



UNIVERSITI
TEKNOLOGI
PETRONAS

**COMPENDIUM OF UTP PUBLIC LECTURES
VOLUME 1**

Copyright and Reprint Permission

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying and recording, without the written permission of the copyright holder, application for which should be addressed to the publisher. Such written permission must also be obtained before any part of this publication is stored in a retrieval system of any nature.

The publisher, authors, contributors and endorsers of this publication each excludes liability for loss suffered by any person resulting in any way from the use of, or reliance on this publication.

Compiled by UTP Corporate Services
Published by UTP Press
Copyright © 2016
Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS,
Owned by Institute of Technology PETRONAS Sdn. Bhd.

ISBN 978-967-0644-98-1



UNIVERSITI
TEKNOLOGI
PETRONAS

**COMPENDIUM
of UTP
PUBLIC
LECTURES**

VOLUME 1

Contents

4 ~ 5	FOREWORD A foreword by the Vice Chancellor DATUK IR (DR) ABDUL RAHIM B HASHIM
6 ~ 17	Cabaran-cabaran Mentadbir Sesebuah Negara TUN DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD Chancellor of Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS <i>07 August 2006</i>
18 ~ 25	Wawasan Dalam Mengisi Kemerdekaan TUN DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD Chancellor of Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS <i>13 August 2007</i>
26 ~ 35	National Identity And Power Sharing TUN DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD Chancellor of Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS <i>16 October 2008</i>
36 ~ 45	Beyond Vision 2020 TUN DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD Chancellor of Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS <i>22 April 2010</i>

46 ~ 53	Towards Sustainability: Bridging Engineering, Technology & Humanities TUN DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD Chancellor of Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS <i>15 June 2010</i>
54 ~ 63	Graduates in the 21st Century TUN DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD Chancellor of Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS <i>27 March 2013</i>
84 ~ 73	Leaders in Today's Society: Issues, Challenges and Way Forward TUN DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD Chancellor of Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS <i>16 April 2014</i>
74 ~ 85	Social Evolution in Malaysia: What's Next TUN DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD Chancellor of Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS <i>19 August 2015</i>

Foreword

A foreword by the Vice Chancellor

I like to listen... I have learned a great deal from listening carefully.

These are the words of one of the great writers of the 20th Century, Ernest Hemingway, a war correspondent, accomplished journalist and recipient of both the Pulitzer Prize and the Nobel Prize in literature.

Just like this influential writer, I too like to listen. Through my years of experience I have come to fully understand what it means to listen, as opposed to just hear. For when we truly listen, we open our ears, hearts and our minds to new experiences, new knowledge and new understanding of the world around us.

Listening to the words of great minds is one of the best opportunities for such positive learning experiences. This is what UTP series of Public Lectures offers.

We first started these series of lectures in December 1998 and our aim has been to create a platform for prominent Malaysian figures to share their thoughts and ideas with the general public. This platform would not only bring these great minds to the forefront of the people, it would also hopefully stimulate thinking and ideas among the listeners as well.

Over the past 15 years since its inception, UTP has hosted numerous public lectures, with speakers the likes of our Chancellor and also former Prime Minister Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamed, prominent historian Emeritus Professor Dato' Dr Khoo Kay Kim and social activist Dato' Lee Lam Thye, just to name a few.

The topics covered have been wide and varied, touching on the economy, culture, business and social development as well as issues and challenges in Malaysia. They have enlightened, entertained, and informed; and they have provoked thought and engaged the public in matters of importance to the society and the nation.

While listening to the speakers "live" during the actual Public Lectures presents the best opportunity to hear and listen to the words of the speakers in their true context and meaning, the next best thing would be to read the speeches in a book.

So we bring you this Compendium of Public Lectures, Volume 1 which is dedicated to YABhg Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad, UTP's Chancellor for the last 12 years. YABhg Tun's leadership has helped elevate our university to new levels of excellence. We have made tremendous progress and have received numerous accolades and recognition. Hence, we are permanently imprinting within these pages the words and wisdom of the eight public lectures of YABhg Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad.

In keeping with the university's role as an institution of higher learning and a conduit of knowledge and information, we hope this compendium will find its way to the hands of many. As the words and thoughts of the speakers jump out of these pages, they will perhaps leave indelible marks in the minds of the readers, provoke thought and offer insights and understanding.

Most of all, we hope that the speakers' efforts and intentions in sharing their thoughts and ideas, printed in black and white in this book, will be further appreciated and will be a source of inspiration and learning.

For what is life, if not a lifelong journey of learning?

DATUK IR (DR) ABDUL RAHIM B HASHIM

Vice Chancellor, Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS



07 August 2006

Saya berpendapat bahawa ini adalah satu tajuk yang current yang menarik perhatian di zaman kita sekarang ini dan amatlah penting, kita sebagai rakyat, sebagai orang biasa pun, sebagai pemimpin di mana-mana peringkat memahami cabaran-cabaran dan cara-cara mengatasi cabaran-cabaran ini kerana hanya jika kita berjaya mengatasinya barulah akan berjaya pentadbiran negara dan pembangunannya. Cabaran-cabaran ini berbeza-beza bergantung kepada sistem pentadbiran yang diamalkan. Kita tahu bahawa terdapat banyak sistem-sistem pentadbiran dan ideologi termasuk sistem kuasa penuh oleh pemerintah ataupun *'authoritarian rule'* sama ada mempunyai raja ataupun mempunyai seorang diktator ataupun sistem yang lebih mirip kepada memberi kuasa kepada rakyat untuk menentukan nasibnya dan sistem ini lebih dikenali dengan perkataan demokrasi. Demokrasi bermakna kita kembali kepada rakyat untuk menentukan nasib mereka. Tetapi sudah tentulah rakyat tidak mungkin mentadbirkan diri mereka kerana jumlah mereka terlalu ramai dan agak sukar untuk semua rakyat mencuba mentadbir Negara untuk memuaskan hati mereka. Sebab itu, kita dalam sistem demokrasi terpaksa menggunakan wakil-wakil yang akan mentadbir negara kita dan juga mempunyai badan pentadbiran yang kekal, *'Permanent Administrative Service'*. Wakil-wakil ini perlulah ditentukan rakyat dan untuk ini kita mengadakan sistem pemilihan dan terpulanglah kepada rakyat memilih orang yang dianggap oleh rakyat sebagai layak mentadbir. Ini adalah teorinya tetapi kadang-kadang ia tidak berlaku demikian. Kadang-kadang kita dapati bahawa pemilihan itu dibuat dengan cara yang kurang tertib dengan penggunaan rasuah dan sebagainya ataupun tekanan-tekanan tertentu oleh pihak yang mampu membuat tekanan. Dengan itu, maka sebenarnya yang dipilih oleh rakyat bukanlah mereka yang cukup layak untuk mentadbir tetapi sebaliknya adalah mereka mereka yang melalui cara-cara yang kurang sihat telah menyebabkan rakyat memilih mereka untuk menjadi pentadbir. Apabila mereka menjadi pentadbir tentulah banyak perkara-perkara yang tidak diingini mungkin berlaku. Tetapi sebaliknya jika rakyat bijak dan menolak segala tindakan-tindakan yang kurang sihat seperti rasuah umpamanya ataupun rakyat berani membuat pilihan sedangkan mereka dihadapkan dengan tekanan-tekanan maka kita akan mendapati pemerintahan yang baik dan boleh mendatangkan kebaikan kepada negara dan juga kepada rakyat.

Itu adalah cabaran yang dihadapi oleh rakyat sendiri. Walaupun kita bercakap di sini berkenaan dengan pentadbir, pentadbiran negara kita bermula dengan pemilihan oleh rakyat kalau kita amalkan sistem demokrasi. Sesudah kita membuat pemilihan, maka cabaran-cabaran akan dihadapi pula oleh orang yang dipilih. Mereka juga menghadapi cabaran kerana kalau tidak berani menghadapi cabaran ini dan membuat keputusan kurang bijak maka negara tidak dapat dibangunkan dan pentadbiran tidak dapat dijalankan dengan baik. Cabaran yang pertama yang dihadapi oleh mereka untuk memerintah ialah cabaran membendung diri mereka, membendung nafsu mereka kerana sebagai orang yang diberi kuasa tarikan-tarikan yang tidak sesuai dengan pentadbiran yang baik bagi negara, mereka berhadapan dengan peluang-peluang untuk melakukan benda-benda yang tidak

baik untuk negara, walaupun mungkin memuaskan hati mereka. Dengan perkataan lain, mereka perlu bendung nafsu mereka kerana apabila diberi kuasa ada sahaja benda-benda yang tidak baik yang boleh dilakukan oleh pihak ini untuk menguntungkan diri dan bukan menguntungkan negara.

Perkara yang pertama ialah membendung nafsu sendiri oleh pihak-pihak yang telah dipilih untuk mentadbirkan negara. Jika diri dan tidak menyalahgunakan kuasa, maka pentadbiran akan berjalan dengan baik. Tetapi, kalau mereka gagal, maka sudah tentulah kuasa yang diberi kepada mereka akan disalahgunakan untuk kepentingan diri ataupun kepentingan keluarga ataupun kepentingan kroni-kroni mereka. Ini adalah cabaran yang amat besar yang dihadapi oleh mereka yang telah dipilih untuk menjadi kerajaan dan memerintah negara.

Selain daripada itu, dalam sistem demokrasi pula, kita ingin tentukan siapa sahaja berpeluang dan berhak untuk dipilih untuk bertanding supaya dipilih sebagai wakil kepada rakyat dan mungkin menjadi anggota kerajaan. Sementara kita yang ingin memasuki universiti ini dikehendaki memiliki kelulusan tertentu diperingkat tertentu, tetapi dalam sistem demokrasi, khususnya sistem demokrasi di Malaysia, kita tidak ada syarat-syarat tertentu untuk orang yang boleh bertanding untuk dipilih sebagai wakil rakyat. Tidak ada sama sekali apa-apa *'qualification'*, sehingga orang yang buta huruf sekali pun boleh bertanding dan boleh menjadi menteri. Di dalam sebuah negara demokrasi, kalau kita tidak memberi peluang kepada orang yang tidak berkelulusan ini, maka ianya tidak demokratik. Justeru itu, mungkin mereka yang kita pilih itu tidak mempunyai kelayakan sebagai pentadbir walaupun dia adalah seorang yang popular kerana sebab-sebab tertentu. Mungkin kerana dia pandai menyanyi, mungkin kerana dia pandai membuat sesuatu apa yang lain yang menarik sokongan daripada pemilih dan dengan itu seorang yang tidak mempunyai kelulusan apa-apa, juga berpeluang untuk menjadi pentadbir. Kita juga tidak mengkehendaki orang yang akan mentadbir negara kita ini, mengadakan kelulusan dalam bidang pentadbiran. Mereka yang dipilih tidak ada latihan untuk menjadi pentadbir sedangkan kalau kita masuk ke Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS ini, kita akan dilatih dalam bidang-bidang tertentu dan kerja-kerja yang kita akan lakukan selepas kita lulus ialah kerja-kerja yang kita telah belajar melalui kursus-kursus berkenaan dan kerja berkenaan atau profesion berkenaan. Tetapi yang akan mentadbir negara kita mungkin terdiri daripada orang yang tidak ada sama sekali kefahaman berkenaan dengan cara-cara mentadbir sesebuah negara. Mungkin dianya dapat bergantung kepada pakar-pakar yang sedia ada dalam *'permanent service'* iaitu pentadbiran yang kekal yang terdiri daripada administrators, pentadbir yang mempunyai kelulusan tertentu, ianya boleh bergantung kepada mereka, mendapat nasihat daripada mereka, tunjuk ajar daripada mereka. Tetapi kadangkala wakil yang dipilih yang membentuk kerajaan mungkin tidak begitu berminat untuk mendengar nasihat daripada pakar-pakar dalam permanent service. Dan ianya mungkin ingin membuat keputusannya sendiri, sedangkan dia bukanlah seorang yang qualified dalam bidang pentadbiran. Ini adalah satu cabaran terhadap dirinya, apakah dia akan membenarkan dirinya mendapat nasihat daripada pakar-pakar dalam bidang pentadbiran ataupun dia menolak usaha untuk mendapat nasihat daripada pentadbir yang professional. Cabaran ini perlu diatasi oleh seseorang yang dipilih untuk menjadi pemimpin, menjadi kerajaan pilihan rakyat dalam sebuah demokrasi. Dia

harus mengatasi perasaan rendah diri kerana terpaksa bergantung kepada pakar-pakar. Kalau dia berjaya menghadapi cabaran ini dan dia mengurangkan perasaan kebesaran dirinya dan sanggup menerima nasihat, mungkin dia dapat mentadbir dengan baik. Ini adalah satu lagi cabaran yang dihadapi oleh pemimpin sebuah negara yang demokratik. Kalaulah dia mempunyai pengetahuan yang mencukupi, entah bagaimana telah dapat menguasai cara-cara mentadbir maka dia akan menghadapi dengan macam-macam cabaran yang lain.

Walaupun dia berjaya mengatasi nafsunya, tidak menyalahgunakan kuasa dan sanggup mendengar nasihat, tetapi dia akan menghadapi macam-macam cabaran lain. Kerana sebuah negara tidak sunyi daripada menghadapi masalah, masalah dalaman dan juga masalah yang datang daripada luar dan tiap satu masalah ini harus ditangani dengan cara yang bijak, dengan menggunakan ilmu yang ada pada diri sendiri, dengan menggunakan pengalaman sendiri dan juga mendapat nasihat pakar-pakar. Kalau dia betul-betul berminat untuk mentadbir dengan baik, maka caranya memang ada baginya mengatasi cabaran-cabaran yang dihadapi. Cabaran-cabaran dalam negara umpamanya mungkin merupakan cabaran ketidakstabilan ataupun rusuhan yang berlaku dalam negara kerana pelbagai sebab. Mungkin rakyat tidak begitu tertib, tidak begitu disiplin, suka memberontak, suka mengadakan demonstrasi, suka mengadakan mogok dan sebagainya. Cabaran-cabaran ini perlu ditangani seorang pemimpin dengan cara yang bijak kerana dalam demokrasi ada kebebasan tertentu sementara rakyat perlu bendung tindakan yang ganas tetapi mereka berhak untuk mengambil tindakan melindungi kepentingan mereka.

Katakanlah pekerja umpamanya, pekerja mempunyai kesatuan pekerja, gunanya ialah supaya mereka tidak ditindas oleh majikan. Jika mereka ditindas oleh majikan, maka kesatuan pekerja dalam demokrasi berhak mogok ataupun mengambil tindakan-tindakan yang lain. Kalau mogok ini melibatkan kegiatan-kegiatan yang penting bagi negara, maka dia mungkin menjejaskan pembangunan dan kelicinan pentadbiran negara. Kepentingan pekerja mestilah dipertahankan. Jika ada tekanan penindasan daripada pihak-pihak majikan, maka pekerja mesti dibenarkan untuk mengadakan tindakan mogok mereka, melawan ataupun menangkis tindakan daripada majikan mereka. Sebaliknya, majikan juga mempunyai hak. Kalau pekerja bertindak mogok dengan sewenang-wenangnya tanpa sebab, hanya kerana mereka tahu melalui mogok mereka akan dapat sesuatu bagi diri mereka, maka mungkin tindakan mogok mereka akan menjejaskan industri berkenaan, perniagaan berkenaan, sehingga perniagaan itu terpaksa ditutup, dan ini tetap akan merugikan negara kerana kita perlu kepada perniagaan dan perusahaan untuk memperkayakan negara kita. Umpamanya kalau kita cuba mengalih daripada sebuah negara, agriculture, negara, pertanian kepada negara industri, tetapi industri sering menghadapi mogok sehingga ianya tidak boleh berjaya, maka peralihan ini mungkin tidak dapat dijayakan. Ini bermakna bahawa pemerintah pada masa itu menghadapi dengan satu pilihan yang memerlukan penekanan dengan cara yang bijak, bagaimana memelihara hak pekerja dan hak majikan dengan tidak menjejaskan ekonomi negara. Ini adalah cabaran kerana kalau kerajaan kepada pekerja umpamanya kerap kali berlaku dalam kerajaan sosialis, demokratik sosialis, mereka sering memihak kepada pekerja dan menekan majikan, akibatnya ialah perusahaan-perusahaan yang dimulakan oleh majikan terpaksa berhenti. Dan kita dapati umpamanya di United Kingdom,

di England, dimana pada satu ketika kerajaan sosialis ataupun 'Labour Party' berkuasa dan pekerja-pekerja berpendapat mereka berhak untuk menuntut gaji yang lebih, kerja yang kurang dan cuti yang panjang dan pihak pemerintah, kerana ianya bergantung kepada pekerja-pekerja untuk dapat untung, maka mereka memihak kepada pekerja-pekerja. Oleh kerana perusahaan-perusahaan ini tidak lagi untung kerana kos-kos *overhead* terlalu tinggi maka industri-industri ini terpaksa ditutup. Dan dengan itu, pekerja-pekerja akan hilang peluang pekerjaan. Sumbangan kepada pembangunan ekonomi negara juga terjejas dan akhirnya negara menghadapi kemerosotan ekonomi. Di UK umpamanya sekarang tidak ada lagi perusahaan automobil, tidak ada sebuah kereta pun dibuat di England milik orang-orang British. Sebabnya ialah kerana mereka memberi terlalu banyak kebebasan kepada pekerja, mereka tidak dapat bersaing dalam pasaran dunia. Dengan itu, kita tidak lagi menggunakan kereta Morris, ataupun Austin, ataupun jenis-jenis lain yang terkenal dahulu sebagai kereta British. Rolls Royce, Bentley sekarang ini adalah milik orang-orang Jerman. Sebabnya ialah kerana tidak ada keuntungan lagi kalau diusahakan di United Kingdom. Ini bermakna bahawa kerajaan telah gagal menangani cabaran yang datang daripada pekerja-pekerja yang menyalahgunakan hak mereka untuk mengadakan mogok. Sebab kerajaan terlalu bergantung kepada pekerja untuk mendapat undi supaya mereka kekal sebagai kerajaan.

Sebaliknya pula, kerajaan kapitalis mungkin akan memberi layanan yang lebih besar kepada majikan dan layanan yang selalunya memihak kepada majikan akan menyebabkan pekerja-pekerja berasa tidak puas hati dan mungkin mereka tidak akan sokong ataupun memberi undi mereka kepada parti yang memihak kepada majikan. Sekali lagi mungkin kerajaan yang memihak kepada majikan ini akan gagal dan tidak dapat memerintah. Jelas sekali bahawa kita menghadapi, pentadbir menghadapi cabaran yang mana-mana pilihan akan membawa akibat yang buruk, samada memilih untuk menyokong pekerja ataupun menyokong majikan, bermakna hasilnya tidak baik.

Jelas sekali bahawa pemerintah perlu belajar bagaimana melayan kedua-dua pihak supaya mereka akan berdamai, sedar akan kepentingan negara dan tidak bertindak secara liar dengan menggunakan kuasa-kuasa yang ada pada mereka. Ini adalah cabaran yang besar tetapi ada banyak cabaran yang lain terutamanya hak asasi manusia. Kita sering bercakap berkenaan hak asasi manusia. Tetapi kita dapati juga bahawa hak asasi manusia juga boleh disalahgunakan. Kerana mungkin dia akan menyebabkan keadaan dalam negara tidak begitu stabil, hak asasi diantaranya ialah hak untuk berdemonstrasi yang memang ini adalah satu hak yang perlu dilindungi tetapi seperti juga dengan yang lain, apabila sesuatu itu keterlaluan, maka kesannya tetap akan menjadi buruk. Kita berdemonstrasi kerana tidak berpuas hati dengan cara Israel menyerang Lubnan. Ini memang baik tetapi demonstrasi itu hendaklah diadakan dengan cara yang tertib. Kalaulah kita ada demonstrasi yang melibatkan satu juta orang di Kuala Lumpur tiap-tiap hari, tidak ada masa untuk yang bebas daripada demonstrasi, maka ini akan menyebabkan keadaan dalam negara tidak stabil dan kita tidak akan dapat mengawal keamanan negara. Sementara demonstrasi mungkin menjadi satu hak asasi tetapi kalau digunakan secara tidak bijak, keterlaluan sepanjang masa, maka akibatnya bukanlah Israel yang akan gagal tetapi kita yang akan gagal. Kita nak supaya ada demonstrasi tetapi kita juga harus ingat bahawa ada kerugian yang akan

datang kalau dianya tidak sama haluan. Justeru itu, pemerintah menghadapi cabaran, setakat manakah hak asasi manusia perlu dibendung ataupun dibiarkan. Kalau tidak bijak, maka mungkin negara tidak akan stabil dan pembangunan negara akan terjejas. Ini adalah perkara-perkara yang dihadapi pemerintah. Pemerintah pula, pemerintah yang dipilih yang menjadi kerajaan, perlu mendapat kerjasama daripada badan pentadbiran, administrative service dan juga badan yang ditugaskan untuk menjaga keselamatan dalam negara, seperti polis. Mereka perlu mendapat kerjasama kerana urusan-urusan yang perlu dibuat tidak boleh dibuat oleh pentadbir yang dipilih untuk membentuk kerajaan. Semua urusan-urusan ini akan dilakukan oleh pentadbir yang kekal. Justeru itu, kerajaan pilihan rakyat mestilah bijak bagaimana menangani, bagaimana melayan pentadbir yang ditugaskan untuk melaksanakan segala keputusan kerajaan. Ini adalah sesuatu yang memerlukan diplomasi, layanan yang baik tanpa menghilangkanan respect ataupun kehormatan diri sendiri. Ini juga satu cabaran yang besar.

Katakanlah, kerajaan yang dipilih oleh rakyat berjaya membendung segala kegiatan yang liar, dapat membendung, dapat menangani perhubungan dengan pentadbir yang kekal, kerajaan juga terpaksa menghadapi usaha untuk membangunkan negara. Kita harus ingat bahawa pada dasarnya pemerintah atau pentadbir ditugaskan untuk menjaga keamanan, "*law and order*" dalam sesebuah negara. Di zaman dahulu, pemerintah cuma bertanggungjawab terhadap "*law and order*", keadaan "*security*", keamanan negara dengan mengadakan badan-badan yang akan menguatkuasakan undang-undang. Tetapi sekarang ini, pemerintah dikehendaki membangunkan negara, memajukan negara dan juga mempertahankan negara. Untuk membangunkan negara, pemerintah perlu ada idea-idea tertentu, pemikiran-pemikiran untuk membawa negara ke arah kemajuan, kearah kesejahteraan hidup rakyat keseluruhannya. Untuk ini, pemerintah perlu memiliki pengetahuan, pengalaman dan juga mempunyai kualiti-kualiti kepimpinan tertentu. Pemimpin adalah seorang yang ditugaskan mengetuai pengikut-pengikutnya ke arah sesuatu yang lebih baik. Tetapi ianya juga harus ingat bahawa jika tidak bijak melayani kehendak mereka yang dipimpin, yang ada dibelakangnya, mungkin dia akan tinggal terkontang-kanting, tidak ada sesiapa dibelakangnya. "*In other words, the leader may not have any followers and if the leader does not have any follower, then he is not a leader. On the other hand, the leader must come up with ideas, but those ideas must be made acceptable to his followers.*" Kalau pengikutnya tidak setuju dengan pembawakan kepimpinan pemimpin, pengikut tidak akan lagi mengikuti pemimpin dan pemimpin akan tinggal pemimpin tanpa pengikut sama sekali. Dengan perkataan lain, dia tidak akan lagi menjadi pemimpin dan dia tidak akan lagi akan dapat membawa kebaikan kepada pengikutnya.

