

Terrorism and Violence: a Danger to the Development of Nationhood

Mohd Mizan Aslam¹, Shushil Azam Shuib², Muhd Nabhan Mizan³

¹ National Defence University of Malaysia. Email: mohdmizan@upnm.edu.my.

² Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. Email: azam.shushilil@mohe.gov.my.

³ University College London. Email: nabhanmizan@ucl.edu.uk.

Article History:

Received: 12 November 2024

Revised: 20 November 2024

Accepted: 20 November 2024

Keywords: *Collective Security, Securitization, National Security, Human Security.*

Abstract: *The objective of this paper is to discuss how violence and terrorism become a threat to nation-building. The main aspects of discussions are collective security, securitization, national security, and human security. These four aspects play significant roles in building nationhood. If one of these elements is threatened, it will jeopardize the nationhood buildings. Thus, it is essential to identify these key factors to stabilize nationhood. This paper will also relate the relationship between human safety and national security, where national security can be threatened if the people are insecure. This paper focused on Malaysian nation-building with the rise of extremism in this region between 2000 years. Secondary data collection is done through literature review and observation from various sources. Findings have been translated into this paper with the main factor on the threat of building nationhood through violence and terrorism.*

Introduction

According to Saad (2012), nation-building often relates to state-building, democratization, modernization, political development, rebuilding post-conflict, and reconciliation. Nation-building also refers to an abstract process of developing the sense of identity and society shared within various groups that form the population in a country. Nation-building tends to be the relationship between the people and the country or, to be more specific, about the country's construction or development. The term nation-building is also widely used in regional and international security debates, regime change, democratization, and others.

Scholars have mentioned that nation-building is an “evolutionary rather than social process” that involves the process of change regardless of the social, cultural, or other contexts. This perspective also describes this process as a functioning state in which nation-building needs to foster social traits that never existed before, were not established and not appropriately framed, or their existence has been weakened due to war or internal conflict (Saad, 2012). However, nation-building does not begin with the end of the violent conflict, or otherwise; it is even a continuous process for a country that aims to create and reproduce an integrated international community based on shared values and objectives.

For example, the concept of nation-building in Malaysia was formed based on maintaining values and exclusivist identities at the early stage of independence, independence, such as diversity of culture, but later moved slowly towards achieving a thoroughly modern state. For ASEAN, the rise of activities such as cross-border crime has become a matter pertaining to nationhood among the regional countries. Thus, shaping a peaceful region is essential and brings a significant goal in maintaining stability in this region.

A radical is “one who advocates fundamental or revolutionary changes in current practices, conditions, or institutions.” In other words, a radical is someone who is driven by ideology. Radical Islam in Southeast Asia is further defined as a movement whose ideology is “to establish an Islamic state governed by Shari`ah through violence and extralegal means. Modern Islamic ideology materialized in the Middle East in the second half of the 20th century as a revivalist and anti-nationalist movement. In the early 1920s, most of the Muslim world was under European imperialism, and then by 1925, the Ottoman Empire (Caliphate) was disestablished. Although the Ottoman Caliphate was limited in power by that time, it was seen as the unifying symbol of Islam

by many Muslims.

Muslim empires and influence were quickly deteriorating and giving way to Westernization. It was under this perceived threat to the Muslim ideals and a "community in crisis" that contemporary Islamic activism emerged. The propagators of the Islamic movement viewed the core of the crisis as having two parts: Western imperialism and Westernization nationalist Muslim leadership. In the movement's early years, the most prominent theorists were Hassan al-Banna of Egypt and Mawlana Mawdudi of Pakistan. The groups founded by each of these religious scholars are Ikhwanul Muslimin (Muslim "Brotherhood") in 1928 in Egypt and the Jamaat i-Islami (Islamic Movement) in 1941 in India; respectively, remain the trademark of Islamic movement organizations today. Both leaders viewed their societies as too reliant on the West- politically ineffectual and culturally defunct.

