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REFERENCES
4.1 **EGYPT**

**Official Name:** Arab Republic of Egypt. Arabic Jumhuriyah Misr Al-Arabiya

**Local Name:** Misr

**Population:** 76,117,421 (July 2004 est.)

**Independence:** 28 February 1922 (From UK)

**Status:** Republic

**Chief of State:** President Mohammad Hosni Mubarak (Since 14 October 1981)

**Prime Minister:** Ahmed Nazif (Since July 2004)

**Capital:** Cairo

**Language:** Arabic (Official)

**Religions:** Sunni Muslim (C.90%), minority largely Coptic Christian (C.10%)
4.1.1 EGYPTIAN HISTORY, ANCIENT:

The history of ancient Egypt stretches roughly from 3100 BC, when a unified kingdom embracing lower and Upper Egypt was first created, to 332 BC, when Alexander the Great brought the rule of the pharaohs to an end. In the intervening millennia, Egypt experienced alternate phases of strong, centralized government and periods of near anarchy, when competing dynasties and warlords fought for power. The periods marked by strong government at home and expansionist policies abroad are called the Old, Middle and New Kingdoms. The chaotic phases go by the name of Intermediate Periods (I-III). In the so-called Late Period, the centuries immediately before Alexander’s conquest, Egypt lacked central authority, and the country was easy prey for the great expansionist powers of the Middle East-Assyria conquered her in 671 BC and Persia in 525 BC.
### 4.1.2 DYNASTIES OF RULERS: ANCIENT EGYPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYNASTY</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>DATE BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Early dynastic period</td>
<td>C3100-2890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>C2890-2686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Old Kingdom</td>
<td>C2686-2613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>C2613-2494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>C2494-2345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>C2345-2181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>First Intermediate period</td>
<td>C2181-2173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>C2173-2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td>C2160-2130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>C2130-2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>C2133-1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Middle Kingdom</td>
<td>1991-1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>1786-1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Second Intermediate period</td>
<td>1786-c1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
<td>1674-1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1684-1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1660-1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>New Kingdom</td>
<td>1567-1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td></td>
<td>1320-1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200-1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>Third Intermediate period</td>
<td>1085-945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII</td>
<td></td>
<td>945-730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>8172-730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>720-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV</td>
<td></td>
<td>751-668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>Late period</td>
<td>664-525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII</td>
<td></td>
<td>525-404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>404-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td></td>
<td>399-380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>380-343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td></td>
<td>343-332²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.3 HISTORY:

Neolithic cultures on river of Nile from C.6000 BC; Pharaoh dynasties from c3100 BC; Egyptian power greatest during the New Empire period, 1576-1085 BC; became Persian Province. 6th-c BC; conquered by Alexander the Great, 4th-c BC; Ptolemaic Pharaohs ruled Egypt until 30 BC; conquered by Arabs, AD 672; Suez Canal constructed in 1869, revolt in 1879 put down by British in 1882; British protectorate from 1914; declared independence, 1922; King Farouk deposed by Nasser 1952; Egypt declared a republic; 1953; attack on Israel followed by Israeli invasion, 1967; Suez Canal remained blocked, 1967-75; changed name to Arab Republic of Egypt, 1971; Yom Kippur War against Israel, 1973; Camp David peace conference with Israel, 1978; Israel returned disputed Taba Strip, 1989; participated in Gulf War with US-led coalition, 1991; governed by a people’s National Assembly, President, Prime Minister, and Council of Ministers.

4.1.4 MONARCH:

1922-36 Fouad I
1936-7 Farouk Trusteeship
1937-52 Farouk 1

Head of state:

1952-4 Mohammad Najib
1954-70 Gamal Abdel Nasser
1970-81 Mohammed Anwar el-Sadat
1981- Mohammed Hosni Mubarak till now (February 2005)
4.1.5 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

Egypt is a country which inherited the legacy of five thousand years old civilization; it may not be the oldest civilization of the ancient world, but is certainly of great antiquity. The Egyptians had built massive structures like the Pyramids- a major feature of ancient Egyptian architecture, and had developed a unique system of preserving mummies. Egypt also has to its credit the invention of the first solar calendar in the history of mankind. Ancient Egyptians laid the foundation for the study of arithmetic and geometry. They perfected the achievement of irrigation, engineering and making of pottery, glass and paper. They were the first ones to have formulated a clear concept of the aesthetic aspect of art, besides its utilitarian purposes. More significant, still, were the Egyptians’ contributions in the fields of religion, and individual and social ethics. From the land of Pharaohs, thus came the germ and the stimulus for numerous intellectual achievements of later countries.

The Arab conquest of Egypt in the seventh century brought Egypt in the fold of Arab and thereby Islam, and Egypt became heir to another civilization, namely, Islamic Civilization of the middle ages. The Arab conquest gave Egypt a new religion, i.e. Islam, and a new language, Arabic. Arab conquest, however, did not cut off Egypt completely from its pharaoh traditional culture.