Pertimbangan ini memerlukan diplomasi, ianya mesti sedar, apa kehendak mereka yang dipimpin olehnya, pemimpin mesti sedar apakah kehendak pengikutnya, dan setakat mana dia boleh membawa pendapat yang berbeza sedikit daripada pengikutnya tetapi adalah yang baik bagi pengikutnya dan juga bagi negaranya. "*It is a very sophisticated thing*", cukup canggih dan memerlukan pemikiran yang mendalam tetapi membawa negara dan rakyat ke arah suatu matlamat. Akhirnya dia mencapai matlamat itu. Janganlah apa yang berlaku ialah sementara dia menuju ke arah suatu maklumat tiba-tiba tiada siapa yang mengikutinya. Ini adalah cabaran yang besar bagi pemimpin. Mengetahui apa yang

dikehendaki oleh pengikutnya dan juga mengetahui jalan mana yang nak dipilih supaya pengikutnya kekal sebagai pengikut dan matlamatnya tercapai. *"This is very important"*. Kalau dia menjadi pemimpin tetapi tiada pengikut, tiada makna sama sekali dan pencapaiannya juga tidak memberi makna. Justeru itu, pemimpin perlulah bijak. Bagaimana perjuangannya, bagaimana memilih jalan ke arah target ataupun matlamatnya, dengan tidak hilang pengikut-pengikutnya. Ini merupakan sesuatu yang mencabar tetapi umumnya, ianya mudah ditentukan, sudah tentulah pengikutnya nak kepada kebaikan. Umpamanya, kita adalah sebuah negara pertanian dahulu dan pemimpin berpendapat bahawa negara pertanian tidak akan membawa kemajuan kepada rakyat. Dan pemimpin memilih untuk industri, untuk menjadikan negara sebuah negara industri. Adakah rakyat bersetuju? Ini bergantung kepada penjelasan secara terang oleh pemimpin. Kenapa dipilih industri? Umumnya kita boleh kata atas sebidang tanah seluas satu ekar, ia tidak mencukupi untuk memberi saraan kepada seorangpun. Satu ekar tidak dapat mengeluarkan hasil untuk seorangpun. Sebaliknya industri, atas satu ekar, mungkin mewujudkan peluang pekerjaan kepada 500 ataupun 1000 orang dengan adanya *factory-factory* yang membuat itu dan ini. Sudah tentu ini lebih menepati kehendak pengikutnya. Rakyat nak peluang pekerjaan. Dengan adanya industri, maka peluang pekerjaan bertambah. Dan dengan itu, rakyat dapat hidup dengan lebih sempurna. Sebaliknya kalau kekal dengan pertanian, peluang kerja tidak akan wujud. Yang berpeluang bertani juga tidak akan mendapat pendapatan yang mencukupi. Dan dengan itu, maka pemimpin akan dianggap tidak berjaya kerana keperluan rakyat untuk mendapat peluang pekerjaan tidak diwujudkan oleh pemimpin. Sebab itulah, pemimpin kita seperti Tun Razak, Tun Hussein, mereka memilih untuk menjadikan Malaysia sebuah negara industri supaya lebih banyak peluang kerja diwujudkan dan rakyat dapat manfaat daripada industri. Dan kita tahu bahawa strategi ini begitu berjaya sehingga boleh dikatakan di negara kita ini tidak ada yang menganggur. Saya sedar bahawa ramai juga kelulusan universiti yang menganggur sekarang ini tetapi mereka menganggur kerana sebab-sebab lain.

Sebenarnya kita mempunyai peluang yang banyak untuk bekerja, sebab itulah rakyat asing datang ke negara kita ini untuk mendapat pekerjaan, kerana di negara mereka tiada peluang bekerja. Sudah tentu rakyat kita sendiri akan berpeluang bekerja kalau mereka sanggup dilatih dalam bidang-bidang yang dikehendaki oleh majikan-majikan di negara kita. Jadi apa yang berlaku ialah, pemimpin memilih matlamat, memberi rakyat peluang untuk memahami kenapa matlamat ini dipilih, dan juga jalan mana yang harus diambil dan dengan itu pemimpin dapat mentadbir, menghadapi cabaran sebuah negara yang sudah tidak maju kerana tiada peluang pekerjaan dan pemimpin kekal sebagai pemimpin, dan pentadbiran negara akan berjalan dengan jayanya, dengan negara mendapat hasil daripada dorongan ataupun pemilihan pemimpin pentadbir untuk mengatasi masalah kekurangan peluang kerja. Ini, kalau kita sedar tentang cabaran ini dan kita tahu menanganinya maka dapatlah kita memajukan negara kita. Alhamdulillah di negara kita ini, kita boleh katakan kita berjaya juga, kerana negara kita ini aman, negara kita ini dapat dibangunkan dengan sempurna dan dapat di majukan oleh pihak pemerintah. Tetapi cabaran juga datang daripada negara-negara asing yang mungkin tidak senang dengan kejayaan kita dan cabaran ini juga perlu diatasi oleh pemerintah. Sebagai contoh kita tahu pada tahun 1997, negara kita diserang penyangak matawang. Mereka sengaja menjatuhkan nilai ringgit kita, dan apabila nilai

ringgit kita jatuh, maknanya kita menjadi miskin. Ianya jatuh sebanyak 50%. Dengan itu, kita perlu RM2 untuk membeli barang yang dahulu bernilai RM1. Inilah maknanya kejatuhan matawang. Kita sebagai individu menjadi miskin, tidak dapat membeli barang-barang biasa. Kita sebagai sebuah negara juga menjadi miskin kerana tidak dapat membeli barang-barang yang diperlukan negara. Kita sekali lagi dihadapkan dengan cabaran memilih pendekatan untuk mengatasi masalah ini. Kita boleh pilih untuk mengikut sahaja nasihat yang datang daripada IMF umpamanya. Ada sesetengah negara yang tanpa memikirkan dengan mendalam mungkin, hanya mengikut nasihat daripada IMF. Apabila mereka mengikut nasihat daripada IMF, maka mereka dapati masalah mereka tidak dapat diatasi, sebaliknya mereka telah menggadaikan kemerdekaan negara mereka kepada IMF, sehingga IMF berjaya menguasai pentadbiran ekonomi dan kewangan negara. Kita tahu pula bahawa IMF ini duduk dibawah telunjuk negara-negara kuasa besar tertentu. Bermakna bahawa negara yang mengikut IMF ini akan hilang kemerdekaan negara, kemerdekaan mereka. Di waktu itu kita hadapi cabaran ini. Apakah kita juga akan mengikut jejak langkah rakan-rakan kita di negara lain ataupun kita memilih pendekatan yang lain supaya menyelamatkan kebebasan, kemerdekaan negara kita. Seperti mana kita semua maklum, kita tidak pilih untuk mengikut IMF, sebaliknya kita cipta pendekatan kita sendiri. Tetapi di masa yang sama, kita harus ingat dalam negara juga terdapat pendapat berbeza. Ada pendapat yang berkata kita harus mengikut telunjuk IMF dan ada pihak yang berkata berlainan daripada itu. Kalaulah pentadbir tidak cekap, tidak tahu menangani cabaran ini, maka mungkin pendekatan yang dipilih itu tidak akan berjaya dan pemerintah yang dipilih itu akan gagal dan terpaksa digugurkan. Ini adalah cabaran daripada luar.

Kita juga nak mengekalkan kebebasan negara kita. Kita tidak mahu negara kita ini dikongkong oleh sesiapa. Sebab itu apabila kita berhadapan dengan cabaran-cabaran daripada luar, maka pemerintah hendaklah cekap dalam memilih pendekatan yang mengekalkan kebebasan negara tetapi tidak menjejaskan hubungan kita dengan negara-negara yang lain. Ini tidak begitu mudah ditangani kerana kadangkala pilihan yang dibuat mungkin akan merosakkan negara dan dengan itu kita akan anggap cabaran itu tidak berjaya diatasi dan kita gagal. Jelas sekali bahawa cabaran-cabaran yang dihadapi ini datang daripada pelbagai sudut.

Cabaran ini bukan terhad kepada pemimpin dan pemerintah sahaja tetapi cabaran ini dihadapi oleh rakyat biasa. Yang dalam demokrasi menentukan siapa yang dipilih untuk menjadi pemerintah. Kalau rakyat tidak bijak, tidak berpengetahuan, mudah terpengaruh, terlibat dengan rasuah, maka sudah tentulah rakyat, awal-awal lagi sudah gagal menghadapi cabaran. Dan akhirnya dia akan menyebabkan negara, pemerintah gagal menghadapi cabaran. Kita perlu kepada rakyat yang bijak yang tahu menilai antara baik dan buruk, tahu membuat penilaian supaya yang dipilih adalah yang berkebolehan. Walaupun kita tahu yang dipilih itu yang berhak bertanding tidak perlu mempunyai apa-apa *qualification*, apa-apa kelulusan, tetapi kalau kita buat pilihan tanpa menilai kelayakannya maka kita akan dapat pentadbir dan pentadbiran yang tidak mampu menghadapi cabaran-cabaran. Itu di peringkat rakyat. Kemudian di peringkat mereka yang dipilih pula, cabaran yang dihadapi ialah untuk membendung nafsu sendiri supaya tidak salahgunakan kuasa. Kemudian daripada itu, ianya perlu mempunyai pengetahuan yang cukup, kebolehan yang tertentu,

kebolehan yang tegap untuk menghadapi cabaran dalam negara ataupun diluar negara. Kalau ia mempunyai kebolehan yang tertentu, maka dapatlah negara ditadbir dengan baik kerana cabaran-cabaran dapat diatasi.

Kita melihat ada negara yang entah bagaimana dapat dimajukan, tetapi ada negara-negara yang tidak dapat dimajukan sehingga sekian lama. Kadang-kadang, ianya bukanlah semata-mata kerana tidak ada ilmu kepada rakyat ataupun kepada pemimpin. Kita perlu menyedarkan diri kita tentang pentingnya masa diberi. Masa untuk membuat sesuatu sebelum ianya dapat dijayakan. Ada sebuah negara di Asia Timur ini yang melantik Perdana Menterinya yang tidak dapat memenuhi atau menghabiskan masa yang ditentukan mengikut undang-undang ataupun konstitusi negara. Undang-undang membenarkan seorang perdana menteri mentadbir negara sekurang-kurangnya 5 tahun dan kemudian dapat dilantik semula dan mungkin dilantik semula. Kita tahu di Malaysia ini ada Perdana Menteri yang mentadbir selama 13 tahun, selama enam tahun, lima tahun dan ada pula yang memerintah sehingga 22 tahun. Di negara yang saya sebutkan tadi, kerana pendapat bahawa tiap seorang ahli parti berhak menjadi Perdana Menteri, Perdana Menteri duduk terlalu lama. Justeru itu, tiap dua tahun ditukarnya Perdana Menteri. Dan negara ini menghadapi masalah kemelesetan ekonominya dan selama 10 tahun, 12 tahun tidak dapat mengatasi resesi ini kerana pemimpin negara, Perdana Menteri hanya berada selama dua tahun. Dalam jangka masa dua tahun, tiap seorang yang menjadi Perdana Menteri menghabiskan satu tahun hanya untuk mengetahui tentang cara-cara pentadbiran, mungkin pada tahun yang keduanya dia dapat membentuk satu-satu dasar atau pendekatan untuk mengatasi masalah negara. Tetapi tamat dua tahun, dia tidak lagi menjadi Perdana Menteri dan dengan itu dasar yang dibentuk olehnya, pendekatan yang ditentukan olehnya untuk mengatasi masalah dalam negara tidak dapat dilaksanakan olehnya. Perdana Menteri yang baru tidak ingin mengikut ataupun melaksanakan dasar Perdana Menteri yang lepas kerana dia juga ingin namanya dicatat dalam sejarah sebagai orang yang membentuk dasar tertentu. Dengan itu, Perdana Menteri ini menghabiskan satu tahun mempelajari tentang pentadbiran, tahun kedua dianya membentuk pendekatan yang baru, tahun ketiga, orang lain ambil alih. Justeru itu, pendekatannya juga tidak dapat dilaksanakan.

Sebaliknya, apabila Perdana Menteri diberi masa yang cukup, maka ianya dapat merancang, membentuk pendekatan kemudiannya, mengawasi pelaksanaan pendekatannya sehinggalah berjaya pendekatannya. Ini semua mengambil masa dan seorang Perdana Menteri perlulah diberi masa. Namun demikian, kalaulah Perdana Menteri itu tidak menunjuk bakat barang sedikit pun kita juga tidak harus habiskan masa yang panjang untuk menunggu apa yang tidak akan berlaku. Ini sekali lagi bergantung kepada kebijaksanaan rakyat sendiri. Apakah rakyat akan menanti sehingga ternampak kejayaan namun kita, rakyat tahu tidak akan ada kejayaan yang akan dicapai. Sekali lagi kebijaksanaan rakyat sangat penting untuk menentukan cabaran-cabaran pentadbiran dapat diatasi oleh sesebuah kerajaan sesebuah negara.

Kita juga dapati bahawa sementara kita mempunyai pentadbir yang *permanent*, *permanent service* yang kekal, kadang-kadang mereka tidak begitu memahami apa yang dikehendaki kerajaan yang dibentuk kerana pemilihan oleh rakyat. Kita dapati di Malaysia

umpamanya, apabila pihak kabinet membuat keputusan, keputusan ini disampaikan kepada pentadbir supaya dilaksanakan. Kadang-kadang pentadbir tidak faham apa sebenarnya keputusan kerajaan dan dengan itu keputusan itu tidak dapat dijayakan. Sebagai contoh, kita telah membina dermaga-dermaga dan pelabuhan-pelabuhan yang canggih yang boleh digunakan oleh kapal yang terbesar, kapal kontena yang terbesar boleh masuk ke pelabuhan kita. Kita bina pelabuhan ini dengan belanja wang yang banyak tetapi selepas beberapa tahun kita dapati bahawa pelabuhan ini tidak digunakan. Kita belanja wang untuk mega projek ini tetapi ianya tidak digunakan. Setelah dikaji kita dapati bahawa pihak pemerintah, pihak yang mentadbir pelabuhan ini tidak begitu faham dan tidak mempunyai kebebasan untuk menjayakan pelabuhan ini. Dengan itu, maka menteri yang bertanggungjawab diarah supaya dia mengambil bahagian dalam pentadbiran secara langsung supaya dapat menjayakan pelabuhan-pelabuhan ini. Menteri mempunyai kebebasan tertentu, iaitu sedikit sebanyak dia dapat mengubah keputusan kabinet yang tidak begitu bijak ataupun tidak dapat dilaksanakan. Jika ianya hendak mengubah sehingga jauh daripada keputusan kabinet, ianya dapat melaporkan balik kepada kabinet dan menerangkan kenapa keputusan kabinet itu tidak dapat dilaksanakan. Kebebasan berbuat demikian tidak ada pada pentadbir. Pentadbir hanya menerima arahan dan mereka melaksanakan arahan itu tanpa menukar, tanpa membentuk keputusan yang lain. Menteri boleh. Sebab itu, apabila menteri disuruh untuk menentukan pelabuhan-pelabuhan kita diguna sepenuhnya, maka dianya dapat bertindak dengan lebih berkesan. Sebelum daripada itu, kita dapati seluruh pelabuhan di Malaysia hanya menangani satu million kontena setahun. Di Singapura *handle* sebanyak 12 *million*, 12 kali ganda apa yang ditangani ataupun *handle* oleh pelabuhan-pelabuhan yang banyak yang ada di Malaysia. Ini adalah satu keadaan yang tidak menyenangkan dan menteri diarah supaya meningkatkan penggunaan pelabuhan dan dermaga-dermaga yang telah kita bangunkan. Oleh kerana menteri bebas dan mempunyai status yang tinggi, maka dia dapat menghubungi secara langsung syarikat-syarikat perkapalan dan memujuk mereka supaya menggunakan pelabuhan kita di Port Klang dan juga di Tanjung Pelepas. Dan hari ini kita dapati bahawa antara Tanjung Pelepas dan Port Klang sahaja kita menangani, kita *handle* sebanyak 10 juta kontena setahun. Peningkatan sebanyak satu ribu peratus. Ini menunjukkan bahawa kita apabila dihadapkan dengan satu-satu cabaran, kita perlu mengkaji dan kita perlu memikirkan tentang pendekatan untuk mengatasi masalah tertentu. Kalau kita tidak bijak dalam usaha kita untuk menangani cabaran ini, maka kita tidak akan dapat satu pendekatan atau *solution* yang akan mendatangkan penyelesaian.

Banyak lagi cabaran-cabaran yang dihadapi oleh sesebuah negara, sesebuah pemerintahan dan cabaran-cabaran ini perlu diketahui secara mendalam daripada segi detailnya dan pemimpin kerajaan perlu mempunyai kebolehan memikirkan tentang pendekatan yang harus diambil untuk mengatasi cabarannya. Jika dianya tidak memikirkan pemikiran ataupun idea yang berkesan, maka ianya harus menggunakan pakar-pakar yang mempunyai pengetahuan dan maklumat dan pengalaman dalam bidang-bidang tertentu supaya dia dapat membentuk pendekatan supaya dapat menjayakan pentadbiran di negara kita. Saya berpendapat bahawa saya telah cuba membincang ataupun menyentuh perkara-perkara ataupun cabaran-cabaran tertentu yang dihadapi oleh sesebuah pemerintah ataupun kerajaan ataupun negara.

Sekarang ini tidak lain seperti saya katakan tadi. Pentadbiran tidak lagi terhad kepada *law and order* sahaja, penguasaan undang-undang dan peraturan sahaja. Kita sekarang ini bertanggungjawab kepada pembangunan negara dan pembangunan rakyat negara. Justeru itu, dia menjadi lebih *complicated*, lebih sukar untuk diatasi kerana bermacam-macam cabaran akan dihadapi oleh sesebuah pentadbiran. Dan tiap satu cabaran ini perlu ditangani mengikut cara-cara yang khusus baginya. Walaupun ada juga standard yang kita perlu tentukan, kenali untuk diguna untuk menghadapi cabaran-cabaran ini tetapi tiap satu cabaran mempunyai pendekatan tertentu. Saya dahulu semasa menjadi Perdana Menteri sering menggunakan pendekatan tertentu. Sebagai seorang yang terlatih dalam bidang perubatan, saya menggunakan pendekatan yang digunakan oleh "*practitioners of medicine*" untuk mengatasi masalah pesakit yang juga boleh digunakan untuk mengatasi masalah pentadbiran, cabaran pentadbiran. Apakah pendekatan pakar-pakar perubatan ataupun doktor-doktor perubatan? Yang pertamanya mesti kenal pasti apa sebenarnya cabarannya. Bagi seorang doktor, apa sebenarnya penyakit yang dialami oleh seorang pesakit. Untuk mengetahui apa penyakit yang menyerang pesakit ini, yang mulanya dengan mendapat maklumat tentang sejarah pesakit itu. Apakah yang menyerang pesakit itu dan kita tanya berkaitan dengan demam ataupun sakit ataupun pening ataupun cirit-birit ataupun apa-apa untuk mengetahui apa sebenarnya penyakit. Kita juga menggunakan pemeriksaan oleh doktor. Kemudian daripada itu, kita menggunakan *laboratory test*. Dan kadang-kadang kita juga bertanya kepada pakar-pakar yang lain dan akhirnya kita dapatlah tentukan apa dia penyakit ini. Mungkin kita dapat tentukan dua tiga penyakit yang sejenis dan kita perlu membuat kajian yang lebih mendalam. Mungkin juga kita terpaksa memberi ubat untuk mengikut apa yang diputuskan oleh kita dan dengan itu mungkin ubat itu mustajab dan dia akan pulih ataupun tidak pulih maka kita kaji semula sama ada diagnosis kita itu betul ataupun tidak. Dan kita pilih yang lain dan mungkin apabila kita sudah kenal pasti penyakit itu dengan tepat. Maka kita perlu pula memilih ubat yang boleh diguna kerana ubat juga bukan satu sahaja tetapi terdapat pelbagai jenis ubat dan satu penilaian dibuat untuk menentukan ubat mana yang berkesan kemudian barulah kita membuat prescription dan kemudian memasukkan dia ke dalam hospital dan membuat pembedahan dan lain-lain supaya kita dapat mengubati penyakit pesakit ini. Demikian juga dengan sesebuah negara. Apabila ianya menghadapi sesuatu cabaran, sesuatu penyakit sebenarnya, maka proses yang sama perlu dilalui. Iaitu mengetahui apa penyakit itu, memastikan secara tepat penyakit itu, menentukan segala pendekatan yang diperlukan dan mencuba mengubati penyakit itu dengan pendekatan yang dipilih. Kadang-kadang berjaya kadang-kadang tidak, kadang-kadang kita terpaksa menggunakan ubat yang lain ataupun membuat kajian yang lain untuk menentukan sama ada diagnosis kita itu betul tepat ataupun tidak. Jadi mungkin sebagai seorang doktor, saya berpendapat bahawa pengalaman saya sebagai seorang doktor berguna untuk menghadapi cabaran-cabaran dalam kerajaan. Dan ini adalah satu pendekatan yang boleh digunakan oleh sesiapa sahaja, bukan sahaja doktor-doktor. Hakikatnya ialah kita tidak boleh membuat sesuatu kebaikan melainkan kita tahu apa dianya masalah dan cara mana kita dapat mengatasi masalah itu.

Jadi, tuan-tuan dan puan-puan, saya fikir saya telah bercakap dengan panjang lebar berkenaan dengan cabaran-cabaran mentadbir sesebuah negara bukan sahaja Malaysia,

mungkin negara-negara lain juga dan mungkin ada ruang-ruang tertentu yang tidak disentuh oleh saya, mungkin lebih baik kalau pihak tuan-tuan, saudari-saudari membuat soalan dan saya akan cuba menjawabnya.



Tema yang dipilih ialah “Wawasan dalam Mengisi Kemerdekaan Negara”, dan sudah tentu tema ini amat tepat sekali kerana kita sudah menjangkau usia kemerdekaan 50 tahun. 50 tahun bukanlah satu jangka masa yang panjang tetapi ia mempunyai makna yang besar bagi kita kerana kita telah dijajah selama 450 tahun. Adakalanya yang kita tidak harap sama sekali untuk mencapai kemerdekaan, untuk memerintah negara kita sendiri kerana selama 450 tahun kita dijajah, bukan sahaja Negara yang dijajah, bukan sahaja wilayah kita yang dijajah, negeri-negeri Melayu yang dijajah tetapi pemikiran kita juga dijajah. Demikianlah penjajahan pemikiran kita sehingga kita percaya tidak mungkin kita dapat memerintah Negara kita sendiri. Kita harus bergantung kepada orang lebih bijak, lebih pintar daripada kita, khususnya orang-orang Inggeris dan juga bangsa-bangsa Eropah yang lain. Kita sudah hilang kepercayaan terhadap diri kita. Dan mungkin hari ini kita masih tidak merdeka jika tidak kerana satu peristiwa yang berlaku pada tahun 1946, sejeurus selepas perang dunia kedua. Pihak British yang kembali setelah Jepun kalah, mereka bercadang untuk membentuk satu Negara yang dipanggil dengan nama Malayan Union. Malayan Union ini ialah cantuman negeri-negeri Melayu di semenanjung bersama dengan tanah jajahan Straits Settlements, Pulau Pinang dan Melaka. Cantuman ini dipanggil Malayan Union, dan Malayan Union ini akan menjadi tanah milik British sepenuhnya dan akan diperintah sebenarnya dari London. Raja-raja Melayu akan dikenali sebagai raja tetapi taraf mereka tidak lebih daripada Chief Kadhi. Mereka tidak ada hak sama sekali terlibat dalam pemerintahan. Mereka hanya akan menjadi tunggul yang tidak ada kuasa sama sekali. Orang Melayu pula yang mendakwa bahawa Tanah Melayu ini adalah milik mereka. Mereka akan hilang keistimewaan ini dan Tanah Melayu akan dimiliki oleh sesiapa sahaja yang ingin menjadi rakyat Negara Malayan Union ini. Tidak ada keistimewaan, tidak ada pengiktirafan bahawa orang Melayu adalah tuan punya Negeri-negeri ini. Pada masa itulah, barulah berlaku satu kejutan yang menyebabkan orang Melayu yang biasanya setia kepada raja-raja mereka selama 450 tahun, mereka tidak pernah menyoal apa yang dibuat oleh raja-raja mereka, kalau nak diserahkan kepada kuasa asing, mereka terima, kalau raja bersetuju. Kalau nak diambil bahagian-bahagian daripada negeri-negeri Melayu, itupun rakyat Malaysia, khususnya orang-orang Melayu, raja-raja akan terima. Tetapi pada tahun 1946, apabila raja-raja Melayu telah menandatangani perjanjian Mac Michael yang menyerahkan negeri mereka kepada British, pada masa itu, rakyat raja-raja ini telah bangun dan menentang cadangan penyerahan ini. Itulah kali pertama, orang Melayu sebenarnya bangun sebagai satu bangsa untuk menuntut hak mereka. Dan raja-raja pula, tidak dapat menentang mereka kerana raja-raja telah menyerahkan negeri-negeri mereka kepada British, membuat sesuatu yang dianggap salah oleh rakyat-rakyat mereka. Untuk memendekkan cerita panjang ini, saya ingin sebut disini iaitu orang Melayu sudah tidak percaya lagi kepada kebijaksanaan raja-raja mereka dalam memerintah Negara, negeri-negeri Melayu dan Negeri-negeri Malaya ini. Justeru itu, mereka bercadang apabila mereka perjuangkan Malayan Union menuntut kepada Federation of Malaya dan kemudiannya menuntut kemerdekaan kepada Negara kita, mereka tidak hendak kembali kepada

sistem Feudal, dimana raja berkuasa penuh. Sebaliknya mereka menuntut Negara yang akan mencapai kemerdekaan ini akan amalkan sistem demokrasi kerana pada masa itu, kepercayaan orang-orang Melayu dan juga bangsa-bangsa lain di Malaysia ialah melalui demokrasi yang bermakna bahawa rakyat sebenarnya berkuasa maka dapatlah rakyat menentukan Negara kita ini diperintah oleh wakil-wakil yang dipilih oleh rakyat dan wakil-wakil yang dipilih oleh rakyat ini tentulah setia kepada rakyat dan akan menjalankan tugas mereka, untuk kepentingan rakyat. Sebab itulah mereka percaya yang Negara Malaya dan kemudiannya Malaysia, hendaklah ditadbir melalui sistem demokrasi. Apa dianya sistem demokrasi? Kalau diambil daripada partinya, sistem demokrasi ini ialah sistem dimana rakyat berkuasa. Bukanlah mereka akan memerintah tetapi mereka diberi kuasa untuk memilih wakil-wakil mereka yang akan membentuk kerajaan diperingkat nasional dan juga di peringkat negeri-negeri. Orang pilihan mereka yang akan memerintah Negara ini atas nama rakyat Malaysia. Itulah demokrasi. Kuasa yang ada kepada rakyat hanyalah sedikit sahaja. Tetapi ianya mempunyai makna yang besar. Kuasa yang ada pada rakyat hanyalah untuk memilih calon, mengundi untuk memilih siapa yang seharusnya memerintah Negara kita ini. Itu sahaja. Namun demikian, ia adalah satu kuasa yang amat penting sekali dalam Negara yang demokratik. Kuasa kata pepatah inggeris akan menyebabkan korupsi. *"Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely"*. Apabila kita anugerahkan kuasa kepada rakyat, maka kita menghadapi kemungkinan kuasa ini disalahgunakan. Kuasa ini diguna dengan cara tidak baik dan kalau mereka menggunakan cara yang tidak baik maka hasilnya tentulah tidak baik juga. Undi mereka hanya satu sahaja. Untuk memilih seorang wakil, tiap seorang rakyat di Negara kita ini hanya mempunyai satu undi sahaja. Tetapi ingat, kemenangan boleh jadi dengan satu undi sahaja. Sudah tentu, kerap kali kemenangan adalah dengan jumlah undi yang lebih besar, tetapi ini juga masih menentukan bahawa undi yang satu itulah yang berkuasa. Dalam sistem demokrasi yang kita amalkan, yang dipilih ialah calon yang mendapat majoriti, iaitu jumlah undi yang terbesar. Yang bertanding, calon yang mempunyai 51% undi akan menang. Yang mendapat 49% akan kalah, walaupun begitu dekat sekali. Kalau ada lebih daripada dua parti politik yang meletakkan calon, kita tidak perlu kepada jumlah 51%. Undi yang terbesar sekali ialah bagi pihak yang dianggap sebagai menang dalam pilihan raya. Mungkin dia mendapat hanya 40% sahaja, tetapi yang dua lain itu terbahagi lagi kepada 30%, jadi yang mendapat 40% ini ialah calon yang dianggap sudah menjadi wakil rakyat. Kadang-kadang kita dapati lebih ramai yang bertanding, calon-calon bebas, calon-calon parti-parti lain, sehingga ada empat atau lebih parti, dalam keadaan ini maka tidak lagi majoriti *absolute*, iaitu lebih 50% memberi kemenangan. Calon yang mendapat 30%, 25% pun boleh jadi wakil dan dilantik sebagai Yang Berhormat Wakil Rakyat. Ini menunjuk betapa pentingnya undi, yang kita beri kepada calon-calon ini dan undi ini berkuasa untuk menentukan siapa yang menang dan siapa yang kalah dan kuasa seperti saya sebutkan tadi, adalah sesuatu yang menyebabkan kemungkinan rasuah berlaku, korupsi berlaku.

