

Re-building the Concept of Nation Building in Malaysia

Suhana Saad

PhD, Senior Lecturer

School of Social, Development & Environmental Studies

Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities, The National University of Malaysia

43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

E-mail: suhanasaad@ymail.com

Received: November 6, 2011

Accepted: December 6, 2011

Published: April 1, 2012

doi:10.5539/ass.v8n4p115

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n4p115>

Abstract

Generally, Malaysia is being described as one of the prime example among those societies that are severely divided along ethnic lines. The country is also among the few pluralistic societies that have achieved some measure of success in managing ethnic conflict and enjoying relative political stability. The complexities of the Malaysian case stem are from the make-up of its ethnic population: Malay (58 percent), Chinese (24 percent), Indians (8 percent), and others (10 percent). Efforts to integrate these diverse groups in the interests of national unity have been, and remain, at the heart of the Malaysian endeavour of nation-building. Her national independence and its Constitution were grounded upon the political bargaining process among ethnic groups which ensued social contract had made them possible. During Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohamad years, the political sensitivity towards the non-Malays was reduced remarkably. Among the important changes were, liberalization of language, education policies and the most important is the promotion of nation building such as *Bangsa Malaysia* (united Malaysian nation). When the present Prime Minister, Najib Razak took over the office, he introduced One Malaysia slogan to develop one nation. One Malaysia seeks to improve the relationship of all Malaysians, regardless of racial, religious and cultural background. This paper aims to examine whether the One Malaysia is a new concept or just a re-branding of existing concepts. Therefore, the principles of One Malaysia will be examined to see the efforts toward nation building.

Keywords: One Malaysia, Re-building, Social contract, Ethnic, Bangsa Malaysia

1. Introduction

National unity has been one of the fundamental themes for nation building since the independence of Malaya then the formation of Malaysia September 16, 1963 (Denison Jayasuria 2010). In his delegation speech in conjunction with the Malaysia 52nd Independence Day in 2009, the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Datuk Seri MOHD. NAJIB Razak stated that the biggest challenge faced by Malaysian citizens was to refurbish the bridge which stands strong today while demolishing walls of segregation amongst the people. He also added that what was in hand today may not necessarily improve but instead, face a possibility of being lost or destroyed if precautions were not taken. This could be considered as a principle passed on amongst the country's line of previous leaders who believed that without the strength of unity amongst the people, Malaysia would fail in increasing and developing the population of the country (Sivamurugan Pandian 2010).

Every Prime Minister has also possessed a similar hope with a vision to see a balance of leadership with continuous emphasis on future issues based on accord among the people in order to brush aside differences which were present in the compendium of its people. The first Prime Minister, TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN Putra Al-Haj ibni Almarhum Sultan Abdul Hamid Shah, brought forward political collaboration as a source of strength in the elements of national politics. Then, New Economics Policy (NEP) was introduced by Tun ABDUL RAZAK to restructure the people and to recover the sense of integration amongst the people. Tun HUSSEIN ONN trying to organise and build an even stronger synthesis which also stood as the inner boost for Tun Dr. MAHATHIR Mohamad's Vision 2020. The vision is to achieving developed country status in 30 years. Tun ABDULLAH Ahmad Badawi then attempted to build inner values so that the element which was emphasised in Islam Hadhari thoughts, concept, slogans or even policies of One Malaysia need to be viewed as a

continuation from what was introduced by leaders of the past.

2. What Is Nation Building?

The term nation building is often used simultaneously with state building, democratization, modernization, political development, post conflict reconstruction, and peace building, but each concept are different, even though their evolution is intertwined. The concept of nation building came to be used mainly among American political scientists after World War II, to describe the greater integration of state and society, as citizenship brought loyalty to the modern nation state with it (Reinhard 1977). Nation building can involve the use of propaganda or major infrastructure development to foster social harmony and economic growth. Nation building is also a normative concept that means different things to different people. The latest conceptualization is essentially that nation building programs are those in which dysfunctional or unstable or failed states or economies are given assistance in the development of governmental infrastructure, civil society, dispute resolution mechanisms, as well as economic assistance, in order to increase stability. But it is important to look at the evolution of theories of nation building and the other concepts which has both been supplanted and included. Many people believe that nation building is evolutionary rather than revolutionary, that takes a long time and a social process that cannot be jump started from outside.