The modern history of Egypt could be traced back to the founding of Mohammad Ali dynasty in the earlier years of nineteenth century. Mohammad Ali, and Albanian soldier, was sent by port to drive out Napoleon who had invaded Egypt in 1213/1798. In the confusion that
followed the French invasion, Mohammad Ali established himself as the ruler of Egypt.

It was with the French invasion of Egypt that the process of Egypt’s modernization began. Mohammad Ali, an ambitious soldier, set Egypt, which was still a province of Ottoman Empire, on the road of modernization by introducing several reforms, particularly in the fields of education and industrialization.

Mohammad Ali’s grandson, Ismail Pasha, sought to accelerate the pace of modernization. Unfortunately, he conceived the process in terms of grand palaces and European style buildings and spent a colossal amount of money in implementing his plans to raise Egypt’s international status. The advanced nations of Europe were his ideal. His zeal for Europeanization was so great that at the time of the opening of the Suez Canal, he proudly declared that he had detached Egypt from Africa and attached it to Europe. Egypt thus was the first Arab state fully exposed to Western civilization.

During the next few years the country became an arena of Franco-British rivalry became an arena of Franco-British rivalry and, as a consequence of nationalist revolt of 1299-1300/1881-1882, Britain occupied Egypt. Henceforth, the power remained mainly in the hands of British Civilian agents, even though technically Egypt still remained part of the Ottoman Empire. It was only in 1333/1914, during the First World War, when Britain found Turkey in the opposite camp, that Britain declared Egypt a protectorate in order to make its position more firm and secure legally and administratively.
After the war, under pressure from the nationalist Wafd party, the British government declared on 1341/28 February 1922 that “the British protectorate over Egypt is terminated and Egypt is declared an independent sovereign state”. However there were certain matters which, His Majesty’s government reserved for its discretion.

Meanwhile attempts were being made to reach a settlement on the “reserve subjects” which were a part of the 1341/1922 declaration. These attempts led to the signing of Anglo-Egyptian Treaty in 1355/1936. The Treaty replaced the unilateral British declaration of 1341/1922, but it also put some limitations on Egyptian sovereignty.

The “indignities” that Egypt had suffered at the hands of the British, together with the inefficient, corrupt and feudalistic government that tolerated all these indignities, aroused some young army officers against both Britain and the ruling class at home. These young officers decided to put an end to the prevalent state of affairs. Egypt’s defeat in the Arab-Israeli was of 1368/1948, which these young officers attributed to corruption and mismanagement at home, hardened their resolve and they decided to rescue the colony from the morass of corruption. They staged a coup d’etat in 1372/July 1, 1952 and captured power.

4.1.6 THE AIMS OF REVOLUTION BY JAMAL ABDU AL-NASSER:

The aims were:

1. extermination of imperialism,

2. eradication of feudalist;
3. termination of monopoly and domination of capital over government;

4. promotion of social justice;

5. establishment of strong national army;

6. bringing about democratic life\textsuperscript{10}.

Though the revolutionary leadership succeeded in achieving some of these objectives, it did not make much progress in bringing about democratic life to any large extent. Nasser Government basically remained a dictatorial government; the leadership did not encourage democratic life and thus getting people's participation and building of modern civil society\textsuperscript{11}.

4.1.7 ANWAR SADAT ACHIEVEMENTS:

Anwar Sadat who came to power in 1390/1970, after the Sudden demise of president Nasser, had three achievements to his credit from the point of view of Egyptian state and society. First, by launching an offensive against Israel in 1393/October 1973, he redeemed Egypt honor and prestige that was badly damaged in 1388/June 1967 War with Israel. As he put it: “we regained our self-confidence and world’s confidence in US”. Second, Sadat decision to visit Israel to remove” psychological barrier” set the peace process in motion, which ultimately resulted in signing the camp David accord in 1399/September 1978. Third, this in turn cleared the way for opening the Suez Canal- one of the main sources of Egypt’s National income. Sadat thus, redeemed Egypt’s lost prestige, regained its lost territory- Sinai desert, and got the Suez Canal opened\textsuperscript{12}.
Sadat took two other major decisions – one on economic front and another on political front – which any other leader would have found it difficult to take. Sadat moved away from Arab Socialism and Liberalized the political arena in order to get rid of the leftist Nasserist wing. On economic front sadat moved away from the policy of nationalization and opted for ‘Infitah’ (Open door policy) – a policy which signaled a switch to market economy. He introduced the most comprehensive legislation on foreign investment in 1394/1974. This liberalization, apart from stabilizing monetary level, had a good effect on the economy, which was growing at the rate of 9 per cent per annum – of course, this growth was also partly due to world oil boom\textsuperscript{13}.

