

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON COUNTER -  
TERRORISM ACT IN MALAYSIA, UNITED STATES  
OF AMERICA AND NEW ZEALAND**

By

Enda Noratika Binti Nordin (2011824342)

Nur Syarah Syazwan Binti Amad Saturi (2011844716)

Farah Amalina Binti AB Ghani (2011846642)

Farahiyah Binti Ahmad Istihar (2011829826)

Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Bachelor in Legal  
Studies (Hons)

**Universiti Teknologi MARA**

**Faculty of Law**

December 2013

The students/authors confirm that the work submitted is their own and that  
appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of  
others

## **ABSTRACT**

Terrorism is the act of violent with the goal of embedding fear to a certain society. For example a massacre is one of it, genocide is also one of it or even killing out of revenge in a small town that makes the people scared to go out. The terror that the violent acts created will make people surrounded by fear, confusion or even discord. Many people just think that terrorism has always been related to just religious and political motives. But actually it is beyond that. It is true that religious and political goals are one of the reasons of creating violent acts but it certainly not the only reason. Terrorists could also act violently because of revenge, mental disorder or anger.

In Malaysia, in order to combat and curb terrorist activities, the government had enacted the Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012. The purpose of this research is to study and examine the terrorism Act in Malaysia and to provide recommendation in order to improve the lacunae in the said legislation.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Acknowledgement   | II  |
| Abstract  | III |
| List of Statutes and Cases  | IV  |
| Table of Contents   | V   |
| <b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH</b>  |     |
| 1.0 Introduction  | 1   |
| 1.1 Research Background   | 1   |
| 1.2 Research Objectives   | 3   |
| 1.3 Research Questions  | 4   |
| 1.4 Significance of the Research  | 4   |
| 1.5 Literature Review   | 5   |
| 1.6 Research Methodology  | 10  |
| 1.7 Scope and Limitations   | 11  |
| 1.7.1 Scope of the Study  | 11  |
| 1.7.2 Limitations   | 11  |
| 1.8 Conclusion  | 11  |
| <b>CHAPTER 2: MALAYSIA TERRORISM ACT: SECURITY OFFENCES (SPECIAL MEASURES) ACT 2012</b> |     |
| 2.0 Introduction  | 12  |
| 2.1 Historical Background   | 12  |
| 2.1.1 The Emergency Regulations Ordinance 1948  | 12  |
| 2.1.2 The Internal Security Act 1960  | 13  |
| 2.2 Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012                                       | 14  |
| 2.3 Broad Definition and Scope in Determining Security Offences                         | 15  |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 2.4 Government's Power under Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012                     | 17 |
| 2.4.1 Exercise of Judicial Power   | 17 |
| 2.4.2 Power of the Ministers   | 22 |
| 2.5 Investigating Power of the Government under Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012  | 25 |
| 2.6 Conclusion   | 30 |
| <br><b>CHAPTER THREE: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA<br/>TERRORISM ACT: THE USA PATRIOT ACT 2001</b> |    |
| 3.0 Introduction   | 31 |
| 3.1 Historical Background  | 31 |
| 3.1.1 The September 11 <sup>th</sup> Attacks   | 31 |
| 3.1.2 The Effects of the September 11 <sup>th</sup> Attacks                                    | 33 |
| 3.2 The USA PATRIOT Act 2001 Broad Scope and Definition on Terrorism                           | 34 |
| 3.3 Presidential Authorities in the USA PATRIOT Act 2001                                       | 37 |
| 3.4 Investigating Power in the USA PATRIOT Act 2001  | 43 |
| 3.5 Conclusion   | 47 |
| <br><b>CHAPTER 4: NEW ZEALAND TERRORISM ACT: THE<br/>TERRORISM SUPPRESSION ACT 2002</b>        |    |
| 4.0 Introduction   | 49 |
| 4.1 Historical Background  | 49 |
| 4.2 The Terrorism Suppression Act 2002   | 50 |
| 4.3 Definition and Scope of Terrorism in the Terrorism Suppression Act 2002                    | 53 |
| 4.4 Investigating Power in the Terrorism Suppression Act 2002                                  | 56 |
| 4.5 President's Power to Designate Terrorists  | 61 |
| 4.6 Conclusion   |    |
| <br><b>CHAPTER 5: COMPARISON, RECOMMENDATIONS AND<br/>CONCLUSION</b>                           |    |
| 5.0 Introduction   | 62 |

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

### 1.0 Introduction

This chapter will be discussing the background of this research paper, the research question and the objectives of the study. This chapter further discuss on selected materials for use in the literature review. Then, it will also discuss the methodology use in research as well as the scope and the limitation of study. The significance of this research will also be highlighted.

### 1.1 Research Background

Violence with the intention to cause fear and chaos among the population is not a new phenomenon. Nevertheless, reference to ‘terrorism’ in law and politics can only found in more recent times. Terrorism is defined in the Oxford Dictionary as the unofficial or unauthorized use of violence and intimidation in the pursuit of political aims.<sup>1</sup> Looking back at the history, the word ‘terror’ was first used to describe the Jacobin ‘Reign Of Terror’ that followed the French Revolution in 1789. However, the word could carry different meaning according to the person’s perception as a study conducted in 1988 found that the word carries 109 different definitions and the number would be far higher today.<sup>2</sup>

The phrase ‘what is terrorism to some is heroism to others’ explains different views of the meaning of terrorism itself.<sup>3</sup> Though the maxim may seem banal, it represents

---

<sup>1</sup>*Definition Of Terrorism In English.* (n.d.). Retrieved September 19, 2013, from Oxford Dictionaries: <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/terrorism>

<sup>2</sup> Golder, B., & Williams, G. (2004). What Is Terrorism? Problems Of Legal Definition. *University Of New South Wales Law Journal* , 270.

<sup>3</sup> Bassiouni, M. C. (2004). Terrorism: The Persistent Dilemma of Legitimacy. *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* , 299-300.