Institut für Asien- und Afrikawissenschaften
Philosophische Fakultät III der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Culture and Politics: An Analysis of United Malays National Organisation (UMNO) 1946 - 1999

Azeem Fazwan Ahmad Farouk

Südostasien Working Papers No. 46
Berlin 2011

SÜDOSTASIEN Working Papers
ISSN: 1432-2811
published by the Department of Southeast Asian Studies
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Unter den Linden 6
10999 Berlin, Germany

Tel. +49-30-2093 66031
Fax +49-30-2093 66049
Email: hiwi-soa@rz.hu-berlin.de

Azeem Fazwan Ahmad Farouk

Culture and Politics: An Analysis of United Malays National Organisation (UMNO) 1946 - 1999

Südostasien Working Papers No. 46

Berlin 2011

Table of Contents

Preface

This study is concerned with UMNO's organizational evolutional process. I became interested in this subject after reading Maurice Duverger's *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State* in which he has successfully sketched a general theory of parties, vague, conjectural, and of necessity approximate, which may yet serve as a basis and guide for detailed studies. In undertaking this study, I have followed the path of the "classical" scholars who wrote about political parties—Ostrogorsky, Michel, Weber, Duverger who conceived them as being above all organizations, arguing that in order to understand and explain their activities and transformation, it was necessary to analyze their organizational core.

Since this study is primarily interested in tracing UMNO's organizational transformation, it calls for an approach that will explore a wide range of variables. Making use of several social scientific disciplinary traditions i.e. history, political science and sociology, I have paid a particular attention to UMNO's different phases of development as well as its power structure. Perhaps the title of this study—*Culture and Politics: An Analysis of United Malays National Organization (UMNO) 1946-1999*—is somewhat misleading. Nevertheless, a perspective of this kind implies referring to Robert Michels' view of parties as instruments for the maintenance and the widening of power of some men over others, as well as to other theories of neo-Machiavellioan school, from Pareto's theory of elites to Gaetano Mosca's theory of organizations as decisive instruments of domination of the minorities—the political classes over the majorities. The striving for the defense of this power is an important component in the continual conflicts with all organizations regardless of their category or type, and regardless of the functions they serve or are supposed to serve within the social system. In the realm of political relations, the emergence of a new organization can bring about a broadening of the boundaries of the political system, i.e. the entry of social groups which had previously been excluded from the benefits of participation. Invariably, however, this also brings about the rise of a new power elite, on that will replace the pre-existing ruling classes or ally with them. The very organization that has consented to this rise to power will, from that moment on, be the principal instrument through which this new ruling class will defend its social power.

To obtain an understanding of UMNO's organizational development, I turned first to Ramlah Adam's *UMNO: Organisasi dan Kegiatan Politik*, a seminal work for both historian and political scientists. Ramlah has provided an invaluable contribution on UMNO's first phase of development from 1945-1951 in which she sought to chart the party's inception and its activities under the leadership of Dato' Onn b. Jaafar. Secondly, I relied on John Funston's *Malays Politics in Malaysia: A Study of UMNO & PAS*. In this comparative study, Funston focused on the years 1945-1969 to coincide with the emergence of broadly based political parties and ending of an era in Malaysian politics with the racial riots of May 1969. Unlike the two previous studies, the scope of this work is wider, that is from 1946-1999. I should state at the outset that this is essentially a study on different phases of UMNO's development. In this work, I do not seek to construct and test a falsifiable model so much as offer a broad analytical framework with which to interpret more than fifty-three years of UNMO's organizational history.

In order to chart UMNO's organizational development, I have scoured some primary UMNO as well as government documents. I have also relied essentially on secondary books, articles, and journalistic accounts in an attempt to reconstruct and reinterpret UMNO's political record. Throughout my research, I have been less interested to gather new information than to offer new analysis. My hope is that this study will provide an impetus for further studies especially in political science and history in the area of political parties in Malaysia.

Abbreviations

ABIM	Angkatan Belia Islam Malaysia (Malaysian Islamic Youth Movement)
APU	Angkatan Perpaduan Ummah (Muslim Unity Movement)
BMF	Bumiputera Malaysia Finance
BN	Barisan Nasiona (National Movement)
CLC	Communities Liaison Committee
DAP	Democratic Action Party
FEER	Far Eastern Economic Review
Gagasan Rakyat	People's Concept
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
Gerakan	Gerakan Rakyat Malaysia (Malaysian People's Movement)
IMP	Independence of Malaya Party
ISA	Internal Security Act
JUST	Just World Trust
KMM	Kesatuan Melayu Muda (Union Of Malay Youth)
MARA	Majlis Amanah Rakyat (People's Trust Council)
MCA	Malayan/Malaysian Chinese Association

MCP	Malayan Communist Party
MCS	Malayan Civil Service
MIC	Malayan/Malaysian Indian Congress
Menteri Besar	Chief Minister
MPAJA	Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army
NBI	National Bureau of Investigation
NEP	New Economic Policy
NOC	National Operation Council
PAP	People's Action Party
PAS	Partai Islam Se-Malaysia (see PMIP)
PBDS	Parti Bangsa Dayak Sarawak (Party of the Dayak People of Sarawak)
PBS	Parti Bersatu Sabah (United Sabah Party)
PKMM	Partai Kebangsaan Melayu Malaya (Malay Nationalist Party or MNP)
Peremba	Property development subsidiary of UDA
Pernas	Perbadanan Nasional (National Corporation)
Petronas	Petroleum Nasional Berhad (National Oil Corporation)
PMIP	Pan-Malaysian Islamic Party
PNB	Permodalan Nasional Berhad (National Equity Corporation)

PPP	People’s Progressive Party
PRM	Parti Rakyat Malaysia (Malaysian People’s Party)
PSRM	Parti Sosialis Rakyat Malaya (Malayan People’s Socialist Party)
Semangat ’46	Spirit of ‘46
UDA	Urban Development Authority
UMNO	United Malays National Organisation
UMNO Baru	New UMNO

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study is an effort to unravel the highly complex, often opaque evolutional process of United Malays National Organization (UMNO) of Peninsular Malaysia. The methodological approach is by a multi-disciplinary study. Since this is, in effect, an attempt to provide a deeper understanding of UMNO's organizational transformation over time, I will rely heavily upon a typology of organizational evolution of political parties developed by Angelo Panebianco.[1] For present purposes, a political party is characterized by the following traits: (a) to designate an associative type of social relationship, membership in which rests on formally free recruitment, (b) the end to which its activity is devoted is to secure power within a corporate group for its leaders in order to attain ideal or material advantages for its active members, (c) these advantages may consist in the realization of certain objective policies or the attainment of personal advantage or both, (d) parties may have an ephemeral character or may be organized with a view of permanent activity, (e) they may appear in all types of corporate groups and may themselves be organized in any one of a large variety of forms, (f) they may consist of the following of a charismatic leader, of traditional retainers, or of rational adherents, that is, persons adhering from motives of expediency or of attachment to absolute values, (g) they may be oriented primarily to personal interests or to objective policies, (h) in practice, they may be officially or merely in fact solely concerned with the attainment of power for their leaders and with securing positions in the administrative staff for their own members, (i) they may, on the other hand, predominantly and consciously act in the interest of a social group or a class of a certain objective policies or of abstract principles and finally, (j) the attainment of positions in the administrative staff for their members is, however, almost always secondary aim and objective programs are not infrequently merely a means of persuading outsiders to participate.[2]

The concepts developed by Angelo Panebianco essential to our analysis are, genetic model (the factors that, when combined, give an organization its mark, define its genetic characteristics), institutionalization (the way the organization solidifies) and maturity. We are therefor dealing with a three-phase more: genesis, institutionalization, and maturity. According to Panebianco, in the passage of institutionalization from the genetic phase to organizational maturity, we see the following transitions: (a) form a solidarity system to a system of interests, for example, form an organization forged to realize its participants goals to an organization bent on guaranteeing its own survival and mediating heterogeneous objectives and demands, (b) from a phase of manifest ideology to one in which organizational ideology becomes latent. A parallel modification in the incentive system accompanies this transformation—from primary collective identity to material-selective incentives in the form of regular remunerations to a bureaucratic body. This leads to a transition from a "social movement" type of participation to professional participation, (c) form a cautious and circumspect strategy of environmental adaptation to an expansive strategy of environmental domination, (d) from a phase in which the leaders have a restriction of their freedom of choice and maneuverability to a phase where leaders have maximal freedom of movement.[3]

Further clarifications on the abovementioned concepts are needed. The genetic model is used in Chapter 2 of this study because as Angelo Panebianco has successfully argued, a party's organizational characteristics depend more upon its history i.e. on how the organization originated and how it consolidated, than upon any other factor. The characteristics of a party's origin are in fact capable of exerting weight on its organizational structure even decades later. Hence, every organization bears the mark of its formation, of crucial political-administrative decisions made by its founders, the decisions

---

[1] See Angelo Panebianco translated by Marc Silver, Political Parties: Organization and Power (London: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

[2] Max Weber has conveniently listed the characteristics of political parties in Max Weber; The Theory of Social and Economic Organization translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: The Free Press) pp. 407-408.

[3] See Angelo Panebianco translated by Marc Silver, Political Parties: Organization and Power, pp. 164-165.

that "molded" the organization. Therefore, each party's genetic model is historically unique. UMNO's formation consisted in the amalgamation of many heterogeneous political groups, specifically by re-establishing the various state centered organizations that had existed prior World War II. The re-establishment of these pre-war Malay State Associations was due to the upsurge of Malays political and ethnic consciousness that accompanied the Malayan Union (Chapter 2). It was also precisely at this time that UMNO developed its collective incentives of identity (official goal/ideology) that of maintaining the identity of the organization in the eyes of its supporters. The Malays, at this juncture, had in actual fact change their allegiance from that of the *kerajaan* to that of *bangsa* and *kebangsaan Melayu*. It was bangs and kebangsaan Melayu that subsequently became the focal point of UMNO's political ideology.[4] If we are to use Anthony D. Smith's definition of nationalism as an ideological movement for the attainment and maintenance of autonomy, cohesion and individuality of a social group deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential nation,[5] then UMNO was not a true nationalist party because the *kebangsaan* that UMNO fought for cannot be interpreted as nationalism. The term *kebangsaan* is derived from the Malay word *bangsa* that can mean race, people, community or even nation depending on the context. But in 1946, UMNO's struggle was more for ethnic solidarity since the Malays felt that the British through the Malayan Union had betrayed them by giving citizenship under very liberal terms to non-Malays (see Chapter 2). Moreover, there was no discussion of forming a nation or of uniting the various Malay communities into one nation. At the same time, the Malays rejected a "Malayan" nationality or even a united Malayan nation. UMNO also differed greatly from most nationalist parties and movements in other parts of Southeast Asia because it saw no need to fight for independence. On the other hand, it demanded continued British "protection" (*naungan*) for the disparate Malay entities.[6] However, what is important for present purposes is how UMNO, at the genetic phase, developed its image as the "protector" of *bangsa Melayu* and that at its inception, UMNO was not a full-fledge political party in the true sense of the word for parties are the only organization which operate in the electoral arena. UMNO, on the other hand, was a social movement bent on preserving the status quo and advancing the Malay cause. When Britain announced her plan to introduce the Malayan Union Scheme, fear of being dominated by politically and economically by the presence of large immigrant communities was uppermost in the minds of the Malays, and by defeating the Malayan Union proposal that would have deprived the Malay community of its special status, UMNO had managed to ally these fears. Hence to the outside electorate or to that portion of the environment in which the organization stakes its claim (in this case the Malay community) UMNO has succeeded in presenting itself as the champion of the Malay community. Therefore, at its genetic phase, UMNO's image as the champion of the Malay community increased the basis of its organizational loyalty. Moreover, it was this image the produced the incentives of identity (one participates because one identifies with the organization), incentives of solidarity (one participates because one shares the political or social goals of the other participants), and ideological incentives (one participates because one identifies with the "cause" of the organization) collectively known as collective incentives. And to its credit, UMNO at the very outset was also active in drafting programs for Malay progress in education and in economics[7] thus further strengthening its image as the champion of the Malay community. Collective incentives, as such, are always associated with activities aiming at the realization of official goals—identity and solidarity diminish if confidence in the realization of these aims is shaken, for example, when the organizations' behavior clearly belies its official aims. In UMNO's case, when first party president Dato Onn Jaafar tried to open the party membership to the non-Malays he faced an open revolt. This further reiterates Panebianco's contention that at the genetic phase, the organization's official goal, that is, goals related to the formation of organizational identity prevails.

---

[4] See Ariffin Omar, Malaya/Malaysia: State, Nation, Nationality, The Emergence of Nationhood in a Vacuum, a paper presented at a confence on "Concepts of State, Identity and Nationhood in Southeast Asia," at the National University of Singapore, 8-11 December 1999, pp. 6-8.

[5] See Anthony D. Smith (ed.), Nationalist Movements (London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1976), pp. 1.

[6] See Ariffin Omar, Malaya/Malaysia: State, Nation, Nationality, The Emergence of Nationhood in a Vacuum, pp. 7-9.

[7] See Ramlah Adam, UMNO: Organisasi dan Kegiatan: 1945-1951 (Kota Bharu, Kelantan: Mohd. Nawi Book Store, 1978), pp. 68-80.

Chapters 3 and 4 of this study are essentially formulated to discuss UMNO's second phase, that is, institutionalization. Institutionalization designates the party's passage from a system of solidarity oriented to the realization of its official aims to a system of interests oriented toward its own survival. Suring the organization's formative phase, the leaders, whether charismatic or not, normally play a crucial role. They spell out the ideological aims of the future party, select the organization's social base, its "hunting ground", and shape the organization on the basis of these aims and this social base—taking into account, of course, available resources, different socio-economic and political conditions in different parts of the country. During this phase, the problem of the leadership, of the political entrepreneurs, is that of "selecting the key values and building an organization that is coherent with them".[8] This explains the crucial role of that ideology normally plays in shaping the newly formed organization, in determining its collective identity (in this case, as the champion of the Malay cause). To its supporters, the organization is still a tool to be used to realize certain ends: their identity is defined exclusively with respect to the ideological aims selected by the leaders, not yet with respect to the organization itself. As institutionalization begins, we can note a qualitative leap. In the words of Angelo Panebianco, this process implies the passage from a "consumable" organization as a pure means to certain ends to an institution. Thus, the organization slowly loses its character as a tool: it becomes valuable in and of itself, and its goals become inseparable and indistinguishable from it. In this way, its preservation and survival become a "goal" for a great number of its supporters.[9]

The organizational goals (the ideological aims) of the party's founders shape the organization's physiognomy; with institutionalization these objectives are "articulated" with respect to organizational needs. These are essentially two processes which develop simultaneously to bring about institutionalization: (a) the development of interests related to the organization's preservation (those of the leaders at the different levels of the organizational pyramid), and (b) the development of diffuse loyalties. Both processes are tied to the formation of an internal incentive system. In order to survive, an organization must, from the very start distribute selective incentives to some of its members (prestigious positions, "internal" career possibilities) and this leads to the development of organizational interests. The development of diffuse organizational loyalties, on the other hand, depends on the distribution of collective incentives (or identity) to the organization's members (its activists) as well as to a part of its external supporters, i.e. the "electorate of belonging", it is related to the formation of a "collective identity" that is guided and shaped by the party's founders. The consolidation of an incentive system—comprising both selective and collective incentives—is thus very much tied to institutionalization. If such a system does not consolidate, institutionalization does not take place, and the organization cannot guarantee its own survival. The organizational loyalties which make the party a community of fate (for its activists and many of its supporters) and the organizational interests which help the organization become more autonomous vis-à-vis its external environment—these loyalties and interests provide the basis for permanent activity geared towards organizational self-preservation.[10]

UMNO's evolution towards institutionalization closely resembles the abovementioned typology of organizational process. As such, it denotes UMNO's evolution form an organization of the social movement type to a political party *par excellence* and it is based on the sociological distinction between "systems of solidarity" and "systems of interests".[11] A system of solidarity is based on the concept of a "community" of equals in which the participants' ends coincide. A system of interest, on the other hand, is a "society" in which the participants' ends diverge. While the system of solidarity is a system of action based on the solidarity between the actors, a system of interests is a system of action based on the interests of the actor. In the former, cooperation in the realization of a common end prevails. In the latter, competition between diverging interests prevails. When a political party is founded,

---

[8] See Angelo Penebianco, translated by Marc Silver, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 52.

[9] Ibid. p. 53.

[10] Ibid. p. 54

[11] See C. B. Macpherson, "Social Conflict, Political Parties and Democracy," in Political Parties and Political Behavior edited by William J. Crotty, Donald M. Freeman and Douglas S. Gatlin (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), pp. 22-27.

it is an association amongst equals created to realize a common ends, and can thus be considered as a system of solidarity. In time, however, the party tends to evolve from a system of solidarity into a system of interests. Through its bureaucratization and progressive involvement in daily routine, the organization diversifies from within, and creates—on the ashes of the initial equality—new inequalities. Participation tends to decline, and we see here a passage from a social movement type of participation to a professional type of participation. What do these two parallel theories indicate? That parties, in the course of their organizational development tend to go from an initial period in which certain needs prevail to a subsequent period in which different needs prevail. As such, in well-established organizations, a process of "substitution of ends"[12] comes about (the official ends are abandoned and organization's survival becomes the real end). The fundamental internal and external roles that the official aims continue to play—even in well-established organizations—allow us to redefine the above thesis in the following terms: whereas the official aims of the party may give way to other official aims (a process usually defined as succession of ends)[13] as a result of consistent organizational transformations, no party can effect a genuine substitution of ends without such transformation. In well-established organizations, a different process takes place, a process that Robert Michels calls articulation of ends.[14] The organization's official aims are never abandoned, nor do they become a mere façade. They are adapted to organizational needs—the rule seems to be that goals are somehow maintained but lose a little something in being translated into organizational requirements.[15] The organization continually engages in certain activities related to those aims, for it is precisely upon these activities that the party's collective identity and the leadership's legitimacy are based. In the course of their articulation, official aims become, with respect to the genetic phase of the party, vaguer. The organizational ideology (official aims), which was manifest (involving explicit and coherent objectives) often, if not always, becomes latent (involving implicit and contradictory objectives). More importantly, a permanent gap opens between official aims and organizational behavior. The relation between aims and behavior never completely disappears—it attenuates. The correspondence of a party's behavior to its official aims is constantly reaffirmed by its leaders, but only those courses of action amongst many possible that the party may choose to achieve its official aims—which are compatible with the organization's stability will be selected. For instance, the recurrent pattern we find in UMNO's second phase (institutionalization) of organizational development could be formulated in the following terms. UMNO's second phase was characterized by an evolution from an organization that was based on a "system of solidarity" to one of a "system of interests". When UMNO's first president Dato Onn b. Jaafar decided to call it quits and formed a "non-communal" party—the Independence of Malaya Party (IMP)—UMNO's organizational stability was at stake. In the Kuala Lumpur Municipal elections of February 1952, UMNO had to face the IMP and due to the serious threat posed by the IMP and to check a non-communal approach to politics, UMNO formed an *ad-hoc* alliance with the Malayan (later Malaysian) Chinese Association (MCA), an organization founded in 1949 by some of the most vociferous spokesman of the community on citizenship. Obtaining *jus soli* was a major goal of the MCA and UMNO was established in 1946 to oppose the granting of citizenship to non-Malays on very liberal terms (Chapter 3). When UMNO decided to compete in the electoral arena, the party had in effect become an end in itself and this mark a passage from an organization of the social movement type to a political party. Thus the political survival of the party had in actual fact became a paramount concern for its leaders.

The UMNO-MCA *ad hoc* alliance was proven a success. Therefore, in August 1953, the two parties reached definite agreements on setting up a National Alliance Organization and in 1954, and Indian component was added to the Alliance when the Malayan (later Malaysian) Indian Congress joined the coalition. One could surely see that in the interest of political expediency, UMNO had to make certain adjustments to its official goal of advancing the Malay cause. Forging an alliance with other ethnic-

---

[12] See Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy, translated by Eden and Ceder Paul (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1978), p. 221.

[13] Angelo Panebianco, translated by Marc Silver, Political Parties: Organization and Power, pp. 14-17.

[14] See Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy, p. 125.

[15] Ibid.

base political parties was the first of many compromises that UMNO had to make. The political landscape of the country was as such that UMNO had to acknowledge the presence of a large immigrant communities and make the necessary adjustments to its official goal. Tunku Abdul Rahman, UMNO's second president, never attempted to justify this sudden preparedness to work with non-Malays in terms of a conversion to non-communalism, or even tans-communalism. Dr. Ismail b. Dato Abdul Rahman, then a senior UMNO official, admitted establishing the Alliance was inconsistent with the Tunku's earlier attitude towards communal issue (Chapter 3). This further reiterates Panebianco's thesis that organizational development tend to go from an initial period in which certain needs prevail to a subsequent period in which different needs prevail. Thus in the second phase of UMNO's organizational development, we also witnessed a process of "substitution of ends" because UMNO had to mediate heterogeneous demands coming from the environment. After defeating the Malayan Union, UMNO's *raison de etre* seemed ceased to exist and the party therefore had to promulgate different forms of *modus operandi* to ensure its relevancy and to generate interest in organizational participation. This entails UMNO diversifying its aims and in 1951, the party changed its slogan from *Hidup Melayu* (Long Live the Malays) to *Merdeka* (Independence). The British through its Colonial Office Secretary, Mr. Lyttleton, however, warned that Malaya would be granted independence only after various races in the country could live and work together. Nevertheless, to some of its supporters, UMNO was still seen as a means to an end (Chapter 3). Panebianco has noted that in the course of its evolution a party goes through a passage from a "consumable" organization as a pure means to certain ends to an institution. Thus the organization slowly loses its character as a tool: it becomes valuable in and of itself, and its goals becomes inseparable and indistinguishable from it. This also marks the change from a phase of manifest ideology to one in which organizational ideology becomes latent. It is apparent that a sudden desire for independence must be accompanied by compromises between UMNO and its partners. What this basically translates into was the creation of "Malayan" identity that was anathema to UMNO's original position on citizenship (see Chapter 3). At this stage, we see UMNO moving towards a system of interest in which the participants' ends diverge. In this context, we would now explain that even though some sections of the party were opposed to the creation of a "Malayan" identity, yet the leadership had to choose the course of action that would ensure maximal organizational stability. Though UMNO had to concede on matters pertaining to citizenship, the party nevertheless stood firm on matters relating to Islam, language and special position of the Malays. Here we see the remnants of organizational characteristics developed during the genetic phase continue to play a role in UMNO's official goal. This is due to the fact that the party's legitimacy and collective identity depend upon UMNO's ability to demonstrate to the Malays that the party was continuously working towards that goal. Nevertheless, the official goal was somewhat vaguer in the second phase of organizational development compared to that of the genetic phase.

Another factor that is essential in our understanding of UMNO's institutionalization is the relationship between the organization and the environment. This stage is dealt with in detail in Chapter 4. Throughout the analysis, we have referred to two different aspects of the organization-environment relation: the effects of pressures and environmental changes on the organization; and the importance of its hunting ground, i.e. the part of the environment targeted by the organization's ideology, which the organization must control if it is to maintain its identity. The degree of adaptation to the environment depends on two factors: (a) environmental characteristics; certain environments demand adaptation, while others allow for manipulation, (b) the level of institutionalization; the greater the institutionalization, the less the party tends to passively adapt itself to the environment, and the more it is able to dominate it and vice versa—the weaker the institutionalization, the greater its passive adaptation tends to be. It follows that organization-environment relations must be considered relations of interdependency.[16] It could arguably be said that in the post-colonial period, UMNO was operating in a hostile environment. Since UMNO was functioning in a plural society, it was operating in a complex environment that is usually unstable. Therefore, complexity, instability and hostility are interrelated. Beyond a certain threshold, a very complex and unstable environment becomes or is perceived by the organization's members as being hostile as it threatens not only the organization's order but also its survival. In addition, two other important factors necessary for our understanding of organization-

[16]Angelo Panebianco, translated by Marc Silver, Political Parties: Organization and Power, pp. 204-205.

environment relations are: (a) organizations not only adapt to but also have their autonomous effect on the environmental changes and pressures, to some extent; (b) a crucial aspect of party environment relations concerns the conquest/defense of the "domain" from which the party gets its identity.[17] In other words, with respect the environment, the party has two options, (a) that the organization tends to "adapt" itself more or less passively to its environment, or (b) that the organization tends to dominate its environment, to adapt and transform it in accordance with its own needs. Hence, the hostile post-colonial environment in which UMNO function presented the party with a dilemma. Being an organization set on assuring its own survival, UMNO had to balance the demands of its numerous actors and thereby guaranteeing the interests of organizational continuity. Thus the party must either reach a "compromise" with its external environment or must adopt a strategy of domination. Since the party is also an instrument for the realization of its official aims—upon which the loyalties nourished by collective incentives depend—the party cannot passively adapt to its environment, but must inevitably develop domination activities. The party moreover, pushed in this direction by its organization ideology, which defines its specific "hunting domain", i.e. the portion of the environment in which the organization stakes its claims, and with respect to which organizational identity is defined both "internally" (in its members' eyes) and "externally" (in the eyes of its electorate). In the interest of self-preservation and loyalties tied to organizational official goal (collective incentives) the organization is often push to dominate the environment.[18] In this instance, UMNO was push to adopt a strategy of domination vis-à-vis the environment due to increasing ethnic polarization in the 1960s that culminated in the May 13th race riots (Chapter 4). There were various challenges coming from the environment such as increasing demands by the non-Malays for greater political equality, first from the Singapore-based People's Action Party (PAP), then by Democratic Action Party (DAP). The DAP in particular called for the implementation of the principle of racial equality at all levels of national life and all fields of national endeavor—political, social, economic, cultural and educational. It laid great emphasis on demolishing the idea of racial hegemony by one community for it was not only desirable but also impractical because of the composition of the population in the country. It maintained that each community in Malaysia, by itself, is outnumbered by the others so as to make the idea of racial hegemony completely impractical. It then took exception to the classification of citizens into *bumiputeras* and *non-bumiputeras* and rejected the system of discrimination against citizens in matters of appointments and promotions, particularly in the public sector on grounds of race.[19] This was in essence a clear attack on the Malay special position guaranteed by the Constitution of Malaysia hitherto never been challenged by any political party, except the Perak-based People's Progressive Party (PPP). Even the PAP, when it had introduced the slogan "Malaysian Malaysia", did not attack the special position of the Malays as contained in the Constitution of Malaysia, but had publicly committed itself to uphold these privileges.[20] On the other hand, as Malay frustration increased over insignificant changes in ethnic patterns, the UMNO leadership came under severe criticism from within its own ranks for the government's non-interventionist policy. Many of these criticisms were voiced during two *Bumiputera* Economic Congresses held in 1965 and 1968 that was organized by Malay politicians and civil servants. In addition, UMNO was also concerned about Pan-Malayan Islamic Party (PMIP) gaining political mileage at its expense especially since the formation of Malaysia in September 1963 particularly since the worsening of relations between Kuala Lumpur and Singapore and the exit of Singapore from the Federation of Malaysia in mid-1965 (Chapter 4). This period had seen a significant revitalization of the PMIP and a substantial increase in its appeal among the Malay masses. After the 1964 general elections, there had been considerable intensifications of communal antipathies. The Singapore and Bukit Mertajam (Penang) communal riots, the exit of Singapore from Malaysia, the domination of the Labor Party and the Socialist Front by the Chinese educated chauvinists, and the national language controversy in the early 1967, all had greatly contributed to this. As a result of these developments, the Malays had come to feel strongly that UMNO and through the Alliance government concept of inter-

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid., see in particular Chapter 11 pp. 208-217

[19] Democratic Action Party, DAP General Elections Manifesto, Our Triple Objective Towards a Malaysian Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Democratic Action Party, 1069), p. 17

[20] See R. K. Vasil, The Malaysian General Election of 1969 (Singapore and Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 16.

communal cooperation, had failed to protect them against the non-Malays. They had become disillusioned with the Alliance policies and had started looking for alternatives to protect their community and its interests. This is where the attraction of the PMIP came in. even though the PMIP had failed badly in achieving rapid economic development in Kelantan, where it retained the control of the state government in the 1964 general elections, the party continued the support of the Malays. It was less the lack of rapid economic growth that stirs the Malay community than the basic fear of the non-Malays and their growing role in the administration, politics, government and economy, and the anxiety that unless it is stopped it would inevitably lead to their being reduced to the status of Red Indians striving to live in the wastelands of America.[21] This is where the PMIP assumed a far greater attraction than UMNO for it was felt that only PMIP went to the root cause of Malay predicament, that is, the presence of large numbers of non-Malays in the country and the great freedom they enjoyed in the political and economic spheres. This new mood of the Malay masses was seen as a great threat to UMNO and in turn to the Alliance, to UMNO's organizational identity both internally and externally. UMNO, therefore, could afford to suffer serious electoral reverses at the hands of the PMIP. It is against this backdrop that UMNO's post-1969 strategy of domination should be analyzed. Following the shock of 1969 and in order to reduce uncertainties coming from the environment, UMNO introduced new economic, cultural and political arrangements that emphasized its Malay nature even more strongly, most notably through the New Economic Policy which provided a huge increase in business, educational and employment opportunities for Malays. These contributed to making the Malaysian political system more Malay-oriented. Thus the *quid pro quo* arrangement: the non-Malays would not make too many encroachments on the preserve of the Malays and the Malays in return would not make serious incursions into the spheres of activity of the non-Malays established during 1956 and 1957, just before independence was terminated. After 1969, UMNO's institutionalization process gave rise to a strong institution and was able to exert a great deal of control over its environment. Being a governmental party that directly controls its own exchange process with environment, UMNO was able to a form of "latent imperialism" which reduces the organization's areas of environmental uncertainty. The more control a party exercises over its environment, the more it can autonomously generate resources for its own functioning. This corresponds to the "ideal type" of the mass party described by Panebianco that has considering its autonomy vis-à-vis the environment institutionalized as much as possible. Such a party directly controls its financial resources, dominates its collateral associations—extending through them, its hegemony over the *classe gardee*—possess a developed central administrative apparatus (i.e. is strongly bureaucratized), and chooses its leaders from within, its public assembly representatives are controlled by the party's leaders—the party's organization remain autonomous regardless of the degree of institutionalization of parliamentary assembly.[22]

The final phase, that is, maturity is dealt with in Chapter 5. As we shall see in Chapter 5, the post-1969 period saw UMNO playing a bigger role and thus was able to exert much weight and dictate the policies of the government. This was made apparent with Tun Razak's pronouncement that "the government is a government which is shouldered by UMNO, and to UMNO I hand the responsibility of determining the pattern of government that will emerge".[23] UMNO's hegemony in the Barisan Nasional gave the party leverage to pursue affirmative action policies strongly in favor of *Bumiputeras*. Since the race riots (Chapter 4) were mainly ascribed to the inequitable distribution of wealth between Malays and the Chinese, the NEP was introduced in 1970. The NEP entailed partial abandonment of the previously more *laissez-faire* style of economic management in favor of greater state intervention, primarily for ethnic affirmative action, including the accelerated expansion of the *Bumiputera* middle class, capital accumulation on behalf of the *Bumiputeras* and the creation of Malay capitalists.[24] In the

[21] Letter to the Editor by "Kampong Malay", The Straits Times, July 7, 1951. For an excellent analysis of election issues and campaign in 1969 see R. K. Vasil, The Malaysian General Election of 1969, ibid.

[22] Angelo Panebianco, translated by Marc Silver, Political Parties: Organization and Power, pp. 53-55.

[23] Tun Razak as quoted in James Morgan, "The Challenge Ahead" in Far Eastern Economic Review, September 26, 1970, p. 29.

[24] For an academic analysis of the NEP see Donald K. Snodgrass, Inequality and Economic Development in Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1980); Jomo K. S., A Question of Class: Capital, the State, and Uneven Development in

1970s, the Malaysian business sector witnessed the emergence of several government-sponsored and assited "corporate *bumiputera*"—*Bank Bumiputera*, the Urban Development Authority (UDA), *Perbadanan Nasional* (Pernas), *Bank Pembangunan*, and State Economic Development Corporations to name just a few—to assist in the achievement of creating Malay capitalists. Through its domination of governmental machinery, UMNO's appeal in fact lay in its patronage-dispensing function. In this context, we can put into perspective the theory of voluntary associations—organizations whose survival depends neither upon paid nor coercively based participation—participation is attributed to the "offering", be it manifest or hidden, of incentives (benefits or promises of future benefits) by the organization's leaders.[25] There are two versions of the incentive theory: in the first, the incentives that the organization must distribute in order to assure necessary participation are above all collective incentives, that is, benefits or promises of benefits that the organization must distribute equally to participants; in the second, the organizational incentives are selective incentives—benefits that the organization distributes only to some of the participants and varying amounts. According to Panebianco, only the second kind of incentive can account for organizational participation. The theory of selective incentives aptly explains the behavior of party elites which compete for organizational control, and more generally for power, as well as of party clients who exchange votes for material benefits and of some members who seek career benefits.[26] This is more pertinent to UMNO because in Malaysia, politics and business have traditionally been closely linked and UMNO's empire is among the biggest conglomerates in Malaysia. In 1987 for instance, the party corporate holdings includes control of a bank, finance company, merchant bank, hotel chain, newspaper group, TV station, property and venture in tin mining, manufacturing and trading. By conservative reckoning, UMNO assets in 1987 were close to a billion ringgit.[27] This battle for selective incentives will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

Organizational Structure and Centralization

An attempt will also be made to assess the relevance of certain theories concerning the nature of political parties of which perhaps the most provocative and interesting is that elaborated by Robert Michels in his *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy.*[28] In this study, Michels devoted his attention mainly to those political organizations (particularly social democratic parties and trade unions) which had set out seriously to challenge the establish order of society and which, initially at least, had made a sincere attempt to ensure that their own internal organization was fully democratic.

After all intensive analysis in which he drew primarily on the experience of German Social Democratic Party and German trade unions, Michels concluded that these organizations fall victim to what might be termed the "iron law of oligarchy". Michels nowhere defines his law very precisely, but he appears to mean by it that individuals who hold positions of authority within an organization are not and in the nature of things cannot be controlled by those who hold subsidiary positions within the organization.[29] Michels, however, did not mean to imply that the leaders of an organization could completely ignore the wishes of their followers. Leaders are restricted in the sense that sculptors are restricted by the nature of the material with which they work; but the material which for the political leader is the mass membership of this organization can have no more than a somewhat remote and negative influence on the activities of the leaders. Michels identifies two main groups of causes of this

---

Malaysia (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1988); Jomo K. S., Growth and Structural Change in the Malaysian Economy (London: MacMillan, 1990).

[25] Angelo Panebianco, translated by Marc Silver, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 25-30.

[26] Ibid.

[27] See "The Billion-Dollar Party," Asiaweek, May 3, 1987, p. 16.

[28] This study was originally published in Germany in 1911. The first English translation was published in 1915; the latest edition by Collier Books (New York, 1962) has a valuable introduction by Seymour Martin Lipset.

[29] For a useful analysis of Michels' ideas, see C. W. Cassinelli, "The Law of Oligarchy," in The American Political Science Review, Vol. XLVII, September 1953, pp. 773-84.

state of affairs; he suggests that there are both "technical" and "psychological" reasons for the strong oligarchical tendencies in all organizations. The "technical" causes relate to what might be termed the inevitable division of labor within any large-scale organization. Certain individuals must be accorded the right to act in the name of mass membership; they come to devote most if not all of their time to the affairs of the organization and become, in this sense, professional leaders. The mass membership is capable of no more than "yes" or "no" responses to initiatives which come from their leaders. Michels concluded that the "psychological"causes related to the widespread sense of need among members of a large organization for direction and guidance and to the sense of gratitude with which they respond to those who guide and direct them. Over a period of time, leaders win recognition for what they readily assume is their indispensability and they tend inevitably to devote themselves to consolidating their own positions of power; they come to regard both the organization itself and their own role in it as more important than the professed goal of the organization.[30]

These views would appear to be of particular relevance to our analysis of UMNO. The most striking feature of UMNO's organizational structure is the enormous power which appears to be concentrated in the party's Central Executive Committee (later renamed Supreme Council; particularly in the hands of the party president). In this study, however, we seek to chart in stages, how this consolidation of powers came about. In Chapter 2, for instance, we look at UMNO's formation process that consists in the amalgamation of many heterogeneous state associations. As Panebianco has observed, a party's organizational development—the organization's construction, strictly speaking—is due to territorial penetration, to territorial diffusion, or to a combination of these two. Territorial penetration occurs when the "center" controls, stimulates, or directs the development of the "periphery", for example, the constitution of local and intermediate party associations. Territorial diffusion occurs when development results from spontaneous germination: local elites construct party associations which are only later integrated into a national organization.[31] This corresponds to Maurice Duverger distinction of "direct" and "indirect" structure. This distinction for political parties coincides with the unitary and the confederate sate at the national level. In the unitary state, there is a direct link between the citizen and the national community; in the same way, in the "direct" party, the members themselves form the party community without the help of other social grouping. On the other hand, in a Confederation, the citizens are joined to the nation through intermediary of the member states; similarly the "indirect" party is made up of the union of the component social groups (professional or otherwise).[32] In this instance, UMNO at its inception was a mere umbrella for the various Malay state-centered associations because at that point in time the Malays were far from united as revealed by the various state organizations that arose to oppose Malayan Union. UMNO, as such, evolves through a "mixed" type of organizational development: initially took place through diffusion—a number of local associations autonomously sprung up in various parts of the country later they unite to form a national organization. The national organization then went on to develop local associations where there were still absent (penetration). A significant step in the process of "nationalization" of UMNO was the development of the national committee from an *ad hoc* group to a continuously operating party headquarters. At its inception, national party committees were committees of correspondence composed of representatives from the Malay states and charged with keeping various elements of the party in touch, and the party alive. In time, however, nationalization and integration emerged as a dominant characteristic of UMNO's evolutional process rather than the hitherto prevalent model of decentralized and diffuse party structures (Chapter 2). Nationalization entails, (a) increasing uniformity of norms for state party participation in national party processes, (b) decreasing range of differences in structure and processes of the state parties, and (c) greater interdependence between the state and national party organizations.[33] Through the process of nationalization, the "branch" designates UMNO's most basic unit. A

---

[30] See C. W. Cassinelli, "The Law of Oligarchy," in The American Political Science Review , Vol. XLVII, September 1953, pp. 779-783.

[31] See Angelo Panebianco, translated by Marc Silver, Political Parties: Organization and Power, pp. 50-51.

[32] See Maurice Duverger, Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State, translated by Barbara and Robert North (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1954), pp. 6-7.

[33] See Charles Sellers, "The Equilibrium Cycle in Two-Party Politics," in Political Parties and Political Behavior, edited by William J. Crotty, Donald M. Freeman and Douglas S. Gatlin (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), pp. 61-70.

branch, therefore, is only a part of the whole, and its separate existence is inconceivable. According to Duverger, parties founded on branches are more centralized because the profound originality of the branch lies in its organization and not in its connection with the other branches.[34] As such, the hierarchy of the branch is similar to that of the central organization and the divisions of duties are very precise.

