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James David Barber's typology for categorizing political leaders forms the foundation for this study.

Lee Kuan Yew, Prime Minister of Singapore, and Tengku Abdul Rahman, former Prime Minister of Malaysia, are categorized vis-a-vis the active-positive, active-negative, passive-positive, and passive-negative continua as defined by Barber. The classification is made by utilizing biographical data.

The classifications are then validated by survey data. Utilizing the semantic differential, questionnaires were sent to 377 prospective respondents to determine their perceptions of Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman. Half of the survey items (21) measured the active-passive spectrum and half (21) measured the positive-negative.

The results obtained via the biographical data collection and the survey data collection methods were compared.
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CHAPTER I
WHY STUDY THE PERSONALITIES OF POLITICAL LEADERS?

The models or theories of political analysis are many and varied. The focus of each of these models, by necessity is upon a restricted area of study. Since there is no approach which can simultaneously study all elements and dynamics of a political situation, one is forced to select a means and therefore an area for analysis.

It is not this writer's contention that one approach to the analysis of a political phenomenon is "good" while another is "bad." All analytical approaches make certain assumptions about the individuals, institutions, or systems being studied.

However, it is imperative that the basic assumptions underlying the research, as well as the area for analysis, be delineated. This chapter has as its goal the statement of the writer's assumptions and the demarcation of the area under study.

The assumption underlying the research is that an understanding of a nation's political leader will give a clue to the kind of leadership which will be employed by the
leader and to a degree will afford the researcher some ground upon which to speculate about the future course of the nation in a broad political sense.

James David Barber's book, *The Presidential Character*, presents a model of political leadership character in which he categorizes some former presidents of the United States by personality type.

To develop the four personality types he relied on biographical sources which reported specific president's words and/or actions. His approach stresses the ways interpersonal experience shapes the person's self-image, his world view, and his political style, and how, in turn, these internalized lessons of experience are turned back to shape subsequent interpersonal experiences. . . . To each situation [man] brings resources from his past, organized in patterns which have helped him cope before. He copes with a situation not only as a structure of realities, but also as a construction of his perception.1

The writer is not implying that a casual survey of a nation's political leadership will provide a definitive answer to the prediction of a nation's course of action. No approach, no matter how sophisticated, can hope to be the last word in the prediction of political events. The personality approach offers no short cuts nor sure answers.

When dealing with people, the element of the unexpected is always—the expected. The task is to reduce the

element of surprise in political actions by whatever degree is possible. If this element can be reduced by a small fraction a more accurate analysis is possible.

This writer is of the opinion that the personality approach to the study of political leaders is valuable in any circumstance but is particularly so under certain conditions:

1. When accurate and timely information about the political situation is not available (when the mass media are government owned and/or censored)

2. When the political leader has no articulate opponent

3. When political opposition is silenced by whatever means—or it is expected that a silencing has occurred

Political scientists including Plato,\(^2\) Machiavelli,\(^3\) Mills,\(^4\) and Lasswell\(^5\) have considered the personality of the political leader an important area of study. Historically, Plato was the "first of several political thinkers to delineate the importance of understanding the role of human nature in the role of politics."\(^6\) One of the


individual parts of the Platonic method is the "psyche . . . all of the invisible, non-physiological parts of a man--what we call the 'psychological' and the 'spiritual' man put together."7

Psychologists also recognize the significance of personality, and Gordon offers this definition of the term:

Personality consists of the specific contents and consequences of behavior and the processes responsible for these contents and consequences.8

This definition includes the study of an individual's motivation, learning, sensory perceptions, responses, and performance, in his environment. He further states:

The study of personality attempts to account for enduring characteristics of people, their uniqueness, the style as well as the what of their behavior, the organization of behavior, and the relationships among events within and without the individual.9

However:

Despite the growing evidence that psychological dynamics play an important role in politics, political scholars have paid little attention to the psychological aspects of political behavior. Political psychology, therefore, has been relatively slow to develop in any systematic fashion as a subdivision of the fields of political studies.10

Political analysis . . . as it becomes more complex and probes deeper into the explanation of  

7Bluhm, Theories of the Political System, p. 70.
9Ibid., p. 19.
10DiRenzo, Personality and Politics; p. 4.
social behavior, inevitably reaches a stage where psychological considerations must be taken into account and placed in proper theoretical perspective in relationship to other variables. Personality is of prime concern in such considerations.\textsuperscript{11} However, only a few scholars appear to be willing to seriously consider the hypothesis "that political behavior is a function, at least in part, of the personality of its agents."\textsuperscript{12}

The focus of political science is often upon institutions, systems, the elite, the masses, and bureaucracy. In short, our attention is directed toward collectives rather than personalities. How does this effect our ideas of causality? Especially when the individual is subordinated to the collective. Where does the individual's responsibility lie—or is there no individual responsibility? Has the person been superseded by the collective? These are important questions for leaders as well as followers. If indeed leaders are not important—or of greater significance, if leaders are really not capable of leading—where does that leave our political apparatus? Does the political system exist sui generis? In effect, is the political system out of control?

The writer prefers to assume that the political leader does have an effect upon the political system. This assumption would appear to imply the converse, i.e., the follower may also have an effect upon the political

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid. \hspace{1em} \textsuperscript{12}Ibid.
system—not as great an impact, to be sure, but an impact nonetheless.

The danger of not believing that ... strong leaders can and do exist in world politics is that the masses of people in the world will be conditioned to believe that political events are inevitable, that history makes history, not men, and that individual human beings are no longer responsible for their own political actions. The age of mass politics has become a totalitarian age because of the willingness of groups of people to give in to and support individual extremists in times of crisis when people are led to believe that no one can solve problems, much less control political reality.\footnote{Robert A. Isaak, Individuals and World Politics (North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury, 1975), p. xi.}

The focus of this thesis is upon the individual leader. The rationale for this approach may be summed up as follows:

Great world leaders prove everyday that individuals do matter in international politics. Leaving nothing to chance, they break beyond existing social reality and use a few basic principles of world politics as tools to move the world. ... We can see how some men move beyond their backyard existences, transform their nations into their own images, and change the rules according to which the game of nations is played.\footnote{Ibid., p. 3.}

Great world leaders come into being by opposing chance, by taking nothing for granted, and by using ideas and action to impose their wills upon others.\footnote{Ibid.}

In the political game of everyday life, the odds aren't equal for everyone. Great world leaders constantly seek to better their odds by controlling their own lives and those of others, by breaking out of the patterns of everyday routine, and by living for ideas beyond their
own selfish needs. Whether they use their power for good or evil is secondary to the fact that they exist and often hold our existence and fate in their hands.\(^{15}\)

**Purpose and Assumptions**

The purpose of this thesis is to validate Barber's model of [leadership] character by studying the personality types of the former Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tengku Abdul Rahman, and the Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew.

When studying the Southeast Asian area, one is frequently faced with the problem of obtaining current and reliable data. Singapore and Malaysia present the student with substantial barriers to sources of information. Both nations employ censorship of all public media as well as governmental control of the same. With these limitations facing the investigator, new avenues of information collection must be found.

This thesis presents information which enables the writer to determine the personality types of Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman.

The focal point for the study of any nation must be with its leaders. Knowledge of the personality of a nation's leader provides insight into the politics of the nation per se.

\(^{16}\)Ibid., pp. 3-4.
With the preceding assumptions in mind, and with the information constraints, methods of data collection and analysis will now be briefly considered.

The data collection and analysis will be in two phases. The first approach will be historical. Data regarding the personality development of Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman will be reviewed and analyzed. The review and analysis of historical data pertaining to the personalities of these two leaders will be based upon Barber's model.

Upon completion of the analysis of the historical data the writer will attempt to classify Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman according to the four personality types outlined by Barber.

The second stage of the thesis will be an attempt to validate the conclusions drawn during the first stage, i.e., the analysis of the historical data based upon Barber's model.

Specifically, the second stage will involve a survey of specialists of the Southeast Asian area. The respondents for the survey were selected from Tilman's International Biographical Directory of Southeast Asia Specialists. Those individuals with either a first or second area of specialty of Malaysia or Singapore were chosen to complete the survey.
The survey instrument used in this study is the semantic differential. The adjectives selected for the semantic differential were obtained largely from Barber's text, *The Presidential Character*, in which he described the qualities associated with the active-passive and the positive-negative personality types. Where only one adjective was listed in Barber its antonym was found in *Roget's Thesaurus*.

The questionnaires were sent by regular mail in the United States and by air mail to those respondents outside of the United States.

On the basis of the response to the questionnaire, the writer will then determine the personality types of Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman as perceived by the Southeast Asia specialists. A comparison will then be made between the findings of the historical data and the survey data.

**Review of the Literature**

Why study Southeast Asia? Why look to this area for trends of the world of the future?

Politically speaking the history of the twentieth century is in large part the history of the re-emergence of non-European areas and states to positions of independence and prominence on the world scene. . . . Asia, Latin America, and Africa together account for approximately
sixty-two per cent of the land area and seventy-three per cent of the population of the earth.\textsuperscript{17}

Pye offers the student of comparative politics many areas upon which to focus, not the least of which are a nation's leaders.

Government—in the sense of a society's legislative, executive, judicial, and bureaucratic machinery—is not, however, the sole concern of students of comparative politics; for it is only a part of the political system as a whole.\ldots Political leaders\ldots serve as active or dynamic agents within a political system, sifting and choosing among the claims which demand action, formulating these in viable terms, gathering support, and presenting the results in the form of demands for political action.\textsuperscript{18}

Of primary importance, in this study of the personalities of the leaders of Singapore and Malaysia is the selection of the model for the study of these two leaders. The single case study falls short of the goals desired in this thesis in that it offers little transferability to other leadership types. The preferred approach is that of a model which offers a means of classifying leaders, i.e., a typological approach. Barber offers a typology which will be useful in the analysis of Tengku Abdul Rahman and Lee Kuan Yew.

First, [a leader's] personality is an important shaper of his\ldots behavior on nontrivial matters.


\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., pp. ix-x.
Second, [a leader's] personality is patterned. His character, world view, and style fit together in a dynamic package understandable in psychological terms.

Third, [a leader's] personality interacts with the power situation he faces and the national "climate of expectations" dominant at the time he serves. The tuning, the resonance--or lack of it--between these external factors and his personality sets in motion the dynamic of his leadership.

Fourth, the best way to predict a [leader's] character, world view, and style is to see how they were put together in the first place. What happened in his early life, culminating in his first independent political success? ... The core of the argument ... is that [leadership] character ... comes in four varieties. The most important thing to know about a [leader] ... is where he fits among these types, defined according to (a) how active he is and (b) whether or not he gives the impression he enjoys his political life.  

Before considering Barber's fourfold personality typology a definition of terms is required. A leader's personality, according to Barber, is made up of five elements:

- Character
- World View
- Style
- Power Situation
- Climate of Expectations

The most visible part of the pattern is style. Style is the [leader's] habitual way of performing his three political roles: rhetoric, personal relations, and homework. No [leader] can escape doing at least some of each. However ... the balance among the three styles elements varies ...  

---

19 Barber, The Presidential Character, p. 6.

20 Ibid., p. 7.
A leader's world view consists of his primary, politically relevant beliefs, particularly his conceptions of social causality, human nature, and the central moral conflicts of the time. This is how he sees the world and his lasting opinions about what he sees. A leader's world view affects what he pays attention to, and a great deal of politics is about paying attention.21

... Character is the way the leader orients himself toward life—not for the moment, but enduringly. Character is the person's stance as he confronts experience. Does he find himself superb or ordinary, or debased, or in some intermediate range?22

Character, world view, and style are abstractions from the reality of the whole individual. In every case they form an integrated pattern.23

The power situation... leadership character resonates with the political situation the leader faces. It is the relationship between the leader and the political configuration that makes the system tick.24

The "climate of expectations" that face any leader are:

People look to the leader for reassurance, a feeling that things will be all right, that he will take care of his people.25

Another theme is the demand for a sense of progress and action.26

A third type of climate of expectations is the public need for a sense of legitimacy from and in the leader.27

... The climate of expectations at any given time is the political air the leader has to

21Ibid., pp. 7-8. 22Ibid., p. 8. 23Ibid.
24Ibid., pp. 8-9. 25Ibid., p. 9. 26Ibid.
27Ibid.
breathe. Relating to this climate is a large part of his task.  

Since "... character has its main development in childhood, world view in adolescence, and style in early adulthood," this study must analyze the available biographical data concerning Tengku Abdul Rahman and Lee Kuan Yew.

"The five concepts--character, world view, style, power situation, and climate of expectations" are the primary areas of study utilized to categorize the leaders.

The continuua Barber employs to define leadership types are two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity-Passivity</th>
<th>Positive-Negative Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity--Passivity [refers to] how much energy the [leader] invests in his [role].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Positive-Negative affect toward one's activity [refers to] how he feels about what he does. Does he seem to experience his political life as happy or sad, enjoyable or discouraging, positive or negative in its main effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two continuua provide the base line for the four categories of leadership types. A brief description of these four categories follows.

Active-Positive: There is a congruence, a consistency, between much activity and the
enjoyment of it, indicating relatively high self-esteem and relative success in relating to the environment. . . . Active-positive [leaders] want most to achieve results.33

Active-Negative: The contradiction here is between relatively intense effort and relatively low emotional reward for that effort. . . . Active-negatives aim to get and keep power.34

Passive-Positive: This is the receptive, compliant, other directed character whose life is a search for affection as a reward for being agreeable and cooperative rather than personally assertive. The contradiction is between low self-esteem . . . and a superficial optimism. . . . Passive-positives are after love.35

Passive-Negative: [Although the] factors are consistent . . . why is someone who does little in politics and enjoys it less there at all? The answer lies in the passive-negative's character-rooted orientation toward doing dutiful service . . . [i.e.] passive-negatives emphasize their civic virtue.36

It appears to this writer that although Barber's model provides a framework for analysis and a typology for classification several shortfalls exist.

First, Barber's model has not to my knowledge, been applied outside of the United States.

Second, Barber's study of presidential character relies solely on biographical data. Barber's previous study, The Lawmakers, utilized survey data.37 As previously

36Ibid.
mentioned, censorship and a paucity of data are parameters that must be considered in the study of Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman. In an effort to compensate for the lack of, and perhaps inaccurate, biographical data an additional data source will be utilized.

This section of the review of literature will deal with the second analytical tool to be utilized in this study—the semantic differential.

The semantic differential, developed by Charles Osgood of the University of Illinois, is not a new instrument. The semantic differential was developed in 1952. This instrument is a "combination of word association and scaling techniques." Before consideration of some of the relevant applications of the semantic differential it is preferred that the logical basis of the semantic differential be reviewed.

The logical basis of the semantic differential is as follows:

1. The process of description or judgment can be conceived as the allocation of a concept to an experimental continuum, definable as a pair of polar terms.  


39Ibid.  40Ibid.