4.1.8 Hosni Mubarak’s Coming to Power:

When Hosni Mubarak came to power in 1402/ October 1981, after the assassination of Sadat by Khalid Istambuli\textsuperscript{14}, the country experienced perhaps for the first time since its independence in 1342/1923, a feeling of relative freedom both physical and psychological. Since Mubarak, as a former Air Force commander, had played important part in 1393/October 1973 war, and also, since he had already been appointed by Sadat as Vice-President of the country, his credibility and legitimacy were never in doubt when he came to power. Mubarak followed all the major policy initiatives of Sadat – Peace with Israel, economic liberalization and democratization. Thus, in his first policy statement Mubarak, while reiterating his support for the Camp David Accord, also stressed the need for peace and justice in the Middle East, including justice for the “oppressed and dispossessed Palestine”. He further said that Egypt would uphold Palestinian’s cause “… in all political circles anywhere in the world”. Thus, while on the one hand
consolidating the gains from Sadat’s policies, on the other hand, Mubarak, wanted to dissociate himself from the unpopular aspect of the latter’s policies. On domestic front, he opened a dialogue with all opposition groups and achieved a measure of consensus on broad national goals. He also released political detainees and even permitted the still out-lowed Muslim Brotherhood to resume its political activities. Opposition groups publicly expressed their willingness to cooperate with the government\textsuperscript{15}.

For the time being, things seem to go well, with Mubarak firmly in the saddle. But gradually, there developed a gap between the state and society. The state agenda became different from society’s agenda, and the respective priorities of the state and the society appeared heading for a clash\textsuperscript{16}.

**4.1.9 MUBARAK’S LEGITIMACY:**

The first item on Mubarak’s agenda was to gain legitimacy. Though, as pointed out earlier, his succession was legitimate, but mere legitimate succession was not enough. Naturally, the best way to get it was to conduct democratic election. Mubarak must have thought that a little dose of political liberalization would not seriously threaten the stability of his government, but rather would ease tensions caused by his predecessor’s harsh method of dealing with opposition. There were also expectations of diplomatic and economic benefits that the regime could achieve through the maintenance of liberal façade. It was hoped that this would induce Western governments and investors to be more sympathetic towards the country. It was also hoped that democratic elections would isolate more radical oppositions groups.
In this sense the real Mubarak era started only in 1405/1984. The first parliamentary election held under the new regime took place in May of that year. In this election conducted under the system of proportional representation the ruling national Democratic Party achieved 72.9 per cent of votes and 87 per cent of seats. The right wing wafd party received 15 per cent of votes and 13 per cent of seats. The socialist labour party got 7.73 per cent of votes but no seat. The left wing progressive Rally Tajaramu’s party got 4.1 per cent of votes and no seats, and Liberal’s party 0.65 per cent of votes and no seats. The election made it clear that the ruling party, headed by Mubarak himself, was well in control and he had established himself well in power.

According to human rights groups, human rights are violated and jails are packed with more than 16000 prisoners. There had never been so many detainees.

There is, therefore, growing demand and mounting tensions for an expansion of democratic process by amending of the civil society groups in Egypt is to limit the number of times a head of the state can run for office. Thus in spite of his electoral victories, Mubarak did not get the expected legitimacy in the eyes of ordinary Egyptians.
(II) TURKEYS:

Turkish (Turkiye),

Capital: Ankara

Official Name: Republic of Turkey,

Population: 68,109,469 (July 2003 est.)

Independence: 29 October 1923 (Successor State to the Ottoman Empire).

Status: Republican Parliamentary Democracy

Chief of State: President Ahmet Necdet Sezer (Since 16 May 2000).

Prime Minister: Recep Tayyip Endogan (14 March 2003)

Languages: Turkish (Turkey) (Official), Kurdish and Arabic; Greek, Armenian and Yiddish Minorities

Religion: Sunni Muslim (98%), Greek Orthodox, Armenian, and Jewish minorities.


4.2.1 HISTORY:

Seljuk sultanate replaced by the Ottoman in NW Asia Minor in 13th-c; Turkish invasion of Europe, first in Balkans, 1375; fall of Constantinople, 1453; empire at its peak under Sulaiman the Magnificent, 16th-c; Young Turks seized power, 1908; Balkan War, 1912-13; allied with Germany during World War I; Republic followed Young Turk revolution, led by Kemal Ataturk, 1923; policy of westernization and economic development; neutral throughout most of World War 2, then sided with Allies, military coups in 1960 and 1980; strained relations with Greece, and invasion of Cyprus, 1974; aided the allied forces during the Gulf War, 1991; constitution provides for a single-chamber National Assembly; a President appoints a Prime Minister and a Council of Ministers.