Kita bernasib baik kerana pada mulanya walaupun ada juga korupsi, tetapi ianya tidaklah begitu berleluasa, terhad mungkin kepada tempat-tempat tertentu, tetapi kita lihat semakin lama, semakin banyak cara-cara mempengaruhi wakil, mempengaruhi pengundi, dengan cara yang haram, seperti memberi wang, seperti memberi sesuatu kepada pengundi supaya akan memberi undinya kepada pihak tertentu. Ini berlaku tetapi pada mulanya seperti saya

katakan tadi, tidak berleluasa, cuma mungkin di satu dua tempat sahaja, tetapi kita dapati bahawa semakin lama, semakin banyak pengaruh korupsi yang terdapat di Negara kita Malaysia ini. Kita dapati kadangkala wang dihulur dengan banyaknya untuk membeli undi, mungkin secara terbuka, mungkin kita tuduh parti lawan yang membuat kelakuan yang tidak baik ini kerana tidak mungkin mereka menang, tetapi di masa-masa yang lampau ini parti memerintah menggunakan sogokan wang kepada pengundi untuk mendapat kemenangan yang mereka tentu akan menyangkal, parti lawan juga menyangkal. Tetapi rakyat tahu. Kita tahu, saya tahu kerana saya juga menjadi mangsa korupsi. Bukan besar, hanya pemilihan untuk menjadi wakil ke Mesyuarat Agong UMNO. Kita ingin hantar 7 orang daripada satu bahagian, dan saya bertandinglah dibahagian saya sendiri, dimana saya telah menjadi wakil rakyat selama 22 tahun lebih. Ramai daripada ahli-ahli UMNO disitu, begitu sekali setia kepada saya, berikrar agar sokong saya sampai bila-bila, sampai mati. Mereka cium tangan saya, ada yang menangis pun bila saya letak jawatan, tetapi malangnya hanya dengan membayar wang sebanyak RM200, saya dikalahkan. Saya tidak dapat cukup undi untuk jadi bukan wakil rakyat, bukan jadi wakil rakyat yang berpotensi untuk menjadi Perdana Menteri, tetapi untuk menjadi wakil ke Mesyuarat Agong UMNO. Saya sedih kerana ini mencerminkan pemikiran yang ada dalam kalangan pengundi-pengundi dalam UMNO. Kalau inilah pendirian mereka, menjual undi dengan harga RM200, satu hari mereka akan jual undi kepada siapa sahaja yang bayar wang yang banyak kepada mereka. Lebih buruk lagi ialah apabila bukti menunjukkan bahawa sebenarnya, wang ini memang diberi. Orang yang menerima wang ini mendakwa mereka menerima wang supaya tidak mengundi saya. Tetapi jawatankuasa berkenaan telah membersihkan proses ini. Kononnya tidak ada rasuah dalam perkara ini. Apabila ini berlaku, maka tidak ada lagi sekatan terhadap budaya menjual undi. Hari ini untuk memilih ahli yang akan mewakili bahagian dalam UMNO tetapi apa akan jadi kepada Negara kita ini apabila pengundi-pengundi amnya akan mengundi mengikut bayaran yang diterima oleh mereka. Tidak banyak. Ada cerita kata diberi RM 1000 seorang. Akan dinafikan sekeras-kerasnya tetapi kita tahu ini sebenarnya berlaku. Apabila kita mengundi kepada seorang calon yang memberi wang kepada kita, kemungkinan ialah kita memilih calon yang tidak baik, calon yang sebenarnya terlibat dengan rasuah. Calon yang terlibat dengan rasuah tidak mungkin menjadi pemimpin yang baik, mendirikan kerajaan yang baik. Sudah tentu Negara kita ini akan rosak jika pemimpin atasan terdiri daripada orang yang menggunakan rasuah untuk mendapatkan tempat, dan untuk mengeluarkan rasuah mungkin juga ada perkara yang curang yang dilakukan. Akhirnya, Negara kita ini akan diperintah oleh rasuah. Orang yang mendapat tempat kerana memberi, dan mereka setelah mengeluarkan bayaran yang begitu besar, ingin mendapatkan keuntungan kepada mereka dan mengenyepikan kepentingan Negara. Kita tahu ada di negara tertentu dimana amalan rasuah ini menjadi perkara biasa. Apabila rasuah diterima oleh masyarakat, sudah diterima bahawa untuk membuat sesuatu mestilah kita bayar sagu hati tertentu. Dalam keadaan ini tentulah banyak urusan-urusan kehidupan kita akan terganggu. Untuk mendapat sesuatu daripada kerajaan, kita terpaksa hulur. Mungkin kepada yang bawah, mungkin juga kepada yang atas, atas sekali, untuk mendapat kontrak umpamanya, untuk mendapat lesen, untuk mendapat AP, semuanya perlu kepada sogokan rasuah. Apa akan jadi kepada Negara kita. Mungkinkah kita mempunyai wawasan yang kita sebutkan tadi? Bolehkah Negara kita ini dimajukan apabila kita mempunyai pemerintah yang terdiri daripada calon-calon yang telah mengeluarkan bayaran untuk undi? Sogokan untuk undi. Sudah tentu kita

mempunyai pemerintahan yang korup. Apabila kita mempunyai kerajaan yang dipilih, yang korup, maka mereka akan menjadi contoh, dan mengizinkan kakitangan kerajaan kalau mereka korup, kerana kadang-kadang mereka terpaksa menggunakan kakitangan kerajaan untuk melindungi mereka. Ini apabila ianya berlaku maka akan runtuhlah pemerintahan. Maka akan kembalilah kita pada zaman-zaman dahulu dimana semua pegawai kerajaan terlibat dalam rasuah. Kita lihat ada Negara-negara tertentu yang tidak perlu disebut pun namanya, yang mana segala-segalanya perlu kepada sogokan. Tak ada sesuatu kerja pun yang akan berjalan melainkan ada sogokan. Sepanjang jalan daripada yang sekecilnya kepada yang berperingkat menteri dan sebagainya. Ini sudah tentu akan menyebabkan Negara tidak dapat dibangunkan dan sesungguhnya negara-negara yang saya sebut ini tidak dapat dibangunkan walaupun Negara-negara ini kaya dengan sumber alam, kaya daripada macam-macam punca, tetapi Negara mereka tidak dapat dibangunkan, maka huru-hara berlaku, kadang-kadang rusuhan berlaku, semuanya kerana kita memilih wakil kita daripada orang yang menggunakan rasuah. Sebab itu, saya sebutkan tadi bahawa undi kita yang satu itu amat penting sekali. Kita harus tahu kenapa kita memberi undi kepada orang ini. Adakah ini bermakna kita setia kepada parti kita sehingga kalau yang perasuah diletak sebagai calon pun saya akan undi? Tidak kira siapa yang diletak. 450 tahun kita dijajah kerana kesetiaan secara buta tuli kepada raja-raja kita, terutama orang Melayu kita kata, Melayu tidak akan menderhaka kepada raja. Memang satu pegangan yang kukuh kerana ada juga pepatah Melayu yang kata raja adil, raja disembah, raja zalim raja disanggah. Tetapi dalam sejarah Melayu, tidak ada peristiwa-peristiwa yang mana rakyat memberontak, melawan raja. Hanya Sultan Mahmud sahaja yang mati dijulang. Sikap itu masih ada pada kita. Kita tidak peduli apapun yang diletak depan kita maka kita setia dan kita akan pilih. Ini akan merosakkan Negara kita.

Demokrasi sememangnya sistem pemerintahan kerajaan yang terbaik yang biasa dicipta. Dahulu kita mempunyai sistem beraja, sistem Feudal, sistem dictatorship juga ada di Negara-negara tertentu. Di antara sistem-sistem pemerintahan ini, yang terbaik ialah sistem demokrasi. Sistem ini menentukan rakyat boleh menaikkan sesiapa, menjatuhkan sesiapa, hanya dengan mengundi. Tidak perlu perang, tidak perlu membunuh, tetapi haruslah kita bijak mengundi. Jika tidak, jika kita menjual maruah dengan RM 200 ataupun lebih, maka kita tidak akan dapat mendirikan pemerintahan yang baik. Saya tidak lagi menjadi Perdana Menteri. Mungkin juga akan ada orang yang berkata pada masa awak dulupun ada juga. Mungkin ada, saya tidak kata tidak ada. Melawan rasuah adalah satu perkara yang amat sukar sebabnya ialah tidak ada pengakuan, tidak ada sesiapa yang mengaku dan sukar sekali untuk membuktikan pengakuan itu berasas ataupun tidak. Kita telah lihat di Negara kita ini, perbicaraan berkenaan dengan beberapa orang melakukan rasuah. Tetapi, berapa banyakkah yang sudah didapati bersalah dan dipenjarakan? Bertahun-tahun perbicaraan berlaku tetapi sukar sekali untuk menentukan salah atau tidak pihak yang dituduh. Baru-baru ini kita baca dalam akhbar tentang seorang timbalan menteri yang dikatakan menerima RM 5 million itu melepaskan tiga orang penjenayah. Akhirnya, ianya dikatakan bersih daripada tuduhan itu kerana penjenayah yang dibebaskan itu, tidak memberi rasuah. Dalam akhbar kita baca, pihak AG berkata oleh kerana penjenayah tidak mengaku yang dia memberi rasuah, maka tidak ada kes, maka kes ini ditutup. Jadi kalau kita dapati penjenayah berkata saya tidak melakukan jenayah, dengan itu kita tutup kes,

tidak adalah kes. Katalah kita tahu satu orang ini telah membunuh orang, dan kita tanya pembunuh, dan pembunuh tidak mengaku, maka tidak ada kes. Ini bukan cerita dongeng, ini berlaku. Dilapor dalam akhbar bahawa pihak AG berkata bahawa kes ini ditutup kerana pihak yang dituduh memberi rasuah kepada timbalan menteri ini berkata dia tidak memberi rasuah. Dengan itu, tidak ada kes. Dua lagi yang bebas yang dituduh memberi rasuah kepada timbalan menteri ini hilang. Jadi tiada kes juga. Saya dapati bukan saya sahaja yang nampak peliknya keputusan ini. Semalam saya terbaca dalam akhbar Sunday Star sebuah rencana yang ditulis oleh bekas IGP. Bekas ketua polis Negara, KPN Tun Hanif Omar. Semasa dia menjadi IGP tiada tuduhan terhadapnya. Selepas dia berhenti, tiada kuasa tiada juga tuduhan. Sekarang dia sedang menulis buku *"the fence that eats the rice"*, pagar makan padi. Dia berasa amat kecewa kerana pihak yang diberi kuasa untuk melindungi masyarakat daripada jenayah nampaknya terlibat dalam jenayah. Ini menjadi buah mulut ramai rakyat. Demikianlah disebutkan di sini, *"the police force and the anti-corruption agency, two crucial institutions leading the fight against bad practices corruption, yet they are sadly disappointing in their inability to even clean up their own back yards"*. Ada juga yang dicatit disini, *"40% of senior officers could be arrested without further investigation strictly on the basis of their lifestyle"*. Ini mungkin ditujukan kepada pihak polis, tetapi apakah tidak terkena kepada pihak lain, pegawai, menteri-menteri dan sebagainya? Apakah *lifestyle* mereka? Kita harus tahu bolehkah kerana *lifestyle* mereka juga, mereka harus ditangkap tanpa penyelidikan yang lain? Kita gaji dapat gaji lebih lah, pegawai kerajaan dapat gaji lebih, hidup lebih mewah sikit tetapi mewah pun tak lah keterlaluan. Ini satu rencana yang ditulis oleh seorang yang tidak ada kepentingan. Saya khuatir mungkin dia juga akan kena sesuatu tindakan. Saya harap tidaklah. Dia berkata berkenaan dengan perkara-perkara yang sedang berlaku ini. *"Whom can we believe when one group is aided by the IGP and the other by a police director backed by the Deputy Minister of Internal Security"*. Ini satu pertanyaan yang amat bermakna. Siapa yang kita nak percaya? IGP ataupun *director* polis yang disokong oleh seorang timbalan menteri, *Deputy Minister of Internal Security*. Laporan yang dibuat oleh ACA, kita tak tahu. Apa yang kita tahu, *what we know is that the AG has absolved both of them so between the two whom are we to believe?* AG kata tidak salah, IGP kata tak salah, timbalan menteri pun tak salah juga. Tapi tuduhan dalam artikel ini yang lebih dahsyat ialah *the AG himself has lost his credibility for his recalcitrance and for his defeats in recent high profile cases as well as high profile police cases, not seeing the lights of day after so long in his hands*. Kata dia lagi, *let me say it here, you will not stamp out corruption by only giving talks or tackling only the lower rankers*. Cakap je tak jadi. Lebih-lebih lagi kalau kita secara terbuka mengamalkan korupsi. Memberi sogokan kepada pengundi. Kita sudah sampai kepada tahap ini. Bukan cuma hati jahat kerana saya tidak menjadi perdana menteri nak kata orang lain tidak baik lah. Saya tiada kepentingan lagi tetapi saya berdukacita terhadap kemerosotan moral di Negara kita. Sesuatu bangsa tidak akan maju melainkan diannya memiliki moral yang tinggi, memegang kepada nilai-nilai hidup yang mulia. Kalau dia berpendapat bahawa menerima korupsi merupakan perkara ringan, mereka menganggap mereka seorang sahaja yang mendapat sogokan. Apabila semua menerima sogokan, maka semua pengundi menerima korupsi. Tidak lama lagi kita akan ada pilihan raya sekali lagi dan percayalah mereka akan datang dengan wang yang banyak untuk beli undi kita. Ingatlah apabila kita mengundi kerana terima wang, kita tolong menghancurkan Negara kita sendiri. Kita, pada ulangtahun yang ke-50 kemerdekaan ini,

kita memasang bendera. Tetapi yang lebih penting ialah kita gunakan kebijaksanaan kita untuk menentukan siapakah yang akan memerintah Negara kita. Pilih orang yang salah maka kita akan terima padahnya. Kita yang akan menjadi mangsa. Kalau kita ingin mengisi kemerdekaan, kita boleh isi kemerdekaan itu dengan tindakan kita. Selain daripada tidak mengundi orang yang cuba sogok wang kepada kita. Selain daripada menolak sebarang cara rasuah, kita juga perlu amalkan cara-cara yang baik. Kadang-kadang kita bukan nak buat yang baik tetapi agak ringan sahaja. Tetapi dirinya salah.

Saya semasa perdana menteri dahulu, membuka sebuah restoran Jepun, Fimarante dan kita ada pekerja-pekerja orang kita. Mereka bekerja situ dapat gaji, adalah pendapatan sikit, tetapi entah kenapa mereka suka mencuri barang-barang kecil. Kita yang beragama Islam tahu ada orang tengok, Tuhan tahu, Tuhan tengok. Kita berkata kita bertaqwa tetapi kita tak takut mengambil benda yang bukan milik kita. Kadang-kadang kalau kita menjadi penonton, kita ambil benda yang bukan milik kita. Daripada perkara yang kecil, dia akan menjadi besar. Kalau kita membaca akhbar, kerap kali kita dengar orang mengambil wang bukan haknya. Ini berpunca daripada tindakan yang dianggap ringan tadi. Apabila sesuatu itu menjadi budaya kita, kita akan melakukan perkara yang lebih buruk. Apabila membesar dan bekerja, maka kita nampak tak akan lah orang nak tahu, ambil sikit. Dari jumlah yang sikit menjadi lebih banyak. Ini soal moral. Kalau kita tidak pegang kepada moral yang tinggi, maka kita tetap tidak akan berjaya. Orang tidak akan hormati kita. Tadi rasuah, sekarang perkara-perkara yang dianggap sebagai kecil tetapi akhirnya akan membawa padah kepada kita. Kita akan terlibat dengan perbuatan jenayah yang akhirnya akan menyebabkan kita dihadapkan ke mahkamah mungkin dipenjara. Di surat khabar, akhir-akhir ini, orang biasa, kadang-kadang pegawai, mereka sudah dihadapkan di mahkamah, disabit bersalah kerana mengambil barang bukan hak mereka. Jadi kalau kita ingin mengisi kemerdekaan, jika wawasan kita adalah supaya menjadi Negara maju, maka kualiti rakyat Negara ini mesti dipertingkatkan. Kualiti bermakna bukan sahaja kebolehan tertentu tetapi moral yang tinggi. Kita tidak dengan mudahnya melakukan sesuatu jenayah walaupun jenayah itu kecil dan kita percaya kita tidak akan dikesan dan berhadapan dengan tindakan tertentu. Inilah kualiti yang diperlukan. Apabila kita rayakan ulang tahun yang ke-50 ini, dan apabila kita rayakan ini tentu juga kita akan berfikir tentang apa yang kita akan lihat 50 tahun akan datang. Sudah tentu kita ingin lihat Negara berjaya. Sudah tentu kita ingin lihat Negara diisi, rakyat berpengalaman, berpengetahuan, berkebolehan supaya rakyat dapat membangunkan Negara supaya maju. Negara tidak akan maju dengan sendiri. Ianya tidak datang bergolek, tidak datang melayang. Kitalah yang akan membangunkan Negara kita ini. Kita mesti ada moral tinggi, ilmu pengetahuan, kecekapan tertentu. Kalau kita tidak ada kebolehan ini, maka kita tetap tidak akan dapat mengisi kemerdekaan kita dimasa akan datang supaya Negara kita menepati wawasan yang telah kita tentukan bagi Negara kita iaitu pada tahun 2020. Kita akan jadi sebuah Negara maju. Ini akan menjadi angan-angan Mat Jenin. Melainkan kalau kita betul-betul berusaha melengkapkan diri kita dengan ilmu, moral yang tinggi, berusaha mengelak daripada sebarang jenis jenayah terutamanya jenayah korupsi, jenayah rasuah. Walaupun kecil, hanya menjual satu undi dgn RM 200, bukan Dr Mahathir nak mati kalau dia tidak dapat pergi ke UMNO, setakat itu sahaja, kita menilai maruah kita. Bangsa yang tidak tahu menjaga maruah mereka, mereka tetap akan menjadi bangsa yang mundur, bangsa yang dihina oleh orang lain, bangsa yang akan dijajah sama ada secara langsung

ataupun secara tidak langsung. Negara ini akan diperintah oleh orang lain, bahkan Negara ini akan tunduk kepada kuasa-kuasa asing walaupun kuasa asing itu tidaklah begitu besar. Saya berpendapat bahawa setakat ini, kita telah berjaya juga. UTP ini jika kita tidak berjaya kita tahu ada Negara-negara lain yang mempunyai syarikat petroleum nasional mereka, tak panggil PETRONAS panggil dengan nama lain, mereka mempunyai lebih banyak minyak untuk dijual, untuk dikeluarkan, tetapi lihat, apakah mereka dapat menjadi sebuah syarikat terkenal seperti PETRONAS ini. Daripada sebuah syarikat kebangsaan, syarikat petroleum kebangsaan, kita sudah jadi sebuah syarikat antarabangsa. Bergerak di lebih daripada 40 buah negeri. Mengeluarkan minyak, mengadakan industri-industri yang diasaskan minyak dan gas dimerata tempat dan kita lihat pegawai-pegawai yang sanggup bekerja di tempat-tempat yang terpencil di padang pasir umpamanya, tak mungkin PETRONAS menjadi sebuah syarikat antarabangsa, sama dengan syarikat-syarikat antarabangsa yang gergasi, tidak mungkin dia menjadi melainkan dia diurus dengan baik. Kita terpaksa bayar gaji besar, itupun ada juga yang lari. Kita tidak dapat membayar seperti Qatar bayar. Itupun lebih banyak daripada pegawai kerajaan, tetapi yang utama ialah budi kita. Ini budaya orang Melayu yang amat mulia tetapi lebih berada di bibir mulut daripada di hati. Kita tahu pepatah Melayu ataupun pantun Melayu, Pulau Pandan jauh ketengah, Gunung Daik bercabang tiga, hancur badan dikandung tanah, budi yang baik dikenang juga. Pisang emas dibawa belayar, jatuh sebiji diatas peti, hutang emas boleh dibayar, hutang budi dibawa mati. Jadi, kita orang Melayu ini pegang kuat kepada pantun, bukan kepada isi kandungan pantun tetapi pegang kuat kepada pantun. Ucapan ada pantun, lebih baik. Jadi, budi yang baik, membalas budi ini adalah satu budaya yang mulia, kalau ada orang yang memberi sesuatu kepada kita, kalau kita dapat kerja dengan gaji besar, kita balas dengan memberi khidmat dengan baik. Janganlah kalau ada orang offer bagi gaji lebih, kitapun tinggallah, walhal, kita tidak sampai ke tempat itu, jika tiada yang berbudi kepada kita. Itulah nilai hidup yang mulia, yang perlu ada pada diri kita.

NATIONAL IDENTITY AND POWER SHARING

16 October 2008

The subject is a little bit difficult to discuss because there are many sensitivities. At some stage I maybe accused of being racist but I would like to say what I think is the true facts and it is only by facing the true facts that we can resolve the problems that we have.