In the passage to institutionalization, organizational size, environment, and technology are among the factors influencing organizational dynamics. According to the so-called contingency theory, organizational functioning is essentially a product of one or more of the three variables just mentioned; variations in organizational physiognomy thus depend on contingent variations arising in relations with the environment, in the state of technology, or in the size of the organization.[35] According to Michels, the party's magnitude is the primary independent variable explaining the formation of an oligarchy. Being the biggest political party in Malaysia, UMNO would inevitably succumb to Michels' contention. In Michels' perspective, organizational size both directly and indirectly affects power relations within the party. Directly because the organization's growth influences its leaders' degree of maneuverability. In theory, the leader is merely an employee bound by the instruction he receives. He has to carry out the orders of the man, of which he is no more than the executive organ. But in actual fact, as the organization increases in size, this control becomes purely fictitious. The members have to give up the idea of themselves conducting or even supervising the whole administration and are compelled to hand these tasks over to trustworthy persons specially nominated for the purpose, to salaried officials.[36] Above a certain numerical threshold, any assembly inevitably succumbs to control by the few and this explains the necessity of the delegate system. In addition, Michels pointed out that an increase in organizational complexity also leads to centralization of the decision making process.[37]

In UMNO's evolutional process, we shall witness the tendency towards centralization. According to Duverger, centralization defines the way in which power is distributed amongst the different levels of leadership. In this instance, it entails the subordination of local UMNO branches and divisions to the wishes of the Central Executive Committee. The critical dimension that distinguishes centralization in UMNO is the development of the national party headquarters as a body that have sufficient autonomy to enable the Central Executive Committee to define and pursue their own programs. The dispensing of federal patronage enables the Central Executive Committee to exert greater discipline over the respective state and local organizations because the method of financing is also important. In middle-class parties, where election expenses are the most part defrayed by the candidates or their local backers, the caucuses at the base are richer than the center and therefore independent. On the other hand, if the financial backers have acquired the habit of directly subsidizing the center, it can exercise greater pressure upon the local groups.[38]

Keeping the preceding remarks in mind, we must nonetheless take account of the established fact (established by a lot of empirical research on parties) that the principal power resources tend to be concentrated in the hands of small groups. Michels' oligarchy, Duverger's "inner circle", Ostrogorski and Weber's "ceasaristic-plebiscitarian dictatorship" and Panebianco's "dominant coalition" are just a few examples that bring this phenomenon to mind. This phenomenon, according to Panebianco, could be attributed to the fact that power resources tend to accumulate. For example, financing may in certain cases take place through channels which are controlled by the ruling elite, and formal rules could thus be modified at the whim of the elite (even though in most cases they depend on the party's organizational tradition and history—see Chapter 5 of this study for instances where UMNO formal rules were change so as to benefit the incumbents). Thus, UMNO's Central Executive Committee would tanta-

---

[34] Maurice Duverger, Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State, pp. 20-23.

[35] Angelo Panebianco, translated by Marc Silver, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 183.

[36] See Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy, translated by Eden & Cedar Paul (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1978), p. 71.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Maurice Duverger, Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State, p. 59.

mount to Duverger's "inner circle" into which it is difficult to penetrate. From this point of view, however, the formation of "inner circle" can be divided into several kinds. In UMNO, the formation of the ruling class took the form of what Duverger calls a "camarilla" that is, a small group which makes use of close personal solidarity as a means of establishing and retaining its influence (Chapter 5; Razak's "gang of four"). It takes the form of a clique grouped around and influential leader (in this case, party president). The president's retinue has a monopoly of the positions of leadership and takes on the characteristics of an oligarchy. In UMNO, the president is empowered to appoint the secretary-general, the treasurer, the information head, head and deputy head of state liaison committees and not more than ten members of the party's central executive committee. Hence, as UMNO grows older, power tends to become more and more concentrated which perhaps reached its apex in 1987. In the party, there has been a tendency to make changes for expeditiousness and convenience, even if they have restricted discussion and consultation. As a result, the party president has benefited from this concentration of power and by virtue of his office he could influence voting behavior for top party posts, accelerate or decelerate the rise of aspiring UMNO leaders thought his control of various re-sources.

CHAPTER 2

UMNO: Genetic Phase and Nationalization

UMNO as a political party has undergone many phases which denote an evolution from a communal movement to a political party, did UMNO follow the traditional path taken by political parties in Europe or was UMNO different? To gain some insight into the evolution of UMNO we would like to refer to Max Weber who states in his famous essay ("Politics as a Vocation") the three stages which in his opinion have marked the development of political parties. At first parties were "pure followings of the aristocracy", changing their allegiance as the "great noble families" which led them changed theirs. The second stage was the "parties of notables". These arouse with "the rising power of the bourgeoisie" and consisted of informal local associations of the propertied and cultured circles, held together in the nation as a whole not by a formal party machine but by members of the party with seats in the legislature. The framing of election programs, the choice of leaders and candidates, and the general control of the party rested with these circles of notables, above all the parliamentary party.

With this structure, Weber sharply contrasted the modern forms of party organization—"the children of democracy, of mass franchise, of the necessity to woo and organize the masses, and develop the utmost unity and direction and the strictest discipline". In these forms there is a large, formally organized machine whose power rests not with the parliamentary party as such or with the formal party conventions and assemblies but with the party bureaucrats, organizers, and especially the party leader who has shown the capacity to win the support of the mass electorate. The party organization outside the legislature disciplines the party members in the legislature; in turn the leader, because of his demagogic ability, tends to dominate machine while using it to rally the masses behind him. This is the stage, in Weber's terms, of "plebiscitarian democracy".[39]

In order to understand the stages of UMNO's organizational development and the subsequent shift in the balance of power in favor of the central leadership, I will use two essential concepts in this analysis—genetic model (the factors that, when combined, give an organization its marks, defines its genetic characteristics[40]) and nationalization.[41] According to Panebianco, a party (like any organization) is a structure in motion which evolves over time, reacting to external changes and to the changing "environments" in which it functions. He suggests that the important factor explaining its physiognomy and functioning are its organizational history (its past) and its relations with changing external environments. In this chapter, I will attempt to explain UMNO's genetic model and its nationalization—how the party originated and how it consolidated.

UMNO and the Malayan Union

According to Panebianco, a party's organizational characteristics depend more upon its history. In other words, all political parties are to some extent conditioned by the circumstances giving rise to their birth, and by experiences during their initial formative years.[42] The formation of UMNO must be traced back to the reawakening of the politically conservative pre-war Malay associations whose efforts to form a national organizational had been interrupted by the Second World War.[43] A. J. Stockwell has pointed out that there were three main elitist groups that emerged within the Malay society in the years before World War II. The first was composed of the religious reformists who sprang mainly

---

[39] See Max Weber, "Politics as a Vocation" in The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: The Free Press, 1947), pp. 350-375.

[40] On the concept of "genetic model", see Cf. D. Silverman, Sociology of Organizations (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1970).

[41] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power (London: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 49-59.

[42] Ibid.

[43] See John Funston, Malay Politics in Malaysia: A Study of UMNO and PAS (Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann Educational Books, 1980), p. 75.

from the urban Muslim bourgeoisie of the Straits Settlements and were of Arab and South Indian stock rather than pure Malay. This movement, however, failed to arouse the mass of Malays since it was centered on the towns and had little appeal in the rural areas. The second group was that of the radical Malay intelligentsia. They were of rural origins and most of them were educated in vernacular schools and at the Sultan Idris Training College for Malay school teachers. Their aim was to use Islam as a vehicle for Pan-Malayan nationalism. During the 1930s this group became increasingly political as it attacked colonialism, the forces of capitalism and traditional Malay society. In 1938, the *Kesatuan Melayu Muda* (KMM; union of young Malays) was founded which aimed at unity with Indonesia. Nevertheless, like the religious reformists, these Malay radicals failed to gain a mass following from within the Malay community. Finally, the third group was composed of the English-schooled sons of the Malay ruling house, who enjoyed the advantages of traditional status and modern education. According to Stockwell, this group was represented in the state governments, in the Malay Administrative Service (MAS) and, to a lesser, in the more rarified Malayan Civil Service (MCS). The aim of this group was to preserve Malay society against the encroachments of the non-Malay world, and in this, despite particular grievances, it favored co-operation with the British government. Members of this group had established Malay associations on a state basis. Despite holding several pan-Malayan conferences—for example, that of August 1939 and in December 1940, this group also failed to assemble a mass following or to establish a significant peninsular-wide organization.[44]

Immediately after World War II, Britain announced a new policy for Malaya. In essence, the thrust of the British pre-war policy—the sovereignty of the Malay rulers, the autonomy of the Malay states and the privileged position of the Malay community were to be demolished. According to Ariffin Omar, in the aftermath of the Japanese occupation, the Malays who were divided politically among the nine Malay Sultanates were leaderless, demoralized, and politically unprepared for the kind of changes that the British had drawn up for the Malay Peninsula.[45] This was due to the fact that some Malays had assumed that with the Japanese surrender, the pre-war social-arrangement would prevail. Fear of Chinese domination was also uppermost in the minds of Malays connected with the ruler's courts and it was reported that immediately after the Japanese surrender "in all villages throughout the Malay states, the Chinese Resistance Forces are in command".[46] The Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army (MPAJA)—a mainly Chinese resistance force that was set up as an Independent Anti-Japanese Regiments—received military training, and were ideologically indoctrinated. Immediately after the war, the MPAJA expanded their operations against the Malay community, paraded their military power, abused Malay cultural heritage, and mocked the Muslim faith. It was clear that the MPAJA was not content to assume a commanding role among the Chinese in Malaya. It also had bolder objectives. It was evidently determined to lay foundations of its own Malayan Republic before the arrival of the British. Malay sovereignty and Malay leadership, no less than Chinese businessmen and merchants, were it targets. This in turn had provoked a violent Malay reaction. As the historian Cheah Boon Kheng pointed out, the violent Malay reaction to the Chinese was due, among other factors, to the fear that their identity, culture, and political institutions would be supplanted by Chinese culture and political dominance. Particularly alarming was the rapturous welcome the local Chinese gave the MPAJA units in their triumphal entry into the main towns and villages.[47]

---

[44] This discussion is based on the introduction of A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948 (Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Monograph No: 8, 1979). For a discussion on Malay Natiionalism, see W. R. Roff, The Origins of Malay Nationalism (Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1967), Ariffin Omar, *Bangsa Melayu*: Malay Concepts of Democracy and Community, 1945-1950 (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[45] Ariffin Omar, *Bangsa Melayu*: Malay Concepts of Democracy and Community, 1945-1950 (Kuala Lumpr: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 34.

[46] B.MA./TS Com No. 58/9, "Report on the Military Government, 12-30 September 1945" by the Deputy Chief Civil Affairs Officer of Malaya.

[47] For a complete account of MPAJA and its activities during and after Japanese occupation, see Cheah Boon Kheng, Red Star over Malaya: Resistance and Social Conflict during and after Japanese Occupation, 1941-1946 (Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1983).

The Malays (particularly the English-educated Malay aristocrats, as well as those Chinese and Indians who were fearful of the MPAJA) who recently experienced with MPAJA terror came all too vividly to mind and fearing that Malay culture would be driven out by Chinese had welcomed the arrival of the British and their determination to re-establish law and order.[48] What the British planned to do, however, was to implement a Malayan Union in the Malay states.[49] A preview of the new arrangement was given in the British Parliament on October 10, 1945. In answer to a question the Secretary of State for the Colonies revealed plans for the establishment of a Malayan Union composed of the nine states on the Peninsula and two Straits Settlements, Malacca and Penang. All persons regardless of their racial background born in Malaya or meeting born in Malaya or meeting a residence requirement would become eligible for a common citizenship in the new state. Then, to explain the plan, a special emissary, Sir Harold MacMichael, was dispatched to the Malay states. In just three months, MacMichael reported that he had "successfully concluded with each Malay Rulers, after consultations conducted with friendliness and good will, an agreement with supplementing the existing treaties, grants full jurisdiction in each State to His Majesty, the King of England".[50] A White Paper issued on January 22, 1946, announced the terms under which civilian administration was to be restored.

First, it proposed to put an end to the formal sovereignty of the Malay rulers. They were to be subordinated to a central government headed by a Governor assisted by Executive and Legislative Councils designed to be broad based and representative. State and local government would operate through powers delegated by the central government to administrative officers and local councils. The Sultan would have to be content with legislative powers on matters involving Muslim religious questions and with presiding over Malay Advisory Council, the members of which they themselves could select (with the governor's approval).

Second, the White Paper revealed British intentions to redefine the political community. No longer could its boundaries be considered congruent with the Malay community. "All those who have made the country their homeland," the document declared, "should have an opportunity of a due share in the country's political and cultural institutions". Regardless of communal affiliation, all those born within the territory of the Malayan Union and Singapore, as well as those who had resided three for ten out of the preceding fifteen years and were prepared to affirm their allegiance would become citizens of it.[51] For the British government to achieve these aims, it was necessary to reorganize citizenship qualifications whereby 83 per cent of the Indians would qualify for the citizenship under very liberal laws.[52] Specifically, all had a right to serve in the government (the British intended to open up the Civil Service—hitherto a British and Malay preserve—to all communities), and as institutions became more and more representative, all had an equal right to elect the government. As such, the immediate aim of the Malayan Union Scheme was to integrate the large Chinese community and smaller Indian one into a Malayan polity. In addition, the British also wished to do away with the cumbersome pre-war administrative structure which comprised ten government units consisting of the Federated Malay States (FMS) of Perak, Selangor, Negeri Sembilan, and Pahang; the Unfederated Malay States (UMS) of Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, and Terengganu; and the Straits Settlements comprising Penang, Singapore and Malacca. The British wanted to integrate them into a single, centrally controlled state with Singapore as a separate entity.

---

[48] Cheah Boon Kheng, Red Star over Malaya: Resistance and Social Conflict during and after Japanese Occupation, 1941-1946, pp. 170-94.

[49] For further readings on the Malayan Union, see Mohamed Nordin Sopiee, From Malayan Union to Singapore Separation: Political Unification in the Malaysian Region, 1945-1965 (Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1976). See also Albert Lau, Malayan Union Controversy, 1942-1948 (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1991).

[50] Sir Harold MacMichael, Report of a Mission to Malaya (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1946), Colonial No. 194.

[51] For details see, Great Britain, Colonial Office, Malayan Union and Singapore: A Statement of Policy on Future Constitution (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1946).

[52] K. J. Ratnam, Communalism and the Political Process in Malaya (Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1965), p. 75.

As the historian A. J. Stockwell pointed out, the vigor of the Malay opposition to the Malayan Union astounded all those convinced of Malay apathy. He argued that its Malay opponents had been mobilized from England by retired Malayan Civil Servants and that the Sultans, fearing the growing hostility from below the throne to the proposed constitution, chose to revoke their agreements and pillory MacMichael for foul practice. Many Malays on the other hand, saw the Malayan Union as "blessing in disguise" because it forced the different Malay groups into a peninsula-wide political movement.[53] The important perception was that sovereignty had continued to reside in the Malay rulers during the colonial period, but it was now to be entirely transferred to the British monarch. The conservative viewpoint was that the Malay states were not colonies but protected states. As stated by the conservative mouthpiece *Majlis*:

According to Malay history, the Malay states and the Malay people of the Malay peninsula were under British protection (*naungan*) starting from 1874, that is about 71 years ago. Since then, it has never been heard that the pure-bred indigenous Malays of the Peninsula have shown any sign of wanting self government, that is a Malay *kerajaan* that is *merdeka* (independent), probably because the Malays of the Peninsula are naturally aware that they do not have the qualifications or ability to administer themselves. What is needed by them are justice, tight protection, peach and quiet, and education that is good so that they will be qualified to rule themselves when the time comes in the future.[54]

As such, the conservatives viewed the signing of the Malayan Union Agreements by the rulers as a disaster. According to Ariffin Omar, the recurring themes in the conservative arguments against change to the *status quo* and the introduction of the Malay Union were that they wanted protection (*naungan*) and that Malays—from rajas to commoners did not want self-government. The concept of *naungan* had been prevalent way before the war—in treatise signed between the British and the rajas, it was agreed that the British would protect the Malay interests. The Malays also considered the Malay states to be the domain of the Malays, whereas the foreign races were just lodgers. The term "Malaya" and "Malayan" were anathemas to the conservatives. The Malayan Union and its consequences were deemed a victory to the "foreign races", giving rise to the emergence of a "Malayan race" that was not indigenous to the land and which would deprive the Malay race of their rights.[55]

Initially, the Malays were at loss as to what should be done in order to oppose the Malayan Union scheme. It could be argued that the internal politics of the Malay community were partly responsible for this uncoordinated reaction to the Malayan Union. Local rivalries and parochial concerns had in some ways hampered a united action. For example, in Kedah a group of young radicals in Saberkas[56] was countered by another youth organization, *Pemuda Melayu Kedah* (Kedah Malay Youth) and by the older and more conservative Malays of the *Kesatuan Melayu Kedah* (Kedah Malay Union). As such, though the Malays reacted vigorously against the Malayan Union scheme, local rivalries and parochial concerns had threatened to deepen the divisions within the Malay society. This was made evident by the revival of the sate-centered pre-war association alongside many new Malay organizations that were founded specifically to protest against the Malayan Union. For example, the pre-war *Persatuan Melayu Perak* (Malay Association of Perak) was now matched by the new *Perikatan Melayu Perak* (The Perak Malay League); the *Persatuan Melayu Pahang* (Pahang Malay Associations)

---

[53] See A. J. Stockewell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948 (Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Monograph No. 8, 1979), p. 64.

[54] Majlis, 24 October 1945.

[55] See Ariffin Omar, *Bangsa Melayu*: Malay Concepts of Democracy and Community, 1945-1950, p. 50.

[56] Saberkas was the abbreviation of the original name which, according to some ex-members of Saberkas, read *Sharikat Bekerjasama Raayat Kedah Alor Star* (People's Co-operative Company of Alor Star, Kedah) or *Sharikat Bekerjasama Kebajikan Am Saiburi* (General Welfare Co-operative of Saiburi—Saiburi being the name given to the state during the Siamese occupation). Later the title Saberkas acquired a nationalist overtones viz *Sayang Akan Bangsa Ertinya Redza Korban Apa Segalanya* (Love of the nation/race means a willingness for total sacrifice. See A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948 (Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Monograph No. 8, 1979), p. 122.

by several new Pahang associations; while in Selangor, the *Persatuan Melayu Selangor* (Selangor Malay Association) now found the rise of parallel associations throughout the state.[57]
The Malayan Uniion controversy also witnessed a "revolutionary change in the ties between Ruler and subject"[58] in Malay society. In particular some Malays had regarded the MacMichael Agreements as a surrender of their birthright. For example, Mohamed Yunus Hamidi, the secretary of the *Persatuan Melayu Selangor*, was openly critical of the Malays Rulers' record in the treaty negotiations, and, as editor of the conservative mouthpiece *Majlis*, Hamidi published a series of articles by Ayo bin Abdullah of Kedah which discussed the Malay rulers' position in society. Ayob put forward the argument that the authority of the Malay rulers rested on the people according to Islam, Malay custom and all world principles; that by signing the MacMichael Treaties, the rulers had failed their subjects; and that without the agreement of the people, the new treaties were invalid. Ayob also urged Malays to establish political associations, since they could no longer rely on their Rajas to defend their society.[59]

It could be argued that "the first Malay reactions to the Malayan Union were diffuse and tended to increase the divisions within the community rather than to improve the prospects for a pan-Malayan Malay movement".[60] In order to overcome the problem of local and state rivalries, it was imperative that all of the state associations should be incorporated within and umbrella organization. The editor of the conservative mouthpiece *Majlis* suggested that of all the states, the greatest political progress had been made in Johore and that Dato Onn b. Jaafar, founder of the *Pergerakan Melayu Semenanjong*, was the most suitable Malay to preside over a pan-Malayan congress. The editorial went on to say that the secretary of the *Persatuan Melayu Selangor* would take the necessary steps to ask the Malay associations throughout the peninsula to adopt Onn as leader of the Pan-Malayan Malay congress.[61] Onn b. Jaafar, whose grandfather, father and two elder brothers were *Menteri Besar* (Chief Minister) of Johore, was then himself a *Menteri Besar* of the state. It could well be said that Onn, a Malay of aristocratic background, might have been chosen due to what Weber has called "traditional authority"—the object of obedience is the personal authority of the individual which he enjoys by virtue of his traditional status.[62]

Due to his personal standing, Onn was able to shift the Malays antagonism towards the sultan to that of the Malayan Union. As such, his call for a Pan-Malayan Malaya Congress was received enthusiastically. And on 1 March 1946, "some 200 Malays from 41 associations gathered at the Sultan Suleiman Club, Kampong Bahru Kuala Lumpur to witness the Sultan of Selangor open the four-day Pan-Malayan Malay Congress".[63] According to the historian Stockwell, the congress considered two matters: firstly, the organization of the Malay National Movement (*Pergerakan Kebangsaan Melayu*) and, secondly, the campaign against the Malayan Union. Once the opening ceremonies were over, Onn was elected chairman of the Congress and a debate on the question of organization ensued. It was decided that the proposed movement be named *Pertubohan Kebangsaan Melayu Bersatu* or United Malays Organization (UMNO). A working committee that comprised of Dato Panglima Bukit Gantang (Perak), Dato Nik Kamil (Kelantan), Dato Hamzah b. Abdullah (Selangor), Zainal Abidin b. Ahmad

---

[57] A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948, pp. 64-65.

[58] See Ariffin Omar, *Bangsa Melayu*: Malay Concepts of Democracy and Community, p. 50.

[59] *Majlis*, January 4, 1946. The historian A. J. Stockwell has pointed out that the most notable case of opposition to the Sultans was the Johore conspiracy. Sultan Ibrahim of Johore had voluntarily signed the MacMichael agreement without consulting members of his state council. His action had stirred up resentment amongst Johore leaders. The latter had claimed that by singing the new treaty (which was a flagrant breach of Johore constitution), the Sultan had failed to do his duty to his subjects. In so doing, the Sultan had committed derhaka (treason) against his throne and the state and people of Johore. For further readings, see A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948, pp. 65-68.

[60] Ibid. p. 68.

[61] *Majlis* as quoted in A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948, p. 68.

[62] See Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 341.

[63] See A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948, p. 69.

(Za'ba) (Selangor) and Dato Onn (Johore) was appointed to draft a charter for UMNO and the next Pan-Malayan Malay Congress held in Johore Bahru on 11-12 May 1946, the UMNO charter was approved and UMNO was officially born with Dato Onn as its official President and the Dato Panglima Bukit Gantang as its acting secretary.[64] The man who was elected President of UMNO, as we shall recall, Dato Onn b. Jaafar, came from the administocratic class. So did the leaders of the number of delegations like Dato Nik Ahmad Kamil, Dato Nar, Haji Abdul Wahab (Dato Panglima Bukit Gantang) Wan b. Md. Yussof (Panglima Kinta, Perak). More significant, however, is the manner in which the Malay community was mobilized. The Malays were harnessed for political action without disrupting the traditional order. The Sultans and the *Menteri Besar* at one level, the *Penghulu* and *Ketua Kampung* at another, were all maintained in the offices that they had held in the old feudal setting and right through the colonial period. UMNO, it should be emphasized, was created within this structure. Chandra Muzaffar has pointed out that UMNO had inherited the relationship of authority and influenced that has always existed between the Sultan and his subjects, the *Menteri Besar* and the *Penghulu*. These relationships were reinforced through new political roles and new political goals. He went on to say that UMNO's strength in 1946 could be explained partly through this factor; because UMNO leaders were also the elited of traditional Malay society they earned support for their movement. In this context we could put into perspective Max Weber's thesis that at first parties were "pure following of the aristocracy", changing their allegiance as the "great noble families" which led them changed theirs. In a society where there has been no revolution or any other type of decisive break with the past, these historical continuities tend to be valuable for political mobilization. In the case of the Malay society, the position of the traditionalist was never in any danger. This could be attributed to the fact that the Malays, at this point in time, still did not have a notion of nation and nationality, and as A. C. Milner has argued decisively, in traditional Malay society, the Malays had perceived their political condition in terms of the *kerajaan*, that is, they considered themselves to be living in a community oriented around a raja who was not only the focus of what is today called political life, but also the endowment of religious and psychological significance.[65] Given the history of the Malay states, the system of indirect rule and the perpetuation of the traditional society, no other group—apart from the traditional elites could have mobilized and galvanized the Malay community into such a strong and dynamic force. It was this strength that persuaded the British to withdraw the Malayan Union in deference to UMNO and decided to restore the sovereignty of the Sultans, and the concept of the Malay State—in short, the old protectorate system.

UMNO's motto was "Hidup Melayu" (Long Live the Malays). The *kebangsaan* that the conservatives who founded UMNO were fighting for, according to Ariffin Omar, cannot be interpreted as nationalism but as a form of communal solidarity. He went on to say that the term *kebangsaan* is itself derived from the Malay word *bangsa* which can mean race, people, community, or even nation, depending on the context.[66] In rejecting the Malayan Union, one such resolution stated that the Malayan Union was not constitutional and does not respect the inheritance, the customs and practices of every one of the Malay States. Another resolution argued that the Malayan Union had destroyed the concept of Malay States, of Malay peoples with their own nation and rulers and Malay rights down through generations.[67]

The British was, nevertheless, adamant in its stance and on March 30, 1946, the British government announced that it was going ahead with the Malayan Union, but it would delay implementing the citizenship regulation. And on 31 March, the day the Malayan Union was to be inaugurated, leaders of the Pan-Malayan Congress held an emergency meeting in which they planned a total boycott of the new constitution. The Congress also adopted the following resolutions; Malays to wear white headbands as a sign of mourning, Malays to boycott the Malayan Union Advisory Councils, Dato Onn to request

---

[64] Ibid. p. 70.

[65] See A. C. Milner, *Kerajaan*: Malay Political Culture on the Eve of Colonial Rule (Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 1982).

[66] See Ariffin Omar, *Bangsa Melayu*: Malay Concepts of Democracy and Community, p. 55.

[67] See Chandrasekaran Pillay, Protection of the Malay Community: A Study of UMNO's Position and Opposition Attitudes, Master of Social Sciences thesis submitted at Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, 1974.

the rulers not to attend any ceremony or official function of the Malayan Union government, and finally Malay associations to refuse recognition to the Malayan Union Governor or his officers.[68] As such, the Malayan Union witnessed a bold demonstration of Malay unity and Malay opposition to the new constitution. By end of May 1946, it was clear that Britain would retreat, and towards the end of July, the Sultans, UMNO representatives and the British sat down to negotiate the terms of the new federation agreement.[69] For a moment, it seemed that the UMNO's main *raison d'etre* had ceased to exist.

The conclusion that one can draw from the Malayan Union episode is that through UMNO's effort, the position of the Malay community as the indigenous community with certain inalienable rights was restored. The Malayan Union also witnessed the heightened consciousness *bangsa* in the Malay community. A Malayan nationality was unacceptable to conservatives and radicals alike because the Malays saw themselves as *Melayu*. The term "Malayan" was rejected for it was seen as distinctly anti-Malay.[70] Both parties felt that it was a British creation to legitimize non-Malay citizenship in Malaya and to relegate Malays to a minor position in their own states. It was in this context that the Malayan Union cut across state boundaries and UMNO was founded on the traditional hierarchy of Malay society—a hierarchy that bound the lowest Malay peasant to the monarch at the very apex.[71] As such, UMNO was different from most nationalist parties movement in other parts of Southeast Asia. Nationalism in both Indonesia and Vietnam, for instance, assumed strength and structure outside the traditional structure and what is more significant, resulted in sharp conflicts between the emergent class of nationalists and the traditional elite. UMNO, on the other hand, saw no need to fight for independence rather, UMNO fought for the maintenance of continued British "protection" of "independent" Malay entities under which the *bangsa Melayu* would progress.[72] As far as UMNO was concerned, it merely associated itself with the British pledge that the Federation of Malaya agreement which replaced the Malayan Union "should on a long view, offer the means and prospects of development in the direction of ultimate self-government".[73]

The withdrawal of the Malayan Union and its substitution by the Persekutuan Tanah Melayu (Federtaion of Malaya) did not mean the attainment of political power for the Malays, and it was seen by some Malay nationalists as a hollow victory. The British government, however, had no intention of abdicating its pre-eminent role in the new political definition. Most of all, it was determined to reorganize the political structure. The British gave up the Malayan Union but many of its essential features were retained such as the requirement of a strong central government and the goal of a common citizenship for all who regarded Malaya as their real home and as the object of their loyalty. Nevertheless, the Federation of Malaya agreement recognized the need for maintaining the individuality of each Malay state and each settlement and the recognition of the special position of the Malays—this is where the UMNO's negotiations made a profound impression and gained major concessions.[74]

UMNO after the Malayan Union: Organizational Structure

As we have already seen, UMNO was, at the very outset, by no means a unitary political party—it consisted in the amalgamation of numerous state and local associations. This corresponds to Maurice

---

[68] *Majlis*, 3 April 1946.

[69] The most detailed exposition of this process is given by Allen J. de V., The Malayan Union, Monograph Series No. 10, Southeast Asian Studies (New Haven: Yale University, 1967).

[70] *Majlis*, April 13, 1946.

[71] See Ariffin Omar, *Bangsa Melayu*: Malay Concepts of Democracy and Community, p. 56.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Constitutional Proposal for Malaya, Report of Working Committee (Government Printer: Kuala Lumpur, 1946), Chapter 2.

[74] See Malaya (Federation of), Report of the Consultative Committee together with Proceedings of Six Public Meetings, A Summary of Representative Made and Letters and Memoranda Considered by the Committee (Kuala Lumpur: Malayan Union Government Press, 1947). For a useful analysis, see Ariffin Omar "Sultans: Guardians or Figure Heads? Constitutional Monarchy: Theory vs. Practice 1948-1993" in Aliran Monthly, 1993:13 (3), p. 3.

Duverger's conception of the indirect structure of political parties. According to Duverger, in the unitary state there is a direct link between the citizen and the national community; in the same way, in the direct party, the members themselves from the party community without the help of other social groupings. On the other hand, in a Confederation, the citizens are joined to the nation through the intermediary of the member states; similarly, the "indirect" party is made up of the union of the component social groups.[75] At its birth, UMNO fell into the second category because at that time, the Malays were then divided among the nine Malay Sultanates and among their grievances against the Malayan Union were the Malays, the conservatives in particular, had wanted the maintenance of the individuality of the Malay Sultanates. It could also be argued that, at that time, the Malays had not envisaged themselves as belonging to a unitary nation-state with fixed boundaries as the Western conception of a nation-state implies. Rather, UMNO was a collection of local and state associations linked to the co-coordinating institution as a form of communal solidarity by their opposition to the Malayan Union. As such, UMNO came into existence through what Panebianco has termed as territorial diffusion—local elites construct local associations that are only later integrated into a national organization.[76]

Bearing this in mind, one could surely see that UMNO was somewhat a loose alliance of many local and state associations. Hence, the UMNO charter that was approved on May 11th 1946 at Johore Bahru impeded decisive action by the central organization because of the many autonomous leaders who control their own state associations. The main items in the charter provided that—any Malay association with membership exceeding one thousand and whose objects included the advancement or betterment of Malays could be admitted to membership, there would be a General Assembly comprising two representatives from each organization with the responsibility of electing a President, establishing departments; the President had the power to appoint his own executive committee, subject to ratification by the General Assembly. The General Assembly was also responsible in the appointment of the Secretary General. Executive committee members were placed in charge of documents which were expected to play a major role in implementing UMNO's policy.[77]

With such loose provisions, the central organization was unable to exercise much control over its affiliated members and because the terms of the UMNO charter specifically prohibited the interference of the central organization in the local affairs of member associations. For example, in the aftermath of the Malayan Union crisis, the Federation of Malaya Proposals were discussed at the peninsular level while the Model State Constitution was referred to each state so that local Malay leaders might draft constitutions to suit their particular circumstances. In Kedah,[78] for instance, Haji Mohamed Sheriff (the Sultan's close advisor) declared that the Sultan was the source of all power and that any concessions which the Sultan might think fit to grant his subjects would be the fruit of a generous disposition. The *Kesatuan Melayu Kedah* (KMK, Kedah Malay Union), on the other hand, argued that according to Muslim law and democratic principle, the ruler was responsible to his people and that he should accommodate himself to their demands. The political associations in Kedah (KMK, Saberkas, and *Pemuda Melayu Kedah*) drafted a proposal stating that they wished to be consulted on two matters—in drafting of the State Constitution and in the appointment of officers who would serve as *Menteri Besar* and State Secretary under the future constitution. Although, in retaliation, the KMK boycotted the celebrations surrounding the inauguration of the Federation and more seriously disputed the legitimacy of the Sultan, the KMK never stood a chance in its tussle with the Malay establishment of Kedah. Although Onn was concerned with the divisions between UMNO associations in the state constitutional

---

[75] See Maurice Duverger, Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State, translated by Barbara and Robert North (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1954), p. 6.

[76] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power (London: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 50.

[77] See Charter of United Malays National Organization UMNO Charter, Supplementary Charter & Regulations—Senarai Fail UMNO Siri Setiausaha Agung Tahun 1946-1961, 1963, UMNO/ED/No.3/46 Arkib Negara Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur.

[78] The Working Committee for the Federation of Malaya Proposal had drafted in addition to the Federal Proposal a Model State Constitution based on the pre-war Johore constitution. This was due to the fact that before the war, only Johore and Terengganu had a written constitution. See A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948, p. 101.

crisis, help from UMNO headquarters was impeded by both the terms of UMNO's charter and by the political sense of UMNO's leaders.[79]

At that point in time, the loyalty of the individual Malay was to his local association and political control rested not so much with UMNO headquarters but with affiliated associations, which were numerous, and sometimes at loggerheads with each other. By the end of 1947, 33 associations were members of UMNO, although 41 had sent delegates to the Pan-Malayan Congress of March 1946.[80] As party president, Dato Onn was keen to create a unitary political party—"all these splitting up into more and more separate bodies are detrimental to the unity that is required, but they appear inevitable as long as associations already do not work together. The amalgamation of associations would help both politically and financially for if only the smaller associations would realize the benefits of affiliations or merger into another smaller body and become a big body, there would be no requests for reconsideration of the $1 subscription".[81] Hence, during its formative years, UMNO, a party that developed through diffusion, was a federation of different local groups, which had given rise to decentralize and semi-autonomous structures.

According to Ramlah Adam, with the advent of the Federation of Malaya in 1948, the political reality was that UMNO—as a loose alliance of various locals and state associations—was not able to carry out its program effectively. This was due to the fact that the various state and local associations had their own agendas and goals.[82] Attempts to create a unitary political party were opposed by several state organizations anxious to preserve their state identity.[83] First moves towards consolidation were made in Selangor where nearly a dozen affiliates of UMNO had sprung up. On September 8, 1946, a meeting which was chaired by Onn and assisted by the Dato Panglima Bukit Gantang as its secretary, considered three courses: to make no changes, to federate the Selangor associations, or to amalgamate the associations and establish "UMNO Selangor". The meeting, however, opted for a federation.[84] Nevertheless, throughout September 1946, the conservative mouthpiece *Majlis* had emphasized the need for alteration in the existing UMNO structure so that the intervening tier of associations between UMNO headquarters and individual Malays might be dissolved and replaced by the direct registration of Malays and the creation of UMNO state branches.[85]

Late in 1946, UMNO members in Penang and Seberang Prai and in Negeri Sembilan were convinced that there should be a revamp of the structure of UMNO and the need to replace the system of UMNO affiliates by a network of state branches.[86] At the next UMNO General Assembly in March 1947, the *Persatuan Melayu Selangor* presented a pamphlet on the advantages of direct membership and state branches, and at the next UMNO General Assembly in Kota Bahru, which met on the first UMNO's inauguration, a resolution in favor of the principle of reorganization was adopted by 20 votes to 5 and a sub-committee was set up to consider the practical implications.[87]

As Stockwell has pointed out, the re-structuring of UMNO was by no means plain sailing. A certain amount of unwillingness, apathy and ignorance amongst UMNO members had delayed the realization of the new scheme for a further two years. Three Malay associations, namely *Persatuan Melayu Sabak Bernam*, *Kesatuan Melayu Singapura* (KMS) and Saberkas of Kedah had refused to surrender their

---

[79] For a full account of the Kedah constitution crisis, see A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948, p. 102-105.

[80] Ibid.

[81] UMNO/SG no. 48/46.

[82] Ramlah Adam, *UMNO:Organisasi dan Kegiatan Politik* (Kota Bahru: Mohd. Nowi Book Store, 1978), p. 43.

[83] Opposition to attempts to amalgamate all the state organizations will be discussed later.

[84] See John Funston, Malay Politics in Malaysia: A Study of UMNO and PAS, p. 81.

[85] *Majlis* editorials on 11, 13 and 16 September 1946.

[86] UMNO/F no. 7/47.

[87] UMNO/F no. 7/47.

autonomy. These associations had resented the power of the UMNO leadership which, they claimed, rested largely in acquiescence of the bulk of Malay associations, and they criticized the process whereby the original confederation was being converted into monolithic structure. The then President of *Kesatuan Melayu Singapura*, Sardon Jubir, worked both as a lawyer and politician both in Singapore and the peninsular, was an assistant to Onn before the war. Sardon, however, did not become an "Onn man" but he was a thorn in the side of UMNO's president. As president of KMS, Sardon pursued an individualistic course within UMNO, often being critical of its leadership and he opposed the creation of an UMNO branch in Singapore because UMNO's communal nature and mainland orientation would aggravate the problems of the already weak Malay community in Singapore.[88] Saberkas, on the other hand, was started by a group of English-educated Malays and they form the most articulate opposition association within UMNO. Saberkas was founded on social justice and sovereignty of the people and demanded civil liberties, the preservation of Malay society, and finally, the political unity of the Malays and their ultimate federation within greater Malay/Indonesian entity.[89] More importantly, Saberkas argued that the confederation of associations provided by UMNO's original charter allowed differences of opinion on specific matters while preserving harmony over general principles. Whereas the introduction of direct registration and UMNO branches would in its view, undermine the Malay unity that it ought to reinforce.[90]

At this juncture, UMNO, which was a Confederation of Malay associations, had very little autonomy vis-à-vis its member associations and the central organization must bargain with them on an equal basis. For instance, the KMS case illustrated that even though Onn had made moves in 1950 to set up an UMNO branch in Singapore, it was not until December 1951 (after the Tunku had assumed the leadership of UMNO) that a branch under the Johore Bahru division was established on the island.[91] Saberkas, on the other hand, chose to remain an affiliated member of UMNO when the new constitution was ratified in May 1949 (see Appendix I for UMNO's organizational structure). Nevertheless, at the General Assembly which met on 28-29 May 1949 the new regulations for direct membership were ratified—a constitutional amendment. incorporating changes and also providing for internal discipline came into being, giving UMNO the form of a Western-style political party a little over two years after its leaders had set out to achieve this.[92]

UMNO, as such, went through certain phases towards a monolithic party: its development initially takes place through diffusion that is, a number of local associations autonomously sprang up throughout the Malay states and later they unite to form a national organization. The national organization then went on to develop its branches through penetration. Initially, the central organization was not able to exercise much authority over its member associations. When the members decided to form a monolithic party, as we shall see, a form of territorial penetration will occur because the "central organization" could control, stimulate or direct the development of the "periphery"—in this case, the various Malay states' UMNO.[93]

UMNO as a Monolithic Party: Bureaucratization and Centralizing Tendencies

According to Maurice Duverger, the leadership of parties tends naturally to assume oligarchic form. He went on to say that a veritable "ruling class" comes into being that is more or less close; it is an "inner circle" into which it is difficult to penetrate and this phenomenon is just as true of titular leaders as of the real leaders, of autocratic as of democratic rulers. In the case of UMNO, some five months

---

[88] Tun Saron Hj. Jubir as quoted in A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948, p. 122.

[89] Wan Din b. Mohd. Hashim, ex-Saberkas member as quoted in ibid.

[90] Ex-members of Saberkas, Mohamed Khir Johari and Senu b. Abdul Rahman, as quoted in ibid.

