

# Political Participation: Radical Young People in Malaysia

Roslizawati Taib

Mohd Rizal Mohd Yaakop

Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

**DOI Link:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i6/3053>

**Published Date:** 18 June 2017

## Abstract

This study aims to identify the struggle of young people in Malaysia politics that has long flourished as early as before the country gained the independence on August 31, 1957. Patterns and trends of political participation among youth since independence, proven that their political participation adheres with specific objective. In addition, there are few factors that contribute to their political participation. The factors that motivate them to participate in politic have been recognised since the colonial era and continue until today. Aspects related to their participation existed within the new political landscape of Malaysia. The purpose of this study is to examine three issues such as youth political participation, new political landscape and human behavioural theory. At the end, the findings could answer all questions that have been highlighted in the beginning of this writing. For this purpose, the secondary data were analysed qualitatively. The study identified that there are changes in the youth political participation that happening in stages, increased their participation which leads to reform and peaceful demonstrations. Therefore, a degree of tolerance should be done by the government to meet the demands of the said party. The youth's struggle contributes particularly to the democratization of Malaysia and as effort in creating a new political landscape in this country.

**Keywords:** New Politics, Political Participation, Tolerance.

## Introduction

The political struggle of the radical young generation in Malaysia has evolved from as early as the days the people struggled for the country to attain independence from foreign colonialism. Their struggle eventually led to the country's freedom from the shackles of imperialism. Moving on, Malaysian youth political movements owed seeds of contribution through their efforts to make the needs of the majority in society known to the government, so that the needs can be addressed by the government. Patterns and the trends of the young people movement since independence indicates that their participation are motivated by specific objectives. Malaysian youth movement began with peaceful demonstrations but

evolved to radicalism over the years due to several factors. Discussions on Malaysian youth political movement since the colonial era have focused on domestic conflicts and the influence of the international political violence that was sparked off by autocratic regime.

As a result of the oppressive reign of the government, the people retaliate through violent revolts and demonstrations with the ultimate aim to either compel the government to change its ways or to overthrow the regime that was deemed be inhuman, unjust and oppressive to them. In view of this, local political radicalism is considered as a justifiable measure not only to usher the desired structural changes for the people, but also to serve as a warning to those in power that the people will not lie low in passivity when under oppression, instead they will rise in retaliation if their rights have been threatened as witnessed in several political uprisings of the people in several countries. Political violence that erupted in the countries of Western Europe in the 19th century that affected Russia, France, Italy and Spain seems to make a comeback when political violence begun raging in big cities (Ross, 2004). The political eruption was due to the people's opposition against the government for having marginalised the needs of people, causing many to feel that they have been side lined economically. This brewing dissatisfaction is likely to cause the people to be involved in protests and demonstrations against the government. Political movements may bear a more devastating impact if the people are involved in an international conspiracy that aimed to topple the targeted leader or the ruling party.

When observing cases of international political violence in this contemporary era, it is noted that the middle-class group were the ones spearheading the political violence that happened in Japan, Uruguay, the United States and Germany as the young middle class group has produced many graduates who have been exposed to basic concepts of social justice (Hobsbawm, 1973, p.221). Palestine, Northern Ireland, Sri Lanka, Kashmir, Punjab, Bosnia and Sudan were faced with a local stage of ethnic conflicts over the past 15 years. However, the ethnic conflicts have been contained through the practice of plural political system and economic development in the industrialized countries of Western Europe. The practice of democratic political systems are tailored to address the issue of political radicalism that erupted due to weaknesses in the system itself, through the constitutional provision of the rights and freedom of speech, equal participation for all, the rights to vote in elections and etc. However, a democratic system does not promise that political violence would not happen in the country. In fact, there are some arguments among scholars who claimed that democracy can be a path that leads to international political violence, as evidenced in cases of political violence that have occurred in democratic states that include India, Thailand, the United States and Sri Lanka.