The evolution of the Italian city-states into a nation, the German city-states into the Zollverein customs union and later a nation, the multiple languages and cultural groups in France into the nation of France, the development of China from the warring kingdoms took a very long time and were the result, not only of political leadership, but the changes in technology and economic processes (the agricultural and then industrial revolutions), as well as communication, culture and civil society, and many other factors. In Africa and the Middle East, new political borders paid little attention to national identities in the creation of new states. Thus, the notion of nation state, a nation which developed the governmental apparatus of a state was often nonsense. While in Europe, nation building historically preceded state building in post-colonial states and state building preceded nation building. The aftermath of colonialism led to the need for nation building (Stephen 2005).

The rhetoric of nation building has emerged as an agenda in most plural societies as the state sought to neutralize ethnic ideologies of nationhood. SMITH (1989) stated that a nation built around an ethnic community. Nevertheless, in many plural societies the development of nationhood had to contend with the strong presence of diverse ethnic communities. It is argued that for a plural society the process nation building means first, the state has to manage centrifugal tendencies derived from the forces of ethnicity and nationalism; and from the point, embark upon the process of mediating identities and moving toward constructing the framework of national identity. In this respect, the idea of state nationalism which precedes nation building activity serves as a device to unite people by creating the sentiment of belonging and common identity.

The concept of nation building often used interchangeably with national integration that contains a vast extent of human relationships and attitudes ranging from the integration of diverse and discrete cultural loyalties, the development or a sense of nationality, the integration of political units into a common territorial framework with a government to exercise power as well as the integration of the citizenry into a common political process to the integration of individuals into an organisation for purposive activities: If nation building so touches the root of people's beliefs and attitudes in regard to politics, then the process of nation building must be affected significantly by the character of a society's political culture. According to SHAROM Ahmat (1980), in the case of Malaysia, nation building is seen as the process by which a stable and integrated society will emerge. This will be achieved through the following means; the creation of a strong economy which will act as the stimulus on which other programs can be built; the stabilization of internal factions and the promotion of domestic tranquillity and, the consolidation of cultural competencies including the improvement of the quality of people's lives, and hence the vitality of the nation.

3. Nation Building in Malaysia

The first project of Malaysian nation building must look since independence in August 1957. The Malaysia Constitution was intended to provide a viable basis for ethnic understanding and good government. Behind it there was a great deal of bargaining, mainly among ethnic groups and political parties. There are two basic points to keep in mind in order to understand the nature and significance of the political process at this time; first, ethnicity is the key and second, the Malays would control the executive. To operate the system of government after independence, the main ethnic groups would have to work together, but the parties had been constructed along ethnic lines (Milne & Mauzy 1999). According to In-Won HWANG (2003), the original agreement on the constitutional contract was a trade-off between Malays and non-Malays, in particular United Malay National Organization (UMNO) and Malaysian Chinese Association (MCA). As a major concession from the Malays, the

constitutional package gave non-Malays liberal citizenship regulations. In return, non-Malays had to accept the constitutional status of Malay special rights in various fields, such as language, religion, and the status of Malay rules. The creation of the Alliance Party was fortuitous. As a purely *ad hoc* tactic, the local leaders of UMNO and the MCA struck a deal. The two parties, intent on defeating the front-runner, decided not to put up candidates against each other. The tactic was successful and the election was won by nine seats to two. An Indian component was supplied when the Malaysian Indian Congress (MIC) joined the Alliance in 1954. At the general election in 1955, the party proved successful and won 51 out of the 52 seats. This is the first successful ethnic bargaining in Malaysian politics.

The Alliance type system resembles the system of elite cooperation and given name of consociationalism. The concept of consociationalism by LIJPHART (1969) contains four key components that would provide a successful political consensus. They are the grand coalition, segmental autonomy, mutual veto and proportionality. First, grand coalition requires power sharing through participation of the representatives of all significant groups in political decision making process. Second, segmental autonomy provides authority to these groups to manage their own internal affairs particularly in two major domains such as education and culture. Third, mutual veto allows each group to protect the disadvantages and advantages thus it simultaneously promotes equality conditionally to settle sensitive issues. Fourth, proportionality offers each significant group an equal distribution in the electoral system, power sharing, position in public office and resources. However, one of the most important aspects of post 1963 period in Malaysia was the increased politicization of both Malays and Chinese; with the result that segmental leader no longer exercised sufficient authority over their own communities. The gradual polarization of communities during the period 1963-1969 was heading towards the breakdown of inter-ethnic consociational conflict management. The period 1963 to 1969 was an important era in the history of Malaysia. In addition to the successful formation of a nation state, it was also marked by the expulsion of Singapore from the Federation and a worsening in race relations. The formation of Malaysia on 16 September 1963 incorporated Sabah, Sarawak, and Singapore. Brunei Darussalam withdrew at the very last moment. The inclusion of Sabah and Sarawak's natives such as the Kadazan, Iban, Dayak, Melanau and Murut expanded the multi-racial composition of the society and they were recognized as *bumiputera* (sons of the soil). On 5 March 1965 however, Singapore was expelled from Malaysia due to problems arising primarily from the proposal to implement the policy of "Malaysian Malaysia" by the Singaporean People's Action Party (PAP), led by LEE Kuan Yew (a former Singapore's Prime Minister).