2. Many different experimental continuua, or ways in which meanings can vary, are essentially equivalent and hence may be represented by a single dimension.1

3. A limited number of such continuua can be used to define a semantic space within which the meaning of any concept can be specified.1

The concepts or "things" which may be measured by the semantic differential vary greatly, e.g., one may assess "attitudes toward newscasters," "attitudes toward certain stereotypes," "voting behavior," or even "images" of a brand, product, or company.1

The object of the semantic differential is to assess the respondents' attitudes toward a person, object, or idea by ranking the person, object, or idea against a "seven-point scale bounded by polar adjectives, e.g., Good-Bad, or Kind-Cruel."1

In this study the semantic differential will be utilized to measure the respondents' perceptions of Tengku

---

1Kjeldergaard, "Attitudes Towards Newscasters as Measured by the Semantic Differential," p. 35.
2Ibid. 3Ibid.
5Ibid.
7Snider and Osgood, Semantic Differential Technique, pp. 618-619.
Abdul Rahman and Lee Kuan Yew. The specific instrument will be discussed in a later section of the thesis.

Adjective modifiers qualify each step on the scale: the greater the intensity of the association, the more extreme the displacement towards one or the other polar term. Each concept [person, object, or idea] is rated on several scales so that the semantic profiles of the concept can be plotted.49

Although the writer has not located an instance in which the semantic differential has been utilized in connection with Barber's model of presidential [leadership] character, there are several studies which warrant our attention.

The potentiality of the instrument in opinion research was shown in the study by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) in which the semantic differential was used in conjunction with a public opinion poll conducted in the Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, area. A sample of 150 subjects representative of the voting public of this area was tested four times during the summer and fall of 1952. These subjects rated 20 concepts, 10 of persons, e.g., Truman, Taft, and Stalin, and 10 of policies, e.g., use of the atomic bomb, our foreign policy, the New Deal. By matching the different profiles of the "undecided" voters with profiles of Stevenson or Eisenhower supporters, the experimenters were able to predict how 18 out of 19 "undecided" actually voted at the polls.50

The respondents for this survey represent various nationalities. Therefore, it must be noted that "several investigations have shown the cross-cultural applicability

49 Ibid. 50 Ibid.
of the semantic differential. . . ."51 "Thus the differential is an ideal instrument for studying attitude in cross-cultural situations."52

Recalling that Barber's model is not based upon the analysis of the "rational" political actor, but rather upon the underlying psychological motivators--let us note similar characteristics of the semantic differential.

The semantic differential . . . measures emotional reactions rather than rational or well-reasoned ones. It encourages intuitive, impulsive, emotional expression of reaction. Essentially, it may be regarded as a projective measure. . . .53

Objectives of the Research

Since no studies of the personality types of Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman have been located--it appears more reasonable to this writer to phrase the objectives of the research in the form of questions rather than hypotheses.

The questions for research in this study are two:

1. What personality types are portrayed by the former Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tengku Abdul Rahman, and the Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew?


52 Ibid., p. 436.

2. What differences or similarities in the personalities are indicated by the biographical data and the questionnaire data?

A brief definition of terms must be undertaken at this point. The specific terms for definition are those found in the two questions previously stated.

**Personality**: As defined by Barber, is made up of three elements: character, world view, and style.⁵⁴

Although these elements have been defined earlier in the thesis the writer believes it will be useful to review their meanings at this time.

**Character**: is the way the [leader] orients himself toward life—not for the moment, but enduringly. Character is the person's stance as he confronts experience ... Does he find himself superb, or ordinary, or debased, or in some intermediate range?⁵⁵

**World View**: consists of the [leader's] primary, politically relevant beliefs, particularly his conceptions of social causality, human nature, and the central moral conflicts of the time. This is how he sees the world and his lasting opinions about what he sees. [A leader's] ... world view affects what he pays attention to, and a great deal of politics is about paying attention.⁵⁶

**Style**: is the most visible part of the pattern. Style is the [leader's] habitual way of performing his three political roles: rhetoric, personal relations, and homework. No [leader] can escape doing at least some of each. However, ... the balance among the three style elements varies. ...⁵⁷

---


Personality types refers to the typology as defined by Barber. The four personality types are defined in detail in the review of the literature section of the proposal. The four personality types are listed below:

- Active-Positive
- Active-Negative
- Passive-Positive
- Passive-Negative

The biographical data are composed of those texts which deal primarily (or at least in part) with the early years of both Tengku Abdul Rahman and Lee Kuan Yew. Greatest emphasis is placed upon the early years, adolescence, through the first political victory of these two leaders. The major sources of biographical data are listed in the bibliography of this thesis.

The questionnaire data will be obtained by the use of the semantic differential. The semantic differential is made up of adjective-pairs selected from Barber's outline of the four types of leadership character. Wherever possible, both of the adjective-pairs were taken from Barber. When only one adjective was listed in Barber, its antonym was selected from Roget's Thesaurus.

The respondents were selected from Tilman's International Biographical Directory of Southeast Asia Specialists. The respondents were selected on the basis of their countries of specialty, i.e., those respondents with Malaysia
and/or Singapore as their first or second country of specialty were selected to complete the questionnaire.

A brief consideration will now be given to the research methods which will be employed in the analysis of Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman.

**Research Methods**

The sample to be utilized in this study is taken from Tilman's *International Biographical Directory of Southeast Asia Specialists* (1969). A more recent directory has not been published. The respondents were selected on the basis of their first and second countries of specialty. That is, specialists with an area specialty of Malaysia and/or Singapore were selected. No attempt has been made to select a random sample from among the Malaysia/Singapore specialists. Since many respondents may have relocated since the compilation of the directory, or may not respond, this writer believes it is appropriate to send questionnaires to all of the possible respondents, i.e., the universe of this population.

The Malaysia and Singapore specialists represent diverse areas of study. A breakdown of the respondents will follow.

There are 377 respondents for this survey. These can be broken down into three categories based upon the first and second area of specialty indicated in Tilman's *Directory*. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The categories are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Specialty</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia and Singapore</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those respondents with area specialties of Malaysia and Singapore were sent two questionnaires (one for Lee Kuan Yew and one for Tengku Abdul Rahman). Those respondents with an area specialty of Singapore were sent a questionnaire dealing with Lee Kuan Yew. Malaysia specialists received a questionnaire regarding Tengku Abdul Rahman.

The questionnaires were sent by first class mail to those respondents in the United States (65) and by air mail to those respondents outside of the United States (312).

The names, addresses, and area of study of all the respondents are listed in appendix A.

The first step in the study of the personalities of Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman was the collection and analysis of biographical data. The model for analysis was Barber.

[Barber's] approach to understanding Presidents [leaders] is much closer to the psychology of adaptation stressing the ways interpersonal experience shapes the person's self-image, his
world view, and his political style, and how, in turn, these internalized lessons of experience are turned back to shape subsequent interpersonal experiences. Man copes. To each situation he brings resources from his past, organized in patterns which have helped him cope before. He copes with a situation not only as a structure of realities, but also as a construction of his perception. While it would be easy enough to dress up these ideas in a fancier vocabulary, doing so would add nothing of substance to the simple adaptive approach.\textsuperscript{58}

Barber's method "paid less attention to the opinions of biographers than to their reports of a President's [leader's] words and/or actions."\textsuperscript{59}

Because the biographical data available are sparse, a second stage of analysis—a questionnaire—was employed.

The questionnaire for this study is made up of adjective pairs found in Barber's The Presidential Character. The adjective-pairs describe two continuua: Activity-Passivity and Positive-Negative traits. In those cases where Barber provides only one adjective, its antonym has been found in Roget's Thesaurus.

The questionnaire is made up of 42 adjective-pairs. A seven-point semantic differential scale separates each adjective pair.

The first 21 adjective pairs describe the Activity-Passivity continuua. The items 22 through 42 of the questionnaire describe the Positive-Negative continuua.

\textsuperscript{58}Ibid., p. vi.  \textsuperscript{59}Ibid., p. v.
Appendix B contains a copy of the cover letter, instructions, and questionnaire sent to respondents.

The validity of the questionnaire was tested in the following way: the internal validity was tested by factor analysis.

The biographical data were analyzed in a nonstatistical way. The data were analyzed as historical data.

The questionnaire data were analyzed by drawing a profile of the individuals, along the two continuua, on the basis of the responses.

It was anticipated that the findings based on the biographical data and the questionnaire data would be the same.

Projected Interpretation of the Findings

It was assumed that the survey data would confirm the findings based upon the biographical data regarding Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman.

At this time it was assumed that Lee Kuan Yew would be classified as an active-negative, and Tengku Abdul Rahman would be categorized as a passive-negative.
CHAPTER II

A BRIEF HISTORICAL REVIEW OF MALAYSIA AND SINGAPORE

The historical review which is presented here will begin with the rule of the British in Malaysia and Singapore. As the reader is aware, the Portuguese and the Dutch had economic inroads in Malaysia and Singapore prior to the British.¹ However, the governments of both nations are largely a model of the British system,² and are therefore emphasized in this section.

The British interests in the Malay archipelago, as that of the Portuguese and the Dutch, were at first purely commercial. The British desired a base in the Far East for trading with China. Such a trading post was established at Balambangan, Sabah, in 1773. This effort was aborted due to physically unhealthy conditions and prolific piracy. Consequently, the British made no further attempts to settle Borneo for the next 40 years. In Malaya, however, the British efforts met with greater success.³

²Pye, Southeast Asia's Political Systems, p. 79.
In 1786 Francis Light occupied the island of Penang on behalf of the East India Trading Company. Penang and its adjacent territory of Wellesley Province were ceded to the Company by the Sultan of Kedah. In 1795 Malacca was surrendered by the Dutch to the British, even though it was returned to the Dutch on two subsequent occasions. The British finally obtained control of Malacca in 1825 in exchange for Bencoolen in West Sumatra to the Dutch. Sir Stamford Raffles provided the finishing touch when he took possession of Singapore in 1819. Thus an effective trading and Naval base was firmly established by the British.

In 1826 Penang, Malacca and Singapore were combined to form the colony of the Straits Settlements. During the year 1867 their administration became the responsibility of the Colonial Office. The earlier British policy of non-interference in the Malay Straits was modified due largely to the prevalence of lawlessness in the area. These infractions were beginning to affect the commercial prosperity of the Straits Settlements. As tin mining in the Malay peninsula increased as a result of the influx of Chinese, disputes among both the Malay chiefs and the Chinese intensified. From 1873 onward, when this change of policy was implemented, British residents were appointed

---

4Ibid., p. 354. 5Ibid., p. 504.
6Gullick, Malaya, p. 28.
in Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan, and Pahang. Their function was to advise the Sultans and Chiefs on all matters other than those dealing with the Malay religion and customs.  

Approximately 100 years elapsed before the British objective of establishing a base for trade in the Far East was achieved. History recounts the piecemeal struggle the British encountered not only from powerful, competing nations, but from the ethnic groups populating Malaysia and Singapore. These relatively small, diverse, ethnic groups under the leadership of their political systems, were also competing among themselves for maintenance or expansion.

In 1896 the four states of Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan, and Pahang were united to form the Federated Malay States. This was the first step toward centralized government in Malaysia. Each of these states had a British Resident General, and a system of centralized government. Johore entered into a treaty of protection with the British in 1855, however, it was not until 1914 that they obtained a General Adviser.

The British Residents were appointed to advise the disagreeing local political leaders, and a semblance of unity and centralization emerged. Thus the British

---

8Gullick, Malaya, pp. 35-36.
Residents acquired the status of legitimate, although limited, political authority, and personified public leadership in a specific geographic area.

The reader is reminded that the purpose of a political system is to:

1. legitimize an authority figure (leader)
2. create an economic base
3. provide security
4. provide social services
5. provide methods of communicating internally and externally

The system is not necessarily based on a formal written document. Traditions, customs, the cultural milieu, emotional temperament and climate of the people, disruptions created by loss or acquisition of territory or economic growth, composition of the population, the struggle for power, security, self-preservation, are some of the factors affecting and molding the political system.

Each political leader develops his role in a manner compatible with his own personality and the situation existing at the moment. As Barber indicates, a political leader:

1. symbolizes the people's hopes and fears for the political future
2. engenders an emotional attachment of the people to their leader
3. interprets political objectives
4. personifies public leadership
5. inspires acceptance and support of political goals

When Thailand transferred to the British all rights of suzerainty which she possessed over Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, and Trengganu each of these states accepted a British adviser. However, these four states remained outside the Federated Malay States. The Malay States were never declared British Territory. An administrative link existed between them and the Straits Settlements since the governor for the Malay States was also the governor of the Straits Settlements.¹⁰

With the establishment of law and order, Malaya enjoyed a long period of prosperity. These developments were accompanied by a large influx of Chinese and Indian laborers. These laborers expanded both road and rail networks which resulted in increased development of rubber plantations and tin mines. Considerable progress was made in the expansion of public utilities and social services. This progress was interrupted by the Japanese invasion in December of 1941. After the Japanese surrender, a British military administration was set up in September 1945. This was followed by the establishment of a Malayan Union in

¹⁰Barber, The Presidential Character, p. 4.

1946. This union's aim was to unite the whole peninsula under a governor and a strong central government. This centralization deprived the rulers and the states of all but nominal authority.\textsuperscript{11}

The Malayan Union proposals aroused a storm of protest especially from the Malays. They had banded themselves together under the United Malay National Organization (better known as UMNO). Consequently, the scheme was abandoned in 1948. At that time the Federation of Malaya was established by an agreement between the British Crown and the Malay Rulers. Under this new scheme, the Malay Rulers remained sovereign in the Malay States; Penang and Malacca remained British territory. Singapore was administered separately as a colony.\textsuperscript{12}

The Federation of Malaya agreement provided for a Federal Legislative Council consisting of 75 members, 50 of whom were unofficial. The agreement promised that elections would be held as soon as possible. Common citizenship was created for all who acknowledged Malaya as their permanent home. These events were additionally complicated by armed insurrection by Communist terrorists which started in 1948. Nevertheless, a new constitution was introduced in 1955 which transferred to the elected

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 57-59.

\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Milne, Government and Politics in Malaya}, pp. 28-32.
31 representatives most of the responsibility for the government of the Federation.\textsuperscript{13}

The first general elections were held in 1955. The alliance consisted of the United Malay National Organization (UMNO), the Malayan Chinese Association (MCA), and Malayan Indian Congress (MIC). This coalition is known as the Alliance, and was led by Tengku Abdul Rahman. The Alliance won 51 of the 52 elected seats.\textsuperscript{14}

Following a conference held in London early in 1956 arrangements were made to grant full independence. Independence was achieved on August 31, 1957, when the Federation of Malaya became an independent monarchy. The sovereign, the Yang di-Pertuan Agong, is elected every five years. The bicameral legislature is patterned similarly to the British Parliament. The Communist threat to the Federation had been crushed. The emergency declared in 1948, as a result of the terrorist war, was officially lifted in 1960.\textsuperscript{15}

Attention must now be directed to what is now known as East Malaysia, i.e., the states of Sabah and Sarawak. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the one influential state of Brunei consisted of its present territory with minimal authority over Sarawak and North Borneo.