### **Statement of the problem**

In recent years, there are perceived changes in political participation amongst young people in constituting the democracy systems especially in developing countries like Malaysia. As we all know, young people actually represent a kind of seismograph for the state of a society. This group of people has also reflected the issue of social fragmentation and crisis. In addition, the young people contain a vast reservoir of potentials, meaning that they constitute the main backbone of the country's development. Their youthful enthusiasm and creativity help to enhance their ability in self-organization and ensure that their political participation will be of significant contribution in sustaining the effectiveness of the measures taken towards progress and development.

Local radicalism is not just a phenomenon in non-democratic countries, but it is also rampant in democratic countries like Malaysia. This leads us to the debate on whether a democratic system that has been considered as the best political system is be at risk to the political violence if the protesters are strongly against policies made by the elected authority? Confronted by such a heated situation, the best solution should be to immediately implement measures that suit the people's needs as far as possible so that the local radicalism can be contained at the onset to prevent further outbreak that will escalate the tension between the government and the people. For example, in the political radicalism against the Suharto regime in Indonesia, the political movement of the students and the middle-class group eventually resorted to bring down the regime when the people's past demands for changes went unheeded.

Due to its radical nature, political violence can easily be labelled unfavourably. Violence is hardly an advocated solution for problems. Attempts to justify radical political struggle more often than not leads us to question the administration of the regime as well as the political environment of the country. Next, we need to contemplate the implications of this this act of terror that was carried out on grounds that it was for the common good. We need to ask as well if it is true that there is a connection between local radicalism and the international political violence. Thus, the researcher feels that there is a need for a deeper understanding of the real causes of local radicalism with the hope that this matter can be positioned in its rightful stance. In tandem with this concern, this research aims to provide an answer to every question stated below.

### **The problems**

- i. What are the factors or causes that contribute to the young people's participation in local radicalism?
- ii. To what extent can we say that there is a connection between local radicalism among young people and the international political violence?
- iii. What are the patterns and the development of radicalism among young Malaysians from pre-independence until now?
- iv. To what extent can local radicalism among young people lead to international political violence?

### **Objectives**

- i. Identify the main factor that led to the occurrence of youth radical movement in Malaysia.
- ii. Analyse the connection between the youth radicalism with international political violence.
- iii. Analyse the patterns and the development of radicalism among young people in Malaysia since pre-independence until the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
- iv. Determine the impact of youth radicalism towards international political violence.

### **Methodology**

#### **The Research Design**

In general, this study is a qualitative research and the discussion will be in the form of descriptive analysis. This is because it fits well with the objectives of the study that seek to explain the extent of radical political participation of young people, the factors that lead to

youth participation in national politics, and radical youth in the contemporary era. The data and information obtained was analysed using qualitative methods.

Acquisition of the necessary information for this research is from available resources such as books, articles, journals, newspapers, online information and academic writing. Primary sources are derive from reports of the government and several NGO's concerned. This research uses in-depth interviews with the subjects who are involved in radical movement and activities. Interviews were also conducted with individuals who are directly involved in the Human Rights Commissioner SUHAKAM who can provide information and report about the radicalism among young people in Malaysia.

As for secondary sources, the library research consists of some printed materials that helps to facilitate the description of concepts and research framework. This method is chosen by the researcher is because it provides lots of space for researcher to analyse and interpret the arguments critically. Questionnaires and surveys are perceived as a fairly complicated method, when compared to qualitative approaches where all the desired information and data have been made from the previous research and studies. Data obtained from the secondary sources also does not require any sample size and is not limited to a certain amount, since the method chosen by the researcher is much easier.

### **Research Sample**

The research is conducted by using the samples that could provide comprehensive information as the selected subjects have knowledge regarding radicalism and political violence. Individuals who are directly involved in the government bodies, non-governmental organizations (NGO's), or private organizations that specializing in politics are familiar with concepts highlighted. Therefore, the research sampling targets at the body or organizations that seek to reform some of the government's policies.