4.2.2 HEAD OF STATE:

1982 – 9 Kenan Evren
1989-93 Turgut Ozal
1993-2000 Suleyman Demirel
2000 – Ahmet Necdet Sezer

4.2.3 TURKEY FROM THE CALIPHATE TO NATION STATE:

The Ottoman state had begun to create a secular framework during the nineteenth century. In 1343/1924 the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, urged on by the triumphant Ataturk, abolished the caliphate. The action should hardly have been necessary. As a real focus of political power, the caliphate had ceased to exist by the end of the tenth century. The ideal of the caliphate continued to live on however,
and the later Ottoman sultans. Particularly 'Abd al-Hamid II (1293-1327/1876-1909), had not been shy about claiming the title of universal leader of the Muslims. This was a tricky proposition since the family of Osman was patently not Arab, let alone descended from the Quraysh. The Ottoman hand was forced however, by rivalry with European powers. In 1188/1774, when the Empress of Russia claimed to be the protector of all Orthodox Christians everywhere the Ottomans naturally could not let the claim go unmatched, and they began calling the Sultan “Sovereign Caliph of the Mahometan religion”.23

The post World-War I Ottoman Society was qualitatively as well as quantitatively, different from the earlier one mainly because of the Arab revolt against the Turks and British occupation of Turkey. The Ottoman totality’ was now non-existent functionally. To the Turk in the Street, the Treaty of Severs seemed a death Warrant, individually and nationally.24 In this background, a new Turkish nationalism took shape under the clashing push and pull of imperialism. The Erzurum-Sivas Congresses (1338/1919) and the National pact (1339/1920), which envisaged a Turkish government on the basis of national will, territorial integrity and complete independence, showed the consolidation of the ideas of Turkish nationalist consciousness.25 This national solidarity made the war of liberation a great success in 1342/1923. The Turkish National Liberation movement represented the collective will of the Turks under the leadership of new ‘revolutionary elite’ which was a substitute for the Ottoman ruling elite. During the liberation movement, nationalism was the main ideology of the Turks and it prepared them for future changes in the Turkish Republic. However, the nature of the movement gave rise to covert, ideological conflict.26
4.2.4 LEADERSHIP OF MUSTAFA KEMAL:

The conservatives representing extreme religiosity and negation of westernization and the moderates representing systemization of tradition and modernity were systematically and completely dominated by the charismatic leadership of Mustafa Kemal. After the successful war of liberation against Western imperialism, the Turks emerged as a new national entity which represented a logical culmination of the nationalist ideas of the young Turks.

The development of Turkish awakening, which had started in the Tanzimat, went through the successive steps of Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism, and Pan-Turanianism. It was left for Mustafa Kemal, the soldier-reformer, to reject them all and succeed with the simple Turkism of the Turks of Asia Minor.

Mustafa Kemal had joined the Committee of Union and Progress. He did not have an active part in the coup d’etat of 1326/1908 and at no time was he identified with the policies or practices of the young Turks who had full control over the government. He had his disagreements with the triumvirate but he was too good an officer to be pushed aside. His defense of Gallipoli won him national acclaim. Perhaps the most important ally of Mustafa Kemal was the Soviet Union. Even though the doctrinaire Marxists among the Bolsheviks looked to Europe for the predicted proletarian revolution, there were enough “Asia Firsters” among them to pay some attention to Iran and Turkey. In 1338/1919, the Bolsheviks were very friendly to Mustafa Kemal and his revolution. On 1340/ March 16, 1921, Mustafa Kemal signed a treaty of friendship and collaboration with Russia against the western powers.
4.2.5 THE TURKISH REFORMS OPPORTUNITY:

For Mustafa Kemal, independence from foreign interference was not an end but only a means to give the Turks the opportunity to build a new Turkey. This could be done by far-reaching reforms in practically every aspect of life. Most of the reform programs launched by the nationalists under Mustafa Kemal had been proposed and discussed by scores of Turkish intellectuals and reformers from Tanzimat on. Some of these ideas had been systematized by the famous sociologist Ziya Gokalp. All reforms, however, before the proclamation of the six principles and after, were based on them. These principles were:

(I) Republicanism, which asserted the idea that sovereignty was rested in the people.

(II) Nationalism, which claimed Turkey for the Turks and rejected jurisdiction over territories with non-Turkish population.

(III) Populism, which did away with the millet system and proclaimed the equality of all classes of all people before the law.

(IV) Statism, which accepted the necessity of the constructive intervention of the state in the national economy.

(V) Secularism, which established the principle of the separation of religion and state.

(VI) Reforms, which emphasized the determination to change and bypass tradition and precedent if they do not serve national purpose.
It is important to note that notwithstanding violent vicissitudes, the death of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk in 1357/1938 and world war II, the above principles have remained operative without much modification. Furthermore, these and all the reforms carried out under them have been directed toward one major objective, namely, the replacement of an eastern civilization with that of a Western one.

