidst increasing opposition from Indonesia and the Philippines, these states, except for Brunei, established a new independent state of Malaysia on September 16, 1963.^[xiv] Singapore however, withdrawn from Malaysia on August 9, 1965, fearing that the Malays would dominate the Federation (Mohamed Nordin, 1974; Lee, 2000).^[xv] The exact reasons for the withdrawn were somehow varied. There were reports, however, saying that it was Tengku Abdul Rahman idea that Singapore should withdraw from Malaysia and become independent. A mainstream newspaper reported that Tengku Abdul Rahman admitted that it was indeed his idea as, in his own words, there was "no hope for peace." Tengku Abdul Rahman goes on to say that,

"My conclusion: There would be no end to the bickerings with Singapore except perhaps if Mr. Lee Kuan Yew is made Prime Minister in the real sense of the world."^[xvi]

Malaysia has ever since moved forward.

REFERENCES

- ABDULHAMID, A.A. (1993). *Crisis in the Muslim Mind*. Virginia, USA: International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- ABDULLAH, A. (1988). *Issues in Malaysian Politics. Occasional Paper Series, no.7*. Singapore: Singapore Institute of International Affairs/Heinemann Publishers.
- ADAIR, J. (1984). *Effective leadership. A self-development manual*. Aldershots, Hants, England: Gower Publishing Company Limited.
- AIDIT, G. (1990). *Development: An Islamic perspective*. Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications
- AL-QURAN.
- AMINUDIN, B. (1996). "The Institution of Debt Slavery in Perak", *Peninjau Sejarah* 1(1), 1996; Available at: <http://www.iht.com/bin/file=529163.html>
- BASS, B. (1989). *Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press.
- BASS, B. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 18, Issue 3, Winter, 1990, 19-31.
- BENNIS, W. (1989) *On Becoming a Leader*. New York: Addison Wesley
- BLAKE, R. R. & MOUTON, J. S. (1985). *The Managerial Grid III: The Key to Leadership Excellence*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.
- BLAKE, R.R. & MOUTON, J.S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston TX: Gulf Publishing Co.
- BLAKE, R.R. & MOUTON, J.S. (1967). *The managerial grid*. Houston TX: Gulf Publishing Co.
- BLAKE, R.R. & MOUTON, J.S. (1978). *The new managerial grid*. Houston TX: Gulf Publishing Co.
- BLAKE, R.R. & MOUTON, J.S. (1985). *The Managerial Grid III: The Key to Leadership Excellence*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.

- BOLMAN, L. & DEAL, T. (1991). *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- BOWIE, A. (1991). *Crossing the Industrial Divides: State, Society, and the Politics of Economic Transformation in Malaysia*. New York: Colombia University Press.
- BOWRING, P. (2004). "Philip Bowring: When the Malays cast their votes". *International Herald Tribune Online*, Tuesday, July 13, 2004.
- BURNS P.L. & COWAN, C.D. (Eds.) (1975). *Sir Frank Swettenham's Malayan Journals 1874-1876*. Kuala Lumpur: OUP.
- BUYONG, A. (1991). *Sejarah Selangor*. KL: Dewan Bahasa & Pustaka.
- CASE, W. (1995). "Malaysia: Aspects and Audiences of Legitimacy." In *Political Legitimacy in Southeast Asia: The Quest for Moral Authority*, ed. Muthiah Alagappa. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- CHANDRA, M. (1996). "Accommodation and Acceptance of Non-Muslim Communities within the Malaysian Political system: The Role of Islam", in *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*, Vo. 13 (1) Spring 1996 pp. 28-41.
- COLE, R. (2005). *Political Leadership*. Modern Library.
<http://www.randomhouse.com/modernlibrary/catalog/display.pperl?isbn=9780812971705&view=excerpt>
- CROUCH, H. (1980). "The UMNO's Crisis: 1975-1977." In *Malaysian Politics and the 1978 Election*, ed. Harold Crouch, Lee Kam Hing, and Michael Ong. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- CRYSTAL, D. (1994). (Ed.) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- FAALAND, J., JACK, P. & RAIS S. (1990). *Growth and Ethnic Inequality: Malaysia's New Economic Policy*. London: Hurst and Co.
- FIEDLER, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- FLUKER, W. (1998). *The Stones That the Builders Rejected*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press.
- FRADETTE & MICHAUD (1998). *The power of corporate kinetics. Create the self-adapting, self-renewing, instant-action enterprise*. NY: Simon & Schuster