[91] UMNO/SG no. 179/50.

[92] See John Funston, Malay Politics in Malaysia: A Study of UMNO and PAS (Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann Educational Books, 1980), p. 81.

[93] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 50.

after its inception, Maxwell made the following observation on UMNO—"with its secretary general, treasury and seven departments, it is a system of government and the President will be a perpetual dictator".[94] Indeed, Robert Michels had noted that the political party possesses many traits in common with the state.[95]

During its early days, the direction of UMNO lay with the President and his executive committee. This was due to the fact that the party president was then vested with the power to appoint his own executive committee, the members of which would be responsible to him rather than the General Assembly.[96] During the period of 1946-1951, UMNO's central leadership was monopolized by a group of English educated Malays and those of aristocratic birth.[97] Chandra Muzaffar has also noted that throughout the Malayan Union episode, the leadership of UMNO was dominated by a group of administrators and aristocrats or as he called them the "administocrats" and the latter were the original UMNO elites. In 1949, for instance, 79% members of UMNO's executive committee came from the "administocratic" class—in 1950, 61%; 1951 58%; and 1952 68%.[98] On that account, in its early days, UMNO depended on the energies of a handful of men mainly in two centers—Johore Bahru and Ipoh. In Johore Bahru there came to be situated the Presidency under Onn, the UMNO Youth Movement under Onn's son, Hussein, the Information Department and the Finance Department. In Ipoh, the secretariat was at first housed in the office of the Dato Panglima Bukit Gantang at 21 Hale Street. Here the clerical work of the secretariat, of the Department of Politics and of the *Kaum Ibu* (UMNO's women section) was carried out by a group of Perak Malays who were already friends, relatives or colleagues, and who were, in the main, leading figures in the *Perikatan Melayu Perak* (Perak Malay League) such as Zainal Abidin b. Hj. Abas, Che Puteh Mariah bte. Ibrahim Rashid, Megat Yunus b. Megat Mohd. Isa and C. M. Yusuf.[99] It should also be noted that numerically and also in terms of political influence, Onn's *Pergerakan Melayu Semenanjong Johore* (some 25,000 members) and the Dato Panglima Bukit Gantang's *Perikatan Melayu Perak* (some 25,000 members) dominated the party. As such, the *Pergerakan Melayu Semenanjong Johore* and the *Perikatan Melayu Perak* were, in Stockwell's words, the twin pillars of UMNO during Onn's presidency, and even after UMNO's reorganization, when these organizations had submerged their original identities in UMNO state branches. Needless to say, these men had succeeded, consciously or unconsciously, in forming UMNO's "inner circle". Nevertheless, as we have already seen, UMNO's original charger had managed to circumscribe the inner circle's dominance. UMNO, prior to 1049, was a party divided into tendencies (loosely organized state and local groups) of geographically concentrated groups.

After its organizational restructuring in May 1949, a new regulation for direct membership was ratified and it seemed that UMNO was placed on a sounder basis as a political party. With it, the most important changes were the inaugural of UMNO's divisions and branches through the Malay Peninsula. The reason given for the creation of a unitary political party was that it was easier for UMNO, as a monolithic party, to advance the cause of the Malays—UMNO members in particular—in matters

---

[94] See Maxwell Papers 17: Maxwell to Jarrett (draft), 25 September 1946 as quoted in A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948, p. 116.

[95] See Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracies (Gloucher, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959), p. 186.

[96] UMNO Charter UMNO Charter, Supplementary Charter & Regulations—*Senarai fail UMNO Siri Setiausaha Agung Tahun* 1946-1961, 1963, ibid.

[97] See Ramlah Adam, *UMNO: Organisasi dan Kegiatan Politik*, p. 100.

[98] See Chandrasekaran Pillay, Protection of the Malay Community: A Study of UMNO's Position and Opposition Attitudes, p. 156.

[99] Zainal Abidin b. Hj. Abas was the first officer in charge of UMNO's Department of Politics and he succeeded Dato Panglima Bukit Gantang as secretary general. Che Puteh Mariah was the wife of Zainal Abidin b. Hj. Abas and was the head of UMNO's women section (*Kaum Ibu*). Megat Yunus succeeded Zainal Abiding at the Department of Politics. C. M. Yusof's daughter had married the Dato Panglima Bukit Gantang. Like Dato Panglima Bukit Gantang, C. M. Yusof was a conscious aristocrat, who saw the hierarchy of Perak chiefs to be the symbol of Malay political power, and in the late 1950s, he became the Dato Bendahara of Perak. These accounts were extracted from A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment 1942-1948, p. 117.

related to politics (*siasah*), welfare (*kebajikan*) and culture (*kebudayaan*).[100] When UMNO was turned into a monolithic political party, the branch designates UMNO's most basic element. According to Maurice Duverger, parties founded on branches are more centralized than those founded on caucuses. This is due to the fact that a branch is only part of the whole, and it separate existence is inconceivable, on the hand the word caucus evokes autonomous reality capable of living on its own. The profound originality lies in its organization.[101] In the case of UMNO, the inevitability of division of labor within a large-scale organization was very pronounced when the party was turned into a monolithic organization. For the purpose of administration, a supreme executive committee was instituted as a top policy-making body. The committee consisted of an elected president, deputy president, five vice presidents and several appointed positions. The officeholders were elected by the delegates to the General Assembly, the exception of the head of UMNO Youth and *Wanita* UMNO (originally *Kaum Ibu*), who were automatically party vice presidents, and we were elected by their own assemblies. As we shall see, the supreme executive council was UMNO's power center.

The administrative set-up of UMNO's divisions and branches were very similar to that of the central body.[102] There is no doubt that the possibility clearly exists that a special type of hierarchy always emerges in any political parties since a coarchal pattern of perfectly equal power distribution does not exist.[103] Theoretically speaking, with the existence of UMNO's divisions and branches, it could arguably be said that there should be a considerable degree of diffusion of power prerogatives and power exercise or a general dilution of power because the party must cope with widely varying local milieus of opinion, tradition and social structure, and this encourages the recognition and acceptance of local leadership, local strategy and local power.[104] Rather, in the case of UMNO, it seemed that a centralized "unity of command" was instituted in its organizational structure. In UMNO's 1949 constitution, it was decided that there should be a state executive committee (*Jawatankuasa Perhubungan UMNO*)[105] in between the central organization and the division in states where there existed more than one division. The head of the state executive committee was to be appointed by the president and has to be an individual from the secretary general's office.[106] The importance of the state executive committee should be seen in the light of the role played by UMNO's various departments, which were expected to play a major part in determining and implementing UMNO's policy at that time. UMNO was active in drafting programs for Malay progress in education and in the economic life of the peninsula. On July 16, 1946, ONN appointed S. M. Zainal Abidin as the first officer in charge of UMNO's Education Department and UMNO's Department of Economics was established in June 1946.[107] Both the programs of social progress and the arrangements for party consolidation were part of UMNO's bid for the leadership of the Malay community. As such, the restructuring of 1949 was the beginning of the process of nationalization. Nationalization stresses the subordination of state and local parties to the national party. Longley defines nationalization in terms of a redefinition of the "traditional authority relationships between national and state parties" resulting in "a growth in the importance of national party organization over state and local organization", and the circumscription of "the traditional autonomy of state parties".[108] He suggests the following as critical elements of party nationalization—

---

[100] See Ramlah Adam, *UMNO: Organisasi dan Kegiatan Politik*, p. 44.

[101] See Marucie Duverger, Politcal Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State, translated by Barbara and Robert North, p. 23.

[102] For a discussion of the structure of UMNO's division and branches, see Ramlah Adam, *UMNO: Organisasi dan Kegiatan Politik*, pp. 49-54.

[103] See Samuel J. Eldersveld, "A Thery of Political Power" in Political Parties and Political Behavior (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 34.

[104] Ibid., p. 36.

[105] The state liaison committee was composed of delegates from UMNO division. See Ramlah Adam, *UMNO: Organisasi dan Kegiatan Politik*, p. 50.

[106] Ibid.

[107] See A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment 1942-1948, p. 110.

[108] See Charles H. Longley, "Party Reform and Party Nationalization: The Case of the Democrats," in The Party Symbol, ed. William J. Crotty (San Francisco, Calif.: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1980), pp. 374-375.

increasing uniformity of norms for state party participation in national party processes, decreasing range of differences in structure and processes of state parties and finally, greater interdependence between the state and national party organizations. According to Gordon P. Means, the Federation of Malaya Agreement resulted in UMNO becoming the dominant party in government affairs. British policy had been brought into essential harmony with the political objectives of UMNO, and particularly at the state level; the key men in government were either UMNO members or conformed to the party's political ideals.[109]

UMNO's First Organizational Dilemma

According to the rational model,[110] organizations are primarily instruments for the realization of specific (and specifiable) goals. UMNO, as we have seen, was founded to oppose the Malayan Union and it succeeded in doing that. Hence, UMNO was an instrument for the realization of a certain aim and with the passing of time, however, its survival and the actors' particular objective predominate. As Robert Michels has persuasively demonstrated, the true objective of an organization's leaders often is not that of pursuing the manifest aims which the organization was established, but rather that of ensuring the organization's survival (and with it, the survival of their own positions).[111]

Onn's leadership of UMNO made him the dominant personality in Malay politics for a number of years. In its formative years, the party accepted his policies and his political views. Although he was an avowed spokesman of Malay nationalism, he expounded a mild nationalism which stressed gradualism and cooperation with the British provided they remained sensitive to Malay opinion. During the fight against the Malayan Union, Onn talked and acted like a narrow-minded Malay chauvinist. In addition, although Onn fought bitterly against the Malayan Union, he was far from being "anti-British". He realized that the Malays were backward and needed assistance of a sympathetic British administration to protect their interest. Yet, a year or two later, he stressed the importance of inter-communal harmony and appeared genuinely interested in accepting non-Malays into full status in Malaya's political and cultural life provided their loyalty to Malaya was undivided.[112]

Onn's quarrel with UMNO over the citizenship and membership issue is very well documented.[113] For the purpose of this study, what is important to note is the fact that in expounding that UMNO should open its membership to all ethnic groups and to change its name to United Malayan National Organization, Onn had went a step further in alienating UMNO's original aim, that is, opposing the creation of a Malayan nation. According to Panebianco, in a well-established organization, the importance attached to the survival of the organization generally prevails over that attached to the pursuit of its original aims. It is also quite clear that organizational actors pursue a plurality of often-contradictory aims, and there remains little doubt that organizational equilibrium depends on the way in which the leaders mediate the particular competing demands.[114]

Onn had regretted that "when I tried to open UMNO membership to others who are loyal to the country UMNO rejected it…"[115] It is important for us to realize, as Panebianco has pointed out, that the official aims continue to influence the organization and will continue to play an essential role both in its internal processes and in the relationship between the organization and its environment even for a long after the organization's foundation. In the case of UMNO, it could well be said that Onn had

---

[109] See Gordon P. Means, Malaysian Politics (London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1970), p. 102.

[110] See Talcott Parsons, "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organization" in Administrative Science quarterly I (1956), pp. 63-85.

[111] See Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracies, p. 125.

[112] See Gordon P. Means, Malaysian Politics, p. 101.

[113] See, for example, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra, Political Awakening (Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, 1986).

[114] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 9.

[115] Onn as quoted in The Straits Times, November 27, 1950.

tried to transform UMNO from a party defending the *status quo* to one cautiously looking towards eventual independence. Onn had initially proposed that "those who were born in this country should be given citizenship; and also those British subjects in the former settlement should follow the British citizenship law, 1948". Once could sure see that this citizenship proposals that was originally recommended by the Communities Liaison Committee (CLC), an elite multi-racial grouping launched in 1948 at the initiative of the British Commissioner General for Southeast Asia, Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, differed very little from the earlier proposals for the Malayan Union. These proposals were accepted by the UMNO executive committee in May 1950, after a "heated" argument. At a special general assembly held late that month, Onn presented a series of "counter-proposals" that differed hardly from those of the CLC and it was passed by the general assembly without amendments.[116]

When Onn proposed that UMNO should immediately be fully opened to all races, it became clear that that it would not be acceptable to UMNO generally. In other words, Onn had failed to take into consideration UMNO's original aim. UMNO's official aims have the function of justifying its underlying interests. It is important to understand the implication of the distinction made between nationality (*bangsa*) and citizenship. Citizenship has an almost legalistic connotation. The conservative mouthpiece *Majlis* had also warned Onn to "go slow" on his proposal to put UMNO on a full national membership by offering equal membership rights to all races. It is undeniable that a section of Malay intelligentsia had recognized the imperative need for a communal unity as a necessary condition for the attainment of a self-governing Malaya and that they have realized the consequences of communalism. At that moment, however, the Malays had perceived the non-Malays as being superior to the Malays and had a higher birth rate and Onn was initially branded as a "traitor to the Malays and the country" when he had proposed the CLC's citizenship proposal.[117] It was clear that UMNO's main *raison de etre* was still strong at that time due the fact that a large segment of its members were not able to accept the change from a Malay to a Malayan nation.

[116] The Straits Times, August 28, 1950.

[117] The Sunday Times, June 11, 1950.

CHAPTER 3

UMNO: The Second Phase—Substitution of Ends and Centralization

Robert Michels has pointed out that the party, regarded as an entity, as a mechanism is not necessarily identifiable with the totality of its members and still less sow with the class to which these belong. The party, according to Michels, is created as a means to secure an end. Having, however, become an end in itself, endowed with aims and interests of its own, it undergoes detachment, from the teleological point of view, from the class which it represents. In a party, it is far from obvious that the interests of the masses which have combined to form the party will coincide with the interests of the bureaucracy in which the party becomes personified.[118]

Max Weber has also pointed out that in practice, parties may be officially or merely in fact solely concerned with the attainment of power for their leaders and with securing positions in the administrative staff for their own members. The attainment of positions in the administrative staff for their members is however, almost always a secondary aim and objective programs are not infrequently merely a means of persuading outsiders to participate.[119]

According to Michels, every party is destined to pass from a genetic phase, in which the organization is entirely dedicated to the realization of its cause to a later phase in which—the growth of the party's size, its bureaucratization, the apathy of its supporters after their initial participatory enthusiasm, and finally the leaders' interest in which the real end is organizational survival.[120] In the previous chapter, we have discussed in detail UMNO's original aim and its nationalization process. In the present chapter, we will discuss the consolidation of UMNO—the phase in which the organization stabilizes and develops stable survival interest. These developments, according to Panebianco, marks the party's passage from a system of solidarity oriented to the realization of its official aims to a system of interests oriented toward its own survival. The party goes from a phase in which collective incentives—related to the formation of organizational identity prevail (involving participation of the social movement type), to a phase in which organizational ideology is latent (the objectives being vague, implicit, and contradictory).[121]

UMNO after 1951

It should be recalled that Onn's resignation as UMNO's first president was the result of the party's unwillingness to open its membership to all ethnic groups. In a sense, UMNO had wanted to remain as an "exclusionist" party, that is, the party still held to its original manifest aim—Malay solidarity. The party had decided that the members' identity (one participates because one identifies with the organization) and solidarity (one participates because one identifies with the cause of the organization) should prevail. As such, when Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj came to power as UMNO's second president after defeating Tuan Haji Ahmad Fuad Hassan and Datuk C. M. Yusof, gaining fifty-seven votes to the eleven and seven respectively of his rivals[122]--he (Tunku) reaffirmed the party's commitment to its original aim:

---

[118] See Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy, translated by Eden & Cedar Paul (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1978), p. 389.

[119] Max Weber, "The Concept of Parties and Their Features", in The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 407

[120] Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy, p. 371, ibid.

[121] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power (London: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 16-24.

[122] See Harry Miller, Prince and Premier: A Biography of Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj First Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya (London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1959), p. 107.

This is a Malay country, and privileges should be given to the Malays…What will become of the Malays if we concede every time to the insatiable demands of the other races? Siam, Ceylon, Indonesia, and the Philippines are independent nations. Why are we not getting out independence? Some people say independence should be handed to Malayans. Who are these Malayans? The Malays should decide who the Malayans should be…[123]

With the passing of time, however, UMNO developed both a growing tendency towards self-preservation and a growing diversification of aims on the part of the actors. Michels above-mentioned theory of "substitution of ends" illustrates precisely this passage of the party from being an instrument for the realization of certain aims to a system in which the survival imperative and the actors' particular objectives predominate.

In the case of UMNO, when Onn b. Jaafar decided to quit as the party's first president, he had already formulated plans for organizing the Independent of Malaya Party (IMP) with the object of getting Malaya her independence. The membership of IMP, according to Onn, was opened to "others" loyal to Malaya. At his farewell address to UMNO, Onn invited all Malays desiring independence and ethnic cooperation to join him in his work. According to Mauzy, Onn evidently did not consider that he was severing all links with UMNO.[124] However, in his first unequivocal statement of his view about the IMP, the Tunku, as the new UMNO president, declared that he "will have nothing to do with IMP and that Dato Onn proposed IMP was a destructive move".[125] The Tunku also called on the Malays to avoid the IMP, saying that its policies were not in the best interests of the Malays because Onn's policy of urging equal rights to every person no matter how recent his residence in the country was detrimental to the Malays.[126] Later he announced that any UMNO member in sympathy with the IMP would be expelled citing that it would be in their interest and the interest of UMNO for these people to resign as UMNO cannot afford to have a split in its ranks and that the policies of UMNO and IMP were in opposition.[127]

In order to form the base for a mass "non-communal" nationalist party, Onn solicited support from as many prominent community leaders as possible. For instance, the first president of the Malayan (later Malaysian) Chinese Association (MCA), Tan Cheng Lock, also called for the formation of a new political party which supersede ethnic boundaries, and he quickly agreed to be the chairman of the inaugural meeting of the IMP, and he urged the Chinese to give their full and active support to the new party.[128] The IMP was inaugurated on September 16, 1951 in Kuala Lumpur and the array of the distinguished political leaders who expressed their support for the IMP gave the impression that this new party would soon dominate the Malayan political scene.[129]

If Weber's contention that the end of political parties activities are devoted to securing power for their leaders is correct, then the inauguration of IMP had in one way or the other posed a challenge to UMNO's existence. Whereas prior to the introduction of elections most political activity in the Malay States was limited to that of making representation to the government or organizing public demonstrations in protest over various issues—the introduction of elections made political parties the primary vehicles to political success and power. As Gordon P. Means has pointed out, the first elections in the Malay States was the Municipal Council of George Town on Penang Island, and were held December

---

[123] Ibid.

[124] See Diane K. Mauzy, Barisan Nasional: Coalition Government in Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Marican & Sons, 1983), p. 14.

[125] The Straits Times, September 13, 1951.

[126] The Straits Times, October 31, 1951.

[127] The Straits Times, September 18, 1951.

[128] See R. K. Vasil, Politics in a Plural Society (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 56-64.

[129] Ibid.

1, 1951.[130] He went on to say that although the George Town elections were watched with much interests—there were not a test of strength between major political parties organized on a national basis and thus provided very little evidence of future trends in the Malay States politics.[131] On the other hand, the Kuala Lumpur Municipal Councils elections of February 1952 had attracted much more national interests due to the fact that Onn's IMP would try to make a strong showing in that elections as evidence to the British that the Malay States was on the road to independence and that a non-communal approach to politics could united the country for such independence.

Because of the serious threat posed by the IMP in the Kuala Lumpur elections, the UMNO Kuala Lumpur chairman, Yahya b. Abdul Rahman, was vested with full authority to do anything reasonable he considered necessary to assist UMNO to win seats.[132] Yahya met Tun H. S. Lee, the influential president of the Selangor MCA for financing and Lee told the former that the MCA would finance the elections if an UMNO-MCA election pact was created. On January 8, 1952 a joint declaration was made by Kuala Lumpur division of UMNO and the Selangor MCA announcing that these two parties would contest the Kuala Lumpur elections in a common front.[133] This *ad-hoc* alliance between UMNO and the MCA could be interpreted in several ways. Firstly, it should be noted that at this juncture, the UMNO-MCA alliance was simply a temporary coalition, which took place in order to benefit the parties concerned in the elections. Secondly, the UMNO-MCA alliance was created as a reaction to the IMP. Thirdly, as Means has pointed out, Onn and the IMP had charted a course that threatened to undermine the political support of UMNO among the Malays and the new president of UMNO, Tunku Abdul Rahman, wasted no time in trying to purge the party of those elements that still supported Onn as he realized if the IMP were to expand its power, UMNO would suffer proportionally. Consequently, UMNO was looking for the means to deal the IMP a decisive blow.[134] As a result of this *ad-hoc* alliance, the UMNO-MCA won 9 of the 12 seats, and the pre-election favorite, the IMP, won only two seats with the remaining seat going to an independent.[135] This development corresponds to Panebianco's theory which states that political parties transform from a system of solidarity oriented towards the realization of its official aims to a system of interest oriented toward its own survival. In order to ensure its survival, the leadership of UMNO was willing to establish relationship with MCA, an organization founded in 1949 by some of the most vociferous spokesman of the community on citizenship. Obtaining *jus soli* (citizenship as a birthright) was a major goal of MCA while UMNO was established to oppose the new citizenship provisions set out by the British in the Malayan Union proposal. As such, two weeks after the Kuala Lumpur polls, Tunku Abdul Rahman was quoted as saying that UMNO "will cooperate with other organizations, but we certainly want to preserve our identity".[136] The upshot of the UMNO-MCA alliance at the Kuala Lumpur polls was the continued supremacy of UMNO. The alliance between UMNO and the MCA made it difficult for the IMP to campaign against communalism in politics. All three parties contesting the election came out in favor of communal harmony, although admittedly the "communal harmony" of the UMNO-MCA was not quite the same as IMP's professed ideal of non-communal politics.

---

[130] The radical party of Penang, the Labor Party and UMNO, were the three parties that contested in the elections. The Penang Radical Party captured six out of the nine seats. See Gordon P. Means, Malaysian Politics (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970), p. 132.

[131] Ibid.

[132] See Harry Miller, Prince and Premier: A Biography of Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj First Prime Minster of the Federation of Malaya, p. 113, ibid.

[133] Malay Mail, January 9, 1952.

[134] Gordon P. Means, Malaysian Politics, p. 133. The Malayan Chinese Association (MCA) also had reasons for joining a common front against the IMP. Even though Onn's IMP was much more liberal with respect to non-Malay rights on citizenship and voting requirements than UMNO, it was still not above suspicion as far as the MCA was concerned. Perhaps the most adequate explanation of the sudden turn-about of the MCA could have been that although Tan Cheng Lock could have supported a non-communal political party, he could never been an enthusiastic supporter of such a party if it also would have given Onn an unassailable position of political supremacy in Malaya.

[135] Malay Mail, February 15, 1952.

[136] Malay Mail, February 22, 1952.

The political agreement between UMNO and the MCA at the Kuala Lumpur elections had been negotiated only between the Kuala Lumpur and Selangor branches of the two parties as a temporary political maneuver which did not involve the central organs of either party. Their victory at the polls prompted both the MCA and UMNO to begin exploring the possibility of expanding their alliances to other municipalities. At their conference in March 1953, the two parties reached definite agreements on setting up a National Alliance Organization, and this was formally instigated on August 23, 1953. Liaison committees consisting of two representatives each were to be set up at the local levels to provide institutional links, an in September 1954, a 30 member National Council was established as the supreme body. The then UMNO president Tunku Abdul Rahman was named the leader of the Alliance.[137] An Indian component was supplied when the Malayan Indian Congress (MIC) joined the Alliance in 1954.

IMP's failure at the Kuala Lumpur Municipal elections deserves some scrutiny. It should be noted that Malaya in the early 1950s was a society dominated by communal cleavages. On the Peninsular proper, Malays had a plurality of the population, 46.4 percent; the Chinese accounted for 37.5 percent; and Indians 14.4 percent. All three communities included a variety of more or less autonomous sub-units; for instance, Chinese could be split into the main dialect groups. However, sub-groups, such as Cantonese or Hokkien, might be too small for a party to drect its appeal to just one, or two or three of them. This might not appeal to a sufficiently large number of electors. When dealing with ethnic politics in Malaysia, it is usual to speak of broader groups, conventionally Malays, Chinese and Indians. Given the prominence of ethnicity in the early 1950s, it was only to be expected that most of the effective partied formed would be ethnically based. It is not too farfetched to say that, at that point in time, both the Malays and the Chinese community were very conscious of their ethnic and cultural identity. One general theme mounted against Onn's IMP was its non-communal pretensions. The IMP program, it was widely asserted by UMNO and MCA candidates, was altogether a bad tendency. A concerted drive toward some form of conglomerate Malay identity shared by all citizens was inspired by British, hence it was a foreign imagination. Unless it was checked by a massive popular rejection, it might well mean intensified governmental efforts leading to the deculturation of Malays and Chinese alike.[138]

Substitution of Ends and Compromises

In March 1951, largely through the persuasion of its Youth Movement, UMNO decided to change the party's slogan from *Hidup Melayu* (Long Live the Malays) to *Merdeka* (Independence). Here we could see UMNO's diversification of aims from an ethnic party par excellence, having been formed in 1946 principally to resist the Malayan Union proposals aimed, it seemed, at the heart of Malay power and status to winning elections and towards securing independence. The party leadership at least had started thinking in terms of independence, and towards this end had moved towards an accommodation with non-Malays. Failure to persuade the rank and file on the correctness of this course led to the exit of Onn and most of the executive committee in August 1951, and the accession to the presidency of Tunku Abdul Rahman. Initially, as we have seen in the previous section, this led to a reversal of UMNO's policy, the new leader rejecting co-operation with non-Malays. This changed, however, in January 1952, when for the purpose of defeating the IMP in the Kuala Lumpur municipal elections, UMNO concluded an electoral pact with the major Chinese political organization, the MCA. We have also seen that the formation of the Alliance had initially been arrived at by the state rather than national party leaders and there was considerable caution on both sides until overwhelming success in the election demonstrated the potentialities of such an arrangement. For UMNO president, Tunku Abdul Rahman, this resolved the problem of how Malays might co-exist politically with non-Malays, and it led him to advocate early independence through the co-operative efforts of the two groups:

Countries which were formerly under the British rule such as India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma have already gained their independence helped by the British government only after those countries have

---

[137] See Diane K. Mauzy, Barisan Nasional: Coalition Government in Malaysia, p. 17.

[138] See K. J. Ratnam, Communalism and Political Process in Malaya (Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1965), pp. 55-60.

fulfilled the conditions laid down by the British government. The condition is that the people of those countries must cooperate and live in peace. We it is said have not yet fulfilled that condition and it is for that reason we were not given our independence. In 1952, with the object of cooperating with other races in this country, UMNO formed an alliance with the MCA in accordance with its constitution. In this way we believe that we could gain independence immediately…[139]

Whereas Onn could be described as an assimilationist in wanting to form a non-communal party that transcends ethnicity, the Alliance formula of co-operation without the constituent parties losing their own identity, as we shall see, prove a success. Nevertheless, it is not without UMNO making adjustments to its original manifest aim of protecting the Malay interests. It is these new circumstances that we must now turn to for they had a tremendous repercussion on UMNO's "substitution of aims". At this juncture UMNO's foremost goal was the desire for *merdeka* (independence). In order to achieve this, the leaders of UMNO knew that *merdeka* would only be granted if there was some basis for communal harmony. In his presidential address to the UMNO 1953 general assembly, the Tunku stressed the need for the Malays to consider working together with the non-Malays since they formed 60 per cent of the population at that point in time. The Tunku also asked the Malays to think it seriously if they could win independence on their own. According to the Tunku:
Do you feel that they (non-Malays) with their intellectual and economic power would be content to accept the position of under dogs? I am afraid they would not. They would naturally protest. And if trouble comes as a result of this, how are we going to settle it? Winning independence is not difficult. But to keep Malaya happy and peaceful after independence would prove much more difficult. Therefore I say it would be better for us to try and work out together a plan for Malaya which would give a proper share to everyone and make for the happiness of all the people. We must not only start well; we must end well too. We have lived in peace with the other races all these years. Everybody has his own pursuit. The Malays are the first to patronize a Chinese shop and the Chinese are the first to approach a policeman. So why cannot go on in future as happily as we doing at present?[140]

However, the UMNO-MCA alliance did receive criticisms from some segment of the Malay community. For example, at a meeting sponsored by UMNO which was held in Johore Bahru in August of 1953, and attended by nine Malay political bodies, several delegates attacked UMNO for failure to consult other Malay political bodies before forming an alliance with the MCA on the question of independence. This UMNO sponsored meeting of Malay organizations was an attempt to win the support of dissident Malay organizations for the UMNO-MCA sponsored "National Convention".[141] On the contrary, the delegates were critical of UMNO's policies. This was due to the fact that after Onn's resignation from UMNO, the Malay communal nationalists had expected that UMNO would revert to a militant form of Malay nationalism such as that expounded by UMNO during the height of the Malay opposition to the Malayan Union. However, the expectations of these Malay nationalists did not materialize since UMNO entered into an alliance with the MCA shortly after Onn's resignation. The ultra-communal Malays were in a quandary and vacillated between support for UMNO as the strongest Malay political organization, and opposition to UMNO for its close association with the MCA. Some of these Malays were active within UMNO, particularly its ancillary Youth Movement. The Peninsular Malays Union (PMU) became the center of Malay communal chauvinism, attracting both public attention and the active support of ultra-communal Malays, including many members of UMNO. The PMU argued that national independence was strictly a question to be decided between the Malays and the British since Britain's power in the Malay States depended upon treaties with the Malay Rulers as the heads of the Malay States. The delegates were also dissatisfied with details in the

---

[139] The Tunku made these comments while he was addressing the UMNO 1953 General Assembly. See Straits Echo and Times of Malaya, April 4, 1955.

[140] The Tunku as quoted in The Malay Mail, September 13, 1953.

[141] The UMNO-MCA sponsored National Convention to counter the National Conference which had been organized earlier under the leadership of the *Mentris Besar*. Just as the *Mentris Besar* sponsored National Conference invited all parties to join, so too did the Alliance-sponsored National Convention. Likewise, the representation in both was weighed in favor of the sponsors. For the National Convention the MCA had fourteen votes, UMNO had fourteen votes and all other parties who were willing to participate were given two votes each. See The Straits Times, August 5, 1953. For further readings on the National Convention, see Gordon P. Means, Malaysian Politics, pp. 143-149.

UMNO made resolutions and suggested amendments to it. The UMNO made resolutions pledged that all-democratic Malayan political party to work by peaceful and constitutional means to attain a sovereign independent state, comprising the Malay States and settlements in the federation within the British Commonwealth. It also pledged to protect and uphold the principles of a fully democratic self-government and to minimize the conflicting claims of various communities and to protect the rights of minorities. The delegates said that these resolutions indicated that UMNO was unwilling to set a target date for independence. They suggested that 1957 be made the target for full-independence and that national election be held in 1954 as a first step towards this goal. The delegates also attacked the UMNO proposal in the resolution that free Malaya should remain within the Commonwealth. Most of all, the delegates deplored the UMNO-MCA alliance's failure to invite all Malay political bodies to the national convention whereas other non-Malay minority parties had been invited.[142] These criticisms leveled at UMNO by some segments of the Malay community, the ultra-nationalists in particular, demonstrated that UMNO was slowly taking accommodative steps toward working together with other races in an attempt to maintain the fiction that its policies were the authoritative representation of nationalist sentiment in Malaya. As a result of its accommodative stance, at the UMNO general assembly in October 1954, the party president Tunku Abdul Rahman came under sharp criticism for being too vague on policy matters and for not insisting upon a more positive program to preserve and promote Malay interests. His critics within the party wanted him to demand that the Alliance draft a concrete program committed to Malay special rights and the adoption of Malay as the official language of the country.[143] In this context we can put into perspective Michels' thesis that in well-established organizations, a process of "substitution of ends" comes about: whereas the official aims of the party may give way to other official aims (a process usually defined as a succession of ends) as a result of consistent organizational transformation, no party can effect a genuine substitution of ends without such transformation. In this case UMNO had substituted its original aim of Malay communal solidarity to another official aim of gaining independence—from a phase where organizational identity prevail to a phase where organizational objectives are vague and often contradictory. While UMNO's independent struggle may not be at the expense of its Malay communal solidarity, one can only speculate on the reasons for the contradiction between UMNO's official goal (ideology) and its subsequent stance of practical accommodation on gaining independence. It is doubtful whether UMNO's leadership had wanted the Malay community to be elevated to the position of a Malay nation. It may have been that UMNO leaders valued practical ideology more highly than pure or that the emphasis on Malay nationalism was a shield for not emphasizing it in practice.

The federal election of 1955 was another occasion where UMNO had to side step its pro-Malay policies in order to accommodate the UMNO-MCA-MIC alliance. In order to prepare for the federal elections of 1955, the power of the Alliance was dependent upon the cooperation and agreement among its three partners because all in all seven parties had participated in that election. Numerically, Alliance's closest rival was Onn's latest party—Party Negara—organized this along Malay communal lines with thirty candidates then followed by the Pan-Malayan Islamic Party (PMIP) with eleven candidates. Eighteen independents also contested.[144] Tunku and the Alliance had two objectives: to win by a large enough majority to avoid the consequences of having to form a coalition government, probably with their chief rival, Onn's Party Negara, and to avoid any breakup of the Alliance which could result in an alternative alliance of Party Negara-MCA-MIC. As such, internal party discipline and cohesion

[142] Nine Malay political bodies met in Johore Bahru to discuss Malaya's independent and the future of Malaya. It was an historic meeting because it was the first time so many Malay political bodies have got together to discuss their national future. It was also unusual because no decision was taken at the meeting. Suggestions made will be tabled before a meeting of the UMNO-MCA Alliance on August 15, 1953. Parties attending the meeting included the All-Malayan Islamic Association, The Peninsular Malays Union, The *Gabongan Persekutuan Pemuda Melayu Kelantan, The Lembaga, Kesatuan Melayu Johore*, The Selangor Malay Union, The Malay Graduates Association, and *The Persekutuan Persetian Melayu Kelantan*. See The Straits Times, August 15, 1953.

[143] The Straits Times, October 18, 1954.

[144] Sunday Times, June 5, 1955.

became the major task of the leadership of the three parties comprising the Alliance.[145] The intra-Alliance tension was greatest when its National Council set about the task of allocating seats on the ticket to each respective party. As such, heated debate on the allocation of seats to the MCA dominated the UMNO general assembly in June 1955. The UMNO rank and file had asked their representatives to allocate only 10 seats to the MCA, threatening a revolt if more seats were given.[146] For the 52 seats to be contested, the Alliance National Council was reported to have selected 40 Malay candidates, 12 Chinese candidates, and no Indian candidates. Despite the favorable ratio of Malays on the Alliance ticket, the dissident elements in UMNO demanded that Malays should be nominated for at least 42 of the 52 positions.[147] In his response to the dissenting groups, the Tunku spoke out vigorously against those who were leaning toward a "Malay only policy" and were attempting to revive the "Malaya for the Malays" policies which had been characteristic of UMNO in its pre-Alliances days.[148] According to Tunku:

Some of our own people have been influenced by certain elements that we must have all the seats in the council. All the seats must be for Malays. Some other had suggested that only 10 percent of the seats contested should go to MCA and MIC. At the general assembly in Penang last year there was no mention of this. It is something which has cropped up of late now that we are very close to the elections. There has been an opinion expressed that if the MCA disagreed with the Malays' suggestion, we will break the Alliance. They say let the Chinese contest the election alone.[149]

The Tunku justified the compromised that the leadership had to make on the question of seats allotted to the MCA on the grounds of independence. He reminded the Malays in UMNO that if they want independence, they must not think on the question of seats alone stressing that the appearance of independence was within their grasp but any false moves could see it vanish.[150] At this juncture, one could clearly see that the leadership of UMNO had placed great emphasis on gaining "independence". In other words, we can say that independence was used to cloud the issue about the nation being a Malay or Malayan entity as the Tunku was not willing to commit himself on this. In order to achieve independence, UMNO's pro-Malay policies had to give way to the environmental conditions in which the party exists. As such, the party had to placate the political demands of the non-Malays. Being a political party set on assuring its survival, balancing the demands of its numerous actors and thereby guaranteeing the interests of organizational continuity, the party must reach a compromise with its external environment and must adapt to it. The party leaders, from this perspective, have no interests in jeopardizing organizational stability with offensive strategies that might provoke equally offensive strategies from threatened groups. [151] In order to maintain the viability of UMNO-MCA-MIC alliance, the leadership of UMNO was forced to take disciplinary action by expelling several disappointed UMNO members who filed nomination papers as independents. At least one of these expelled UMNO members had been leading critic of UMNO's cooperation with the MCA and had been attempting to persuade Malay voters not to vote for any non-Malays even though they might be running on the Alliance ticket.[152] Since the party is also an instrument for the realization of its official aims—upon which the loyalties nourished by collective incentives (one participates because one identifies with the cause of the organization)—UMNO cannot passively adapt to its environment, but must inevitably develop domination activities. UMNO was, moreover, pushed in this direction by its organizational "official aim" which defines its specific portion of the environment in which the party stakes its claims, and

---

[145] For a complete account of the 1955 of the federal legislative council elections, see Diane K. Mauzy, Barisan Nasional: Coalition Government in Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Marican & Sons, 1983). See also Gordon P. Means, Malaysian Politics (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970), pp. 153-167.

[146] The Straits Times, June 6, 1955.

[147] Ibid.

[148] The Sunday Times, June 5, 1955.

[149] The Malay Mail, June 4, 1955.

[150] Ibid.

[151] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 11.

[152] The two expelled members were Haji Abdullah Abbas and Idris bin Hakim, both of Kedah. See The Straits Times, June 17, 1955 and June 14, 1955.

with respect to which UMNO's organization identity was defined both "internally" (in its members' eye) and "externally" (in the eyes of the electorate).[153] It was this respect to this same domain that UMNO's conflictual relationships (based on competition for the same resources) and cooperative relationships (based on exchange of different resources) with other political organizations were established. UMNO, as we have seen, was formed to protect Malay power and status—the party's stake lies in the fact that it should be seen as fighting for the Malay cause as the participation of much of the rank and file in the party could be persuasively explained in terms of their adherence to the party's official goals, in terms of adherence to party's official goals, in terms of organizational identification and solidarity. However, it is apparent from the previous discussions that a sudden desire for independence and the need for electoral success of the Alliance did much to foster, brought about this change in UMNO's policy. If the policy was not quite one of independence whatever the cost—as indeed it appeared to many Malays within and outside UMNO—it allowed UMNO a quite extraordinary flexibility in its relations with Malays and non-Malays. Nevertheless, as Panebianco had pointed out, the first internal function of the official organizational aim is that of maintaining the identity of the organization in the eyes of its supporters.[154] As such, UMNO's relationship with the non-Malay political organizations should not obscure the fact that UMNO sought not merely to perpetuate the symbols of Malay supremacy but also to portray the image that the Malays as a race distinct from other races in the country. This has already been illustrated in noting the Tunku's reluctance to use the word "Malayan" or accept that citizenship should be based on nationality. Even though the Tunku has been justly acclaimed for his preparedness to work together with non-Malays, his views on Malay nationalism have tended to go unrecognized. In 1954, he expressed regret at the publication of a book that referred to Malays as a community rather than a nation,[155] and in a book he asserts categorically that Malaya "is a Malay country…"[156] John Funston has aptly phrased the basis of UMNO's struggle:
The theory of nationalism pursued by UMNO is a broad concept, in accord with the methods of democratic government and international acceptance, that is, while striving for privileges, sovereignty and priority (*hak, kedaulatan, keistimewaan*) of Malays as the owners of this country, UMNO also acknowledges that members of other races who have already become citizens, those who have severed all connections and loyalty to their country of origin, also shall receive specified rights as citizens of Malaya.[157]

In the case of UMNO, the organization's original aims are never abandoned, nor do they become a mere façade. Rather, they were adapted to the organizational needs; the rule seems to be that goals were somehow maintained but lose a little something in being translated into organizational requirements.[158] UMNO continually engaged in certain activities related to these aims, for it was precisely upon these activities that the party's collective identity and leadership's legitimacy were based. The party aims were always, however, pursued *sub condicione*, that is, they were pursued only on the condition that their pursuit did not jeopardize the organization. In the course of their articulation, official aims become—with respect to the genetic phase of the party (Chapter 2) vaguer. The organizational aims, which was manifest (involving explicit and coherent objectives) always becomes latent (involving implicit and contradictory objectives).[159] More importantly, a permanent gap opens between official aims and organizational behavior. The relationship between aims and behavior never completely disappears; it attenuates.[160] The correspondence of a party's behavior to its official aims is constantly

---

[153] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 11.