4.2.6 KEMAL ATATURK'S ABOLITIONS:

In addition to the abolition of the ‘Sultanate’ of Mohammad V and the Caliphate which offended all Sunni Muslims everywhere, Mustafa Kemal also abolished Islamic law and replaced them with Swiss civil and Italian Penal codes, and also changed Islamic Calendar to Christian Calendar, and Arabic Alphabet by English Alphabet. Many other abolitions included abolition of Friday as the weekly holiday, abolition of old titles like Pasha and abolition of Bey and closing down of mosque-schools. Several other abolitions were also carried out by this regime.

4.2.7 THE SECOND TURKISH REPUBLIC AND ITS POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT:

While the trials were in progress and the constitution was being written, new political parties were being formed and they were preparing for the promised elections. Some 11 parties registered and carried on a lively campaign. In the election held on 1381/October 12, 1961, only four parties were able to win seats in the assembly. The Republican people’s party won 173 seats, the Justice party 158 seats, the New Turkey Party 65 Seats, and the Republican Peasants’ National Party 54 seats. Inasmuch as the Republican People’s party did not have
a majority, it arranged a coalition with the Justice party. The Assembly
elected General Gursel as President and Ismet Inonu as Prime Minister.
A year later internal disagreement in the coalition caused the People’s
Party to seek coalition with the other two parties and leave the Justice
party out of the government.

No one was surprised that the Republican People’s Party got
more votes than any other. Beside from being Ataturk’s party, it
spearheaded opposition to the excesses of the Democratic Party. What
surprised the observers, however, was the strength shown by the Justice
Party. Generally it was composed of conservatives who believed in
lower rates of taxes and transfer of state monopolies to private industry;
the Party was also for the abolition of governmental controls and against
all state planning. On the whole, the Justice Paty captured the votes of
the followers of the Democratic Party.

The New Turkey Party was made up of economic, liberal, and
political progressives which someday might pose throat as the chief
opponent to the Republican People’s Party. They were strong secularists
and advocated the rights of labor to strick. The Republican Peasants’
National party advocated social conservatism and had anti-secularist
tendencies. It and the Justice Party generally appealed to the rural areas
while the Republican and the New Turkey Parties had their followers
among the Urban dwellers.32

The secularists wanted to follow Ataturk, which means no
religious education in school and no use of the Arabic language in
religious observances. The clericalists, on the other hand, wanted
religious education in school, demanded the use of Arabic in worship
and wanted all the religious endowment funds turned over to the 'ulama'. Between these two were the moderates who believed in the "Partial" restoration of Islam. But when it came to translating this restoration into action, most of the moderates were afraid that freedom of religious instruction will reinstate the use of Arabic letters, veil, polygamy, caliphate etc. So the final decision will be made, not by fiat, but by the process of education and the rapidity with which the rural areas westernize.
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(III) **MALAYSIA:**

Local Name: Malaysia

Population: 25,092,940 (July 2004 est.)

Status: Constitutional monarchy

Independence: 31 August 1957 (from UK)

Capital: Kuala Lumpur

Chief of State: Paramount Ruler Fuanku Syed Sirajuddin ibni Almarhum Tuanku Syed Putra Jamalullail, the Raja of Perlis (Since 12 December 2001).

Head of Government: Prime Minister Abdullah bin Ahmad Badawi (Since 31 October 2003).

Languages: Bahasa Malaysia (Malay) (official), also Chinese, English, and Tamil widely spoken

Ethnic groups: Malay (59%), Chinese (32%), Indian (9%)

Religions: Muslim (53%), Buddhist (17%), Chinese folk-religionist (12%). Hindu (7%), Christian (6%).
4.3.1 HISTORY:

Part of Srivijaya Empire, 9th–13th–c; Hindu and Muslim influences, 14th–15th–c; Portugal the Netherlands, and Britain vied for control from the 16th–c; Singapore, Malacca, and Penang formally incorporated into the British Colony of the straits settlements, 1826; British protection extended over Perak, Selangor, Negeri Sembilan, and Pahang, Constituted into the Federated Malay States, 1895; protection treaties with several other states (Unfederated Malay States), 1885–1930; occupied by Japanese in World War 2; Federation of Malaya, 1948, independence, 1957; constitutional monarchy of Malaysia 1963; Singapore withdrew from the Federation in 1965; government by a bicameral Federal Parliament; Head of State is Monarch elected for five years by his fellow sultans; advised by a Prime Minister and a Cabinet.

4.3.2 HEAD OF GOVERNMENT:

1963-70 Abdul Rahman Putra al-Haj
1970-6 Abdul Razak bin Hussein
1976-9 Haji Hussein bin Onn
1979-97 Mahathir bin Mohammad
1997 Anwar Ibrahim Acting
1997- Mahathir bin Mohamad

4.3.3 POLITICAL SYSTEM IN MALAYSIA: CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY:

In the traditional Islamic state, it is expected that the ruler be an exemplary Muslim, observant of the full “Shariah” law. The favourite
Malaysian example of the ideal ruler is embodied in the Four Religious Caliphs, especially Omar.

