ETHNICITY AND RELIGION AMONG URBAN HINDUS
IN PENINSULAR MALAYSIA

R. RAJOO

In recent decades, religion has assumed a greater significance in the expression of group identities among the various ethnic groups in Malaysia's multi-ethnic society. In the case of the Hindus, religious activities have increased to an unprecedented degree; several religious associations and movements have emerged; temple festivals and group devotional worship are becoming more and more popular and new ritual forms have been created. All these have become important phenomena of urban Hinduism in particular. In anthropological literature such phenomena have come to be seen as a return to, and reassertion of, one's own ethnic group identity and as characteristics of poly- or multi-ethnic societies undergoing rapid socio-political change. Such a development is also seen as a reverse process which is in contrast to the predictions of the earlier sociological theories of societal change which saw the movement of societies from the *gemeinschaft* to *gesellschaft* (Tonnies, 1957) stage. The important point here is that the persistence of ethnic cultures under conditions of change has come to be viewed in terms of ethnicity.

This paper examines the relationship between ethnicity and religion among the urban Hindus in Peninsular Malaysia. The paper is not an exhaustive one. This is deliberately so. It is mainly concerned with certain theoretical issues with regard to religion and ethnicity. The approach taken in the present paper is the one developed by Barth (1967), Cohen (1969; 1974), Glazer and Moynihan (1963) and Gans (1979). The data used in this paper was collected at various times between 1970 and 1972 and from 1980 to 1982 through field work carried out by the writer.

The term 'ethnicity' has been defined variously by different scholars. In short, it denotes a phenomenon where people stress their identity by using some aspects of their traditional culture, either real or imagined, and in reference to a common ancestry. The phenomenon itself is believed to be an expression of the existing conflicts between ethnic groups in a given socio-political context. Cohen (1969:4) goes even further and says that "ethnicity refers to strife between such ethnic groups, in the course of which people stress their identity and exclusiveness." He also sees ethnicity as essentially a political phenomenon. According to him, "It is a process by which a group from one ethnic category within the framework of a *formal* political system manipulates some customs, values, myths, symbols, and ceremonials from their cultural tradition in order to articulate an informal political organisation which is used as a weapon in that struggle" (1969:2). Barth (1969:15-16) sees culture as a boundary-maintaining system between ethnic groups.

The point is that in multi-ethnic urban situations ethnic groups become interest groups which are involved in the struggle for control over resources in the public arena. Under such conditions, "members of an ethnic group must mobilize its resources in order to find solutions to a number of problems". These problems include distinctiveness, political communication, decision making, authority, ideology and discipline (Cohen 1969:5). In such contexts, as Cohen argues, formal political groups organise these functions legally and bureaucratically. But informal groups organise these functions through the idiom of custom. Some ethnic groups make

extensive use of *religious idiom* (emphasis supplied). Others use kinship, or other forms of moral relationships instead.

Cohen sees kinship and religion as alternative modes of informal political organisation. Nevertheless, when members of an ethnic group from a kinship-based rural setting settle and reproduce themselves in town, kinship becomes less effective for informal group orgnisation. Religion is then likely to produce a more viable and practicable principle. This, as Parkin note (1974:124), is due to the fact that 'religions emphasise unambiguous membership of congregation' while at the same time having the same unilineal descent ideology as kinship, friendship and neighbourhood.

In the case of religion, however, rituals and their significance are used for emphasising ethnic group distinctiveness not because of their uniqueness but because the ways in which they are used to maintain group cohesiveness, sustain and enhance identity, and establish social networks and communicative patterns that are important for the group's optimisation of its socio-economic position in the society (Partterson 1977:102). This is, of course, an unconscious process and not a conscious one.

It would thus seem that in a migrant situation, it is the existence of ethnicity (that is, a phenomenon which is both self-ascribed and ascribed by others) that determines the forms of the cultures of migrant communities.