- FUNSTON, J. (1980). *Malay Politics in Malaysia: A Study of UMNO and PAS*. Singapore: Heinemann Educational Books (Asia).
- GALE, B. (1982). *Musa Hitam: A Political Biography*. Petaling Jaya: Eastern Universities Press.
- GARDNER, J. (1989). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- GILL, R. (1986). *Razaleigh: An Unending Quest*. Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications.
- GREENLEAF, R.K. (1970). *The servant of leader*. Available at:
<http://www.butler.edu/studentlife/hampton/principles.htm>10
- GREENLEAF, R.K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. Paulist Press.
- GULLICK, J.M. (1958) *Indigenous Political Systems of Western Malaya*. London: Athlone Press – revised edition 1988.
- GULLICK, J.M. (1987) *Malay Society in the late Nineteenth Century – the Beginnings of Change*. Singapore: OUP.
- GULLICK, J.M. (1992) *Rulers and Residents – Influence and Power Malay States 1870-1920*. Singapore: OUP.
- GULLICK, J.M. (1998) “A History of Selangor 1766-1939”. Kuala Lumpur: *MBRAS* Monograph No, 28.
- GULLICK, J.M. “The entrepreneur in Late 19th Century Malay Peasant Society”, *JMBRAS* 58(1), 1958.
- HORII, K. (1991). “Disintegration of the Colonial Economic Legacies and Social Restructuring in Malaysia.” *Developing Economies* 29, no. 4: 281–311.
- Information Malaysia 1997 Yearbook* (1997). Kuala Lumpur: Berita Publishing.
- Information Malaysia 2005 Yearbook* (2005). Kuala Lumpur: Berita Publishing.
- ISLAM, S.S. (2005). *The politics of Islamic identity in Southeast Asia*. Kuala Lumpur: Thomson.
- ISMAIL, N. & MUHAMMAD, A. (2000). *The Malays par excellence ... Warts and all. An introspective*. Selangor: Pelanduk Publications.
- ISMAIL, N. (1999). *Prophet Muhammad’s leadership. The paragon of excellence altruistic management. A cross-application to modern management and leadership practice*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publications & Distributors Sdn Bhd.

- JAWAN, J.A. (2006). *Malaysian politics & government*. Shah Alam: Karisma Publications Sdn Bhd.
- JESUDASON, J.V. (1989). *Ethnicity and the Economy: The State, Chinese Business, and Multinationals in Malaysia*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- KATZ, D. & KAHN, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- KHOO, K.K. (1972) *The Western Malay States 1850-1873*. Kuala Lumpur: OUP.
- KHOO, K.K. (1995). *Malay Society. Transformation & democratisation*. Kuala Lumpur: Pelanduk Publications.
- KHOO. K.K. "Malay Society 1874-1920's", *JSEAS* 5(2), 1974.
- KHURSID, A. (1982). (Ed.). *Islam – Its meaning and message*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Pustaka Islam.
- KOUZES, J.M. & POSNER, B.Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- KUCZMARSKI, S.S. & KUCZMARKSI, T.D. (1995). *Value-based leadership. Rebuilding employee commitment, performance, and productivity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- LARSEN, H.O. (1999). Position, relation or preference? Approaches to the study of political leadership roles. *ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops on "The Changing Role of Local Councillors"*, Mannheim 26.03-31.03 1999.
- LASSWELL, L. (1963). *The Future of Political Science*. New York: Atherton.
- LEE, K.Y. (2000). *From Third World to First. The Singapore Story: 1965-2000. Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew*. Singapore: Times Media Private Ltd.
- LEEDS, C.A. (1981). 3rd Edition. *Political Studies*. Plymouth: Macdonald & Evans.
- MAUZY, D. K. (1988). "Malaysia in 1987: Decline of "The Malay Way"." *Asian Survey, Vol. 28, No. 2*, A Survey of Asia in 1987: Part II (Feb., 1988) , pp. 213-222.
- MILLS, L.A. (2003). (MBRAS Reprint 22). *British Malaya 1824-67*. Selangor: MBRAS.
- MILNE, R.S & MAUZY, D.K. (1999). *Malaysian politics under Mahathir*. London: Routledge.
- MINTZBERG, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.