Furthermore, they viewed the increasing incursion of Western culture, such as education, law, customs, and values, as being significantly destructive in the long term because they directly threatened the core of the Muslim community. Al-Banna and Mawdudi believed the internal aspects of the problem were most pressing and, therefore, focused on the Islamization of the Muslim community. They shared the belief that Islam, by providing comprehensive guidance for every aspect of a Muslim's life, was better than capitalism and other ideologies. They established organizations that promoted social and political activism to support this key principle.⁹³ They also worked to match modernization with scripture and tradition by reinterpreting Islam and applying it to the challenges of modernity. For al-Banna and Mawdudi, the solution for the crisis of the Muslim communities in their respective regions lay in indoctrinating people (socio-religious reform) while changing the government (political reform) at the same time. For Mawdudi, a truly Islamic state recognized only the sovereignty of God (hakimiya), worshipped God alone, and implemented His law, which means Sharia Law. Anything short of this was Jahiliya.

Another prominent scholar of Muslim radicalism was Sayyid Qutb. Following the assassination of al-Banna in 1949, Qutb emerged as the leader of the Ikhwanul Muslimin. Although influenced by Banna and Mawdudi's ideological theories and the concept of the Islamic state, Qutb saw the means for attaining their goals as requiring a more radical program of action. By rejecting all forms of nationalism, Qutb declared the Egyptian policy illegitimate. His uncompromising delegitimization of all artificial political communities, prompted in part by the state's violent attack on the Brotherhoods and its teaching, led many of their members to embrace violent struggle. Qutb wrote his most influential and radical works while in prison from 1954 until his execution in 1966, named *Ma'alim Fi al-Tariq* (Milestone). As explained by Anthony Bubalo, Qutb was best known as "the man whose ideas would shape Al Qaeda."

Method

This study used a qualitative descriptive method. Data were obtained from several political analyst institutions in China and Europe that have played a role in geopolitical study. Data comes from library research regarding the role of geopolitical studies and public governance in delivering significant change in the current situation, including the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU), and all relevant entities. Data were obtained through documentation, literature review, and internet searches. The literature review was based on reference journal articles. The open-ended interview and data analysis was conducted using a descriptive approach.

All the data collected was analyzed in detail to produce findings that fulfilled the research objectives. Several cities were visited in the research process, including Kuala Lumpur, Yala, Narathiwat, Pattani, Phnom Penh, Singapore, and Jakarta. Primary and secondary data were also collected from several Malaysian governmental institutions such as the Prime Minister's Office (PMO), Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) and National Security Division (NSD) as well as the

Companies Commission of Malaysia (CCM). Based on the data gathered through extensive fieldwork and theoretical assessments, this study provides an empirically detailed analysis of how radicalism takes form and emerges in a given society over time.

Result and Discussion

Identifying Indicator: Violence and Terrorism

Violence and terrorism have been identified as a threat to nation-building in Malaysia. Malaysia's strategic geographical position is surrounded by the South China Sea and the Straits of Malacca, and it borders Thailand, Indonesia, Philippines, and Singapore, being the gateway to Malaysia, porous by carrying out the illegal activity of the authorities to detect. In this case, the issues on the sovereignty, border integrity (territorial integrity), the survival of the political system, social, economic, and civilization of a country, including its society (political, social, economic, and cultural survival should be studied in depth so that the process of improvement of the existing security system be improved and make Malaysia a nation free from terrorist threats.

The United States Department of Defense defines terrorism as the calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear, intended to coerce or intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological. Based on this definition, we can identify that terrorism involves violence, crime, and attempts to scare society of particular interest. Terrorists plan their attacks to obtain the most excellent publicity and plan their strategy to attain financial support.

The globalization era patterns of violence witnessed more sophisticated and complex changes in the diversity of tactics and strategies of terrorist groups. Based on the observations, the researchers found that most events associated with international terrorism are reactions taken by force by a group of individuals on behalf of the ruling government or other targets deemed oppressive rights, needs, and requirements of the general public.