The May 13 in 1969 racial riots were the single most intensive case of inter-racial violence Malaysia had undergone since independence. According to the Malay perspective, the consociational Alliance regime did not seem to guarantee their intrinsic privileged political hegemony as an indigenous people, even though Malays recognized the superior economic position of non-Malay. The non-Malays especially the Chinese increasingly challenged Malay political hegemony which was an essential part of the Alliance bargain. The consociational Alliance eventually collapsed when escalating Malay grievances over the undermining of their special political position turned into serious inter-racial riots in 1969 (In-Won Hwang 2003). The report from British document (Public Records Office in Kew Gardens, London) shown the riots were not spontaneous acts of communal violence, as is constantly alleged by UMNO, but were fanned by Malay elements, with support from the army and police, wanting to discredit the accommodating Prime Minister and impose a much more rigorous Malay agenda. KUA Kia Soong in his book *Declassified document on the Malaysian Riots of 1969* stated that the goal was to formalise Malay dominance, sideline the Chinese and shelve TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN. The riots was rather a planned attack to oust then TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN who remained Prime Minister until September 1970 but had little authority anymore. In 1971, he stepped down as President of UMNO after virulent criticism by the Malay "young Turks" headed by MAHATHIR Mohamad, the future Prime Minister. Otherwise, the official report from Malaysian government was that the riots were sparked by opposition parties "infiltrated by Communist insurgents" following huge opposition gains in the election 1969 (Bowring 2007). As a result, the national principles or *Rukunegara* was introduced as a tool of unity (Kartini Aboo Talib@ Khalid & Suhana Saad 2010). *Rukunegara* presented five principles by which the Malaysian peoples were to be guided; belief in god; loyalty to king and country; upholding the constitution; rule of law and good behaviour and morality. The national principles are mandatory to public schools to embrace them by requiring all students to state their pledge by reading the national principles in the morning assembly in all public schools. However, the implementation of these principles is no longer common.

Other government policies were also introduced in an effort to create a positive attitude towards cultural assimilation and the creation of a national culture. Among them was the National Culture Policy (NCP) which was introduced in August 1971 to develop a national culture from three elements: the indigenous culture;

suitable elements from the non-Malay cultures; and Islam as an important component. Beside the national ideology, Malaysia's NEP was first announced in 1970 as the principal policy response to the post-election race riots of May 1969. The NEP had two prongs, namely poverty eradication regardless of race and restructuring society to eliminate the identification of race with economic function. The NEP was supposed to create the conditions for national unity by reducing inter-ethnic resentment due to socio-economic disparities (Jomo, K.S. 2004; HENG Pek Koon 1997). In general, the Malays were employed predominantly in the agricultural where output per worker was lowest, while the Chinese were more easily found in the manufacturing and commercial sector where it was highest. Employment targets for Malays were based on the premise that their promotion in agriculture should decrease. In most employment sector, however, the numbers (but not the proportion) of Chinese and Indian would not decrease (Milne & Mauzy 1999).

The government declared that the NEP's ultimate goal was national unity (In-Won Hwang 2003). The rationale behind the NEP is based on the recognition that national unity in Malaysia is the pre-requisite for development in all aspects of life. Even though the government has strived hard to integrate the society through various visions and ideologies, it is still difficult to accomplish as ethnocentrism is still rife among the various ethnics. It involves politicians, academicians, associations, and even students. The inclination to preserve one's traditions has made history, vision and ideologies proposed by the country's leaders simply rhetorical in nature. The adversity was expressed by Tun Dr MAHATHIR Mohamad, the forth Prime Minister, who introduced Vision 2020 in February 1991. He outlined the country's major challenge in nation building that is to create a Malaysian nation that is united and has similar aspirations, integrate at the territorial level and between ethnics based on equal rights and justice. Vision 2020 stresses development in terms of national unity and social cohesion, economy, social justice, political stability and system of government, quality of life, social and spiritual values, national pride and confidence. Vision 2020 sets out not only an economic agenda, social agenda, political agenda, psychological agenda, science and technology agenda but a comprehensive and rounded agenda for the nation. The nine strategic challenges set out by Vision 2020:

- The first of these is the challenge of establishing a united Malaysian nation (Bangsa Malaysia) with a sense of common and shared destiny. This must be a nation at peace with itself, territorially and ethnically integrated, living in harmony and full and fair partnership, made up of one *Bangsa Malaysia* with political loyalty and dedication to the nation.
- The second is the challenge of creating a psychologically liberated, secure and developed Malaysian society with faith and confidence in itself, justifiably proud of what it is, of what it has accomplished, robust enough to face all manner of adversity. This Malaysian Society must be distinguished by the pursuit of excellence, fully aware of all its potentials, psychologically subservient to none, and respected by the peoples of other nations.
 - The third challenge is fostering and developing a mature democratic society, practicing a form of mature, consensual, community-oriented Malaysian democracy that can be a model for many developing countries.
 - The fourth is the challenge of establishing a fully moral and ethical society, whose citizens are strong in religious and spiritual values and imbued with the highest of ethical standards.
 - The fifth challenge is establishing a mature, liberal and tolerant society in which Malaysians of all colours and creeds are free to practise and profess their customs, cultures and religious beliefs and yet feeling that they belong to one nation.
 - The sixth is the challenge of establishing a scientific and progressive society, a society that is innovative and forward-looking, one that is not only a consumer of technology but also a contributor to the scientific and technological civilization of the future.
 - The seventh challenge is establishing a fully caring society and a caring culture, a social system in which society will come before self, in which the welfare of the people will revolve not around the state or the individual but around a strong and resilient family system.
 - The eighth is the challenge of ensuring an economically just society in which there is a fair and equitable distribution of the wealth of the nation, in which there is a full partnership in economic progress. Such a society cannot be in place so long as there is the identification of economic backwardness with race.
 - The ninth challenge of establishing a prosperous society, with an economy that is fully competitive, dynamic, robust and resilient.

Mahathir believes that this ambition can be achieved provided the country can sustain economic growth of at least 7 percent a year from the time the Vision was unveiled until 2020. Nevertheless, he envisages that Malaysia should not be a duplicate of any other developed country, but instead be a developed country in our own mould. In Mahathir's words:

“Malaysia should not be developed only in the economic sense. It must be a nation that is fully developed along all the dimensions: economically, politically, socially, spiritually, psychologically and culturally. We must be fully developed in terms of national unity and social cohesion, in terms of our economy, in terms of social justice, political stability and the system of government, quality of life, social and spiritual values, national pride and confidence (Mahathir Mohamad, 1991)”.

There are two main points which Mahathir attempts to highlight here. The first is peoples' obligation with regard to the 1957 consensus, or the constitutional compromise which he argued must be fulfilled, sincerely and fully. The second is redressing the socio-economic imbalances amongst the various ethnic groups, the success of which is heavily dependent on the extent to which economic growth and prosperity can be created and sustained in the country. Obviously, these are not new issues, but rather something which many Malaysian are familiar with, since they have formed the basic framework of national integration since 1970 (Mohamed Mustafa Bin Ishak 1999).

Despite leadership change, nation building projects in Malaysia is still ongoing. After Vision 2020, Datuk Seri NAJIB Tun Razak the current Prime Minister has introduced the slogan ‘One Malaysia’. The objective is to create oneness or unity within a multi-religious and multi-cultural nation. This slogan means Malaysia embrace a diversity of ethnicity, religions and beliefs and, by being inclusive, build mutual respect and acceptance into a solid foundation of trust and cohesiveness. One Malaysia is not a new project for nation building. It is built upon the foundations of Federal Constitution, various laws and policies, the *Rukunegara*, Vision 2020, the National Mission and our view of unity and fairness.