Using this theoretical frame as an analytical tool, let us examine the case of the Hindus among the Indians in Peninsular Malaysia.

Historical background

In 1980, Indians formed about 10.5 per cent or 1,239,000 in the predominantly Malay and Chinese dominated Peninsular Malaysia's multi-ethnic society (see Table 1, below).

About 80.0 per cent of these Indians are Hindus. Out of this, about 40.0 per cent live in the urban centres while the rest in the estates. The Indians who live in Malaysia today are the descendants of those who emigrated directly from the sub-continent during the first four decades of this century. It is important to know certain aspects of the historical background of these Indians in order to understand their pesent-day position in Malaysia.

Although Indian emigration to the then Malaya began even before the advent of the British colonial rule, the presence of Indians as a significant minority in Malaysia today is the result of large-scale movement of Indian emigrants beginning from the middle of the nineteenth century until 1957 when Malaya became independent. Indian emigration in this period was primarily

Table 1

Ethnic group	Number	%
Malay	6,384,000	53.9
Chinese	4,136,000	34.9
Indian	1,239,000	10.5
Others	90,000	0.7
Total	11,849,00	100.0

Source: Fourth Malaysia Plan (1981), p. 74.

encouraged by the British in order to fulfil their commercial, economic, and political interests in the colonies. One of the chief characteristics of this migration was that it was essentially a labour movement whereby Indians form the lower rungs of the village communities of South India were induced to emigrate, first under the indenture, and later, the *kaṇkāṇi* (a 'foreman' of workers) systems of immigration.[1] Thus it also came to be known as *coolie* migration. The majority of these Indians were brought to work in the rubber estates while the rest to work in the Malayan railway, public works department and the municipal service. However, there were some who came as educated groups and as petty traders and money-lenders. These Indians who came from India and Ceylon (Sri Lanka) formed about 20.0 per cent and were mainly settled in towns.

In the host country, those Indians who settled in the estates were isolated and effectively cut off from the rest of the host society and the Chinese immigrants. Their life was very much controlled and regulated under the rigid supervision and the authoritarian system by which the estates were run. There was some interaction between the Indians settled in the towns and the Chinese and Malays, but even there the interaction was limited to the conditions of a "plural society" as Furnivall (1956:304) described it.

Certain factors contributed to ethnic exclusiveness during the colonial period. The Indians were never encouraged to integrate with the rest of the Malayan society; they were regarded as a separate and distinct ethnic group and were thus accorded separate treatment as Indians in terms of opportunities, privileges and rights. Besides, they were also distinguished by occupational activities and geographical locations as estate and urban workers. These factors led to ethnic insularity among Indians within a distinct cultural milieu that they had brought along with them. Since the country's independence in 1957, ethnic or communal factor began to dominate Malaysian politics in which the position of all Malaysian citizens came to be identified along ethnic lines as Malays, Chinese and Indians or as Malays and non-Malays. This further reinforced the existing ethnic identities and cleavages.

Social structure of the Indians

The Indians in Malaysia formed a loosely-structured segmentary social group. Their ancestors came from different regions in India, spoke different languages and followed different religions. The following tables (2 and 3) illustrate this.

Table 2

Linguistic Groups Among Indians*	Total Number	%
Indian Tamils	746,558	80.00
Malayalis	44,199	4.70
Telugus	31,332	3.40
North Indians	72,138	7.70
Ceylon Tamils	25,288	2.70
Pakistanis	10,185	1.10
Other Ceylonese	3,550	0.40
Total	933,250	100.00

Based on 1970 census. See Chander (1977), Vol. 1, p. 292.

[1]For a detailed discussion of this topic, see K.S. Sandhu, (1969), pp. 75-129.

Table 3

Religious Groups Among Indians*	Total Number	%
Hindus	757,795	81.2
Christians	77,939	8.4
Muslims	62,778	6.7
Buddhists	4,389	0.5
No Religion	1,369	0.1
Others (mainly Sikhs)	28,980	3.1
Total	933,250	100.0

*See Chander (1977), Vol. II, p. 132.