In 2002, the President of the United States of America, George W. Bush, announced that the Southeast Asian region was the second layer in the so-called 'global war against terrorism' (Aslam, 2013). The point from his statement is that Southeast Asian countries such as Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand, and Malaysia have become hot spots for terrorism. After the end of Al-Qaeda threats and terrorism, the world is inhibited by the traits of Islamic State (IS), the new terrorist group. This group, which shares the same ideology as the earlier group, is even more extreme, using a different modus operandi. The ideology is to create chaos and panic in societies, so the targeted countries face social and political instability.

Collective security

In this paper, collective security has been identified as an instrument for building nationhood. Collective security can be described as a political, regional, or global security arrangement in which each state in the system obtains that the security of one is the concern of all and, therefore, commits to a collective response to threats to and breaches of the peace. In this region, ASEAN works as collective security, which is more ambitious than alliance security or collective defense systems. It seeks to encompass the totality of states within a region or, globally and address various possible threats (Macmillan, Palgrave 2015). According to Nikkei Asian Review, security concerns loom as a deeply divisive issue for ASEAN in this region. For ASEAN, collective security is critical to the future.

Violence and terrorism have become a collective security issue in this region. The threat of violence and terrorism can become indicators that threaten nation-building in this region. Even if we share the same values, such as elements of society, culture, and history, these elements can disintegrate our unity. To achieve this mission, ASEAN must practice collectivism instead of individualism among its members. Collectivism involves communal, societal, or national interests in various political, economic, and educational systems.

Securitization

Security is defined as a country's long-term survival from enemy and military threats outside its borders. After the end of the Cold War between the US and the Soviet Union, the safety concept underwent a significant transformation process. Some new security concepts have challenged a traditional security concept that emphasizes borders, sovereignty, and the concept of a country that was widely used during the Cold War (Makinda, 2001).

Security issues are no longer focused on traditional security only after the Cold War, but the scope of security extends beyond military, economic, political, community, and environmental forces. This contemporary security discourse also covers the issue of international relations in which non-military factors are regarded as a threat to international security. This situation caused various issues in the developing world, and the previously neglected domestic issue has begun to be taken into consideration. Migration, cross-border crime, trafficking, infectious diseases, environmental pollution, poverty, and other issues can create conflicts and threaten national, regional, and global security (Idris, 2012).

Safety actors play a role in securitization to eliminate non-traditional threats such as the economy, poverty, and terrorism. These actors can change an issue into a security issue, which is done through a securitization process. Therefore, Buzan states that; "Traditionally, by saying 'security,' a state representative declares an emergency condition, thus claiming a right to use whatever means are necessary to block a threatening development."

This statement shows that the state is an actor in the securitization process. States are entitled to securitization to act on any threat. According to Buzan, discussions on concussions are about achieving freedom from threats and security issues. When this discussion is within the context of an international system (any independent unions or political entities that are independent of each other and interact with one another according to organized processes), security is about the ability of the nation and society to maintain their free identity and integrity of their functions. The actors involved have also expanded not only on actors but also on non-national actors such as organized crime groups, terrorist groups, and non-governmental organizations.

Kamarulnizam Abdullah (2012) commented that the discourse on national security in Malaysia is still sharing the national security concept of nation building in terms of state conception and maintained core values. This developed security concept has also introduced core value elements (core values) in which each country must identify the core values it wants to maintain. Although core values can generally be identified based on country concepts, core values may also change based on perceptions of national threats.

The focus of securitization research aims to understand precisely who sees the issue of an issue (threats), for whom (reference objects), why, what causes it, and what situations (Smith, 2005). Therefore, it is not politically purely general. This situation has resulted in issues such as human security being raised as an issue that could threaten the nation's security and have been securitized.