- MOHAMED AMIN, H. "Raja Bot bin Raja Jumaat", *JMBRAS* 40(2) 1967.
- MOHAMED AMIN, H. "Raja Mahadi bin Raja Sulaiman" *Peninjau Sejarah* 1(2) 1966.
- MOHAMED AMIN, H. "Raja Musa ibni Sultan Abdul Samad" *Peninjau Sejarah* 1(1) 1966.
- MOHAMED IBRAHIM, A. M. (1975) *The Voyages of Mohamed Ibrahim Munshi*, KL: OUP.
- PAIGE G.D. (1977). *The Scientific Study of Political Leadership*. New York: Free Press/Collier MacMillan Publishers.
- ROSSITER, C. (1960). *The American Presidency*. New York: New American Library.
- RYAN, N.J. (1962). *The cultural heritage of Malaya*. Kuala Lumpur: Longman Malaysia.
- SHEPPARD, M. (1985) *Taman saujana – Dance, Drama, Music and Magic in Malaya, Long and Not-so-Long Ago*. Petaling Jaya: International Book Service.
- SWETTENHAM, F.A. (1900). *The Real Malay – Pen Pictures*, London: John Lane Bodley Head.
- SWETTENHAM, F.A. (1942). *Footprints in Malaya*, London: Hutchinson.
- SWETTENHAM, F.A. "About Perak", Singapore Straits Times, 1890.
- SWETTENHAM, F.A. "Some Account of the Independent Native States" *JSBRAS* 6, 1880.
- SYED OTHMAN, A. & AIDIT, G. (1994). *Islamic values and management*. Kuala Lumpur: IKIM.
- TORII, T. (1997). The new economic policy and the United Malays National Organization — With special reference to the restructuring of Malaysian society— *The Developing Economies*, XXXV-3(September 1997): 209–39.
- WEBER, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press.
- WRIGHT, P. (1996). *Managerial leadership*. London: Routledge.
- YUKL, G. (1981). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

ZALEZNIK, A. (1977) "Managers and Leaders: Is there a difference?", *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, 1977.

[ⁱ] Gullick (1998:35) reported that the first Chinese miners in Malaya worked (from 1793) in the safe enclave of Malacca territory, to recover gold and tin. He reiterates further that “although mining around Malacca continued until the mid-nineteenth century, the Chinese miners moved cautiously into adjoining Sungei Ujong. It also spread to Lukut, where the mines were not in the remote and dangerous interior; there were Chinese miners at work at Lukut from 1815.”

[ⁱⁱ] The Malacca Sultanate, with Malay as the lingua-franca and Islam as the religion, has built the foundation of Malay world polity that lasted for more than five centuries in this region until the Malacca empire surrendered to the Portuguese in 1511. Even then, the Malay polity attributes however, remained intact at least in terms of the language used and other dominant aspects such as culture, politics and administrative. A lengthy discussion on the relationship of Muslim and non-Muslim communities in the context of Malay world and the role and contribution of Islam in the history of modern Malaysia is available in Chandra’s (1996) paper, “Accommodation and Acceptance of Non-Muslim Communities within the Malaysian Political system: The Role of Islam”, in *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*, Vo. 13 (1) Spring 1996 pp. 28-41.