They divided themselves as South Indians, North Indians and Ceylonese who further segmented as Tamils, Telugus, Malayalis and as Punjabis, Gujaratis, Bengalis, etc; and as Hindus, Muslims and Christians. Within each subgroup there existed further sectarian and caste and subcaste divisions. Each of these subgroups functioned as endogamous units. But all these socio-cultural traditions were to some extent modified to suit the local needs. Nevertheless, the different subcultural variants were retained sufficiently to distinguish one another.

The colonial rulers regarded all these subgroups as a single homogeneous group. The status thus accorded came to be continued even after independence. Thus, within a given socio-political context the diverse subgroups with conflicting interests and loyalties had to function and interact as a distinct ethnic group. While in India the different regional-linguistic groups functioned within a particular territory, in Malaysia this was no longer possible. This created organisational problems, both during and after the colonial periods from a political vantage point. In short, the Indian 'community' in Malaysia came to face a serious problem of the lack of an internal authority structure in the new environment.

Kinship, Caste and Social Change

Three institutions, namely, kinship, caste and religion have been greatly responsible for the retention and persistence of the Hindu-Indian culture in the migrant situation. Kinship became the organising principle for the domestic group while caste, as an extended kin network, regulated marriage within each subgroup. The two, however, underwent a great deal of change, while between the two, the latter became more fluid than the former due to acculturative processes under conditions of migration. Caste, which was more suited to a peasant culture, could not with hold its resilience in an industrial economy in Malaysia. In the urban setting its tenacity was further eroded. With regard to kinship, the ideal norm of the Indian joint-family system which was again more suited to a peasant economy, never became functional among the Indian migrants, the majority of whom were industrial workers. Except in the case of the business and land-owning classes, among whom property was held in common and hence the continuity of the joint-family system, the usual trend was to set up nuclear families, though usually the tendency among married sons was to stay with their parents for some time after their marriage. This paved the way for the emergence of the popular extended kinship system which, perhaps, became more suitable for the organisation of the domestic group under pressures of change.

However, while the unilineal kinship ideology served as a useful principle of organisation at the domestic level in the urban setting, it was less effective for the organisation of the Indians as a social category at the larger level, especially when they began to interact with other ethnic groups more and more. This then led to the emergence of religion (that is, Hinduism) as an important organising factor in the Indian community with a predominance of Hindus.

Certain salient features of Hinduism

If one were to follow the classification of Srinivas (1952), since the majority of the Indians came from South India, it is the 'Peninsular Hinduism' that became the dominant religious form among them. There were, however, two 'types' of Hinduism, viz., 'folk' and 'village' Hinduism on the one hand, and, Āgamic[2] (or Sanskritic) Hinduism on the other. Though this classification serves as an important tool for analytical purposes to understand the otherwise more complex religious practices found among the Hindus, it must be taken with some reservation, for what is known as 'folk' and 'village' Hinduism also had elements of Āgamic Hinduism and *vice versa*. In the course of time, the two also underwent further change by influencing one another in Malaysia.

Although Hinduism is not a religion with a centralised authority like Islam, Christianity and Buddhism, this did not mean that religion had little role in the life of a Hindu. In fact, worship formed an integral part of the life-pattern of a Hindu to which he was socialised since childhood by his parents at home. Moreover, in the Hindu society the influence of religion was so pervasive that the notion of 'secular' and 'sacred' was foreign to the Hindus until recent times. In Hinduism, worship may be classified into two kinds: one centring round the domestic sphere and, the other the temple.

In the domestic sphere a Hindu worshipped the domestic gods and goddesses like Ganeśa, Subrahmanya, Rāma, Krishna, Sarasvatī, Laksmī and so forth. Besides this, there were also the cult of the ancestral worship, the observance of numerous fasts and festivals and the life-cycle rites.