National Security

The main agenda of the international system in securing security is to protect national security, military development, and war issues, defend territorial boundaries, and protect its core values as it is an essential aspect of a country. In discussing strategy thinking, Buzan (1991) argues that the concept of security should be linked to individual and national security because security is referred to individual units. Hence, security and individual threats must be addressed to understand national security. M. Alagappa (1998) sees internal security as protection against life, freedom, and property, while external security refers to protection against the rights of the people from external aggressive actions or threats from non-state entities.

According to Kamarulnizam Abdullah (2012), the national security concept pioneered by

US policymakers and scholars during the Cold War was at its peak around the 1950s, it has shown that the nation's objective is to protect its contextual interest in the context of protecting core values of a country. These core values vary by country, and they can be divided into fixed core values (referring to maintaining the country's physical characteristics) and change core values (influenced by the perceived threat of a country, perceptions, and current issues). Booth (1991) argues that individuals and non-states should be the essential reference for determining safety. For him, salvation must be seen from a holistic perspective, not just from the state and military power perspective. He also emphasized political emancipation and democratic form in human security.

According to Ruhanas Harun (2009), national security refers to the purpose and how a state defends itself from its threats and its ability to maintain its core values. This shows the realist mindset focused on military-based security threats. Security can be divided into traditional and non-traditional security, where non-traditional security is now an essential component of international politics. In summary, security is now more comprehensive and extensive, covering political, economic, social, and military issues..

Security can no longer be defined or translated in the traditional form, which includes military threats and related issues. Globalization has caused countries to cooperate to safeguard common interests. In this matter, the common interest is collective security, and the common threat is violence and terrorism.

Relations between Human Safety and National Security

The concept of human safety was developed from the UNDP Human Development Report, published in 1994. Based on this report, the UN categorized human security targets into seven sections: economic, food, health, environment, personal, community, and political security (Rashila, Zarina et al., 2010). Human security focuses on the quality of life or advancement of people (citizens) compared to the country. This means that if people are unsafe, they can threaten national security. Human security focuses on well-being and safeguarding human dignity rather than protecting national borders. The concept of human safety has a complete set of criteria for assessing the impact of globalization on human well-being, covering socioeconomic and personal safety aspects as a result of conflicts of violence. Human well-being is important and essential to enable people to enjoy the safety of people (Nor Azizan Idris & Rashila Ramli 2013).

Human security focuses on prosperity and safeguarding human dignity rather than protecting national borders. Human security discourse can be outlined according to three categories of thought. First, a flow of thought sees the individual as a safety object. Secondly, there is a flow of thought that sees the theory of world systems, including globalization, as a threat to human security and needs to be understood in the context of economic structure, inequality in power, and materials. Lastly, a flow of thought shows that the threat to humanity stems from within the country. This third thought of the trend has challenged the realism and neorealism approach, which has long assumed that national security is essential for the well-being of its people. For human security thinkers and advocates, the state is the threat's source, not a protector.

Human security, democracy, human rights assurance, and strengthening civil society are among the essences of achieving it. In addition to the country, NGOs also play an essential role in ensuring human safety for individuals and communities. From the fundamental aspects of the government, social security networks are one approach to strengthening human security, as they can empower communities in the long run.

This understanding assumes that the population will be threatened if national security is threatened. Though military or external threats remain, national security can be threatened if human beings are threatened. Threats to these people include non-traditional threats such as poverty, civil war, nation-building, and military threats, which can jeopardize the nation's stability and security. Hence, national security is focused on the country as an essential actor, while human security focuses on people as more essential actors.

Case Study: Malaysia's National Security

According to the Strategic Plan of the Home Ministry (KDN) 2015-2020, security is a condition where we are free from threats and dangers. It is a situation with a relationship with a country often associated with security components such as the population, geography, and strength of the security forces.