### **Literature Review**

Adam (2004: 3) in her book, *The Radicalism Movement in Malaysia: 1938-1965* discussed the existence of young Malay radical movement in the 1930's since the formation of the Young Malay Union (YMU). Subsequently in 1941, the radical movement became more apparent with the establishment of the Malay Nationalist Party (MNP) after the Japanese invaded Malaya. This movement, which was considered the most famous, was triggered by the occupation of Japan, international politics, the revolution in Indonesia, the movement of Malayan Communist Party (MCP) and etc. According to Adam, cooperation and intervention of the MCP, coupled with the external traders, finally led to the radical movement amongst the Malay young people (Adam, 2004: 75). In fact, she also discussed the radicalism movement towards the independence of Malaya under the topic *Indonesia Raya* or *Melayu Raya* in the final part of the book.

Homer (1979: 374) in his book *Terror in the United States: Three Perspectives* discussed political violence in a democratic society in the United States. There are 3 different community dimensions, which are democratic society, terror society and a pluralist society. According to Homer, most people assume that U.S. democracy is a democracy that works ideally. According to Howe (1976, p . 60 ), as a democratic system comes with advantages which include giving freedom to individuals to effect change in a peaceful manner and with the promotion of tolerance, by right the people should not have to resort to violence. Political violence may be considered not only unacceptable due to the above reasons, but it is also

morally wrong. However, some argue that radicalism and violence from the perspective of a democratic society is appropriate if it aims to revolutionise the political system for what is deemed as the common good. The assassination of the President, for example, John F. Kennedy (the eighth President of the United States) is an example of political violence. Political violence is normally carried out with the conviction that it helps to eliminate the threats to the nation as evidenced in the political violence against leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr. Robert Kennedy, Malcolm X, George Lincoln Rockwell, Joseph A. Yablonski, George Wallace and James.

Austin (1994:3) in his book *Democracy and Violence in India and Sri Lanka* discussed political violence in a democratic society while focusing on India and Sri Lanka. Austin says that the violence in Sri Lanka was due to issue of different languages and religions. In fact, there were radical groups that were inspired by Marxist ideology. Those involved in the violence consisted of jobless young people who were trying to overthrow the government by launching an attack on a police station. Austin also noted similar problems in India. Although the two countries, India and Sri Lanka are democratic countries practicing electoral system and parliamentary democracy or are known as the democratic Third World (Third World Democracy), violence can still erupt in both countries. The violence in India occurred in the 1980's where Mrs. Indira Gandhi was murdered, which caused her followers to retaliate in violence as well. Austin claimed that the two countries, India and Sri Lanka, are the two countries that practice democracy, yet they are still facing a lot of violence and political conflicts, which leads to assumption that perhaps democracy itself is a catalyst for violence. In India where the community has divided based on religious reasons, Islam and Hinduism, democracy has actually worsened the split through the electoral system that encourages people to hate and fight against each other as well as against the government. Attempts to mediate conflict has been eroded by violence.

According to Cummings and David (2007: 193), most of the incidents in the world clearly shows that democracy can and is able to build a society that is involved directly or indirectly in the political system of a country. This means that the opinions and views of the people is the key to the political process. However, if the political system continues failed to meet the people's expectation, the political movement will evolve from being peaceful to become increasingly radical so that their voice would be heard and taken seriously by the government. Such violence can be categorized as political violence or social protest. Past history of political violence in the United States recorded the killing of the Presidents such as Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley and Kennedy. Clinton also experienced a similar incident when a man tried to kill him in 1995. Political violence which started from local radical movement is able to develop into one of a larger conspiracy that involves acts of terrorism that explicitly rejected the existing political system.

Thomas (1975:5-25) in his book *Political Violence in the Muslim province of Southern Thailand*, pointed out that political violence against the Muslims in Southern Thailand by the Bangkok government occurred because the government assumes that Malay Muslim community as second class citizens besides territorial issues that actually increased the conflict. The oppression and murder of Muslims in Thailand is considered as a violation of human rights in a very high degree of cruelty. This can be a catalyst to the occurrence of a revolution and the rise of the radical Muslim community against the government. This is

because the Malay-Muslim community is a minority in Thailand, while Thailand is mainly populated by the Siamese and Buddhists. Regrettably, the situation is getting worse due to the ethnic, religious and cultural conflicts. The case of attack against the police stations in the district of Battani, Yala and Narathiwat, on 24 December 2001 caused the death of five policemen. A series of other attacks carried out after that, including the attack on the Temple of Buddha and five government schools in Songkhla province, attacks on police and marine force in 2003, the assassination of Thai Buddhist monks and soldiers eventually creates a black mark in the history of Thailand due to the brutal actions of the Bangkok government. Yet the violence continued to rage on, as seen in the attacks and killings of Muslims that has sacrificed many lives (Funston, 2008:1-19).