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., pp. 30-36. \textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 36. \textsuperscript{15}Gullick, Malaya, pp. 120-121.
The British intervened in this area in 1841 to secure the safety of the seas for commerce and navigation. At this time James Brooke became the Rajah of Sarawak. The Sultan of Brunei conferred this appointment as a reward for helping the Sultan's Viceroy against a revolt by Malays and Land Dyacks. With the help of the British Navy, Brooke suppressed piracy in the region. He laid the foundations of administration. Under the rule of his successor, Sir Charles Brooke, the state was enlarged. With piracy virtually controlled, prosperity was increased. Development continued under the rule of the third Rajah, Sir Charles Vyner Brooke, who succeeded his father in 1917. In 1941 the Rajah enacted a new constitution which abrogated his absolute power and laid the beginnings of democratic government.\footnote{Milne, Government and Politics in Malaya, pp. 56-60.}

In 1946, after the Japanese occupation, the Rajah handed over his rule to the British Crown. The Supreme Council and the Council Negri were established in 1941 and retained their authority, while the powers of the Rajah were now vested in a governor.\footnote{Ibid., p. 57.}

The Council Negri consisted of a body of 25 members (14 official and 11 unofficial) who represented the different peoples of the country and their interests. The
Council Negri had legislative powers and control of the public expenditures. By 1956 a new legislature numbering 45 (24 of whom were elected unofficials) came into operation. From 1959 representatives from local district councils elected from among themselves, representatives to the five divisional councils of Sarawak. The representatives, together with the urban councils of Sibu, Kuching, and Miri, chose the unofficial members of the Council Negri.\textsuperscript{18} Elections were accompanied by rapid development of political parties. As constitutional advancement progressed, the proposals for the creation of a new nation to be called Malaysia were initiated. Malaysia was to be comprised of the Federation of Malaya, Singapore, and the British territories in Borneo. In March of 1963 the Council Negri adopted a motion to amend the constitution providing increasing local autonomy. Elections on the basis of the new provisions resulted in overwhelming victory for the pro-Malaysia Alliance Party.\textsuperscript{19}

Sabah, unlike Sarawak, was developed largely as a commercial proposition by businessmen who were attracted by the timber, reported mineral wealth, and land. The development of the territory was under the control of the

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., pp. 58-59.

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., pp. 99-104.
British North Borneo Chartered Company. This Company established the rudiments of government and the exploration of the territory's wealth. Slow but steady progress was achieved. Initially, tobacco was its primary crop. Later a balanced economy was achieved with the export of rubber, tin, and copra. Rail and road networks were developed primarily along the west coast. With the conclusion of the British military administration in 1946, North Borneo which was part of the Straits Settlements now became a colony.

A governor and an advisory council maintained the government until a new constitution was written and approved in 1950. This constitution provided for an executive and a legislative council. The unofficial members of the legislative council (a minority) were chosen by the governor from people considered to be representative of the various sectors of the community. In 1960 the unofficial membership was increased thus becoming the majority. By 1962 the legislative council also included 18 official members.

Elections for local authorities had been established in 1954 but were not held until April 1963. During the

---

20Pye, Southeast Asia's Political Systems, p. 29.
21Milne, Government and Politics in Malaya, p. 60.
period between 1954 and 1963 local officials were nominated members. The elected local councils functioned as an electoral college for the selection of members of the state legislature. The major issue in these elections was the proposed creation of Malaysia. The pro-Malaysia Alliance Party won a resounding victory in Sabah and Sarawak.23

In 1961 Prime Minister Rahman suggested that Malaya, Singapore, Sabah, Brunei, and Sarawak be brought closer together in political and economic cooperation. The political leaders of these territories reacted positively and swiftly to this suggestion. The new nation, Malaysia, provided a way for the Federation of Malaya to be associated with Singapore and the Borneo territories. This plan created two distinct advantages: racial balance and control by the central government over Communist subversive elements in these territories. To the people of Singapore it offered a quick means of ending colonial rule. To the people of the Borneo territories (Sabah and Sarawak), Malaysia offered the quickest means of achieving independence.24

The British viewed the Malaysia Plan as a satisfactory solution to their colonial responsibilities in the region. The Prime Ministers of Malaya and Great Britain

23 Ibid.

24 Milne, Government and Politics in Malaya, pp. 61-62.
met in London the latter part of 1961, and agreed that the establishment of Malaysia was desirable. However, prior to reaching a final decision the views of the people of Sabah and Sarawalk were to be determined. Meanwhile, Malaya and Singapore agreed on the terms of merger of the two territories. The terms were endorsed by the Singapore Legislative Assembly and the Malayan Parliament. The merger agreement provided for Singapore's autonomy in labor and educational matters, representation in Parliament by 15 seats, retention of multilingualism, and Malaysian nationality for all Singapore citizens.²⁵

A joint British/Malayan commission to ascertain the opinions of Sabah and Sarawalk citizens, was appointed in January 1962. It was reported in June that a substantial majority in each of these territories favored the merger. Brunei's legislative council approved the Malaysia Proposal in July of 1962. With this acceptance, the British and Malaysian governments agreed to formally create the Federation of Malaysia on August 31, 1963. An intergovernmental committee was constituted to work out the details of participation. The legislatures of Sabah and Sarawalk agreed to the creation of Malaysia with the understanding that their special interests would be safeguarded. The Malaysia agreement was finally signed on July 9, 1963 in London by

²⁵Malaysia Year Book 1972, p. 29.
representatives of Britain, Malaya, Sabah, Sarawak, and Singapore. The agreement provided for the transfer of sovereignty of North Borneo (Sabah and Sarawak) and Singapore by Britain on August 31, 1963. The Brunei government withdrew from the Malaysia Plan primarily as a result of disagreement over financial matters.\textsuperscript{26} Brunei's withdrawal may be directly related to its petroleum resources. Is it probably that Brunei considered the cost/benefit too high?

Because of open opposition from Indonesia and the Philippines regarding land claims in Borneo, a meeting was held in July 1963. The contingency imposed by these two governments was that the UN Secretary General ascertain the wishes of the people of Sabah and Sarawak. The report of the UN Secretary General confirmed the support by the residents of Sabah and Sarawak. The Yang di-Pertuan Agong (King of Malaya) proclaimed the establishment of Malaysia on September 16, 1963.\textsuperscript{27}

The Singapore government's decision to join the Federation was approved by a referendum with 71 percent support. Elections were held in September 1963 which returned the People's Action Party (PAP) to power in Singapore.\textsuperscript{28}

The Indonesian opposition to Malaysia was expressed by a policy of confrontation which included economic and

\textsuperscript{26}Ibid. \textsuperscript{27}Ibid. \textsuperscript{28}Ibid., p. 30.
military reprisal. Action by the UN Security Council was blocked by a Soviet veto. The confrontation was officially ended by mutual agreement August 11, 1966.\textsuperscript{29}

The Federation as it existed in 1963 was short-lived. About two years later Singapore separated from Malaysia and became an independent republic. The differences between the two countries appeared to be irreconcilable. A constitutional amendment provided for the separation and was approved by both Houses of Parliament. It should be noted that Singapore representatives were members of these legislative bodies. The separation agreement provided for separate currencies, immigration, and unrestricted travel into both countries. Economic cooperation and mutual defense continues to bind the two countries in a unique relationship.\textsuperscript{30}

In 1969 several significant events occurred: the Alliance Party retained their majority in the general elections; racial conflict erupted and Parliamentary rule was suspended. A state of emergency was declared.\textsuperscript{31}

September 1970 heralded a new dawn in the short history of Malaysia. After 13 years as Prime Minister, Rahman retired and Deputy Prime Minister Razak assumed that office.\textsuperscript{32}

Although the preceding historical synopsis is brief, it will hopefully provide some awareness of the foundations

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid. \textsuperscript{30}Ibid. \textsuperscript{31}Ibid. \textsuperscript{32}Ibid.
for the present government. The primary significance of the historical data indicates that the Malaysian and Singaporean system is modeled after the British, with a King or President who is largely a figurehead, and a Prime Minister in whom political power is vested.

**Malaysia's Political System**

With Malaysia's historical background in mind, the focus will now be upon her modern political system.

It should be noted that Malaysia is an independent member of the British Commonwealth. This status was granted on August 31, 1957.\(^3\) 3

Malaysia's transition from colonial status to independence was relatively orderly. When Malaysia gained Merdeka or Independence on August 31, 1957, it put into effect one of the most novel constitutions of modern times. In an effort to bring the sovereign rulers of the separate states into the Federation of Malaysia, the drafters of the constitution introduced the idea of an elected king. The Yang di-Pertuan Agong is elected by the Conference of Rulers from among their own members. He serves a five year term. It should be noted, however, that the King (or Paramount Ruler) has very limited constitutional powers. He is charged to guarantee and protect the Islamic religion within the country.\(^3\) 4

\(^3\)Pye, Southeast Asia's Political Systems, p. 48.

\(^4\)Ibid., pp. 78-79.
The Deputy Paramount Ruler (the Timbalan Yang di-Pertuan Agong) is elected by his brother rulers (the Sultans or governors of the states) in the same manner as the supreme head. He exercises no power as the Deputy, but is immediately available to fill the King's role and carry out his functions if the Agong is disabled or absent from the country.  

The Conference of Rulers consists of the hereditary rulers or governors of the states. These Sultans (or governors) of the various states then select the Paramount Ruler and the Deputy. It should be noted here that the Sultan's role is a minor one concerned basically with religious matters and not so much with the political matters of the state.

The political power of the nation resides in the Prime Minister and his Cabinet. The Prime Minister is selected from among the members of the lower house of the Parliament. This house, the Dewan Ra'ayat, consists of 144 elected members. The Prime Minister must be a federal citizen by birth, not by registration or naturalization. He must be a member of the House of Representatives (Dewan Ra'ayat) and in the opinion of the Supreme Head must

---

36 Ibid., pp. 281-282.
37 Pye, Southeast Asia's Political Systems, p. 78.
command the confidence of the majority party in that house.\textsuperscript{38}

The Cabinet is a council of ministers appointed by the Supreme Head (King) upon the advice of the Prime Minister. The Cabinet consists of the Prime Minister, as the chairman, and an unspecified number of other ministers who the Prime Minister selects from either house of Parliament. The Cabinet is collectively responsible to Parliament.\textsuperscript{39}

The Cabinet usually meets about once per week. The Prime Minister holds the dominant position in the Cabinet where he is first among equals. He has the power to appoint and dismiss Cabinet members. The Prime Minister advises the King on the appointment of judges, the public service commission, the election commission, and the filling of certain senior posts in the civil service. The Prime Minister is the chief negotiator with representatives of foreign powers.\textsuperscript{40}

The National Operations Council (NOC) was first developed by special proclamation as the result of racial disturbance in May of 1969. The Yang di-Pertuan Agong, upon the advice of the Prime Minister, vested emergency

\textsuperscript{38}Henderson et al., \textit{Area Handbook for Malaysia}, p. 282.

\textsuperscript{39}Ibid. \textsuperscript{40}Ibid., pp. 282-83.
power in the National Operations Council. The NOC was made up of a varying number of members including the Attorney General, the heads of the Armed Forces, the heads of the Police, and the Prime Minister. In June of 1969 there were six Malays, one Indian and one Chinese member. The NOC coordinated the work of the civil administration, military, and police in an effort to restore peace.1

The executive departments serve to assess the needs and the operations to be carried out to meet those needs within the country. The number of executive departments may be increased or decreased and their functions may be transferred from one ministry to another. The executive departments are under the control of the Prime Minister.2

The Parliament consists of two houses: the Dewan Negara (Senate), and the Dewan Ra'ayat (the House of Representatives). The Dewan Negara (Senate) represents the interests of the separate states.3 The 58 member Senate is made up of 26 elected members, 2 from each state, and 32 members appointed by the Supreme Head (King) upon the recommendation of the Prime Minister. The elected members are selected by their individual state legislatures and are frequently, but not necessarily, members of those bodies. The term of office for a member of the Senate is six years.4

---

1Ibid., pp. 283-284.  2Ibid., pp. 284-285.  
3Pye, Southeast Asia's Political Systems, p. 78.  
4Henderson et al., Area Handbook for Malaysia, p. 287.
Membership in the House of Representatives (Dewan Ra'ayat) may be altered by law. In 1969 there were 144 members: 104 from West Malaysia, 24 from Sarawak, and 16 from Sabah. The members of the House of Representatives have a tenure of five years unless it is reduced by the dissolution of Parliament. Every citizen resident in Malaysia is qualified to be a member of the Senate if he is not less than 30 years old, and of the House of Representatives if not less than 21 years old unless otherwise disqualified by law.\textsuperscript{45}

Bills may originate in either house usually with the assistance of the appropriate ministry. Money bills originate only in the House of Representatives and must be sponsored by a Cabinet Minister. Money bills, once signed by the Supreme Head, can become law without Senate consent, although the Senate has the power to delay them for one month. Other bills can bypass the Senate if they are passed twice by the House in successive sessions, a year having elapsed between passages. Bills are given three readings: when they are introduced, when they are debated and voted upon section by section, and when they are finally voted upon.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., p. 288.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., p. 289.
In all essential respects the Malaysian system operates along the line of the British Parliamentary or Cabinet system.\textsuperscript{47}

The Constitution provides for a Judiciary independent of the executive and legislative branches. It establishes the Federal Court consisting of the Lord President, two Chief Justices of the high courts, and four other judges. The Judiciary is an entirely federal service. Courts subordinate to the high courts are provided for, not in the constitution, but by federal law. One of the two high courts is for West Malaysia and one is for East Malaysia. Each court is presided over by a regional chief justice. The high courts have unlimited jurisdiction over civil and criminal cases arising under federal and state law. Appeals go to the federal court, presided over by the Lord President, which has original jurisdiction in constitutional cases and advisory jurisdiction in constitutional matters referred to it by the Supreme Head (King). Appeal may be taken from the federal court to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in London. This procedure is derived from membership in the British Commonwealth. The consent of the Supreme Head must be obtained for such an appeal. Among the functions of the Judiciary is that of considering the validity of acts of Parliament and enactments and

\textsuperscript{47}Pye, \textit{Southeast Asia's Political Systems}, pp. 78-79.
ordinances of State Legislatures. The criterion used is that of consistency with the constitution.48

There is, in Malaysia, a federal civil service system largely bequeathed by the British and their tenure in Malaysia. The civil servants are classified into four major divisions. Those in the first division have the highest educational and professional qualifications. These people occupy the top administrative positions within the government. The second division includes executive or supervisory personnel. The last two divisions overlap, but in general one includes such employees as stenographers and junior members of the police force, and the fourth division includes junior postal workers and less skilled office workers. The civil service employees are denied by law the privilege of active political participation. Civil servants may not solicit votes for any political party, nor may they hold party office.49

The governments of the 13 states of Malaysia model themselves after the federal governmental structure. There is a chief ruler or governor for each state. There are legislative assemblies, executive councils, and state judiciary posts. However, because the governmental system of Malaysia is very highly centralized the state governments