For a sovereign country, national security is one of the major focuses of governments where border administration, citizenship, and defense issues are an aspect of policymaking. National security is a matter of grave concern, with the impression that the development of a country is closely linked to internal security, which enables development and peace to be achieved by its people (Nor Azizan Idris & Rashila Ramli 2012). In general, the concept of security in Malaysia combines political stability, security, and economic development (Ruhanas Harun, 2009).

To ensure the peace and well-being of the country are preserved, the Home Ministry (2015) has identified several challenges that need to be addressed: Globalization, a borderless world, technological advances, security, illegal immigrants, crime, legislation, enforcement, and integrity. The country's sovereignty and defense fortress became more difficult due to globalization. This is because globalization will open space and facilitate cross-border crimes covering terrorism, money laundering, cybercrime, economic crime, drug trafficking, firearm smuggling, trafficking, and migrant smuggling. For Malaysia, political stability, economic development, and people's well-being are essential to maintaining peace and ensuring national security.

According to Mushamir Mustafa (2016), with the new development of terrorism in Malaysia, it is estimated that over 150 Malaysian citizens have been arrested in terms of activities since the formation of Daesh. Malaysia should be well aware that the current threat from radicals is essential, one type of political warfare that requires security action and a comprehensive counter-strategy. Utusan Malaysia, in 2003, stated that there have been thirteen militant groups identified by the Malaysia Home Ministry as having planned and or attempted a violent takeover of the country's administration since 1967. According to Hashim, R. (2004), significant radicalism emerged in Malaysia in the 1970s. Since this time, several radical groups have been formed, including Tentara Sabiullah, Koperasi Angkatan Revolusi Islam Malaysia (KARIM), Golongan Rohaniah, Kumpulan Crypto, Kumpulan Mohd Nasir Ismail, Kumpulan Jundullah, Kumpulan Revolusi Islam Ibrahim Libya, Kumpulan Mujahidin Kedah (KMK), Kumpulan Perjuangan Islam Perak (KPIP), Al-Maunah, Kumpulan Militan Malaysia (KMM) and Jemaah Islamiyyah (JI). Some of these groups have tried to stir up trouble related to ethnic relationships in Malaysia, and some have been involved in terrorist activities.

Conclusion

Securitization can explain thoroughly how an issue is raised as a threat. Violence and terrorism have been identified as a threat to building nationhood in Malaysia. This flow has established some essential concepts for us to rethink the concept of security through the securitization term, and this trend has widened the concept of security by presenting a framework for analyzing how an issue becomes 'securitized.' When an issue has been securitized by the government and accepted by society as a threat to national security and society where core values are threatened, it is considered a security threat. In order to achieve a great nationhood and civil society, this threat must be eliminate. These are the key indicators for understanding Malaysia's national security. The threat from radicals and predominantly Muslim militants will continue unless comprehensive action can be taken. This initiative may take a long time to succeed, but it must be carried out.

Acknowledgements

This study was carried out independently by the researcher.