4. Refreshing the Project of Nation Building

One Malaysia leans against three tenets in enhancing national unity which are: principle of acceptance, principle of national spirit and, principle of social justice. Principle of acceptance means acceptance principle means that even though Malaysians live different lifestyles, practices and culture, we accept each other as loyal friends. The second principle is national spirit regarding to unity concept, nationalism and love for the country have been inculcated early on by past leaders. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN through the Alliance Party which he led with the assistance of Tun TAN Cheng Lok and Tun V.T SAMBANTHAN fought for independence and freedom from the British Colonists for the Malays states. The main features of a Malay nation state were framed up, legally and constitutionally, just before the independence of Malaya. However, in the next 12 years, the TUNKU's administration would move away from this framework. He delayed the full implementation of the Malay nation state project. He began building a more pluralistic and multi-cultural Malaya in order to fulfil his immediate priority-national unity (Cheah Book Kheng 2002).

Tun ABDUL RAZAK, in turn, inspired the NEP, which aims to unite the multi-races in this country. Subsequently, Tun Hussein Onn, known best for his efforts in instilling unity among the multi-races in Malaysia was bestowed the name ‘Father of Unity’. Tun Dr. MAHATHIR and Tun ABDULLAH Hj Ahmad Badawi introduced vision 2020 and the concept of excellence, glory and distinction, respectively, in efforts to instil unity among the many races in this country. The third is principle of social justice, each race in this country regardless of background or religion will be accounted for fairly and equitably in their welfare and other social aspects. Through the One Malaysia, each representative needs to transcend racial boundaries and extend their services to other races. Even then, the One Malaysia which espouses social justice principles is not a platform for any quarter or party to make outrageous claims or demands. The culture of excellence, endurance, humility, acceptance, loyalty, meritocracy, education and integrity are the eight values hem in the One Malaysia slogan.

Overall, all these eight values show that the idea of One Malaysia is faced with moral value. NAJIB intends to witness the grandeur of a new civilization that is shared with by all levels of society via these eight values and also the birth of determination and motivation among society so that the pride of life in Malaysia is upheld. All these values are also vital towards the practice of interpretation and, if made as fad in activities, programmes and policies, how far can it raise the level of acceptance and even more from that, develop the agenda created as inside precursor in generating strength to the idea of One Malaysia (Sivamurugan Pandian 2010).

Hence, the slogan of One Malaysia aspires to strengthen relationships among races. Mutual trust and respect among races needs to exist in order to sow the spirit of unity. People must understand and practice things that

place national interests as priority. In creating a unified national race in a multi-ethnic country like Malaysia in this era of globalization, it is imperative that we allow free and fast flow of not just information, capital and people but also value systems, cultures and beliefs from different countries. The ability to build a unified national race depends on the sharing of the values of integrity, ability, dedication and loyalty.

5. The Challenges to Achieve Nation Building

Although nation building is the core of national development, this effort is not easy. This is due to the gap between the races, especially in economic terms. *Bumiputera* (the Malays and native from Sabah and Sarawak) achievement is still far from the target of 30 percent in equity. Chandra Muzaffar (2010) stated that since independence, the top 20 percent of income earners in Malaysia have benefited much more from economic growth than the bottom 40 percent. It is significant that the report of the National Economic Advisory Council (NEAC) on the New Economic Model (NEM) admits that the bottom 40 per cent of households have experienced the slowest growth of average income earning less than RM 1 500 per month in 2008. The wage trend in Malaysia recorded only 2.6 percent growth during the past 10 years compared to the escalating cost of living during the same period. It explains why almost 34 percent of about 1.3 million workers earn less than RM700 a month below the poverty line of RM720 per month. This is an urgent challenge that must address to achieve nation building through One Malaysia.

The second factor is to accept the national ideology and the constitution. This includes the Malay privilege and Islam is the religion of the federation. The problem arises when some parties opposed the constitution that has been agreed. All of these issues are related to the social contract. In his argument, Shad Saleem Faruqi (2010) stated that in Malaysia, the term social contract has a very different and unique meaning. It referred to the difficult and elaborate compromises between the ethnic Malays, Chinese and Indians on their mutual rights and privileges and their bargains with the Malay Rulers and the British for the creation of a democratic, federal, non-theocratic system of government based on constitutional monarchy. Mavis Puthuchery (2005) said the UMNO version of the social contract would allow for Malay interests as defined by UMNO "Malay Supremacy" to be given greater emphasis. Any call for debate on its content is viewed as a challenge to the existing political system. According to Puthuchery, in such situation it is unwise to recognize the legitimacy of the social contract as it is applied in the Malaysian context. History has demonstrated that nation building in Malaysia began with the formation of Malayan Union on April 1, 1946 which was deemed a failure from the beginning as it did not gazette the rights of the native Malays, abolished the Malay monarchy's sovereignty, and by according equal citizenship status to everyone. Peaceful demonstrations by the native people managed to convince the British to convert the status of the country to the Federation of Malaya on February 1, 1948 maintained the status quo and power of the monarchy and granting of citizenship was made more stringent (Wan Norhasniah Wan Husin 2011). The founding of Malaya provided the platform of nation building through the emergence of a new political territory, but it was not an easy task as the proposal had resulted in some apprehension among the non-Malays who felt that their traditions had been neglected. The Malays claimed the reinstatement of the Malays' special rights in the constitution, and the use of Malay language as the medium of communication in education.