49 Ibid., pp. 290-292.
do not play a great role. For this reason the state governments will not be examined in detail.\textsuperscript{50}

The system of political parties in Malaysia is that of a nationalist coalition. The Alliance, the coalition of political parties in Malaysia, is made up of the United Malay National Organization (UMNO), founded in 1946; the Malaysian Chinese Association (MCA), founded in 1949; and the Malaysian Indian Congress, created in 1945.\textsuperscript{51}

In the first national elections held in July of 1955 the Alliance won 51 of 52 seats. In the first election after independence, August 1959, the Alliance won 70 of 100 seats.\textsuperscript{52}

The other political parties within Malaysia are of relatively minor significance. They tend to represent various forms of extremist views. The Pan-Malaysian Islamic Party (PMIP) with 13 seats is the second strongest party within the House of Representatives (Dewan Ra'ayat). It represents a group dedicated to the application of Islamic principles to government. The third strongest party is the Nationalist Socialist Front formed in 1957 by the merger of the former Party Rayat and the Labor Party of Malaya. This party seeks to become the leading noncommunal force in

\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., pp. 292-297.
\textsuperscript{51}Pye, Southeast Asia's Political Systems, pp. 55-56.
\textsuperscript{52}Ibid., p. 56.
Malaysia politics. To this end it has sought to obtain the support of the People's Progressive Party, which has four seats in the House, and of the Malaysian Socialist Youth League. The Nationalist Socialist Front seeks to campaign a more ideologically oriented form of politics. The most openly right wing party in Malaysia is Party Negara (National Party) which was founded in 1954 as a successor to the Independence of Malaya Party. These minor parties represent frustrations either over the lack of ideological content within the Alliance or to the extent which Chinese have been accepted within the government of Malaysia.53

The strength of the Alliance lies in its recognition of the most basic fact in Malaysian society, i.e., the division of the country into three major ethnic groups: Malays, Chinese, and Indians. The platform of the Alliance has largely been devoted to the extension of education, health, housing and welfare services and to the support of the potential interest groups within the society.54

The Alliance has sought to balance off the interests of the trade unions with those of foreign private enterprise.55

In the Malaysian setting, a break-up of the Alliance coalition among communal lines would produce an extremely

\footnote{53Ibid. 54Ibid. 55Ibid., pp. 56-57.}
dangerous situation in which Malays and Chinese would become bitter opponents. Although, under the Alliance, the country has prospered and realized a high rate of economic growth the price for this has been what some have described as an intellectual and ideological void.\(^5\)\(^6\)

When Malaya became the Federation of Malaysia in 1963 one of the most difficult problems was the integration of the party systems of the congruent elements of the new federation. Right at the beginning there was tension between the Alliance and the People's Action Party (PAP) of Singapore. The PAP leaders under the guidance of Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew had given Singapore possibly the most dynamic and imaginative leadership in Asia. After the establishment of the Federation of Malaysia they began to aspire to a greater role in the new government which the Alliance considered its own preserve. As a party which had defeated the communists at the polls and which vigorously espoused the ideals of a multiracial society the PAP expected to gain adherents in the Malaysian states. The attempt of Lee Kuan Yew to expand the influence of the PAP beyond the island of Singapore was seen as a direct threat both to the more conservative Chinese in the MCA and the anti-Chinese radical wing of the UMNO. This challenge to the unit of the Alliance caused Tengku Abdul Rahman to

\(^5\)\(^6\) Ibid., p. 57.
decide in 1965 that Malaysia could no longer include Singapore.\textsuperscript{57}

With the expulsion of Singapore in 1965 and therefore the elimination of a large Chinese population, it seemed as though Malaysia might achieve a degree of stability through the balance of the races in the Alliance.\textsuperscript{58}

In 1969, however, the Alliance was severely challenged in the general elections by a combination of radicalized Malay and Chinese parties. Although these parties were sharply opposed to each other they were able to cut into the Alliance vote to the point that the Alliance gained only a plurality and not an absolute majority of the votes.\textsuperscript{59}

The Pan-Malaysian Islamic Party (PMIP) appealed to the rural more traditional Malays particularly along the east coast. The Gerakan or Malaysian People's Movement, a democratic-socialist party, had strong support among the urban Chinese. The Gerakan Party was the most vocal challenger of the Alliance. After the election, Gerakan supporters celebrating their success in reducing the Alliance majority sparked a serious racial riot in Kuala Lampur. The government responded by creating the National Operations Council (NOC) to introduce controls over public expression which might incite racial discord.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{57}Ibid. \textsuperscript{58}Ibid. \textsuperscript{59}Ibid. \textsuperscript{60}Ibid.
The constitution of Malaysia guarantees a number of basic freedoms some of which are absolute while others are qualified by Parliament in certain circumstances. There is a specific bill of rights which includes personal liberties characterized by Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. The basic liberties include: the right of habeas corpus, protection against unjust detention, the right to be dutifully and expeditiously notified of the reasons for detention, council of one's choice, arraignment before a magistrate within 24 hours of apprehension, no person may be tried twice for the same crime, a person is not liable to punishment for an act made illegal after his actions, citizens of the country are free to move about within its confines at will but are subject to the laws regulating security, public order, public health, and the punishment of offenders. Banishment is prohibited. Slavery and forced labor are forbidden but compulsory national service such as conscription and other service to the country by an act of Parliament may be made binding on all residents.61

It should be noted that in spite of the constitution's detailed provisions granting equality to all and favoring none, the constitution does contain protective features which benefit the Malays. Specifically, Article 153 provides that "it shall be the responsibility of the Yang di-Pertuan Agong (King) to safeguard the special position

of the Malays and the legitimate interests of other communities. Article 153, as might be suspected, has been the cause of a great deal of animosity among other racial groups in the country.62

Ethnic and Cultural Factors

Any consideration of Malaysia and her politics and political leaders must be coupled with an awareness of her ethnic make-up. It appears to this author that racial balance is a key factor in the political situation in Malaysia. There are three major racial groups which comprise the Malaysian population: the Malays, Chinese, and Indians and Pakistanis. One important factor to note in the racial groups is that no one group appears to have a clear majority. The following table illustrates the racial breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malays</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians, Pakistan</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everything that is political or economic in Malaysia is dominated, and must be dominated, by considerations of "racial arithmetic."64

The racial diversity also underlies certain other diverse elements within the Malaysian society, namely

62 Ibid., p. 278. 63 Ibid., p. 73.
64 Milne, Government and Politics in Malaysia, p. 4.
In the case of language the following languages will be found within Malaysia. The elites of all races speak English. The government has instituted that Bahasa Malaysia or the Malay language will be the official language of the state. In addition to English and Malay, however, Chinese with approximately 12 dialects is also spoken, while Tamil is primarily used by Indians.

In addition to the language, there are also religious differences which complicate a national identity. The Malays, for all practical purposes, are Muslim. Some Chinese are Christian; others are Buddhist, Confucianist, or Taoist, or a combination of these. In other races the dividing line is less marked; an appreciable number of Indians and Pakistanis are Muslims, but many of the Indians are Hindus. Since Islam is the national religion in Malaysia, government funds are spent for the construction of mosques and religious centers for the Islamic community. Because matching funds are not given for Chinese, Hindus, or Christian religious activities, this tends to create further division and animosity in a nation striving for national unity.

The language factor mentioned previously also makes a national identity and unity difficult to achieve. For instance, within the educational system it is possible for a student to attend an English, Chinese, Malay, or Tamil

---

65 Ibid., pp. 5-7.
medium school. Allegations are often made that schools of the Malay medium tend to receive a disproportionate amount of funding, while schools of other mediums are financially neglected.

In Malaysia control of the government is primarily in Malay hands; while control of the economic sphere is dominated by the Chinese community. In dealing with the historical factor it is easy to see why the bifurcation of control exists in Malaysia. Malaysia was a British colony for approximately 150 years. The rule exercised by the British was largely that of working through the existing Malay rulers in an attempt to reduce reactions against colonialism. In the economic sphere, the Malays have largely been agrarian. The climate and the land are favorable for the production of crops and the maintenance of life. Consequently, the Malays often feel little compulsion to exert themselves strenuously when their daily needs can be met with a minimum of effort. The Chinese, on the other hand, are generally from southern China. Those who made the journey from China and survived, were exceptionally hardy and determined. Their attitudes were by necessity fiercely competitive. This is in striking
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66 Ibid., pp. 6-7.
68 Milne, Government and Politics in Malaysia, pp. 6-7.
contrast to the Malays who were eminently noncompetitive, because there was no point in it. Given the numbers and the energy of the Chinese, it is natural that under British rule they should dominate industry and trade. The Chinese, therefore, have tended to concentrate in towns; the Malays have tended to live in the rural areas.

In an attempt to improve the economic position of the Malays both before and after independence, schemes were implemented for training Malays in business and making it easier for them to obtain capital. There has been emphasis placed on rural development and land settlement. The 1957 Constitution of Malaya, which came into force when Malaya gained independence, gave protection to Malays in certain types of occupations. These provisions have been continued after the formation of Malaysia in 1963. Concurrently, arrangements have been made to speed up the economic advancement of the indigenous people of East Malaysia who were in even more need of such help than the Malays in West Malaysia. Essentially these are long-term plans.

The economy of Malaysia is atypical for the Southeast Asian region. Its national income per capita is among the highest in Southeast Asia. And it is second only to that of Japan's. Although there are differences in income levels in various parts of Malaysia, the figures for annual per capita income in 1961 were roughly:
Malaysia $270  
Sabah $230  
Sarawalk $180  

It should be noted here that the corresponding figure for Singapore in 1961 was $430.69

Summary of Singapore

The nation of Singapore consists of the island of Singapore, and some 54 out-islands. It is located approximately 85 miles north of the Equator. The area of Singapore is 225.6 square miles. The island itself is about 26 miles in length by 14 miles in breadth. It is linked by a three-quarter mile causeway to West Malaysia.

Its immediate neighbors are Malaysia on the north, the Philippines on the northeast, and Indonesia on the south. The City of Singapore is located at the southern part of the island, and encompasses approximately 37 square miles.

The mid-1970 population figures estimate the population to be 2,049,500. These can be ethnically divided as follows:

74.4% Chinese  
14.5% Malay  
7.9% Indian and Pakistani  
3.2% Composed of other races.

The population density is estimated at 9,085 persons per square mile.

69 Ibid.
Approximately 75 percent of the population are native-born Singaporeans, and more than 50 percent of the population is under 20 years of age.\textsuperscript{70} Singapore was under British rule for 140 years. Singapore became a member of the British Commonwealth on May 27, 1958.\textsuperscript{71} Their colonial status ended in 1959. The first elections under the new Constitution were held May 30, 1959, with the People’s Action Party winning 43 out of 51 seats in Parliament. The Cabinet system of government provided for in the Constitution formed the first fully elected government with full powers of self-government. In 1961 the concept of the Federation of Malaysia was proposed and was accepted by the people of Singapore in a referendum held in September of 1962. The referendum passed by a 73 percent margin. The Federation of Malaysia, with Singapore as one of the constituent states came into being on September 16, 1963.\textsuperscript{72}

The union between Singapore and the other Malaysia states was brief. Some attribute separation to racial causes. On August 9, 1965, by mutual agreement of the Malaysian government and Singapore, Singapore separated

\textsuperscript{70}Ministry of Culture, Singapore Facts and Pictures 1971 (Singapore: Ministry of Culture Publication, 1971), pp. 5-16.

\textsuperscript{71}Pye, Southeast Asia's Political System, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{72}Ministry of Culture, Singapore Facts and Pictures 1971, pp. 10-12.
from Malaysia and became a fully independent and sovereign nation. On December 22, 1965, it became a Republic with a President as its chief of state.\textsuperscript{73}

The governmental structure in Singapore was affected very little either by the creation of the Federation of Malaysia or by the separation of Singapore in 1965. When Singapore separated from the Federation of Malaysia in 1965 it had only to add a Foreign Office to become a complete modern government.\textsuperscript{74}

Since separation, the People's Action Party has been the dominant political force in Singapore. Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew has remained since independence as the major political leader of the nation.

Lee has developed not only an effective party organization in the People's Action Party but also a group of dedicated government officials who have been energetic in carrying out economic development and social welfare programs. Lee has pushed programs rather than ideology, and he has been concerned with the success of policies rather than with his own popularity. Yet increasingly Lee's government has become less tolerant of opposition elements, and Singapore has been transformed into an essentially technocratic, one party state.\textsuperscript{75}

By the early 1960s the first generation of Southeast Asian political leaders began to lose their popularity. At

\textsuperscript{73}Ibid., p. 16.

\textsuperscript{74}Pye, Southeast Asia's Political Systems, p. 79.

\textsuperscript{75}Ibid., p. 64.
the end of the decade only Lee Kuan Yew remained as a founding father still in power.\textsuperscript{76}

In Singapore . . . the People's Action Party of Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew was originally based upon the trade-union movement, and during the first year of independence the unions grew in power; but after the separation of Singapore from Malaysia, the government felt that the island country could not afford to have either labor strife or a rise in labor costs, and thus the power of the unions was steadily cut.\textsuperscript{77}

In the 1972 general election the PAP won all the seats in the Parliament but the victory was not entirely gratifying to Lee Kuan Yew because the voting showed that he was opposed by the minority communities of Malays and Indians.\textsuperscript{78}

Although the contest for political power may appear to be made up of diverse elements within Singapore's society, the bottom line of our analysis indicates a representational system with total one-party control. Since 1968 through 1972, the PAP party has held all legislative seats within the Parliament. While the PAP monopoly in the Parliament may indicate voter satisfaction with PAP performance, it would appear to this writer that voter satisfaction is not indicated by 57 seats being contested by opposition candidates in the 1972 Parliamentary elections. At the very minimum, the writer would speculate

\textsuperscript{76}Ibid., p. 65. \textsuperscript{77}Ibid., p. 70.

\textsuperscript{78}Henderson et al., \textit{Area Handbook for Malaysia}, p. 275.
that certain elements in the society are not gaining the representation they desire.

The Constitution of Singapore, effective August 9, 1965 when Singapore withdrew from the Federation of Malaysia, provides for the creation and legitimization of the institution. The basic components of Singapore's political institution as set forth by the Constitution include that the form of national government is a Republic; and provides for a Legislative Department consisting of the President and the Parliament (unicameral); finances, and the Executive Department with authority vested in the President who is elected by the Parliament. Also included in the Executive Department is the Cabinet composed of the Prime Minister and other ministers collectively responsible to Parliament. The Members of Parliament are elected by the citizens of Singapore. Singapore has universal suffrage with every citizen 21 years of age and over eligible to exercise the franchise, regardless of sex, race, creed, language, education, or income. Proof of the right to vote lies in the inclusion of the voter's name on

---
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One weakness of the universal suffrage concept is that since 1959, voting has been compulsory. Another weakness in the voting procedure is that although voting is by secret ballot, the individual's vote may be traced as the ballots are numbered.