Independent Malaysia combines its parliamentary democracy with a legacy of nine sultanates, of which one is elected every five years as King of Malaysia. Beyond their role as head of religion in their respective states, the Sultans’ real strength remains in their symbolic representation of Malay identity and power as the original and dominant people of the country. The constitutional monarchy, however, retains certain arbitrary powers is seen as residues of the ‘feudal’ age. Loyalty to the Person of the King and the elaborate trappings of pre-Islamic rituals and titles, lead others to say that ‘we fear the King more than Allah’ which means that rulers are in fact above the law. A number of incidents over the past decade involving anti-social, corrupt and even criminal behaviour by some of the rulers finally reached crisis point in late 1413/1992, culminating in a parliamentary constitutional amendment to remove the Sultans’ legal immunity. The Prime Minister, the first in Malaysia not to come from an aristocratic or royal background, was personally strongly committed to this move, although critics claim that the measure also strengthens his own powers. Despite their formal roles as head of religion, the sultans’ newly publicized lifestyle and character were quickly targeted as ‘Feudal’ and ‘un-Islamic’, hence unfit for office and for the title Baginda, one also used for the Prophet.

The ‘mufties’ and ‘fatwa’ councils of several states have issued statements to the effect that stripping Sultans of their legal immunity is in line with Islamic law and justice, and even the PAS Council of Ulama asserted that royals are not above the law; all are equal before Allah.
When the final parliamentary vote was taken, however, PAS voted against the constitutional amendments to abolish royal immunity, once again for political reasons. For the federal government, however, the issue is clearer: The legitimacy of the Malaysian state is thoroughly secular even though many of its policies and characteristics are presented in Islamic clothing. In its latest stand-off with royalty, the rights of the people are re-defined in a civil, constitutional sense, with Islam as a social and political leveling mechanism.  

4.3.4 THE POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN MALAYSIA:

Unceasingly since Independence in 1377/1957, Malaya/Malaysia has been engaged in a process of state building and consolidation. To the extent that the country aspires to be a ‘nation-state’, the national focus has always been on Malay, and the constitution clearly establishes the primacy of Malay status in a number of provisions and policies, while the constitutionally defined characteristics of Malayness-by languages custom and (the Muslim) religion-are essentially cultural, thus theoretically permitting assimilation of immigrants and minorities (to Malay status) according to the classic ideal, in practice, informal social mechanism prevent full acceptance of culturally qualified non-Malays. From another perspective, the constitution also requires that Malays be Muslims, as a condition of ethnic recognition, and a non-Muslim Malay is thus a legal anomaly. Malays, therefore, are the only Malaysian to enjoy no freedom of religious choice or practice, a price paid for political re-requisite and ethnic protection. Malaysia thus remains a plural state, whose principle political parties are also ethnic based. The ruling coalition (Barisan Nasional) which has ruled in substantially the same format since independence consists of a core of
the United Malays National Organization (UMNO): The Malaysian Chinese Association (MCA); and Malaysian Indian Congress (MIC), to which are added from time to time other parties. Among the permanent opposition parties are the largely Chinese Democratic Action Party (DAP): a splinter party from UMNO, known as Semangat 46, led by a Malay prince; and an attenuated multiethnic Peoples’ party (Party Rakyat). The other principle opposition player is the Pan-Malayan Islamic party or PAS, which keeps the UMNO constantly on its moral and religious toes, and which at present, in alliance with Semangat 46, is the ruling party of the heavily Malay north eastern state of Kelantan. In its early years, beginning in 1371/1951 as Hisbul Muslimin, PAS was more concerned with the promotion of Malay interests, an ethnic party legitimated by the moral force of Islam. Now that PAS has been in power in Kelantan since 1411/1990.

4.3.5 Malaysia’s Relations with the ‘West’:

Malaysia’s relations with the ‘west’ are highly ambivalent and sometimes defensive. Beneath the co-operation, it perceives a lurking ‘orinetalist’ bias, which may be partly a projection of Malaysia’s own uncertain identity. Western countries are portrayed alternately as role models to be emulated or rejected, as indeed are Muslim ones. In the positive mode, the Prime Minister rhetorically asks his countrymen (especially the Malays) why the Muslim People of today are less developed and enterprising, unable to co-operate among themselves or to gain respect for their achievements, ‘like fruits floating haphazardly in the sea’? The Malaysian leader ponders how Muslim countries can modernize without destroying the faith. The defenders of economic development are usually scrupulous in separating the west’s technical
and scientific contributions from its accompanying social and cultural shortcomings. Further compensation is sought from history, and the glories of the Islamic civilization in times past.