According to Carrano in the book, *Democracy, Citizenship and Youth* (2009: 28), he suggested that in order to integrate the young people into society in various aspects that include education and communication, there is the need for cultural dialogue and debate (arguments) in order to promote better understanding among members of society. Such measure can indirectly lead to a democratic process that reduces unfairness in the government administration. The aspirations, quality, quantity, space and scope of a political culture in terms of social, cultural and political tendencies can then be united. Carrano carried out a research titled *Brazilian Youth and Democracy Participation, Spheres and Public Policies* (2009: 11-12), using the respondents from the age range of 15-24 years old. His findings indicate the factors that cause this group of people to participate in politics. The study also took account of the main aspects that motivated young people to engage in politics in Brazil. When discussing about this group of people, socio-economic problems and injustice issues were the catalyst for their participation in politics.

Azman, Abdul Hamid and Othman in their book, *Malaysian Youth in the Global World: Issues and Challenges* (2011: 11-20) analyse the implications of globalization on the development of political participation among young people. Radicalism among young people is more dynamic leading to the transformation of all aspects that are related to them either in the economic, social or in cultural change towards a more globalized world. A study conducted by them also found that young people in Malaysia are more daring to participate in any movement or organization in the contemporary era after having been given the exposure through the development programs that teach them how to be active and productive citizens for the country. In fact, increase of awareness and political participation of young people in a multi-ethnic society should not be taken lightly because their involvement can make a difference to the development and transformation of the civil movement in Malaysia. Family factors and mass media become the main factors of the involvement of young people in politics.

Snyder (2000: 27-32) in his book *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict* expresses that the relationship between democratization and conflict is due to the spirit of nationalism. The principles of democracy itself gives the freedom of individual expressions and freedom of the press, leading to radicalism and political violence. Malaysia and Sri Lanka are the two Asian countries that experience ethnic conflict that led to radicalism and political violence. In Malaysia, ethnic conflict in 1969 was seen not as a result of democracy but due to the restricted and controlled democracy. Even though Sri Lanka implemented the full democracy, they were bounded by narrow ethnic identity, thus causing

the Tamils to be oppressed and became violent. The comparison between these two countries shows the degree of democracy carried out by the country. This clearly shows that political violence and terrorism can happen to any country where there are injustice and dissatisfaction among the people.

Collins (2000: 29) in his book *The Security Dilemmas of Southeast Asia identifies* the dilemma of international security issues in the region. In chapter 1 of this book, he examined the usefulness in understanding the ethnic conflict that existed in the region. It also determined whether ethnicity is a security issue and the possibility to mitigate or escape from the detrimental effects. He attempted to determine the applicability of ethnic tensions within states by taking Malaysia, Southern Thailand, and Moro's ethnic of Mindanao in Philippines with a multitude of ethnic tensions that have arisen through the process of nation-building and state-making. Collins also highlighted that the main concern in the Third World countries is their internal issues. The conflict rages across the Southeast Asia including Burma and Malaysia.

Neal and Kristen (2011) in the book named *Ethnic Conflict: A Systematic Approach to Cases of Conflict* touched on the ongoing conflicts that plague the international community. Violence involving either between countries or conflicts in a country can lead to many deaths and injuries. In fact, ethnic conflict and national identity are the conflicts that are becoming more common in this contemporary period. The book also touches on the link between identity and institutions as a means to reduce ethnic conflict. Radicalism involves a lot of people especially young people.

Daldjoenin a book, *Sociology and Problems of Youth* (1974) have pointed out the factors that promote the awareness of young people to come forward, struggle for the education, bureaucracy and authority, as well as social and economic problem. The emergence of a movement called ZP Zero Population Growth Movement among students in Yogyakarta at the end of 1972 proves that the awareness about the issues that are being faced and must be addressed. Moreover, with the advent of modern technology, science, magazines and newspapers and mass media, a mainstream of foreign wave begin to enter the country until the cultural collision occurred and secularism begins to change the perception of the people, from elderly to the young ones. In this context, young people should be more knowledgeable about what is needed by their cluster and the role that they can play in their country.