[154] Ibid.

[155] Warta Negara, December 20, 1954. The claim was made by Dato' Senu b. Abdul Rahman in "Falsafah Perjuangan UMNO" in UMNO 20 Tahun, p. 55.

[156] See Tunku Abdul Rahman, May 13 Before and After (Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Utusan Melayu, 1969), p. 149.

[157] See John Funston, Malay Politics in Malaysia: A Study of UMNO and PAS (Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann Educational Books, 1980), p. 139.

[158] See T. J. Lowi, The Politics of Disorder (New York: Norton Co., 1971), p. 49.

[159] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 16.

[160] Ibid.

reaffirmed by its leaders, but only these course of action—amongst the many possible that the party may choose to achieve its official aims—which were compatible with the organization's stability were selected.[161] For instance, the recurrent pattern we find in UMNO during the 1950s is better understood as the result of an articulation of aims: on the one hand, the original goal (Malay solidarity/rights) was constantly evoked as it is the basis of the movement's collective identity but on the other hand the chosen courses of action, pragmatic and guaranteed organizational stability without taking credibility away from the notion that one was still working towards the official aims. This explains the Tunku's contradictory statements toward communal issues. On the one hand, Tunku Abdul Rahman made a communal appeal for the support of the Malays, stressing such issues as the "alien danger" and the threat to the Malays posed by the immigration of "foreigners". On the other hand, he defended the Alliance manifesto which attributed the "alien danger" to the restrictive citizenship requirements which made it difficult for non-Malays to acquire full status as citizens of the Malay states (the legal and accepted name of the country was Persekutuan Tanah Melayu). Thus, the leadership of UMNO tended to utilize the "foreign threat" issue in appealing to the Malays, but hastened to explain to its MCA and MIC members that the loyal Chinese and Indians in these two organizations were not a part of that "foreign threat". In addition, the Malays, UMNO members in particular, were constantly reminded that they must realize that they had the power and right to govern the country and had much more to gain form independence. As such, they (the Malays) should not be worried about working together with other races because the non-Malays will not submerge them.[162] The Alliance impressive victory at the 1955 federal elections[163] was a testament of UMNO's image of safeguarding the Malay interests and its independence stand, and its past electoral successes for the registered electorate in 1955 comprised approximately 84 per cent Malays, 11 per cent Chinese and less than 5 per cents Indians.[164] As such, too few non-Malays were eligible to vote for it to be regarded as a real test of non-Malay support and the Alliance concept because "enough Malays voted for Alliance non-Malays, often competing against Malay candidate, for all 17 non-Malays to win—the Malay voted for Alliance because UMNO told them to do".[165]

UMNO and the Citizenship Proposal

In the Alliance manifesto entitled "The Road to Independence" promulgated for the first fedral elections of 1955, the Alliance promised independence within four years.[166] The overwhelming victory of the Alliance in the elections of July 1955 can be attributed to a large extent to their ability to identify themselves more successfully than their opponents with the struggle for independence. The British had recognized that Alliance attitudes toward ethnic relations and electoral practices were probably best that could be cultivated, particularly as their own tutelary influence was waning. The drafting of a constitution for independent Malaya was therefore left almost completely to bargaining among Alliance members,[167] a task merely formalized by the British and Commonwealth officials who sat on the

---

[161] Ibid.

[162] The Straits Times, August 15, 1953.

[163] Means records that the Alliance won 51 of the 52 elected positions on the council enabling Tunku Abdul Rahman to serve as chief minister until 1970. See Gordon P. Means, Malaysian Politics, p. 153.

[164] These figures were obtained from R. K. Vasil, Politics in a Plural Society (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 56-64.

[165] Quoted from Diane K. Mauzy, Barisan Nasional: Coalition Government in Malaysia, p. 26.

[166] *Menuju Ke arah Kemerdekaan* (Kuala Lumpur: Alliance National Council, n.d.).

[167] When the Colonial Secretary, Mr. A. Lennox-Boyd, visited Malaya a month after the elections, the Alliance Government informed him of its desire to send a delegation to London to duscuss constitutional reform. At the inauguration of the newly elected Legislative Council, Tunku Abdul Rahman reiterated the Alliance request for negotiations between an Alliance delegation and Whitehall to consider the terms of reference for a review of the constitution by an independent commission. Meanwhile, Mr. Lennox Boyd had discussed this proposal with the Malay Rulers, who indicated their willingness to consider the problem of further revision of the Federation Agreement. However, the Rulers were unwilling to have negotiations conducted by a Malayan delegation composed only of the Alliance members. Ultimately, agreement was reached on an eight-member delegation, four representing the Rulers and four representing the Alliance Government.

Reid Commission.[168] The blow by blow account of how the bargaining process for independence was conducted between the Malayan delegation, the Colonial Secretary, the High Commissioner and the United Kingdom Minister of State, need not be repeated here. What is more important for us to consider for the purpose of this study is how UMNO as a political party that was born as a social movement opposing the creation of Malayan Union because it was seen as a threat to the *bangsa* and *kebangsaan* Melayu as it would give the non-Malays citizenship rights in the Malay states come to terms with the citizenship proposal proposed by the Reid Commission. The proposal would give citizenship to all persons born in Malaya after independence and non citizens might attain citizenship by the following requirements: (i) residing five to eight years in Malaya; (ii) taking oath of allegiance; (iii) renouncing foreign citizenship; and (iv) passing an elementary examination in the Malay language.[169] It could arguably be said that the citizenship proposal would give rise to what Benedict Anderson has defined as the new nation of our imagination as a sovereign but limited community, an essentially abstract mental construct because it had given birth to a Malayan identity. According to Anthony D. Smith, historically the nation and nationalism were Western concepts and Western formations. The first steps, the first trajectories, towards nationhood, were also Western.[170] To the Malays, however, the Malay States (*Tanah Melayu*) belong to the Malays and the non-Malays were seen as *bangsa asing* (foreign races) who could be given citizenship rights but on the other hand, could never be accepted as *anak negeri* (sons of the state).[171] The Reid Commission citizenship proposal had in actual fact envisaged "a common nationality" that presupposed the sense of solidarity and fraternity upon attachment to the land and an affiliation with the community, a sense of brotherhood, which could only be found among those whose parents (and perhaps grandparents or even ancestors) had done so.[172] In other words, as Anthony D. Smith has argued convincingly, the newly arrived, though formal citizens, could never be part of the *pays reel* of the solidarity community of residents by birth; and just as in ancient Athens, laws had been passed to limit citizenship to those whose parents had been Athenians, so the first revolutionary impulse in France to grant citizenship on the basis of an ideological affinity later gave way to a growing sense of historical, even genealogical, community, based long residence and ethnic ancestry.[173] The Malay states was, at this point in time, a society dominated by communal cleavages with each group (Malays, Chinese, and Indians) having its outlook on its physical and human environment, and, at least in the case of Malays and Chinese, a belief system which made monopolistic demands upon its members. All along, the solidarity of Malays and Chinese was unquestionably reinforced by the historical development of their communities on the Malay Peninsula. In any case, the Reid Commission citizenship proposal would spell absolute membership, and legal equality of rights and duties as befits a resident member and active participant. As a result, citizenship exercised a leveling influence, binding classes and strata into a common community of theoretical equals and insiders.[174] How does a political party that opposes a creation of a common citizenship as one of its original aims come to terms with the Reid Commission's citizenship proposal? Naturally, there were groups within the Malay community and even within UMNO that could not accept the Reid Commission's citizenship proposal. Ironically, one of the leading critics of the citizenship proposal was Onn b. Jaafar, UMNO's first president who was then leader of *Parti Negara*—a party opposed to UMNO. Onn said, "if this action of UMNO is not stopped (in accepting the Reid Commission's citizenship proposal), the Alliance will in due course, be nailing the coffin of the Malay community. When the Malay community realizes what has happened to it and its country (assuming that the pro-

---

[168] The five members of the Commission were Sir Ivor Jennings from the United Kingdom, Sir William McKell from Australia, Mr. B. Malik from India, Mr. Justice Abdul Hamid from Pakistan, and the Chairman, Lord Reid, from the United Kingdom. See The Straits Times, July 18, 1956.

[169] Report of the Federation of Malaya Constitutional Commission, Appendices II, III, and IV (Kuala Lumpur: Government Press, 1957), pp. 128-133, Articles 14-23.

[170] See Anthony D. Smith, The Ethnic Origins of Nations (Great Britain: Alan Sutton Publishing Ltd., 1986), p. 144.

[171] See Majlis, October 3, 1945.

[172] Anthony D. Smith, The Ethnic Origins of Nations, p. 136.

[173] Ibid.

[174] Anthony D. Smith, The Ethnic Origins of Nations, p. 139.

posals are approved) I believe that not only the Malays who are living today, but also their descendants will weep without end".[175] In an editorial, a Malay newspaper, the *Warta Negara* argued:
The Malays should remember that if they could have fought single-handedly against the Malayan Union, there is no reason why they could not fight to defend their rights and sovereignty from perishing. The Malays must ponder and reflect over the consequences of the independence which fulfils these demands (the demands of the non-Malays principally jus soli). This is the time when the *raayat* must either give their support or make their protestation freely and unequivocally. We must raise our hands now or never. Our leaders think that all what they do are good for the *raayat* and they think that they are the only people who are broadminded. At the moment when Malay leaders had become more influential, the voices of the *raayat* began to fade, the hands of the *raayat* got tied up and their lips sealed. While other races who were already better off than the Malays shouting at the top of their voices and hammering the table to emphasize their demands, Malays were being asked by their leaders to adopt a policy of give and take, to keep quiet and be patient.[176]

The opinion that was expressed above was directed to the Malays urging them to speak up and chose to upbraid the leaders in UMNO for trying to gag them. This was due to the fact that the Reid Commission's proposals had incorporated so many of the Alliance recommendations and it was felt that UMNO and the National Council of the Alliance had failed to satisfy Malay interests in their memorandum to the Reid Commission, the body entrusted with the formation of the constitution. The strong voices adopted by the *Warta Negara* or the views expressed by Onn were by no means isolated voices in the wilderness. The Penang Malays Association for instance, fears that "if the demands now being made by non-Malay organizations were fruitful the Malays could no longer regard this country as theirs".[177] Even within UMNO, in spite of warning from the leaders that disciplinary action would be taken against those who failed to toe the party line, there was a great deal of dissention. For instance, the Selangor UMNO called upon the UMNO headquarters to summon an emergency meeting of the All-Malayan delegates to decide on the stand to be taken on the *jus soli* issue. The Selangor UMNO was of the view that if jus soli was adopted, the special position of the Malays will be affected because its acceptance (jus soli) would make an estimated 450,000 Chinese state nationals.[178] Abdullah b. Hj. Yassin of the Selangor UMNO pointed out that the Malays were generally opposed to *jus soli* because "fears have already been expressed by the community, I had warn the UMNO representatives at the meeting to go back to their villages and kampongs and tell the people to have faith in the leaders. I made it clear that there is nothing to worry for the time being, they in turn wanted to know the reasons for *the jus soli* demand".[179] The Selangor UMNO also disagreed giving the full authority to the UMNO executive committee to make a decision on the report before independence because the members of the Selangor UMNO felt that the Reid issue (the citizenship proposal) should be decided after independence when every detail in the report would have been studied by the Malays as this was only possible after the Malay translation of the report has been available and the Alliance Government should wait for this.[180] The Selangor UMNO was not the only state that decided not to give complete authority to the executive committee to go ahead and make the Reid Report as the basis for the constitution of independent Malaya. Negeri Sembilan UMNO put up the same stand as Selangor and even went a step further when at the March 1956 UMNO general assembly that was held to consider the Reid Commission's report, the delegates from Negeri Sembilan staged a walkout in protest against UMNO's attitude.[181] According to the secretary of the Negeri Sembilan UMNO, Dato Raja Mohamed Hanifah, the walkout was a testament of Negeri Sembilan UMNO's commitment to safeguard the

[175] Onn b. Jaafar, as quoted in Straits Times and Echo of Malaya, April 13, 1956.

[176] Warta Negara, as quoted in Straits Echo and Times of Malaya, April 21, 1956.

[177] Straits Echo and Times of Malaya, September 1, 1956.

[178] Malay Mail, April, 2, 1956.

[179] Malay Mail, April 2, 1956.

[180] Malay Mail, April 11, 1957.

[181] Straits Echo and Times of Malaya, April 13, 1956.

rights and special privileges of the Malays in their own country.[182] As Chandra Muzaffar has argued, it is patently clear that opposition to *jus soli* within the Malay community was severe and serious compared to disagreement over previous attempts to liberalize citizenship in the early fifties. In a sense, this was understandable for the concept of citizenship by birth was the irrefutable right of the indigenous community. It was the Malay badge of loyalty, others had to earn the right to war it.[183] As such, certain groups within the Malay community objected vehemently against *jus soli* proposal, they argued that they has given too much felt that the Malay leadership in UMNO continued to demonstrate a great deal of tolerance with each new concession, with each new amendment to existing citizenship laws culminating *in jus soli* itself. Some segment of the Malay community felt that while the Chinese and other non-Malays were vehemently demanding the implementation of the principle of jus soli and while MCA and MIC branches were allowed to voice their criticism freely, the Malays on the other hand, were not allowed to do so. If the Malays were forced under disciplinary measures to follow their leaders blindly and be subjected to constant scolding, the psychological effect upon the Malays would eventually cause them to be like ancient Jews under the tyrannical rule of the Pharaoh.[184] We may now put into perspective Michel's thesis that the party regarded as an entity, as a mechanism is not necessarily identifiable with the totality of its members and still less so with the class to which these belong.[185] In the case of UMNO, its leadership was criticized by the head of Kampong Bahru division of UMNO, Tuan Hj. Yahya b. Sheikh Ahmad, for steering UMNO out of its original course. According to Yahya, he viewed with grave concern the deviation of UMNO from the stand enunciated by Tunku Abdul Rahman in first presidential speech in 1951 namely (i) that in considering the aspiration of the non-Malays, the Malays should realize what will happen to them, (ii) that this is a Malay country and Malays must be given special privileges, (ii) that the time has arrived when the Malays must realize their position and existence and must demand in full what has been promised to them, (iv) that the Malays must realize what will happen to them and must therefore hold fast to their aspirations so that the sovereignty of this country will be returned to them, and finally (v) that in demanding independence, the Malays must not sell their honor. Haji Yahya went on to say that UMNO's policy of give and take was far from the one originally set and this has caused grave concern to the Malays. In addition, the proposals submitted by the National Council of the UMNO-MCA-MIC alliance and the acceptance of most of those proposed by the Reid Commission were viewed with even greater concern as these were against the interests of the Malays.[186]

Despite the overwhelming protestation over the Reid Commission's citizenship proposal, the UMNO general assembly gave the Tunku and his executive committee complete authority to go ahead and make the Reid's report as the basis for the constitution of independent Malaya, however, at least three states passed a resolution that the Reid Report should be discussed after independence.[187] We now see UMNO in its course of its organizational development tend to go from an initial period in which certain needs prevail to a subsequent period in which different needs prevail. The Tunku had managed to placate the unhappy feelings of UMNO's rank and file by assuring the Malays that they had nothing to lose but on the other hand a lot to gain in independent Malaya—even more striking was the Tunku's reference to UMNO and how it differed to other political organizations "although an all Malay party the UMNO has at heart the interests not only of the Malays but also the non-Malays. It is on this basis that we lay down our policies. Malaya cannot achieve a peaceful and prosperous independence without the co-operation of the various races in the country".[188] How can one explain this sudden turnabout in UMNO's attitude? We could attribute this to Michel's argument that every party is destined

---

[182] Malay Mail, April 16, 1957.

[183] Chandrasekaran Pillay, Protection of the Malay Community: A Study of UMNO's Position and Oppositon Attitudes, Master of Social Sciences thesis submitted at the Universiti Sains Malaysia Penang, 1974, p. 35.

[184] These views were expressed in an editorial of Warta Negara as quoted in Straits Echo and Times of Malaya, April 21, 1956.

[185] Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy, p. 389.

[186] Malay Mail, April 12, 1957.

[187] Malay Mail, March 29, 1957.

[188] Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra, as quoted in the Malay Mail, April 12, 1957.

to pass from a genetic phase, in which the organization is entirely dedicated to the realization of its cause to a later phase in which (a) the growth of the party's size, (b) its bureaucratization, (c) the apathy of its supports after their initial participatory enthusiasm, and (d) the leader's interest in preserving their own power, transform the party into an organization in which the real end is organizational survival.[189] In a society dominated by communal cleavages, UMNO had to make certain compromises for the party to be seen as representing the interests of all communal groups in the country. This was done by forming an alliance with the other two communal base parties, namely the MCA and the MIC. In order to ensure the viability of the Alliance, UMNO had to tone down its ultra-communal demands and this had enraged some groups within the party. For UMO to maintain its image as a "protector" of the Malay community, the party declared that it will never agree to amend or bargain with the MCA and MIC in their memorandum to the Reid Commission on the following: (i) Islam as the official religion of independent Malaya; (ii) Malay as the official and national language; and (iii) the special position of the Malays to be preserved.[190]

As Gordon P. Means has argued, we may note that the highly explosive issue of citizenship was settled by creating, in effect, a single nationality with provisions to enable all persons in Malaya to qualify for citizenship, either by birth or by fulfilling requirements of residences, language and oath of loyalty. The implications of those provisions were clear. The proportion of citizens from non-Malay communities would steadily rise. It was a major concession by the Malays to agree to such liberal citizenship requirements. UMNO was persuaded to accept these provisions on the understanding that the constitution would contain other sections which would give the Malays special privileges.[191]

UMNO: Internal Structure and Centralizing Tendencies.

Max Weber has pointed out that "active leadership and freely recruited following are necessary elements in the life of any party". Structure as the mark of party exists as a relatively durable or regularized relationship between leaders and followers. For example, in the United States of America, it has developed as a pattern of stable connections or relations between leaders at the center of government and lesser leaders, party workers or cadremen, and active participants at the outposts in states, counties, and towns.[192] In the 1950s, UMNO had undergone some substantial changes because the party had moved toward the performance of certain critical functions. At a minimum, these functions include nominating candidates and campaigning in the electoral arena. In order to win elections and to win support for policies it may espouse, parties operating in a society with a significant measure of pluralism must find formulas of agreement that will bring disparate groups together or play broker in gratifying, adjusting, or compromising conflicting interests.[193] A major revision to UMNO constitution was done in 1955. The 1955 constitution, in effect, provided for the formation of a central executive for each state called the State Executive Committee. At this juncture, the UMNO central headquarters would deal with more general policies and leave the individual state matters to the state concerned. Under the 1949 UMNO constitution, the various divisions of UMNO were under the direct control of the headquarters. With the 1955 amendments, however, the control of divisional organizations passes into the hands of the respective state executive bodies.[194] This development demonstrated a continuous tug between the national and state party leaders on the extent of central direction over lower party bodies. For example, the 1955 UMNO constitution gave the central UMNO headquarters direct control over its Youth and Women sections and the overall changes embodied in that constitu-

---

[189] Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy, p. 389.

[190] Malay Mail, September 18, 1956.

[191] See Gordon P. Means, Malaysian Politics, p. 177.

[192] See William Nisbet Chambers, Political Parties in a New Nation: The American Experience, 1776-1809 (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 45-51.

[193] Ibid.

[194] See *Undang-undong Tunoh Pertubohan Kebangsaan Melayu Bersatu Malaya—Dipersetuju dan diluluskan oleh Perhimpunan Agong UMNO di-Kuala Lumpur pada 25 dan 26 Diesember 1955*. *Senarai fail UMNO Siri Setiausaha Agung Tahun* 1946-1961, 1963 UMNO/SG/No. 18/49 Arkib Negara Malaysia Kuala Lumpur.

tion were that the UMNO Youth and Women sections would have wider representation in the general assembly.[195] This acceptance of the new constitution by UMNO youth leaders was seen as a major victory for the UMNO headquarters because the Youth section had criticized the move as an attempt by the parent body to control them.[196] This was due to the fact that prior to 1955, the Youth movement had showed some independence, generally taking a more communal line than its parent body. Its prominent role at this time gave rise to some fear that Saron b. Hj. Jubir, elected to leadership in 1951, was attempting to use the Youth to further the interests of a communally oriented group within UMNO led by himself.[197]

The move to centralize UMNO in 1955 should be seen as an attempt to control electioneering at almost all levels by the central body. The UMNO headquarters wanted to set up divisional organizations in the federal constituencies which branches in all polling station areas. It was seemed as a logical order of battle for the 1955 federal elections for, by giving the state UMNO greater powers, the central body hoped to overcome the problem of local loyalties.[198] This corresponds to a practice Duverger refers to as the generally accepted notion of decentralization that is characterized by the following factors: the local leaders of the party come from the bottom and they enjoy wide powers. As such the center has little control over them and the fundamental decisions are taken by them. However, this local decentralization sometimes has an important influence on the political attitude of the party because it makes for parochialism, that is to say it directs the party's energies towards questions of purely local interests at the expense of great national and international questions.[199]

In addition, the extensive powers over state affairs given to the State Executive Committee under the 1955 UMNO constitution stimulated the growth of separate state machines and in some states, resulted in prolonged factional fights over the control of the State Executive Committee. For example, in 1958, steps were taken by the UMNO headquarters to form a special caretaker committee to reorganize Kedah UMNO which faced a domestic crisis. The trouble began when a sub-committee recommended that Kedah constitution should be amended so that nominated officials in the state council would be replaced by Alliance nominees. This in-fighting led to the expulsion of the Chairman of Kedah UMNO Tuan Syed Ahmad Shahabudin, the secretary Johari b. Hj. Salleh, deputy chairman Mohamed Zahir Ismail, and state publicity officer, Shaik Osman b. Ibrahim, by the State Executive Committee. In his turn, the expelled chairman declared that his expulsion and that of the secretary null and void.[200] On its part, the UMNO headquarters responded to this crisis first, by dissolving the Kedah UMNO Executive Committee, and second, by forming a caretaker committee that would act as the state UMNO executive committee.[201] Similarly, Negeri Sembilan UMNO also faced a domestic crisis in 1956 when the Tampin division of UMNO passed a vote of no confidence on the Negeri Sembilan State Executive Committee. The decision followed the rejection by the State Executive Committee the six names submitted to the state ruler for nomination in the Negeri Sembilan State Executive Council as demanded by the Tampin division. The State UMNO Executive Committee, however, maintained that the responsibility to nominate members for the state executive council lies with elected councilors. It said that elected councilors had the right to choose the names without having to consult members of UMNO State Executive Committee, less still Executive Committees of the party's division.[202]

These prolonged factional fights over the control of State Executive Committee prompted the party leadership at the central level to change the UMNO constitution in order to strengthen central control.

---

[195] Malay Mail, December 27, 1955.

[196] Ibid.

[197] See John Funston, Malay Politics in Malaysia: A Study of UMNO and PAS, p. 176.

[198] The Straits Times, October 15, 1954.

[199] Maurice Duverger, Political Parties, p. 53.

[200] The Straits Times, September 26, 1958.

[201] Malay Mail, October 25, 1958.

[202] Malay Mail, October 30, 1956.

One of the arguments mooted by the UMNO headquarters against the 1955 UMNO constitution was that it decentralizes the party. In addition, it was also argued that the 1955 UMNO constitution had given rise to autonomous power to the state organization.[203] On his part, the Tunku argued that the 1955 constitution had resulted in the state leaders adopting provincial policies which were contrary to the UMNO national policies as a whole. For example, the Tunku referred to the decisions made by the various UMNO state organizations on the eighth schedule of the federal constitution concerning the composition of the state executive councils and state legislative assemblies. Some states had chosen the final provisions of the schedule which provided for fully elected state executive council and state legislative assembly. Others had plumped for the temporary provisions which stipulated a partly-elected state executive council and state legislative assembly. According to the Tunku:

> Most of the trouble in UMNO recently was because of this. The state organizations referred the matter to the headquarters only after they could not cope with the crisis. This is dangerous, the party will be divided if each state organization is allowed to frame its own policies without reference to the headquarters. Some of the Malay rulers had agreed to the final provision. Some did not. This matter should first be discussed among ourselves before it is submitted to the rulers.[204]

The extreme bickering and factionalism within UMNO must have been an object lesson to the party. As such, in 1960, a six-man committee was appointed by the UMNO headquarters to prepare a blueprint for the party's reorganization. Under the propose blueprint, UMNO would revert to its pre-1956 set-up by having state liaison committees in place of the state executive committee.[205] This new arrangement would give the UMNO national president the power to appoint chairman of all state organizations. The UMNO headquarters maintained that this new organizational set-up would put an end to party crisis, minimize cliques and most of all, streamline the organization's structure.[206] The new arrangement had in effect replaced the state organizations with state liaison committees. The state liaison committee would comprise of a chairman (appointed by the national president), a secretary and a treasurer (appointed by the chairman) and chairman of various divisions in the state. Hence, the UMNO post 1960 organizational set-up created a state liaison committee having minimal authority over the lower organs of the party. The Supreme Executive Council of the central organization was given full powers to determine policies, select candidates, supervise the lower organs, and settle party disputes.[207] This move to restructure UMNO was by no means plain sailing. For instance, the Penang UMNO had directed its delegates to the UMNO general assembly to oppose the amendment to the party's constitution that provide for state liaison committee to replace the state executive committee as Penang UMNO felt that the 1955 organizational set-up was satisfactory.[208] The Selangor UMNO also doubt the effectiveness of the move to restructure UMNO because "the abolition of state executive committees and their replacement with state liaison committees with no power at all does not fall in line with the federal set up of the government. The state executive committees are to help the state government. The Tunku's plan is alright if we have a Unitarian form of government in this country. However, as it is now the headquarters has direct control over the divisions in financial matters and the inefficiency of the headquarters has been responsible for UMNO's financial stringency".[209] In addition, the Malacca UMNO also opposed the abolition of the state executive committees. However, at the April 1960 UMNO general assembly, 84 delegates voted for the amendments while 14 candidates

---

[203] The Straits Times, February 10, 1959.

[204] The Tunku as quoted in The Straits Times, February 10, 1959.

[205] The Straits Times, January 19, 1960.

[206] The Straits Times, April 4, 1960.

[207] See The Constitution United Malays National Organization passed by the General Assembly at its thirteenth meeting on April 16 and 17, 1960—Chapter Six Article XV composition and functions of State Liaison Committee. UMNO/SG/No. 17/60—Arkib Negara Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur.

[208] The Straits Times, February 9, 1959.

[209] A spokesman from Selangor UMNO, as quoted in The Straits Times, October 16, 1959.

from Malacca and Selangor against.[210] In explaining their stance against the amendments, the Malacca and Selangor UMNO maintained that it was the work of the state UMNO's organizations' machinery that was responsible for the victory of the Alliance in all the states. They were of the opinion that the crises experienced by UMNO did not originate from the weakness of the state organization but from the selections of candidates for elections.[211]

In conclusion, Duverger has pointed out that there are two forms of centralization—one autocratic, the other democratic. In autocratic centralism, all decisions come from above, and their application is controlled by representative of the center. Democratic centralism, on the other hand, presupposes that very free discussion takes place at the base before decisions are taken in order to enlighten the center.[212] What are repercussions of the move to centralize UMNO in 1960? Does it lead to an autocratic or democratic form of centralization? These questions will be dealt with in the latter chapters, particularly Chapter 5.

[210] The Malay Mail, April 18, 1960.

[211] Ibid.

[212] Maurice Duverger, Political Parties, p. 52.

CHAPTER 4

UMNO: Post-Colonial Erosion of Ethnic Cooperation and UMNO's Strategy of Domination

It has been suggested that organizational development is strictly conditioned by the relations that the party establishes in the genetic phases and after by its interactions with other organizations and societal institutions. As such the relation between collective incentives (one participates because one identifies with the organization; one participates because one shares the political or social goals of the other participants; one participates because one identifies with the cause of the organization) and legitimacy is complicated. Collective incentives depend on the official goals. The official goals, however, in order to be credible, must be accompanied by an indication of the means to be used.[213]

Because UMNO was founded during the upsurge of Malay political and ethnic consciousness that accompanied the Malayan Union, the party attracted support from nearly all the elements that compose the Malay community. However, with the passing of time, UMNO developed very varied goals and interests. Nevertheless, UMNO was designed to be the political expression of Malay opinion (collective incentives) and in order to maintain its credibility as a Malay party *par excellence*, the party consistently advanced case for the Malays in the intra-Alliance negotiations on public policy. In one form or another, communalism has been a recurring issue that was particularly difficult for the Alliance Government. In part, this may be ascribed to the peculiar structure of the Alliance, composed as it was of communal political associations that took communal stands on political issues, but were generally willing to compromise their position to preserve the unity of the Alliance.

In this chapter, I will attempt to illustrate the "strains" and "stresses" of the long process of give-and-take negotiations between the three partners in the Alliance. Particular attention is given to the racial riot of May 1969 because "if you examine the May 13 riots, you will find that one body is making more economic demands whilst the other body is trying to exert demand for greater political rights. It so happens that these two groups are Malays and non-Malays. Viewed from that aspect it is also an economic and political clash because it is not so physically easy to identify this aspect which has been ignored by many people. Therefore, the struggle is still economic and politic rather than racial except that it appears to be racial".[214]

This chapter sought to demonstrate how UMNO was pushed to choose a political strategy of either adaptation or domination in its relation over its external environment. Panebianco has pointed out that every organization must, at least to some extent, develop a strategy of domination over its external environment. Such a strategy is generally manifested in a sort of disguised imperialism whose function is to reduce environmental uncertainty that is, to safeguard the organization from surprises, for example the challenges made by other organizations which may come from the environment. As such, every organization will thus be pushed by its relation with the external world in two different directions at the same time: it will be tempted both to colonize its environment through domination, and to "reach a pact" with it through adaptation.[215]

Post-colonial Erosion of Ethnic Cooperation

In Politics in *Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability,* Alvin Rabushka and Kenneth Shepsle underscore the importance in multiethnic settings of colonial rule and elite cooperation for stable and democratic regimes. According to Rabushka and Shepsle, "an ethnically divided society

---

[213] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power (London: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 40-42.

[214] This statement was made by Lim Kean Siew, a member of the Labor Party, shortly after the May 13th race riot in Bob Reece "Under the Skin", Far Eastern Economic Review, September 18, 1969, p. 697.

[215] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 58.

requires some external force to hold it together. Colonial rule is a prime candidate".[216] With decolonization, Rabushka and Shepsle argue that elite restrain and ethnic peace are inevitably eroded, albeit at variable speeds: gradually in what they conceptualize as bipolar, balanced ethnic configurations (for example, Malaysia, Guyana, and Belgium), and rapidly and rapidly in skewed configurations involving dominant majorities (for example, Sri Lanka and Northern Ireland) or dominant minority segments (for example, South Africa and Rhodesia). Hence Rabushka and Shepsle assert that democratic breakdown may be delayed by such conditions but that elites are unable to stave it off indefinitely. Indeed in their view, elites serve usually as the agents of divisive ethnic forces, ambitiously spearheading the corrosive process.[217] In the Malaysian case, they claim that this fated march on democratic breakdown was completed after twelve years of independence, culminating in the ethnic rioting of May 13, 1969.[218]

Rabushka and Shepsles's seminal study on democratic breakdown in plural societies has successfully identified an overall progress toward post-colonial destabilization in post-colonial plural societies that resulted in a regime form that is basically unstable and fully authoritarian. However, as William Case has successfully argued, while elite relations in Malaysia were doubtless tested at several junctures by ethnic tensions and power struggles, the longer record shows that these crises were largely resolved, that elites adjusted their relative statuses and game rules, and that regime stability and openness were renewed and extended.[219] While Case's observation rests largely on the ability of the governing elites in Malaysia to make the necessary adjustments to avoid the breakdown in consensual elite unity, he fails to address the issue of how UMNO as the backbone of first the tri-party Alliance, and later the multi-party Barisan Nasional was pushed to choose a political strategy of domination. This strategy was necessary in light of increasing ethnic polarization in the 1960s because as Rabushka and Shepsles assert, once local elites have together wrested independence from the colonial power, they will wheel to confront one another over the ethnic divide.[220] This is a phase specified by Rabushka and Shepsle as the steady escalation of ethnic demands into open communalism at the elite, subelite, and mass levels. They identify two opposing behaviors: first, ambitious politicians arousing ethnic grievances and pushing for access to decisional committees and second, the tendency among elites to pare their committees to a minimum proportion consistent with winning.[221]

What this chapter sought to demonstrate, however, is how UMNO as a political party which defines the Malay community as its "hunting domain" that is, the portion of the environment in which the party stakes its claims, and with respect to which its organizational identity is defined reacted to the pressures of communalism in the 1960s. These pressures came both from within the party as well as from the opposition. The most successful challenge to UMNO at the 1959 parliamentary elections came from the Pan-Malayan Islamic Party (PMIP).[222] Under the leadership of Dr. Buhanuddin Al-Helmy the PMIP began an extensive campaign to extend the base of its support and win voters away from UMNO. As such, UMNO and PMIP were involved in what Panebianco has identified as competition in the same domain, that is the party's conflictual relationships based on competition for the same resources (in this case their appeal to the Malay community), were established.[223] Under the leadership of Burhanuddin, PMIP played upon the two themes of Malay chauvinist nationalism and the political obligations of the state to preserve and promote Islam. According to Burhanuddin:

---

[216] Alvin Rabushka and Kenneth Shepsle, Politics in Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability (Columbus Ohio: Charles E. Merril, 1972).

[217] Ibid., p. 12.

[218] Ibid., p. 217.

[219] William Case, Elites and Regimes in Malaysia: Revisiting a Consociational Democracy (Clayton, Victoria: Monash Asia Institute, 1996), p. 88.

[220] Alvin Rabushka and Kenneth Shepsle, Politics in Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability, p. 74-75.

[221] Ibid., p. 81.

[222] For further readings on the origins of PMIP and its successor Parti Islam SeMalaysia or PAS, see John Funston, Malay Politics in Malaysia: A Study of UMNO and PAS (Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann Educational Books, 1981).

[223] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 13.

First and foremost it should be emphasized that Malaya belongs to the Malays and they are the masters in this country. It is to the Malays as the rightful owners that this country should be returned. The Malays should not be asked to pay for the mistake of the imperialists in bringing non-Malays into the country. This does not mean that we must push non-Malays out, but there must be a distinction between the aliens and the masters.[224]

According to Gordon P. Means, under Burhanuddin's direction, the PMIP began a systematic campaign to win over the support of the Malays who could be roused on communal and religious issues. For example, during the protracted negotiations and debate over the Meredeka constitution, the PMIP attacked the Alliance for its communal compromises and for abandoning the Malays. On repeated occasions the party demanded that the constitution include a statement that "Malaya belongs to the Malays" and sought to have Malayan citizenship defined as "Melayu" citizenship.[225] In the 1959 state elections, which preceded the federal elections of that year, the PMIP won control of the state governments in Kelantan and Terengganu by capturing 41 out of a total 53 seats at stake in those two states. In other states, the PMIP had scattered support, primarily in Pahang, Perak, Selangor and Kedah, but was only able to elect one other state assemblyman in the Krian district of Perak. In the federal elections of 1959, the PMIP won 13 out of the 14 parliamentary seats in Terengganu and Kelantan, but was unable to win anywhere else.[226] While the PMIP argued that the constitutional contract granted too many rights to non-Malays in a Malay country, another opposition group, the Socialist Front, insisted that it reserved too many privileges to the Malays in the newly independent Malayan state. The Socialist Front was a coalition of the Party *Raayat* (People's Party) and the Labor Party. The former was primarily a Malay party, relying on the support of fishermen and rural workers. Conversely, the Labor Party's support came from urban areas, particularly from Chinese workers. What the Labor Party and Party *Raayat* shared was a common socialist ideology. They argued that communal groups existed but should never be recognized as the basic components of the political systems. They also held that the constitutional contract was a travesty and communal cleavages were fostered by the political leaders of all the major communities of the country in order to distract the masses from realization that they were being exploited. Indeed, the real issue was class differences. The masses of rural Malay farmers and fishermen have a common cause with the masses of Chinese urban workers. Together they were separated from their natural antagonists, the handful of Malay traditional leaders, and Chinese capitalists. Malays could share in prosperity if the working classes of all communities joined together and gained control of the government.[227] Hence, the political situation in the country had altered considerably by the 1959 elections. As Diane K. Mauzy has argued, first, independence had been granted in 1957, thus sweeping away an issue which had served to unite large portions of all communities, and which had especially benefited the Alliance Party in 1955. Second, the percentage of non-Malay voters had been greatly increased as a result of the citizenship provisions of the 1957 constitution. On that account, the electoral roll for the 1959 federal elections constituted approximately 36 per cent of Chinese voters and 7 per cent of Indian voters. Third, in March 1958, there was a leadership change in the MCA, when Dr. Lim Chong Eu defeated Tan Cheng Lock for the presidency. Although Dr. Lim was a fairly moderate compromise candidate, he had been supported by a new group of MCA "new bloods" (also sometimes called Chinese-firsters) who captured most of the important positions in the MCA. The new group wanted to alter the political balance of the Alliance by challenging UMNO's supremacy. They were prepared to insist on a larger seat allocation and they wanted revisions in language and education policies.[228]

---

[224] Dr. Burhanuddin, as quoted in Straits Budget, March 28, 1956.

[225] See Gordon P. Means, Malaysia Politics (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970), pp. 226-229.

[226] Ibid., p. 231.

[227] For further readings on the Socialist Front, see K. J. Ratnam, Communalism and the Political Process in Malaya (Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1965).

[228] See Diane K. Mauzy, Barisan Nasional: Coalition Government in Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Marican & Song, 1983), pp. 26-29.

The UMNO-MCA dispute heightened when Dr. Lim Chong Eu, MCA president, made public a letter to Tunku Abdul Rahman asking for 40 seats. Dr. Lim had feared that "Malayans of other racial origins—Chinese, Indians, Eurasians—is simply one of fear of Malay communalism, the fear still remains and it is kept alive by the provision of the constitution, which allows amendment of the constitution with a two-thirds majority".[229] In addition, Dr. Lim demanded that "if we do not succeed in getting what we think is fair, the MCA general committee will decide on July 12 whether we fight under the Alliance banner or on our own. The MCA will stand absolutely firm on the issue of Chinese education and the allocation of seats for the MCA. As a compromise, we are prepared to accept 35 seats—nothing less".[230]

The above crises correspond to Rabushka and Shepsle contention that once local elites have together wrested independence from the colonial power, they will wheel to confront one another over the ethnic divide. They identify this stage as a steady escalation of ethnic demands into open communalism at the elite, subelite, and mass levels.[231] In the case of UMNO-MCA crisis of July 1959, the Tunku responded to the MCA demands by demanding that a complete withdrawal of all MCA demands, a purge of certain radicals, and complete authority for himself to allocate personally all seats and select all candidates for the federal election.[232] According to Funston, the Tunku's ultimatum to the MCA did a great deal to lift his sagging prestige both within UMNO and amongst Malays generally.