On this question of National Identity, we in Malaysia find some difficulties. This is because Malaysia is not like most other countries. Most other countries are single ethnics. But Malaysia is multiethnic. It has not only Malays, Chinese and Indian but we also have Iban, Kadazan, Bajay and etc. this makes it very difficult for us in Malaysia to create an identity that is acceptable to everyone. We find that any attempt to gather everybody under one identity becomes very difficult because each and every one of us want to retain our own special identity.

National Identity is relatively a new thing. In the past, there were no nation states. Instead, there were principalities, ruled by princesses, dukes, all kinds of rulers. In Malaysia, we are ruled by Rajas and Sultans. We are loyal to our own Rajas and Sultans just as the Europeans and other Asians' are loyal to their overlords. Sometimes, these overlords are very powerful and in some cases, the overlords, the powerful leaders of particular small states would be so powerful as to overcome all the other states where the people are from the same ethnic origin. A good example would be Italy. Until Garibaldi came uniting different states in Italy, there was no Italy. There was Rome, Milan, Naples all ruled by their own leaders or chiefs. But Garibaldi forced all the states to come together in order to make up the country or the nation that we now know as Italy. It is the same as Germany. Germany too was also divided into Prussian, Bavaria and many other states, but it was eventually united under one National Identity where the population is basically Germans who spoke the same language. So in fact, the concept of nation states is quite new. Even in Japan, it was like that. In Malaysia, we are divided into subjects to different rulers. So there was no National Identity. There was the subjects of the Kedah's ruler, subjects of the Kelantan's ruler and other rulers. But there was no real Malaysian subject and certainly no Malaysian identity. Now eventually, after the last war, the people struggle in order to build a single state to unite all the state in the Peninsular into one country, one nation.

Just like what happen in Italy and in Germany and in Japan, Malaysia became a nation but it is not the same as most other countries that I have mentioned. Most of these countries are single ethnic. They are divided into subjects of different overlords but they all speak Italian, they identify themselves as from the Italian ethnic group. It is the same with Germany, it is the same with Japan even it is the same with China. Of course China is quite unique in that the people are divided not really by region but also by language and dialects but they all regard themselves as Chinese and eventually the warlords of China manage to unite all these states in China into one country to have a

National Identity. Incidentally, China was not united by the Chinese but by the Mongols. The Mongols conquered China and it was during the period of Kublai Khan that the North and South were united to form the country that we now call China. After that, there is a National, Chinese National Identity.

Malaysia came late, and it was late because we are not a single ethnic country. We in Malaysia are people of very different races, Malays, Chinese, Indians, Ibans and the likes. But the problem is made more complex because these races have different languages, different cultures, different religions and more importantly different levels of wealth. Some are very poor, some are very rich but the poor and rich are each identified by their racial origins. This makes it difficult for us to unite under one race or National Identity. For example, let's take Australia. Australia of course, originally belonged to the Aborigines. But the Europeans came and conquered Australia, practically eliminating the Aborigines. They then establish the nation that we now know as Australia. It is a country founded by the English speaking people and they were the dominant race in Australia. They were the first race to colonise Australia. People who came later had to conform to these, to the definition of an Australian, that is an Australian must be English speaking, must have the culture basically of European origin and they have certain features which define them as Australians. I was in Australia recently. I was in Melbourne where I met a very unique group of Muslims. These are not white Australians. These are black, brown and yellow Australians but these Muslims have a starters school in Australia. One would have thought that they would choose the language of their country of origin as the medium of teaching but in Australia, all school whether German aided use the Australian version of English as their medium of instruction. They don't have any Indian school, Indian Australian schools or Korean Australian schools or Vietnamese Australian schools. They have only Australian schools where the language medium is English and as a result these people identify themselves as the main body of Australians. The majority is the people of European origin and in the case of Australia; they speak the Australian version of English.

I was startled when I attended this dinner given by the Australian Muslims. I had my back to the speaker at the rostrum and I heard a very Australian voice speaking about the function. If not looking at him, I wouldn't know that he was not a white Australian. He is actually an Arab Australian but you cannot distinguish him from the voice and the way he speaks, the strain the language evolves, the English language that is used in Australia. He sounded very much like an Australian speaking English the way the Australians speak English. It was the same as a lady who was also not a white Australian Muslim but a Lebanese but she spoke with the same Australian accent. So if you don't look at the features, at the face, you would assume that they are Australians, white Australians. It is much easier for them to identify themselves as Australians because they speak the same language, they have the same culture with some addition of their own cultures and they move around as Australians. So National Identity for them is not too difficult. Although there is still the feeling that Australians that are not white are not really Australians but believe me that in two generations, the children will be really fully blooded Australians. Therefore, the question of National Identity is not going to be a problem.

The other factor of course is that the main group, the majority is very big, so big that it can literally impose its power on the minorities. Immigrants are from Malaysia, Indonesia and China. The immigrants allow themselves to be assimilated to become Australians despite the fact that the colour of their skin and their basic religion and culture are different from the majority of Australians who are mainly white people. Of course the problem of National Identity is not so easily solved even in Australia where people of different origin, races have absorbed the Australian culture, language and behaviour and habits of the Australians.

You can see that if a country is a single ethnic, then the problem of National Identity is not a big problem. It is almost natural for them to consider themselves as one identity. If they are Russians, they consider themselves as Russians, if they are Germans, they consider themselves as Germans, if they are Japanese, they consider themselves as Japanese, if they are Koreans, they consider themselves as Koreans, if they are Chinese, they consider themselves as Chinese. All of them find no difference at all in accepting their National Identity.

But, we have a problem in Malaysia. We have a problem because Malaysia is multiracial. Therefore, we are faced with this problem of integrating this multiracial population. It was assumed at the beginning that Malaysian identity would mean the identity of the people who not only live in Malaysia but who has accepted the language and part of the culture of the indigenous people. That was what the indigenous people felt at the beginning. They thought that as in other countries that people who came later would accept the culture, language of the majority and be absorbed or assimilated by them. It is not such a strange thing because if you look back into the history, into the history of Malacca, Penang and Singapore, you will find that the early migrants into Malaysia, who are not Malays, they accepted the Malay language and much of the culture of the Malays. We talk about the Baba's and Nyonya's. They are almost extinct now but in those days when the number of immigrants was small and majority of the people were Malays, indigenous Malays, and the tenancy of the indigenous people. That is why among the Baba's and Nyonya's, we find that they couldn't speak a word of Chinese, they spoke Malay and they accept a lot of the Malay culture in terms of dressing. Chinese normally wear their own dresses such as Cheongsam and Sam Foo but these Baba's and Nyonya's, they wear sarongs and the ladies wear kebayas and they would speak Malay and they would appreciate Malay music etc. That was because the community was very small and it would seem that they were partially assimilated by the Malays.

The question of National Identity at that time did not arise but of course at that time we also didn't have the country we call Malaysia. We had many Malay states and the people who were migrating to Malaysia, they were not considered as citizens or subjects of the Malaysian rulers. Nevertheless, they were closely identified with the country and with the culture of the indigenous people and they all speak the language of the indigenous people. However, this small community grew by leaps and bounds and the British rules. Now, the British were not thinking about the problem that will arise when you have a multiracial population. They were interested in building up the economy of this country and making money for themselves. So they allowed an inflow of migrants so much that go at one time there were actually less Malay indigenous people than the people who came from outside Malaysia. If at that time,

this country had demanded independence, we would be like Singapore where the Malays would make up the minority. And the identity of the independent nation would not be what we see today. Certainly, you would not be as diverse as we are today. But in 1929, 1930, there was a worldwide recession and the rubber industry, the tin industry collapsed. Many of the migrants went back to their own countries. The result was that the Malay indigenous people who were in the minority became once again the majority but only a small majority. At the time when we struggled for independence, the Malays make up only 52% of the population, the rest was of the Chinese origin, Indian origin.

Now, you can imagine how different it would be if the Malays tried to assimilate or absorb this foreign immigrant population. It is just impossible. Nevertheless, we thought if we can have one common language then perhaps that would bring us together but what happened to us was that each group wants to maintain its own identity and school system, language, culture and as a result, it is difficult in Malaysia to have a single National Identity. Still, we have to make do with what we can do. Of course, we may struggle and try to force people to be absorbed or assimilated with the locals but the locals, but the Malay indigenous people are very small in number and the immigrant population are too large for the Malays to absorb. Now, I say the immigrant population because that is the origin. I am not saying that the current Chinese populations, Indian population in Malaysia are immigrants but let's accept it that they came from a country that are called China and India. Yes, I would agree that the Malays too have absorbed foreign elements. Many Malays has Indian blood, Arab blood and now many Malays have even European blood. There are people who, if they look back into the past, they will discover that they are not totally indigenous. But there is a difference. These people not only blend with the Malays in the country, not only do they accept the identity as Malays or other indigenous people, but they actually speak the language and have the same culture and practices and also they are all Muslims.

Now, the Malaysian constitution states that Malay is a person who habitually speaks Malay, practices Malay culture and tradition and is a Muslim. If we have those three things, then you become Malay, Legally, you are Malay even if you have different antecedents. Your grandfather or father may be non-Malay but if you accept the language, speak the language and the culture and is a Muslim then you are Malay. If we follow that, if people of the Chinese origin, Indian origin were to accept these, they would become Malays. Legally, they would become Malays but they choose not to accept. As we know many Indians who are Muslims who came here married Malays and today, you cannot distinguish them. You cannot distinguish them from Malays. Of course, some people will say who are you to speak, you also have Indian blood. I mean I have Indian blood but to find people who are pure Malays are very difficult now, because Malaysia is at the cross roads between the East and the West. Since ancient times, traders came and passed Malaysia on the way to trade with each other. They came from India, Arab, China and they passed the Straits of Malacca, passed next to the Peninsular and because of the Monsoon, they have to stop in Malaysia to wait for the winds to change. When they stop in Malaysia, they find life quite good and some of them decided to settle down in Malaysia and many of them married Malays and became Malays in terms of their language, culture, religion. That is why today, most Malay are mixed, but that does not mean that they are not indigenous.

Anybody who wishes to be Malay can literally change himself by adopting Malay as their home language and practices Malay culture and traditions, customs as well as become a Muslim. But the line is drawn between religion of the Malays and the religions of the others, which makes it difficult for them to convert and become Malays. In any case they do not wish to convert; they want to retain their identity. They want to remain as Chinese, Indian. They want to have Chinese schools, Tamil language schools, they want their own culture and unfortunately in some cases, they want to stay apart from the Malays. That makes it very difficult for us to unite and integrate them as can easily happen in a single ethnic group. In a multi-ethnic country, if the different ethnic group insists on their original identification, then of course we cannot have a National Identity, We would have to be multiple National Identity.

Now, there is a saying that at the beginning, the Malays thought that on achieving independence, they would be able to assimilate the non-Malays. But this has not happened and does not look as if it's going to happen. People want to remain separated, this is their wish. We can of course try to use force but this is not going to be good for the country, for any country if you use force. If people want to retain their identity, they should be allowed to retain their identity. Nevertheless, they can still be loyal to the country. They can still be Malaysian and that is why our National Identity is rather diverse, not a single National Identity. Maybe in the distant future, there will be a single National Identity, but at the moment we are still separated. We still speak different languages at home, we still practice different culture and we belong to different races, different religions, but we must not allow these differences to prevent us from identifying ourselves with the country in which we live and the country that we live in is obviously Malaysia. And our National Identity is that of a Malaysian, We are all Malaysian whether we speak Indian, Chinese, Kadazan, Malay or whatever.

A strange thing has happened because I noticed when in this country the fact of being different is always laid out. People talk about Chinese and Indians and Malays. But when they are abroad and asked by the people 'who are you', their answers are not "I am a Chinese or I am an Indian or I am Malay but I am a Malaysians". So there is clearly a feeling that they belong to the country. It does not matter that they have different culture and different languages but they feel that they are Malaysians. To the rest of the world, they are Malaysians. It is only when they come back to the country; they became conscious of the difference in races. That is about how much that we can achieve in this multiracial country. We can try of course, to force or recognise only the Malay speaking, culturally Malay cultured Muslims are Malaysians. But that is not going to work.

The fact is that this country has people but it is a people of different races and each one of them has played a role in the development of the country. They have contributed to the process and development of Malaysia. We cannot imagine a Malaysia that is prosperous as it is now without the Chinese entrepreneurs and the business people building up the economy. All the contributions by the Indians, mostly lawyers of course, but in other fields also. Indian professionals contribute towards the wealth, the development of the country. The Malays are the principle administrators of this country. We may not agree or think that the contributions of each community are not the same. Well, some Chinese might say that they build up this country, look at all the towns. They are built by us. The Malays would say

we were the original people and we administer this country so have the rights and of course Indians have their own claims. But, the fact is that Malaysia is built up by these 3 races, the indigenous people which include Malays, Chinese and Indians. If we are prepared to accept this, then we can have the National Identity that we are looking for. We don't have to be single ethnic. It is alright if some of us are Chinese or Indians or Malays for as long as we consider ourselves as citizens of this country. If you consider yourself as the loyal citizen of the country then your National Identity is that of a Malaysian.

But there are problems. We cannot have one race very advanced and the other race backwards. That is going to cause a lot of conflicts. In a single ethnic country, the disparity between rich and poor is sufficient to cause conflicts. Conflicts between the rich and the poor. That is why the communists and the socialist ideology were introduced. In Europe, 200 or 150 years ago, there was a conflict between the same ethnic group but divided because of wealth. There were the entrepreneur and the capitalist classes and working class. In Britain, there were rich people who owned factories and industries and poor people who work in these industries. The disparity is very big. The rich are very rich and the poor are very poor. Because of the disparity, there was conflict between the rich and the poor. It was in this situation that Karl Marx came up with the idea of Communism. Communism means eliminating the entrepreneurs, business people, capitalist, eliminating them, taking over all the industries as government owned them. Of course, whatever profits that comes from these industries will be shared among everyone including the workers. In theory, that was fine, but industries strive if all the people are rich. If all the people are poor workers, they cannot buy most of the products produced and therefore the industries have failed. Therefore, you can see that there is some kind of synergy or relation between the rich and poor, between workers and capitalist. Even if the workers and capitalists belong to the same race, still there will be extreme conflict to the point where we know, in Russia, millions of people were killed in order to communise it. Millions of rich people were killed because they want the wealth of these people to be owned by the government and supposedly distributed to the poor people who would then become rich. But as we know they didn't become rich, they became poorer. That happens in a single ethnic country but in multi-ethnic country, if you have this disparity emphasised by difference in ethnicity or race, one race being rich and the other race being poor, the fact of race can lead to conflict. But when it is emphasised or amplified by difference on wealth of the different races then the potential for conflict is much greater.

It is important that we reduce the disparity. We cannot change the race. That is something born with but we can reduce the disparity between the races so that the potential for conflict is less. That is what we try to do in Malaysia. That is what the New Economic Policy; NEP is all about, to reduce the disparity in wealth between one race and another. Of course it means we have to discriminate against one race in favour of another race. But the end result is what matters. The end result is that the disparity has been reduced between the Malays and the Chinese, so much so that during the 1997, 1998 financial crisis, where in other countries the blame was put on the Chinese so much so that the indigenous people actually killed, burnt, raped Chinese people in their midst. In Malaysia, there was no such thing. There was no racial animosity because of the financial recession. People were calm;

they don't fight each other and they shoulder the problem of the recession together. This is what happened in 1997, 1998 which enabled the government to take measures to overcome the problems posed by the financial recession. So you can see that whereas we can accept the different races, the different culture, religion, etc, which we cannot change very much. But, the difference in the economic field must be reduced as much as possible. As they say in the NEP, they have to abolish or reduce poverty irrespective of races and also to reduce the identification of race economic function. We have done that for the past 30 years and certainly today, we can see less disparity. There is still disparity, the Malays are still not as well off as the non-Malays but partly, this is still their own fault of course. But the disparity has been so reduced that the animosity or antagonism towards each other is much less. Of course, now some people want to raise other issues but the NEP has been instrumental in reducing the disparities between the different races and because of that, Malaysia has been a stable country. For 50 years, this country has remained stable despite the fact that we are a multi-ethnic multiracial country which has different languages, culture, religion, etc. but Malaysia has remained stable. Malaysians whether they be Chinese, Indians or Malays feel that they are Malaysians and abroad they will identify themselves as Malaysians. This is their National Identity that they are Malaysians. But, what about the sharing of power? We talked just now about the economic disparity, what about Power Sharing?

Well, we have formulated a way of distributing power so that everyone has a role to play but there is a need for balance. The balance must come because there is economic disparity. Until economic disparity is eliminated or reduced, the sharing of power must give some advantage to the less well-off group. In politics it is very common. For example, to give weightage, to put the people in the rural areas against people in urban areas. This is not done only in Malaysia; it is done in most countries. Urban people are usually much more influential. That is why during the British times, rural areas were neglected. Urban areas were given proper attention but in order to prevent the country from being lopsided in terms of developments, we have to give more weightage or political power to the rural areas against the urban areas. That way, we share political power. But, all races must be represented in the government. We have been able to do that not perfectly, not to the satisfaction of everyone but to the satisfaction of the majority. For years, we have seen people returning the same government which has the same policy at every election. Every 5 years, we have an election and on every election, people have the right to reject the government if they feel the government is not carrying out a good policy. But we have seen the people electing the same government, giving it 2/3 of the majority at almost all the elections except for 1969 and 2008. The people has backed the same party of the same policy which of course implies that they are not against the kind of political power sharing that is practiced in Malaysia.

In 2008, unfortunately, some other factors have moved in and the people became disillusioned by the government party and they refused to give full backing. But that is not because of the policy. The policy of balancing the economic wellbeing of the different races is accepted. The policy of power sharing between the different races is accepted. But other factors have come in and these factors has cause disillusionments with the government and as a result, they practically voted out the government giving it a small majority at the federal level, causing the government party to lose in 5 states and the federal territory. So, we can

see that there is no rigid definition of National Identity. It cannot be just one race with one culture, one religion before the National Identity can be accepted. We can have in Malaysia, people of different races, religion, culture but they still consider themselves as Malaysians and this is their National Identity. We perhaps can hope that in the future there will greater integration but even if there is no integration now, it is possible to consider the people of Malaysia as having one National Identity. Other countries of course have less difficulty as they only have one ethnic but we are multi-ethnic.

In the case of power sharing, the power sharing goes along the sharing of economic field. On the one hand perhaps the one group has more power politically but on the other hand we have the other group more powerful in the economic field. So it is largely, evenly distributed in Malaysia and because of that, Malaysia remain stable until 2008. So, I would like to say that we should accept things as they are, that the Malaysian National Identity is not the same as the National Identity of a single ethnic nations and that the power sharing in Malaysia involves races as well not just economic growth or whatever. We have to share power between the different races. It's not perfect but I believe that most Malaysians feel that they have a National Identity although it is not as rigid or similar as the National Identity of single ethnic nations.

So, I hope I have been able to explain a little bit of the situation in Malaysia as an example. Because I am not here to speak only about Malaysia but I had made comparison with other countries and I think if we accept the situation as it is, Malaysia tends to gain along because each community have a lot to contribute to the wellbeing, to the stability of this country and indeed they have done so. We should still strive to reduce the disparities between the different races in terms of their power, political power and economic strengths.

BEYOND VISION 2020

22 April 2010



I have been given the subject entitled Beyond Vision 2020. Vision 2020 *pun belum sampai lagi*. Tetapi kita nak bercakap berkenaan dengan selepas Vision 2020. I remember very well when I launched Vision 2020 in 1991. That was a little bit late. It should have been launched in 1990 which would mean that in 30 years we would reach 2020 and then of course we should have accomplished, or we should be able to attain the objectives of vision 2020. We said that what we want to be in 2020 is a developed country, be a developed country in our own mould, *dalam acuan kita sendiri*. We also specified that we would not just be focus on economic progress but also maintain our social and cultural characters. Vision 2020 was launched 30 years before the date 2020 and of course in 1991, we cannot possibly project the kind of environment, persekitaran which will be found in 2020. But not knowing that did not deter us from having this grand ambition to become a fully developed country irrespective of what will happen in the environment. Now we will see beyond 2020 and of course we do not know the environment, what the world environment would be like beyond 2020. We know in our progress towards 2020, the world has changed. The world has changed radically almost from 1990. We see now the world becoming smaller and becoming what people call a global village, we also see new ideas, approaches in the fields of politics, economics, sciences and technology.

Things has changed almost radically because now we see people talking about the borderless worlds, we see people talking about the rights of some powerful countries to affect changes in governments of other countries, violently in some cases as in the case of Iraq. Powerful countries believe they have the right to change the governments of other countries so as to see that those governments react positively towards them and for these we actually see them launching wars in order to change governments, what they call regime change. We did not anticipate this in 1990, 1991. But today, it is a fact that powerful countries no longer respect the neutrality or the independence of other countries. We also see that the economy of the world is very closely related. What happens to one country will have affect the rest of the world especially if that country is a very powerful country with a very big economy. We are also seeing a shift in the centre of economic development where before we believe that the economy will always be developed in the west and the rest of the world following. Today we are seeing shift from the west to the east and the emergence of countries like China, India and of course Japan and Korea. The shift to the east is very visible. It is already affecting us. We also see the emergence of a lot of greedy people, who has destroyed the economy of the most powerful nation in the world, the United States, through their abuses of the financial systems and that has resulted in the current crisis which of course affects us as much as it affects other countries. So, we are seeing something that in 1990, we did not foresee. So if today we are going to see beyond 2020 we have to appreciate that our projection, what we imagine what would happen beyond 2020 will not be accurate. It will not be what we expect it to be. It will not even be what we plan it to be because whatever we plan for our country will be affected by what happens in other countries. As you

know today, we are feeling the effect of the currency crisis, whereas in 1998, 1997, the problem was the devaluation of our Ringgit and that made us poor. I mean it is possible for some people to impoverish whole countries. And yet they are not regarded as having done anything wrong. They claim that this is the market. Market forces working. But now what you are seeing is slightly different. We are not impoverished directly. We can see countries like the United States, the most powerful economy in the world actually becoming poor. And it is becoming poor because they decided to allow the rogues to play around with the banks and the financial market. And because they played around and abused the banks and the financial market, suddenly we find the United States, the richest country in the world becoming poor. They wouldn't admit, they wouldn't say that they are poor but actually they are poor. It is very difficult for rich people to say they are poor because they are used to being rich but that is what is happening. When the United States become poor, we are affected because we produce things to sell to them and if they don't have money and we cannot sell to them, we become poor. So, indirectly, it has affected us. What happens to the United States affected us and affected the rest of the world. The only people who are not affected are those people who are quite isolated, traded with no one, and they are not involved in manipulation of financial systems. What has happened in United States is due to the abuse of the banking system. We do not know much about banking, in fact, the banker do not like us to know about banking. Then of course they would make a lot of profits at times, through cheating. I'm not saying the Malaysian banks are cheating us. I am not saying that but banking is a system which creates wealth out of nothing. Bank actually lends money that they don't have, do you know that? If you go to your friend, ask him to lend you money, they will say sorry I can't lend you money because I don't have the money. But not banks. You go to the banks, banks can you lend us money, and they would only want to know whether you use the money profitably or not. If you can use the money and make more money and repay their loans, then they always have money. They never say they don't have money. Who has gone to the bank and were told sorry we can't lend you money because we don't have money. Selalunya ada duit kerana bank boleh cipta duit. The banks can create money. I don't want to tell too much about these things because you will lose confidence in the banks. We never ask the banks whether the money that you lend us is real money or not. Because of their ability, their right to create money, some people think that this give them the opportunity to play around with money and make money out of money but actually making money out of nothing. When they were trading in ringgit, in 1997, 1998, many of us wondered, how did they get many ringgits to sell? Dia jual berbillion ringgit, dari mana dia dapat? That is something that we wondered, until we realised they do not really have the ringgit. Not a single ringgit moved during their transaction. Even if they sell the ringgit, the ringgit doesn't move. This I learn through, as mentioned just now, I had to learn about this, you want to learn to ride a horse, you have to learn how to balance yourself. You want to run a country; you have to know something about money. If you don't, you cannot run a country. What I realised was that, when they sell ringgit from A to B, the only thing that happened, is that the entries of the books of the banks, the account books of the banks changes in terms of ownership of A to B. If A sells 1 billion ringgit to B, the only thing that happens is that now, in the books of the banks, B has 1 billion ringgit. But, did any money cross? No cash cross. *Ini sistem yang kita guna sekarang. Kita baca dalam surat khabar, umpamanya kerajaan Amerika Syarikat telah bail out, the American government has bailed out the bankrupt banks*

and financial institutions in America with 3 trillion dollars ataupun tiga ribu billion dollars. *Apakah kerajaan Amerika simpan duit tiga ribu billion dollars ini di bawah tilam?* Where are they keeping this money, you ask yourself, where are they keeping this money? You know what 3 trillion means? *Tiga ribu billion ataupun tiga million. Tak ada tempat nak simpan. Dalam bilik ini pun tak cukup. Kalau betul-betul lah ada duit. Tak ada duit. Tak ada duit.* It is impossible for the government of America yang bankrupt kerana government of America actually depends on the money that they borrowed. They borrowed, they run their country on borrowed money they have double deficit. They cannot be keeping these 3 trillion dollars and yet they were able to suddenly come up with three trillion. *Bukan cash, bukan duit, bukan currency note, just a small check. Dulu kita boleh tulis cek untuk satu million ringgit. Duit lah tu.* When you write one million on a cheque, that cheque becomes money because you can pay people with that check. So money is not even printed. The three trillion dollars that the US government used to bail out companies and banks was not in terms of cash, it is just in terms of papers with figures written on them. So that is money. They don't have the money so they create the money out of nothing. *Macam orang main silap mata*, this magician, they can produce a rabbit out of a hat, the US government produce 3 trillion dollars out of their hat. *Penipuan.* So *ini yang menyebabkan sekarang ini kita menghadapi currency crisis.* This is the cause of currency crisis. This is because the financial system can be abused not just by rogues but also by the governments. *Kita kalau tidak ada duit, we have to go and borrow.* If we don't have money we have to go and borrow from international banks and from the IMF or from somewhere. But the US did not borrow. Did you read in the papers US borrowing money from the international banks to pay for the bailouts? *Siapa yang baca? Tak ada.* They didn't borrow money but tiba-tiba ada 3 trillion dollars untuk bailout. *Tipu. Kerajaan tipu.* That is the kind of world we are living today. Now beyond 2020, what kind of world would it be? More rogues? More crooks, who steal money, maybe, that would be the environment. So when we tried to figure out what may be the kind of world after 2020, we have to face these possibilities that the cheating will go on. Unless, of course, they reform, stop this fiddling around, playing around with money. It is very important that the system, financial system, banking system be changed. So, if they change the financial system, the environment will change and probably our growth, Malaysia's growth would be much more steady. But if they don't change, the threat of abuse that has happened, the kind of abuse that has happened in the US today will be repeated again and again. We will live in a very unstable world. And if the world is going to be unstable, when we look beyond 2020, then we have to take an unstable world into consideration. How do we manage our economy, our country, in an unstable world? That is going to be very difficult. Fortunately, I will not be responsible. It is left to our leaders now. They will have to face this, the present leader and the future leaders of Malaysia. Maybe some of you. Some of the students here may one day become Prime Minister, which one of you? You would have to tackle this problem of an unstable world.