Another institutional weakness of Singapore's Constitution is that no provisions are included in the Constitution relating to the Judicial power. Perhaps the major weakness of Singapore's Constitution is that the source of sovereign power is not stated, nor is there any section of the Constitution relating to the rights of the people.

The Legislature of Singapore is composed of two parts: the President and Parliament. Legislation is enacted after being passed by Parliament and receiving Presidential approval. The Parliamentary constituencies have recently been increased to 65. Every citizen 21 years of age or above is, subject to certain qualifications, eligible to run for election to Parliament. The Parliament continues in office for five years unless it is dissolved sooner by the President.

---
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The President of the Republic is elected by the Parliament for a term of four years. The President then appoints from the members of Parliament, a Prime Minister. On the advice of the Prime Minister, the President then appoints other ministers from among the Parliament to form the Cabinet. The Cabinet is responsible to Parliament and is composed of the Prime Minister and the appointed Cabinet ministers. It should be noted here that Cabinet reshuffles have periodically taken place since 1965 in Singapore. However, these reorganizations have indicated reassignments within the Cabinet rather than realignments produced by the removal of Cabinet members and the infusion of new members in the Cabinet.83

The Judicial system of Singapore is modeled after the British legal system with a Supreme Court consisting of the High Court, Court of Appeal, and Court of Criminal Appeal. The lower courts consist of Magistrates' courts, and Civil District courts.

Singapore has taken some steps to incorporate its ethnic minorities within its political system. The Constitution specifically states that the President of Singapore must be a Malay.89 The Malays are also granted special

position in Article 89 of the Constitution. It should be noted, however, that although the President of Singapore is designated as the head of government, it appears that the Prime Minister emerges as the chief head of state.

A final element appears to be a lack of the freedom of communication in public media. The government controls all forms of communication in Singapore, and has at times taken the initiative to silence opposition by putting them out of business, e.g., the closure of newspaper publishers.

"Possibly the country that has been the most successful in attracting foreign capital during the late 1960s and early 1970s is Singapore, which now has a booming economy and little unemployment." The discovery of oil off the coast of Singapore should further stimulate its economy.

"In seeking to create new jobs the government has made Singapore the center of advanced technology for the region." However, this "efficiency has been bought at the price of making the government appear to be increasingly authoritarian."

This brief sketch of the political situation in Singapore necessarily omits many factors, most critically the

90Ibid., p. 1128.
92Pye, Southeast Asia's Political Systems, p. 91.
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dynamics of the political situation in Singapore. However, it is hoped that this summary, brief as it is, will give the reader some basis for the analysis to follow.
CHAPTER III
FRAMEWORK FOR THE PERSONALITY TYPE

Prior to analysis of Lee Kuan Yew and Tengku Abdul Rahman's personality types, it will perhaps be beneficial for the reader to review briefly some of the characteristics of each of Barber's four personality types.

The essence of Barber's approach is that the leader's personality shapes his performance.¹ Barber speculates that leadership decision making is based upon rational and emotional considerations which are related in the personality of the leader.² The writer wishes to speculate and indicate some support for the idea that personality not only shapes performance, but also indicates the type of performance. This may lead to an assumption that certain personality types tend to become political leaders, while other types tend not to do so.

The writer is not attempting to say that all political leaders fall into one specific personality type, in that not all political leaders appear to have great control

²Ibid.
over, much less recognition of, the political decisions in which they are involved.

Prior to a discussion of Barber's four personality types, we should consider the yardstick utilized in measuring these personality types. Barber considers the pattern of character, the world view, style, power situation, and "climate of expectations," in determination of leadership character. Insofar as possible, the first three of these five elements will be utilized in our analysis of Prime Ministers Rahman and Lee's personalities. Let us note Barber's definitions for each of these characteristics.

Barber indicates the most visible part of the pattern as style. "Style is the President's [leader's] habitual way of performing his three political roles: 'rhetorical, personal relations, and home work.'" A President's [leader's] world view consists of his primary politically relevant beliefs, particularly his conceptions of social causality, human nature, and the central moral conflicts of the time." Character, as defined by Barber, is "... the way the President [leader] orients himself toward life--not for the moment, but enduringly." For Barber's analysis, these three characteristics compose the major elements to be considered in analyzing leadership characteristics. The character, world view, and style of a leader are considered
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in combination, i.e., they form an integral pattern of leadership qualities and except for analysis cannot be said to exist in isolation.\textsuperscript{7}

The last two elements (the power situation and climate of expectations) included in Barber's analysis are of less importance for this study. They represent the most difficult areas for analysis. Perhaps lack of information in regard to these two factors is one of the limitations upon this type of analysis as applied to another nation. In short, the power situation and climate of expectations represent the sociopolitical milieu in which the President [leader] functions.\textsuperscript{8}

With the preceding elements as our guideline for analysis, we shall now consider the four types of Presidential [leadership] characteristics as outlined by Barber.

The first element for consideration is a definition of leadership activity-passivity.\textsuperscript{9} In short, the question addressed is "how much energy does the leader invest in his leadership role." The second area for consideration is what Barber calls positive-negative affect towards one's activity.\textsuperscript{10} This addresses how the leader feels about what he does--his role.

As can be seen, we have two basic guidelines upon which the personality is analyzed. By combining the

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid.  \textsuperscript{8}Ibid., p. 9.  \textsuperscript{9}Ibid., p. 11.  \textsuperscript{10}Ibid.
extremes of these two continua. Barber designates four categories of leadership character: active-negative, active-positive, passive-negative, passive-positive. 11

The active-negative personality type indicates a basic contradiction. 12 The actor invests relatively intense effort and receives a relatively low emotional reward for that effort. The activity is characterized by a compulsive quality. The seeking of power becomes a major objective. The leadership character of this type is aggressive and has difficulty managing these aggressive feelings. The leader's self-image is vague and discontinuous. Life is seen as a difficult struggle to achieve and hold power. However, the actor's commitment to perfectionism disallows success for the political actor. In short, the active-negative type spends great amounts of energy in the political arena but is never a "winner."

The active-positive leader displays a consistency between the degree of political activity and the enjoyment of that activity. 13 This type of behavior indicates relative high self-esteem and relative success in relating to the political environment. The emphasis is on flexibility to attain relatively well defined personal goals. There is an emphasis upon the rational mastery of problems which may cause some difficulty since this approach does not take

into account man's irrational nature, especially as those around him show irrationality. The goal for the active-positive is problem-solving.

The passive-positive leader is a compliant, other-directed character, whose major goal in life is a search for affection as a reward for being agreeable and cooperative, rather than being personally assertive. As with the active-negative, there is a basic contradiction in this basic personality type. The contradiction is between low self-esteem (as a result of being unattractive), and a superficial optimism displayed by the actor. The hopeful attitude displayed by this type helps to gain reassurances and encouragement from others. The basic weakness lies in the actors' dependence upon a display of affection, and the fragile optimism which they display. Such a combination indicates a great likelihood of disappointment for them in politics.

The passive-negative type is motivated by a sense of duty. There is no basic contradiction in these two elements. However, it would seem that this type of leader would rarely engage in political activity unless forced to, through a sense of duty. This type of actor does little in politics, and enjoys it even less. The orientation toward duty compensates for low self-esteem based upon a feeling of uselessness. These types, particularly, lack the

---

14 Ibid., p. 13. 15 Ibid.
experience and flexibility of style to perform effectively as political leaders. The major tendency is to withdraw. One major method of withdrawal for this type of political actor is to emphasize vague principles and procedures. In short, the emphasis is upon what they know (which is little), and is restricted to areas with little chance of controversy. They become the guardians of "right and proper way,"16 i.e., the politicking of lesser men is beneath them.

The active-positive wants to achieve results; the active negative wants to get and keep power; the passive-positive wants love; and the passive-negative emphasizes civic virtue.17

With Barber's model as our guide, the writer shall now attempt to discover which personality type among the four indicated would best describe Tengku Abdul Rahman and Lee Kuan Yew.

Rahman's Personality Type

Tengku (Prince) Abdul Rahman Putra al-Haj18 was born on February 8, 1903, in Alor Star, the Capital of the Northwestern Malay state of Kedah. At that time Kedah was a

16Ibid.  
17Ibid.  
dependency of Siam. His father, the Sultan Abdul Hamid Halim Shah, had 8 wives who bore him 45 children. Rahman was the seventh child of the Sultan's sixth wife. After a reign of 61 years, his father died at the age of 79. The fact that Rahman was the seventh child made his prospects for succession to the throne fairly remote, even though the sixth wife was the Sultan's favorite.

The Sultan behaved irresponsibly many times during his life. At the time Rahman was born, the Sultan was engaged in a spending spree which bankrupted the state. The culmination of this extravagance was the wedding party for his eldest son which lasted for three months. During this period state offices were closed and all public work practically ceased.

In addition to draining the State Treasury, the Sultan borrowed heavily from the Penang money-lenders. A rough estimate of the cost of this gala was between three and four million Malayan dollars. With the Kedah State Treasury's depleted coffers, the Sultan appealed to the Siamese government for financial assistance. Siam agreed to lend him money only on the condition that he accept a financial advisor. This advisor, an Englishman, preceded the British government's extension of "protection" to Kedah in 1909.

The Tengku saw little of his father except on Fridays when the Sultan's usual schedule took him first to the
mosque for prayers and then to the palace of Makche Menjelara, the Tengku's mother. From all accounts, Makche Manjelara, or Mak Chek as she was usually called, must have been an extraordinary member of the harem. She was not a Malay, but a Siamese-Burmese, the daughter of a Thai provincial governor of Burmese descent. As the Thai governor had many daughters, he sent Mak Chek to Kedah to live as a foster child in the home of the former Sultan. As an adult she was both beautiful and intelligent. Her beauty attracted the Sultan. Her business acumen brought her wealth and prosperity not only in Alor Star but in Bangkok as well. She wisely kept her finances separate from those of her husband.

As a mother Mak Chek seems to have combined discipline with affection. She maintained an agreeable tolerance toward the leisure time activities of her children. Raham lived in her "palace" but wandered about Alor Star like any other kampong (village) child.

The Tengku's education was haphazard from the very beginning. What his teachers remember best about him was his capacity for inattention and enjoyment. Rahman's formal education began at the age of four in a neighborhood kindergarten. Later he progressed to the government sponsored English school in Alor Star. At age ten he was sent to study in a Siamese school in Bangkok. In Bangkok Rahman lived with his brother Tengku Yusoff who was a

The Penang Free School was the oldest and was considered the best secondary school in Malaya. At that time its student body was composed of the sons of wealthy Chinese and Indian families and the sons of British families. As a Malay, Rahman was in the minority. The school was staffed largely by British schoolmasters. Although Rahman was able to pass the examinations he did so without much margin.

In 1920 Tengku Abdul Rahman went to England to continue his studies as the recipient of the newly established Kedah State Scholarship. It was Rahman's intention to enter Cambridge but the Kedah State government arranged for some preliminary tutoring. Rahman found country life and sports more appealing than study. Consequently, he made little academic progress. At Cambridge he also enrolled with a private tutor who managed within six months to enable Rahman to qualify for entrance.

Once enrolled in St. Catherines, one of the smallest of Cambridge's colleges, Rahman encountered racial prejudice. When he applied for residential quarters in the college he was informed that none were available. He was eager to play football for the university and although he
was an outstanding player he was never called for the freshmen trials. He played football for St. Catherines, if not for the university, and found plenty of time to travel about attending country matches.

Rahman's $4,000 per year allowance enabled him to live in style. He purchased a sports car and spent the bulk of his time engaged in diversions such as football, horse racing, dog racing, and dancing. This schedule left him little time for study and almost none for lectures. Rahman's leisurely academic progress was the result not only of failing his examinations but on at least one occasion of failing to appear on the right day to take his examinations.

In December 1925 he managed to become the first Kedah Prince to receive a B.A. degree from an English university. The academic basis of this distinction does not invite close scrutiny.

Rahman then began what was to be a marathon pursuit of a law degree. In 1949, after repeated failures and prolonged interruptions, he finally received his degree. It should be noted that Rahman's colleagues are largely responsible for his graduation, since they tutored him for the exam.

Rahman's childhood and educational experiences molded his orientation toward life and provided the basis for his value system. His relatively unstructured preschool
environment, the lack of attention and efforts toward learning during his public school education, the need for tutoring throughout his college years, the rejection of his peers—all impacted on his feelings of worth and capabilities.

One of Rahman's distinctive characteristics was that he did not take himself very seriously. Consequently, no one else did either. As an undergraduate he plunged headlong and thoughtlessly into his first political experience. He chauffeured a young British friend into a working class district to campaign for Lloyd George. This debacle ended with both men fleeing the scene.

He manifested his political ineptness when he decided in 1946 that it was time for Malay students in London to organize for political action. He revived the Malay Society of Great Britain. In doing so, he encountered mass insubordination from his associates. Some alleged, with justification, that he wanted them to do all the hard work.

The reader may conclude that Rahman was a "playboy prince." However, there is evidence that Rahman was attempting to become a useful citizen. He entered and worked hard as a Kedah civil servant. Initially, he was assigned to minor posts and then achieved the rank of District Officer. As such he was responsible for the administration of the police, sanitation, agriculture, education, and tax collection. His salary was about $300 (Malayan) per month.
which contrasted with the $1,000 (Malayan) per month while he was in England. He achieved a reputation as a champion of the rights of the poor and gained popularity with the people of his district. Unfortunately, his popularity did not extend to the senior Malay and British officials in Alor Star, especially when he took positions contrary to those of the government. His opposition to government directives resulted in his transfer to Kulim prior to the onset of World War II.

The Tengku remained in the Kedah state government service throughout the Japanese occupation. During this time, Kedah was under the administrative control of Thailand. It is reported that Rahman, on more than one occasion, boldly confronted the Japanese authorities on behalf of his people. At the time of the Japanese collapse the Tengku was largely responsible for the reoccupation of the state by British troops. It was at this time that accusations were made against Rahman for alleged collaboration with the Japanese. Ultimately, these charges against Rahman were dropped.

The Tengku, despite the geniality which characterizes him, tangled with left-wing extremist groups (especially the Communists) and with right-wing feudalists (especially his brother the new Sultan). In 1947 Rahman went to England to attempt once again to pass his bar examination. His motivation was largely a desire to remove himself from
the state of Kedah. Rahman was unsuccessful at this time in his attempt to pass the British Bar. In 1949 he met with success.

Having achieved his law degree, Rahman joined the Legal Department of the state of Kedah. The relationship between Rahman and his brother, Sultan Badlishah, deteriorated rapidly. It became obvious that Rahman had no future in Kedah. The Tengku welcomed the opportunity to accept the post as Deputy Public Prosecutor in Kuala Lumpur.

When Rahman returned to Kedah after receiving his baccalaureate degree, working in a governmental capacity seemed to be a logical decision for the Prince who was aware of his sense of duty. His geniality, warmth, and social skills gained the support and popularity of the citizens. He earned the reputation of being a champion of the poor. Rahman's civic virtue was also manifested at a later date when he confronted the Japanese authorities on behalf of his people, during World War II.