In principle, all nation building processes are cultural interventions as the centre establishes a particular identity on the periphery or in other words, the elite creates a national identity for the rest of the population (Raphael Utz 2005). Therefore, the creation of a Malaysian national culture is intended to achieve three objectives: strengthening social and national unity through culture, nurturing and preserving a national identity which stems from a national culture, and enriching and increasing the quality of life from a practical and spiritual perspective, in line with socioeconomic development. The NCP specifies national culture as the native culture to this region (in particular, culture seen as relating to Malays), and that Islam plays an important role in the national culture. Cultural elements that are determined appropriate and holding the Islamic value as a major element embrace in the national culture. KUA (1985) argued that authorizing a certain culture to have a dominant role in nation building and in the construction of national identity eradicates equality of cultural manifestation and contribution into the nation by the minorities. Therefore, the critics of the NCP counter-proposed a natural assimilation policy to allow the assimilation of culture naturally. The 1983 Joint Memorandum on National Culture submitted by major Chinese organizations had promoted cultural pluralism and the establishment of common cultural values (Shakila Yacob 2006). This is some challenges that government needs to overcome to ensure our citizens live in harmony.

In education field, the system in Malaysia may be seen in tandem with the other national policies mentioned above. For instance, education also plays a role in the NEP. Providing a national education is one of the means by which redistribution of wealth according to ethnic group is to be fulfilled. In the effort of nation building, there is the need for a common cultural value system to promote national identity and nationhood. (Sandra Khor

Manickam 2004). The country needs a community that places importance in education and knowledge over the above things. The challenge comes when the education becomes an ethnic and political issue. For instance, the Vision Schools project was mooted on February 19, 1997, that held the same objectives of the singular system of education as envisioned in the 1950s, to produce a generation that is tolerant and understanding so as to realize a united nation. Unfortunately, the idea Vision Schools has not received wide support from Malaysians in large part due to communal politics that champions the perpetuation of vernacular schools based on mother tongue education (Shakila Yacob 2006). Education and language issue are very sensitive in Malaysia because it is related to the ethnic identity. So, the government should be wise to resolve this issue in order to maintain ethnic relation in Malaysia.

Another challenge to One Malaysia vision is many people assuming that One Malaysia is similar to the concept of Malaysian Malaysia proposed by People Action Party (PAP). After Singapore was expelled from Malaysia in 1965, some PAP member in Malaysia mostly Chinese has established Democratic Action Party (DAP). The essence of the idea was that Malaysia was conceived as belonging to Malaysians as a whole and not to any particular community or ethnic. This concept emphasized that public policy should address all Malaysian citizens as equals. This aroused strong communal sentiment in the Chinese community (In-Won Hwang 2003). Our citizens should know that One Malaysia is an idea to harmonize citizens of different ethnic in this country without changing their identity. The Malaysian Malaysia concept, on the other hand, is a policy that seeks to effectively disintegrate the basic foundation that the community is built on. The fairness that is espoused in the Malaysian Malaysia blindly takes advantage of the utilization of the total equity version. Besides taking care of the needs of all races, One Malaysia emphasizes integration and the existence of the Malaysian race. This is quite different from Malaysian Malaysia, which is limited to equitable rights and does not consider reality and Malaysian history. Whatever argument behind this slogan, the government should explain to the people that any policy should not oppose the constitution.