Jaharudin (2012) in his masterpiece, *The New Social Movement Post- Reformation: Restoring Function Description Public Space* (2012) clearly discussed about the existence of a social movement history that erupted in Malaysia as a result of the globalization process at the end of the 1990's. This was in recognition with increased emphasis on civil rights of the citizens of this country the people became more vocal in bringing up the issue of human rights , good governance, the fair and transparent distribution of public resources, civil rights, and issues involving gender (Sulaiman & Bala 2002: 28 -59). The *political tsunami* that erupted in 2008 was not something that could be used as a yardstick to measure the Malaysian public awareness about civil rights, but we cannot disregard this issue. A political participation in non- formal scope has expanded since the 1980's. The growing number of NGO's led by the various categories of society, including the middle class, the students, women's organizations, the fighters of environmental issues, human rights and others aimed to establish a stable

democracy. The financial crisis in 1997 and the sacking of Anwar Ibrahim caused the changes of the political landscape in the era of the 1990's, increasing the number of political movement especially among youth (Francis 2003: 47). This book also discussed the cultural community that has generated the impact of the reformation in 1998 where the University of Bangsar Utama (Ubu) students became involved in a New Social Movement.

Fishman and Solomon, *Youth and Social Action: An Introduction* (1972) that there is evidence showing that the awareness and interest of young people in politics around the world has increased and it is not a new phenomenon in Europe. The young people are the pioneer especially in young political movement in developing countries such as Asia and Africa. Countries like Israel, Egypt, Ghana and Turkey is a product of the revolutionary movement of young people on a large scale. Similarly, in the United States where the participation of young people is not only seen in demonstration and the student movement, but also in the rise of the civil rights revolution. This uprising may end up with armed guerrillas, to the election campaign, peaceful assembly, street demonstrations and violent or otherwise peaceful demonstrations by the civilians.

McIntosh & Youniss (2010) in his writing titled *Towards a Political Theory of Political Socialization of Youth*, questioned about the youth political participation in which they are usually closely related to the existence of conflict in the society. This is because no matter how rational people are trying to contribute to the society, participation will require a struggle (Merelman, 1990: 47-65). The political issues associated with the process involves appeal, arguing, conflicts of views, defend and compromise. Without the above elements, the ideas that are put forward will remain impersonal and not have an impact on society or the political space. Political participation should involve three other elements, i) co-operation between the group members that have the same tendency in the form of great power to influence the political system. Next is ii) the ideological conflicts. Finally, non-coercive actions or voluntary participation will give greater impact in changing the political system (Ostrom 1990; Verba et al., 1995).

## **The Theoretical Framework**

### *Democracy*

This thesis applies the concept of democracy as applied in the administration of many countries all over the world. This is because when we talk about human rights, justice and freedom surely it cannot be separated from the practice of democracy as practiced by most countries. Actually, there have been so many meaning given by various scholars in defining the concept of democracy itself. In fact, the word democracy itself can be controversial, and there is an element of provocation in political science.

The word democracy comes from the Greek word *demos* meaning "people" and *kratos* means "power". When they are combined, it means power or rule by the people (Hymas, 1973). It can also be said that it is a system that focuses on freedom to the people in decision making and in any government policy-making (Dahl, 1992). In dealing with the concept of democracy, there arises a term called "extreme democracy" where in it there is a mix between *anarchism* and *communism* (which was introduced by Karl Marx), which refers to the direct democracy that led to a government that cannot escape the will of the people. Apparently, one of its features is an open democracy that will symbolize political equality during the

election. In the election process, anyone can be free to compete without any hindrance or restriction. Any individual who wins in the selection process will represent the voice of the people to deliver any policy or proposal to the government. According to Abraham Lincoln, democracy refers to a system where the people lead the people in to the government that covers the law of freedom of speech and equal rights to all.