While he was popular with the residents of the district as the District Officer, the senior government officials did not share these feelings. A confrontation was avoided when Rahman withdrew from the district. After receiving his law degree in 1949, Rahman and his brother, the Sultan of Kedah, disagreed. Rahman again withdrew from the situation by joining the Public Prosecutor's staff in Kuala Lumpur.
Rahman's friends began encouraging him to devote more of his time to politics. In 1951 the United Malay National Organization (UMNO), under the leadership of Dato Onn bin Ja'afar, was experiencing a major crisis. The UMNO had become fractionalized when Dato Onn proposed that it accept non-Malays for membership. At this point, the UMNO found itself without a clearly defined program or an acknowledged leader. Rahman's friends suspected that he would have popular appeal and thereby unify the UMNO party. As a result they maneuvered him into the party presidency in August 1951.

The most influential of these friends, Tun Abdul Razak, could have had the UMNO Presidency for himself. Razak considered himself too young for the party presidency in 1951 and urged Rahman to accept the position. It appears, to this writer, that Razak and Rahman made a congenial and complementary team. Abdul Razak, in contrast to Rahman, was a rigorously self-disciplined intellectual and a man of outstanding drive and ability who lacked but valued the Tengku's warmth. Razak was elected vice president of the UMNO when Rahman became president of the party. It should be noted that Razak later became the Deputy Prime Minister of Malaya under Rahman's Prime Ministership.

With the driving force of Tun Razak behind him, Rahman worked hard to convert the UMNO and the Alliance into the paramount political party in Malaya. Rahman also
worked to achieve independence for Malaya and later to achieve the independent Federation of Malaysia.

The early phase of the Tengku's leadership of the UMNO (1951-1955) corresponded with the height of the Communist emergency and the Malayan campaign to achieve independence. Rahman's first task was to build up the strength of the UMNO. After 1952 Rahman joined together the UMNO, the MCA (Malayan Chinese Association), and the MIC (Malayan Indian Congress) to form the Alliance Party. In theory, the Alliance was to operate on the basis of reconciling its differences in party councils and thereby presenting a unified front in public. In practice, the Alliance operated on the basis of ad hoc arrangements and threatened to fall apart.

Rahman did not devise the strategy of the Alliance. The multiracial cooperative approach to politics was first implemented in the Kuala Lumpur municipal elections of 1952. Rahman saw the advantages of this arrangement and decided to extend its scope to the Alliance.

In 1954 the Tengku and the Alliance forced a showdown with the British on the issue of independence. This encounter was nonviolent and of short duration. A mutually acceptable compromise between Malaya and the British was reached. Elections were scheduled for 1955. The Alliance startled both the British and Rahman by winning 51 of the 52 elective seats. As leader of the victorious Alliance
the Tengku became Chief Minister heading a council of ministers which ran the administration. The new government proved to be stable. After two more missions to London the Tengku gained absolute assurance that independence would be conferred on August 31, 1957.

Upon independence, Tengku Abdul Rahman became the Prime Minister with Tun Razak as the Deputy Minister. Rahman referred to himself as "the happiest Prime Minister" in Asia.

Prior to the 1959 elections, Rahman temporarily resigned as Prime Minister and spent the next six months campaigning for that office. In the interim Tun Razak acted as the Prime Minister. Throughout the campaign Rahman remained relaxed, cheerful, confident, and rather vague about what the Alliance now offered.

The Alliance easily won the 1959 elections. However, the margin of victory was not as large as that of 1955. Specifically, 51.4% of the vote was pro Alliance in 1959 as compared with 55.5% in 1955; and 74 of the 104 seats in 1959 compared with 51 of 52 seats in 1955. Rahman's opponent polled approximately one-third of the 18,600 votes cast. This significant opposition surprised Rahman, and immediate efforts were initiated to strengthen his public support. Among the projects were highly visible public works and social improvements. Upon implementation of the domestic schemes, the Tengku announced that he would
concentrate more upon foreign affairs even though his pri-
ority was with domestic affairs. His efforts as an inter-
national figure were less than successful. Some of the
Indonesian leaders disagreed with Rahman's priorities.
This came as a great blow to Rahman who expected complete
support from "brother Malays."

On May 27, 1961 the Tengku emerged more by accident
than design, as a key figure in a domestic and interna-
tional drama. At that time, he proposed the concept of the
Federation of Malaysia. Lee Kuan Yew had been pressing the
Tengku for several years to accept Singapore into the Fed-
eration. Rahman had resisted because of Singapore's left-
wing politics and its preponderantly Chinese population.

Rahman became directly involved as a political leader
in 1951, as an accommodation to his friends. Razak was a
particularly influential friend who joined with Rahman as
the political leaders of their party. This merger combined
the strengths of each man's personality to achieve polit-
ical success.

Razak's forte was planning, organizing, coordinating,
and evaluating political strategy. Rahman's was in his
ability to gain the support of the constituents. There is
little doubt that both men worked hard at their tasks, but
probably for different reasons.

The remark made by Rahman when independence from the
British was consummated is particularly significant. He
referred to himself as "the happiest Prime Minister" in Asia. His happiness was for the people who had sought independence from British domination, rather than for himself as being the only person who could have accomplished it. He was truly a champion of the people.

Characteristically, however, as the government continued to operate in an acceptable manner, Rahman's interests and efforts in politics seemed to wane.

To summarize, Rahman now lives with his third wife and their two adopted children, one of whom is Chinese. Also included in his household are various relatives and retainers. He enjoys recreational activities—golf, swimming, boating, sports cars, watching football, and horse races. He is devoutly religious and interested in Malayan history and culture. Rahman would probably not have been selected by many political pollsters as a man likely to become Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaysia. His own Malay associates were rather dubious about selecting him to head a forlorn political party, the UMNO. He is neither brilliant nor industrious. Facts and figures elude him, and he lacks ability to project a strong public image.

Conclusions

This chapter deals with the characteristics of the four personality types of Barber's model, viz, active-passive and positive-negative. The active-positive political leader will be recognized by the intensity of his
political activity and the enjoyment derived therefrom, high self-esteem, flexibility to attain personal goals, the probabilities of a rational acceptance of a political solution. The objective is to solve the problem.

The active-negative person presents as being a power-seeking, aggressive, compulsive, a perfectionist, expending a lot of energy which is often futile because it is less than perfect.

The passive-positive leader tends to be compliant, appears to have low self-esteem, superficial optimism, agreeable, cooperative, needs reassurance and encouragement from others.

The passive-negative type exhibits such characteristics as having civic virtue, guardian of the "right and proper way," a tendency to withdraw from confrontations, emphasizes vague principles, noncontroversial, low self-esteem, motivated by a sense of duty, and enters politics as he is forced to.

Using Barber's model as a tool for classification the writer will attempt to determine Tengku Abdul Rahman's personality type. The active-passive continuum provides a clearer determination of Rahman's personality than does the positive-negative continuum.

The available data show the Tengku to be passive as compared with active. For example, his indifference to his education, his recruitment into the UMNO by others, his
vagueness in political program objectives, and his interest and activity in nonpolitical diversions (e.g., horse racing).

The positive-negative continuum appears to be less clear-cut. Although Rahman appears to have enjoyed his position as Prime Minister the writer doubts that he derived personal satisfaction from this source. In short, he enjoyed the title of Prime Minister more than the role. For example, Rahman tended to withdraw by emphasizing vague programs, he engaged in areas of little controversy, and believed his was a "good government," i.e., right and proper. It is difficult to determine the intensity of his sense of duty. Rahman appeared to lack a driving fervor in controversial political issues.

It is this writer's contention that Rahman would be characterized as a passive-negative political personality.

Lee's Personality Type

In this section, the writer will attempt to indicate where Lee Kuan Yew would fit into Barber's personality types.

The writer will attempt to gather information based upon the three major criteria indicated by Barber in determination of political character, i.e., character, world view, and style. The power situation and the climate of expectations will be difficult to discern as a result of incomplete information.
"Character is the way the President [leader] orients himself toward life—not for the moment, but enduringly." As one would suspect, the development of character occurs largely during childhood. The attempt will be made to focus upon these experiences which in large part may have molded Lee's character.

"World view consists of his [the leader's] primary politically relevant beliefs, particularly his conceptions of social causality, human nature and the central moral conflicts of the time." In short, world view represents one's perception of the world.

Style is the most visible part of the pattern. Style includes the leader's "habitual way of performing his three political roles: rhetoric, personal relations, and home work." In short, style is the way the political leader acts.

The book, Lee Kuan Yew's Singapore, by George, provides the basis for the personal background of Lee Kuan Yew. A second source, Lee Kuan Yew, by Josey provides a

---
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limited amount of material; however, this text is very subjective.²

Lee Kuan Yew was born in 1923 and is a member of the Hakkas, a Chinese clan originating in northern China. Among the Chinese each clan's members are reputed to have certain characteristics. It is highly probable that members of a clan are socialized to internalize characteristics and values typical of its clan. The characteristics associated with the Hakka clan include some of the following: a sense of adventurousness and wandering (in fact, Hakka means sojourner), a strong individualist, pugnacious, courageous fighter, and hard workers. Although the Hakkas are originally from northern China, during the Mongolian invasion, many relocated in Kwang Tung province in southern China. Lee's ancestors were among this group.

When Lee was born the family had been in Singapore for about a century. Lee Hoon Leong, the grandfather, was English educated and became a chin chu (subagent) with a shipping line. Hoon Leong was successful as a subagent and later became the managing director. His occupation brought him in contact with the British, whose customs he learned and emulated.

Lee Chin Koon was Lee's father. In search of greater success, Chin Koon left the family shipping business and

²⁴Alex Josey, Lee Kuan Yew (Singapore: Donald Moore, 1968; Reprint ed., Singapore: Donald Moore, 1971), pp. 3-44.
joined a petroleum company. This move afforded him a high
degree of status and security. While relatively young he
married Chua Jim Neo. Jim Neo is characterized as a flam­
boyant and independent person. It should be noted that she
is culturally Malay. This factor may account for Lee Kuan
Yew's apparent multiracial tolerance. The writer cannot
help wondering whether Jim Neo attempted to vicariously
participate in Lee Kuan Yew's future success by pushing him
during his childhood. The second class status of women in
a Chinese dominated society appears to make this at least a
possibility. Lee's mother believed that he was Singapore's
saviour, and as a first born male child in the family, Jim
Neo directed her energies to assure that Lee would have this
opportunity.

Lee Hoon Leong (the grandfather) was instrumental in
directing the educational plans for Kuan Yew. These in­
structions were given to the parents who carried them out.
Lee's mother became obsessed with the idea that he was
going to make good. She wanted him to be a "provincial
gentleman in the best English tradition," and spoke only
English around him. In a very practical way one could
improve his socioeconomic position best be emulating the
standards and styles of the English.

Education began when he was eight years old at an
English medium school. At age 12, he went to Raffles Insti­
tution, the most prestigious school in Singapore. It was
here that he developed into a hard worker and to insist upon having his own way with his peers. He was at the top of his class academically. In sports he was an aggressive competitor, and was also involved in speeches and literary activities. At 16 he finished his Senior Cambridge exam, and was then ready to go to college. His mother had planned on sending him to England to school, but due to the war, he entered Raffles College (later, University of Singapore). His curriculum included economics, mathematics, and English literature. His ability to debate was refined in college.

Lee's rhetorical ability later became one of his most important political assets. Lee then attracted public acclaim because he emerged from college at the top of his class and won a scholarship. It was while he was at Raffles Institution that he met his future wife. Both of them won a scholarship to Cambridge; however, Lee was not able to go to England at that time because of the war. During the Japanese occupation, he learned that language and obtained a job as translator in the official Japanese News Agency. His experience at this time resulted in his feelings of contempt for the journalistic fraternity. This feeling is apparent in Lee's dealings currently with the publishers of newspapers, when he revokes their press licenses which forces closure of their publications.

In 1946 Lee went to England. The comments of Lee's shipmates are enlightening.
Fresh water was strictly rationed. We were six to a cabin and the steward would bring in three buckets of water early every morning—half a bucket for each person. But Harry [Lee Kuan Yew] would rise as early as five or six o'clock and use up all three buckets in his cabin for himself, and then go over to the other cabin for more. This, of course, made him quite unpopular, but he did not seem to care. We all thought he was a spoiled boy and quite selfish.25

Lee spent one semester at the London School of Economics to study under Harold Laski. The atmosphere of the London school was not to Lee's liking. After one term, he managed to get admission to Cambridge.

Lee's future wife was at Girton College as a Queen's scholar when Lee was at Cambridge. While he was at Cambridge, Kwa Geok Choo, his future wife, decided to marry Lee when they returned to Singapore.

The tutorial system of education at Cambridge had a great influence on Lee. He read widely and, more importantly, he established contacts with socialist thinkers. He came in first with honors in the examinations. It was during Lee's college career that he planned to enter politics. Also at this time he perceived that the only political party in Singapore that was capable of running the country and forcing the British to leave, was the Communist party. Lee, however, did not have Communist leanings. In 1950 Lee finished his studies in Cambridge and married Kwa

at the age of 27. It is interesting to note that he had an English style wedding in Singapore.

As far as family relations, he was quite distant with his parents and brothers. Toward his own family he appears to be a devoted husband and father of his two children. His style is one of hard work. He relaxes only when he is at home with his family. He is highly disciplined, a health fanatic, does not drink or smoke, and seems to devote practically all of his energies to political achievement. For example, "He never listens to music, sees no movies, reads no novels, has no hobbies, golf is his only indulgence." He is extremely unpopular with leaders of neighboring nations. A personal and intellectual alienation completes the picture. "Lee is so conscious of his intellectual superiority that others find him arrogant."  

Lee set up a law firm in Singapore with his wife and he used this as a stepping stone to become Prime Minister. Between 1950 and 1959 Lee Kuan Yew worked in support of popular causes and became a nationalist hero with strong labor and student backing. In 1954 Lee formed the People's Action Party (PAP) which was heavily supported by labor. Many of his supporters in the PAP were pro-Communists, since labor unions had been primarily under the Communist influence in Singapore, as had the Chinese
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26 Ibid., p. 27. 27 Ibid., p. 29. 28 Ibid., p. 35.
community in general. At this time Lee could not afford to be anti-Communist and maintain PAP support. Lee utilized the Communist leaders of the PAP to achieve his own political goals. Lee maneuvered for popular support among diversified elements of the society, utilizing any and all groups or means which would enable him to achieve his ends. His goal was to build the PAP into the dominant party in Singapore and then to purge pro-Communist elements, i.e., the Communist leaders, from PAP ranks. In short, Lee sought to ride the Communist tiger. Lee thus solidified his position as leader of the PAP. This will be considered his first political victory.

Conclusions

Using Barber's model as a guide to understand Lee's character, the values which he developed as a child and young adult provide his basic orientation toward life. The preceding information indicates Lee has a strong loyalty to his family and culture, is a courageous fighter, hard worker, highly disciplined, articulate, socially skilled, intellectual, achievement oriented, politically energetic, and pugnacious. These values and skills provide the bases for attaining his subsequent objective as the political leader of Singapore.