One Malaysia slogan became a controversial when the opposition leader and Permatang Pauh MP Datuk Seri ANWAR Ibrahim said the One Malaysia slogan was copied from the One Israel and was allegedly related to APCO Worldwide. APCO Worldwide is an award-winning, independently owned global communication consultancy with offices in major cities throughout Asia, the Americas, Europe, the Middle East and Africa. APCO offers services related to business and finance, media, public opinion and society, and government and public policy. ANWAR claimed that Israeli-linked APCO Worldwide employed by the NAJIB administration was behind both the One Malaysia and One Israel concepts otherwise NAJIB said One Malaysia is his original concept. During the press conference on March 30, 2010, ANWAR claimed to have documents linking One Malaysia One Israel and the public relations firm APCO Worldwide. On Nov 22, 2010, de facto law minister, Datuk Seri NAZRI Aziz proof two documents containing denials from APCO and American political consultant over the consultancy involvement in the One Israel campaign (Shazwan Mustafa Kamal 2010). Regarding to APCO Worldwide statement "we did not devise the One Malaysia concept. In our work as communications consultants we are not involved in policy formation but in the presentation of information the government intends to share with the public. We work for governments which are prepared to take our counsel on transparency, democracy and the rule of law. We are honoured to continue our work with the government of Malaysia (apcoworldwide.com)."

Another controversial is when DAP adviser LIM Kit Siang's challenged Tan Sri MUHYIDDIN Yassin, Deputy Prime Minister to resign if he refused to admit that he is a Malaysian first and a Malay second as proof that he was in full support of the One Malaysia concept. As a response to LIM, Tan Sri MUHYIDDIN Yassin declared he is Malay first but does not mean that he is not a Malaysian at heart. According to MUHYIDDIN, when a leader spoke out on his community, it did not mean that he did not support the One Malaysia concept which was based on the Federal Constitution and *Rukunegara* (The Star April 1, 2010). Some people look MUHYIDDIN statement contradicted to One Malaysia. The speculation that there was a split between the two spread in light of NAJIB's inaction but the two subsequently denied the allegation and attributed the rumors to the opposition. On March 31, 2010, MUHYIDDIN said, he supported the Prime Minister's message of One Malaysia and criticised LIM Kit Siang of the DAP for trying to drive a wedge between NAJIB and him.

According to Penang's Chief Minister, LIM Guan Eng (also the Secretary General of the DAP), a platform for unity that cuts across race and religion is basic human rights and a civil society shared by all. He was introduced Middle Malaysia that puts people first and offers good governance based on six core principles. One, we are Malaysian First. Two, we deserve to enjoy basic human rights and a civil society. Three, there must be equality of opportunity for all. Four, there must be rule of law where what you know is more important than who you know. Five, we must build integrity and intelligent city communities towards a high-income and knowledge-based economy. Middle Malaysia prefers cooperation not conflict, consultation instead of confrontation and an inclusive

shared society rather than an exclusive separate society. Middle Malaysia belongs to every Malaysian. Unlike Umno Malaysia, in Middle Malaysia the content of our character is more important than the colour of our skin. Unlike BN's Malaysia, in Middle Malaysia we look at each other as brothers and sisters, fathers and mothers and as sons and daughters of Malaysia. Unlike Crony Malaysia, Middle Malaysia respects and celebrates you with the firm belief that Malaysia's wealth, opportunities and resources belongs to all Malaysians (Lim Guan Eng 2010). On March 16, 2010, NAJIB in parliament described this concept is a re-branding of the concept Malaysian Malaysia. According to NAJIB, Malaysian Malaysia is a failure. It is just reaction to the concept of opposition is not based on Federal Constitution and Malaysian history.

6. Conclusion

The concept of nation building in Malaysia aspires to strengthen relationships among ethnic and ensure Malaysians sow the seed of unity as enshrined in the national principles. The implementation of nation building project would surely play a major role in unifying the different sectors of society and shaping a new political culture conducive for nation building. The appreciation of cultural, linguistic and religious differences could then pave the way to a more open, tolerant, liberal and progressive political culture that will propel the nation forward to face the challenges of globalisation and trade liberalisation. One Malaysia is to refresh the concept of nation building from the previous policy and national agenda. In Malaysia although the leadership was changed, but the vision to achieve social cohesion have never change. Based on this argument, One Malaysia actually is not a new concept in term of nation building. One Malaysia values and respects the principles of the Federal Constitution as well as ethnic identities of each race so that we can live together and have mutual respects among us. What happened if Malaysia cannot realize their Vision 2020? One must understand that the Vision 2020 program was initiated for making Malaysia a developed country but however, if the target failed, the government project for nation building will not change with the social cohesion of the country. Since Malaysia independence, the government has been actively involved in the project of nation building and will not quit even if the vision might not be achieved.