4.3.6 **MALAYSIA’S RELATIONS WITH MUSLIM COUNTRIES:**

As for the present, Malaysia’s relations with Muslim countries and peoples are selective. Although formally a member of the organization of Islamic conference (OIC), Malaysia has a rather low opinion of that grouping, for it perceived indecisiveness and lack of coordination amid the compelling events of Bosnia, Somalia and the Gulf War. The Malaysian government generally tries to distance itself from the immediacy of local Middle Eastern politics, and some of its publications are critical of the disposition of Arab Wealth, which does not necessarily appear to benefit the world’s poorer Muslims. It is apparent; too that Iran is not a role model for Malaysia ever since some of the ‘dakwah’ movements openly declared their inspiration from the Iranian revolution. The latest exercise in religious politics for Malaysia has been in the new Central Asia republics of Kazakhstan, Tajikestan and especially Uzbekistan, where it perceives a tempting vacuum. Political and trading overtures, followed by a Prime Ministerial visit to Uzbekistan mark this new alignment for the region’s Muslim population and re-incorporation as members of the wider ‘Ummah’. Also in the name of the Ummah, but outside the purview of the state.

4.3.7 **THE FUTURE OF MALAYSIA IN THE POST-MAHATIR MUHAMMAD ERA:**

Mahatir has contributed positively to the economic development of his country, and succeeded in building self-confidence and a “can do”
attitude among his people. But in his zeal to instill self-discipline and accelerate progress, he managed to eradicate the political power of his rivals and critics, often resorting to questionable means. In the process he has not only weekend the constitutional and legal foundation of Malaysia’s Political Institutions, but has even succeeded in subordinating the judiciary to his office. He forced, for instance, the resignation of Malaya Chief Justice Yahya Saleh because the later refused to dance to the political tone of Mahatir’s government. The latest sacking of his deputy was intended to guarantee that no one should dare to oppose his decisions and policies. Few People with authentic values and independent minds remain in the government today. Undoubtedly, this has dire consequences for the post-Mahatir era.

As for the Islamist, they are likely to continue to be an important force to be reckoned with. One important development that came as a result of the political crisis in Malaysia was the founding of the National Justice Party (Parti Keadilan Nasional). The party is currently led by Wan Azizah Ismail, Anwar’s wife who serves as the party’s president, and by Chandra Muzaffar and Tian Chua as Vice Presidents. The National Justice Party represents a drastic shift from the communal polities that dominated Malaysia’s political life since its independence, bringing the three major ethnic communities- The Malays, the Chinese, and the Indians- into political unison. While the party has a little chance to muster political power in the next elections, it reflects a deep political transformation currently underway, particularly when one realizes that the party is founded by individuals counted among the Islamically oriented forces.⁴¹
(IV) **TAJIKISTAN:**

**Official Name:** Republic of Tajikistan,

**Capital:** Dushanbe

**Population:** 6,863,752 (July 2003 est.)

**Independence:** 9 September 1991 (from Soviet Union)

**Chief of State:** President Emomali Rahmonov (Since 6 November 1994)

**Head of Government:** Prime Minister Oqil Oqilov (Since 20 January 1999)

**Date of Independence:** 1991

**Languages:** Tajik (official), Russian

**Ethnic groups:** Tajik (59%), Uzbek (23%), Russian (13%)

**Religion:** Sunni Muslim 85%, Shi'a Muslim 5% & Others 10%
4.4.1 **HISTORY:**

Conquered by Persia, and Alexander the Great; invaded by Arabs in 8th –c; Turkish invasion, 10th –c; until mid 18th –c part of the emirate of Bukhara, which in effect became a protectorate of Russia, 1868; following the Russian Revolution (1917), became part of Turkestan Soviet Socialist Autonomous Republic, 1918; scene of the Basmachi revolt 1922-3; Tajik Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic created as part of the Uzbek SSR, 1924; became a Soviet socialist Republic, 1929; declaration of independence from the Soviet Union, 1991; joined Commonwealth of independent states, 1991; Republican communist party remained in power until civil war, 1992; governed by a president, Prime Minister, and Supreme Assembly.

4.4.2 **Head of state:**

1992 – Imamoli Rakhmanov

4.4.3 **Head of government:**

1996 – 9 Yahya Azimov
1999- Oqil Oqilov

4.4.4 **POLITICAL SYSTEM OF TAJIKISTAN:**

The extended internal armed conflict precluded the development of the Tajikistan political system, which is currently both weak and prone to violence. The country is headed by the president, Emomali Rahmonov, who will be serving his second term until 1427/2006. In 1420/1999 the president’s term of was extended through referendum from 5 years to 7 years.
The Tajikistan Parliament comprises two chambers—a 63-seat lower house, the council of Representatives, and a 34-seat upper house, the National council. This parliament, elected in 1421/March 2000, replaced the Former unicameral Supreme Assembly. The MPs (Member of Parliament) are elected for 5 year term.