But that is in the field of finance, but what about in other fields? Today, people are very mobile. People can travel between countries much more easy. In the good old days, during the time of the Malacca Empire for example, it would take a Chinese junk maybe 6 months or 1 year to travel from China to Malaysia. It is very difficult and because of that, we don't see Chinese people migrating to Malaysia in large numbers. But today, there is a report

in the press, almost every day, raids being carried out by the police, because of illegal immigrants. Illegal immigrants. But, some are legal and the borders have become porous and you can easily cross borders. So there will be a lot of movement of people between countries. Of course movement would be mostly from poor countries to rich countries. So, the rich countries, must expect an influx of foreign people. Some of them of course can contribute, because they are very well educated, they can contribute towards the economy of the country, towards the well-being of the country. But some of them will be common labourers, and uneducated people who cross over from a poor country to a rich country in order to seek a better life. To seek for better income for themselves. As time goes on, beyond 2020 to maybe 2050, it would be extremely easy for people to cross borders. No matter how many people you put at the border to stop people from crossing over, they will come through, they will come in boats, they will come at night through the jungles, they will swim across rivers. We have to rear crocodiles in the rivers to stop them from swimming, now you know the United States, they are having the problem with Mexicans crossing over to California. So it is because the United States, of course, is very unhappy about this, they have border guards with dogs and all kinds of electronic detectors to stop people from crossing over the Rio Grande between Mexico and California. But so far they have failed. The United States with its guards and things like that, they have failed. And if you go to California today, most of the people in California are Mexicans, are Hispanics. They have been able to avoid the United States security people and get into California. In fact, a Mexican once told me we have re-conquered California. You must know that California at one time belongs to Mexico. But United States as usual keeps on taking the territories of its neighbours. California, Florida, New Mexico, etc, these are foreign countries but United States being strong has never hesitated to seize territories belonging to others. But having seized California, United States find California being occupied by Mexicans again. So, this is happening everywhere. In England, I like to listen to the speakers' corner. And now of course, you are going to launch a speaker's corner here. I went to listen to the speakers at the speaker's corner. There was one West Indian, maybe from Bahamas or Jamaica, I don't know, he was speaking, he said we have taken over England, the West Indians have taken over England. He says just look at London transport, and you can see all transports are driven by Jamaicans. So they have taken over London's transport as a beginning. And of course, the Indians, the Pakistanis and the Bangladeshis have taken over all the restaurants and all the sundry good shops. Kalau pi England nak tengok restaurant, yang British punya tiada. But, in the future, the numbers are going to increase. There will be more Mexicans not only in California but in the United States than they are now. And in Europe, there will be more Arabs, more Indians, more Chinese. Just imagine, if a hundred million Indians migrate into Europe and a hundred million Chinese go into Europe, they will actually outnumber the European. So at that stage, it is no longer Europeans or rather we have dark Europeans. This is the future, what I am telling you are what is going to happen in the future. I may be wrong but if I am wrong I won't be there for you to say in 2050. What I am trying to say is that in terms of populations, demography, the world will not be the same as it is today. It is impossible for us to still maintain our people in our country largely our citizens, although a lot of tourist who come into this country somehow rather they disappear. But, this phenomenon is going to go on in the future; Malaysia is going to see more foreigners in this country and maybe one day they will outnumber the locals.

Malays think they are the majority now, you are only about 51% and you are not to be, and if they come in numbers, the Malays will be a minority. In fact, Malaysian's might be a minority in the future, we don't know. So, this is the future we can visualise in order to see beyond 2020. The demographics is going to be changed. The 2 countries which will not change will be India and china. You can't change the Chinese population because there are so many of them, 1.3 billion Chinese. To dilute 1.3 billion, you need another 1.3 billion foreigners to move into China. There won't be enough foreigners to move into China. And as you know, people who conquered China has found to their cost that when you conquer China you have to change your identity to Chinese. Kublai khan was a Mongol. He was the Mongol conqueror of China. He ended up becoming a Chinese. Till now, the Chinese history regarded Kublai Khan as a Chinese. And anybody will speak Chinese and practice Chinese culture and become Chinese. So it's difficult for you to dilute China or even to dilute India because there are 1 billion Indians. So many. That's why they have to go elsewhere and live. So the demography of the world will change. We are going to live in a world which is multicultural everywhere, multiracial like Malaysia today. So in this kind of environment, how do you manage your country's economy?

We have to take that into consideration because it is going to be a different world all together. The finance part is one thing, now we have the demographic part. And then we have technology. The technology today is already mind-boggling. When we pick up our cell phone and ring up somebody, we don't realise that cell phone is a condensed version of the radio station of the past, before, in order to communicate on the airways, you have to have a big station with a huge antenna in order to talk or you need a cable under the sea cable from here to England in order to talk. And you use huge telecommunication systems in order to talk. I think the younger people might not know this because they have cell phones. But in those days, to call London, you have to dial the operator. Operator, please give me the London number. You have to wait for 1 hour because it has to go through many cables. After the delay, the operator will get you the number and ask you to speak up. And you have to shout. Because you think if you shout only then you can hear in London. But today, you have this radio station in your pocket, you take it out and you ring up New York. You speak to the person in your normal voice, you don't need to scream. You can hear them clearly and can recognise their voice. That is the change in the communication industry. That is not the only technology that moved forward. There will be more things coming. I can't predict what is coming, but already what is available is difficult for us to understand. Difficult for me to understand. I still cannot manage the computer as well as my children. Somehow or rather, children know how to use the computer better than 80 year old people. It is because their mind is very open. I cannot conceive the knowledge that computer can carry so much information, unlimited information. Nowadays if you want to find out something, you want to find out the population of Albania, you just press a button, go to whatever, yahoo or whatever, and go Albania and you will get the information. You can study history or technology to make nuclear bomb. All this can be obtained from the computer. All the information available in the computer is huge and at the same time millions of people are using the computer. Can you imagine, 1 million people using this small box and assessing all the information. Of course, we sometimes ask ourselves, where is this information coming from? So when you assess something that you shouldn't

assess, somebody in America knows you have done that. So don't think you have privacy on the computer. Maybe some people have been assessing pornographic literature. That is another thing about the future.

Today, we have access to things that are very good for us, information that will do us a lot of good. We can learn a lot of things, but we can also have access to the worst of information, which will make us not good citizens but bad citizens. For example, today, we hear so much about cases of rape, buang anak, dan sebagainya. I think it is because you are looking at the pornography in the computer. You assess this pornography and maybe you get very excited, and then you commit things you would never dream of committing before. When I was a small boy, I couldn't assess these things. It is all banned by the government. All things related to pornographic couldn't come into Malaysia. We have a custom people who examined all the mails coming in to find out whether there is any unwanted literature, and they will stop it, confiscate it, and even charge you. But today, government cannot stop you from assessing filth coming through the computer. So, that computer can give you good information, it can also give you bad information. Now, supposing, in the future, somebody begins to preach some ideology, though the computer and you know in one day many of us spent 5 hours in the computer, and we hear this preaching, maybe preaching some other version of our religion, we may be taken up, influenced and we don't know how far we can resist, how strong our belief, faith is, iman akan terancam kerana terdedah kepada informasi yang datang melalui komputer. And how do you manage this? After 2020, this is going to be easily available to our people, to our young people. Their minds are going to be influenced by what is coming from outside. Government cannot stop the future. We are already seeing this future today, but in future, it is going to be worse. How do we plan to counter this? That is of course, for future prime ministers of Malaysia. As I say, I don't have to worry. I will be somewhere down there. So, this is the scenario, that will influence the situation that our lives beyond 2020. Technology will change things in many ways.

I was told recently, that a man discovered an island in the Pacific Ocean. The island is made up entirely of plastic materials, plastic bottles, plastic sheets, and plastic containers, because when you throw your plastic wastes, into the river, a lot of it will go to sea. When it reaches the sea, it is carried by the sea currents and finally it will begin to collect. More and more will be carried by the sea current until it means more plastic materials floating in the sea and over the years, imagined the amount of plastic that are thrown into the river. Not all will go to the sea but even one tenth of that or even one twentieth of that goes into the sea and moved by the currents and collects in one place in the sea, you are going to have an island that is made of plastic. You don't know. It can be very big. It can be very big. Overtime, it is going to affect lives in the sea, the fishes and the other creature you find in the sea. We depend on the sea to get fish for our food. Now, supposing, there are thousands of these islands of plastics in the sea, it is going to affect our lives. Plastic is a very fantastic material, developed after the war and we thought this is a gift to humanity. Water cannot go through plastic, it is not porous, and it lasts forever and we thought it was fantastic that it lasts forever. And later we discover we cannot get rid of plastics. You cannot burn plastic. You burn, you get noxious gasses, poison coming out. If you burn the islands of plastics, which can be maybe 50 miles wide by 50 miles, if you burn the island of plastic, you are going to

poison the whole atmosphere. You already read in the newspaper what happens when a volcano in Iceland spouted ash. You cannot even fly. But if you allow the plastics to be burnt because that is one way to get rid of it, the whole atmosphere is going to get poisoned with the poisonous gases, because there is no other way to get rid of plastic. If you bury it in the ground, that's not a solution because in the end, you will have no space for you to live. You have to dig out the plastics if you want to build a house. You will have a huge problem with plastic. But it is a convenient thing and we keep on using the plastics not knowing what to do with the waste. If you throw it on the ground, it will not rot, it will remain on the ground. If you burn it, you will get poisonous gases. Until now, we have yet to focus on how to get rid of plastic or more importantly, how to not use plastic or creating biodegradable plastics. Maybe the scientists in PETRONAS University will focus on how to get rid of plastics. Until now, we don't know but plastic is not just the only thing we cannot get rid of.

We are using nuclear material today. Nuclear material can be developed. You can convert uranium into radioactive uranium but once you make radioactive uranium, you can't reverse the process. It will remain radioactive. The problem today with radioactive material is that when it becomes waste, it still emits radio waves, which are harmful to us which can cause cancer. In the past when I was prime minister, I was a bit of scared about radioactive materials and therefore, we decided that in this country, we will not use nuclear power stations. Not because it is not cheap. The initial cost will be very high but running it will be very cheap but nuclear waste cannot be rid off. To reprocess it, you need to send it to another place where they reprocess it. But when you reprocess it you cannot get rid of it. You cannot burn it. I don't know how many Perak people knows but there is a place where we bury nuclear waste. 1 square mile of land cannot be used because we buried nuclear waste there. That is our experience with nuclear waste. We buried it, we covered it with concrete, but still that place cannot be used anymore. Now, if you produce a lot of nuclear waste, you cannot bury, you cannot do anything with it, you are going to have a very big problem because it is going to affect us through radiation. *Ini masalahnya. Kita patut ada nuclear power station tetapi nuclear waste kita tidak boleh buang mana-mana. Tak boleh buang dalam tanah, tak boleh buang dalam laut kerana ia adalah satu bahan yang berbahaya.* It gives us cancer and a lot of other diseases. So this is a problem that we face, that we will face in the future, when we deplete our hydrocarbon resources, our petroleum, do we switch to nuclear power, beyond 2020. You do that, you are going to have a problem. So in future, we will have a problem merely to generate power for us. We are happy now you can switch on the electric lights, and you have lights but you need power generation, power generation involves hydrocarbon or petroleum. You can burn coal. It will cause a lot of coal dust floating in the air. Also not very good. We want to have clean power generated through hydro power but of course the environmentalist will tell you No, you cannot develop hydropower because you will cut down trees and where will the squirrels go? You don't have enough oil or gas to use them for energy, generating power. You cannot use coal; you cannot use nuclear material, so what you will do? One of the ways is everyone buys bicycle and put dynamo and you paddle. You get good exercise, get good muscle but I don't think that is practical. These are the problems of the future. There are many other problems. Not only regarding finance, environment and technology but there are many other problems that will come with the coming years. And the people of the future will have to deal with it.

But in order to deal with something in the future you must do something to alert us now. We must be alert so that we will not create an environment which will be dangerous for beyond 2020. If for example today we are conscious that plastic is a material that cannot be destroyed and therefore we should not use plastic, we should use paper instead. Paper can be destroyed because it is biodegradable. But some environmentalist will say you cannot chop down trees to make papers. I don't know what the environmentalist will do if you don't have paper. They are writing all their things, their articles against our destroying the environment on paper. They don't write it on something else. But they are telling us that we must not chop down trees. Of course we must not chop down trees to grow our rubber trees, palm trees. We must allow the forest to grow. And in Malaysia, if you don't cut or trim the forest or prune the trees, in 3 years' time, this whole area will become one jungle. Maybe I should ask the University PETRONAS, *cuba tengok, jangan potong rumput, jangan tebang pokok, jangan prune pokok, untuk 3 tahun. Kita nak tengok apa jenis universiti yang akan ada di sini.* Ini environmentalist. Environmentalist kata *jangan potong kerana cicak semua nak lari ke mana.* These are the problems that will be for us in the future. *Masalah lepas 2020. Apakah kita sudah bersedia untuk tackle masalah yang akan datang ini? Pada hari ini, sebelum sampai 2020, kita harus memikir kemungkinan-kemungkinan ini. Mungkin akan berlaku sesuatu yang menidakkan segala-gala yang saya sebut di sini berlaku di masa depan.* It is possible that what I am saying here is not going to happen but I suspect it is going to happen. And as I say, I keep on reminding myself, I am not going to be around. But it is you and your children, your grandchildren, beyond 2020. Tak dalam 2020, diri sendiri pun akan terlibat selepas 2020. You are going to feel all this things. You are going to face all these problems. You are going to tackle all these problems. I can go on and on telling you what will happen beyond 2020 but I think I should stop there because I think you are more interested asking questions than listening to my talk. *Kebanyakan yang hadir mungkin nak dengar cerita-cerita lain jadi,* because of that, I will stop now and give you a chance to ask questions.



I think we all realise that we are living in a scientific age. An age in which science determines our character, our way of life and the things that we do. We cannot escape from the influence of science because it is science that has created wonderful things that we can use in our daily life. Perhaps the best example is how science has contributed to communication. Today using your handphone, your mobile phone, you can speak clearly without distortion with people who are 12,000 miles away on the other side of the world. Basically what you are doing is you are holding a transmitting station in your hand, a tiny transmitting station in your hand which enables you to communicate 12,000 miles with somebody who has a receiving station and when he speaks back in reply to what you have said, you become a receiving station as well. Not so very long ago, we need to have a huge composite equipment in order to broadcast by radio alone. But today, all that huge numbers of equipment housed in very ornate and big-sized building, all that has become so compressed and miniaturised that you can hold the whole thing in your hand. And it can do much more than what was being done by the broadcasting houses of the past. And because we can communicate, we tend to use this communicating instrument much more than before. It is so easy for us merely to press a few buttons on this tiny broadcasting station, and we can talk to people from any part, in any part of the globe. And because we can do that, we use the telephone much more than before. Whereas before in order to call someone overseas, you have to ring up the operator and you have to wait for quite a considerable length of time before the operator can put you through. But today, no operators are involved, you are the operator and you can speak with just about anyone anywhere in the world. That has changed your character because you feel now that you are part of a network that criss-crosses all over the globe. And because you can do that, you feel safer, you feel that you are connected. And when you are abroad, you don't worry too much about what's happening at home because you can immediately call home and find out whether so and so is sick or not, whether he is getting better or what he is doing at that very moment. Because of this, you have a feeling that you are never far from people. Never far from people who can be of help to you. Today, people can explore the most remote parts of the world and still not feel that they are cut off from the rest of the world. They can always use satellite phones for example, so that they can call whoever it is that they had in mind. So our lifestyle now has changed because science has enabled us to discover ways of communicating much more easier and at very low cost. But of course, science has not just contributed that to us. We now make use of all kinds of household equipments to enable us to lead a better life. We don't need to go out marketing every day because we can preserve the food that we buy for weeks on end and therefore we don't go out shopping as much as we used to. Where before people have a need to go to the market to buy fresh fish and vegetable, today you buy for one whole week or two weeks or if you expect something nasty to happen, you can store up for months because we have learned how to preserve food better. But all the time, we are getting more and more, increased capacity for us to preserve food so that we can feel safe that even in any disaster period,

we can still have access to the food that we have stored. That too, has changed our lives. And there are many other things of course that has changed our life almost totally, we are no longer cut off from the rest of the world. The internet for example, has enabled us to gain any amount of knowledge that we want. The whole encyclopedia or even the library of congress of the United States can be accessed through the internet. Not only can we access knowledge, etc through the internet, we can also send messages through the internet. And a whole new industry has formed; new sets of industries have been developed around the internet. Today, we don't need to read, to buy a newspaper in order to read it, we can read the paper through the internet. Again, that has changed our lifestyle. And there are many more, many more scientific discoveries which have influenced the way we live, the way we behave and even our value systems, our civilisation has been much influenced by science. Science has developed all kinds of new technologies which were unheard of before. Among the things that has changed, that has influenced the changes taking place in our life is the invention of the microchip, the miniaturised transistors have become smaller and smaller, so that you can put a million transistors on just a piece of silicon. And that piece of silicon has been made use of for all kinds of applications. In the past, we need a film in order to take a picture.

Today, we have the memory card which we insert into your camera and you can take more than a thousand pictures using just one small memory card which is reusable. It is quite mind-boggling to think that so much information can be captured and stored by the memory card. I remember the time when I just could not believe in the internet. I was told that you can access anything through the internet. I thought that there must be a limit to what you can access in the internet. But apparently, there is no limit. You can keep on digging into the internet and discovering all kinds of knowledge without ever having to refer to books and other papers that you had to buy with great difficulty. Today if you wish to construct a nuclear bomb, you can also find out how to do it through the internet. That is a very useful information for some people but I have been talking about the positive side of scientific discoveries. It's not always good that we know of a lot of things that science has discovered and enabled us to perform things we could not perform before. A lot of scientific discoveries are applied to improve the efficiency in killing people. Billions and trillions of dollars are spent every year in developing means, more efficient means of killing people. Science has contributed much to that, because today we don't have just the nuclear weapons, now we have means of delivering the nuclear weapons without ever having to leave your office. For now the craze is to find, to develop unmanned vehicles, airplanes, which are not manned, tanks which have nobody inside, even ships if you like, controlled by radio waves and other means of traversing the space without ever putting in any solid thing. This is a great achievement, to be able to control an airplane many hundreds of miles away from us. It's a great thing, except that the people who invented this thing think first about how to kill people and so they developed this plane in order to be safe while killing other people. You can stay 3 miles away or 10 miles away or 10000 miles away and direct this unmanned vehicle so as to go some place and to bomb and kill people. That is the dark side of science, that science can contribute to human wellbeing but it can also contribute towards the killing, the maiming, and the destruction of humanity. Why is this happening? It is happening because we don't focus on the other needs to shape our life; the value systems that we should have. When a person

is given a knife, he can use the knife in order to carve out beautiful objects, he can also use the knife to kill people. The knife has now developed into weapons which are, which were unthinkable before. Today, we can destroy the whole world if we like, but by just dropping some nuclear bombs. There are enough nuclear weapons in this world to blow us all up. I'm told that between the great powers in the world, they have something like 30,000 nuclear warheads. Now if you have been to Hiroshima which I have done, and seen the destruction there, caused by just one atom bomb which was not very powerful in those days. Now we have atom bombs or nuclear weapons which are much more powerful, which can destroy many times more than what happened to Hiroshima. And we have not just one. At the time when Hiroshima was bombed, we are told that they had a few, but they dropped only two – one on Hiroshima and the other on Nagasaki. And they caused tremendous destruction, killing some 200,000 people. When you multiply that by the new bombs which have greater capacity, and multiply that again with the 20,000 or 30,000 nuclear warheads that are possessed by the powerful countries of this world, should they ever use these nuclear warheads simultaneously, we will not be sitting in this hall anymore. We'll be disintegrated or we'll be changed to just steam or powder or whatever. That's the capacity we have and that capacity also comes to us from our knowledge of science, technology and engineering. So there is a need for us not just to teach science, engineering and to develop technologies. There is a need for us to understand or to be guided by better values, more human values. That is why there must be a bridge between these two. While we teach science in schools, for example, and in the University, so as to produce the robots that you see just now but we do not tell them that if you misuse this knowledge, you can destroy the whole world. It is therefore necessary for us to inculcate the minds of our people with good values so that when they make use of the scientific knowledge, the technology that they have developed, they make use of them in a positive way in order to give a better life for people. Not to destroy them, not to damage whole cities, but rather to build, to lengthen human life for example and also to build new cities and new habitations which are much more suited to the claim that we are civilised. It is probably questionable if we claim that we are civilised now. We are not civilised really, we are partially civilised. That is why in any society, killing a person is described as murder, it is a crime that deserves the most severe of punishments. Indeed in many countries, people who commit murder would be sentenced to death. Some countries feel that this is too inhuman. So you shouldn't kill a person even if he has killed another person. Such is our value system which looks upon the killing of people as a crime. But if we kill 100 people, 1000 people or even 1,000,000 people in war, that is not a crime. So there is something, something wrong with our value system. When we see the killing of one person is such a severe crime that the perpetrator, the murderer would be hanged, but a man who directs that the country, the soldiers to kill, to kill not one or two but 1,000, even a 1,000,000, that is not a crime. You don't hang the person who directs the killing of so many people. Why is this so? This is so because when we acquire this power that science gives us, we do not teach the value system that will make us more human, more civilised. So as not to abuse the scientific knowledge that we have. That is why there is a need today for people not just to focus on science and not care at all about the destructive effect of science in order to have sustainability. For any of our discoveries, we need to look more into what damage the discoveries can cause for our society. Long ago, scientists found that they could convert fuel, oil, into plastics. It was a great discovery. Plastics can be used in so many

ways, you can build a ship with plastic. You can also have a bag, to fill, to put your shopping in with plastics. It was great until it was discovered that this is one material that is totally sustainable. It doesn't rot, it doesn't disappear, it doesn't vaporise, you cannot burn it without causing a lot of noxious gases from being thrown into the air. So it is sustainable. But you don't want that kind of sustainability. We need things to rot. It is very strange when we talk about things rotting, we're thinking about bad smell and things like that but plastics refuses to rot and plastics today have become such a menace to humanity. I've read that somewhere in the Atlantic Ocean, there is a plastic island, a huge island, we don't know how many feet in terms of its depth but it was an island and this island is formed by the plastics that are thrown into the river, the rivers of the world. Some of them of course may not reach the sea, but a sufficient number would reach the sea and be carried by certain currents to a particular place where they collect. And they keep on collecting over the years so much so that they have become so big and have become islands, islands of plastic. Now if we keep on going at this rate, we may find that it's very difficult to navigate in the seas, in the oceans because there are so many plastic islands in the seas and the oceans. They do not rot. Throwing them into the sea doesn't make them dissolve and disappear. They remain there for as long as we can think. Now the population of the world is increasing as mentioned just now by Datuk Wan Zulkiflee.