Lee's political, or world view orientation is indicated by his behavior and selection of activities
congruent with his political ambitions. His family history in Singapore reveals a background of financial, educational, and social success. Both Lee's grandfather and his parents developed the foundation for his political career. The university education in England and emulation of the British customs enhanced his status as a potentially knowledgeable, worldly political leader. Specifically, his capability to recognize popular causes expressed by the various groups in Singapore, to assess these needs, to merge a coalition of the significant groups into a politically effective entity, and to personify the political objectives of the residents, is manifested by his position as Prime Minister of Singapore. His achievements, politically, emerged from the lifestyle he evolved.

Barber defines style as the individual's observable pattern of behavior. Lee directed his attention and efforts to acquiring and refining the skills necessary to achieve political success. They include competencies which the majority of people value. Lee is viewed as being articulate, studious, self-improving, aggressive, goal-oriented, self-disciplined, knowledgeable, competitive, a devoted family man, and a persistent and diligent worker. These abilities present to his constituents both credibility and capability of their political leader.

In summary, the aforementioned statements about Lee Kuan Yew and his activities can be seen to relate to
Barber's concepts of character, world view, and style. Although Lee Kuan Yew would perhaps not fit the active-negative type perfectly, his aggressiveness and single-mindedness in pursuit of his political goals appear to this writer as active-negative traits. Although there may be little evidence to indicate that Lee Kuan Yew does not enjoy his political role, it would appear that his seeking of power as an end in itself indirectly indicates his personal dissatisfaction with his achievements.
CHAPTER IV

METHODS AND DATA ANALYSIS

The objective of chapter IV is the analysis of the survey data to determine, if in fact, the survey data validate the findings obtained from analysis of the biographical data.

The biographical data indicated that Tengku Abdul Rahman would most appropriately fit the passive-negative category and that Lee Kuan Yew is active-negative. With these classifications in mind, the survey data will be presented.

Survey Instrument

The analytical tool utilized for the survey portion of the study is the Semantic Differential, developed by Charles Osgood of the University of Illinois in 1952.¹ This instrument is a "combination of word association and scaling techniques"² based on the following logical considerations:


²Ibid.

93
1. The process of description or judgment can be conceived as the allocation of a concept to an experimental continuum, definable as a pair of palor terms.

2. Many different experimental continuua, or ways in which meanings can vary, are essentially equivalent and hence may be represented by a single dimension.

3. A limited number of such continuua can be used to define a semantic space within which the meaning of any concept can be specified.

The concepts or "things" which may be measured by the semantic differential vary greatly, e.g., one may assess "attitudes toward newscasters," "attitudes toward certain stereotypes," "voting behavior," or even "images" of a brand, product, or company.

The object of the semantic differential is to assess the respondents' attitudes toward a person, object, or idea by ranking the person, object, or idea against a "seven-
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9 Snider and Osgood, Semantic Differential Technique, pp. 618-619.
point scale bounded by polar adjectives, e.g., Good-Bad, or Kind-Cruel."\(^{10}\)

In this study the semantic differential will be utilized to measure the respondents' perceptions of Tengku Abdul Rahman and Lee Kuan Yew. The specific instrument will be discussed in a later section of the thesis.

"Adjective modifiers qualify each step on the scale: the greater the intensity of the association, the more extreme the displacement towards one or the other polar term."\(^{11}\) "Each concept [person, object, or idea] is rated on several scales so that the semantic profiles of the concept can be plotted."\(^{12}\)

Although I have not located an instance in which the semantic differential has been utilized in connection with Barber's model of presidential [leadership] character, there are several studies which warrant our attention.

The potentiality of the instrument in opinion research was shown in the study by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) in which the semantic differential was used in conjunction with a public opinion poll conducted in the Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, area. A sample of 150 subjects representative of the voting public of this area was tested four times during the summer and fall of 1952. These subjects rated 20 concepts, 10 of persons, e.g., Truman, Taft, and Stalin, and 10 of policies, e.g., use of the atomic bomb, our foreign policy, the New Deal. By matching the different profiles of

\(^{10}\) Kjeldergaard, "Attitudes Towards Newscasters as Measured by the Semantic Differential," p. 35.

\(^{11}\) Ibid. \(^{12}\) Ibid.
the "undecided" voters with profiles of Stevenson or Eisenhower supporters, the experimenters were able to predict how 18 out of 19 "undecided" actually voted at the polls.\textsuperscript{13}

The respondents for this survey represent various nationalities. Therefore, it must be noted that "several investigations have shown the cross-cultural applicability of the semantic differential . . ."\textsuperscript{14} Thus the differential is an ideal instrument for studying attitude in cross-cultural situations.\textsuperscript{15}

Recalling that Barber's model is not based upon the analysis of the "rational" political actor, but rather upon the underlying psychological motivators--let us note similar characteristics of the semantic differential. "The semantic differential . . . measures emotional reactions rather than rational or well-reasoned ones. It encourages intuitive, impulsive, emotional expression of reaction. Essentially, it may be regarded as a projective measure. . . ."\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 436.

Survey Procedure

The sample to be utilized in this study is taken from Tilman's *International Biographical Directory of Southeast Asia Specialists* (1969). A more recent directory has not been published. The respondents were selected on the basis of their first and second countries of specialty. That is, specialists with an area specialty of Malaysia and/or Singapore were selected. No attempt has been made to select a random sample from among the Malaysia/Singapore specialists. Since many respondents may have relocated since the compilation of the directory, or may not respond, this writer believes it is appropriate to send questionnaires to all the possible respondents.

The Malaysia and Singapore specialists represent diverse areas of study. A breakdown of the respondents will follow.

There are 377 potential respondents for this survey. These can be broken down into three categories based upon the first and second area of specialty indicated in Tilman's *Directory*.

The categories are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Specialty</th>
<th>Number of Potential Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia and Singapore</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those respondents with area specialties of Malaysia and Singapore were sent two questionnaires (one for Lee Kuan Yew and one for Tengku Abdul Rahman). Those respondents with an area specialty of Singapore were sent a questionnaire dealing with Lee Kuan Yew. Malaysia specialists received a questionnaire regarding Tengku Abdul Rahman.

The questionnaires were sent by first class mail to those respondents in the United States (65) and by air mail to those respondents outside of the United States (312). The names, addresses, and area of study of all the respondents are listed in appendix A.

The questionnaire for this study is made up of adjective-pairs found in Barber's The Presidential Character. The adjective pairs describe two continuua: Activity-Passivity and Positive-Negative traits. In those cases where Barber provides only one adjective its antonym has been found in Roget's Thesaurus.

The questionnaire is made up of 42 adjective pairs. A seven point semantic differential scale separates each adjective pair.

The first 21 adjective pairs describe the Activity-Passivity continuua. The second half, items 22 through 42, of the questionnaire describes the Positive-Negative continuua.

Appendix B contains a copy of the cover letter, instructions, and questionnaire sent to the respondents.
Survey Results

Of the 377 potential respondents selected for this study 96 returned their completed questionnaires. Two of the 96 participants neglected to complete questionnaires for both political leaders and therefore were excluded from the study.

The tables below illustrate the response results for the survey:

Response Results

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total possible respondents</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned--not forwardable</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned--respondent deceased</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned--not wishing to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total questionnaires returned</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total usable questionnaires</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total possible respondents</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total usable questionnaires</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response by Geographical Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
<th>Total Returned</th>
<th>Percent Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. and Canada</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other--Overseas</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the adjective pairs, a t-test was run to compare the difference between the mean scores of the two political leaders as evaluated by the respondents.
For each test let $X_1$ be the mean score Rahman received from the respondents, and $X_2$ be the mean score Lee received from the respondents. The test statistics for each t-test is:

$$t = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

where:
- $X_1$ = sample score mean for Rahman
- $X_2$ = sample score mean for Lee
- $n_1$ = sample size for Rahman
- $n_2$ = sample size for Lee
- $s_1^2$ = variance of scores for Rahman
- $s_2^2$ = variance of scores for Lee

A level (type I error probability) was set at .05.

The scale of the scores was set from -3 (negative or passive) to +3 (positive or active). A table of the activity-passivity items (items 1-21) with means, standard deviation, test statistics (t-values), level of significance, and results of comparison is presented on page 101 (table 1).

**Observations**

On the "active-passive" continuua, the difference between Rahman and Lee is clear-cut. Twenty out of 21 comparisons showed a significant difference at the .01 level and the remaining item showed a significant difference at
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description (Active-Passive)</th>
<th>Rahman Mean ($X_1$)</th>
<th>Lee Mean ($X_2$)</th>
<th>Rahman Standard Deviation ($S_1$)</th>
<th>Lee Standard Deviation ($S_2$)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Test Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Sharp-Dull</td>
<td>+1.968</td>
<td>+2.885</td>
<td>1.455</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>-12.600</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fast-Slow</td>
<td>+.202</td>
<td>+2.594</td>
<td>1.508</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>-14.060</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Energetic-Lethargic</td>
<td>+.777</td>
<td>+2.625</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>-10.280</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Productive-Unproductive</td>
<td>+1.330</td>
<td>+2.448</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>-7.147</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Rational-Irrational</td>
<td>+2.245</td>
<td>+2.719</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>-2.168</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Compulsive-Indifferent</td>
<td>+.223</td>
<td>+1.500</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>-7.656</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ambitious-Apathetic</td>
<td>+1.191</td>
<td>+2.573</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>-8.800</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Dogmatic-Receptive</td>
<td>-1.138</td>
<td>+.438</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>1.690</td>
<td>-6.735</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Belligerent-Compliant</td>
<td>-.691</td>
<td>+1.500</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>-12.460</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Self-directed-Other directed</td>
<td>+.245</td>
<td>+1.896</td>
<td>1.680</td>
<td>1.460</td>
<td>-7.210</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Problem-solver-Procrastinator</td>
<td>+.691</td>
<td>+2.333</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-8.820</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Goal Oriented-Nongoal Oriented</td>
<td>+1.298</td>
<td>+2.552</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>-7.859</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Dominant-Submissive</td>
<td>+1.160</td>
<td>+2.479</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>-7.725</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Aggressive-Timid</td>
<td>+.755</td>
<td>+2.448</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>-11.690</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Bold-Defensive</td>
<td>+.649</td>
<td>+2.073</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>-6.996</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Fight-Flight</td>
<td>+.819</td>
<td>+2.427</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>-11.740</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Participates-Withdraws</td>
<td>+1.468</td>
<td>+2.104</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>-4.144</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Approach-Avoidance</td>
<td>+.904</td>
<td>+1.792</td>
<td>1.420</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>-4.959</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Inflexible-Flexible</td>
<td>-1.426</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>-5.278</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Agreeable-Disagreeable</td>
<td>-2.138</td>
<td>-.396</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>1.530</td>
<td>-8.927</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the .05 level. The data clearly indicate that Lee is more active than Rahman (table 1).

The difference between the two leaders, it should be noted, is one of degree. Both Lee and Rahman can be classified as active leaders as is probably the case for most long-term political leaders.

The scores for Rahman generally had a higher variability than the scores for Lee. This shows that Lee has a more unique image among the respondents than Rahman.

Although the t-tests clearly indicate Lee to be more active than Rahman on the Active-Passive scale, factor analysis may enable one to more specifically categorize the personality traits of each leader (table 2).

Since Lee was indicated as clearly more "active" than Rahman on the t-tests it is possible that the factor analysis will not shed much additional information, however, let us consider the factor loadings.

As shown in table 2, the highest loadings for factor I yielded this combination of items:

**Factor I**

- Sharp-Dull
- Fast-Slow
- Productive-Unproductive
- Ambitious-Apathetic
- Goal-oriented-Nongoal Oriented
- Aggressive-Timid
- Bold-Defensive
- Fight-Flight
- Participates-Withdraws
- Approach-Avoidance
Table 2
Factor Analysis Items 1-21
(Active-Passive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharp-Dull</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-Slow</td>
<td>-.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic-Lethargic</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive-Unproductive</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational-Irrational</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive-Indifferent</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious-Apathetic</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-seeking-Egalitarian</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatic-Receptive</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belligerent-Compliant</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-directed-Other-directed</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solver-Procrastinator</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Oriented-Nongoal Oriented</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant-Submissive</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive-Timid</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bold-Defensive</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight-Flight</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates-Withdraws</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach-Avoidance</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexible-Flexible</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeable-Agreeable</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This factor is clearly an active-passive dimension.

In terms of Barber, factor I would be indicative of Lee perceived as the problem-solver.

Factor II is made up of the following items:

- Compulsive-Indifferent
- Power-seeking-Egalitarian
- Dogmatic-Receptive
- Belligerent-Compliant
- Inflexible-Flexible
- Disagreeable-Agreeable
This factor appears to be more of an authoritarian personality type. This finding concurs with the biographical data which show Lee as seeking and achieving control over the state and her people.

Factor III consists of:

- Energetic-Lethargic
- Rational-Irrational
- Self-directed-Other-directed
- Problem Solver-Procrastinator
- Dominant-Submissive

The factor III correlation coefficients are close to that of factor I. This factor is more like the first than the second. If only two, rather than three, factors had been extracted, most of these items would probably have loaded on factor I. This factor appears to indicate the type of a rational leader.

It should be noted that the factor analysis did not reveal any new data regarding Lee, since the t-tests already indicated Lee to be much more active than Rahman. However, as we shall notice in the analysis of the positive-negative continuua, the factor analysis is very significant.

Now, the second part of the items, the Positive-Negative continuua comparison will be considered. On the active-passive dimension the response was clear-cut, with Lee clearly more active than Rahman. However, the respondents reacted differently on the dimension describing the positive-negative attributes of the two leaders.
As presented in table 3, the t-tests showed that Rahman was more positive than Lee on 8 out of 21 item comparisons, while Lee was more positive than Rahman on 11 out of the 21 items (with 2 items showing no significant differences).

Is one of the two leaders more positive than the other? A Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test between the ratings of Rahman and Lee indicated a nonsignificant difference between the two leaders on the positive-negative dimension. This test takes the magnitude of the difference of each item mean into consideration (table 4).

Let us briefly consider the findings of the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, using the null hypothesis as our starting point.

\[ H_0: \text{there is no difference on the positive-negative attributes between Rahman (} \bar{X}_1 \text{) and Lee (} \bar{X}_2 \text{).} \]

\[ H_1: \text{there is a difference between Rahman (} \bar{X}_1 \text{) and Lee (} \bar{X}_2 \text{).} \]

\[ \alpha = .05 \]

\[ n = 21 \]

\[ \text{critical value} = 58 \]

That is, if \( H \) is true, the probability of \(|T| \leq 58\) is .046.