When we discuss issues related to democracy, we cannot escape from the fact that democracy has been implemented successfully in most of the First World countries. If we look briefly at the definition of the word democracy itself, democracy refers to a form of government and it is determined by the people. This also includes the government's structure that is determined by the people or representatives authorized by the people. Usually countries are adopting this system of government and patterned democracy called "democratic countries".

Democracy is not only concerned with aspects of fairness but also impartiality in the implementation as well as putting emphasis on the participation of citizens in the government selection process (Hussein, 1994:96-98). The level of democracy of a country is often measured by the availability of a clean electoral process, civil liberties, judicial transparency, independence organized, civil society and rule-based majority (Othman, 2002:29). The definition above is broad, which means even if a country is able to provide economic prosperity to the people, yet does not fulfil the criteria of democracy, the government is regarded as an autocratic regime.

Democracy is split into two parts: direct democracy and indirect democracy. Direct democracy involves citizens directly, in terms of public policy represented by the state without any representation for the people to involve directly. The indirect democracy is the individual or organization chosen by the people who ultimately will create the multi-party. Schumpeter (1942) stated that democracy refers to the main procedure for the election and selection of leaders elected by the people they lead. Schumpeter also has details about the lack of democracy in terms of classical equating definition. Democracy also refers to a procedure undertaken to achieve a political decision where individuals compete to acquire the power to represent the voice of the people. Democracy involves an elected government through elections that are fair, honest and periodical and the system also allows independent candidates to compete for votes and support. Thus, the meaning of democracy involves two dimensions, which are competition and participation.

#### 1.5.2 Political violence

Salmi (1993: 16-23) argues that political violence is often viewed in a negative context where it is often translated as act of war, murder or violent demonstrations. If the actions of intimidation and doing physical and mental injuries are considered as one of the forms of this violence, the cause of the violence cannot be ignored. For example the causes may stem from racism, pollution or poverty.

According to him, violence can be divided into several parts, direct violence, indirect violence, oppression or violence in the form of repressive violence, violence in the form of isolation or alienating violence.

i . Direct violence refers to physical and psychological warfare. It includes acts of violence of war, murder, torture, kidnapping, etc., that the action taken is unlawful and violations of human rights or the right to live freely.

ii . Indirect violence can be categorized as an act of violence intended to protect people from harm. For example, in cases of famine and food scarcity caused by social or political factors and the spread of diseases caused by social, ethnic, political power and purchasing power. Both examples above have been used as excuses to act as Mark Twain where a terrorist is hailed as a hero among the poor communities. In addition, this violence occurs also when there is denial of the right of security, basic needs, or medication.

iii . Oppressive violence (repressive violence) refers to the denial of the most basics of human rights, political rights and social rights. Human rights refer to freedom of speech and religion, freedom of movement, justice and fairness. The political right refers to the right to participate, the right to vote, freedom of speech and opinion and freedom of the press. The denial to these rights has prevented the people from having a means to express their grievances.

iv . Violence in terms of isolation or alienating violence refers to the highest forfeiture for each individual that includes emotional, cultural and intellectual development. Examples are children who are taught in a foreign language to restrict the use of their mother tongue, for example Kurds in Turkey, Iraq and Iran are said to be one of the forms of violence.

It is clear here that the capitalist economic system has led to radicalism and lead to communities or individuals to be involved in international political violence. Most of the political violence is prevalent in communist countries as such as Germany, China, North Korea, Russia, Laos and Vietnam. In addition, countries like Turkey and liberal republic countries such as Indonesia, France and Singapore. However, we cannot rule out that political violence can happen to a democratic country like the United States, Malaysia, Thailand and others. This is because the latter is also able to create political violence and thus could lead to the occurrence of terrorism.

Political violence that occurred in the Muslim village in southern Thailand affected the minority. In fact, the minority groups are treated as invalid cluster politically integrated in any country. Muslims that are mostly based in Thailand Satun, Yala, Pattani, Songkhla and Narathiwat feel that they are marginalised by the Thai government. The Thai government has failed to give them their rights and has left them destitute in an economic slump. In addition, the Thai Muslims are perceived as foreigners, leading to political violence in Thailand (M. Ladd Thomas, 1975).