The population of the world will increase by 20%. It is now 6.3 billion. You increase that by 20%, or even if we maintain the population at 6.3 billion, and these people keep on throwing plastics into the river, and the plastics keep on collecting in a particular place because of the currents, and they will form plastic islands. That is not going to contribute to our wellbeing. Although we may find better ships which can travel faster, more comfortably perhaps. But when the seas are covered with plastic islands, then you may reconsider the idea of sustainability for the plastics. So what is the answer to that? That is something that we have to consider. If we do not just look at the results of our scientific knowledge, the products that comes through our scientific knowledge and its application, but also what happens to the products later on because it is difficult to get rid of waste. Today, the problem of the world is how to get rid of waste. The population of the world is so big that the production of waste has increased tremendously. And we find it difficult to get rid of the waste. We bury them but they don't rot and disappear. And later on when we want to build something over the place where we have buried the waste, we have to dig out the waste. And what do we do with the waste that we dig out? Maybe bury in another place. That's not going to be a solution. We cannot burn because we don't like pollution, more carbon dioxide. I don't know how many tons of carbon dioxide was mentioned just now. But we are not going to help things by burning the waste. That is something that we have to think while we enjoy the products resulting from scientific knowledge and technology and engineering. We must also think about the end products of the scientific products that we use. But that is not all, today we talk a lot about the need for power. If we burn fuel oil, we emit a lot of carbon dioxide and other noxious gases. But if we don't burn fuel oil, what do we do? We can develop hydroelectric power but of course the environmentalist say 'No, you cannot because you are going to drown a lot of forest trees because you have dammed up the river.' So you cannot use hydropower also. Coal? Coal is a problem of course. A lot of coal dust will be thrown into the air. Gas? Maybe, clean but depleting. So now the talk is about nuclear power. We really do not know enough

about nuclear material. We do not know enough because we do not know how to get rid of nuclear waste. This is a problem today because even if we use nuclear power for power generation, the waste from the use of whatever material that you use in order to generate power, the waste cannot be got rid of. Some people bury them but that is not a solution either because there's going to be much more waste produced until there will be no place where we can bury the nuclear waste. We have not found a way of reversing the process, to reverse the process so that the nuclear waste can no longer be dangerous to humanity, to health. Perhaps we in Malaysia are, we think that we are not involved in power-generation using nuclear waste, nuclear material. Of course now there is a lot of talk that we should use nuclear power. But we have one experience which should teach us a lesson. Long ago colour TV was made through using radioactive material that is part of the by-product of tin mining, ilmenite, which is produced through tin mining. It can be processed so that it can be used for colour TV. But then of course we know today colour TV does not use that system, that kind of material anymore. Now we have LED etc. Plasma and LED. But we in Malaysia produced this material, this radioactive material and because the people who used to buy this radioactive material stopped buying because they are not using it, they are not using it anymore. We found difficulty in trying to get rid of the material which have been activated. After long negotiations with the buyers, we decided that we should bury this nuclear waste and cover up, cover this up with concrete. We have done this in the state of Perak and we have to reserve an area almost one square mile because it's too dangerous for people to go there. Now that is just a small amount of nuclear waste. But if the whole country were to use nuclear energy and produce nuclear waste, and we have to bury them because we cannot do anything with them, we are going to find lots of places in Malaysia closed to settlement by human beings or even for people to go there because it is still radioactive. So these are, well, very sustainable. In fact, the shelf life of this material is about a million years. So it is really sustainable but it's not the kind of sustainability that you like. What we want is something that would improve over time and give us better products, that we can use. But nuclear waste is not something that we want to have anywhere in this country. So we need to understand these things better because although scientific knowledge and technology can give us a lot of products that can be used to better the quality of life that we enjoy, but they can also produce a lot of very noxious thing, very dangerous material that we cannot get rid of. So before we make use of scientific knowledge, we have to understand also how to deal with them, how to make use of them properly; not in the production of weapons to kill people, but in the production of equipments and products that can be used in order to improve the quality of our life. That is why when we teach science, when we learn engineering or about technology etc, we have also to bear in mind that what we do may harm people more than give them a good life. If we don't connect the two together, we are in danger of destroying our life rather than improving the quality of our life. It is therefore important that as we teach science in schools and in universities, we should also teach that they can be misused or abused or they can produce waste that cannot be got rid of, that will continue to harm us forever. This is the problem that we face. Unless we have better values, human values, we should not really be given the scientific knowledge without thinking that it may, without knowing, that they may create, well, cause danger to us in our life. Today, scientific knowledge is being used in prolonging human life. Our lifespan now is much longer than it was a long time ago. But that is of course due the advances made in medicine. But

even medicine may have to use dangerous material in order to prolong human life. If the material is wrongly used, then it will not prolong human life, it may affect the lives of the whole community. We have to learn about this also and not just about science. So these are things that we don't think much about today because we are so very much, so excited with our ability to do fantastic things, to produce fantastic things, to enable us to do things which were unheard of before. But we should also learn that they can do us a lot of harm. Of course some of these are not real. For example, for a long time it was suggested that the cellular phone can affect your brain. So far, I have not met, or there have been no reports that somebody has gone mad using the cellular phone but there are other materials that we use which may cause a lot of, may do a lot of harm to us. That is why there is a need for us not just to learn science and acquire the knowledge, the scientific knowledge that can create a better world for us. We need also to know how they can be abused and how they will undermine our quality of life. So I hope that your discussion on science and technology and engineering will also include the bad or the evil effect of this new knowledge to us and our community. I thank you.

GRADUATES IN THE 21st CENTURY

07 March 2013



Now as you know, things change overtime. Today, we see changes still taking place even as we prepare ourselves for the future. It has been pointed out that I am 87 years old. So, I have been through quite a lot and I have been able to see changes taking place in Malaysia and all over the world. These changes invariably relate to the lives of people. Even as the environment, our situation changes, our lives become affected. One of the most important things in a modern society is that people should be able to live a good life, to have food, clothing and shelter. These are the basic needs of everyone. To have these, we need to earn an income. We need to have some way of sustaining ourselves. Of course, in a very small society, the way we earn an income would be very simple. When I was a small boy, the people live a very relatively primitive life. People do not get university education. The level of education when I was a small boy was only up to primary level. In Malaysia, it is Standard 4 Malay School. A few were more fortunate, like myself. I was able to go to what was known as the English school where our studies is up to standard 9 when we sit for the Senior Cambridge examination. When you pass the examination, people consider you as qualified to do anything in the world. That was the level of the development of the community at that time. We didn't need much education because what is required of us is very little. We can work as a clerk in the government offices or as a salesman and we don't need much knowledge in order to do that. But, as time progresses, the country's environment becomes more sophisticated, more complex, and to deal with this complexity we must have more knowledge. Therefore, when we become independent, we decide that what is important is to upgrade the knowledge of the people. To cope with the changing environment, strangely during the time of the British, there was no university at all in Malaysia or even in Singapore. I went to a college, the King Edward VI, college of medicine in order to qualify as a doctor. Half way through, they decided that the college should join up with Raffles College to form the nucleus of a university, the University of Malaya. Unfortunately, in order to move from a college to a university, they need to prove their standards are high and the way to prove it is to fail the students. Unfortunate for the students, but to show that our standards are high, they almost deliberately failed the students. If we hadn't had the ambition to become a university, it was quite alright. But we wanted to be recognised as a university, so students failed and these earned us the recognition as an institution of very high learning, qualified to become a university. But, today you don't need to do that, you don't need to fail anyone because the paper recognised our university as world standard but that is the response to the environment.

The need to have a better educated people in a changing environment forced us to upgrade the standards in our institutions of higher learning and a few people had to pay the price. But, as a result of that, the universities which started in Malaysia were recognised so that their graduates could do postgraduates studies and in foreign universities mainly in the British universities. We must say that they did well and they actually contributed to the

recognition of Malaysian Universities as institutions of higher learning. This may be taken for granted in Malaysia but in many countries, there are universities which sell the certificates. So, if you like to have an easy certificate, you can buy, if you have the money. The result we have unqualified people doing things required of people who are specially trained. In one country, doctors, students who studies medicine and failed their exams can actually put up on the board failed MBBS, in the belief that a person who have studied medicine knows better than an ordinary man on the street. So, they can make money that way but there are governing bodies in most countries and certainly Malaysia, we won't allow that to happen but what is happening is that it shows that there is a demand for better educated people and all along the demand for education kept on increasing. The levels get on being raised. We are not satisfied with BA, Bachelor of Arts. In those days, if you get a BA, you are capable of doing anything. Bachelor of Arts is nothing. You need to have a Masters and need to become a Phd doctor and even go beyond that. So all along you see progress being made in education in coming with progress of society. We must realise that we live in a scientific age. Science have contributed much to our life, our way of living. Anywhere you go, anything you do, it is related to the contribution of science to your well being, as civilised people. For example, if you come here, you need to be transported. In the good old days, before science became so universal, travelling was a great problem. The people from China who came to Malaysia before had to sail in junks. It took them 6 months to reach from China to Malaysia. Along the way, many of them perished because of storms, shipwrecks and etc. Today, science has made it possible for the Chinese in Kunming to fly to Kuala Lumpur in 3 hours. This represents a change that the people today are much more mobile, much more able to migrate and live in other parts of the world ever before. This is the contribution of science. It is just one thing but today, we can communicate much more easily not only in terms of ease of travel.

Mobility. We can also communicate directly with someone who is half way around the world. We can talk with someone who is in New York, Washington, as if they are next door. The cell phone today is a fantastic broadcasting and receiving station. It broadcast your voice right up to 12 000 miles away and you receive instantly the reply from 12000 miles away and it is perfect. But of course we have gone beyond that. We can send pictures, movies, very simply because of this small broadcasting and receiver set that you carry in your pocket. When radio was first applied, you have to have a big house to house all the complex instruments for broadcasting. You have to have aerials, very high aerials with lots of wires in between the aerials in order to broadcast. And the sounds, you have all kinds of steaming sounds, whistling sounds; it was not perfect at all. And the receiver use to be a very big receiver, a big radio. The quality of the sound was not perfect. Today, you don't have to have this whole house of broadcasting house. You have it in your pocket and you can speak to someone who is broadcasted to many thousands of miles away and receive the reply also from that distance and the quality is so good. Why the quality is so good now and not so good 30 years, 40 years, 50 years ago? It is all about science. Science keeps on improving and improving on all the discoveries that we made before, so that they will serve us better. Today, we can communicate much better than ever before. Because we are able to communicate, we are able to know more about the rest of the world than we used to. As a boy, I remember my world was confined to the coasts of Seberang Perak. There is just a

small room and that is what I knew about the world because I have no access to the rest of the world. My world enlarged a little bit to include the town of Alor Star, the school which was about a mile away from my house. Eventually I was able to travel a little bit. First, to Penang for example and eventually I went to study in Singapore and after graduating, I was able to travel to countries like Japan and Europe. Obviously, the world for me was enlarging. It was enlarging at a very rapid rate although by our present standard was quite slow but it was enlarging. The enlargement of our field of activity requires that we make adjustments and that adjustments can be better made if we are educated. If we have the knowledge especially the knowledge of relevant things, the world is changing all the times. Every time, there will be improvements. We see everything that we use, keep on being upgraded all the time as we are not satisfied with the quality that we have. The first model cars, we had to crank it to start it. Today, you go there and press a small button, the car starts and you could hardly hear the engine. In those days, the engines make a lot of noise. So, all the time there have been improvements. So this is the way of life, contributed largely by science which helps us to improve all the time. Now, we are in the 21st century and the 21st century is a very sophisticated century in comparison with the past. There are lots of things which we have, which we take for granted, as usual which were not found before. But, you can be sure that in the future, they will regard us as very primitive people. We are really backwards by the standards of the 22nd century, 23rd century, so if we accept that things will improve all the time, the process of learning does not stop in the university. Learning is a lifetime work occupation. You have to continue to learn and upgrade yourself, otherwise you will be irrelevant. Nobody will find you useful. You may know something after graduating from UTP, you may consider yourself as knowledgeable, you have your first degree, your masters, your Phd, and you feel that you are qualified. But believe me, in the future you will be considered as under qualified unless you learn. You keep increasing, upgrading the knowledge that you have with you so as to deal with the new environment that will develop among us. So do not regard university education and your degrees as the end of the quest of knowledge.

The quest of knowledge must go on all the time. Here I would like to diverge a bit because I am in disagreement with the government. I had introduced the teaching of Science and Maths in English when I was still the prime minister. You know Prime Minister have lots of power. They can insist on doing things which other people do not like. That's why I was able to do all those nasty things. Of course I was Prime Minister. Now, of course, I am not the Prime Minister. I have been dismissed. But before I was dismissed, before I gave up being Prime Minister, I introduced the teaching of Science and Math in English. Now, we are nationalists, especially the Malays, we are nationalist. We want to project ourselves. We want to show that we are as civilised, as progressive as anybody else that we have the capacity to improve ourselves, to educate ourselves and we can do this in our own language but let's be truthful. We need to learn other languages in order to increase the amount of knowledge that is available to us. Simply because, most new knowledge are not generated by us, it is generated by other people and if we want to increase our knowledge, we must know what other people have introduced into the field of knowledge. And they do not introduce this in the Malay language. So if you want to learn something new discovered elsewhere, you must have the knowledge of that language. Fortunately, this was sort of tied up with English and most people learn English and study in English and most of the new knowledge comes to

us in English. If we say we should translate into our language, I find that not practical. To translate anything, a new knowledge, from one language to another requires expertise in the two languages and expertise in the subject to be translated. You can learn geography or history and other subjects in your own language because the amount of knowledge does not expand very rapidly. A country that is in that shape will remain that shape for years and years, they don't change. Although Singapore is changing because they are doing a lot of reclamation but otherwise, the borders of countries remain the same, the directions of north, south, east, west remains the same, the distances between points are the same. Geography doesn't change very much. History doesn't change. If there is a war in 1914, you cannot say it didn't happen in 1914, it happens in 1816. You cannot say that. The fact is there is a war in 1914 and it lasted for 4 years until 1918 before they decided to stop killing each other. Those are historical facts, they don't change. But science is different. Science changes almost every day. People are doing research all the times. They are publishing the results of their research. Their researches are not only introducing new things into the discoveries but sometimes, they prove that old theories, old scientific laws are no longer valid. They are actually wrong and needs to be replaced with new laws. Every day, somewhere in the world somebody is writing something about his discoveries, the results of his researches. They write these down in paper because if you do research you must put it down in paper because otherwise you cannot let other people know. You cannot always be talking to people. You may be a Korean, Japanese, and German but strangely almost all these people put down their findings in English. So, every day, new papers on scientific discoveries are being printed, published and spread. We can read English, if we cannot read English, we cannot understand what the new discovery is all about. We can say let somebody translate it for us. To translate, you need a man who is fluent in English in Malay and in the subject that he is going to translate. How many of them are there, who have these 3 qualifications and even if they have these 3 qualifications, they are not going to spend their lives translating this for us. You wouldn't I am quite sure when you graduate, would you spend your time translating. Very dull. But if you learn it in English, you will immediately have access to new knowledge. Then, of course, you are up to date. You know what the latest with regards to electronics is, Nano science, space and many other things that before was not part of knowledge that you have acquired or the knowledge you acquired were no longer correct and they are replaced by new knowledge. So, it is important therefore that the teaching of science be in English and Mathematics. Mathematics also, it doesn't change but new ways of using mathematics are being introduced and you need mathematics to calculate. Supposing you are going to launch a rocket from here to carry our astronaut, he is going to go to the International Space Station, ISS, and you want to launch it from somewhere in Kazakhstan. You have to calculate a whole lot of things because the earth is moving, the earth is tilting, the earth is moving in space, it is not static. While we are here, we feel very stable, but actually we are moving. You don't feel it but we are moving. The world is moving. It is not that the sun rises in the East and set in the West. It is just that the globe is turning and you are going to launch something from a site which is moving. It is like running and jumping and shooting a gun at the enemy. It is very difficult. You have to calculate these things precisely and on top of that, this object in the air, in the sky, the space station is not static. It is called a geostatic relative to the earth, it is supposed to be static. But, it is also moving. It is moving with the earth and when you shoot, you have to

calculate the trajectory so that you will then hit this invisible thing, the small tiny thing in the atmosphere. Imagine the amount of mathematical knowledge that is needed. But, can you get this mathematical knowledge in our language? It is not available. Let's be frank. I am very proud that I am Malay, that my language is Malay, not English. But, I have to learn this in English. I studied medicine in English. Of course, now, I can translate some of the things in Malay, but I find great difficulty translating in Malay without using English words and we are using a lot of English words. Today, in the Malay language, can you use English words if you don't understand the words? You will borrow and use the word incorrectly. That would be difficult for us, but this is just digressing. This is my favourite subject, so since I have a captive audience, I thought that I might vent my displeasure with the government over this issue. But, believe me, education is about acquiring knowledge.

Education is not entirely about learning how to speak your own language or write in your own language. Education is about acquiring knowledge. In order to acquire knowledge, you need to understand the language of knowledge and the language of knowledge today is English. There was a time when the language of knowledge is Arabic. You know, about the Arabs, when they became Muslims, they were told that they must read and to read means to acquire knowledge. What was there to read? Initially there was no kitab, books on Islam being published, so they read about the findings about the great philosophers, the great mathematicians, scientists, numerologists and others. They learnt the knowledge that has already been discovered by other people and they acquire it. Having acquired this knowledge, they add to the knowledge through their own researches. Later books came out written in Arabic, books with new knowledge. After the Islamisation of Arabs, knowledge came to the world in the Arabic language. There were great libraries in Cordoba, in Spain, in Baghdad, in Iran, great libraries where all these knowledge are kept in the great libraries in book forms, mostly hand written. That is some of the knowledge available at that time. As you know, the Muslim Arabs was able to create the greatest civilisations of the age. They were much more civilised, much more progressive than all the rest of the world. The Europeans at that time were living in what is now known as the dark ages. Why the dark ages? It is because the Europeans were very ignorant. They know nothing about science. They know something about science but not like the Arabs. They didn't know much about philosophy about thinking and all that, about the way to think and analyse things. So, how the Arabs were progressing? Just as today, we saw how the Europeans were progressing. In those days, the Europeans were looking at the Arabs because the Arabs created this great civilisation and they decided in order to make progress, they have to learn Arabic. To access the knowledge of the Arabs, which were found in the great libraries, in the Muslim world. We find it difficult to imagine it but for a long time, the Spanish people spoke only Arabic. They couldn't speak Spanish and many of the priests in Europe decided that they must acquire this knowledge from the Arabs and they studied Arabic and they went to the libraries to acquire the knowledge. So, with that knowledge, they built the present European civilisation, based on science, because the Arabs were the greatest scientists in those days. Unfortunately, this was about the 15th century. When the Europeans obtained the scientific knowledge of the Arabs, the Arabs themselves decided to discard the knowledge. They say that it is secular knowledge. It is not about religion so it doesn't give you merit in the afterlife. So, you see what happen was that the Europeans acquire Arab scientific knowledge and they progress. The Arabs discarded

this scientific knowledge and they regrets. So, we find today that the Europeans are way ahead of the Arabs in terms of science, in terms of knowledge in every field. So in order to acquire knowledge, you have to understand the language of the people with knowledge. The Europeans wanted the Arabs knowledge so they studied Arabic. The priests studied Arabic and translated the knowledge into Latin and did research after that in their own languages and today, most of the language, most of them use English as the language of research. So, it is important for us in order to cope with the changes that are happening around us is to learn the language of knowledge. What is the language of knowledge today? Mainly, it is English. But, other languages too can contribute to us. I'm not saying the Arabic language is completely useless to us. It is still useful but scientific knowledge is coming to us today in English. Therefore, not only in the 21st century, even in the last century, the people with the knowledge are the people who have good command of English. Then, they can follow the changes, the new discoveries that were made in other parts of the world, written in English, and therefore, they become better, more knowledgeable people and this contributed towards their growth and their civilisations. So, I am glad that UTP teaches in English. It is not a loss. You are not losing. You don't become an Englishman. I am speaking to you in English now, am I an Englishman? You know I am still a Malay. I am a Malay Muslim. Just because I speak English doesn't make me an Englishman but you need English in order to cope with the expanding field of knowledge that we are living in today. We need all the knowledge in order to cope with changes. There will be changes. There will be changes all the time. What is accepted today may be rejected tomorrow. What is the limit today may not be the limit tomorrow. Knowing this, we have to prepare ourselves. The graduates of the 21st century will have to acknowledge the field of knowledge has expanded and the death of knowledge has also been made much deeper and greater. So, you need to all the time acquire knowledge so that you can deal with the changes that are taking place around us. This change that is taking place is not always about politics. Of course, we see some people that see only political changes, all the talk about freedom, freedom of expression, of this, of that. So, that is what they are concerned with but that is not going to build our civilisation. If our civilisation is to be built, it will be built on the basis of the knowledge that we have. Let's take for example the Korean people. You know Samsung. I have a Samsung phone in my pocket. 10 years ago, 20 years ago, you will not think of having something from Korea. It is a backward nation. I remember going to Korea way back in 1965 when I was a member of parliament. It was very backward. They were learning from us, from Malaysia, how to industrialise. But, they decided that they must face it to develop their country. Their leader who was accused of being a dictator, Park Chun Hee, the father of the new president, he decided that Korea must progress and be as industrialised as Japan. The advice he got from the Americans was that, Korea should concentrate on agriculture and making small, simple products. But, Park Chun Hee didn't agree. He was a bit of a dictator. He's like some Prime Minister in Malaysia also. He rejected the advice given to him by the Americans and by the World Bank. He decided that Korea should be as good as Japan. He was actually an officer in the Japanese army when Japan occupied Korea. He decided that Korea must be like Japan. How was he to do this? He decided to call about 10 or 12 prominent small business people who had succeeded. People like the man who founded Hyundai, Samsung, Dae Woo. They were called by the President and they were told, "you go into this industry, the government will back and lend you money but if you fail, you will get

thrown out". These people were given full backing with funds and with policies of the government, compatible with their development and with also laws that enable them to grow and these people then, took up the challenge by their president and decided to go into heavy industries. They identified the heavy industries. They wanted to build ships, they wanted to build motorcars. They wanted to go into the electronics, etc. Each one of them, the one's chosen by the president led the way, because they were backed by the president. Today, Samsung, a name that you didn't know before, now leads the world and was even able to beat Apple and Sony. It is bigger than Apple and Sony. This country, these people who were very backward before, known as the hermit kingdom, Korea before, did not want to have anything to do with the rest of the world. They were hermits. They just want to be by themselves. But, today, they are the leaders in so many fields. They can build complicated things much faster than most other people, most other industrialised people that you see. For example, recently, a Malaysian boat building company, they build sophisticated boats for the petroleum industry and all kinds of very sophisticated boats. So this company was given a contract by the government. When government gives contract, immediately the person becomes the crony of the government. If you don't want to have cronies, you must make sure everybody fails. If anybody succeeds, then he became one of the cronies. Actually, many of my cronies, real cronies are very poor. But the unreal cronies, these are successful, I didn't know them before, but since they are successful, I knew them and it is the same with the ship, boat building people. I thought they should upgrade their capability. They should be able to build war ship. War ships are very sophisticated ships. They are not like ordinary ships. They have all kinds of electronics, controls, these and that in their operation room. They can actually steer the boat without seeing the sea at all. Before, you must look at the sea to see whether there is another boat in front or something in front. But nowadays, you don't have to look at that, you just have to look at the picture at the screen which tells you whether there is something in front or not. You can actually sit at the bowel of the ship and steer the ship. That is how sophisticated ship steering is today. Koreans are able to design the ship, put in all the electronics, the wiring, the plumbing, everything and do it faster than anybody else. This Malaysian company teamed up with the Koreans and they were able to have half the time of building the ship at almost half the cost. That is how Koreans are able to compete because, they are faster, they are cheaper, they maintain good quality. If the Koreans can transform themselves, we can transform ourselves if we learn something from them. They want to face the challenges of this world. They don't want to remain a developing country, planting rice, cabbage, chillies, kim chi.