[ⁱⁱⁱ] Chandra, *ibid*. Interestingly, despite all difficulties the Malay community had been suffering during the 1950s in particular, they – the Malays – showed no signs of selfishness or aggressiveness. In fact the policy of ‘accepting and accomodating’ non-Malay community to co-exist in the Malay world remained undisturbed, thus prompted Chandra to throw a question, “*What were the reasons behind what appears to be the Malay’s tremendous political magnanimity?*” (pg. 29).

[^{iv}] The Malay administrators, among those noted in various historical documents which are readily available, include Raja Busu (died 1834), Raja Jumaat (died 1864), Sultan Abdullah (the founder of Kuala Lumpur), Sultan Ahmad Tajuddin (1855-1879), Sultan Abu Bakar (1862-1895) and Tunku Kudin (1868-1878).

[^v] A more detailed account of the clashes is provided in Gullick’s (1998) *A History of Selangor 1766-1939*, page 35.

[^{vi}] Gullick (1998) in, *A History of Selangor 1766-1939*, pg. 69.

[^{vii}] *Straits Echo* (July 11, 1957).

[^{viii}] The social contract, in this context, refers to a pact that was initiated by the British before Malaya was granted independence. Among other things, the pact, or the contract, gave citizenship to non-Malays and special privileges to the Malays and other Bumiputera. Responding to a remark made by one political party leader, Dr. Chandra Muzaffar, the President of Just World Trust stated that those who claimed that the social contract was no longer relevant after 48 years of Merdeka, did not understand it at all. Chandra states further that, “Without the social contract, there wouldn’t be the Federal Constitution. Without the social contract, we might not have gained independence because the British imposed it as a prerequisite to granting independence. The social contract is the key to race relations as enshrined in the Constitution. Source: *New Straits Times*, “Understanding the social contract”, September 1st, 2005, p.21.

[^{ix}] Ismail (2000).

[^x] In a recent publication – a book entitled *Malay Political Leadership* (Shome, 2002) – which is highly commendable, the need to understand the traditional Malay-Muslim polity and its institutions is mentioned. Shome says that, key to an understanding of Malaysian leadership is the knowledge that throughout its evolution symbols for the perpetuation of leadership veneration have persisted in its institutions and the sublime power of the sultans.

[^{xi}] Cultural issues remain to be one of many elements that shape the Malaysian polity and often debated in the Parliament. During a debate in the Parliament, the Prime Minister was once asked by an opposition leader whether the Government has ever used race as the basis of public sector appointments. Responding to that question, the Prime Minister stated that all citizens irrespective of race can apply to join any public service scheme based on the suitability of their academic qualifications to the position applied for. *New Straits Times*, “Race not used as basis for recruitment in public sector, says PM”, July 7, 2006, pg.11.

[^{xii}] *Information Malaysia* (1997).

[^{xiii}] *The Straits Times*, “4 a.m.: Alliance 27, rest 0”, July 28, 1955.

[^{xiv}] According to one report, the word “Malaysia” was used as early as 1929 in an article about a zoological exploration to document flora and fauna at Mount Kinabalu. The article, *A Sacred Mountain: Exploration of*

Mount Kinabalu was taken from the *Singapore Free Press* and published on page 125 of the British North Borneo Herald on July 1, 1929.

Another view said that the name “Malaysia” most likely referred to “Malay Asia” or the Malay archipelago. Source: *New Straits Times*, “Query over origin of “Malaysia”, September 1, 2005, p.10.

[^{xv}] An account of Singapore’s political events and its course to a self-governed state is narrated by Lee Kuan Yew, former Prime Minister of Singapore at length in his book, *From Third world to First. The Singapore Story: 1965-2000. Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew*. Singapore: Times Media Private Ltd.

[^{xvi}] *The Straits Times*, “Tengku: It was my idea...”, August 10, 1965.

nasrudinmuhammed@hotmail.com