written constitution and parliament as one of the most viable alternatives to a new political system for the modern Ottoman Empire, a political system of the “post-Second Empire” or the “Third Empire.” There is no doubt that the emergence of the modern Ottoman constitutional government resulted not only from such external factors as pressures from abroad or the influx of Western ideas but also from internal factors peculiar to the political history of the Ottoman Empire. In particular, the political tradition of the early modern Ottoman Empire had a great influence on modern Ottoman constitutional ideas. Now we can clearly see the new horizons of Ottoman constitutional history extending from the early modern to the modern era.
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Notable Politics and Parliament in Modern and Contemporary Egypt

SUZUKI Emi

(Research Fellow, Toyo Bunko; Fellow, Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies)

In July of 2013, large scale demonstrations demanding the resignation of Egypt’s first democratically elected, President Morsi, took place in the center of Cairo, at Tahrir Square, the iconic place of the Egyptian revolution. Just then, the Supreme Commander of the Egyptian Army and also the Minister of Defense, Abd al-Fattah al-Sisi, carried out a coup d’état and dismissed President Morsi in response to the demands of the Egyptian people.

The Egyptian people ultimately rejected President Morsi for a variety of reasons, and depending on whom you ask, the primary reason could be for political, economic, or security reasons. Most noteworthy, however, is that the people who rejected Morsi regarded the election results as suspect due to Morsi’s mobilization of farmers
who could hardly read or write and did not understand the meaning of the electoral success of the Muslim Brotherhood.

This was not the first time political disorder had ensued in Egypt over the mass mobilization of certain citizens by the Muslim Brotherhood during an election. This has been a repeated occurrence, and has been a problematic element from modern monarchal times and this disorder often ended up in the disruption of the parliamentary.

Egypt has witnessed an era of party politics since the nominal independence from British occupation in 1922, and the Wafd Party has been at the forefront of this era. Many researchers criticize the Wafd Party and nationalism of the Nasser era as doing nothing more than advocating for the land-owning class.

In the context of party politics during the interwar period, the Wafd Party was regarded as the party of the masses. On the other hand, the People’s Party, which was strongly antagonistic to the Wafd, was depicted as oppressive to liberalism. Ismail Sidqi, who organized the People’s Party, was regarded as a dictator who abolished the liberal constitution of 1923, which limited the political power of the king and provided for the freedom of speech.

This research paper will focus on the political struggles of modern Egypt by examining the confrontation between the then-Prime Minister Ismail Sidqi and the Wafd leader Mustafa Nahhas, and the accompanying discourse of who should take charge of Egyptian politics.

After Egypt attained independence in 1922, Egyptian parliament enacted a liberal constitution, which limited the political rights of the king. As a result, the Wafd became the center of the parliament. This era was called the liberal age of modern Egypt and in the beginning, even the politicians who later left the Wafd to establish other political parties were in support of the charismatic Wafd leader Saad Zaghlul. However, when Zaghlul became self-righteous and resorted to high-handed measures, politicians who were once sworn friends of Zaghlul left him and the Wafd Party.

The Wafd split was accelerated and further divisions within the party developed when Zaghlul died in 1927. In 1930, Sidqi was appointed as Prime Minister by the King. Sidqi began to chip away at the dominant power of the Wafd. At first he abolished the liberal constitution of 1923, despite popular opposition to the measure, and he enacted the new constitution of 1930, which granted the King much power and imposed a requirement that all eligible voters must own property. Sidqi then set up his own party, the People’s Party. This party has a characteristic feature different form other parties although the party’s platform itself was the same as the others. In the modern era, members of the parliament changed their party affiliations so frequently according to the situation and it seemed that they had no creed or political foundation. However, Sidqi’s People’s Party was different. Sidqi did not appoint his party’s members from the existing members of parliament; instead, he dared to adopt new village mayors (umadas). By choosing members from the new village elites, who were not related to the Wafd leadership, Sidqi was attempting to oppose the Wafd, which had a wide network throughout Egyptian masses.
This appointment of the new class of umdās as members of parliament is a result of not only political conflict between Nahhas and Sidqi, but also the change of the social structure of the rural areas, where the new emerging classes are confronting the old upper classes.

Both Sidqi and Nahhas carried out political tours all over Egypt to gain the support of rural notables. As these two political leaders toured the country, antagonism between their respective parties became deep, and violence expanded all over Egypt. Though the most violent incidents happened in Upper Egypt, in areas like Maniya and Beni Suweif, the flames of violence spread to Cairo as trains were burned and shops were destroyed.

Although Egypt witnessed this chaos in 1930, there was every reason for Sidqi to try to remove the Wafd from the parliament by any means necessary. Sidqi was never opposed to the concept of democracy, though he did consider, at least in the beginning stage of democracy, that only selected elites should be in charge of the democratic government, not the masses. Sidqi strongly opposed the ways of the Wafd, which mobilized the university students and the masses to accomplish their political goals and to ring the alarm bell of populism.

This question over Egyptian populism and mass mobilization by the dominant party remains unsolved even now, since the time of nationalism of 1950–1960 and through the democratization process after the 2011 revolution.
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**Constitutional Government and the Local Administration System of Republican China**
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In 1912, immediately after its birth, the Republic of China (ROC) enacted the Provisional Constitution of