So, they have made progress because they adjust themselves to the surroundings. The world is very challenging to them. If they remain backward, they cannot succeed in this world. To do that, they acquire knowledge; they learn everything, all the knowledge that is available. They develop their own skills, they worked very hard. They are much more disciplined. For the graduates of the 21st century I would recommend that you learn from the Koreans if you want to deal with the 21st century which is going to be very challenging. We are living in a very challenging world. If you make a mistake and you fail, even the great countries in the West, they are facing financial crisis because they made a mistake. We must avoid making mistakes. To avoid making mistakes, we must know what is it that they did which caused them to go into this state of crisis. So we need knowledge and we need to

accept the fact that we have to face competition and the only way we can face competition is to have the necessary language knowledge and to have the quality, value system that can enable you to succeed. You may have all the knowledge in the world, but if you go to sleep all the time, 24 hours a day you are not going to succeed. You see, the man with the knowledge must also have the will to work hard, to be disciplined, and not to be diverted by a get rich scheme. When somebody come along and says you don't have to work, you give me your money and I will multiply it, you get taken up with some intelligent people giving the money. In the America, there is a bigger scheme and the person has been arrested. If you get diverted to this get rich schemes and not working with your knowledge, then you will fail to meet the challenges of the 21st century. So apart from acquisition of knowledge as much as possible and doing it continuously, you also must have the quality, the character that enables you to face challenges, stand on your feet to face the challenges, think about it, develop a plan, strategise so you overcome obstacles, you will succeed and your society will also succeed. So, there are many morals. Malaysia has this policy of looking East because, in the East, we find very successful countries. We looked to the East a long time ago. Now, of course, the West is looking East, because the West has not done so well now. All of them are bankrupt. Greece today is literally bankrupt. Spain is going that way, so is Portugal, Italy. France and Britain are also in bad shape. They now look to the East. We have been looking at the East a long time ago and now they are saying it is right, we must look East. There are many things that we did before, which were condemned by them but now they are doing it at a grander scale like bailing out companies. When we bailed out our companies during the financial crisis they said you must let failed companies go bankrupt. But when their companies failed, they printed money and invested. We should learn how to print money also. Actually, they don't print money, they write cheques. A cheque is good as money. What I would like to say is that in the 21st century, there will be many more challenges. The challenges will be different. You can only face these challenges and overcome them or make use of them if you have the knowledge and your knowledge have to be up to date. You must have the latest knowledge and you must have the character of people who are able to meet challenges, who believe in themselves. *Malaysia Boleh*, kita boleh. We can. We can beat anybody else provided we have the knowledge and we have the right value system and attitude which will enable us to overcome the challenges of the future.

LEADERS IN TODAY'S SOCIETY: ISSUES, CHALLENGES AND WAY FORWARD

16 April 2014



Firstly, I would like to say thank the University for this invitation to talk on a subject that is of interest to everyone of us. It is about leadership. We need leaders. Whenever people gather in any groups, small or big, they need somebody to lead and without leading, without a leader, they cannot achieve any degree of progress or success. For example, we participate sometimes in a tug of war it is called a tug of war almost as if it is a war of sorts. In a tug of war, we have two teams pulling a rope from each end. Now, for the side to win, it must have a leader who coordinates the pulling efforts of his team. If there is no leader, the chances of winning are very, very low, very few. Let's take for example a team of 10 people each weighing 100 kilos. Pulling against a team of 10 people with each weighing 50 kilos, half that of their opponents. Now, is it possible for the small, the team of very light people to pull against such heavy people? It is possible if the team coordinates under a leader who will ensure that all of them will pull together, perhaps break and rest and then pull again in a kind of rhythmic way led by the leader. Now, if the heavy weights, the 100 kilo team of 10 people, if they are not well coordinated if they pull at the wrong time without pulling in unison then they cannot make use of their heavy weight in order to give strength to their team. If anybody pulls at any time he likes, he pauses and then when he pulls the others are not pulling, in such a situation it is possible for the small, the team of very light people to win in the tug of war. It illustrates the importance of leadership because leaders provide coordination and also the leaders ensure that everyone does the same thing at the same time to maximise their strength. Now, I would like to go back to Malay history. We all read about the history of the Malay states, we all know about how the Sultanate of Malacca lost to the Portuguese in 1511. Now, the Portuguese came here with a small number of people, of course they were trained, they were a small army of sorts, maybe about 200 or 300 of them. They had just travelled over the seas and you know travelling in sailing boats across the sea is not the most pleasant thing to do. Most of them would have been, would have just recovered from sea sickness for example. On the other hand, the Sultan of Malacca had a huge army numbering thousands, equipped with elephants and whatever weapons that they may have at that time. And we know that this small army brought by the Portuguese was able to defeat the huge army of the Sultan of Malacca and in 1511, Malacca became Portuguese territory. Why has this happened? I have always asked this question whenever I think about politics in Malaysia and I realise that it is about leadership. The Sultan and his people led an army without really leading. Until now, we don't know who was the General in Command.

Was it the Sultan, was it his children or the Bendahara or whoever, who was the Commanding Officer of the Sultan's army which is a big army equipped with elephants? But who was the leader? Until now, we are not quite sure. We are not quite sure who was the leader and because of that, their defence of Malacca was disorganised. On the other hand, the Portuguese came with a well structured unit, fighting unit. They have of course

their Admirals, they have various grades of Officers and they have the common soldier. And the line of command is very clear. It is from top to bottom, from the General down to the Colonels, down to the Lieutenant Colonels, to the Captains, to the Lieutenant, to the Sergeant, to the Corporals and then to the soldiers. They were very well organised and they were led by one person, not by you know not fully recognised leaders but by one person. It was under the command of the Admiral; at that time it was Albuquerque and he directed the operation, the fight against the Sultan's army and he defeated this large army because he was better organised. He knows the line of command, he knows the command words and whatever he says is understood right to the bottom, to the ordinary soldier. I don't know what are the command words used by the Sultan's army but until now, the command words are still not very clear. We adopted the command words of the British in our present modern army but at the time of the Sultan of Malacca, the great Sultanate, we are not sure what were the command words and as a result their movements were not coordinated. The Portuguese were well coordinated, they know what they have to do, they were trained and they know who their leaders were at each level, not just at the very top but at each level, who were the in-charge and because of that they were able to defeat the army of the Sultan fairly easily. And this story, this experience is repeated over and over again throughout that period when the Europeans decided to well create their empire by conquering all the countries that cannot fight against them, countries like India, with its Mogul Emperor, with its many huge armies and people lost to the British. Indonesia was subjugated by the Dutch. The Spanish took over the Philippines and all over the world, we see this Europeans defeating, invading and defeating the huge armies of the local people and creating their empire. It is all about leadership. Without leaders, without a single purpose, without coordination, I don't think this small armies coming from Europe and Europe has a small population, even smaller in those days than now. They were able to conquer the world with very few people. I mean imagine India at that time already had hundreds of millions of people but they were defeated by General Clive and became a part of the British Empire ruling this huge continent with only a few people. And if you examine why is it they were able to do so, the answer is leadership. Now, it is clear that leaders are necessary. Now, in the history of humanity, there has always been a need for leaders. Since people, humans are gregarious they like to live in groups, every time, they live in group, they need somebody to lead them. From the system of chiefs of tribes evolve, the monarchy. The Monarchs were supposed to be leaders of course, because they would lead their country. Sometimes, they would lead their country into wars even with them leading in front. Nowadays, of course Generals lead from 3,000 miles behind but in those days, to lead an army means to be in front. To lead properly and because the leaders are good, they win. But sometimes, the leaders are not so good, of course they will lose. Everything depends upon leadership. The great leaders who emerged throughout history for example is about leadership. The prophet of Islam, Muhammad SAW was a great leader, a man who was able to convert the ignorant Arabs, the Jahiliah to become a great race, to build a great civilisation that expanded from China to Spain in the west. That is leadership. Of course following that, there were other normal people who became leaders in history; we know about Genghis Khan, we know about Peter the Great. We know about Napoleon and a host of others. These were great leaders and under these great leaders things undergo radical change. The ignorant Arabs, the Jahiliah Arabs became a great

nation spreading the word to the whole world at that time to build a great Muslim civilisation. All lead by one man, the Prophet of Islam. Of course, later on there were such great leaders as Genghis Khan, the tribes, the Mongol tribes were divided into very many groups fighting against each other but Genghis Khan through his personality and his bravery was able to gather all the troupes, all the different tribes together and built a great nation, the Mongol nation and Genghis Khan as you know conquered the whole of Central Asia extending into Eastern Europe and into China. The only difference between Genghis Khan and the European is that when they conquer, they don't rule, they allow the locals to rule and in the case of the Mongols, they actually adopted the religion of the people in that place. So today, you see leaders of Turkey, some of them are of Mongol origin. The Mogul Emperors of India were Mongols. Kublai Khan who united the whole of China was a Mongol. All these are examples of great leaders, people with the capacity to bring people together and to arrange them or to administer them so that they become effective as a force. Effective in war and effective in the administration of their countries. These are great leaders because they understand what leadership means. What is leadership? Leadership means being able to provide guidance to whoever it is that become the followers. How do we recognise a leader? Well, as I said just now, monarchs, kings and rajas were at one time leaders and these leaders probably started as just chiefs in their own tribes, later on because of their strong leadership, they were able to unite many different tribes to build a nation or a state and to rule that state and the Ruler of course is the leader. But the system depends or rather was slightly corrupted because instead of choosing the best person to become a leader, the system began to deteriorate into leadership based on family ties of succession. The son of the King becomes the next King and the son of the next King becomes the next King after that. The question as to whether the new Monarchs are capable or not does not arise anymore. They build a great mystery about their own person and because of that they were honoured and obeyed because they come from that family or this family. Over time of course some of the descendants of these Rulers were not really good leaders and they failed. They began to enjoy life and forget about their need to lead the people. They were so powerful, they amassed a lot of wealth and they have a grand life but they forget that leaders have to lead. You have to lead the people. When you think of yourself as a leader with privileges and you forget your duty to lead, then obviously your followers will begin to question, question whether they need this leader by hereditary leaders or not. And so it was that the French decided to revolt against their Monarch, we know about the French Revolution. The French Revolution happened simply because the Ruler as a leader had forgotten his role as a leader. He was not uniting his people, his followers, not giving them the kind of things they expect from life, not giving them good leadership. And so eventually the people rose and even as the people rose against their leader, they need a leader from amongst themselves. And of course a few leaders emerged from all revolutions. The leaders will then try to unseat the hereditary leader because the hereditary has failed but in order to do that, the leader must have a kind of quality that allows him to become a leader, to lead people. A leader must have ideas. A leader must be brave. A leader must take risks. A leader must, well, stretch out his neck to be chopped if he fails. A leader must understand the needs of his followers. What do the followers want? Is it independence, is it better lives or whatever it is. So we find eventually that the Monarchy system in Europe was thrown out and replaced with Republics. Republics, going back to

the public to find a leader and then how do you find a leader from amongst so many people?

That becomes a problem; some people emerge and assume the role of leaders but is not very satisfactory. So eventually they evolve or they design a system of going back to the people and letting the people determine who their leader should be and that is what we call democracy. In a democracy, the people chose the leader and the leader will then lead them. The belief is that the people would know who should be their leader. Obviously they would choose the man who is best qualified to become a leader. And the democratic process of course would enable the people to choose who should be their leader. Unfortunately initially, of course it worked; they chose the best man, the man with the best capacity to lead, to become their leader, giving him titles like Presidents or Chairman or Prime Ministers for that matter. This is the people's right and the people's choice to choose the best man to become their leader. But over time, democracy begins to deteriorate like all human ideas. Over time, the idea becomes corrupted. New things get thrown in which affects the system and in the case of democracy, we find today, after determining that the leader should be the person who leads the majority of the people because you can't get everybody to agree so you decide that ok, anybody getting the support of 50% or more of the people should become the leader. It is a good idea. It enables us to determine who should become a leader and in order to do this, we have political parties forming all over. But then the system is sometimes corrupted by people who do not think about whether the leader is capable of leading or not. You chose a leader because you like him. You chose a leader because he is of the same race, the same tribe and the same religion. Not the best person but you want somebody that you are comfortable with and the people you are comfortable with would be people who understand you, who are of the same tribe, the same race or the same religion. So the choice now is not based on the capability or the ability of the person involved who should be your candidate. The choice now is based on your loyalty to your race, to your ideology, to your religion, to your tribe. And when you base the choice of a leader not on his capability but because you like him, because he is from your own group, then you are likely to choose the wrong leader. The leader who is chosen not because he has the capacity to lead but because of your loyalty to your own group. That is what we are seeing today in many countries including in Malaysia, we don't chose the best leader, we chose because we belong to this party or that party, this race or that race, this religion or that religion. And we are likely to choose, sometimes we are right, we chose the right leader, sometimes we make mistakes and we chose the wrong leader. And of course the wrong leader cannot provide the kind of leadership that you need. What is the kind of leadership that you need? When the right kind of leader is the one who is able to marshal, to gather everybody to become his followers, to accept him as the leader. He should be a person who has a lot of ideas on how to solve problems. He comes up with ways in order to achieve progress for example. He must know more than his followers. If he is of average capacity and is no better than his followers, he will not last very long as a leader. He must be superior not in terms of dignity and things like that but in terms of ability to solve problems because the community is always faced with problems. No matter how big or how small they must have problems and there must be conflict between them. But the problems should be resolved by a leader. A capable leader must be able to solve the

problem, provide leadership with new ideas. Define the direction that his followers should go. Define the objective, the target that is the role of the leader. Therefore, he must be not of average intelligence but he must have something more than that. He can see things better than his followers. If he can see what is going to happen in the future, that is even better because knowing the dangers coming then he will be able to make preparation. Knowing that his people wants development he would know how to achieve development. That is a leader. A leader who is merely a leader by name but has got no idea about where they should go, in what direction they should go, what are the things needed then obviously, he is going to fail. Of course, in the world where there are conflicts and wars, we need somebody, not necessarily a General; we need a leader who prepares the country to meet the exigencies of violence, wars. What does he do? Obviously, he must have a very good force, a very disciplined force, led by a very disciplined officers, equipped with the right weapons, drilled in the ways to fight a war. When the leader knows that his country is in danger, then he has to make this preparation. Alternatively, a good leader would use diplomacy, for example in order to avoid having to face a war. Instead of preparing, spending huge sums of money on weapons, on big military forces the leader can through diplomacy ensure that he has friends around. The enemies would become his friends who will not attack him. And he would be saving the nation from having to expend so much money on armed forces. So that is a leader. He has ideas, he is brave, he is willing to take risks, he is willing to be up there in front to take the full brunt of the attacks. Now, today, we are living in very challenging times. We are faced with technological development which we never dreamt of before, which we never thought of before. Today, we can communicate with everyone, merely by taking a small instrument from your pocket and you can communicate. You can communicate with everyone. Of course, people who are not, who do not have good intentions also can have these small instrument and they will use in order to well, to achieve their own objective which may not be good. And you will have to learn how to handle these attacks coming to you from every direction. No longer for example can we say let us censor this book, let us censor this magazine. It is a lot of lies directed at us and exposing us to a lot of problems, etcetera. In those days, we censor magazine, we censor the films that are shown in the cinema and at one time, we thought that we will have only one TV station, one radio station which is controlled by the government. That was the way that leaders dealt with before there was the new information technology, the advances that we see today. Today, leaders have to handle a much more intelligent population. Now, if the people are not so intelligent they don't question you very much. They will follow you and they will be very loyal to you especially if you give them money for example but today, we find the people in this country and in the rest of the world have a higher rate of intelligence than before. They question, they ask question, they want to know why. Why do you do this? They will point out to you that what we have done is wrong, it has brought bad results, they will question and a leader needs to be able to handle these constant intellectual attacks against the leader. If he is not capable of dealing with such attacks then obviously he will lose his position as a leader. So a leader must understand technology not in detail but understand the effects of technology. The ability of people to actually face the leader and question him every day on the Facebook, on the internet, WhatsApp and all these things have now become very common. Everybody has access to this ability. People have become very powerful. They are no longer weak people living in the villages, not knowing

what is happening outside the village even. Today, although we may be Malaysians we are also world citizens. The whole world is where we live in and we have access to the rest of the world, we know what people are thinking in America, in Europe, in Japan, in China, we know in detail their thoughts and therefore, we are much more intelligent, much more critical of things. Now, a leader of today must face with a very intelligent group of followers. Of course, if he fails to satisfy his followers, they will become his opponents. And that will bring greater problem for the leader and he may even lose his leadership. It is not enough for a leader to be charismatic, that is to say he is a popular guy. Why is he popular? Because he shakes your hand. Because he is nice. He kisses the babies and things like that. Nowadays, that is not enough. We are dealing with very intelligent people, University educated. When I went to University, I was one of seven Malays who went to the University. But today, everybody goes to the University, if you go up to the school level, SPM and the like, you will never get a job. Everybody has got University degree now. Beyond that they are all doctors.

So many people are now doctors that I lose my identity as a doctor. I thought that doctors cure people's illness. But these doctors, please don't go and see them when you are sick. They are doctors; they are PhDs, not MDs. So we have so many doctors to deal with. Dealing with one doctor is bad enough but having to deal with a whole room full of doctors is very, very difficult. But a leader must learn that he is living in a new environment, an environment of intellectuals of people with University and post University education able to think for themselves, able to question you, to analyse what you have done, to find faults with what you have done and to enunciate, to tell you, look, you are wrong. So for a leader to be told by his so called followers or the people whom he wants to have to support him, makes life very difficult for a leader which is why I resigned from being the Prime Minister before this alternative media came around, just in time. But beyond that a leader must have the skills to administer, to administer his followers, to gather them, to consolidate their strength so as to be able to oppose those who challenge him. That is also the need for a leader. It is not just a question of winning elections. You know sometimes, we win election not because we are very clever but because well, this people think that you are of the same race, the same religion, the same culture and you speak my language, so I chose you but once you are up there as a leader, things change because now you are faced with problems that you must solve and if you fail to solve those problems, you will very soon lose your leadership and you see it throughout the world, how often people have been ousted from being leaders. Not only that, they also have to behave themselves. When you are a very private person you can do like, nobody cares. But if you are a leader the slightest mistake you make, the slightest act which is not morally correct, you will be condemned, criticised and thrown out. So you have to behave yourself as a leader. You know I realise this when I became a leader when I was Minister of Education long, long ago. This nice government provided me with security escort. Anywhere I go the security man is behind me. I wanted to do bad things but this man is around. I had to behave because I never know when he is going to tell somebody about my bad behaviour. So when you become a leader you also have to behave. You have to be very correct in the manner that you conduct your life, your relationship with your own family, with your wife or wives, all these will be taken into account. So a leader must be morally correct. If you indulge in something

that is not correct that is not approved of, that is a sin, you will not last long as a leader. So apart from having to have full knowledge of modern technology and the capacities of this technology. You also have to be a very good person not indulging in the things that others can indulge in. You have to make that sacrifice if you are not prepared to make that sacrifice, you cannot be a leader because today a leader is in full view of the whole world. You do something wrong, they will publish in the paper about what you have done. Of course, knowing that they can pull you down, they can also tell lies about you so as to bring you down. This also a leader needs to learn how to handle. Well, during my time, I was called a dictator. I know it is not true. I am a very nice man. I am not a dictator but they build up a story that this Firaun is now running the country and in one of the Facebook entries in the Facebook of somebody, he stated that I am a billionaire with 4 billion dollars stolen from the government. Before such things he may entertain that idea but he cannot tell people about that idea but now the whole country has to content with this news that I am a billionaire. And I have to face this problem. What do I do? Basically of course if you are really not a billionaire, you can tell them. I am not a billionaire. But these kinds of attacks also is now directed at the leaders. And if they don't know to handle these attacks, they will also fail as a leader. So as you can see a leader needs multiple skills, the skill to be accepted as a leader, to stay on as a leader, to have the skill to carry out the work of a leader, to have ideas and solutions to the problems of your followers. To understand technology for a modern leader, to understand the capacity of new technologies, to make use of these new technologies and to understand how to fight against the abuses of these technologies. So a leader must have multiple capabilities. If the system is going to work, if you are a leader in a democratic country, you must have multiple skills but leaders of course are not always at the top, at various levels there will be leaders. You may be a leader in your office, that also requires you to have better skills than all the others in the office. You may be the CEO, you may be the other ranks that they hold in the business sector, you must have the skills. Without the skills at that level you will not become a leader. But of course right as you mount the ladder to become leader with greater function, greater power, greater skills will be needed and you must also remember that you cannot afford to abuse your position as a leader. We talk a lot about corruption. You know some people assume that all leaders are corrupt. They must be corrupt because if I am in that position, I would take bribes, so on the basis of what he would do should he become the Prime Minister, then he assumes that the Prime Minister must be corrupt. All Prime Ministers are corrupt, that includes me. So these are the problems that he will be faced with and the best solution to that of course is not to be corrupt. To deny yourself to dedicate yourself to your work and forget about personal wealth and position. So as you can see, you need to have many, many skills, many, many moral values in order to be a leader. And it is of course difficult to find people with all these assets. Most people have got some weakness; for example if they are followed by their security too much you can always tell the security, 'Please today I don't want you. I am going somewhere.' And if you do that often enough, the security will tell people, 'Look, this man is going somewhere and always tells us not to secure him.' So that too is something that may work against you. So I have said quite a lot of things about leadership in modern times and in the past. You need to know the past because you need to make a comparison to the past. In the past we have absolute kings, absolute monarch who can do what they like even kill you, even kill you without trial. In the

past, Kings did that but today Prime Ministers and Presidents cannot say that well, 'He is opposed to me; please put him under ISA.' No more ISA. So their leaders are not so safe now as they were before. So we have to deal with changes within our society, changes which are in terms of moral, in terms of values and changes in terms of technology, in terms of the wider environment. You are not a leader in a small group anymore. You are leader of a country, therefore you have to think about how you should satisfy a whole nation if you are a leader at that level and this is of course very difficult for the leader. We all have weaknesses but if you want to be a leader for a longer time, curb the weaknesses. Stop abusing your position. Then you will stay as a leader. So I will stop there because I believe you are going to have some question and answers.

SOCIAL EVOLUTION IN MALAYSIA: WHAT'S NEXT

19 August 2015



When we talk about evolution, obviously we are talking about changes taking place in society. And when we talk about changes taking place in society, we need to know the situation before, the current situation, and what we think the future would be like. There is continuity. It's not something isolated. The past, that, is one item, the present another thing all by itself, and the future is totally divorced from what is happening now. Society continues and the way society behaves, the culture, the value systems and all that, evolve over time. So, to know what is in the future, we need to look into the past. We need to examine the present and therefore we may make a guess as to what will happen in the future. Now, I have been quite fortunate in that I have had quite a long period of time to observe changes taking place in the society in Malaysia, the social changes. We, in Malaysia, are always affected by outside influences. Because Malaysia is in a way unique, because it is a multiracial country, has multiracial society. And each one of these societies have their own contribution towards the whole of the Malaysian social structure. Now, we all began of course by the peninsular being peopled almost exclusively by the indigenous people, the Malays. And they developed their own culture. Of course, it's also influenced by their beliefs. Prior to their becoming Muslims, they were animists or they were... they professed the Hindu religion. So, that influenced them, and it still influences them today. Because we find a lot of Malays still believing in all kinds of invisible creatures: ghost, Jembalang, Pelesit, and the like. We believe in those things and because we believe in them, we live in fear of them. We haven't got rid of that fear just yet. Many of us are still influenced by the fear of unknown things. That is why we find for example among young Malay girls a tendency towards hysteria. Suddenly they go into a kind of trance and they scream and they say something is influencing them. But this is actually the result of their beliefs. But that is jumping ahead. What I would like to say is that, initially, the culture of this country was that of the Malays generally. And they developed a kind of civilisation centred around the leader, and the leader is acknowledged by them as their 'Raja', their 'Ruler'. And of course when they became Muslim, they changed from Raja to Sultans. But their life is centred around the palace, and they developed a very strict code of ethics, code of behaviour which is influenced by the palace. So much so that we see among the Malays two different languages. One language for the common people, and one language for the Raja. You 'mandi', they 'bersiram'. But the process of course is the same. But the words are different. We have to use special words because to distinguish them from us. And the need for us to conform to the ethical codes developed around the palace gives us a certain character -- a character that is quite different from others. Because we are actually, from the very beginning, very feudalistic, we believe in the right of the Raja to rule and there was no idea about democracy and the things like that. It is the right of the Raja to rule. That was the system that we developed by ourselves, the Malays. And in those days, of course, the government is the Ruler. Which is why we talk about the 'Kerajaan' -- the situation of having a Raja, 'Kerajaan'. But if you go to Indonesia, they won't call the government 'Kerajaan'.