It has also been suggested that the crisis was a demonstration of the natural stresses inside the Alliance which were exacerbated as a result of "outbidding" by an opposition party. It also showed that the political balance in the Alliance could not be altered to the disadvantage of UMNO without threatening to break up the coalition. UMNO leaders desired and believed in multi-ethnic coalition, but UMNO's participation was based on two tenets of its existence: supremacy inside the Alliance, and thus control of the top officers of government, and the maintenance of solid Malay support. In 1959, PMIP outbidding was bothersome, and UMNO moved to protect its flank by pronouncements and promises which catered more to Malay opinion.[233] We may now put into perspective Panebianco thesis that every organization will thus be pushed by its relation with the external world in two different directions at the same time: it will be tempted both to colonize its environment through domination, and to "reach a pact" with it through adaptation. UMNO, as such, had to grapple with two opposing forces simultaneously. First, UMNO had to counter the PMIP, and secondly, it had to handle the increasing demands made by the Chinese community both within the Alliance and from the opposition.

In addition, UMNO also had to handle internal difficulties from within the party when Malay nationalists in UMNO began pushing for programs to overcome Malay economic problems. For example, Abdul Aziz b. Ishak who was Malaya's first Minister of Agriculture had built an image of being the champion of the rural Malays. In October 1958, Aziz announced plans to form rural cooperatives which would be granted monopoly over the rice trade.[234] He accused Singapore merchants of exploiting the Malay fisherman on the East Coast. In a broad indictment at a meeting in Sungei Kembong, he told the Malays that they had an average income of RM60 to RM70; "why should this be so, the reason is that you work hard and your actual earnings are being exploited by the "middle-men". What you should therefore do is to do away with them".[235] Hence, he felt that the cooperative movement held the key to successful Malay competition with non-Malays in the field of agriculture, trade and industry. He believed that the padi middlemen system should be instituted with a cooperative program such

---

[229] Dr. Lim Chong Eu's letter to the Tunku as reported in The Straits Times, July 10, 1959.

[230] Ibid.

[231] Alvin Rabushka and Kenneth Shepsle, Politics in Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability, pp. 66 and 83.

[232] For a full account of the UMNO-MCA July crisis of 1959, see Gordon P. Means, Malaysia Politics, pp. 212-215.

[233] Diane K. Mauzy, Barisan Nasional: Coalition Government in Malaysia, p. 28.

[234] The Straits Times, October 11, 1958.

[235] Aziz Ishak as quoted in the Malay Mail, November 14, 1961.

as padi purchasing and marketing by the co-operatives of North Malaya designed to improve the standard of living for the rural Malays. Aziz, however, felt that "the Alliance government had chosen to portray the peasants-middlemen conflict as a communal one. This is not a communal question but one between peasants and middlemen, and yet the Alliance government has chosen to present this case as a case of conflict between Malay privileges and non-Malay rights".[236] In pursuing the task of improving the economic conditions for the Malay peasantry, Aziz had alienated the UMNO and MCA leadership. According to Aziz:

The fact was that in Selangor and in Malacca where private middlemen were eliminated, rural income increased. Is therefore the MCA middlemen a group of people who should forever be placated whilst the padi planters in Krian remain perpetually in poverty and economic slavery? Now that we have after a great trouble worked out a solution which can be a panacea to their [rural Malays] economic ills, it will be most distressing if Government in the face of its promises to the people decides to throw its weight on behalf of the few middlemen. What about Malay privileges about which so much noise is made inside and outside Parliament? Are these just something to dangle before the eyes of the Malay people while in practice we do something else? How much longer can the people be dazzled by the construction of fine roads, magnificent buildings in Kuala Lumpur and such things as wells and community halls? Empty stomachs and crying children will soon open their eyes to the true state of affairs and then it may be too late.[237]

The MCA leadership, in particular, deeply resented his persistent attack on Chinese middlemen.[238] He transgressed, they felt, the terms of the constitutional contract, as he not only established cooperatives to aid the rural Malays but also granted them monopoly and thus for all practical purposes expropriated Chinese businesses. The MCA lost all patience with him when he pushed his campaign of cooperative rice mills into northern Perak and then in clear violation of the Constitution began to revoke the licenses of some 350 Chinese middlemen. To stop him, Dr. Lim Swee Aun, a member of the Cabinet, led the campaign to remove Aziz from the Ministry of Agriculture. For that reason, Aziz Ishak's expulsion[239] from the cabinet was partly the consequence of his efforts to transfer the ownership of rice-mills in Perak and Province Wellesley from private to co-operative hands. Lim observes that "The Malayan Chinese Association threatened to leave the ruling Alliance Party over the issue, as capitulation would result in a loss of confidence by Chinese businessmen in the ability of the MCA to protect their interests. The MCA won the case, and the Aziz was removed from his post for unconstitutional practices".[240]

The above scenario highlighted the ambivalent position of UMNO leaders. On the one hand, tradition and the pressures of their constituencies pushed them toward the maximization of Malay interests. On the other hand, their loyalty and commitment the tri-party Alliance coalition drew them toward recognition of the aspirations of other communities. However, one of the bitterest reverberations of communal politics occurred in Malaya during the 1964-1965 conflicts between the ruling Alliance and the People's Action Party (PAP) of Singapore. This happened when Malaya extended its territory and increased its population in 1963 when, together with two former British colonies Sarawak and Sabah (the former British North Borneo) it formed Malaysia. Singapore joined as well, but political and eco-

---

[236] Aziz b. Ishak as quoted in The Straits Times, May 29, 1963.

[237] Letter from Abdul Aziz b. Ishak to Tunku Abdul Rahman, May 10, 1962, as reproduced in Karl von Vorys, Democarcy without Consensus: Communalism and Political Stability in Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur and Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 177-178.

[238] The Straits Times, April 18, 1960.

[239] Before the frontal conflict with the MCA leadership, both the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister were inclined to be patient and forgiving. After the head on confrontation between Aziz and the MCA, the former was transferred to another portfolio as Minister of Health as announced on the July 15, 1962 cabinet reshuffle. Aziz, however, refused to accept the decision and he was subsequently removed from the cabinet. The Tunku claimed that Aziz was removed from the cabinet because of his mismanagement and of wasting million of dollars in hastily conceived schemes to promote cooperatives. In 1962, the cabinet had also rejected Aziz's proposal to construct a cooperative urea fertilizer plant as the cabinet felt that the paln was too costly and impractical. See Malay Mail, July 16, 1962; The Straits Times, April 20, 1962; The Straits Times, April 28, 1962.

[240] Lim, D., Economic Growth and Development in West Malaysia, 1947-1970 (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 191.

nomic tensions led to its peaceable expulsion in 1965. The motives behind the formation of Malaysia, announced by Tunku in May 1961 were complex[241] and it need not concern us here. What is more important, however, is the repercussion of PAP's participation in Malaysian politics. Even though the PAP's participation in the peninsular elections was minor (only 11 candidates filed nomination papers for Parliamentary contest, and 2 of these did not campaign, on PAP orders)[242]—the bitterness created by PAP participation exceeded the strength of the challenge, and in the end, only one PAP candidate was elected.[243] However, it was the nature and the style of the PAP attached which precipitated trouble. For Lee Kuan Yew, then head of the City State and leader of the PAP, he and his party entered the 1964 elections determined to replace the MCA. At stake were personal ambitions economic questions, communalism, political ideology and questions of federal power versus state autonomy. His actions had taken the Tunku by surprise because in 1963, Lee Kuan Yew had stated that the PAP would not enter the elections.[244] At first, the PAP appeared to be in competition with the MCA whom it called "effete and corrupt, and centered its appeal almost entirely on the urban Chinese community".[245] The PAP manifesto observed: "The UMNO can deal with the PMIP in the rural areas. In the urban areas, because the ineffectiveness of the MCA, the PAP has to help in the battle against the anti-Malaysia Socialist Front".[246] Nevertheless, the MCA fared well in the 1964 elections. When the possibility of replacing the MCA seemed unlikely, Lee Kuan Yew and the PAP changed their strategy. They sought to persuade the Tunku to accept a PAP-Alliance condition. The Tunku firmly refused, though he assured Lee that he would be consulted on all-important matters.[247] In any case, the UMNO leadership had a shrewd suspicion that Lee Kuan Yew as the leader of the Chinese community comprising nearly 40 per cent of the population of the states on the Malayan peninsula might assume a decidedly revisionist posture, and destabilize the internal distribution of power of the Alliance. Explaining his views, the Tunku did not mince words: "The PAP wants to teach us what is good for us. We know what is good for us, and what is bad. What the PAP really wants is to discipline the MCA. They say they want to join the UMNO, but we don't want them".[248] The rebuff notwithstanding, Lee Kuan Yew was firm in purpose:

If all the nine [parliamentary candidates] win, an agonizing reappraisal will have to be made. In the heat of the elections, it is isaid that even though there are only five MCA MP's left, UMNO will carry on with the MCA. That may well be. But can UMNO leadership go through the awful predicament of pretending for the next five years that these five MCA MP's really represent the urban Chinese? The Tunku knows that good leadership is reconciling of ideal solutions with the realities of life. If the urban areas, constituting more than half the people of Malaya give their verdict for the winds of change, no leader can afford to ignore it.[249]

Lee Kuan Yew must have been taken aback by the election results as the MCA won eight out nine parliamentary constituencies. As a result, Lee became very critical of the Alliance Government, the concept of the Alliance, and the terms of the constitutional contract, offering instead an alternative nation-building formula. Lee called it democratic socialism which called for a "Malaysian Malaysia", with political equality for all rather than a "Malay Malaysia", which gave the Malays political predominance. We have noted in Chapter 2 how the British wanted to "forge democracy" onto the Malay States in the guise of the Malayan Union scheme and how it had failed. According to Lee Kuan Yew:

---

[241] For an insightful discussion on the formation of Malaysia, see R. S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Malaysian Politics under Mahathir (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), pp. 19-21.

[242] See R. S. Milne and K. J. Ratnam, Malaysia: New States in a New Nation (London: Frank Cass, 1974), p. 139.

[243] Ibid.

[244] Tunku Abdul Rahamn, "Looking Back", The Star, March 31, 1975.

[245] See Diane K. Mauzy, Barisan Nasional: Coalition Government in Malaysia, p. 31.

[246] PAP manifesto as produced in R. S. Milne and K. J. Ratnam, Malaysia: New States in a New Nation, p. 140.

[247] Diane K. Mauzy, Barisan Nasional: Coalition Government in Malaysia, p. 33.

[248] The Tunku as quoted in R. S. Milne and K. J. Ratnam, Malaysia: New States in a New Nation, pp. 146-147.

[249] Lee Kuan Yew, as quoted in R. S. Milne and K. J. Ratnam, Malaysia: New States in a New Nation, p. 147.

Would a multiracial Malaysia be achieved more quickly and better through communal bodies meeting at the top or through inter-racial political organizations at all levels? The political structure of the segregated communal parties is brittle and unstable, because cooperation is only at the top between a few individuals, and it is an unequal cooperation. The leaders of the dominant communal party are unlikely to have the same regard for the views of the leaders of other communal parties when they are in effect appointees of the dominant communal party. But, even worse, if communally organized party were genuinely so organized and all leaders of the various groups were leaders as of right of the different communal bases, it would still be dangerous and unstable arrangement, fraught with constant strife, because the three different communal bases would be kept separate and distinct, having different attitudes and values, and being fed different and often conflicting communal sentiments. In the end only multiracial politics, in which the ground is integrated not along racial, religious or language lines but along economic and social interests will provide a permanent basis for sound popular government in Malaysia.[250]

It could well be argued that Lee Kuan Yew's "Malaysian Malaysia" had, at its core, challenged the political power of the Malays. Since UMNO's support from the Malay community depended upon its ability to project the image of fighting for the Malay cause (collective identity), Lee Kuan Yew's "Malaysian Malaysia" invited strong criticisms from UMNO. For example, Dato Harun b. Idris, *Menteri Besar* of Selangor, described Lee Kuan Yew as an enemy of Malaysia.[251] An editorial in *Utusan Melayu* observed: "Now it is known who is trying to cause a clash between the Malays, and the non-Malays, particularly the Chinese. Only those who wished to cause disorders shouted against the special rights of Malays".[252] As Means has pointed out, what had begun as a friendly test of strength between the Alliance and PAP in the Singapore and Malayan elections had, by mid-1965 become an undisguised effort to mobilize all non-Malays, with the promise of "equal rights for all" and the end of a "Malay Malaysia".[253] The upshot of PAP's challenge was when PAP Deputy Prime Minister, Dr. Toh Chin-chye, announced the formation of a united opposition front.[254] Five parties, the PAP, the Sarawak United People's Party, the United Democratic Party, the People's Progressive Party, and Machinda of Sarawak met in Singapore to form the Malaysian Solidarity Convention and jointly pledged to build a Malaysian Malaysia. All these parties were known for their preponderant Chinese composition, and all but the PAP had been outspoken critics of Malaysia.[255]

Karl von Vorys has observed that all along, inter-communal tensions were increasing. On the one hand, Chinese-English educated professionals and workers saw Lee Kuan Yew as a hero. Indeed, he alone seemed to satisfy their needs of modern leadership since the Communists were defeated. The Malays, on the other hand, especially those living in urban areas, perceived him as a villain. They were very much afraid that Lee Kuan Yew would get his way and then, as in Singapore, the Malays would be dominated by the Chinese. Tensions arose in fact to a point where inter-communal violence was flaring up.[256] The Malay paper, *Utusan Melayu*, responded to PAP's call for "Malaysian Malay-

---

[250] See Lee Kuan Yew, The Battle for Malaysian Malaysia (Singapore: Ministry of Culture, 1965), pp. 354-355.

[251] Dato Harun b. Idris, as quoted in Utusan Melayu, July 9, 1965.

[252] Utusan Melayu, July 9, 1965.

[253] See Gordon P. Means, Malaysia Politics, p. 345.

[254] The Straits Times, April 28, 1965.

[255] Gordon P. Means, Malaysia Politics, p. 347.

[256] During July and September communal passions in Singapore erupted into serious racial riots. These disorders were a by-product of the intense competition between the PAP and the Alliance. The PAP had defeated all UMNO candidates in the 1963 elections. Meanwhile, the Alliance sent the then Secretary-General of UMNO, Syed Ja'afar Albar to Singapore to rebuild UMNO after its total defeat in the Singapore elections. To regain Malay support, Syed Ja'afar began playing on the theme that the PAP was a Chinese party hostile to Malay interests. PAP also invited 114 Malay organizations to discuss programs to assists the Malays. On the day of the PAP sponsored Malay convention, two people were killed, but the worst rioting began two days later. An incident during a procession of Malays celebrating the Prophet Mohamed's birthday triggered off pitched battles between pro-Indonesians Malay extremists gangs and pro-Communist Chinese extremists. Over in the Malay Peninsula, riots occurred at Labuan and another in Bukit Mertajam. The worst broke out on July 21, 1964 when a procession of Malay youths attacked a Chinese policeman who was alleged to have pushed a Malay steward. For further

sia" by stating: "that to be a co-owner of Malaysia, the people should be converted into Muslims and adjust their way of life to that of the Malays".[257] On the other hand, Malay politicians within UMNO who were been branded by Lee Kuan Yew as "ultras" for their image of reacting to any real or imagined threat of Chinese encroachment became alarmed by the possibility of political realignment. They began to press harder for measures that would reinforce successful in their demands that they be given a more important role on policy-making within the government. In addition, some UMNO branches proposed constitutional amendments to provide for uniform administration throughout Malaysia—a move designed to eliminate administrative autonomy in troublesome states controlled by opposition parties.[258] In this context, we can put into perspective Rabushka and Shepsle contention that elites (in this case, UMNO and PAP politicians) serve usually as the agents of divisive ethnic forces, ambitiously spearheading the corrosive process.[259] The implications were clear, one ethnic group (Chinese) was pressing for more political equality while the other ethnic group (Malays) was in a mood of increased hostility due to what they perceived as a challenge to their political preeminence.

R. K. Vasil has pointed out that several UMNO leaders were convinced that Lee Kuan Yew should be held accountable for the increased communal tension both in Singapore and Malaysia. They suggested that he be arrested and a new government should be installed in Singapore. Syed Ja'afar Albar was particularly fond of this "solution". Among Malays it would have been perceived as an intercommunal victory of Malays over Chinese.[260] The PAP, on the other hand, continued to make comments in Parliament admonishing the federal government for its failure to include in the speech a promist to progress toward a "Malaysian Malaysia".[261] On his part, Lee Kuan Yew wanred that if the Alliance Government wee to use unconstitutional methods to stop "Malaysian Malaysia", then Singapore would consider "alternative constitutional arrangement". He went on to mention Sabah, Sarawak, Malacca and Penang as states which might get together with Singapore to form a "Malaysian Malaysia".[262]

According to Gordon P. Means, Lee's statement provide convincing evidence that he was confident a stable non-Malay majority could be formed to end Alliance rule and seemed to believe that this eventually could be prevented only by unconstitutional rule by force.[263] It could arguably be said that the country was on the verge of a full-blown ethnic conflict. This situation was saved by the fact that in January 1963, Indonesian Prime Minister Subandrio announced that Indonesia was pursuing a policy of "confrontation" against Malaysia, and as a result the Alliance Government had managed to hold the country together by appealing to the public for loyalty and patriotism in a time of crisis. Nevertheless, PAP's challenge to the Alliance supremacy and the special position of the Malays was a cause for concern, if not properly dealt with, could destabilize the constitutional bargain that was reached by the various ethnic groups in the country prior to independence. The Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, mindful of the Alliance defeats in Singapore, wanted to know two things before he would decide on the course of action: (i) the consequence upon public order and (ii) the consequences for the

---

readings on ethnic relations in Malaysia, see Goh Cheng Teik, The May Thirteenth Incident and Democracy in Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1971).

[257] Utusan Melayu, as quoted in The Straits Times, June 14, 1965.

[258] Straits Budget, September 9, 1964; The Straits Times, May 14, 1965.

[259] Alvin Rabushka and Kenneth Shepsle, Politics in Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability, p. 217.

[260] See R. K. Vasil, Politics in a Plural Society: A Study of Non-Communal Political Parties in West Malaya (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 23-24.

[261] The censure motion expressed "regrets that the Address by His Majesty did not reassure the nation that Malaysia will continue to progress in accord with its democratic constitution to a Malaysian Malaysia; on the contrary , the Address had added to the doubts over the intentions of the then Alliance Government and to the measures it will adopt when faced with a loss of majority popular support", The Straits Times, May 28, 1965.

[262] Lee Kuan Yew, as quoted in The Straits Times, June 5, 1965.

[263] Gordon P. Means, Malaysia Politics, p. 348.

MCA.[264] The first question was directed to Tun Razak and Tun Dr. Ismail; and the second question to Tun Tan Siew Sin. None of the responses rejected the idea of arresting Lee Kuan Yew, all implied it was unwise as it would create a difficult law and order situation in Singapore as well as in Malaysia; it would alienate Britain which still had substantial forces in the area; it would grant a serious advantage to Indonesia in its confrontation, especially in East Malaysia; and finally, it would not only not strengthen the MCA, but further discredit it. The alternative suggestion was the expulsion of Singapore form Malaysia.[265]

The Tunku, who was then in London for medical treatment, decided to ask Tun Razak to have a talk with Lee Kuan Yew to determine whether the latter would tone down PAP's heavy politicking. However, Lee Kuan Yew was not prepared to make any pledges to keep out of Malaysian politics. According to the Tunku:

It was clear some action to be taken. It is odious for us to take repressive measures against Singapore Government, for such action is repulsive to our concept of parliamentary democracy. Even then it would not have solved the problem before us because as I said just now, there is not one problem but many, and one that gave us the most concern with communal issue. This is the matter which concerns me most, because the peace and happiness of the people in this country depend on the goodwill and understanding of the various races for one another. Without it this nation will break up, with consequential disaster which we have seen and read about happening elsewhere. We feel that this repressive action against a few would not therefore solve the problem because the seed of this contempt, fear and hatred has been sown in Singapore, and even if we try to prevent its growth, I feel that after a time ti will sprout out in a more virulent form. Things are getting worse every day. Irresponsible utterances are made by both sides which, reading between the lines, is tantamount to challenge, and if trouble were to break out innocent people will be sacrificed at the altar of belligerent, heartless and irresponsible troublemakers of this country. So I believe that the second course of action we are taking—the breakaway—is the best and the right one, sad as it may be.[266]

The decision to expel Singapore from Malaysia was made by the Tunku on July 25, 1965 while he was still recuperating in London. However, official pronouncement was only made on August 9, 1965 when parliament was called to order. At the same day, simultaneous announcements were made from Kuala Lumpur and Singapore to the press and over the radio that Singapore was seceding from the Federation.[267] Even though the separation of Singapore abruptly terminated the Alliance-PAP conflict, the repercussions from the PAP attack lingered on, with important political consequences.

First and foremost, the Tunku had alienated the call by UMNO "ultras" particularly from then secretary general of UMNO, Dato Syed Ja'afar Albar and the UMNO Youth led by Senu Abdul Rahman urging the arrest of Lee Kuan Yew and other PAP leaders. Syed Ja'afar Albar registered his displeasures with the Tunku's decision to expel Singapore from the Federation by resigning from his post as UMNO's secretary general. Second, many young non-Malays, too young to remember the wanton ethnic violence at the end of the second world war or the slow process of ethnic accommodation which produced "the bargain" and led to independence, remained committed to the notion of a "Malaysian Malaysia". To be sure, the Chinese and Indians had already received the fruits of the compromise. Nearly all were citizens, their properties were protected and most of all, they were eligible to vote. The Malays, on the other hand, were waiting for their benefits both in economic and cultural terms. As such, the most hotly contested communal issue was the controversy of the national language. Article 152 of the constitution established Malay as the national language, but allowed English to remain an official language for at least ten years after independence. With the expiry of the interim period in

---

[264] Karl von Vorys, Democracy without Consensus: Communalism and Political Stability in Malaysia, p. 170.

[265] Ibid.

[266] The Tunku, as quoted in The Straits Times, August 10, 1965.

[267] A Constitutional Amendment Bill was approved unanimously in the Dewan Ra'ayat (Lower House) by a vote of 126 to nothing. Later in the day, the Dewan Negara (Senate) also passed the bill unanimously. See Mohamed Nordin Sopiee, From Malayan Union to Singapore Separation: Political Unification in the Malaysian Region (Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Universiti Malaya, 1976), pp. 212-215.

1967, a number of Malay politicians under the leadership of Syed Nasir b. Syed Ismail formed the National Language Action Front (*Barisan Bertindak Bahasa Kebangsaan*) to press for legislation that would ensure thorough conversion to Malay as the sole national language. As Malay chauvinist demands intensified, non-Malays become mobilized to defend the continued use of English, Chinese, and Indian for various purposes. In this endeavor, the MCA became the primary vehicle for the representation of non-Malay demands. A select committee headed by Khir Johari, then Minister of Education, worked out the government's position. Communal chauvinists on both sides were dissatisfied with the final proposals which were incorporated into the National Language Bill of 1967. While Malay was affirmed as the "sole national language", English was permitted to continue for some official purposes as deemed appropriate by federal and state governments, or by action of the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. Similarly, Chinese and Indian were tolerated for non-official non-governmental purposes.[268] In addition, Malay firster politicians within UMNO had hoped that conversion for Malays in both public and private sectors, and that the government would utilize the national language legislation as an instrument to break non0Malay supremacy in various sectors of the economy. They argued that tolerating continued use of other languages would ensure that non-Malays would retain their dominant position in the economic and professional life of the country. Although Malays were being aided by the system of Malay special rights to acquire employment in government and to secure entrance to higher educational institutions, the net effect of special rights upon the ethnic redistribution of economic roles and on the re-allocation of special income had been a disappointment to those who hoped to ensure for the Malays a dominant role both in government and the economy. For that reason, the Malay "ultras" in UMNO harbored resentment against Tunku Abdul Rahman and top Alliance leaders for conceding too much to non-Malays and for pursuing policies which threatened to relegate the Malays permanently to a secondary position in the economic and cultural life of the country:[269]

For the importance of national unity and racial harmony, the Malays who are sons of the soil (*bumiputeras*), have agreed to compromise with non-*bumiputeras*, especially the Chinese, on the question of their language, one of the few remaining properties. They agreed to compromise and allow citizenship rights to these non-Malays and agree to uphold the status of the Chinese language and other non-official languages, where the question of compromise need not arise at all, because the question of Malay becoming the National Language and the official language of this country is a logical fact and a right of the language [*yang paling lojik dan hak bagi bahasa itu*].[270]

Here we see the political situation developing into a steady escalation of ethnic demands into open communalism at the elite, subelite, and mass levels. As Rabushka and Shepsle have pointed out, in an atmosphere of ethnic tensions, political ambitiousness and exclusionary pressure, otherwise moderate ethnic leaders must succumb to the temptations of ethnic appeals in order to stake out warring positions because "ethnic preferences are intense and are not negotiable. To promise less for one's group in the name of harmony and accommodation is to betray that group's interest".[271] The spillover effect of PAP challenge was that politics had become intensified, many new controversial issues had been raised, and the "political system has become overloaded with seemingly irreconcilable demands".[272]

The post-independent period from 1064 to 1069 was one of unprecedented ethnic political militancy, partly the result of the PAP's articulation of the "Malaysian Malaysia" theme, partly because the Indonesian confrontation was winding down and ended in 1966 and partly because one of the pro-Malay parts of "the bargain" came due—the National Language Bill of 1967. As such, the 1960 general elections were heated with communal issues. This was due to the fact that when Singapore left Malaysia, the remnants of PAP still in the Malay Peninsula reconstituted themselves as the Democratic Action

---

[268] See R. K. Vasil, The Malaysian General Election of 1969 (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1972) pp. 14-15.

[269] Gordon P. Means, Malaysia Politics, pp. 391-392.

[270] Excerpts from *Pengorbanan Orang Melayu* (The Malay's Sacrifice) as reproduced by Karl von Vorys, Democracy without Consensus: Communalism and Political Stability in Malaysia, p. 204.

[271] Alvin Rabushka and Kenneth Shepsle, Politics in Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability, pp. 66 and 83.

[272] R. S. Milne, "Malaysia and Singapore, 1975", Asia Survey, Vol. XVI No. 2 (February 1976), p. 186.

Party (DAP).[273] Continuing the slogan of building a "Malaysian Malaysia", the DAP attracted substantial urban support from the Chinese community. The DAP also formulated "The Setapak Declaration" as its manifesto for the 1969 elections. As its first objective, the party stated its commitment "to the ideal of a free, democratic and socialist Malaysia, based on the principles of racial equality, and social and economic justice, and founded on the institutions of parliamentary democracy".[274] The principle of racial equality and cultural pluralism was stressed throughout the manifesto, while the "idea of racial hegemony by one community" was attacked as inimitable to nation building in a multi0racial society. For that reason, the DAP program presented an attack on the entire structure of Malay special privileges and political predominance. On the other hand, the DAP had in effect proposed equalitarian policies and national integration on the basis of the common economic of the have-nots of all races.[275]

Similarly, the People's Progressive Party (PPP), with its power base among the Chinese and Indian communities at the Ipoh area, enunciated a political program for the 1969 elections very similar to that of the DAP. The PPP adopted the common slogan of a Malaysian Malaysia asserting that it meant "the nation and the state is not identified with the supremacy, well-being and the interests of any one particular community or race".[276] In its manifesto, it criticized Malay special rights as "a constant irritant to non-Malays disrupting the unity of the people and perpetuating racial prejudices" while failing to better the condition of the poor and peasant Malays. The PPP proposed socialism and welfare state based on principles of equality. In education the party supported the continuation of the four language streams of education, and "equal treatment for all educational institutions irrespective of race" as well as equality "in the matter of selection of jobs, irrespective of whichever school or college they were educated in".[277] The PPP also promised Chinese and Tamil as official languages along with Malay.[278] The Pan-Malayan Islamic Party (PMIP), on the other hand, elicited support of the Malays by appealing to their Islamic faith and their identity as an ethnic and culturally community. On most issues, the PMIP stressed that further efforts should be made to help the *bumiputera*. The party proposed constitutional amendments that would strengthen the guarantees and the rights of the *bumiputera* bud did not specify what these additional Malay special rights were to be. It also proposed more comprehensive federal laws to strengthen Islam, and promised to make Islamic laws the basis of economic development.[279]

The May 13 Riot and UMNO's Strategy of Domination

Diane K. Mauzy has observed that the 1969 campaign was conducted in an atmosphere of ethnic militancy and hostility that have vent to unbridled appeals to ethnic emotions on all sides. Outbidding was rampant and there were few legal checks against calculated incitement of the ethnic groups.[280] When the elections results were returned, the Alliance won 66 out of 103 parliamentary seats, with 48.5 per cent of the popular vote—a drop about 10 per cent below its 1964 showing.[281] UMNO had won 51 of 67 seats it contested, the MCA 13 of 33, and the MIC 2 of 3 seats. In the opposition DAP won 13 seats, PMIP 12, Gerakan 8, and the PPP 4. In the state elections, the Alliance won a total 162 of the

---

[273] The Registrar of Societies declared that the People's Action Party had become illegal because it was a foreign political party. Consequently, a new organization had to be formed without ties or support from political parties outside the country. See The Straits Times, September 15, 1965.

[274] See Democratic Action Party, DAP, General Elections Manifesto, Out Triple Objective towards a Malaysian Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Democratic Action Party, 1969) p. 17

[275] Ibid., p. 22.

[276] See R. K. Vasil, The Malaysian General Election of 1969, p. 66.

[277] Ibid.

[278] Ibid.

[279] See Persatuan Islam Sa-Melayu [PMIP], Menghadapi Pilehan Raya Umum 1969 [in Jawi script], (Kuala Lumpur: PAS, 1969)

[280] Diane K. Mauzy, Barisan Nasional: Coalition Government in Malaysia, p. 36.

[281] Ibid.

227 seats, but failed to recapture Kelantan from PMIP, lost Terengganu, lost Penang, and did not have a majority in either Perak (19 or 40 seats) or Selangor (14 out of 28 seats).[282] The Maalys were not alarmed about losing Penang, since it had been a part of the Crown Colony and never a Malay state with a Malay ruler, and Penang was generally viewed as a "Chinese" state. Nevertheless, the prospect of UMNO and the Alliance not controlling either Perak or Selangor, and the specter of a non-Malay *Mentri Besar* in either, greatly heightened Malay anxieties. In addition, the "victory" celebration organized by Gerakan and DAP supporters the day following the election during which racial tensions were aroused even further by the jeers and epithets directed by some boisterous Chinese and Indian demonstrators against Malay onlookers helped to heighten Malay anxieties and rage. In the belief that Malay power in government was being challenged, Malay demonstrators who had earlier participated in a pro-government counter demonstration organized by the Selangor *Mentri Besar*, Dato Harun Idris, were determined "to teach the Chinese a lesson". Very quickly the assembled Malay demonstrators began a rampage of killing, looting and burning directed against Chinese who lived in Kuala Lumpur. The May 13th riots were confined mainly in Kuala Lumpur and its surrounding that lasted for four days.[283]

A blow-by-blow account of the riots had been addressed elsewhere and need not be repeated here. However, for the purpose of this study, what is more important is to see how UMNO reacted to it. First of all, Malay firster politicians within the party made a move in opposition to the Tunku because the "ultras" had blamed the Alliance losses on the Malayan Chinese Association, which had suffered the defeat of 20 out of its 33 candidates on the Alliance ticket. With such a weak mandate from Chinese voters, and under pressure from Malays in UMNO, Tan Siew Sin announced on May 13 that the MCA would not be represented on the federal cabinet or on any Executive Councils of State Assemblies.[284] Led by Dr. Mahathir b. Mohamed, the "ultras" blamed the Tunku for UMNO and Alliance poor showing in the election. According to Dr. Mahathir:

Your "give and take" policy gives the Chinese everything they ask for. The climax was the commuting of the death sentence, which made the majority of the Malay angry. The Chinese on the other hand regarded you and the Alliance government as cowards who could be pushed around. That was why the Chinese and the Indians behaved outrageously toward the Malays on the 12th May. If you had been spit in the face, called dirty names and shown obscene gestures and private parts, then you could understand how the Malay felt. The Malays whom you thought would never rebel went berserk, and they hate you for giving too much face. The responsibility of the deaths of these people, Muslim or infidels, rests on the shoulders of the leader who holds views based on wrong assumptions. I regret writing this letter, but I have to convey to you the feelings of the Malays. In truth the Malays whether they are UMNO or PMIP supporters really hate you, especially those who had lost homes, children and relatives, because of your "give and take" policy.[285]

Most of all Mahathir's letter had requested "that it is high time you resign as our Prime Minister and UMNO leader".[286] In essence, Mahathir's letter to the Tunku had implied that the latter had lost the legitimacy because the Tunku's strategy of "give and take" had endangered the party's survival. This implies, as Panebianco has pointed out, a close relationship between political strategy and the leadership's legitimacy. Once a political strategy has been formulated and accepted by the party, the elite's ability to distribute identity incentives to its followers depends on its applications: if the political strat-

---

[282] R. K. Vasil, The Malaysian General Election of 1969, pp. 58-62.

[283] For an official account of the May 13th race riots, see Government of Malaysia, The May 13 Tragedy: A Report of the National Operations Council (Kuala Lumpur: Government Press, 1969). For a useful analysis, see Felix V. Gagliano, Communal Violence in Malaysia 1969: The Political Aftermath (Athens, Ohio: Center for International Studies, 1970); Tunku Abdul Rahman, May 13 Before and After (Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Utusan Melayu, 1969); Goh Cheng Teik, The May Thirteenth Incident and Democracy in Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1971).

[284] The Straits Times, May 14, 1969.

[285] Dr. Mahathri Mohamed's letter to Tunku Abdul Rahman, June 17, 1969 as reproduced by Karl von Vorys, Democracy without Consensus: Communalism and Political Stability in Malaysia, p.374.

[286] Ibid.

egy loses credibility, the party's identity suffers, at least until a new political strategy is adopted.[287] In the case of UMNO, Tunku Abdul Rahman's accomplishments were great—up to April 1969. Past performance, however, was not sufficient for continued leadership. After all, Dato Onn was the chief architect of UMNO, yet he had to go when he was no longer representing the best interests of the party. On that account, the Tunku conceded, "it was true enough that Datuk Seri Dr. Mahathir's open letter, which was widely circulated, did me a lot of harm".[288]

According to Dr. Mahathir, his letter was directed at the Tunku's idea that the only way to have racial harmony in the country was to give in to Chinese demands. The Tunku, Mahathir pointed out, had not stuck to the original agreements made with the Chinese at the time of independence. Rather, the Tunku had gone on to placate the Chinese by giving in on the question of language, and on the question of the number of Chinese who should be in the administration.[289] In addition, Dr. Mahathir felt that the fault of the government all along was that whereas it had kept on repeating that the Malays have privileges, it had never explained to the Chinese why these privileges were there in the first instance. They were just protective measures to ensure that the Malays had a fair share in the life of the country—in the administration and in the economy.[290]

In aftermath of the race riots of May 1969, UMO was faced with only two choices. A swing might occur towards an authoritarian Malay-dominated government or the more difficult alternative would be a swing back to the former liberal coalition's policies which own the confidence of the outside world by achieving a balance between the Malay desire to obtain a bigger share of the national wealth and the Chinese basic desire to be allowed to go on making money with a reasonably stable framework.

During the twenty months of emergency rule (Parliament was suspended as a result of the Malay riots), the state was basically run by a civilian-military National Operations Council (NOC), headed by then Deputy Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak. Tun Abdul Razak had directed that Malaysia's economic plan should be appraised. He was of the opinion that the government would play a positive role in launching new and would move into industrial projects itself. A larger government role meant a larger Malay role. The government would thus influence employment policies, which must reflect "from top to bottom, the multi-racial composition of our country".[291] In other words, industry will be encouraged to employ more Malays. The government would also disperse industries from the largely non-Malay towns to Malay rural areas. Tun Razak added: "I must make it very clear that this increase in prosperity is not for any particular group or community…only in this way we can correct the imbalance that exists and rebuild trust and confidence".[292] Hence, Tun Razak's views appeared to coincide with the views of UMNO "ultras" that the root of the May riots was Malay economic resentment, and his policies seem geared towards propitiating this demon. We can now put in perspective Panebianco thesis that there exists a relationship between a party's political strategy and the leadership's legitimacy. The Tunku's strategy of "give and take" and the basis of these proposals was an ethnic *quid pro quo* package deal; often called the "Bargain" was terminated. Under the "Bargain", the elite compromises gave the non-Malay revisions in citizenship regulations and, most important, the granting of *jus soli* after independence. In return, the non-Malays accepted Malay "special rights", Islam as the state religion, Malay as the sole official language from 1967, and the continuance of the functions assigned

---

[287] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power (London: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 40-41.

[288] See Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra, Contemporary Issues in Malaysian Politics (Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications Malaysia, 1984), p. 184.

[289] Dr. Mahathir gave these views after he was expelled from the UMNO Executive Council in an interview with the Far Eastern Economic Review. See Bob Reece, "Alliance Outcast", in Far Eastern Economic Review, September 18, 1969, p. 698.

[290] Ibid.

[291] Tun Abdul Razak, as quoted in Derek Davies, "The Racial Balance Sheet", in Far Eastern Economic Review, July 10, 1969, p. 119.

[292] Ibid.

to the Malay Rulers. The "Bargain" consisted of another, unwritten but acknowledged, level as well. At the elite level, the non-Malays recognized that the Malays should, by virtue of their indigenousness, be politically supreme, and by having, eventually Malay as the sole official language. In return, the Malay elites recognized the right of the immigrant races to make Malaya their home and primary source of national loyalty, and agreed that the non-Malays should not be unduly subject to restrictions disadvantageous to their economic activities, although they were to give assistance to the Malays to help them catch up economically. As we have discussed earlier, the Tunku's political strategy of "give and take" was under fire by the UMNO "ultras" and this has led to his retirement both as Prime Minister and UMNO president.

When Tun Razak came to power, he had in effect call for a "new realism" in the country. What this translated into was a reformulation of the terms of the "Bargain". As such, the "new realism" meant accommodation on essential Malay terms. Tun Razak stated on several occasions that UMNO could rule alone, but in the interest of national unity preferred to share power.[293] In other words, under the leadership of Tun Razak, UMNO "strikes out on a new course". What this translated into was that UMNO, as a political party, had to choose whether to reach a "pact" or adopt a strategy of domination in its relation with the environment. Panebianco has suggested that the environment, form the organization's point of view, is the primary source of uncertainty.[294] In this case, it could well be said that UMNO had chosen the latter strategy as a course of action. In order to reduce environmental uncertainties, Tun Razak announced that democracy could only be restored once Parliament had passed changes in the constitution. The amendment would ensure the depoliticization of the system as far as possible by entrenching ethnically sensitive issues such as citizenship, the national language, Islam, Malay special rights, the Rulers in the constitution and prohibiting the questioning, even in Parliament, of these issues.[295]

In the aftermath of the May 13 incident, UMNO's leadership had to re-establish the party's political strategy and in order to maintain its credibility in the eyes of the Malay community it must be accompanied by an indication of the means to be used. One cannot identify with a "cause" if there are not at least credible proposals as to the paths to be taken for their realization.[296] In essence, the top UMNO leaders had concluded that the underlying cause of the May riots was Malay economic dissatisfaction. To correct ethnic imbalance and identification of race with economic function, a New Economy Polity (NEP) based on preferential ethnic policies would be instituted.[297] Under the twenty year NEP, a number of socio-economic targets were proposed for the *Bumiputera* (but in reality, primarily for the Malays). The most widely quoted goal was for the *Bumiputera* to manage and own at least 30 per cent of the total corporate commercial and industrial activities in all categories and scales of operation by 1991. Under the NEP, the government would actively intervene to help the *Bumiputera* achieve these targets. As a key strategy, the state would actively acquire the assets of existing businesses, which it would hold in trust for the *Bumiputera* until such time that these assets could be turned over to *Bumiputera* individuals. Institutions were set up to help the Malays get business training and advice, secure loans and accumulate capital, and buy shares of businesses.[298]

---

[293] The Straits Times, January 25, 1971.