Besides, we can see violence from the other perspectives. Poverty, hunger, repression and social alienation causing human misery are also considered as a structural violence (Galtung, 1969). This type of violence is normally practiced in systematic and organized ways by political institutions (Wenden, 1995, p. 3).

### 1.5.3 Political participation

Political participation is an important tool that measures the political development of a country. Each political activity has its particular trait. Based on the observations, it appears that individual political participation is dependent on socio-economic backgrounds of the individual in determining how the individual acts (Milbrath 1965: 9). Moreover, individuals who are actively participating in the community will affect political behavior when compared with individuals who are not actively involved in politics. Comparisons are made between the

following five countries, their level of participation, social movements and activities of the association in the United States and Britain is higher than in Germany, Italy and Mexico (Almond & Verba 1963: 261-299). According to Almond and Powell again, their participation in politics are closely related to the differences between the structure of society itself according to social class, geographical, ideological, religious, and the influence of the urban and rural areas (Almond and Powell 1988: 52-55). The political participation of the people will an indirect deciding factor that help determines the decisions made by the government.

### **Conclusion**

This study is important to reveal the need for a mechanism or key elements that need to be created or maintained in overcoming radicalism and political violence, so that it does not spread and prevail. Instead of merely labelling political radicalism as a negative phenomenon, taking measures to suppress its violence occurrence, there is a greater need to look into the factors that cause political radicalism so that this phenomenon can be addressed at its roots and the impacts of measures taken to overcome political radically can be a better pragmatic approach that nip the problem at its buds instead of just addressing its symptoms.

### **Acknowledgement**

First of all, I would like to say thank you to my Supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rizal Yaakop from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, and to my family members, friends and all lecturers from Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi who had giving me a fully support in publishing this paper.

### **Corresponding Author**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mohd Rizal Yaakop  
Lecturer in Political Science, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.  
Email: rizaly@ukm.my  
Bangi, Selangor.

### **References**

- Adam, R. (2004). *Gerakan Radikalisme di Malaysia (1938-1965)*. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka: Kuala Lumpur.
- Almond, G. A. & Verba, S. (1963). *The Civic Culture*, pp. 261-299. USA: Princeton University Press. First edition.
- Almond, G. A. & Powell, G. B. (1988). Political recruitment and political structure. In. *Comparative Politics Today*. Stanford University, Boston: Little Brown. Fourth edition.
- Austin, D. (1994). *Democracy and Violence in India and Sri Lanka*. The Royal Institute of International Affairs. London.
- Azman, H., Abdul Hamid. B., & Othman, Z. (2011). *Malaysian Youth In The Global World: Issues and Challenges*, pp. 11-20. Selangor: Penerbit UKM.

Carrano, P. C. (2009). Democracy, Citizenship and Youth. In. *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth* (Eds.). Sherrod, L. R., Torney-Purta, J & Flanagan, C. A.). 11-30. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Carrano, P. C. (2009). Youth and Social Participation in Brazil: Results of a National Dialogue with Young People in Metropolitan Regions. In. Silva, I & Luiza Salles Souto, A. (Eds.). *Democracy, Citizenship and Youth: Towards Social and Political Participation in Brazil*, p. 11-29. New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers.

Chalk, P. (1996). *West European Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism: The Evolving Dynamic*, Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Collins, A. (2000). *The Security Dilemmas of Southeast Asia*. Macmillan Press Ltd.: London.

Cummings, M. C. & David Wise, JR. (2007). *Democracy Under Pressure: An Introduction To The American Political System*. Thomson Wadsworth Learning Inc.: USA. Tenth Edition.

Thomas, M. L. (1975). *Political Violence in the Muslim province of Southern Thailand*. Occasional Paper No. 28. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies: Singapore.

Dahl R. A. (1992). *Democracy and Its Critics*. Yale University Press.

Daldjoeni, N. (1974). *Sosiologi dan Permasalahan Pemuda*. Tanpa Penerbit.

Enders, W & Sandler, T. (2012). *The Political Economy of Terrorism* (2<sup>nd</sup>ed.). Cambridge University Press: USA.