They call their government 'Pemerintah'. The people who, well, 'perintah', who direct things that should be done within society. But, in Malaysia, we still talk about Kerajaan although of course we have changed, because today we don't have monarchs with absolute authority. But our perception, our concept of government is still that of a certain body that is very superior, very high above, that we must obey, and that shaped our culture. And if you see, you study the Malay culture, you will find them having all kinds of sayings: Pepatah Melayu. All kinds of sayings to guide them in their lives. In any situation, this is how you think, this is what you do. Always you are governed by the Adat. And, of course, eventually, we introduced laws. And when we became Muslims, of course, we adopted Islamic Laws for the country. But even then, we never really forgot our original native beliefs in animism, in Hinduism even. So, that is... that was the community into which came foreign people. People from China, basically from India. They came here not to stay here. They came here to earn a living and then go home to their own country. That was the original intention. But of course when they come in here, they brought with them their own culture, their own beliefs, their own system, their own methods. And like it or not, we have to, the Malays, have to absorb and practise some of these things that are brought in by the foreigners, mainly, from India and from China. So, already there is a mixed culture, a social system that is different, that is a mixture of three different races with their own cultures. And then, of course, we were colonised by the Europeans. The Portuguese came to Malaysia in 1509, and 1511 they conquered Malacca. But the Portuguese influence was confined largely to Malacca, although to this day, Portuguese is found in the Malay language. 'Almari' for example, is a Portuguese word. 'Mentega', 'Keju'. These are things that are inherited by us and became a part of our culture, our system, our beliefs, because of 100 years of Portuguese rule. That was followed by the Dutch. The Dutch left some impression but not much. But the most influential people were the British. They came in through treaties with the rulers and they introduced new ideas, new methods, new thinking, new organisations. And we accept them unquestioningly. Of course we retained our own cultures to a certain extent, but we gradually become more and more Eurocentric. Our society becomes Eurocentric. Whatever change that takes place in Malaysia within Malaysian society is influenced, has been influenced by what happened in Europe. We do this thing almost automatically. But we don't really realise because many of the changes brought by the Europeans were good changes. We have better organisation for example in the government. During the time of feudal rulers, the taxes collected were for the Ruler -- not for the government, but for the Ruler. And the Ruler can then give some money for the development of the State for whatever administrative needs that you may have. It is the Ruler's money. The tax goes directly to the Rulers. But when the British came, the tax goes to a new body called the Treasury. And the money is then used to pay even the Ruler. Even the Ruler gets a pay coming from the Treasury. So this is a very major change in terms of organisation, in terms of values, in terms of attitude, from being totally feudal, autocratic, monarch, we now have Rulers who are paid a salary, are given certain appurtenances but they are not really the owners of all the wealth that is generated within the country. So, that is a very major change. And that was a good change because in the past, obviously there was no order in terms of how the money is expended. I come from Kedah and I know what happened in Kedah during the feudal era. The money was collected by civil servants who are actually servants of the Rulers. They collect the money and they are supposed to deliver the money collected as taxes to the Ruler. But of

course somewhere along the way, some of the money disappeared. And the Ruler got just a small amount of money, and Rulers need money all the time when they are not happy with this small amount of money that they received because of the taxes that are pocketed along the way before reaching the Ruler. Now, along comes 'Kapitan Cina' -- the leader of the Chinese in the State -- In the State of Kedah.

I'm talking about Kedah. I'm not going to insult other States. But, I think I can insult Kedah because I'm from Kedah anyway. So, a Kapitan Cina came along. Of course, Kapitan Cina is very close to the Ruler because of his generosity. So, he told the Ruler that if you give him a tax monopoly, give him the right to collect the taxes, he guarantees that he will pay the Ruler a bigger sum of money. And, of course, the Ruler agreed. And indeed, when the Kapitan Cina collects the taxes, the amount he pays to the Ruler is much bigger than what the Ruler used to get. So, this is one lesson about corruption. You know, when you are corrupt, in the end you lose everything because you don't get the rights to collect the taxes anymore and you cannot even pocket some of it. Of course, how much the Kapitan Cina pockets it's his business. But I'm quite sure he also pockets some. But his collection was much bigger and the Sultan was, or the Ruler was very happy about it. Subsequently, the Kapitan Cina was also given a monopoly to sell opium. You know, today we talk about opium as drug and drug addiction is something we don't want to see in our society. But during feudal times, opium was a source of income for the Ruler, for the government. They sell the opium. But as usual, when the opium is sold by officers in the government, part of the money somehow or other disappears. You know, monies can disappear. Even RM42 billion can.... So, because the revenue from the opium which should be very big was small, again, Kapitan Cina offered to sell the opium to get an opium monopoly. So, the Kapitan Cina sold the opium, mainly to the Chinese workers and all that but also some members of the elite group including members of the royal family in those days also smoked opium. So, the Kapitan Cina collected much more money, and the Ruler was very happy that he is earning much more money from taxes and from opium. The people who used to pocket some of the money now have got no more source of income. So, that is one lesson that we can learn from the social evolution. From money being collected by corrupt officers, to money being collected by a much more efficient Kapitan Cina. This is going to be the kind of society we are going to see in Malaysia because some people feel that if other people can do work for them, why should they work? Let other people do the work. And eventually, of course, you let other people do work for you, you lose your position, you lose your power. That is something that we need to remember. But of course when the British came, they took over the collection of the taxes, they took over the opium monopoly. Believe me, Malaysia was developed by the British through selling opium. This is the British way of raising funds. They tried to sell opium to China. And they were making tons of money selling opium in China until of course the Chinese government felt this was not right and there was the so-called Opium War in China. But in Malaysia, there was no war. People were happy to smoke opium. Opium smokers were licensed. And they pay for one tube of opium, if they are allowed one tube a day, they get one tube. And everybody feels happy. The opium smokers feel very happy. Actually it is a very good system making the people smoke opium. You know what happens when people smoke opium? They dream. They see fantastic things. Beautiful girls. All kinds of things. Just smoking opium and they enjoy life. They have no time to demonstrate. They have no

time to go condemn the government, why do you impose GST on us? So, one way to quieten the country is by legalising opium smoking. How about that? It's not, what's going to happen next. But it can happen. A lot of people take opium, take all kinds of drugs. But unfortunately, now it results in a lot of crimes. When they don't get the drugs, they get violent, they kill people, they do all kinds of things, to their own parents even. But in those days, during the British time, I know, because I lived during that period, the opium smokers were mainly the coolies, the hardworking labourers, mainly Chinese. They work very hard every day pulling rickshaws, working hard in sawmills and others. In the evening, they retire to the opium dens and they smoke opium and they dream and they sleep, and the country was peaceful. No demonstration whatsoever. No talk about politics. Politics is not for the people. So that was the culture which developed with the advent of the British. They came in with a lot of new ideas about governments, about collecting taxes, about building roads, about building bridges. These things were brought by the British. And their collection of taxes went to the Treasury, the Treasury then allocates funds to -- for this project and that project, to pay the civil servants etc. It was much better organised. And the country developed to a certain extent. It could have developed much more, but the British also need the money to be sent back to London. But some of the money is spent in the country, and Kedah and other parts of Malaysia developed. And what is good about the British is the introduction of education. Of course, we had the Malay school, we had the Madrasah and all that, but they were not properly organised. But the British organised the education system and some people are fortunate in that they were given English, so-called English education. I was one of the fortunate ones. In one year, only 30 people get to go to these English schools. And when you go to English school, you are inundated with stories about the West, about Europe, about the greatness of Europe, about their achievements, about their thinking, about their ideas, and whether we like it or not, all these things are absorbed by us and influenced our thinking. A social change takes place. We feel that we are very inferior people, and that the superior people are in Europe, and the world must be Eurocentric because that is the centre of the world. Europe is the centre of the world. Whatever they do there, is the right thing to do. Follow them, and you will be fine. Of course, we see countries like Japan, and to a certain extent Thailand, tried to follow the West. Some succeed, some did not succeed so well. But Malaysia, the educated elites were English educated. And the Chinese were allowed to have their own schools, Chinese schools, but many of them prefer to attend the English schools and so do the Indians. And now there is a mix of all these three major races in Malaysia. And this mixture absorbs a lot of the culture of the West. At the same time, of course, they interact between them and they were able actually to benefit from the mixture between the different races in Malaysia through the English schools. Of course, the Malay schools were for the Malays, Chinese schools for the Chinese, and the Tamil schools were for the Indians. But in the English schools, the three races meet. And they became very influential people because they were very well educated. And of course, much of what they believe in, the culture that they adopt, the social values that they believe in, mostly come from the West, from Europe. We became Eurocentric. We became, to a large extent, copiers. We copy. We don't think any more about our own way of life. Even among the Muslims, they now begin to look towards the West. And our culture, our social structure changed because of this influence coming from Europe. Not bad all the way but some of them are actually very bad. Because we became addicted to what comes from Europe. Addicted in a very real

sense. Our value system is actually a copy of the Western value system. And whatever changes take place or took place in Europe, very soon, those changes will also be seen in Malaysia. In those days, I still remember, Malays for example, used to wear a second sarung to cover their face. Put it across like that like the... like our Arab tourists who come here, they cover, only the eyes are seen. My sisters used to wear this second sarung. But gradually, the sarung became more loose, more loose, and then it dissolves and becomes just a tiny transparent shawl. And then it disappeared altogether. Everybody had bobbed hair. They call it bobbed hair. You go to the hairdressers, they use some instrument to curl your hair and you want to show how nice you look with your hair bobbed, no more shawl, and we were moving around much more freely. When I was small, my sister when going to the girls' school, Malay girls' school, which is about only about 300 yards from the house, she would go in a rickshaw. You have not seen a rickshaw. A rickshaw is a... well, carriage that is pulled by a rickshaw puller. But it is covered. For the girls, you cover the sides and the front. The girls can see over the front cover but you cannot see the girls, because girls are not supposed to be seen. They have to go to school and the rickshaw will take them to the school and take them back, but nobody can see them. That was the beginning. But later on, of course, the front part is taken off and people become more exposed. And as I said, eventually, people became more free.

Why are they more free? It's because we have accepted Western value system, Western culture. In the West, they don't cover their faces. But eventually, we too adopted that system so that by the time we were struggling for independence, nobody covers his head or face. The ladies don't cover. They all have bobbed hair. They all come to meetings and all that. And there is a definite change, a westernised version of the culture that we get from... a culture that is very westernised in many ways. Of course, a few girls do go to English school, and of course they are regarded as some kind of a genius, including my wife. I think, that year, perhaps 30 or 40 girls get to go to the school and a few Malay girls also got to go to the school, and they were regarded as some peculiar human beings quite different from the others. But of course in those days the others also go to the hairdresser. They have their hair permed. Bobbed or permed whichever way you want to use. So, you can see the change that is taking place within our society. Of course, for the Chinese girls, no problem at all. They used to wear the Samfu which is a kind of jacket and trousers. They haven't adopted the Cheongsam yet, but gradually they too began to copy the fashion of Shanghai. But the Malays tend to copy the Western styles. At least those who... who had the good fortune of going to an English school. There are others who go to school also but we have less girls going to school than the boys. The girls are not expected to be educated. Home life is quite different from what you see today. When I was a boy, boys are privileged. We sit for lunch or dinner together with the father and the mother, and the boys. And after we have finished, what is left over is taken to the dapur, the kitchen side, where my sisters eat what is left after we have eaten. Today, you do that, I think there will be an explosion. But that was the social life then. We accepted that. I mean, the girls do not complain. They are quite happy to carry the dishes with some leftovers to the kitchen side, and there they finish whatever is left by us. See, it was a great life that time. But nowadays, of course, they consider men as their equals and all that which is wrong. But this copying of the West should stop somewhere there. But we went on. We want to copy the West in many ways. And today, what do you

see? What I was telling about is the past, during my young days. Now, today, what do you see? You see a change in the mindset of our people which affects their social life. They no longer want to be confined to the house. They want to be free. They want to do what they feel they like to do. The don't want to be disciplined by their parents. These are new ideas coming out of the West. And of course, if it comes from the West, it must be very good. The first thing that they think about now, of course, is about freedom. Of course, we should all go for freedom. We should be free. We shouldn't be shackled and confined to houses and things like that. We should be free. But then, how free should we be? Is there no limit to freedom? Some people say there is no limit to freedom. Anything that I want to do, I should be allowed to do and nobody should criticise me or scold me or tell me off or your parents beat you up. Those things are no more. Our present culture is such that the most important thing in life is freedom. You must be free to choose what studies you want to follow. During my time, of course, I became a doctor by accident. I didn't want to become a doctor, I wanted to become a lawyer because I like to argue with people. In the school, I was head of the Literary and Debating Society. Always arguing with teachers and the teachers didn't like me. And I thought that if I become a lawyer, I will be able to argue even more. You know, being a lawyer is much better than being a doctor. A doctor has only one direction. When you have somebody who is sick, your job is to cure. Not to make him worse but to cure him. Of course sometimes he gets worse but that's too bad. But a lawyer, you can give him whatever job, whether it is defence or prosecution, they can argue both sides. You know, if you ask them to defend, they can defend even though you know he is a murderer, the lawyers are prepared to defend. But if you ask him to prosecute, he will also be able to prosecute and has his argument. So lawyers are what I would like to be before I was chosen to study medicine. Then I can argue to my heart's content. But they gave me a scholarship to study medicine and you don't ask question. You just go and study. And I'm very grateful for that. I'm very grateful I'm not a lawyer. Although sometimes I like to borrow their methods as well because they are quite useful when you are arguing with your opponent. But when you are given a scholarship, you just accept. But today, you are given a scholarship, you say 'no, I don't want this. I don't want to study medicine. I want to become something else.' You argue and you demand that you should be given scholarship to study whatever it is that you want to study. Freedom. You must have freedom. So the culture has changed. Before, you were obedient, there was discipline in the house. Today, our present culture is that you have to be free to do what you like. But then, is there a limit to what freedom you can exercise. This idea about freedom was enshrined by the French Revolution -- about equality, fraternity, and the like. And that was to be free from the oppression of the king, the ruler. That was the first idea. And of course it was an excellent idea. But that idea of freedom is carried through now in every phase of our life. Everything that we do, it must be governed by the need to be free. So what happens? When you are free to do what you like, you can ignore custom, tradition, adat, etc. And the greatest expression of freedom in the West today is to be able or for a man to be able to marry a man. So what's wrong with that? He wants to get married to a man, why should he marry a woman? Small problem, cannot have children. So now, men can marry men, women can marry women as part of the expression of freedom. Now, if we continue with our natural urge to copy what comes from the West we too would say one day, well why not. I mean, why cannot he marry a man? What's wrong with that? You ask that question, of course, everybody, somebody will tell you, no, there's nothing wrong with that.

And so, when you copy, you have to be selective. Currently we are still resistant to these ideas. I don't know what you think about these ideas but maybe we should resist this idea about freedom to that extent. Then, there is freedom of speech. You can say what you like. You should be free. But if you say something against somebody, then you might get a reply or you might be punched in the nose. Freedom of the press for example. Well, it's a good thing for people to have freedom of the press. But when the press decides to insult people, is that the right kind of freedom? You know about what happened with this French magazine called Charlie Hebdo. Charlie Hebdo decided to insult the Prophet of the Muslims. What is the result? They get shot and killed by some nasty Muslims. Of course people who shoot other people must be nasty. So, the claim is that I'm free to say what I like. Why should you kill me just because I'm insulting your Prophet? There is something wrong now about freedom. There should be a limit. There should be a limit to freedom because you don't want to have your society becoming unstable -- because of the freedom exercised by people. Supposing you go to your friend and you say nasty things about his mother or his father, and he punches you in the nose, and you complain that is my freedom of speech. He might reply that is my freedom of expression to punch your nose. Imagine society in which there is no limit to freedom. You do just what you like. Then, I think that will not be a very stable society capable of developing. So while we should accept eurocentrism, we should be selective. Take what is good and push off what is bad. That is what you should do if you have a way or you have the capacity to think for yourself. When you are copying anything, never copy without questioning. If you want to see the future society in Malaysia a better society, you have to be selective. Today, what we see is the ascendancy of the East. The countries of the East are now developing, becoming more powerful, more assertive than in the past. In the past, of course it is Eurocentric. But in the future, it's going to be Asia centric. This is not something very new. At one time, China regarded itself as the Middle Kingdom. Meaning to say, China is the centre or was the centre of the world. China had anticipated being the centre of the world before the Europeans became the centre of the world. But now it is likely that the centre of the world would move East again.

And you have to understand there must be something right that is done by Eastern countries that has propelled them towards greater height so must so that they are now influencing the thinking of the peoples of the world. So while would should look West, we should also now look East and see what is the culture of the East that has enabled the East to catch up and outstrip the West almost. Of course the West will never say they have been outstripped, they are still number one, but the East is coming up very very fast. Now, if we want to have our society fitting in with development in the rest of the world, we need to look East, West, North, and South. Now, we began to look East about 1980s, as you know, the government introduced the Look East Policy. Why look East? Because even at that time, it was noticed that we were copying the West without thinking: without selecting the good and rejecting the bad things that are coming out of the West. In the East, already there were countries which were growing and developing and excelling in new knowledge etc. So we should, if you want the future, the evolution of our future society to be something that is in keeping with what is happening in the world, we should not just look at the West but we should also look at the East. And in the East, you find a different culture although they too were influenced by the Eurocentrism. The Japanese changed their system of government

because they saw that the European countries in those days, during the time of Emperor Meiji for example, the Europeans were very strong, very powerful, able to colonise countries, able to invade and take over countries. So the Japanese copied that much. But they retained a lot of their own culture. And because they retained a lot of their own culture, they have been able to grow and develop and overtake the countries of the West. So what are the differences that you see between East and West. In the West, you see this demand for freedom, absolute freedom. You want to do anything you can do because nobody should stop you. For example, because of the oppression of the workers in Europe, the idea came that the workers have their own rights and therefore they should protect their rights. How do they protect their rights? By forming unions. And the unions have the power to destroy the wealth of the employers unless the employers treat them fairly. That was a good idea which we should copy. But then, like somebody says, power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely. That is the saying coming from the West of course. And when the unions discovered they were powerful, they could destroy the company if the company does not meet their demands. First of course it is because they were badly treated. But later on when they are very well treated, they still feel that since you have the power, you should exercise that power and make more demands. And so wages in Europe shot up very high. And of course this is good for society because people have got better purchasing power, etc. But what happens is that the products of Europe became too expensive and could not compete with the products in the East. In the East where the culture is different where there are unions. For example the unions in Japan, they go on strike after working hours. They don't go on strike during working hours. And they work in their own company until they die. The company looks after them from the cradle to the grave. And they have lifelong employment. So they felt there was no need for them to go on strike and demand for higher pay all the time. And because of that, they were able to produce goods of high quality and compete with goods coming out of the European countries which are too expensive. Eventually all the goods coming from Europe were swept off the shelves of the market place and replaced by Japanese goods, Korean goods, and now of course Chinese goods. So you can see that in the competition that has taken place within East and West, the culture of the West has been the cause of their downfall. And the culture of the East has contributed towards their growth and development. So we are in Malaysia, we have a chance to see the East and look at the West and make a comparison. If we want a future that is good for us, a social evolution or revolution that will contribute towards our goodness, then we should learn how to distinguish the good from the bad. Not all the things coming from the West is bad. Nor all the things coming from the East is good. But if we learn how to distinguish the bad from the good, then you can have a choice of the best coming from the East and from the West and that should shape the social structure of Malaysia in the future. Now, if you study, you take trouble to study the culture, the behaviour, the society, in Japan for example, you will find that in many ways they are quite primitive. They are very obedient to their superiors, they work very hard when actually they don't have to work so hard but they work very hard and they produce goods of high quality at a lower price. This is not happening in the West. Why are the Japanese able to develop and catch up with the West? It's because of their culture, of the kind of society that they have. And we should know about this society if we want to shape the society of Malaysia in the future. Now, if you look at Japan, they train their children, they train their people from the time they were in kindergarten. Simple things like if you have

some pieces of paper, waste paper, you don't throw it on the street. You fold it up, put it in your pocket, and when you meet a rubbish bin, then you put it into the rubbish bin. And so their country is clean. Because from the time when they were small, they had this discipline, this restraint upon themselves not to do things which are bad but to do things which are good not only for themselves but for society. Now, I often talk about the Japanese sense of shame. We also feel a sense of shame. You know, we are ashamed if we score low marks for example, or we fail, we are ashamed. We are ashamed if for example you are not well dressed etc. we are ashamed of that. But the Japanese have got a very strong sense of shame in that if they do something that they are ashamed of, they would rather kill themselves than face the world. They commit harakiri. Of course today they don't do that. I don't think they should but some of them still throw themselves off from five storeys building if they find something that they are ashamed of. For example, if a plane crashed, the Minister of Transport kills himself. Can you imagine that happening in Malaysia? It's not his fault. You know, this stupid pilot, he crashed his plane, why should I kill myself. But in Japan, the sense of responsibility is such that the minister feels that he cannot face his colleagues, he cannot face the world because during his tenure as Minister of Transport, the plane crashed. But that of course not the usual thing that happens. But what happens when you have a sense of shame is that you don't want to be ashamed of yourself. And if you don't want to be ashamed of yourself, you must do the best you can and produce the best product possible. For example, if you produce a car that breaks down, you should feel ashamed. If you produce handicraft product that is shoddy, not well carved, you should feel ashamed. The Japanese would. But here, well, we work until 4:00PM, at the end of the day, why should we bother. We don't even clean up the place. We don't feel ashamed about that. But the Japanese sense of shame is what drives them to achieve, to do the best possible. So that they don't have to be ashamed or that the Japanese people will have to be ashamed. Supposing we have that quality, that feeling of shame, strong feeling, then I'm quite sure if we go through this social evolution and we build up a new set of values, then we are going to succeed. Succeed like the Japanese succeed, like the Korean succeed, like the Chinese succeed. So when you talk about evolution, evolution seems to be something that happens all by itself. But there is nothing wrong if we direct the things that are going to happen to this country. We know what is good and what is bad. We can choose and we can promote. Promote what is good and get rid of what is bad. It doesn't make you less of a Malaysian, less of a Malay or Chinese or an Indian. By having some good qualities that we get from Japan, for example. As much as before we got some of the good things from the European countries, now it is time to look East and find out what is it that makes them tick, what is it that makes them successful. It is the culture that they have; the value system. Because people succeed or fail not because of their colour, not because they live in the tropics or in the temperate zone, not because of the cold climate or the hot climate. People succeed or fail because of the culture that they believe in and they practise. And the culture in this sense is about the value system. If we want to have an evolution that brings us forward to become a greater nation, then we must have the right culture. And the right culture can come from the East or the West or from the North or the South.

But be able to distinguish between what is good and what is bad. In Malay, we call ambil yang jernih dan tolak yang keruh. What is... well not so clean, we reject. So if there

is going to be an evolution in the social structure of this country, it should not be allowed to just happen by itself. We have the right to think, we have the ability to act. We should choose the best and reject the worst. Then we can have an evolution that is directed, not just by itself, it's more a revolution than an evolution because evolution doesn't... sometimes does not involve you are doing anything about it. It just so happens. And for the most part, evolution has happened in this country because we were not in the position to direct this country. Before we were independent, we had no say in how people develop. How people are educated. What fields they should excel in. That was before independence. But now we are independent and we are in charge of ourselves, we are free and we should use that freedom to shape the society of the future. Not too distant a future because we cannot say what will happen. To shape the society of the future, we have today a choice of picking from the East and from the West and imbibing those values, practising them, and using them with proper discipline and passion. There must be passion. To do anything right, to succeed in anything, there must be passion. If you are in the university to study engineering for example, you must have passion to study because you want it because it is good for you, then you work very hard but if you say well, I'm passing my time here. After all, I'm not paying anything, somebody else is paying. And well, if I pass, ok, if I don't pass, I'll go and do some other work. If that is what drives you, forget it. You have come to the wrong place. But if you have passion for your studies, you want to change, you want to do something good for yourself, for your family, for society, for your country, you drive yourself to acquire what knowledge that you need, then you will be a part of the evolution that will come to Malaysia. But if you feel that, well, this thing will happen. So what, a few billion dollars lost, that's ok. It's not your money anyway. But actually it is your money, but never mind about that. If that is the culture, this country will go to the dogs. If you think that receiving money is ok, what's wrong, I mean, if the President gives you money, you accept it. Why not? If that is your attitude, then the society that you live in will be a very poor society indeed. But if you have the sense of pride, the strong sense of shame where you do something that is wrong, you have passion for what you are doing and you know where you are going, you know you want to contribute towards a better life for this country, I think this country will be a great country. I'm told that I can speak for 15 minutes and then stop for you to ask question. If you don't have any question, please don't ask. But, how long have I been talking? Cukup dah? Ok. Well, I talk about the things I like. It may not be what you like. What you like, you can ask. And if I like I will answer. Thank you.