References

- Ali, M. (2007). *Coping With the Threat of Jemaah Islamiyah*. Singapore: Taman Bacaan Pemuda Pemudi Melayu Singapore, 108-115.
- Ashour, O. (2008). De-Radicalization of Jihad? The impact of Egyptian Islamist Revisionists on al-Qaeda. *Perspectives on Terrorism*, 2(5), 11-14
- Ashour, O. (2009). *The De-Radicalization of Jihadist: Transforming Armed Islamist Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Aslam, M. M. (2008). The Southern Thailand Insurgency: Ideological and Identity Challenges, *Journal of JATI*, 13, 75-93.
- Aslam, M. M. (2009). The Thirteen Radical Groups: Preliminary Research in Understanding the Evolution of Militancy in Malaysia, *Journal of JATI*, 14, 145-161.
- Aslam, M. M. (2013). The threat of ISIS in Southeast Asia: The new episode of war on terrorism.
- Aslam, M. M. (2015). Transnational Peace Movement & De Radicalization Process in Malaysia, Paper presented at Mahathir Global Peace School (MPGS2015), Kuala Lumpur, 14 September.
- Chertoff, M. (2008). Ideology of terrorism: Radicalism revisited the radicalism's roots. *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 15(1), p.11.
- Cronin, A. K. (2004a). *Attacking Terrorism: Elements of a Grand Strategy*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Desker, B. (2003) The Jemaah Islamiyyah (JI) Phenomenon in Singapore. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 25(3), 489-507.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2006). *The Radicalization Process: From Conversion to Jihad*. Retrieved from <http://cryptome.org/fbi-jihad.pdf>
- Gopinathan, S. & Sharpe, L. (2004) New Bearings for citizenship education in Singapore. *Citizenship Education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and Issues*, pp. 119-133.
- Kementerian Dalam Negeri. (2016). *Modul Pemulihan Bersepadu Orang Tabanan: Akta Pencegahan Keganasan (POTA) 2015*. Selangor: Penerbit UPM
- Hassan, M.H. & Pereire, K.G (2006). "An ideological Response to Combating Terrorism- The Singapore Perspective." *Small Wars and Insurgencies* 17, No. 4, p. 458–477.
- Hanif, M.H. (2007). "Counter-Ideological Work, Singapore Experience," in *The Ideological War on Terror, World-wide Strategies for Counter-Terrorism*. New York: Routledge. p.15.
- Hassan, M. H. (2007). *Singapore's Muslim community-based initiatives against JI: Perspective on Terrorism*. Retrieved <http://www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/index.php>
- Hassan, M. F. M. (2009) "The Roles of Religious Rehabilitation Group (RRG) in Singapore." Religious Rehabilitation Group retrieved from http://www.rrg.sg/edisi/data/The_roles_of_RRG.pdf.
- Hong, M., (2003) *Jemaah Islamiyah: The Threat and Responses*. Retrieved from http://sam11.moe.gov.sg/racialharmony/download/Jemaah_Islamiyah_final.pdf
- Ismail, L. (2016, January 26). Malaysia's Deradicalization Programme has 95 per cent success rate. *New Straits Times Online*.
- Martin, G. (3rd ed.) (2010). *Understanding terrorism: Challenges, perspectives and issues*. USA: Sage Publication Inc.
- Neumann, P. R. (2010). *Prisons and terrorism radicalisation and de-radicalisation in 15 countries*. England: ICSR King's College London

- Neumann, P.R. op cit. in Sedgwick, M. (2010), 'The Concept of Radicalisation as a Source of Confusion', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 22, No. 4.
- Noor, S. & Hayat, S (2009). *For Deradicalization: Approaches and Models*, Pakistan: Institute for Peace Studies.
- Ramakrishna, K. (2009) "A Holistic Critique of Singapore's Counter-Ideological Program," CTC Sentinel 2, No. 1, p.10.
- Silber, M. & Bhatt, A. (2007). *Radicalization in the West: The Homegrown threat*. Retrieved from http://www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/downloads/pdf/public_information/NYPD_Report-Radicalization_in_the_West.pdf
- Tan, A. (2002) Terrorism in Singapore: threats and implications. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 23(3), 1-18.
- The International Centre for The Study of Radicalization and Political Violence, Prisons and Terrorism and De-Radicalization in 15 Countries (2010) (ICSR Publication, www.icsr.info).
- Tegas Tangani IS (Firmly Tackle IS). *Utusan Online*. Rahimullah, R. H., Larmar, S. & Abdulla, M. (2013). Understanding violent radicalization amongst Muslims: A Review of Literature, *Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Science*, Vol 1. No 1.
- Veldhuis, T. & Staun, J. (2009). *Islamist Radicalization: A Root Cause Model*. Belanda, Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael.
- Zachary, A. (2009). "The Rehabilitation of Jemaah Islamiyah Detainees in Southeast Asia: A Preliminary Assessment." In *Leaving Terrorism Behind, Individual and Collective Disengagement*, edited by Tore Bjorgo and John Horgan, New York: Routledge, p.193-211