[294] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 34.

[295] See "Sensitive Issues Must Be Avoided: Return to Democracy only after Parliament has Passed Changes in Constitution", The Straits Times, January 22, 1971.

[296] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 41

[297] For an official account of the NEP, see Government of Malaysia, Second Maalysia Plan, 1971-1975 (Kuala Lumpur: Government Printing Office, 1971). For a useful analysis, see Jomo K. S., A Question of Class: Capital, the State, and Uneven Development in Malaysia (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1988) and Jomo K. S., Growth and structural Changes in the Malaysian Economy (London: MacMillian, 1990).

[298] Among the public corporations formed to implement the public sector segments of the economic plans have been the following: the Rural Industrial Development Authority (RIDA) which was reorganized in 1966 and renamed Majlis Amanah Ra'ayat (MARA); PERNAS, an investment holding company which has formed over a dozen subsidiary companies to engage in insurance, foreign trade, construction, engineering, off-shore mining and participate in numerous joint ventures with private firms; the Urban Development Authority (UDA) to plan and implement urban renewal and development; the Malay-

According to Diane Mauzy, the justifications for the NEP were two-fold. First, the new nationalist Malay political elite, brought into prominence by Tun Razak (such as Dr. Mahathir Mohamed, Musa Hitam, Abdullah Ahmad, and Razaleigh Hamzah), strongly believed that the non0Malays had never lived up to a condition of the "Bargain": that they were actively to help uplift the Malays economically. Second, the imperative of national unity required a more equitable ethnic distribution of wealth. However, the Malays would not confiscate the wealth of non-Malays, and a key feature of the NEP would be that preferences would be instituted only in an expanding economy, so that while Malays would be catching up proportionately, all groups would experience growth absolutely, and hence no group would be deprived.[299] However, from organizational development perspective, UMNO was pushed in Panebianco's words, to develop a strategy of domination in its relation with the environment. First and foremost, this was done by replacing the Alliance with the Barisan Nasional—a considerably expanded grand coalition (from three to nine, then to fourteen parties) that brought into the fold the major Malay opposition (PMIP, for several years only, as it transpired) although not the main non-Malay opposition party. In addition, under Tun Razak's "new realism" in the cabinet, after parliamentary rule was re-established in 1971, proportionality in a qualitative sense became less meaningful: the Chinese lost the Commerce and Industry portfolio, and then in 1974, they lost Finance. UMNO held all key portfolios—thus beginning of UMNO's political hegemony and intended to remain so at any cost for the foreseeable future.[300]

UMNO Internal Structure and Centralization

In the aftermath of the May riots, UMNO's organizational structure reflects the party's "disguised imperialism". In order to reduce any uncertainties coming from its relations with the environment such as challenges from the opposition, UMNO "announced a new set-up to bring the party closer to the government".[301] On that account, UMNO took a major step to streamline the party and improve its dialogue with the government by creating six bureaus. This was done to ensure that the government kept in line with party policy (policies to be carried out by the government must first be approved by the central executive committee and guidelines to carry out the party's wishes must first be worked out by the central executive committee).[302] The six bureaus were political headed by then party president Tun Abdul Razak, finance headed by then deputy party president Tun Dr. Ismail, economics headed by the party vice-president Ghafar Baba, social bureau headed by another party-vice president, Syed Nasir Ismail, education bureau headed by then Minister of Education Hussein Onn, and finally, religious bureau headed by Wan Abdul Kadir.[303] The creation of these bureaus entails greater control by the party headquarters over its divisions and branches, as its main aim was to streamline the party machinery.[304] In addition, this development points to the fact that UMNO had become highly institutionalized party, possessing an extensive central bureaucracy and can achieve autonomy from its environment as well as high internal structural coherence. Structural coherence is, in turn, correlated with level of bureaucratization because of centralizing tendencies inherent in bureaucratic development: In a strong bureaucracy the "center" possesses a very efficient tool with which to control the organiza-

---

sian Industrial Development Authority (MIDA) to plan industrial development and make loans to industry; and the Federal Agricultural Marketing Authority (FAMA) to assist farmers and peasants with marketing problems. In addition, each state has formed State Economic Development projects at the state level. See Gordon P. Means, Malaysia Politics, p. 416.

[299] Diane Mauzy, "Malaysia: Malay Political Hegemony and Coercive Consociationalism", in John McGarry and Brendal O' Leary, The Politics of Ethnic Conflict Regulation (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 106-112.

[300] Ibid.

[301] The Sunday Times, March 14, 1971.

[302] The Straits Times, September 24, 1971.

[303] The Straits Times, February 14, 1971.

[304] Ibid.

tional periphery.[305] In this instance, the bureaus were headed by top UMNO hierarchy and were staffed by full-time officers. The UMNO headquarters would in its turn appoint full-time working member to each UMNO divisions, executive secretaries at state level to monitor the setting up economic and political bureau at the divisional and state level.[306]

Steps were also taken under the UMNO constitution of 1971 providing for a three-year term of office for top party leaders. Those who will serve for the three-year term are: president, deputy president, three vice-presidents and 20 members of the central executive committee (under the old constitution, top party officials were elected for one-year term). Other features of the constitution were—a two-year term for divisional leaders instead of annual election and a seven-men disciplinary committee at national level to replace former regional committees. In addition, the central executive committee (later renamed UMNO Supreme Council) gained complete authority over the selection of electoral candidates (parliamentary and state elections) and gained new powers to call meetings at the divisional, and branch levels.[307] The reason given for these amendments was to prevent conflict within UMNO divisions and branches on the choice of candidates and to streamline the party machinery.[308]

The crisis in Malacca UMNO best describes the power vested in the party's central executive committee over its divisions and branches. In July of 1972, UMNO president Tun Abdul Razak announced that a special committee chaired by then Education Minister and UMNO vice-president, Hussein Onn, would be set up to investigate the possibility of splitting up the one UMNO division in Malacca into four.[309] Malacca UMNO exco member Mohammed Abdul Rahmad made the proposal for the split up of Malacca UMNO to the UMNO central executive committee. Mohammed suggested that the Malacca division be divided into four—Malacca Town, Alor Gajah, Jasin and Malacca Tengah divisions.[310] However, before a decision was reached by the UMNO's central executive committee on the matter, an action committee to split UMNO Malacca at the state level announced the setting up of Malacca Tengah and Bandar Malacca UMNO divisions and sent a telegram to then secretary general of UMNO, Senu b. Abdul Rahman. On his part, Senu maintained that the recognition of a division according to Clause Seven of Article 11 of the party's constitution depended on the central executive committee. As a result, the UMNO headquarters ruled the formation of Malacca Tengah and Bandar Malacca as invalid because the formation had not obtained the approval of the party's central executive committee as required by the UMNO constitution. Again, we see the central headquarters had in effect tightened party discipline and as a result had a upper hand in its relations with its divisions and branches.[311]

Other important changes in UMNO's organizational structure were revealed in 1974. In this instance, the beneficiary was the already all-powerful central headquarters executive committee because UMNO divisional committee members could no longer be able to expel their leaders by merely passing a "no confidence" vote on them. The expulsion could not take effect unless the party's central executive committee concurs.[312] Explaining this move by the party's central executive committee, the party president Tun Razak explained that small groups had in the past used various tactics to gain power in the divisions, such as influencing committee members to put up a no-confidence vote on their leader to replace him with a new leader. The amendment was necessary to prevent such occurrences from spreading so that democracy would be maintained within the party.[313] However, this

---

[305] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organizations and Power, p. 220.

[306] The Straits Echo, October 31, 1971.

[307] The Straits Times, September 24, 1971.

[308] The Straits Times, May 2, 1971.

[309] The Star, July 1972.

[310] Ibid.

[311] The Star, May 7, 1972.

[312] The Star, June 26, 1972.

[313] Ibid.

move by the party's central executive committee entails a highly centralize decision-making structure. Another important amendment to UMNO's constitution was limiting representation in future party assemblies to a maximum of 10 delegates per division and representation in divisional delegates conference to 5 delegates per branch.[314] With this amendment, divisions with as high a membership as 20,000 will be able to send only 10 delegates, as will divisions with only 5,000 members (prior to the amendment, delegation sizes were based on membership without limit). As such, delegates from Bukit Bintang and Setapak divisions of UMNO queried the purpose of the amendment.[315] The delegate from Bukit Bintang, Radin Supatan suggested that the party's central executive committee was "afraid of shadows" by sponsoring the amendment. Explaining the move by the party's central executive committee to limit the number of representatives to the general assembly, party vice-president, Abdul Ghafar Baba, said that when the re-alignment of UMNO divisions was completed, there would be 114 divisions and if each were presented by 10 persons, there would be 1,140 people and if the number was not limited, a time would come when 3,000 and 4,000 people would be present at the assembly. In addition, he pointed out that the limitation would also help vote buying.[316]

According to Michels, the party's magnitude is the primary variable explaining the formation of oligarchy. In this perspective, organizational size both directly and indirectly affects power relations within the party. Directly because the organization's growth influences its leaders' degree of maneuverability. In theory, the leader is merely an employee bound by the instruction he receives. He has to carry out the orders of the man, of which he is no more than the executive organ. But in actual fact, as the organizational increases in size, this control becomes purely fictitious. The members have to give up the idea of themselves conducting or even supervising the whole administrations, and are compelled to hand these tasks over to trustworthy persons specially nominated for the purpose, to salaried officials.[317] Above a certain numerical threshold,[318] any assembly inevitably succumbs to control by the few. Michels pointed out that this is partly due to mass psychology (the "manipulatability" of the crowd) but also partly due to technical-organizational factors: The regular holding of deliberative assemblies of a thousand members encounter the gravest difficulties in respect of room and distance; while from topographical point of view such an assembly would become altogether impossible if the members numbered ten thousand.[319] This explains the necessity of the delegate system and, in time, the end of democracy. But organizational growth also has an indirect effect on the distribution of power within the party, brining about an increase in its complexity: growth in size is correlated with growth in internal division of labor, multiplication of hierarchical levels, and bureaucratic development. An increase in organizational complexity also leads to centralization of the decision making process.[320]

---

[314] Ibid.

[315] The Star, June 30, 1974.

[316] Ibid.

[317] Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy, translated by Eden & Ceder Paul (Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1978), p. 71.

[318] On this point, see C. W. Cassinelly, "The Law of Oligarchi", in American Political Science Review, XLVII (1953). [/ 783.

[319] Robert Michels, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy, translated by Eden & Ceder Paul (Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1978), p. 65.

[320] Ibid., p. 188

CHAPTER 5

UMNO: The Third Phase: Selective Incentives and Power Struggle

In this chapter, I will attempt to demonstrate UMNO's near maturity stage by highlighting a process involving the changing roles of party president and the central executive committee. A significant step in this process was the development of the UMNO headquarters as a continuously operating party headquarters that administers a sizeable staff who carry out ongoing programs. Central to this development is the theory of voluntary associations—organizations whose survival depends neither upon paid or coercively based participation.[321] Participation is attributed to the "offering", be it manifest or hidden, of incentives (benefits or promises of future benefits) by the organization's leaders.

There are two versions of the so-called incentive theory.[322] In the first, the incentives that the organization must distribute in order to ensure necessary participation are above all collective incentives, that is, benefits or promises of benefits that the organization must distribute equally among the participants. In UMNO's case, we have seen in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 how the party develops its official goal, that is, fighting for the interests of the Malay community. The function of the official goal is that of maintaining the identity of the organization in the eyes of its supporters. The organizational ideology is thus the primary source of collective incentives. The second internal function of the party's official aim is that of concealing the distribution of selective incentives, not only from the eyes of those who do not benefit from within the organization, but even from the eyes of those who do.[323] Panebianco has pointed out that this dissimulation is of the utmost importance, because excessively visible selective incentives would weaken the credibility of the party as an organization dedicated to a "cause", and therefore adversely affect its distribution of collective incentives. Selective incentives, as defined in this study, are benefits that the organization distributes only to some of the participants and in varying amounts. As such, the theory of selective incentives aptly explains the behavior of party elites which compete for organizational control and more generally for power, as well as of party clients who exchange votes for material benefits and of some party members who seek career benefits.[324]

In this chapter, I will attempt to use the concepts mentioned above to illustrate UMNO's near maturity stage and the battles within the party to gain control of "selective incentives". Particular attention is given to the UMNO split of 1987, and de-registration of UMNO.

Prelude to a Crisis

In Chapter 4, we have witnessed UMNO's strategy of domination in light of an unprecedented challenge from the opposition. UMNO's top leadership had attributed UMNO's poor showing among the Malay community to the latter's economic frustrations. As a result, UMNO, under the leadership of Tun Abdul Razak b. Datuk Hussein, had embarked on a social restructuring program to correct the economic imbalances that existed in the country. In addition, after the May 13 race riots, UMNO's pre-eminence as the single most influential party to have shaped not only the political contours but also the overall social terrain in the country was reinforced, first by an amendment to the country's constitution and second, by streamlining the government's policies to that of UMNO's. Under Tun Razak's "new realism", UMNO played a bigger role in the government (Chapter 4) and his policy clearly favors the Malays and other indigenous groups collectively known as *bumiputera* (literally, sons of soil), especially the economic and educational spheres. Hence, UMNO's bigger role in the

---

[321] On the theory of voluntary associations, see D. Shills, The Volunteers (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1057).

[322] The theory of incentives owes its first formulation to C. Barnard, The Functions of Executive (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938). It most refined formulation can bound in J. Q. Wilson, Political Organization (New York: Basic Books, 1973).

[323] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power (London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 9-13.

[324] Ibid., p. 11.

government coincided with the growth of factions within the party (factions as it is aptly in this study means strongly organized groups) fighting over the distribution of selective incentives both in terms of material and social benefits. Being a governmental party, UMNO's appeal in fact lay in its patronage-dispensing function. According to Harold Crouch, in the 1960s, UMNO was able to provide its supporters with access to land and government employment while the distribution of timber licenses was of importance to aspiring businessmen.[325] However, with the onset of the New Economic Policy (NEP), patronage networks in UMNO grew. As Edmund Terrence Gomez and Jomo K. S. have noted, it is through the NEP that rents have been created, captured and disbursed, ostensibly as part of the government's policy of "restructuring" to attain greater inter-ethnic wealth parity and to develop *Bumiputera* entrepreneurs.[326]

UMNO's growing hegemony over the state coupled with increased power in the hands of ruling politicians and bureaucracy was crucial for the development of patronage networks. Thus, some party leaders were able to exploit UMNO's dominance and found it politically expedient to use expanded state machinery and the party's access to economic resources to patronize groups and individuals in return for support within the party.[327] This use of political patronage to establish power bases has inevitably led to rancorous infighting and bickering that has deeply divided UMNO. In vying for power, each party faction, with its own sources of funding and business proxies often operated quite independently.[328]

When Tun Razak came into power in 1970, heightening factionalism came head on between the "old guard" and the "new blood". As Tun Razak saw it then, only better-educated and technocratically oriented leaders could carry out the successful implementation of the NEP action strategy. Therefore, the 1974 general elections witnessed the rise of an inner circle of Tun Razak's protégés mostly hand-picked by him, some of whom became politicians and cabinet ministers overnight. Amongst them were Dr. Mahathir Mohamed and Musa Hitam, both expelled from UMNO by Tunku Abdul Rahman for "insubordination" after the 1969 general election, and Tengku Razaleigh, considered by many then as a "Malay economic genius". Naturally this move by Tun Razak was resisted by the "old guard" or *pimpinan lama* within uMNO and subsequently a crisis erupted within UMNO's national leadership which affected the grass-roots leadership as well. As Harold Crouch has rightly pointed out, the latter crisis has received less attention from most analysts although it was quite serious.[329] This was due to the fact that the political strength of many of the "old guard" politicians, especially at the state level, rested mainly on patronage distribution and they felt increasingly threatened by the new trend toward centralized and technocratic administration. Tun Razak, on the other hand, appreciated the importance of patronage in maintaining support for the party and did not attempt to overhaul and transform the party's character. Instead, he sought to impose a new type of leadership that could guide the party's national policies in a planned direction without unduly disturbing its patronage distribution network at the local level.[330] On that account, the "new blood" began to gain political clout through effective

---

[325] Harold Crouch, "Authoritarian Trend, the UMNO Split and Democracy", in Joel S. Kahn and Francil Loh Kok Wah, Fragmented Vision: Culture and Politics in Contemporary Malaysia (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1992).

[326] Edmund Terrrence Gomez and Jomo K. S., Malaysia's Political Economy: Politics, Patronage and Profits (Singapore: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 25.

[327] Ibid., p. 25.

[328] Ibid., p. 26.

[329] For a full account of the UMNO crisis, see Harold Crouch, "The UMNO Crisis: 1975-1977", in *Malaysian Politics and the 1978 Election*, edited by Harold Crouch, Lee Kam Hing and Michael Ong (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 11-36.

[330] As soon as Tun Razak became UMNO's third president, there was a hard tussle for top posts in UMNO. At the UMNO general assembly that was held on January 22 to 24, there was a tough fight for the three posts of vice president and also for head of the young and women sections. Among the "new blood" elected to the UMNO central executive committee were Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah, Ghazali Shafie and Musa Hitam. Before the 1971 UMNO general assembly, the "old guard" had lashed out at the "new blood". Those politicians who had grown politically under the leadership of Tunku Abdul Rahman such as Mohamed Khir Johari and Senu Abdul Rahman warned of an attempt by "certain quarters" to split UMNO. Nevertheless, the "new blood" suffered a temporary setback at the 1972 UMNO general assembly when Dr. Mahathir and Ghazali Shafie failed in their bid for the vice presidency of UMNO. The two winners were Sardon Jubir and Abdul Ghafar Baba,

implementation of their centralized and technocratic administration which was strongly and positively felt by grass-roots supporters as well as the emerging Malay entrepreneurial group. The "new blood" politicians, however, owned their political success to the overall economic conditions that existed in Malaysia then.

Nevertheless, Tun Razak did not live to carry out his plans. His untimely death in January 1976 came at most inopportune time for his closest colleagues and protégé in that they had not yet fully established their positions in the party while their rivals were still strong.[331] Many of the Tunku's men had been pushed aside but they remained on the sidelines to take advantage of circumstances that might enable them to return to positions of influence. On that account, an intense and complex leadership struggle within UMNO took place in 1976-1977, one which set the tone for successive ones. This development corresponds to what Panebianco has described an an institutional order than favors party stability and leader preeminence in the case of government parties. A strong executive tends to make the government's party dominant coalition relatively stable whether be its internal groups' degree of organization. The factions that have allied against other factions in creating the dominant coalition at the moment of the choice of the Premier cooperate until the next crisis of succession.[332] Hence, after the death of Tun Razak, UMNO experienced a "leadership crisis" with the "old guard" going all out to oust those politicians who had risen under the patronage of the late premier. Even though the transitionary period between the death of Tun Razak and the rise of Tun Hssein Onn as Malaysia's premier was relatively calm, the question of who would fill the second leadership slot and thus the next Deputy Prime Minister was one of crucial importance.[333] This could be attributed to the fact that Tun Razak had already prepared the ground by placing several younger leaders in the positions from which they could expect to rise further. Tun Razak had smoothed the way for the return of Dr. Mahathir to the

---

came from what might be termed as the party's older guard. Dr. Mahathir and Ghazali Shafie, however, were elected to t[330] Harold Crouch, "Authoritarian Trend, the UMNO Split and Democracy", in Joel S. Kahn and Francil Loh Kok Wah, Fragmented Vision: Culture and Politics in Contemporary Malaysia (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1992).

[330] Edmund Terrrence Gomez and Jomo K. S., Malaysia's Political Economy: Politics, Patronage and Profits (Singapore: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 25.

[330] Ibid., p. 25.

[330] Ibid., p. 26.

[330] For a full account of the UMNO crisis, see Harold Crouch, "The UMNO Crisis: 1975-1977", in *Malaysian Politics and the 1978 Election*, edited by Harold Crouch, Lee Kam Hing and Michael Ong (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 11-36.

[330] As soon as Tun Razak became UMNO's third president, there was a hard tussle for top posts in UMNO. At the UMNO general assembly that was held on January 22 to 24, there was a tough fight for the three posts of vice president and also for head of the young and women sections. Among the "new blood" elected to the UMNO central executive committee were Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah, Ghazali Shafie and Musa Hitam. Before the 1971 UMNO general assembly, the "old guard" had lashed out at the "new blood". Those politicians who had grown politically under the leadership of Tunku Abdul Rahman such as Mohamed Khir Johari and Senu Abdul Rahman warned of an attempt by "certain quarters" to split UMNO. Nevertheless, the "new blood" suffered a temporary setback at the 1972 UMNO general assembly when Dr. Mahathir and Ghazali Shafie failed in their bid for the vice presidency of UMNO. The two winners were Sardon Jubir and Abdul Ghafar Baba, came he UMNO central executive committee. See James Morgan, "Changing Guard", in Far Eastern Economic Review, February 6, 1971; Dahari Ali, "Tengku: Beware of "new" or "old" order talk", in The Sunday Times, January 24, 1971; "Khir warns of bid to split UMNO", The Straits Times, January 2, 1971; "Mahathir Nominated For Top Post", The Star, April 30, 1972; and James Morgan, "UMNO Election" in Far Eastern Economic Review, July 8, 1972.

[331] The shroud of secrecy that had been thrown around Tun Razak's illness was demonstrated by the fact that then Malaysian Foreign Minister, Tengku Ahmad Rithaudden, and Chief Secretary to the Government, Tan Sri Abdul Kadir Shamsuddin, arrived in London on January 13, 1976 unaware that their Prime Minister was close to death. They had come to consult Tun Razak on already-postponed Malaysian-Thai border talks, instead, they were told by doctors that the Prime Minister was in no condition to talk to them. Only then did the Kuala Lumpur visitors realized that their Prime Minister was dying. It was many hours after Tun Razak had died that it became known that acute leukemia had claimed him. See K. Das, "Speculation over Razak's Illness", Far Eastern Economic Review, January 2, 1976; Ranjit Peiries, "The Final, Tragic Hours of Tun Razak", Far Easter Economic Review, January 23, 1976, p. 6.

[332] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 169.

[333] Harold Crouch, "The UMNO Crisis: 1975-1977", in Malaysian Politics and the 1978 Election, p. 15.

party in 1972 and appointed him as Minister of Education in 1974. The other outspoken critic of the Tunku, Musa Hitam, was reappointed in 1973 as a deputy minister and 1974 joined the cabinet as Minister for Primary Industries. Outside the cabinet, the young leader of UMNO Kelantan, Tengku Razaleigh, who had been associated with Mahathir and Musa in 1969, was appointed to head the new state corporation, Pernas, and then the new state oil company, Petronas, while at the same time in 1974 at the age of 37 as one of the party vice presidents.[334] A political analyst described the political development in UMNO after the death of Tun Razak situation in UMNO then as *anak ayam kehilangan ibu* (a brood of chicken has lost the mother hen).[335] When (later Tun) Datuk Hussein Onn became Premier, the tensions within UMNO became more intense. The power game acquired a new dimension, which in a sense, was an extension of what had begun in Tun Razak's time. Leading the crusade against Tun Razak's protégé were Tan Sri Syed Jaafar Albar, the leader of the UMNO Youth section, and Datuk Senu Abdul Rahman, then secretary-general of UMNO. Behind them were the "old guards" of the ruling organization, eager for the chance to settle old scores and throw their hats into the ring when they think a change of leadership was in the offing. The first to bare the brunt of the "crusade" were a group of politicians whose careers had been hitched to the leadership of Tun Razak and, after his death to the new Premier Hussein Onn. Tun Razak's protégé then known as the "gang of four" (Abdullah Ahmad, former political secretary to Tun Razak, then Deputy Minister of Science and Technology in Hussein administration; Abdullah Majid, press secretary to Tun Razak and then Deputy Minister of Labor and Manpower; Khalil Akasa, executive secretary of UMNO; and Samad Ismail, former managing editor of the New Straits Times). The UMNO "old guard" had accused the "gang of four" of isolating Tun Razak from the UMNO "old guard" and consequently having them excluded from the decision-making process. Another charge leveled against the "gang of four" was that they persuaded Tun Razak to groom their man, Tengku Razaleigh, as a future Prime Minsiter, overlooking the party's "old guard". Hence, it is important to note that the UMNO crisis that occurred in 1975-1977 was not ideological in nature. Rather, it was a battle to secure selective incentives. The power struggle and the acrimonious divisions within UMNO which the "gang of four" apparent monopoly over the Premier provoked could be explained in terms of the nature of the ruling party. UMNO was and is not a party which is wrecked by political debate on which "ism" it should follow. Apparently there was an agreement on objectives—raising the status of the hitherto economically underprivileged Malay community and giving them state financial and other support to achieve this economic restructuring. Within this consensus, however, conflicts do erupt over the exercise of power and spoils of office. Therefore, for the system to function smoothly, UMNO members, or at least all of its leaders, should have access to the party president who also happens to be the Prime Minister to influence decisions, or to obtain benefits for their clients and constituencies.[336] This development corresponds to Panebianco's observation on party participation—that there exists a clear-cut distinction between the simple party members and the activists. In fact, much of the rank and file activity has a very discontinuous character: some members participate on particular occasions (e.g. during electoral campaigns) and the activists do not all participate with the same intensity. Some activists dedicate all their free time to voluntary political work for the party, others only part of it, and still other alternate between periods of greater participation and periods in which they reduce their commitment without, however, withdrawing altogether. However, the activist "nucleus", the party's small minority which continually participates and whose activities enable the organization to function, is clearly the most important

---

[334] For a discussion on Dr. Mahathir b. Mohamed's return to UMNO after being expelled from the party in 1969, see James Morgan, "Prodigal's Return", in Far Eastern Economic Review, March 18, 1972, p. 7. Musa Hitam was active in the second echelon of UMNO leaders in the period of 1960s and was associated with the "ultras" who led the attack on the Tunku after the 1969 race riots. Musa was subsequently expelled from the government as an Assistant Minister and spent a year on study leave at Sussex University before returning to the Malaysian political arena. Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah, a Belfast-educated economist was then 36 years old, held the portfolio of UMNO treasurer. He was elected to the UMNO central executive committee (Supreme Council) at the 1972 UMNO general assembly. Following the death of Tun Dr. Ismail b. Dato' Abdul Rahman on August 2, 1973, Tun Razak named Hussein Onn as his deputy. Since one of the posts of UMNO vice president was left vacant following the appointment of Hussein Onn as UMNO's acting deputy president, Tun Razak appointed Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah as one of the party's vice presidents. See The Star, July 29, 1974; The Straits Times, July 29, 1974.

[335] See Khalid Abdullah, "Search for Second-Slot Man", in Asean Review, February 16, 1976.

[336] The political developments mentioned here were abstracted from K. Das, "Succession Struggle—Round Two", in Far Eastern Economic Review, November 26, 1976, pp. 21-25.

group. The leaders' exchanges with this group will have the most relevant organizational consequences. Panebianco termed those activists whose participation depends primarily on selective, material, and/or status-oriented incentives as *careerists*. Careerists are active members primarily interested in selective incentives and thus their presence has considerable organizational importance. The careerists constitute the main force behind the factionistic games, are often human base for the schisms, and represent a potential source of turbulence and threat to the organizational order which the leaders must attempt to neutralize. In addition, the careerists constitute the pool from which future party leaders emerge. The selective incentives from which the careerists benefit are related to the system of internal inequality: the party hierarchy (its inherent system of unequal status) is one of the careerist's main sources of remuneration.[337] It is against this backdrop that the UMNO crisis of 1975-1977 could be understood. This was made evident when the "old guard" claimed that the "gang of four" by numerous power-plays, had split party unity and used their influence with Tun Razak to drive into exile men who had grown up politically with the former Premier and party president, Tunku Abdul Rahman, in an effort to establish a "new order"—the title of an UMNO manifesto issued by them—under Tun Razak. The "old guard" also complained that the "gang of four" had ousted Mohamed Khir Johari, then Trade Minister, from the cabinet, and also pushed aside Tan Sri Sardon Jubir, the former Minister of Communication, who belonged to the traditional-conservative Malay element.[338] Hence, the UMNO crisis of 1975-1977 centered on the question of the distribution of selective incentives, that is, the distribution of spoils of office and access to party leadership.

Clearly, the power struggle in UMNO from 1975 to 1977 was a potential source of turbulence that could have stabilized the organizational order. As such, the then acting party president Hussein Onn, had to step in order to neutralize the situation. In fact, the most delicate problem that Hussein had to handle was the Harun Idris affair. Harun, the former *Mentri Besar* of Selangor and the leader of UMNO Youth section, was one of the more influential personalities from the "old guard". Nevertheless, in the period after 1969, Harun had joined other UMNO leaders in calling for a new deal for the Malays and was thus no supporter of the Tunku and the "old guard". During the UMNO crisis of 1975-1977, however, this process was reversed with the "old guard" and Harun working in concert to topple the "gang of four". This was due to the fact that Harun believed that the "gang of four" was instrumental in getting Tun Razak to act against him on the charges of corruption.[339] Consequently, Harun was expelled from UMNO and jailed after being convicted of corruption.[340] Thus getting rid of the "gang of four" became an obsession with those excluded from the power and perks structure. The assault on the "gang of four" took shape in the guise of the party "old guard" making subtle innuendos about UMNO being infiltrated by "communists" and subsequently a hunt for "communists" in the party gained momentum. Even though the then acting UMNO president, Hussein Onn, managed to somewhat neutralize the situation, it was not without its toll with the three of Tun Razak's protégé

---

[337] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, pp. 26-27.

[338] See K. Das, "Succession Struggle—Round Two", in Far Easter Economic Review, November 26, 1976, p. 21-25.

[339] Datuk Harun, as quoted in an interview with M. G. G. Pillai, "My Fate was Being Decided", in Asiaweek, April 2, 1976, p. 7.

[340] See The Straits Echo, "Harun Sacked from UMNO", March 23, 1976. The first charge of corruption against Harun alleged that he corruptly solicited RM250, 000 between February 22 and July 24, 1972 from the Hong Kong and Shanghai Bank Corporation as gratification for UMNO. The charge alleged that the was an inducement to him as Menteri Besar in respect of the banks' application to amalgamate three pieces of land and for a piece of state land in Kuala Lumpur to construct a multi-story building. The second charge alleged Harun accepted RM25,000 gratification from the Bank at Kuala Lumpur International Airport on or about August 16, 1972 through Haji Ahmad Razali, allegedly for UMNO to obtain approval of the State Executive Council relating to the Bank's application. The third charge alleged Harun on or about March 27, 1973, while being Menteri Besar, accepted from the samebandk the sum of RM225,000 in his office for the same purpose. Shortly after the sentence, new charges of criminal breach of trust involving RM7.9 millionof shares held by Bank Kerjasama Rakyat was laid against Datuk Harun that resulted in his conviction and a further six months goal sentence. The charge alleged that Datuk Harun had used RM7.9 shares held by the Bank Kerjasama Rakyat of which he was the chairman to promote the world heavyweight championship between Muhammad Ali and Joe Bugner in Kuala Lumpur in 1975. See K. Das, "Jail and Tears for Datuk Harun" in Far Eastern Economic Review, May 28, 1976, p. 12; K. Das, "Harun Loses Another Round", in Far Eastern Economic Review, February 4, 1977, p. 13.

ending up as political detainees for alleged involvement in "communists activities".[341] However, the new leadership under acting UMNO president Hussein Onn managed to divert a potential source of organizational instability only after reversing his resolution that Harun Idris should be kept out of UMNO. He was also pressured into detaining Tun Razak's protégé, deputy ministers Abdullah Ahmad and Abdullah Majid.[342] Attempts made by the "old guard", however, to implicate other prominent politicians who had risen under the tutelage of Tun Razak such as Dr. Mahathir Mohamed, Musa Hitam and Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah with communists activities were unsuccessful.[343] This could be attributed to the fact that Dr. Mahathir had grassroots support from school teachers who he could cultivate more intensively as Minister of Education. At that time, teachers function as UMNO branch executives in the *kampongs*. The attack on Tengku Razaleigh and Musa Hitam was mounted by those who saw them as possible obstacles to their ambitions.[344]

The UMNO crisis of 1975-1977 demonstrated the changing pattern in UMNO's power struggle. Thus competition for party posts had become more intense partly because party members had started to equate holding important party positions at branch, division and central executive committee (later renamed supreme council) with increased opportunities to enrich themselves.[345] For that reason, the claim made by some observers that UMNO in the 1970s was still "peasant in outlook with traditional values that regard any form of open defiance of the leadership as impolite" was proven inaccurate and insensitive to the social reality prevailing in Malaysia.[346] It was also in the late 1970s (July 1978) that for the first time ever in UMNO's history the post of party president hitherto been return unopposed was challenged. Tun Hussein Onn, who was actually the acting UMNO president at that time having taken over Tun Razaks position after the latter's death, was challenged by Sulaiman Palestin, a candidate put up by the "old guard" during the 31st UMNO general assembly in order to register their disapproval over the way Hussein Onn treated Harun Idris who by then had been expelled from UMNO and convicted of corruption. As Shamsul A. B. has rightly pointed out, although Hussein Onn won hands down, a "sacred" UMNO tradition was "demystified". By 1978, all the top UMNO leadership posts had been contested.[347] It is against this background that one must situate and understand the origins of subsequent power struggle in UMNO and by 1981, all of UMNO's top posts (president, deputy president, vice presidents and those in UMNO Youth and Women sections) had been contested.

---

[341]The communists witch-hunt that was initiated by UMNO's "old guard" culminated in the resignation of two deputy ministers—Abdullah Ahmad, then Deputy Minister of Science, Technology and Environment and Abdullah Majid, then Deputy Minister of Labor and Manpower. The two Abdullahs along with Samad Ismail and Khalis Akasah were part of Tun Razak's inner circle known as the "gang of four". Samad Ismail, Abdullah Ahmad and Abdullah Majid were detained under the Internal Security Act for alleged links with the communists. For an excellent account of the sage, see K. Das, "The Purge from Within", in Far Eastern Economic Review, November 12, 1976, p. 20; K. Das, "Switching on the Confessions", Far Eastern Economic Review, 1977, p. 10; and "UMNO Supreme Council Acts against the two Dollahs", The New Straits Times, May 22, 1977.

[342] See "Harun Back in the Fold: No Conditions on his Re-admission into UMNO, says Hussein", The Sunday Times, October 24, 1976. See also "UMNO Supreme Council Acts against the Two Dollahs", The New Straits Times, May 22, 1977.

[343] Samad Ismail claimed that while he was detained under the Internal Security Act (ISA), he was forced to link Dr. Mahathir with the communists. Similarly, Dr. Syed Husin Ali revealed that while he was detained under the Internal Security Act, he was also forced to confess that Dr. Mahathir and Musa Hitam were communists' sympathizers. See Aliran Monthly interview with Dr. Syed Husin Ali, President of Party Rakyat Malaysia—"We Want Change that will Benefit the People", Aliran Monthly, August 1999, 19 (7) p. 40. A full account of Dr. Syed Husin Ali wrongful detention under the Internal Security Act is available in his book, Syed Husin Ali, Two Faces: Detention without Trial (Kuala Lumpur: Insan, 1996).

[344] See K. Das, "Succession Struggle—Round Two", p. 25.

[345] This calim was made by an UMNO founding member, Tan Sri Aziz Tapa in Sa'odah Elias, "Future Directions in the Hands of a New Breed", The Star, April 17, 2000.

[346] See, for example, the editorial of The New Straits Times, March 28, 1976 and Harold Crouch, "The UMNO Crisis: 1975-1977", pp. 34-35.

[347] See Shamul A. B., "The "Battle Royal": The UMNO Elections of 1987" in Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Southeast Asian Affairs, 1988, Singapore: ISEAS, p. 172.

New Economic Policy (NEP), Mahathir's "Malaysia's Incorporated" and The 1987 UMNO Split

Hussein Onn was at the helm of power for fairly a brief period (197601981). Having suffered a heart attack, Hussein was regarded as an ailing Premier and the pervasive belief being that only a frail heart beat stood between the Prime Minister and others aspiring to this office. During his tenure as Prime Minister and UMNO president, Hussein surprised the country by making politically unpopular decisions. To the amazement of his party and the country, Husin expelled one of the most charismatic leaders the Malays had produced—Dato Harun Idris, Mentri Besar of Selangor and leader of the UMNO Youth—followed by the charges of corruption. This Harun-Hussein confrontation dominated his entire premiership.[348] According to William Case, the way in which Hussien Onn yielded the UMNO presidency to Dr. Mahathir in 1981 illustrated some of the party's formal and informal game rules. For example, the transfer of party leadership appeared first to require sanction from the retiring position holder and second, an institutionalized means for elites and sub elites to deliver up their endorsement.[349] Consequently, Hussein Onn's chosen successor Dr. Mahathir Mohamed stood unopposed for the UMNO presidency in the general assembly election in June 1981. At the outset of his premiership, Mahathir's one-time ultra posture continued to appeal to many nationalist Malays. On the other hand, some sections of the Chinese community had reservations about his ascendancy due to his widely publicized Malay partisanship.[350] Nevertheless, Dr. Mahathir maintains: "I have been misinterpreted and misunderstood, even at the time when I was labeled as ultra. I felt that the labeling was a political gimmick, and that image was unacceptable to a large majority of Malaysians. When I was a Member of Parliament, all I was talking about was that the Malays should have a fair share in this country—no more than that".[351] As shown by the 1982 election returns, however, many groups appreciated Mahathir's assertiveness. His evident dynamism and stated commitment to "clean, efficient and trustworthy" (*bersih, cekap dan amanah*) procedures in the Malay operated bureaucracy made him tolerable to many in the Chinese community. Hence, in order to realize the redistributive and growth policies favored respectively by these communities, Mahathir concentrated state power in the planning and technocratic units of an invigorated Prime Minister's Department. Mahathir's fundamental policy aims may be summarized as: (1) establishing Malaysia's newly industrialized country (NIC) status through a program of state-led heavy industrialization; (2) accelerating ethnic Malay participation in this growth process by expanding *Bumiputera* equity ownership and managerial skills; and (3) furthering yet containing the Islamization of Malaysia's political, economic and social life. The first two objectives were carried out by the terms of New Economic Policy (NEP), while the last on an unexpected urgency in the atmosphere of the early 1980s,[352] that is, Mahathir's Islamization policy could be drawn up to check Parti Islam Se-Malaysia's (PAS) advancement in Malaysia's northeastern "Malay-belt" states.[353]

Mahathir's public policies have already received much scholarly attention and they need not be repeated here.[354] However, what is important for us to note here are the repercussions of UMNO's hegemony over the state and Mahathir's capitalism through political patronage, Mahathir's fixation with the creation of *Bumiputera* capitalists has been evident since the publication of his 1970 "treatise" on

---

[348] For a useful analysis of Hussein's retirement, see K. Das, "The Old Guard Changes", Far Eastern Economic Review, July 3, 1981.