References

- Bowring, P. (2007). Digging up the racial past. Retrieved November 28, 2011, from www.Littlespeak.com/ThePast/CPast-My-Kiasoong-070517.htm
- Chandra Muzaffar. (2010). Widening income inequality: A challenge to 1 Malaysia. Retrieved October 3, 2011, from <http://www.Malaysianinsider.com>
- Cheah Boon Kheng. (2002). *Malaysia: the making of a nation*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (Chapter 3).
- Denison Jayasuria. (2010). National Unity Advisory Panel: Opportunities and challenge in a multi-ethnic society. In Ho Khok Hua, Sivamurugan Pandian, Hilal Hj. Othman and Ivanpal Singh Grewel (Eds.). *Managing success in unity* (pp.168-193). Putrajaya: Department of National Unity and Integration.
- Heng Pek Koon. (1997). The New Economic Policy and the Chinese community in Peninsular Malaysia. Retrieved October 3, 2011, from http://www.ide.go.jp/English/Publish/Periodicals/De/pdf/97_03_03.pdf
<http://www.apcoworldwide.com>
- In-Won Hwang. (2003). *Personalized politics: The Malaysian state under Mahathir*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (Chapter 2).
- Jomo, K.S. (2004). The New Economic Policy and interethnic relations in Malaysia. Retrieved October 3, 2011, from [www.unrisd.org/unrisd/website/document.nsf/\(httpPublications\)/A20E](http://www.unrisd.org/unrisd/website/document.nsf/(httpPublications)/A20E)
- Kartini Aboo Talib@Khalid & Suhana Saad. (2010). Power sharing and unity: The politics of Alliance in plural society. In Ho Khok Hua, Sivamurugan Pandian, Hilal Hj. Othman and Ivanpal Singh Grewel (Eds.). *Managing success in unity* (pp. 112-147). Putrajaya: Department of National Unity and Integration.
- Kua Kia soong. (1985). *National culture and democracy*. Petaling Jaya: Kersani Sdn. Bhd (Chapter 2).
- Lijphart, A. (1969). Consociational democracy. *World Politic*, 21, 207-225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2009820>
- Lim Guan Eng. (2010). 5 core principles of Middle Malaysia. Retrieved Nov 26, 2011, from <http://limguaneng.com>
- Mavis Puthucheary. (2005). Malaysia's social contract: exposing the myth behind the slogan. Retrieved October 11, 2011, from www.projectmalaysia.org
- Milne, R.S & Mauzy, D.K. (1999). *Malaysian politics under Mahathir*. London: Routledge, (Chapter 1).

- Mohamed Mustafa Bin Ishak. (1999). From plural society to *Bangsa Malaysia*: ethnicity and nationalism in the politics of nation-building in Malaysia. PhD Thesis. The University of Leeds, United Kingdom.
- Raphael Utz. (2005). Nations, nation building, and cultural intervention: a social science perspective. Retrieved October 27, 2011, from http://www.mpil.de/shared/data/pdf/pdfmpunyb/utz_9_615_647.pdf
- Reinhard, B. (1977). *Nation building and citizenship*. Berkeley: University of California Press, (Chapter 3).
- Sandra Khor Manickam. (2004). Textbooks and nation construction in Malaysia. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from http://www.rchss.sinica.edu.tw/capas/publication/newsletter/N28/28_01_04.pdf
- Shakila Yacob. (2006). Political culture and nation building: whither Bangsa Malaysia? *Malaysian Journal of Social Policy and Society*, 3, 22-42.
- Sharom Ahmat. (1980). Nation building and the university in developing countries: the case of Malaysia. Retrieved October 27, 2011, from www.jstor.org
- Shazwan Mustafa Kamal. (2010). PKR claims APCO pressured over One Israel. Retrieved Nov 26, 2011, from www.themalaysianinsider.com
- Sivamurugan Pandian. (2010). Managing diversity: From independence to 1 Malaysia. In Ho Khek Hua, Sivamurugan Pandian, Hilal Hj. Othman and Ivanpal Singh Grewel (Eds.). *Managing success in unity* (pp. 210-244). Putrajaya: Department of National Unity and Integration.
- Stephen, C. (2005). Nation building. Retrieved October 25, 2011, from <http://www.beyondintracapability.org>
The Star April 1, 2010.
- Wan Norhasniah Wan Husin. (2011). Nation building and 1 Malaysia concept: ethnic relations challenges in the educational field. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1, 228-237.