Outside the domestic sphere, every local Hindu group built its own temple, sometimes more than one, depending on its needs, in which worship was performed both individually and collectively. There were those who had temples for deities like Māriyamman and Munīśvaran. Others had temples for Śiva, Ganeśa, Subrahmanya, Rāma and Krishna. However, the former were more popular than the latter, a phenomenon which may be due to the fact that the majority of the Hindus came to Malaya from the agricultural classes of the village communities where the worship of these deities was more common according to their functional needs. Nevertheless, many of the temples of these deities gradually transformed themselves into the Āgamic type in Malaysia.[3]

But whatever deity one worshipped and whatever the mode (or 'style') of worship might be, the objective was always the same, that is, the general welfare of the individuals and the group. The temple became important also in another sense, that is, it represented the collective identi-

[2]This term is derived from the word *Āgamas* which are manuals of ritual, relating to temple worship. In Peninsular Malaysia the local Tamil *pandits* ('scholars') often use the term Āgamic worship rather than Sanskritic. In this paper, however, both are used synonymously.

[3]For a detailed account of this and other aspects of Hinduism discussed in this paper, see Rajoo, 1976.

ty of the local group. In fact, in the estates until the introduction of the labour movement in the 1940s, temple worship was the only form of activity in which the workers could meet and act collectively without the interference of the estate management. In the towns, too, the temple became a place of congregation for members of the local group through which, in a socio-psychological sense, the identity of the members of the local Hindu community was expressed.

Aspects of change in Hinduism in the urban setting

While this was the dominant role played by Hinduism in general, in due course it came to assume a new significance, especially in the urban setting as new developments began to take place. These new developments in Hinduism were influenced by a number of factors. Firsts, as Hindus began to interact with other ethnic groups, there arose a need for reinterpreting traditional Hinduism and creating a new Hindu social personality and identity that would be more suited to the multi-ethnic situation in Malaysia. Secondly, there was also concern with regard to the acculturative pressures undr urbanisation and westernisation which led to secularisation. Thirdly, there was a similar concern with regard to the pressures of the proselytising religions such as Christianity at first and later Islam, which became the official religion after independence. Fourth, after the Second World War, religion began to assert a new role in expressing group identity between the various ethnic groups in the emergent ethnic politics in Malaysia.[4] Among the Malays, who subsequently began to dominate and wield power in the country's politics, Islam was fused with the Malay identity because all Malays are also Muslims. A similar force took shape among the Hindu dominated Indian minorities. Indian political leaders were thus expected to patronise Hindu religious activities both at the local and national levels and become the custodians of Hinduism in a political sense, if they were to get the support of the majority of the Hindu ethnics at the grass-root level. In this process kinship, caste, sect and other sectional identities became less important and irrelevant in the expression of a larger group identity.

The lead towards creating a new Hindu social personality and Hindu identity was undertaken by the urban educated Hindus. These Hindus took the more universalistic 'All-India Hinduism' as a model for creating the new Hindu-Indian identity, as it was the Pan-Indian Hinduism that represented the 'higher' Hindu culture in the subcontinent. Efforts were also made at the same time to discourage the local beliefs and practices based on caste , class and sect which emphasised particularism. They thus came to play the role of "cultural brokers" in their attempt to reinterpret Hinduism that would be more suitable to a multi-ethnic and multi-religious society and at the same time to defend it from Christianity, Islam, and urbanisation and secularisation. The underlying tone of this socio-cultural process was the creation of an integrated and unified Hindu-Indian community. In a sense, it may be said that these Hindu leaders resembled somewhat like the 'renaisssance Hindu leaders' of the nineteenth and early twentieth century India like Tilak, Rāmakrishna, Swāmi Vivēkānanda and Aurobindo (Bharati, 1971). Infact, the process itself was not unique to Malaysia but it was also found in India and other overseas Indian communities (see Jayawardena 1968: 444-447).