[349] See William Case, Elites and Regimes in Malaysia: Revisiting a Consociational Democracy (Clayton, Victoria: Monash Asia Institute, 1996), p. 152.

[350] See Dr. Goh Cheng Teik, "A Malaysian Chinese View", Asiaweek, March 12, 1976, p. 10.

[351] Mahathir, as quoted in Philip Bowring, "Mahathir and the New Malay Dilemma", Far Eastern Economic Review, April 9, 1982, p. 20.

[352] See William Case, Elites and Regimes in Malaysia: Revisiting a Consociational Democracy, p. 157.

[353] See Suhaini Aznam, "Godfather Party Runs Short of Islamic Plums", Far Eastern Economic Review, January 2, 1986, p. 24.

[354] For a full account of Mahathir's economic policies, see Jomo K. S. "Mahathir's Economic Policies: An Introduction", in Mahathir's Economic Policies, (2nd ed.), edited by Jomo K. S. (Petaling Jaya: Institute of Socal Analysis, 1989).

the problems of the indigenous community, *The Malay Dilemma*.[355] Therefore what is of particular importance for the purpose of this study is to chart more closely Mahathir's combined pursuit of political patronage, specifically as they were manifested in career experiences in UMNO. On the one hand, the implementation of the NEP has resulted in a rapid, almost phenomenal, expansion of the Malay middle class. A large portion of the new Malay middle class, however, comprising civil servants, professionals, and entrepreneurs, belongs to UMNO and consequently, this new Malay middle class, however, comprising civil servants, professionals, and entrepreneurs, belongs to UMNO and consequently, this new Malay middle class was heavily dependent on the party for access to patronage. On the other hand, the NEP-produced business opportunities coupled with Mahathir's concept of "Malaysia Incorporated" inevitably increased the stakes in the struggle for power in UMNO. It is against this backdrop that we could make sense of the intense personal rivalry that developed between Musa Hitam and Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah for the post of UMNO deputy presidency (which carries the post of deputy prime minister with it) first in 1981 (when the post was contested for the first time ever in UMNO's electoral history) and then in 1984. According to Shamsul A. B., this is significant in UMNO's context because after 1981 any challenge to its top leadership was seen by its members at all levels, as a sign of their "political maturity" and not as being "un-Malay", because before this, any form of open defiance of the leadership had been considered not only impolite but heretical in terms of Malay traditional values. In addition, Shamsul A. B. pointed out that it was during the protracted battles between Musa and Razaleigh that this "political maturity" developed and was realized and two identifiable factions developed within UMNO led by Musa and Razaleigh respectively.[356]

As we have seen in the previous section, this factional struggle within the UMNO leadership took place in the context of growing competitiveness within the party as a whole since the 1970s. This development further reiterates Panebianco's contention that control over the distribution of incentives, particularly selective incentives—incentives being the currency of exchange (patronage) in vertical power games—constitutes another source of organizational instability; another resource of organizational power within the horizontal power games, for example, in the relations among the dominant coalition's leaders, and in the relations between the dominant coalition and the minority elites. The negotiations, in fact, do not only take place between the dominant coalition and its following, but also within the dominant coalition itself. Power equilibria within the coalition can be altered at any moment, because the control of some leaders over certain crucial zones of uncertainty[357] grows, thus increasing their control over the distribution of incentives at the other leaders' expense.[358] In UMNO's case, before the Razaleigh-Musa showdown, division was only felt at the top (dominant coalition) but with the onset of Razaleigh-Musa battle, it went down to the grass roots—in the words of Shamsul A. B., to the *warung* ("stall") and Malay dominated trade union meetings in the urban areas and to the *kedai kopi* ("coffee shop") and *surau* ("small prayer house") in the rural areas. *Orang Musa* ("Musa's man") and *Orang Razaleigh* ("Razaleigh's man") were not only labels but often became the "key phrases" which opened or terminated a business or any other discussion, guaranteed or denied an individual getting a contract or a scholarship, and expedited or delayed an application for a job, a license, or even the transfer of a school teacher from an *ulu* ("remote") to an urban school and vice-versa. In short, the idiom of political interactions especially at the grass roots, whether amongst UMNO members or its sympathizers became highly divisive in content and nature, articulating the leadership conflict in the dialect of local issues, in a manner never seen before within UMNO.[359] The election campaign for the deputy presidency, which began in April 1981, was unparalleled in its ferocity and in the

---

[355] Edmund Terrence Gomez and Jomo K. S., Malaysia's Political Economy: Politics, Patronage and Profits, p. 117.

[356] See Shamsul A. B., "The "Battle Royal": The UMNO Elections of 1987", p. 172.

[357] Angelo Panebianco defines zones of uncertainty as areas of organizational unpredictability. The survival and functioning of an organization depend on a series of activities; the very possibility that a vital activity could be denied, that someone could walk out on the organization, that an interruption could take place in crucial activities, constitutes an uncertain situation for the organization. People who control the zones of uncertainty upon the operation of the services depends, hold a trump cars, a resource that is "spendable" in the internal power games. See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 33.

[358] Ibid., p. 38.

[359] See Shamsul A. B., "The "Battle Royal": The UMNO Elections of 1987", pp. 172-173.

interest it generated throughout the country. Millions of ringgit were said to have been laid in bets not only in Malaysia but also in neighboring Singapore, where the business community was reported to have come under pressure to manipulate the market to influence the election. The old bogey of Musa being and extremist was reportedly raised to give credibility to Razaleigh, whose Chinese friends in business were worried about possible changes in the Finance Ministry if he lost. There were endless rumors in the corridors of the hotels about vote buying by Chinese businessmen pouring millions of dollars into the campaign.[360] History was recorded that Musa Hitam won in both contests (1981, and then again in 1984). Musa's victory, however, was not without its toll. Musa had made it clear that he was a Mahathir man. Mahathir, on the other hand, was officially neutral but actually favoring Musa.[361] As Panebianco has pointed out, negotiations do take place within the dominant coalition itself and the dominant coalition's degree of cohesion depends upon the fact that control over zones of uncertainty is either dispersed or concentrated. The principal distinction here lies between partied divided into faction (strongly organized groups) and partied divided into tendencies (loosely organized groups). Factions—organized groups—may be of two types: groups which cut the party vertically, from the top to the rank and file (these being the true or "national" factions), and geographically concentrated groups, organized at the party's periphery. Tendencies can be characterized as aggregations at the top without organized rank and file (which does not necessarily mean without consensus). In a party in which groups are factions, control over zones of uncertainty is dispersed (subdivided among the factions) and the dominant coalition is not very cohesive because it is the result of a compromise between certain factions.[362]

If we are to re-look at Mahathir-Musa confrontation that culminated in the latter's resignation in the context of Panebianco's above mentioned theory, we could argue that Musa's sudden resignation shocked Mahathir and his men because UMNO was a party that was divided into factions. Moreover, Musa's decision complicated matters within UMNO's dominant coalition (top level) but things became even more complicated and confused at the grass roots level especially within the "Musa faction", where there were many supporters of Mahathir as well, because Musa was the Mahathir endorsed candidate in the contest for the top post of UMNO deputy president both in 1981 and 1984. Most analysts, however, would agree that Musa's differences with Mahathir was not ideological, rather it was a struggle for power and position around the question of succession to Mahathir.

The falling out over the two began soon after the UMNO triennial elections in 1984. After losing the 1981 battle, Razaleigh had stayed on as finance minister and treasurer of UMNO. In 1984, he challenged Musa again for the same post in a much bitterer and more expensive campaign that drained both sides of their financial resources. With his big-business connections, however, Razaleigh had little trouble raising funds. Musa, on the other hand, was still burdened with the cost of funding his 1984 campaign. As such, Musa's supporters claimed that there was a tacit agreement between their mentor with Mahathir (coincides with Panebianco's contention that negotiations do take place within the dominant coalition itself) that if Razaleigh contested and lose, he would be dropped from his cabinet post and denied any nominated post in UMNO. Musa's supports claimed that Mahathir kept only half of the promise—Razaleigh lost the party treasurer post but was kept in cabinet as Trade and Industry Minister—and left the door open for a third contest between the two in 1987.[363] One could surely see that UMNO's dominant coalition (top level leadership) at that point in time, was not very cohesive. As a party that was divided into factions, the distribution and competition of selective incentives by the leaders of the various factions in the party to their followers could be a source of conflict. This could be attributed to the fact that the followers represent the potential risk-zone for the party leaders because it is within this group that the aspiration towards upward mobility is strongest. In addition, the fact that only some of the followers can be co-opted (due to scarcity of distributable resources

---

[360] These observations were made by K. Das in "The Old Guard Changes", Far Eastern Economic Review, July 3, 1981, pp. 14-16.

[361] See John Berthelsen and Rapheal Pura, "Malaysia's UMNO Faces Leadership Rift", Asian Wall Street Journal, March 3, 1986.

[362] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, pp. 37-40.

[363] See "Rift at the Top", Asiaweek, March 16, 1986, pp32-33.

at any moment) explains in large party the practically endemic character of intra-party conflicts.[364] It is against this contention that we could re-interpret Mahathir-Musa fallout. After winning the post of UMNO deputy president, Musa had thought that he could dictate and slowly consolidate his grip on the party and the government. To begin with, he wanted a transfer to the Foreign Ministry and other important cabinet portfolios to some of his close associates. Musa had asked that his own Home Ministry portfolio be given to Abdullah Badawi who he had identified as his potential deputy-to-be. Again, Mahathir met Musa halfway. Musa could take the Foreign Ministry but Tengku Ahmad Rithauddeen would be brought into the Home Ministry; Musa's choice, Abdullah Badawi, would go to the Education Ministry. Three days before the cabinet reshuffle in July 1984, Musa reportedly told Mahathir he did not want a transfer after all: "he wanted the powerful Home Ministry himself or under someone who would follow his orders, if he had accepted the Foreign Ministry and let the Home Ministry go to Tengku Ahmad Rithauddeen, he would be in a much weaker position".[365] Thus, the competition for the spoils of political office between the Mahathir and Musa factions was among the reasons that had caused the rift between the two top UMNO leaders. While Musa was grooming his "boys" towards upward mobility in the party hierarchy, Mahathir had decided to keep Tengku Razaleigh in the cabinet. In addition, Mahathir picked his close friend and prominent Malay entrepreneur Daim Zainuddin as the new Finance Minister and UMNO treasurer. He also announced that he had chosen his close associates and loyalist Sanusi Junid as UMNO secretary-general. Meanwhile, in 1982 Mahathir had co-opted the former Muslim Youth leader (ABIM) and prominent critic of the government, Anwar Ibrahim, into UMNO and he was rapidly moved up the party hierarchy. Anwar's rapid rise and his growing influence with Mahathir disturbed Musa and his followers who had begun to envisage the possibility that Anwar, who was in his late 30s, might eventually displace Musa, who was in his early 50s, as the heir apparent if Mahathir stayed on too much longer.[366] Similarly, Musa's supporters saw Mahathir's choice of Sanusi Junid as UMNO secretary-general in unfavorable terms. As party secretary-general, Sanusi was flexing his muscle in the party, taking firm control of the headquarters and gradually extending his grip to the grass roots. Musa's followers claimed that Sanusi and UMNO executive secretary Kamarulzaman Bahadon had such a strong grip on the party apparatus that it was difficult for those who did not see eye to eye with them to act without their blessings. As such, even in his capacity as UMNO deputy president, Musa was unable to gain extra clout within the administration and apparently, his supporters claimed that he had no say on how the party headquarters should be run.[367] We must, however, observe that both cohesive and divided dominant coalitions are the result of alliances between groups; what varies are the degrees of organization in the groups. Moreover, if we examine the groups (factions and/or tendencies), we discover that even these are usually the result of alliances between smaller groups. The difference is that if the group is a tendency, the ties between its sub-groups are weaker and more changeable than those between a faction's sub-groups. What is important is that the dominant coalition is always an alliance of alliances, an alliance between groups which are, in turn, coalitions of smaller groups. Degree of cohesion is concentrated in the hands of a few, or are dispersed amongst numerous leaders. Degree of cohesion is based upon the extent to which vertical exchanges (the elite-follower exchanges) are concentrated in the hands of a few, or are dispersed amongst numerous leaders. Degree of stability, on the other hand, is related to horizontal exchanges (elite-elite exchanges), and, in particular, to the character of compromises (whether stable or precarious) at the organization's upper echelons.[368] The source of instability in UMNO at the time of Mahathir-Musa confrontation was the nature of horizontal exchanges. If we are to look closely at the origin of Musa's discontent, we could see that his supporters were getting quite impatient and restless at the nature of the horizontal exchanges that was going on. Mahathir had placed his men in key cabinet and party positions while Musa's men felt that the purpose of those people (Mahathir's men) was to identify and isolate them as if they were preparing to oust Musa from the party. As the result of this

[364] See "Rift at the Top", Asiaweek, March 16, 1986, pp. 32-33.

[365] A high-ranking UMNO source, as quoted in "Musa's resignation Shock", Asiaweek, March 9, 1986, p. 44.

[366] See "Musa's Resignation Shock", Asiaweek, March 9, 1986, pp. 43-45.

[367] See Suhaini Aznam, "Mahathir's Dilemma: Delegation Sent to Mecca to Discuss Musa's Resignation", Far Eastern Economic Review, March 13, 1986, pp. 10-13.

[368] Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 39.

jolting for selective incentives (power/positions) from both Musa and Mahathir factions, there was instability at the party's dominant coalition. On the one hand, Musa felt that he was left out of the decision-making process:

I am not playing much role in the party. I am the deputy president and I only attend meetings that are required of me. I am not consulted. I am not called upon to express [views] on party matters, but I am not taking issue with this. But I can't say I am happy. I accept this as a reality, as a result of what I did. I cannot force the president of the party or the supreme council to consult me.[369]

On the other hand, Mahathir was of the opinion that "Musa's boys" "were undermining him, threatening his position and saying bad things about him, about his being the richest Prime Minister, corrupt and a dictator".[370] Mahathir also claimed that "certain quarters" were trying to "split", "topple the government" and "we know who they are within and without the party". In other words, Mahathir had accused Musa of privately discrediting him so as to "bring him down".[371] These sweeping allegations by Mahathir "were too strong for me [Musa] to say well, let's forget it. The belief of the Prime Minister in what he said in accusing me…he was too convincing for me to think that it could be brushed aside".[372] Musa was of the opinion that it was better for him to resign so that "you [Mahathir] can now choose those who you trust completely to assist you when you face the people later".[373] At a hurriedly convened UMNO Supreme Council meeting of 28 February1986 to discuss Musa's resignation, Mahathir countered by producing another, earlier letter from Musa Hitam to Mahathir, dated 5 July 1984. By making available this letter—in which Musa wanted to "register my strongest views against Tengku Razaleigh's appointment at Ministry of Trade and Industry"—Mahathir meant to show that Musa resigned because Mahathir would not comply with Musa's demand that Razaleigh be removed from the cabinet after Razaleigh lost his second contest against Musa.[374] Musa eventually agreed to withdraw his resignation as UMNO's deputy president—but not his resignation from Deputy Prime Minister's position. He reasoned that he was elected by the party to be its deputy president, but was appointed by Mahathir to be his Deputy Prime Minister. By staying on as UMNO deputy president, however, Musa left little doubt that he was very much interested in the party and government. In this context, a well-known theory of organizational power captures the "sense" of intra-organizational power relations. It is the theory of power as an exchange relation. In the words of two of its most representative supporters:

Power can once again be defined as a relation of exchange, and therefore reciprocal, but in the sense that the exchange is more favorable for one of the parts involved. It is a relation of force, in that one is advantaged over the other, but where the one can, however, never totally be defenseless with respect to the other.[375]

Power is therefore relational and asymmetrical, but also reciprocal. It manifests itself in an "unbalanced negotiation" in a relation of unequal exchange in which one actor receives more than the other. Power is, thus, never absolute: its limits are implicit in the very nature of the interaction. One can exercise power over others only by satisfying their needs and expectations; one thereby paradoxically submits oneself to their power. In other words, the power relation between a leader and his followers must be conceived as a relation of unequal exchange in which the leader gets more than the followers, but must nonetheless give something in return. The outcome of the negotiation depends on the degree

---

[369] Musa Hitam, as quoted in an interview with Asiaweek. See "A Liking for Contest", Asiaweek, December 7, 1986, p. 34.

[370] Ibid.

[371] Musa Hitam's resignation letter to Mahathir as UMNO president—widely circulated to UMNO Supreme Council members as reproduced in "Rift at the Top", Asiaweek, March 16, 1986, pp. 31-36.

[372] Musa Hitam, as quoted in an interview with Asiaweek. See "A Liking for Contest", ibid.

[373] Musa Hitam's resignation letter to Mahathir as UMNO president—widely circulated to UMNO Supreme Council members as reproduced in "Rift at the Top", ibid.

[374] Musa Hitam, "Letter to Mahathir" 5 July 198. Razaleigh was removed from the Ministry of Finance. Musa's letter was "written with a very heavy heart and the greatest reluctance" and delivered "before your [Mahathir's] final decision" to offer Razaleigh appointment as Minister of Trade and Industry, which Razaleigh accepted.

[375] M. Crozier and E. Friedberg, as quoted in Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 22.

of control that different actors have over certain reseoruces—those resources that Angelo Panebianco defines as the "trump cards" of organizational power games. Power resources are based on control over zones of organizational uncertainty, that is, over factors which, if not controlled, menace or can menace the survival of the organization and/or its internal stability. The leaders are those who control the crucial zone of uncertainty for the organization, and can capitalize on these resources in internal negotiations (in power games), swinging them to their own advantage. In organizations especially in voluntary organizations as parties, every organizational actor controls at least a small "zone of uncertainty", that is, possesses resources that can be capitalized on in power games. Even the lowliest party member possesses some resources—he can abandon the party and thus deprive it of his participation, he can give his support to an internal minority elite, and so on.[376] As for Mahathir-Musa confrontation, the definition of power as an exchange relation should be seen in light of negotiations among leaders (horizontal power games). The emergency UMNO Supreme Council meeting convened to discuss Musa's resignation turned out to be the first terrain upon which Musa's and Mahathir's supports commences their tactical maneuvers to outflank one another. The UMNO Supreme Council more or less reached a compromise: it stated its allegiance to Mahathir's leadership but sent a party delegation to meet with Musa and to persuade him to withdraw his resignations.[377] Musa's decision to stay on as UMNO deputy presided exerted pressures on Mahathir. As Khoo Boo Teik has argued convincingly, never having been a real "party boss" with personal grass roots base in UMNO, Mahathir owed his appeal to the party membership primarily to his Malay nationalist and his ideological influence. That did not quite matter as long as an unchallenged Mahathir remained above the intra-party power struggles by virtue of being UMNO president and Prime Minister. But Musa's manner of desertion effectively dragged Mahathir into the intra-party power struggle.[378] This corresponds to Angelo Panebianco's theory that in voluntary organizations, political parties in particular, every organizational actor controls at least a small "zone of uncertainty"—resources that could be capitalized on in power games. Musa Hitam, however, was by no means an ordinary organizational actor—he was active in UMNO since 1964 when he was recruited by the late Tun Sardon Hj. Jubir, then Minister of Transport as his political secretary. Three years later, Musa ran for parliament and won by a large margin, joined the cabinet in 1974 as Minister for Primary Industries, Minister of Education in 1978 and finally as party deputy president and Deputy Prime Minister in 1981. In addition, Musa was the leader of Johor UMNO, a state with the second largest number of delegates to the annual UMNO general assembly (Perak was the state with the largest number of delegates to the annual UMNO general assembly).[379] Surely, we could argue that Musa had at his disposal the control of resources, those resources that Angelo Panebianco had defined as "trump cards" of organizational power games which he could capitalize in the intra-party power struggle. It is against this background that we shall analyze how the "war of the giants"[380] in UMNO began.

As we have seen in the previous section, this increasingly intense power struggle within UMNO, which began in mid-1970s continued throughout the early 1980s. With Musa's resignation as Deputy Prime Minister in 1986, however, the internal power struggle within UMNO took on a new dimension. Angelo Panebianco has pointed out that in a party in which internal groups are factions; control over zones of uncertainty is dispersed (subdivided among the factions). As such, when Musa decided to remain as the party deputy president, there were numerous speculations on how the "war of the giants" would take shape at the UMNO triennial elections in 1987:

Will Musa run against Mahathir or settle for a defense of the No. 2 post? Will Razaleigh run against Mahathir or against Ghafar Baba, an old friend and ally who supported him in two contests against Musa? Will there be a three-way fight between Mahathir, Musa and Razaleigh for the top post or a

---

[376] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, pp. 22-23.

[377] "MT Ikrar Setia Pada Mahathir", *Utusan Malaysia*, March 1, 1986.

[378] See Khoo Boo Teik, Paradoxes of Mahathirism: An Intellectual Biography of Mahathir Mohamed (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 230.

[379] See "A Political Man", Asiaweek, March 16, 1986.

[380] This phrase was first used by Shamsul A. B. in his "The "Battle Royal": The UMNO Elections of 1987", p. 173, ibid.

Ghafar-Musa-Razaleigh struggle for deputy? Might not old foes Razaleigh and Musa team up to take on Mahathir and Ghafar? Or perhaps Razaleigh, not fancying his chances against Ghafar or Mahathir, might team up with them to take on the common enemy: Musa. When it comes to the crunch, will Mahathir and Ghafar stick together?[381]

The answer to this puzzle was unveiled around February 1987 when, first, Musa declared that he would defend his deputy president, and second, Razaleigh indicated that he would challenge Mahahthir.[382] Clearly, this tunr of event in UMNO was the result of two formerly opposing factions forming an alliance in order to topple the top leadership. Hence, the degree of cohesion/division of a party's dominant coalition refers to the concentration/dispersion of control over the zones of uncertainty, and thus over incentive distribution; it also refers, therefore, to the vertical power games (elite-follower exchanges). Stability/instability refers, on the other hand, to the way in which the horizontal power games are played (among the elites). It refers, more specifically, to their ability to make long lasting compromises concerning spheres of influence within the party. There is naturally a relation between a dominant coalition's degree of cohesion and its degree of stability.[383] The instability in UMNO's 1987 dominant coalition could be attributed to numerous facts. First and foremost, some supporters of the "Razaleigh faction" were overjoyed to see the Musa-Mahathir split and saw it as clearing the path for Razaleigh's comeback to the top. However, as later events demonstrated, this was not the general feeling of the "Razaleigh faction". They might have disliked Musa but they hated Mahathir for his alleged double-dealing made obvious by Musa's resignation and Mahathir expose of Musa's letter to him in July 1984 asking that the defeated Razaleigh be kept out of the cabinet, a request to which Mahathir did not accede. Secondly, the struggle for power within UMNO would not have escalated to such a height if Malaysia's economy had not been suffering from a prolonged recession. As long as the economy was booming, the competing interests and aspirations of Malay upper and middle classes were relatively easily met and fulfilled by those in power. However, when the economy suffered from serious setbacks, those who were adversely affected, especially those who were excluded from the party's perks structure became bitter and frustrated and disillusioned. It is, therefore, not surprising when those who were looking for scapegoats transformed their dissatisfactions into political action. This corresponds to Panebianco's observation that control over the distribution of incentives constitutes another zone of uncertainty.[384] Rightly or wrongly, Mahathir was seen as being very "cliquish" and "dictatorial" in the way he ran the government and conducted business, political or economic, both as UMNO President and as Prime Minister. He was accused of having a small business clique that he favored and a smaller "kitchen cabinet" within his cabinet, thus giving the impression that the economy and the politics of the country were in the hands of the elites of the elites. As a consequence, those outside this very close circle of Mahathir allies claimed that they had only limited access to him. In addition, he was also accusing of paying little attention to views different from his, from within his Cabinet, from UMNO national officials, and from those outside the government, hence the accusation that he was "dictatorial". In sum, we could attribute the 1987 UMNO crisis to the then dwindling Malaysian economy and UMNO's specific internal circumstances. Resulting shortfalls in patronage were reflected in the UMNO general assembly election in April 1987. A quarter of the delegates were, as in 1984, Malay business people,[385] though now grown resentful over unfamiliar hardships and the party's narrowing favoritism in awarding contracts and licenses. Generally blaming the then Finance Minister, Daim Zainuddin, for overall mismanagement and criticizing

---

[381] This astute analysis was made by a journalist in "Gearing for Battle", Asiaweek, December 7, 1986. After Musa's resignation, Mahathir had chosen Abdul Ghafar Baba who was then a veteran party vice president as his new deputy. Most political observers were of the opinion that Ghafar was chosen in order to strengthen Mahathir's hand in any contest with Musa at the UMNO 1987 polls. By stayig on as UMNO deputy president, Musa left little doubt that he was very much interested in the top posts in the party and government. Making the picture more complicated was Ghafar's own ambitions—since he was already Number Two in the government, would he run for UMNO deputy presidency at the 1987 UMNO polls? See "Sizing up Ghafar for No. 2", Asiaweek, April 13, 1986, p. 29.

[382] See Suhaini Aznam, "In Everythin bu Name", Far Eastern Economic Review, March 12, 1987, p. 14.

[383] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, p. 168.

[384] Ibid., p. 38.

[385] The Star, March 29, 1987.

Mahathir for suspending the NEP's 30 per cent restructuring quotas,[386] many delegates were receptive to new mobilizing appeals. In these circumstances, Musa Hitam, the UMNO deputy president, and Tengku Razaleigh, the Minister of Trade and Industry, recognized clear political opportunities. They conferred first through intermediaries, the personally in London over the possibility of setting asides their differences and mounting a joint challenge against Mahathir and his deputy, Ghafar Baba.[387]

Shamsul A. B. has pointed out that although Razaleigh and Musa did not declare officially that they were contesting for the posts of president and deputy president respectively until the eleventh hour, from the weeks when divisional party elections began on February 6, 1987 to the end of February 1987, both Mahathir and Razaleigh received nominations for the post of president, while Musa and Ghafar were nominated for the post of deputy president.[388] Hence, as the weeks went the rumor that Razaleigh had sealed a pact with his former nemesis, Musa, to oppose the Mahathir and Ghafar combination no longer remained a rumor. Things came out into the open at a symbolic divisional party meeting. Razaleigh was by Musa to officiate the latter's divisional party meetings onFebruary 27, 1987 in Segamat, Johor, and the former reciprocated by inviting Musa to officiate his [Razaleigh] divisional meeting in Gua Musang, Kelantan, on March 20, 1987. At the Segamat meeting, Razaleigh fired his first salvo (aimed at Mahathir, of course) by chiding his supporters not to wait until midnight to see him because of fear of being blacklisted by the cronies of the incumbent UMNO leader and for:

Fearing a person we vote in every three years even more than God. Sometimes people in power get a bit swollen-headed, and forget to look at the ground. If you don't dare to act, you will get what you deserve because you have become frightened hens. We don't practice dictatorship here; our leaders always say we practice democracy.[389]

For the first time in UMNO's political history, the incumbent party president was seriously challenged—it was not simply a personal challenge to Mahathir, the president, but to his whole team by an alternative team led by Razaleigh and Musa. UMNO was offered an unprecedented alternative involving not only an alternative president and deputy president but also vice presidents and Supreme Council members.[390] As such, Mahathir, Razaleigh, Musa and Ghafar Baba carefully adopted strategies to defending or promoting their respective statuses. Mahathir, as national leader, initially remained aloof. However, as the party polls approaches, Mahathir decided to break his silence. He did this while opening the new UMNO headquarters in Kelantan, as a guest of Razaleigh and in front of thousands of the latter's noisy supporters. Mahathir's message was couched in the familiar subtle metaphor of Malay proverbs, *air dicincang tidak putus* ("slashed water is never severed"), expressing the brother-like relationship that he has had with Razaleigh. Nonetheless, he warned that if he was pushed too far, *air boleh jadi ais dan ais boleh retak, macam hati manuisa* ("water could become ice and ice could break, like the human heart"). And as he stepped up his campaign he become more and more direct in his attacks on Razaleigh, to which Razaleigh replied in equally harsh terms. The verbal exchanges continued unabatingly for about three weeks, covered extensively by the media, especially the Star, an MCA-owned English daily, and *Watan*, both of which had been consistently giving a more balanced coverage of the campaigns of the two opposing camps.[391]

The two opposing groups were commonly referred to as Team A, led by Mahathir-Ghafar, and Tem B, Razaleigh-Musa. According to Milne and Mauzy, the choice of these labels were said to have been made by the press, which is quite credible, because the label "A" would seem to have conferred a de-

---

[386] Lee Poh Ping, "Heavy Industrializtion" in Mahathir's Economic Policies, 2nd ed., edited by Jomo K. S. (Petaling Jaya: Malaysia Institute of Social Analysis, 1989), pp. 98-96 and 43.

[387] See Khoo Boo Teik, Paradoxes of Mahathirism: An Intellectual Biography of Mahathir Mohamed, p. 233.

[388] See Shamsul A. B. "The "Battle Royal": The UMNO Elections of 1987", p. 176, ibid.

[389] Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah, as quoted in "Razaleigh's Offer to Lead", Asiaweek, March 29, 1987, p. 14.

[390] Harold Crouch, "Authoritarian Trends, the UMNO Split and Democracy", p. 11-12, ibid.

[391] See Shamsul A.B. "The "Battle Royal": The UMNO Elections of 1987", p. 179, ibid.

cided advantage and the press was strongly pro-Mahathir.[392] What was more significant was the fact that even the thirteen UMNO Cabinet ministers were split into two camps, with six each behind Mahathir and Razaleigh and one Najib Tun Razak, sitting on the fence. However, Mahathir received the support of all the state *Mentri Besars*, who as early as February 26, had pledged their loyalty to him. This move was not surprising for all of them owed their offices to Mahathir.[393] The candidates for the three posts of UMNO vice president were also split into two camps. The three from the Mahathir-Ghafar camp were Anwar Ibrahim (a cabinet minister), Wan Mokhtar and Ramly Ngah Talib (both were state *Mentri Besars*), and from Razaleigh-Musa camp were Abdullah Badawi, Rais Yatim (both cabinet ministers) and Harun Idris (ex-state *Mentri Besar*).[394] Similarly, the line up for the party's 25-men Supreme Council could also be grouped into the two major camps, which indicated an obvious desire by both camps to control the powerful inner circle. Once the lines of battle had been drawn, there were very few switches. The UMNO General Assembly elections were held on April 24, 1987; the contest between the teams produced a close result. Mahathir won the battle but with a very narrow margin of merely forty-three votes, that is, only 51.45 per cent of the 1,479 votes cast (Razaleigh, on the other hand, received 718 votes or 48.55 per cent of the total votes cast, while Ghafar prevailed over Musa by 139 to 699; see Appendix 2 for the 1987 UMNO election results). Team A also won about two-thirds of the Supreme Council elected seats and two of the three vice presidential positions (Anwar Ibrahim and Wan Mokhtar Ahamd). The other winner, Abdullah Ahmad Badawi was from Team B.[395] Former UMNO president and Prime Minister Hussein Onn was struck by Mahathir's narrow victory margin as it showed that there were very deep divisions in the party with regard to Mahathir's leadership.[396] Hussein's astute observation coincides with Shamsul A. B.'s contention that the results clearly indicated that Mahathir's popularity had been drastically reduced, his image dented, his authority eroded, his "cleanliness" questioned, his "efficiency" doubted, and his "trustworthiness" under suspicion. Thus, Mahathir-Ghafar had won the battle but not necessarily the war.[397]

The narrow victory margin had also put Mahathir in a position where he was not able to make any compromise, for the sake of UMNO's future unity, with the opposite camp, either in the form of retaining some of the "rebel" ministers or appointing those "rebels" who lost in the vice president and Supreme Council contests. This was made evident when he "purged" the "rebel" ministers from the cabinet on April 30, 1987.[398] On the other hand, Mahathir rewarded those who were responsible for his victory and had shown unwavering loyalty to the leader.[399]

According to Tengku Razaleigh, by getting rid of those cabinet ministers associated with Team B, Mahathir indicated that he did not respect 49 per cent of the delegates.[400] As such, it came as no surprise that a group of disenchanted Team B supporter known as the "UMNO 11" brought a suit to nul-

---

[392] See R. S. Milne and Diane K. Mauzy, Malaysian Politics under Mahathir (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 41.

[393] See "Bounds of Battle", Asiaweek, March 1, 1987, p. 21

[394] Ibid.

[395] For a useful analysis of the UMNO elections result, see Suhaini Aznam, "The Vital Forty-Three", Far Eastern Economic Review, May 7, 1987, p. 12.

[396] Tun Hussein Onn, as quoted in "The Price of Victory", Asiaweek, May 3, 1987, p. 12.

[397] See Shamusl A. B., "The "Battle Royal": The UMNO Elections of 1987", p. 181.

[398] Mahathir announced on April 30, 1987 that he had terminated the services of Defense Minister, Abdullah Badawi, Welfar and Services Minister, Shahrir Samad, and Minister in the Prime Minister's Department, Abdul Ajib Ahmad. Also dropped were four deputy ministers—Kadir Sheikh Fadzir, Zainal Abidin Zin, Rahmah Othman and Radzi Sheikh Ahmad. All these ministers and deputy ministers were essentially from Team B. See "Mahathir Cracks the Whip", Asiaweek, May 10, 1987, p. 27.

[399] Mahathir rewarded his allies who had supported him at the UMNO election. The most conspicuous reward went to the vocal UMNO Wanita (Women) section head, Rafidah Aziz, who was promoted from Public Enterprises Minister to Trade and Industry Minister—the post previously held by Mahathir's rival, Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah. Most of Mahathir's other allies remained where they were, including Finance Minister, Daim Zainuddin, Education Minister, Anwar Ibrahim, and Deputy Home Minister, Megat Junid. See Suhaini Aznam, "Mahathir Rewards Support", Far Eastern Economic Review, May 28, 1987, p. 44.

[400] See "Mahathir Cracks the Whip", p. 28, ibid.

lify the election in the general assembly, because they alleged that the April 1987 elections was null and void since delegates from thirty branches as well as some under aged women at the UMNO Women's Wing Section meeting and over aged men at the party's Youth Wing Section meeting had selected divisional delegates to the April general assembly. In relation to UMNO's organizational structure, branch elections are held each year whereby delegates are elected, who in turn attend divisional meetings (*mesyuarat perwakilan bahagian*) to elect delegates to the general assembly. The High Court delivered an unpleasant surprise when it held that UMNO, by virtue of the existence of the unregistered branches, had become an unlawful society. According to Harun J., "that being so, the plaintiffs as members of UMNO cannot acquire any right which is founded upon which is unlawful. The court will therefore not lend its aid to the reliefs sought by the plaintiffs".[401] A rush began by each group to register a new party, and lay claim to UMNO's substantial assets, frozen until their ownership could be determined (see Appendix 3 for UMNO's asset in 1987). To restore the organization of the deregistered UMNO, the incumbent group in power clearly had the advantage. Dr. Mahathir, as Home Minister, retained the final say on all applications pertaining to the registration of political parties and societies, as the Registrar of Societies is a subordinate government official technically accountable to the Home Minister. Thus, by virtue of being the Prime Minister as well as Minister of Home Affairs, Mahathir had the control of the zones of uncertainty, that is, he has a resource that is "spendable" in the internal power games.[402] The upshot was that an application of Mahathir to register was accepted, whereas the application of the two former Prime Ministers, Tunku Abdul Rahman and Hussein Onn was rejected on the grounds that the Registrar of Societies had not yet actually deregistered UMNO. Mahathir's party, after some delay, and after demonstrating that it had recruited most of the original UMNO's members, was able to gain control of the assets. It had been ruled that neither group could use the original name, "UMNO"—the name chosen by Mahathir's Team A was "UMNO *Baru* (new)"[403]

UMNO: Internal Structure and Centralizing Tendencies

After the High Court ruling which declared the original UMNO as an unlawful society, the old UMNO and its spirit had in actual fact died. Thus, the development of UMNO's *Baru* (New) internal structure should be seen in a different light. When Mahathir succeeded in registering the new UMNO, he had in effect alienated most of the supporters of Team B.[404] A sizeable number of Team B supporter joined Tenku Razaleigh when he founded a new party—*Semangat 46* (Spirit of 46). Razaleigh and his supporters, however, returned en-bloc to UMNO in 1996 when the party was dissolved.[405] When UMNO was re-instituted as UMNO (*Baru)*, there was a marked tendency towards consolidation of power in the hands of the party president. In retrospect, the deregistration of UMNO may have come as a blessing to Mahathir for he could now design a party and a constitution more appropriately reflecting his ideas, interests, and aspirations without much opposition from the new membership. To ensure total loyalty the party and its program, Mahathir initially established eligibility criteria for entering UMNO Baru that can be deemed arbitrary if viewed from the standpoint of the party's declared objective of uniting all Malays. Such criteria—for example, barring those responsible for the suit bringing the old UMNO to court wre intended to keep out Team B leaders who were increasingly condemned as "trai-

---

[401] Justice Harun Hashim, as quoted in H. P. Lee, Constitutional Conflicts in Contemporary Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 52-53. For chronology of events leading to the high court ruling, see "Search for a Compromise", Asiaweek, October 9, 1987; "UMNO Given Two Weeks", The New Straits Times, October 1, 1987; "These 12 Out to Destroy UMNO: Mahathir", The New Straits Times, August 14, 1987.

[402] For a thorough discussion on what constitutes the zones of uncertainty, see Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, pp. 33-36.

[403] For a blow by blow account on the race to re-register UMNO, see Rodney Tasker and Suhaini Aznam, "Challenge of Elders", Far Eastern Economic Review, February 18, 1988, p. 13; Suhaini Aznam, "The Tilt of Power", Far Eastern Economic Review, March 31, 1988, p. 15; and Rodney Tasker, "The Balance of Power", Far Eastern Economic Review, February 25, 1988, p. 12.

[404] See Rodney Tasker, "A Grand Master Move", Far Eastern Economic Review, March 3, 1988, p. 14.