Tajikistan has experienced a devastating five years civil war that ended in 1418/1997 with the conclusion of an agreement between the Tajik Government and major opposition group, the United Tajik Opposition (UTO). As a result of the agreement the opposition is now integrated in the political process, following constitutional amendment on the legalization of political parties based on religion. Nevertheless, the political situation is complicated by the exclusion of “Third force” opposition powers, which include representatives of the northern region of Leninabad, the most developed and productive region in the country the government’s ban on independent political organizations in Leninabad could weaken the stability of the country and marginalize a reign- with a large ethnic Uzbek population – already susceptible to calls for secession.

4.4.5 STATE POWER IN TAJIKISTAN:

According to the Constitution of Tajikistan, adopted in 1415/1994, state power is based on the principle of Separation of power to legislative, executive and judicial ones. These functions are reformed by the majlisi oli (Parliament), Government and Court, respectively.

However, the constitution separates functions among branches of power inaccurately. There are some cases of duplication of functions of one branch of power by another one. For example, according to the
constitution, the constitutional court is authorized to supervise the coordination of the country. At the same time, the president of the country is authorized “to abolish or suspend the resolutions of the organs of state government in the case of their contradictions to the laws and the constitution of the country”.

The parliament also has the right to interpret the constitution and laws.

According to the Constitution, the president has the right to introduce to the parliament the candidatures of Chairmen, their deputies and judges of the constitutional, Supreme and supreme economic courts for both election and recall the judges of the martial courts as well as judges of regional, city and district courts are appointed and dismissed by the president of the country on presentation of the Minister of justice. Such procedures make the judicial power to be dependent on the president of the executive power.

The state power unofficially, is formed on a regional basis. For example, now all key positions are divided between the representatives of Kulyab, Leninabad and Gissar regions, who came to power in 1413/1992 after the victory over the Islamo-democratic coalition. Previously the Islamo-democratic coalition, in its turn, represented the coalition of Qarategin and Badakhshan Tajks.

4.4.6 A SERIES OF CHANGES TO THE ELECTION CODE BY THE TAJIK PARLIAMENT:

The Taj parliament has approved a series of changes to the Election code that should improve the election process. The
amendments, among other things, call for independent members to be appointed to local election commissions and outlaw the presence of armed men at polling stations.

On the negative side, the amendments for the first time impose a registration fee on candidates, but a compromise allowed for this fee to be lowered to $500 per candidate from an original proposal of $3000. Still, some say parties may not be able to afford registering many candidates.

A spokesman for the Islamic Renaissance party of Tajikistan, Nasriddin Saidov, said his party generally welcomed the amendments, but added there were two issues the party wished had been included. “Two amendments that would have had a huge influence on elections were not accepted”, he said. “We proposed a change to article 15 of this law, to include representatives of political parties at polling stations on voting day. They should be there because experience has shown that all violations occur in these places. Also, we proposed changes to Article 46, so that all parties should be provided with the tabulation of vote results right after counting. All the parties indicated the amendments give them a better chance to complete in a vote they hope will be more transparent than previous efforts.

4.4.7 DEVELOPMENT OF THE POLITICAL SYSTEM:

We may declare that its political structures, political culture and subsystems autonomy have a limited character. According to the classification of the political system types. The political systems with limited political structures are called pre-mobilized modern political systems. They are called modern as they have attributes typical for
modern societies—a constitution, and political infrastructure, though in the limited size. Judging by the ruling regime, pre-mobilized authoritative and democratic political systems are differentiated. Unlimited power and lack of control of the state by citizens, use of force, monopolization of power and politics, prohibition of political opposition, non-interference or limited interference of non-political spheres is typical for authoritarian regimes.

The characteristics of authoritative power have been described in detail because they are all present in the ruling regime of Tajikistan. In addition, the heads of executive power of cities and towns are not elected but appointed and relieved by the president of the country. This also is a criterion of a authoritative ruling regime.

According to the level of its development problems which face the country's political system, are typical for this type of the political system. Challenges which cause the development of a political system come from outside, and inside the society, or from the political elite of the society.

A threat coming from a neighboring state forces a political system to strengthen its extractive function, and to mobilize resources to repulse a possible attack. The political system adopts its structures and creates new structures to fulfill this task.

Development results when the exiting structure and culture of a political system is unable to cope with the problem or challenge which confronts it without further structural differentiation and cultural secularization. Almond differentiates four types of challenge which may lead to the development of the political system:
1) The integration of the society and control of the society-state building.

2) The increase of national self-consciousness national building.

3) The participation of the citizens in decision-making-process participation.

4) The distribution of weals.

The peculiarities of the historical and current development of the Tajik Society have developed in such a way that these four problems simultaneously face the country’s political system.
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