The concomitant result of all this was reflected in a new interest towards Hinduism. Efforts were made to learn Hindu texts and the "pure" form of Hinduism. This led to the emergence of several Hindu religious associations and movements, especially from the beginning of the

---

[4]A detailed account of this matter has been avoided here for obvious reasons. For discussion of this and other related ethnic problems in Malaysia, see K.J. Ratnam, 1965, J. Nagatha, 1979 and M.R. Stenson, 1980.

1950s. They were the Malaysia Hindu Sangam, the Hindu Youth Organisation, the Divine Life Society of Malaysia, the Gītā Association, the Aruḷ Neṟit-Tirukūṭṭam, Tiruvaruḷ Tavaneṟi Manṟam, Swāmi Satya Sāibāba movement, the Appar Tirunerik-Kaḷakam and Śri Rāmakrishna-Śārada Sangam. Most of these emerged in Kuala Lumpur, the capital city of Malaysia, but the major ones soon spread to other towns and even estates.

These associations and movements undertook a wide range of Hindu religious activities, namely, holding Hindu conferences and seminars, religious classes for teachers and local temple priests, youths, and children. Foremost among them was the Malaysia Hindu Sangam with an urban middle class leadership which gradually began to exert significant influence on issues relating to Hinduism in Malaysia. The urban temples, too, came to play an important role as centres of Hindu religious learning. In this process, the English-educated turned to texts written in English on the *Bhagavat-Gīta*, the *Mahābhārata,* the *Rāmāyaṇa* and so forth while the Tamil-educated to the devotional texts known as *Tirumuṟaikal.*[5] The process also resulted in the syncretisation of the various Hindu sects, especially, Śaivism and Vaisnavism. It even led to the incorporation of local cults through the process of Sanskritisation[6] or Agamisation. Thus, the deities Māriyammaṉ, Kāli and Muṉiśvaraṉ, traditionally held to be non-Āgamic deities, came to be 'Sanskritised' and identified with the Pan-Indian canonical deities in many temples. Certain Sanskritic festivals like *Siva-Rāttiri* (the 'Night of Śiva') and *Nava-Rāttiri* (the 'Nine Nights'), a festival dedicated to the worship of the goddess Sakti, which were previoiusly confined to the upper castes and classes were popularised. The emergence of *Taippūcam* as the most popular Hindu Temple festival syncretising both Āgamic and non-Āgamic elements within it, and the evolution of the Lord Subrahmanya temple at Batu Caves in Kuala Lumpur as a sacred centre where the *Thaippūcam* festival is celebratd annually on a large scale, represented a significant unconscious process towards creating the new Hindu indentity at the popular level. Side by side, interest was also shown in learning the traditional Indian classical dance *(bharatanāṭṭiyam)* and the *Carnatic* music as part and parcel of the same process.

Another development in the process was the emergence of the urban congregational worship, sometimes, called *bhajaṉs*. This devotional cult is quite different from the traditional temple worship in that it is less ritualistic and emphasises group hymn-singing. It does not require a trained temple priest and can be held outside the temple — in private homes and public halls on a most convenient day and time. The various Hindu religious movements seem to be giving greater importance to this devotional worship.[7] It is ecumenical in that it cuts across caste, sect, class and even regional identities as may be the case in temple worship. The common theme

---

[5]These are devotional hymns composed by the Tamil Śaivite poet-saints between the fifth and tenth century A.D., in South India.

[6]This term has been widely used in anthropological literature to describe the cultural process since Srinivas used it in 1952 in his study of the society of the Coorgs in South India. It appears that in Malaysia there are varying degrees of Sanskritisation. In some instances it may be confined to introducing certain elements of Sanskritic mode of worship like 'vegetarianism' and the observance of certain Sanskritic festivals only, as has been mentioned in this paper. Sanskritisation is a process which takes place over a period of time. It is, in fact, closely linked with social mobility.