[405] See "Semangat 46 Bubar", *Utusan Malaysia*, February 8, 1996; and "Pemimpin S46 Mahu Bersatu dengan UMNO", *Utusan Malaysia*, February 6, 1996.

tors".[406] These development corresponds to Maurice Duverger observations that two essential facts seem to have dominated the evolution of political parties since the beginning of the 20th century: the increase in the authority of the leaders and the tendency towards personal forms of authority. In addition, as early as 1910, Roberto Michels noted an increase in the obedience of party members when he analyzed the structure of socialist parties and especially of German Social Democracy.[407] In UMNO's case, Mahathir named himself UMNO (*Baru*) president, Ghafar Baba as deputy president, and his loyalist Daim Zainuddin as treasurer. Eventually, Mahathir modified the party constitution so that UMNO tradition discouraging direct challenges for top posts was made nearly ironclad. Specifically, each divisional nomination of an UMNO (Baru) candidate for president or deputy president would carry with it ten "bonu" votes.[408] This would ensure that nominations were followed by virtual block voting at general assembly elections, rather than permitting divisions publicly to nominate incumbent position holders, then vote secretly for challengers or high bidders. Hence, the system adopted gave weight, not only to the votes cast for these two posts, but also provided for the number of nominations each candidate received. Furthermore, the party president was also empowered to nominate the heads of the Youth and Women's sections, rather than allow these sections to elect their own leaders (prior to the UMNO crisis of 1987, these sections were allowed to elect their own leaders). Hence this partial recourse to open autocracy did not prevent the employment of methods of disguised autocracy. According to Maurice Duverger, all parties that are officially democratic in structure employ them. Two techniques may be thus made use of to camouflage autocracy: the manipulation of elections and the distinction between real leaders and apparent leaders. Duverger notes that within parties, where elections take place in a narrower circle and where publicity is less considerable, these tricks are even more numerous and effective.[409] At this stage, we could see that UMNO's organizational development moving away from a divided-unstable dominant coalition as well as stability of the entire organization. This translates into the leader's freedom of movement because leaders are primarily interested in a type of participation which helps the organization function and which at the same time implies that the followers support the leaders (certain kinds of participation are of no interest to the leaders, for example, participation in form of protest or contestation of the leadership—which took place in UMNO's 1987 election).[410]

However, in 1998 the "bonus system" adopted by UMNO in the aftermath of the 1987 UMNO split was scrapped. There were numerous reasons given for the abolishment ranging from being "undemocratic" on one end of the spectrum, and to curb "excessive politicking" on another.[411] Nevertheless, as Duverger has noted, some parties in their constitution officially limit the party electors' freedom of choice by laying down a procedure for nomination. Frequently, moreover, this system is linked not only with the desire to introduce an element of autocracy into the party, but also with an attempt to increase centralization or decentralization (in UMNO's case, local party leaders are required to submit proposal of election candidates via the State Liaison Committee to the party headquarters for approval which obviously increases centralization). Also in 1998, in lieu of the "bonus system", the leadership of UMNO formulated a new "percentage system" that requires those vying for party presidency to receive at least 30 per cent support or 50 nominations, deputy president 20 per cent or 33 nominations, vice president 10 per cent and Supreme Council members 5 per cent or 8 nominations.[412] Surely this requirement will limit the electors' freedom of choice and increase the incumbent's chances of being

---

[406] See K. S. Nathan, "Malaysia in 1988: The Politics of Survival", Asian Survey, Vol. XXIX, No. 2, February 1989, pp. 129-130.

[407] See Maurice Duverger, Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1995), p. 168.

[408] See Fasal 7.3 *Perlembagaan UMNO Dipersetujukan dalam Perhimpunan Agung Khas UMNO pada 19hb. Jun 1994* (Kuala Lumpur: Ibu Pejabat Pertubuhan Kebangsaan Melayu Bersatu (Baru) atau UMNO, n.d.)

[409] Ibid., p. 138.

[410] See Angelo Panebianco, Political Parties: Organization and Power, pp. 22-23.

[411] See "*MT Perlu Kaji Mansuh Undi Bonus*", *Utusan Malaysia*, August 20, 1998.

[412] See "*Usul Pindaan Perlembagaan Dilulus*", *Utusan Malaysia*, December 4, 1998.

re-elected because incumbents are usually better known than others, and with more power to influence others, were likely to attract more nominations. A good example of incumbency advantage was demonstrated when the incumbent party president Mahathir Mohamed retained the UMNO presidency with 133 of 165 nominations as opposed to only one nomination for Tengku Razaleigh. Similarly, the then acting UMNO deputy president also won the deputy presidency unopposed when he received 133 nominations as opposed to only two nominations for Tengku Razaleigh.[413] Looking at the formal sanction such as the "percentage system" only tells half of the story. Maurice Duverger has noted that persuasion, even more than sanctions, has aided the development of obedience. In all parties, calls to discipline and unity have multiplied. In some obedience has become the very foundation of party community, the source of the solidarity that unites its members.[414] In UMNO, the party's dominant coalition (UMNO's Supreme Council) has issued a "co-contest advise", that is, a method of "persuasion" advising party members to let the party president and deputy president be returned unopposed.[415] In this context, we can put into perspective Maurice Duverger's contention that the development of obedience implies the homogeneity of the party, the absence of "fractions" and wings. In practice, the disciplinary institutions and the system of purges serve to preserve orthodoxy of the party and to maintain strict unity among its members. Nevertheless, the development of factions is not a sign of the liberty of members and weakening in the authority of the leaders, rather does it point to differences of opinion between members of the ruling class. Each fraction is itself authoritarian in structure because it is composed of a few leaders and the party members whom they have gathered around them and whom they generally submit to a discipline similar to that which exists in the party itself. Splitting does not take place at the level of the masses but at the level of the leaders—generally it is the result of an attempt by subordinate leaders to oust leaders of higher rank, or of certain higher ranking officials to obtain the majority in collective executive bodies. By their very nature these fractions are not opposition coming from the base but opposition coming from apex. Their existence entails a natural weakening of the authority of the leaders because of the division it introduces among them. In sum, their effect can be compared with that of the separation of powers in the state, which sets limits to each one through the others and weakens the power as a whole. In UMNO, however, after the UMNO party of 1987, organizational stability was enhanced because the party has a cohesive dominant coalition, which resulted from the absence of competing fractions going after the party's top leadership. This came about as a result of a series of amendments to the party's constitution as well as "advice" coming greater freedom of movement for the party's top leadership and personalization of power. According to former UMNO deputy president Musa Hitam, the no-contest advise (implying no challenge to party leadership) has been a trend in the party for the past ten years and it is an unhealthy trend because if the top leaders are not contesting in the manner that all top leaders had decided time and time again, it would give top leadership a false of security and a false sense of popularity.[416] In short, there exists in UMNO a tendency towards strengthening the power of the leader who systematically acted as to obtain from members obedience as complete as possible and to imply that the followers support the leader.

---

[413] The Star, March 27, 2000; The Star, March 28, 2000.

[414] See Maurice Duverger, Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State, p. 175.

[415] In 1995, the UMNO president Dr. Mahathir said that there would not be any contest for the top two part posts in the 1996 UMNO election, see Rashid Yusof and Kamarulzaman Salleh, "Anwar Won't Challenge", The New Straits Times, September 24, 1995. Similarly, on January 3, 2000, the UMNO Supreme Council passed a resolution calling for Dr. Mahathir and Abdullah Ahmad Badawi to be nominated without contest for the post of president and deputy president, respectively at the May 2000 UMNO polls, see Leslie Lau, "Keep to Two", The Star, January 4, 2000.

[416] Musa Hitam, as quoted in an interview with Mergawati Zulfakar, "Let Members Select the Best", The Sunday Star, February 27, 2000.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

Our objective n this study has been to demonstrate the relevance of analyzing the United Malays National Organization (UMNO) through the concept of organizational evolutional typology of political parties, with a view to explaining a series of opposing needs that every party must counterbalance. The way these needs in fact counter-balanced defines a central dimension of the party's organizational order. This order varies from party to party and depends on numerous factors, above all, as we have seen, the party's organizational history and the features of the environments in which it operates. In other words, there is neither and "iron law" of parties' organizational evolution nor of any other organizations. A number of outcomes are possible and thus a number of organizational orders. However, by using a preliminary general three-face model of organizational development developed by Angelo Panebianco through his empirical research in the field of political parties, we were able to use his model as interpretive tools pertaining to different disciplinary traditions, some of the basic factors explaining party politics. In addition, it is also possible to identify certain tendencies that appear to operate in many parties. Combining these tendencies, we were able to construct a model of UMNO's organizational evolution. In the course of this evolution, some organizational needs tend to grow in importance with respect to others.

In its genetic phase, we have seen how UMNO developed its official goal, that is, fighting for the "Malay cause" and the function of this official goal is that of maintaining the identity of the organization in the eyes of its supporters. As such, after the Malayan Union episode, UMNO designed programs for social progress and the arrangements for party consolidation as part of its bid for the leadership of the Malay community. In this, it competed with Malay groups which were at pains to point out that UMNO's aims and methods had either failed to advance the Malays or had threatened their customary way of life. On the one hand, UMNO was criticized as retrogressive in its attitude to the British, to the Malay states and to the Malay society in particular. *Pusat Tenaga Rakyat* (PUTERA: Center for People's Power), for example, argued that the Anglo-Malay federal settlement failed to guarantee independence, create a Malayan nation or ensure the sovereignty of the people,[417] while *Utusan Melayu* lamented the fate of the Malay peasants who had helped the Sultans and UMNO leaders in the campaign against the Malayan Union only to be excluded from any share in the spoils of victory.[418] In order to justify themselves in the eyes of their community, UMNO leaders strove to prove both the charges and promises of their rivals to be false. To match the nationalist aspirations of the radicals, Dato Onn played host to Sjahir, Prime Minister of the Indonesian Republic, when the latter visited Singapore and Johore Bahru in April 1947, to counter the National Bank, the *Sekolah Raayat* (people's school) and the *Barisan Tani* (peasants' front) of the Malay Nationalis Party (MNP) and its affiliates, the UMNO executive devised its own economic, educational and labor programs. At the same time, UMNO took care to emphasize its concern for Islam. UMNO's department was among the first party offices to be established in 1964.[419] However, during the immediate post-war period, political activity in the Malay states had no institutionalized means of expression or in other words, "politics was without power". Before elections provided effective avenues to power, political parties were, for all practical purposes, indistinguishable from pressure groups; in fact, most political parties were the offspring of the larger interest groups. With the introduction of elections as an institutionalized means of political expression and a vehicle for political power, no matter how slight that power may be—they provided the first opportunity for self-styled leaders to test their political support. UMNO's first president, Dato' Onn b. Jaafar, realized the need for a political party operating in a plural society to build political support that extended beyond communal boundaries. Thus, Onn who was a leading post-war spokesman on Malay nationalism began to act less and less like a spokesman for one ethnic

---

[417] See A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment: 1942-1948 (Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Monograph, No:8, 1979), p. 125.

[418] *Utusan Melayu*, May 23, 1948.

[419] See A. J. Stockwell, British Policy and Malay Politics during the Malayan Union Experiment: 1942-1948, pp. 125-127.

community. He tried to persuade UMNO to expand its base support by opening its membership to non-Malays and by avoiding political stands that would likely antagonize most non-Malays. However, by adopting a non-communal approach to politics, Onn had belied UMNO's collective identity as the champion for the Malay cause par excellence and at the same time alienated the party's "hunting domain" i.e. the Malays. Hence, the failure of his Independence of Malaya Party (IMP) to attract a sizeable following from the Malay community. The first opposing need that UMNO had to counterbalance was that of either maintaining its collective identity or ensuring its organizational survivability. This came about when UMNO had to face the IMP in the Kuala Lumpur Municipal elections in February of 1952. In order to frustrate the IMP, UMNO collaborated with another ethnic base political party the Malayan (later Malaysia) Chinese Association (MCA). By adopting a "multi-communal" instead of a "non-communal" approach to politics, UMNO was able to preserve its identity in the eyes of its supporters and at the same time, developed a sound basis for communal cooperation that was vital for its political survival.

UMNO's passage to institutionalization was by no means plain sailing. This entails a process of "substitution of ends" as well as certain domination activities vis-à-vis the environment. The relation between the party's official aims and behavior never completely disappears; it attenuates. For that reason, its leaders constantly reaffirm the correspondence of the party's behavior to its official aims though in practice, UMNO had to make considerable concessions to non-Malays. This was particularly so when UMNO leaders realized that independence would only be granted if the various races in the country could prove that they could work together. And to this end, UMNO formed an Alliance with the other ethnic base parties, namely the MCA and MIC.

In the post-independent period, UMNO faced an unprecedented challenge from the opposition parties both from the Malay and non-Malay communities. During the elections of 1959 and 1964, the Alliance had achieved landslide victories. Therefore, the results of the 1969 general election in Malaysia came as a surprise to many. Since the 1964 elections, the non-Malay communities were becoming restive and more willing to fight for the interests of their communities. The Malays, on the other hand, had begun to show their disenchantment with UMNO and an increasing preference for the Pan-Malayan Islamic Party (PMIP). While the non-Malays were calling for greater political rights, Malay fears of Chinese political and economic domination prompted them to demand greater protection from the status quo. A central weakness of the state in the 1960s was its economic dependency on international capital in the primary sector, which nevertheless produced healthy growth figures. A laissez-faire policy exacerbated the pattern of colonial uneven development, which nurtured the view that Chinese capital was responsible for denying the emergence of Malay capital. This prompted certain sections of the Malay community to make demands on the state to ensure economic parity on a communal basis. Face with a possible backlash of support from its power base, UMNO had to adopt domination strategy to ensure its continued dominance. In the post 1969 period, it could arguably be said the political hegemony of the Malay community in Malaysia in uncontestable. This translated into the formalization of "Malay Special Rights". Though these provisions were established in the Constitution, it was given greater legitimacy after the 1969 racial riots.[420] Hence, part of UMNO's post-1969 strategy of domination involves enhancing the party's image as the champion of the Malays through positive discrimination polices in favor of the *Bumiputeras*—the New Economic Policy (NEP).

In the third phase of its organizational development, UMNO's hegemony has led to an unfortunate, perhaps inevitable by-product of organizational maturity, that is, the eruption of serious internal differences within the dominant party in 1987. This corresponds to a parallel modification in the incentive system that accompanies this transformation—from primary collective identity to material-selective incentives in the form of regular remunerations (patronage). For the first time in its organizational history, the triennial UMNO elections in April 1987 saw the top leadership barely survive a strong challenge. In 1987, the government had been plagued by the continued effects of recession and this affected the equilibrium of UMNO's perks structure. The recession, which reached its lowest

[420] See H. P. Lee, Constitutional Conflict in Contemporary Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995) pp. 13-15.

point in 1985, coincided with a wave of rising expectations encouraged by the promise of the NEP. Politically, it produced frustration, engendering greater competition for the limited political rewards available and later contributed to a split in UMNO. As such, Team B (led by Tengku Razaleigh and Musa Hitam) accused the party leadership (led by Dr. Mahathir and Ghafar Baba) of blatant abuse of power, an authoritarian leadership style, economic mismanagement—especially loss-making mega projects and patronage—and corruption that were reducing incentives for Malays to acquire sound business skills.[421] Thus, at its maturity phase, UMNO was faced with a central dilemma in its organizational development, that is, how to balance the opposing need of maintaining the party's identity as a champion of the Malay cause and at the same time distributes its incentives, be it manifest or hidden, by its leaders. This dissimulation is of utmost importance, because excessively visible selective incentives would weaken the credibility of the party as an organization dedicated to a "cause", and therefore, adversely affect its distribution of collective incentives.

An analysis of UMNO's organizational structure reveals it to be a highly centralized party. This was more pronounced after Dr. Mahathir's victory at the 1987 general assembly and it appears to result from the "iron law of oligarchy". Nevertheless, this study opens up more questions than answers. Could UMNO's official goal of championing the Malay interests be classified as an ideology? Since the party has succeeded in creating the Malay "middle-class", will there be a major paradigm shift in that the party has to re-adjust its identity in order to be seen as still relevant to its "hunting domain", i.e. the Malay community? What are the expectations of this Malay middle-class vis-à-vis UMNO? Should UMNO change is *modus operandi* in order to attract younger Malay generations especially university students? As such, this study invites the intervention of specialists in other disciplines such as Malay studies, philosophy, sociology, political thought and political economy. My hope is that this study would invite further discussions on organizational development of political parties in Malaysia especially those parties that are in opposition such as PAS. This would provide an excellent comparative study as it allows us to compare the evolutional development of two parties that defines the same community as its "hunting domain"—one being a governmental party and the other oppositional party.

[421] See Diane K. Mauzy, "Malaysia in 1987: Decline of the Malay Way", Asian Survey, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2, February 1988.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIVATE PAPERS

Arkib Negara, Kuala Lumpur

UMNO Files

Charter of United Malays National Organisation UMNO/Ed/No.3/46

Supplementary Charter of United Malays National Organisation UMNO/Ed/No.4/46

United Malays National Organisation Regulation No. 1 UMNO/Sg/No.6/46

United Malays National Organisation Regulation No. 2 UMNO/Sg/No.7/46

United Malays National Organisation Regulation No. 3 UMNO/Sg/No.8/46

United Malays National Organisation Regulation No. 4 UMNO/Sg/No.9/46

United Malays National Organisation Regulation No. 5 UMNO/Sg/No.10/46

Undang-undang Tuboh Pertubohan Kebangsaan Melayu Bersatu Malaya 1949 UMNO/Sg/No.18/49

Undang-undang Tuboh Pertubohan Kebangsaan Melayu Bersatu Malaya—Dipersetujui dan diluluskan oleh Perhimpunan Agong UMNO di-Kuala Lumpur pada 25 dan 26 Disember 1955 UMNO/Sg/No.38/55

The Constitution United Malays National Organisation passed at it´s thirteenth meeting on April 16 and 17, 1960
UMNO/Ed/No.2/60

Perlembagaan UMNO dipersetujui dalam Persidangan Agong Khas UMNO pada 19hb Jun 1994. Dikeluarkan oleh Ibu Pejabat Pertubuhan Kebangsaan Melayu Bersatu (Baru) atau UMNO.

Dicetak oleh Utusan Printcorp Sdn. Bhad., Kuala Lumpur.

Unpublished Papers and Theses

Ariffin Omar, "Malay/Malaysia: State, Nation, Nationality, The Emergence of Nationhood in a Vacuum". A paper presented at a conference on "Concepts of State, Identity and Nationhood in Southeast Asia," at the National University of Singapore, Kent Ridge, Singapore, 8-11 December 1999.

Hoh Kin, Albert, "Mahathir and Malaysian Modernization", M.A. Thesis, Department of History, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, 1998.

Pillay, Chandrasekaran, "Protection of the Malay Community: A Study of UMNO's Position and Opposition Attitudes", Master of Social Sciences Thesis, Pusat Pengajian Sains Kemasyarakatan, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 1972.

Puthucheary, Mavis C., "Administration, Politics and Development: A Case Study of West Malaysia", submitted for the degree of doctor of philosophy, University of Manchester, 1973.

Thambipillai, Pusphathavi, "Political Participation in Rural Malaysia", Master of Social Sciences Thesis, Pusat Pengajian Sains Kemasyarakatan, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 1975.

Published Government Sources

Malayan Union and Singapore: Statement of Policy on Future Constitution, Cmd. 6724, London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, January 1946.

Malayan Union and Singapore: Summary of Proposed Constitutional Arrangements, Cmd. 6749, London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, March 1946.

Federation of Malaya: Summary of Revised Constitutional Proposals, Cmd. 7171, London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, July 1947.

Constitutional Proposals for Malaya: Report of the Consultative Committee together with the Proceedings of Six Public Meetings, a Summary of Representations Made and Letters and Memoranda Considered by the Committee, Kuala Lumpur: Government Printer, 1947.

Constitutional Proposals for Malaya: Report of the Working Committee Appointed by a Conference of His Excellency the Governor of the Malayan Union, Their Highness the Rulers of the Malay States and the Representatives of the United Malays National Organisation, Kuala Lumpur: Government Printer, 1946.

Federation of Malaya: Summary of Revised Constitutional Proposals Accepted by His Majesty's Government, 24 July 1947, Kuala Lumpur: Government Printer, 1947.

Federation of Malaya: Self Government for the Federation of Malaya, Report of the Constitution Conference, London, January-February 1956, Kuala Lumpur: Government Press, 1956.

Government of Malaysia: Towards National Harmony, Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Chetak Kerajaan, 1971.

Government of Malaysia: Second Malaysia Plan, 1971-1975, Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Chetak Kerajaan, 1971.

Peristiwa Memali, Kertas Perintah 21 Tahun 1986, Dikemukakan dalam Dewan Rakyat/Dewan Negara Menurut Perintah, Malaysia: Kementerian Dalam Negeri, 1986.

Government of Malaysia: The May 13 Tragedy: A Report of the National Operations Council, Kuala Lumpur: Government Press, 1969.

Government of Malaysia: Malaysia 1969, Official Yearbook, Kuala Lumpur: Government Press, 1971.

Government of Malaysia: Parliamentary and State Elections, 1964, Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Penerangan Malaysia, 1964.

Government of Malaysia: Education in Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1968.

Newspapers and Magazines

Aliran Monthly (Penang) 1985-2000

Asean Review (Kuala Lumpur) 1974-1978

Asiaweek (Hong Kong) 1973-2000

Correspondent (Hong Kong) 1986

Far Eastern Economic Review (Hong Kong) 1969-2000

Majlis 1945-1946

The Malay Mail (Singapore) 1949-1978

National Echo (Penang) 1975-1978

The New Straits Times (Kuala Lumpur) 1974-2000

Pinang Gazette and Straits Chronicle (Penang) 1955

The Straits Echo and Times of Malaya (Penang) 1953-1955

The Straits Times (Singapore) 1951-1974

The Star (Penang) 1973-2000

Sydney Morning Herald (Australia) 2000

Time (United States of America) 1999

Utusan Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur) 1974-2000

Wall Street Journal (United States of America) 1974

Books and Articles

Abdul Rahman, Tunku, May 13—Before and After, Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Melayu Press, 1969.

_____, Political Awakening, Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications (M) Sdn. Bhd., 1986.

_____, Looking Back: The Historic Years of Malaya and Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur: Pustak Antara, 1977.

_____, Something to Remember, Singpore: Eastern Universities Press, 1983.

Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munshi, Hikayat Abdullah, Jld. 1, Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara, 1963.

_____, Hikayat Abdullah, Jld. 2, Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara, 1966.

_____, Kesah Pelayaran Abdullah, Singapura: Malaya Publishing House Ltd., 1961.

Adnan Hj. Nawang, Za'ba dan Melayu, Kuala Lumpur: Berita Publishing Sdn. Bhd., 1998.

Allen, James de V., The Malayan Union, New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1967.

Ariffin Omar, Bangsa Melayu: Malay Concepts of Democracy and Community 1945-1950, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Aziz Zariza Ahmad, Mahathir: Triumph after Trials, Kuala Lumpur: S. Abdul Majeed & Co. Publishing Division, 1990.

Brown, C. C. (tr.) Sejarah Melayu or Malay Annals, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Case, William, Elites and Regimes in Malaysia: Revisiting a Consociational Democracy, Clayton, Vic.: Monash Asia Institute, 1996.

_____, "Semi-Democracy in Malaysia: Withstanding the Pressures for Regime Change", Pacific Affairs 66: 183-205.

Chandra Muzaffar, Protector? Penang: Aliran Publications, 1979.

_____, Issues of Mahathir Years, Penang: Aliran Publications, 1988.

_____, Islamic Resurgence in Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Fajar Bakti, 1987.

Chamil Wariya, UMNO Era Mahathir, Petaling Jaya: Penerbit Fajar Bakti, 1988.

Cotter, Cornelius P. and Bibby John F., "Institutional Development of Parties and the Thesis of Party Decline," Political Science Quarterly Volume 95 No. 1 Spring 1980.

Crouch, Harold, Government and Society in Malaysia, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

_____, Lee Kam Hing and Michael Ong (eds.), Malaysian Politics and the 1978 Election, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1980.

_____, "Authoritarian Trends: The UMNO Split and the Limits to State Power" in Joel S. Kahn and Francis Loh Kok Wah (eds.), Fragmented Vision: Culture and Politics in Contemporary Malaysia, Sydney: Asian Studies Association of Australia, 1992.

Dahl, Robert A., Polyarchy: Partcipation and Opposition, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.

Diamond, Larry (ed.), Political Culture and Democracy in Developing Countries, Boulder: Lynne Reinner Publishers, 1994.

Duverger, Maurice, Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State, translated by Barbara and Robert North, London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1959.

Emerson, Rupert, Malaysia: A Study in Direct and Indirect Rule, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1964.

Esman, Milton J., Administration and Development in Malaysia, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1972.

Fan Yew Teng, The UMNO Drama: Power Struggles in Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur: Egret Publications, 1989.

Foong Wai Fong, The New Asian Way, Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, 1999.

Funston, John, Malay Politics in Malaysia: A Study of UMNO and PAS, Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann Educational Books Asia, 1980.

_____, "Malaysia" in Mohammad Ayoob (ed.), The Politics of Islamic Reassertion, London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Gagliano, Felix V., Communal Violence in Malaysia 1969: The Political Aftermath, Athens, Ohio: Center for International Studies, 1970.

Gale, Bruce, Musa Hitam: A Political Biography, Petaling Jaya: Eastern Universities Press (M) Sdn. Bhd., 1982.

Gill, Ranjit, Razaleigh: Cita-cita dan Perjuangan, Petaling Jaya, Selangor: Pelanduk, 1987.

Gomez, Edmund Terrence, Money Politics in the Barisan Nasional, Kuala Lumpur, Forum, 1991.

_____, Politics in Business: UMNO's Corporate Investments, Kuala Lumpur: Forum, 1990.

_____, and Jomo K. S., Malaysia's Political Economy, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Gullick, J. M., Indigenous Political Systems of West Malaysia, London: The Athlone Press, 1958.

Jomo, K. S., Beyond 1990: Considerations for a National Development Strategy, Kuala Lumpur: Institute of Advance Studies, University of Malaya, 1989.

_____, Growth and Structural Change in the Malaysian Economy, London: Macmillan, 1990.

_____, The Way Forward? The Political Economy of Development Policy Reform in Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur: Institute of Advance Studies, University of Malaya, 1989.

Kassim Ahmad, Hikayat Hang Tuah, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1966.

_____, Perwatakan dalam Hikayat Hang Tuah, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1973.

Kessler, Clive S. "Archaism and Modernity: Contemporary Malay Political Culture" in Joel S. Kahn and Francis Loh Kok Wah (eds.), Fragmented Vision: Culture and Politics in Contemporary Malaysia, Sydney: Asian Studies Association of Australia, 1992.

Khoo Kay Kim, Malay Society: Transformation and Democratisation, Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, 1991.

_____ (ed.), Lembaran Akhbar Melayu, Kuala Lumpur: Persatuan Sejarah Malaysia, 1980.

Kua, Anne Munro, Authoritarian Populism in Malaysia, London: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1996.

Lau, Albert, Malayan Union Controversy, 1942-1948, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Lee, H. P., Constitutional Conflicts in Contemporary Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Lijphart, Arend, Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1977.

Lim Kit Siang, Time Bombs in Malaysia, Petaling Jaya: Democratic Action Party, 1978.

_____, Malaysia in the Dangerous 80s, Petaling Jaya: Democratic Action Party, 1982.

_____, BMF: The Scandal of Scandals, Petaling Jaya, Selangor: Democratic Action Party, 1986.

Lim Mah Hui, Ownership and Control of the One Hundred Largest Corporations in Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Linz, Juan J., "Authoritarian Regime: Spain" in Erik Allardt and Stein Rokkan (eds.), Mass Politics: Studies in Political Sociology, New York: Free Press, 1970.

_____, "Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes" in Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby (eds.), Handbook of Political Science, Volume 3: Macropolitical Theory, Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1975.

Lipset, Seymore Martin, Political Man, New York: Doubleday, 1960.

Loh Kok Wah, The Politics of Chinese Unity, Singapore: Methuen Asia, 1982.

Lukman Thaib, The Politics and Governments of Southeast Asia, Kuala Lumpur: Golden Books Centre Sdn. Bhd., 1977.

Mahathir b. Mohamad, The Malay Dilemma, Singapore and Kuala Lumpur: Times Books International, 1970.

_____, The Challenge, Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, 1986.

_____, A New Deal for Asia, Petaling Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, 1999.

Mauzy, Diane K., "Malaysia in 1986: The Ups and Downs of Stock Market Politics" in Asian Survey, XXVII, 2 (February 1987): 231-41.

_____, "Malaysia in 1987: Decline of the Malay Way" in Asian Survey, XXVIII, 2 (February 1988): 213-222.

_____, and Milne, R. S., "The Mahathir Recovery in Malaysia", Current History, 89, 545 (March 1990) 113-26.

Means, Gordon P., Malaysian Politics (second edn.), London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1976.

_____, Malaysian Politics: Second Generation, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Michels, Robert, Political Parties: A Sociological Study of Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy, translated by Eden and Cedar Paul, Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1978.

Miner, A. C. Kerajaan: Malay Political Culture on the Eve of Colonial Rule, Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 1982.

_____, The Invention of Politics in Colonial Malaya: Contesting Nationalism and the Expansion of the Public Sphere, London: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Miller, Harry, Prince and Premier, London: George C. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1959.

Milne, R. S., Government and Politics in Malaysia, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967.

_____, Politics in Ethnically Bipolar States: Guyana, Malaysia, Fiji, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1981.

_____, "Malaysia—Beyond the New Economic Policy", Asian Survey, 26, 12 (December 1986): 1364-82.

_____, and Diane K. Mauzy, Malaysian Politics under Mahathir, London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

Milkis, Sidney M., Political Parties and Constitutional Government: Remaking American Democracy, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Mohamed Nordin Sopiee, From Malayan Union to Singapore Separation: Political Unification in the Malaysian Region, 1945-1965, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1976.

Morais, J. Victor, Mahathir: A Profile in Courage, Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, 1982.

_____, Anwar Ibrahim: Resolute in Leadership, Kuala Lumpur: Arenabuku, 1983.

Nathan, K. S., "Malaysia in 1988: The Politics of Survival", Asian Survey, XXIX, 2 (February 1989): 129-44.

Panebianco, Angelo, Political Parties: Organization and Power, tanslated by Marc Silver, London: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Parnickel, B. B., An Epic Hero and An Epic Traitor in the Hikayat Hang Tuah, Moscow: Konrada, 1974.

Pathmanathan, Murugesu and Lazarus, David (eds.), Winds of Change: The Mahathir Impact on Malaysia's Foreign Policy, Kuala Lumpur: Eastview Productions, 1984.

Pye, Lucian W. (with Mary W. Pye), Asian Power and Politics: The Cultural Dimension of Authority, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985.

Rabushka, Alvin and Kenneth A. Shepsle, Politics in Plural Society: A Theory of Democratic Instability, Columbus, Ohio: Merril, 1972.

Ramlah Adam, Dato' Onn Ja'afar: Pengasas Kemerdekaan, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, 1992.

_____, UMNO: Organisasi dan Kegiatan, 1945-1951, Kota Bharu, Kelantan: Mohd. Nawi Book Store, 1978.

Ratnam, K. J., Communalism and the Political Process in Malaya, Singapore: University of Malaya Press, 1965.

Roff, W. R., The Origins of Malay Nationalism, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1974.

Rogers, Marvin L., Local Politics in Rural Malaysia: Pattern of Change in Sungai Raya, Colorado: Westview Press, 1992.

Salleh Abas, The Role of the Independent Judiciary, Kuala Lumpur: Promarketing Publications, 1989.

_____ with K. Das, May Day for Justice, Kuala Lumpur: Magnus Books, 1989.

Scott, James C., Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Shaharuddin Maaruf, Concept of a Hero in Malay Society, Petaling Jaya: Eastern Universities Press, 1984.

_____, Malay Ideas on Development: From Feudal Lord to Capitalists, Singapore: Times Books International, 1988.

Shafruddin, B. H., The Federal Factor in the Government and The Federal Factor in the Government and Politics of Peninsular Malaysia, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Shamsul, A. B., From British to Bumiputera Rule, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1986.

_____, "The "Battle Royal": The UMNO Elections of 1987", in Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Southeast Asian Affairs, 1988, Singapore: ISEAS, 1988, pp. 170-188.

Shaw, William, Tun Razak: His Life and Times, Kuala Lumpur: Longman Malaysia, 1976.

Stockwell, Anthony J., British Policy and Malay Politcs during the Malayan Union Experiment, 1942-1948, Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Monograph No. 8, Kuala Lumpur, 1979.

Strauch, Judith, Chinese Village Politcs in the Malaysian State, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Syed Hussein Alatas, "The Grading of Occupational Prestige Amongst the Malays in Malaysia" in Modernization and Social Change, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1972.

_____, The Myth of the Lazy Native: A Stud of the Image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from the 16th to 20th Century and its Functions in the Ideology of Colonial Capitalism, London: Frank Cass and Company Ltd., 1977.

_____, Corruption and the Destiny of Asia, Petaling Jaya, Selangor: Prentice Hall (M) Sdn. Bhd., 1999.

Syed Husin Ali, Malay Peasant Society and Leadership, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Tengku Razaleigh Hamzah, Mengapa Saya Tentang Mahathir, Petaling Jaya: Az Distributors, 1989.

Vasil, R. K., Politics in a Plural Society: A Study of Non-Communal Political Parties in West Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1971.

_____, The Malaysian General Election of 1969, Singapore and Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Von Vorys, Karl, Democracy without Consensus: Communalism and Political Stability in Malaysia, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Weber, Max, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, New York: The Free Press, 1947.

Zakri Abadi, Suatu Analisa Pilihanraya Umu '86, Kuala Lumpur: Syarikat Grafikset Abadi, 1986.

_____, Menjelang Pilihanraya Umum ke-8: Mahathir "Machiavelli Malaysia"? Kuala Lumpur: Sarjana Enterprise, 1990.

Zawawi Ibrahim, "And Anthropological Perspective' in Murugesu Pathmanathan and Robert Hass (eds.), Political Culture: The Challenge of Modernisation, Petaling Jaya: Centre for Policy Sciences, 1995.

_____, "Malay Peasants and Proletarian Consciousness", Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars, 15, 4 (1983): 39-55.

SÜDOSTASIEN Working Papers

1. **Hans-Dieter Kubitscheck** (1996) Das Südostasien-Institut an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. Zur Geschichte der Südostasienwissenschaften.
2. **Andreas Schneider** (1996) Reintegration. Untersuchungen am Beispiel laotischer Absolventendeutscher Bildungseinrichtungen.
3. **Ingrid Wessel** (1996) State and Islam in Indonesia. On the interpretation of ICMI.
4. **Nguyen Minh Hà** (1996) Die Ergänzungsglieder im vietnamesischen Satz.
5. **Ursula Lies** (1996) Vietnamese Studies in Australia.
6. **Martin Klein** (1997) Javanismus und Herrschaft in Indonesien. Zum Zusammenhang von Kulturinterpretation und Ideologie. Vorstudien zu einer Kritik der politischen Praxis der Neuen Ordnung Indonesiens.
7. **Thomas Engelbert** (1997) Staatskapitalismus unter der Führung einer nationalistischen Partei. Zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion des Zusammenhanges zwischen ökonomischem Pragmatismus und politischer Legitimierung der Kommunistischen Partei in Vietnam.
8. **Nguyen Minh Hà** (1997) Zur Entwicklung der vietnamesischen Sprache und Schrift.
9. **Jean-Dominique Giacometti** (1998) La Bataille de la Piastre 1918-1928. Réalités économiques et perceptions politiques dans l'Empire colonial Français.
10. **Georgia Wimhöfer** (1998) Wissenschaft und Religiosität im Werk von Y.B. Mangunwijaya.
11. **Uta Gärtner**, Myanmar verstehen: Sprachlehrbuch. (11/1&2). Glossar und Schlüssel (11/3). 2. Auflage.
12. **Nguyen Minh Hà** (2003) Einführung in die Phonetik der vietnamesischen Sprache. 4. Auflage.
13. **Kristina Chhim** (1998) Die 2. Parlamentswahlen Kambodschas. Hoffnung oder Farce?
14. **Stefan Hell** (1998) Siam und der Völkerbund, 1920-1946.
15. **Claudia Götze-Sam** (2002) Welche grammatischen Relationen verbergen sich hinter den sog. Passivkonstruktionen im Khmer? 2. Auflage.
16. **Nguyen Minh Hà** (1999) Vietnamesisch zum Anfassen. Konversation, Teil 1.

17. **Nguyen Minh Hà** (2000) Vietnamesisch zum Anfassen. Konversation, Teil 2.

18. **Nguyen Minh Hà** (2000) Vietnamesisch zum Anfassen. Konversation, Teil 3.

19. **Michael Steinmetz** (2000) Siam im Jahr 2475 (1932): Das Ende der absoluten Monarchie.

20. **Johannes Herrmann** (2000) Staat und Menschenrechte im Demokratisierungsprozess in Indonesien.

21. **Andreas Schneider** (2001) Laos im 20. Jahrhundert: Kolonie und Königreich, Befreite Zone und Volksrepublik.

22. **Heinz Schütte** (2003) Hundred Flowers in Vietnam, 1955-1957.

23. **Thomas Engelbert and Jana Raendchen,** eds. (2003) Colloquium and Round-Table Discussion on Ethnic Minorities and Politics in Southeast Asia.

24. **Verena Beittinger** (2004) Zwietracht in der Vielfalt: Indonesiens chinesische Minderheit, das Masalah Cina und die Maiunruhen 1998.

25. **Dirk Heidersbach** (2004) Widerstand, Assimilation & die Frage nach der Legitimität: Die Rolle der religiösen Traditionen Nordthailands zwischen 1874 und 1892.

26. **Anja Herbst** (2004) Das Konfliktfeld Aceh im Rahmen der Dezentralisierungspolitik in Indonesien.

27. **Nguyen Thanh Duc** (2005) Privatisierung in Ostdeutschland und einige Schlussfolgerungen für Vietnam.

28. **Gunnar Stange** (2005) Islamistischer Terrorismus vor dem Hintergrund der Demokratisierung in Indonesien.

29. **Antje Mißbach, Eva Streifeneder, Ragnar K. Willer**, Hrsg. (2006) Indonesia – sedang mengapa? Neuste Forschungsbeiträge des Doktoranden Netzwerk Indonesien.

30. **Johann Friedrich Herling** (2006) Staudämme in der Oberen Mekong-Region. Analyse der Auswirkungen auf die Anrainerstaaten des Mekongs.

31. **Sindy Herrmann und Frederik Holst**, Hrsg. (2007) Gesellschaft und Politik in Südostasien. Eine studentische Festschrift zu Ehren von Prof. Dr. Ingrid Wessel.

32. **Frederik Holst und Eva Streifeneder**, Hrsg. (2007) Myanmar. Eine studentische Festschrift zu Ehren von Dr. Uta Gärtner.

33. **Serhat Ünaldi** (2008) Reconstructing Angkor. Images of the Past and Their Impact on Thai-Cambodian Relations.

34. **Barbara Zeus** (2008) Identities in Exil. De- and Reterritorialising Ethnic Identity and the Case of Burmese Forced Migrants in Thailand.

35. **Eva Streifeneder und Boryano Rickum**, Hrsg. (2009) Quo Vadis, Indonesien? Neuste Beiträge des Doktoranden Netzwerk Indonesien.

36. **Hans-Bernd Zöllner** (2009) Neither Saffron Nor Revolution. A Commentated and Documented Chronology of the Monks' Demonstrations in Myanmar in 2007 and their Background. PART I .

37. **Hans-Bernd Zöllner** (2009) Neither Saffron Nor Revolution. A Commentated and Documented Chronology of the Monks' Demonstrations in Myanmar in 2007 and their Background. PART II: Documents .

38. **Muhammad Febriansyah** (2009) Performing Arts and Politics. Compromise and Resistance.

39. **Frederik Holst** (2010) Ethnicization and Identity Politics in Malaysia.

40. **Benjamin Baumann** (2010) On Centrism and Dualism - A Critical Reassessment of Structural Anthropology's Contribution to the Study of Southeast Asian Societies.

41. **Carola von der Dick und Jörg-Ch. Lanca** (2011) Re-evalutating research directions In the study of Malaysia: An overview of a workshop held in Berlin in November 2009.

42. **Ik Tien Ngu** (2011) Global trade and political continuity: The rise of timber tycoons in Sarawak, 1945-1963.

43. **Norzarina Mohd-Zaharim** (2011) Religiosity and Religious Coping among Malaysians.

44. **Claudia Seise** (2011) Muslimah Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia: An Introduction to its Thoughts and Activities.

45. **Prof. Vincent Houben, Dr. Ambeth Ocampo, Prof. Bernhard Dahm** (2011) Dr. Jose Rizal "Connecting the Philippines and Germany": An Overview of a Symposium held in Berlin on 14 June 2011.

46. **Azeem Fazwan Ahmad Farouk** (2011) Culture and Politics: An Analysis of United Malays National Organisation (UMNO) 1946 – 1999.