Since the test statistic of \(|T| = 102\), \( H_0 \) is therefore retained.
Table 3
Positive-Negative Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (Positive-Negative)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rahman Mean ($X_1$)</th>
<th>Rahman Standard Deviation ($S_1$)</th>
<th>Lee Mean ($X_2$)</th>
<th>Lee Standard Deviation ($S_2$)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Test Significance</th>
<th>Direction*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Self-esteem-Low-Self-esteem</td>
<td>+1.883</td>
<td>+2.437</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>-3.749</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic-Perfectionist</td>
<td>+.915</td>
<td>+.021</td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td>2.191</td>
<td>+3.232</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic-Superficial Optimism</td>
<td>+.915</td>
<td>+2.094</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>-6.175</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic-Pessimistic</td>
<td>+1.638</td>
<td>+1.104</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>+2.873</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful-Skeptical</td>
<td>+1.362</td>
<td>+.760</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>+2.918</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair-Unfair</td>
<td>+1.670</td>
<td>+.563</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>1.507</td>
<td>+5.147</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy-Sad</td>
<td>+.885</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>+4.476</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert-Introvert</td>
<td>+.947</td>
<td>+.948</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>-.0047</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Trapped</td>
<td>+1.117</td>
<td>+1.000</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>+.5830</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregarious-Loner</td>
<td>+1.617</td>
<td>+.062</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>1.690</td>
<td>+7.188</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success-Failure</td>
<td>+1.819</td>
<td>+2.396</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>-4.436</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable-Rigid</td>
<td>+1.521</td>
<td>+.260</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1.892</td>
<td>+5.461</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love-Hate</td>
<td>+1.415</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>+7.950</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong-Weak</td>
<td>+1.064</td>
<td>+2.321</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>-9.008</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearless-Anxious</td>
<td>+.713</td>
<td>+1.687</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td>1.439</td>
<td>-4.842</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident-Doubtful</td>
<td>+1.468</td>
<td>+2.302</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>-5.178</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courageous-Cowardly</td>
<td>+1.521</td>
<td>+2.219</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>-4.970</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical-Emotional</td>
<td>- .447</td>
<td>+1.135</td>
<td>1.579</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>-6.617</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunistic-Moralistic</td>
<td>-.989</td>
<td>+.146</td>
<td>1.387</td>
<td>1.908</td>
<td>-4.682</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible-Obligated</td>
<td>+.649</td>
<td>+1.271</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>-2.894</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful-Unsuccessful</td>
<td>+1.819</td>
<td>+2.437</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>-4.410</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This column indicates which leader was rated as more positive for each adjective pair. This entry was not included on the Active-Passive Comparison since Lee was clearly more active.
Table 4
Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test Between Rahman (X₁) and Lee (X₂) (n = 21)

| Variable | $\bar{X}_1$ | $\bar{X}_2$ | $d = \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$ | $|d|$ | Rank | Signed Rank |
|----------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------|------|-------------|
| 1        | 1.883       | 2.437       | -0.554                      | 0.554 | 4    | -4          |
| 2        | 0.915       | 0.021       | 0.894                       | 0.894 | 12   | 12          |
| 3        | 0.915       | 2.094       | -1.179                      | 1.179 | 16   | -16         |
| 4        | 1.638       | 1.104       | 0.534                       | 0.534 | 3    | 3           |
| 5        | 1.362       | 0.760       | 0.602                       | 0.602 | 6    | 6           |
| 6        | 1.585       | 0.563       | 1.023                       | 1.023 | 14   | 14          |
| 7        | 1.670       | 0.885       | 0.785                       | 0.785 | 10   | 10          |
| 8        | 0.947       | 0.948       | -0.001                      | 0.001 | 1    | -1          |
| 9        | 1.117       | 1.000       | 0.117                       | 0.117 | 2    | 2           |
| 10       | 1.617       | 0.062       | 1.555                       | 1.555 | 20   | 20          |
| 11       | 1.819       | 2.396       | -0.577                      | 0.577 | 5    | -5          |
| 12       | 1.521       | 0.260       | 1.261                       | 1.261 | 17   | 17          |
| 13       | 1.415       | 0.000       | 1.415                       | 1.415 | 18   | 18          |
| 14       | 1.064       | 2.521       | -1.457                      | 1.457 | 19   | -19         |
| 15       | 0.713       | 1.687       | -0.974                      | 0.974 | 13   | -13         |
| 16       | 1.468       | 2.302       | -0.834                      | 0.834 | 11   | -11         |
| 17       | 1.521       | 2.219       | -0.698                      | 0.698 | 9    | -9          |
| 18       | -0.447      | 1.135       | -1.582                      | 1.582 | 21   | -21         |
| 19       | -0.989      | 0.146       | -1.135                      | 1.135 | 15   | -15         |
| 20       | 0.649       | 1.271       | -0.622                      | 0.622 | 8    | -8          |
| 21       | 1.819       | 2.437       | -0.618                      | 0.618 | 7    | -7          |

$T =$ the sum of all negative signed rank values  
= -102  
the sum of all + signed rank = 103  
Conclusion: Based on the totality of the positive-negative scale, Rahman and Lee are almost equal in positiveness.
An analysis of the Factor Analysis may indicate areas of difference along the Positive-Negative spectrum between Rahman and Lee (table 5).

Table 5
Factor Analysis Items 1-21 (Positive-Negative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective-pair</th>
<th>Direction*</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Self-esteem-Low Self-esteem</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>-.546</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic-Perfectionist</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic-Superficial Optimism</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>-.633</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic-Pessimistic</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>-.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful-Skeptical</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.645</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair-Unfair</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>-.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy-Sad</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>-.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert-Introvert</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>-.637</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Trapped</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>-.386</td>
<td>-.474</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregarious-Loner</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.607</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success-Failure</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable-Rigid</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love-Hate</td>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>-.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong-Weak</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>-.793</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearless-Anxious</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>-.761</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident-Doubtful</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>-.806</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courageous-Cowardly</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>-.743</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical-Emotional</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunistic-Moralistic</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible-Obligated</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful-Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>-.688</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This column indicates which leader was noted as more positive for each adjective-pair.

While the t-tests indicate Rahman and Lee to be more or less evenly divided on the positive-negative dimension,
the factor analysis loadings will enable one to more accurately categorize the leaders.

For factor I, the highest loadings yield the following combinations of items:

- High Self-esteem-Low Self-esteem
- Realistic-Superficial Optimism
- Success-Failure
- Strong-Weak
- Fearless-Anxious
- Confident-Doubtful
- Courageous-Cowardly
- Logical-Emotional
- Responsible-Obligated
- Successful-Unsuccessful

It should be noted that Lee dominates in these attributes in both t-tests and factor analysis.

Factor I follows a line of confidence and courage; it has been said of Lee that he rules Singapore like a chief executive runs a business—this factor would seem to indicate thus. The factors indicate a behavioral, decision making approach characterized by an independent action oriented style. It should be noted that these factors indicate an authoritarian approach which matches well with factor II of the Active-Passive factors.

Factor II is made up of the following items:

- Pragmatic-Perfectionist
- Optimistic-Pessimistic
- Hopeful-Skeptical
- Extrovert-Introvert
- Free-Trapped
- Gregarious-Loner
On factor II Rahman dominates on four of six of these items and is the same as Lee on two of the six. Lee does not dominate on any of these items.

Factor II follows a line of passion and feeling--more human-relationship oriented. Rahman is perceived as a warmer person than Lee. It is possible to argue that the coalition government of Malaysia demands a leader with consummate skill in the art of blinding divergent ethnic groups into a cohesive unit.

Singapore's more homogenous ethnic structure may not demand the attention to human relationship factors. However, Lee must have sensed the importance of this factor when several years ago he began a campaign to "soften" his public image.

Factor III consists of:
- Fair-Unfair
- Happy-Sad
- Adaptable-Rigid
- Love-Hate
- Opportunistic-Moralistic

The items loading on factor III appear to be somewhat similar to those for factor II. Rahman dominates on four of the five factors, while Lee dominates on the Opportunistic-Moralistic continuum. Rahman appears, in the opinion of the respondents, as the warmer personality type and also as more fair than Lee.
In light of the factor I loadings, Lee is, not unexpectedly, seen as the more opportunistic of the two leaders.

In summary, on the active-passive spectrum Lee is seen by the respondents as clearly more active than Rahman. The biographical data also support this finding.

On the positive-negative continua, it does not appear that either leader is clearly more positive than the other. For 11 of the 21 items Lee was rated as more positive. Eight out of 21 items indicate Rahman as more positive and 2 items indicate no difference between Lee and Rahman.

The factor analysis shows Lee to be more independent and action oriented, while Rahman is considered as a warmer and fairer person.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a brief summary and comparison of the personality types of Tengku Abdul Rahman and Lee Kuan Yew based upon the biographical and statistical data.

Barber's Model

To recap briefly, the characteristics of the four personality types of Barber's model, viz, active-passive and positive-negative. The active-positive leader will be recognized by the intensity of his political activity and the enjoyment derived therefrom, high self-esteem, flexibility to attain personal goals, the probabilities of a rational acceptance of a political solution. The objective is to solve the problem.

The active-negative person presents as being a power-seeking, aggressive, compulsive, a perfectionist, expending a lot of energy which is often futile because it is less than perfect.

The passive-positive leader tends to be compliant, appears to have low self-esteem, superficial optimism, agreeable, cooperative, needs reassurance and encouragement from others.
The passive-negative type exhibits such characteristics as having civic virtue, guardian of the "right and proper way," a tendency to withdraw from confrontations, emphasizes vague principles, noncontroversial, low self-esteem, motivated by a sense of duty, and enters politics as he is forced to.

Biographical Data

Using Barber's model as a tool for classification, the biographical data regarding Tengku Abdul Rahman yielded the following personality type. The active-passive continuum provides a clearer determination of Rahman's personality than does the positive-negative continuum.

The available data show the Tengku to be passive as compared with active. For example, his indifference to his education, his recruitment into the UMNO by others, his vagueness in political program objectives, and his interest and activity in nonpolitical diversions (e.g., horse racing).

The positive-negative continuum appears to be less clear-cut. Although Rahman appears to have enjoyed his position as Prime Minister, the writer doubts that he derived personal satisfaction from this source. In short, he enjoyed the title of Prime Minister more than the role. For example, Rahman tended to withdraw by emphasizing vague programs, he engaged in areas of little controversy, and believed his was a "good government," i.e., right and
proper. It is difficult to determine the intensity of his sense of duty. Rahman appeared to lack a driving fervor in controversial political issues.

The biographical data yield, to this writer, that Rahman would be characterized as a passive-negative political personality.

Biographical data for Lee Kuan Yew suggest that the values which he developed as a child and young adult provide his basic orientation toward life. The data indicate Lee has a strong loyalty to his family and culture, is a courageous fighter, hard worker, highly disciplined, articulate, socially skilled, intellectual, achievement oriented, politically energetic, and pugnacious. His family history in Singapore reveals a background of financial, educational, and social success. Both Lee's grandfather and his parents developed the foundation for his political career. The university education in England and emulation of the British customs enhanced his status as a potentially knowledgeable, worldly political leader. Specifically, his capability to recognize popular causes expressed by the various groups in Singapore, to access these needs, to merge a coalition of the significant groups into a politically effective entity, and to personify the political objectives of the residents, is manifested by his position as Prime Minister of Singapore.
In terms of style, Lee has directed his attention and efforts to acquiring and refining the skills necessary to achieve political success. They include competencies which the majority of people value. Lee is viewed as being articulate, studious, self-improving, aggressive, goal-oriented, self-disciplined, knowledgeable, competitive, a devoted family man, and a persistent and diligent worker. These abilities present to his constituents both credibility and capability of their political leader.

Although Lee Kuan Yew would perhaps not fit the pure active-negative type personality, his aggressiveness and singlemindedness in pursuit of his political goals appear to this writer as active-negative traits. Although there may be little evidence to indicate that Lee Kuan Yew does not enjoy his political role, it would appear that his seeking of power as an end in itself describes an active-negative personality type.

Survey Data

The reader is reminded at this juncture that while the biographical data have been utilized to classify active-passive or positive-negative personality types, no indication of degree of difference was attempted. The survey data, while not so readily fitting distinct categories perhaps is a truer reflection of reality in that it indicates degrees of difference between the two leaders.
On the active-passive continua, the distinction between Rahman and Lee is clear-cut. Twenty out of 21 comparisons showed a significant difference at the .01 level and the remaining item showed a significant difference at the .05 level. The data indicate Lee clearly more active than Rahman.

The difference between the two leaders, as indicated by the survey data, is one of degree. Both Lee and Rahman can be classified as active leaders. Although this finding is different than indicated by the biographical data, the placement of the two leaders along the active-passive spectrum remains the same, i.e., Lee is more active and Rahman is more passive.

The scores for Rahman had a higher variability than the scores for Lee. This shows that Lee has a more unique image among the respondents than Rahman.

The survey respondents indicate that Lee is perceived as a rational leader and problem solver. In addition, Lee is seen as seeking and achieving control over Singapore and her people. Clearly, active traits.

While the active-passive comparison was very clear-cut, with Lee clearly more active than Rahman, the positive-negative dimension was not so well defined.

The t-tests showed that Rahman was more positive than Lee on 8 out of 21 item comparisons, while Lee was more positive than Rahman on 11 out of 21 items (with 2 items
showing no significant differences). However, based on the totality of the positive-negative scale, Rahman and Lee are almost equal in positiveness (as shown by t-tests).

Factor analysis loadings enable one to more accurately categorize the leaders along the positive-negative scale.

Lee is perceived by the respondents as utilizing a decision making approach characterized by an independent action oriented style--an authoritarian approach.

Rahman is seen as the more human relationship oriented and is perceived as a warmer person than Lee. In questions of fairness, Rahman is considered more fair, while Lee is considered as the more opportunistic of the two leaders.

Conclusions

To answer the question: Do the survey data support the findings obtained from the biographical data? The writer is forced to reply--Yes and No.

On the active-passive spectrum Lee is seen by the respondents as clearly more active than Rahman. The biographical data also support this finding.

On the positive-negative continuum, it does not appear that either leader is clearly more positive than the other. Lee is shown to be more independent and action-oriented, while Rahman is considered a warmer and fairer person.
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Dear Doctor

May I ask for your assistance?

My master's degree thesis is concerned with the personality types displayed by the former Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tengku Abdul Rahman, and the Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew.

Your knowledge of Southeast Asia makes you a valuable resource. Would you share your expertise with my be completing the enclosed questionnaire? A self addressed envelope is provided for your convenience.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Lim
Instructions

The purpose of this study is to measure the meanings which the following adjective-pairs have to you, by indicating your perceptions of the former Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tengku Abdul Rahman, and the Prime Minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew. For each political leader there is an identical set of adjective-pairs. Treat each political leader separately in your analysis.

Here is how you are to use these scales: If you feel that the individual named at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

(For example:) Tengku Abdul Rahman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you feel that the person is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

(For example:) Lee Kuan Yew

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

(For example:) Tengku Abdul Rahman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The directions toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging. If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important: (1) Place your check-marks in the middle of a space, not on the boundaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Be sure you check every scale for every concept--do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at a fairly high speed. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.
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