[7]For an example of this trend of development, see Raymond Lee's (1982) recent study of the Sāi Bāba movement in urban Malaysia.

of this cult is devotion (or *bhakti*) and its underlying message is unity. Singer (1974:156-160), who studied a similar porcess in Madras City, says that even orthodox Brahmins who once emphasised ritual observances are now turning to this devotional cult. He notes that the modern devotional cult in Hinduism seems to be a modified form of the medieval *bhakti* cult and has perhaps emerged as a more suitable alternative to the modern urban and industrial setting where Hinduism has come to be subjected to various kinds of pressures. He writes:

> The devotional movement in Madras City has become ecumenical, an expression of democratic aspirations with Hinduism. It links village and town, traditional and modern, the folk and classical, and in sacred and secular spheres of culture. It brings together, at least within the religious and cultural sphere, different castes and sects, linguistic and religious communities. Historically, devotional movements have had similar tendencies but have usually resulted in the formation of exclusive sects. The contemporary movement inspired not so much sectarian and denominational formations as a diffuse emotion of brotherhood, which softens the rough edges of group differences (p. 158).

The new devotional cult emerging in urban Malaysia among the educated Hindus is no doubt identical in many respects to the one studied by Singer in Madras City.

But the process towards the emergence of a Hindu identity among the Hindus in Malaysia is not a unilinear one, although there is a conscious effort towards that goal. For instance, while at one end there is the movement towards the higher, 'All-India Hinduism', at the other end there is a tendency towards a model that has little relevance to the Āgamic mode of worship, but partly based on the older 'folk' model of Hinduism. This is reflected in certain ritual acts, namely, bearing of the long 'spiked' *kāvaṭis*[8] and other ritual acts of inflicting physical pains together with the accompaniment of the beating of the long drums called *bongo*[9] and dance by teenagers during the annual temple festivals such as the *Thaippūcam* celebrated at Batu Caves in Kuala Lumpur. There are many Hindus who do not consider them as part of the traditional temple rituals.

Such developments in Hinduism may be explained by the existing structural conditions within the Hindu 'community' and the uncentralised and diffused nature of Hinduism, which in a migrant situation becomes diluted and thus allows its adherents to create their own ritual models according to their imagination. This is also seen to be specifically a lower, working class phenomenon. Some writers attribute this to the nature of traditional Indian culture being rooted in a peasant way of life; as such, the more extensive the process of proletarianisation, the more extensive is its erosion (Jayawardena 1980:439). Nevertheless, the point is that both the trends could be attributed to the phenomenon of ethnicity as well.

---

[8]A traditional *kāvaṭi* is an arc made of poles carried on the shoulders of the devotees. It is used to carry offerings in honour of the worship of Lord Subrahmaṇya.

[9]It is played by beating with a stick. It has no connection with the traditional temple band and is usually played by teenagers in groups with the accompaniment of devotional songs taken from Tamil movies. On such occasions, the youths also tie around their head a red ribbon. It is typically a Malaysian development and has nothing to do with traditional temple ritual, either Āgamic or non-Āgamic.

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing discussion, I have tried to show the relationship between ethnicity and religion among Hindus in Malaysia's multi-ethnic urban setting by using the theoretical model used by Cohen and his followers. Briefly, when rural inhabitants migrate to urban centres they are faced with a number of problems like competition, individualisation, impersonalisation and so forth due to the complex and heterogenous nature of the urban society. This problem is further complicated by the presence of conflicts between ethnic groups. Members of the ethnic groups need to be organised to cope with the new challenges of the urban setting. Under these conditions, kinship becomes less effective as an organising principle for the members of the group. Religion then serves as an effective alternative. This dynamic socio-cultural process is closely linked with social mobility.

Although this is seen to be essentially a phenomenon of developing societies, it is nevertheless found to be a characteristic of developed societies like the United States as well. This is shown by Glazer and Moynihan (1963) and Gans (1979) in their studies.