Francis L. K. W. & Saravanamuttu, J. (Eds.). (2003). Towards a New Politics of Fragmentation and Contestation. In. Francis Loh Kok Wah and Johan Saravanamuttu. *New Politics in Malaysia*, pp. 278. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Fishman, J. R & Solomon, F. (1972). Youth and social action: An introduction. In. Anthony M. Orum (eds.). *The Seeds Of Politics*, p. 247-253. USA: Prentice-Hall. Inc. Englewood Cliffs.

Funston, J. (2008). *Southern Thailand: The Dynamics of Conflict*. Seng Lee Press Pte Ltd: Singapore.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, Peace and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 166-192).

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1973). *Revolutionaries*, New York: Pantheon Books.

Homer, F. D. (1979). Terror in the United States: Three Perspectives. In. *The Politics of Terrorism*. MichaelStohl (Ed.) Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York.

Howe, I. (1976). The Ultimate Price of Random Terror. *Skeptic*, no. 2 (January/February).

Hussein, S. A. (1994). *Pengantar Sains Politik*. Kuala Lumpur: DBP.

Hymas, E. (1973). *A Dictionary of Modern Revolution*. Cet. 1. London: Allen Lane.

Jaharudin, M. H. (2012). Gerakan sosial baru pasca reformasi: Usaha mengembalikan fungsi ruang awam. In. Hariszuan & Rizal Hamdan. *Wacana Baru Politik Malaysia: Perspektif Ruang Awam, Budaya dan Institusi*. 51-76. SIRD: Petaling Jaya Malaysia.

Jesse, N. G. & Williams, K. P. (2011). *Ethnic Conflict: A Systematic Approach To Cases Of Conflict*. CQ Press Inc: Washington.

Lago, I. & Montero, J. R. (2006). The 2004 Election In Spain: Terrorisme, Accountability and Voting. In. *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*, Volume 2, No. 1: 13-36. The Taiwan Foundation For Democracy: Taiwan.

Lutz, J. M. & Lutz, B. M. (2004). *Global Terrorism*. Routledge: London.

McIntosh, H & Youniss, J. (2010). Towards a Political Theory of Political Socialization of Youth. In. Sherrod L. R., Torney-Purta, J & Flanagan C. A. (Eds.). *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth*, 23-42. USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ.

Merelman, R. M. (1990). The role of conflict in children's political learning. In. O. Ichilov (Eds.). *Political Socialization, Citizenship, Education and Democracy*, p.47-65. New York: Teachers College Press.

Milbrath, L.W. (1965). *Political Participation: How and Why Do People Get Involved In Politics?* Chicago: Rand-McNally and Co.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Actions*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Othman, Z. (2002). Masyarakat Sivil dan Pendemokrasian. In. Ghazali Mayudin (Eds.). *Politik Malaysia Perspektif Teori dan Praktik*: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Ross, D. (2004). *Violent Democracy*. Cambridge University Press: UK.

Salmi, J. (1993). *Violence and Democratic Society: New Approaches To Human Rights*. Zed Books Ltd: London.

Schmid, A. P. (1983). *Political Terrorisme: A Research Guide to Concepts, Theories, Data Bases and Literature*, New Crunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Schmid, A. P. (1992). Terrorism and Democracy, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 4(4), 14-25.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1943). *Capitalisme, Socialisme and Democracy*. Geo. Allen & Unwin University Books: London.

Snyder, J. (2000). *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc : New York.

Sulaiman, N & Bala, B. (2002). Persaingan Parti dan Demokrasi Malaysia. In. Kasim, M. Y & Ahmad, A. (Eds.). *Politik Baru dalam Pilihan Raya Umum*, 28-60. Penerbit UKM: Bangi.

Weinberg, L. B. & William L. E. (1998). Terrorism and Democracy: What Recent Events Disclose, *The Terrorism and Political Violence*, 10(1), 108-118.

Wenden, A. (1995). Defining Peace: Perspectives from Peace Research, in Schaffner and A. Wenden (Eds.). *Language and Peace*. Dartmouth, Aldershot, 3-16.