The role of ethnicity and religion in influencing political behaviour has been a subject of conflicting opinions for some time. Some argue that religion, race and ethnicity would fade away as political determinants of functional economic interests emerge (Lipset and Rokkan, 1967). Others, however, argue that ethnicity would decline, but religion would remain salient for some time. Glazer and Moynihan (1963:314) see religion and race becoming the major defining categories for groups, even as the nationality of immigrant groups declines in importance.

Whatever the argument may be, the Malaysian situation shows the role of religion in a context of ethnic conflict during a particular phase in the history of the country.

REFERENCES

BARTH, F. 1969. "Introduction," In, F. Barth *(ed.), Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (London: George Allen & Unwin), pp. 9-38.

BHARATI, Agehananda. 1971. "Hinduism and Modernisation," In, Robert F. Spencer *(ed.), Religion and Change in Contemporary Asia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), pp. 67-104.

CHANDER, R. *(Ed.).* 1977. *1970 General Report. Population Census of Malaysia.* Volumes 1 and 2. Kuala Lumpur: Department of Statistics, Malaysia.

COHEN, Abner. 1969. *Custom and Politics in Urban Africa.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1974. "Introduction: The Lessons of Ethnicity," In, Abner Cohen *(ed.), Urban Ethnicity* (London: Tavistock Publications), pp. ix-xxiv.

FURNIVALL, J.S. 1956, *Colonial Policy and Practice: A Comparative Study of Burma and Netherlands India.* New York: New York University Press.

GANS, Herbert, J. 1979. "Symbolic ethnicity: the future of ethnic groups and culture in America," *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* Volume 2, No. 1, pp. 1-19.

GLAZER, Nathan and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. 1963. *Beyond the Melting Pot.* Cambridge: The MIT and Harvard University Press.

GOVERNMENT OF MALAYSIA. 1981. *Fourth Malaysia Plan, 1981-1985.* Kuala Lumpur: National Printing Department.

JAYAWARDENA, Chandra. 1968. "Migration and Social Change," *Geographical Review,* 58, pp. 426-49.

———. 1980. "Culture and Ethnicity in Guyana and Fiji," *Man* (n.s.), 15, pp. 430-50.

LEE, Raymond, L.M. "Sai Baba, salvation and syncretism: Religious change in a Hindu movement in urban Malaysia," *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n.s.), 16, no. 1 (1982), pp. 125-140.

LIPSET, Seymour and Stein Rokkan. 1967. *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*. New York: Free Press.

NAGATHA, Judith. 1979. *Malaysian Mosaic* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

PARKIN, David. 1974. "Congregational and Interpersonal Ideologies in Political Ethnicity," In, Abner Cohen *(ed.), Urban Ethnicity* London: Tavistock Publications, pp. 119-158.

PATTERSON, Orlando. 1977. *Ethnic Chauvinism*. New York: Stein and Day.

RAJOO, R. 1976. *Patterns of Hindu Religious Beliefs and Practices Among the People of Tamil Origin in West Malaysia,* Unpublished M.A. thesis. Kuala Lumpur: Department of Indian Studies, University of Malaya.

RATNAM, K.J. 1965. *Communalism and the Political Process in Malaya*. Singapore: University of Malaya Press.

SANDHU, Kernail Singh. 1969. *Indians in Malaya*. Cambridge: The University Press.

SINGER, Milton, S. 1972. *When a Great Tradition Modernizes*. London: Pall Mall Press.

SRINIVAS, M.N. 1952 *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India*. London and New York: Oxford University Press.

STENSON, M.R. 1980. *Class, Race and Colonialism in West Malaysia. The Indian Case*. St. Lucia (Queensland): University of Queensland Press.

TONNIES, Ferdinand. 1957. *Community & Society. (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft)*. Translated by Charles P. Loomis. Michigan, U.S.A.: The Michigan State University Press.