

Refugee Review Tribunal

AUSTRALIA

RRT RESEARCH RESPONSE

Research Response Number: MYS17627
Country: Malaysia
Date: 7 November 2005

Keywords: Malaysia – Ethnic Chinese – Islamic Law – Forced conversion – ETA

This response was prepared by the Country Research Section of the Refugee Review Tribunal (RRT) after researching publicly accessible information currently available to the RRT within time constraints. This response is not, and does not purport to be, conclusive as to the merit of any particular claim to refugee status or asylum.

Questions

1. What is ETA?
2. Do these ‘Islamic’ laws apply in Malaysia by force of parliament, or some other way (such as if married to a Muslim woman)?
3. Do Muslim groups in Malaysia act in ‘an outrageous and borderline illegal manner’?
4. Do the authorities protect people from forced conversion to Islam as a consequence of a relationship with a Muslim partner?

RESPONSE

1. What is ETA?

The sources consulted could provide no information on the acronym ETA as regards the institutions and regulations which attend Malaysia’s Islamic (*Syariah* or *Sharia* or *Shariah*) laws.

2. Do these ‘Islam’ laws apply in Malaysia by force of parliament, or some other way (such as if married to a Muslim woman)?

The sources consulted indicate that Malaysia’s Islamic laws are the responsibility of Malaysia’s state legislatures and that Malaysia’s civil laws are the responsibility of the Malaysian federal parliament. Malaysian Islamic laws apply only to those who are formally registered as professing the faith of Islam (the faith of each Malay citizen appears on his/her national identity card). The sources consulted indicate that Malaysia’s dual legal system would not recognise the marriage of a Muslim woman and a non-Muslim man. To marry a Muslim woman a non-Muslim man would have to legally convert to Islam, and thus become subject to *Shariah*, so that the marriage could then be registered under Islamic law.

Salbiah Ahmad’s recently published study, ‘Islam in Malaysia: Constitutional and Human Rights Perspectives’, notes that there are “two parallel systems of law in Malaysia; federal

civil law and state Islamic law”. “As a federal state, Malaysia has a federal legislature (Parliament) and thirteen state legislative assemblies”, and it is “[t]he state legislature [which] has power to make laws on Islam and to establish state Shari’a courts”. “The Shari’a court is nevertheless a creature of the Federal Constitution as its existence is provided for under the State List in the Ninth Schedule to the Constitution”; and “Parliament may extend the legislative powers of the state. It has done that under the Muslim Courts (Criminal Jurisdiction) Act 1965” (for more on this see below). Ahmad’s paper indicates that the civil “federal laws are laws of general application”; while the state legislature’s Islamic “law-making power includes *inter alia* ‘Islamic law and personal law and family law of persons professing the religion of Islam’”. The relevant passages follow in detail:

One of the implications of Islam as religion of the Federation is the provision of Islamic law as a parallel system of law at state level. This arrangement has been given due recognition in the arrangement of legislative powers between the center and the states. As a federal state, Malaysia has a federal legislature (Parliament) and thirteen state legislative assemblies. Parliament is the legislature for the Federal Territories of Kuala Lumpur, Labuan and Putrajaya. There are three legislative lists: the federal list, the state list and the concurrent list. Parliament may make laws for the whole or any part of the federation. The state legislature may make laws for the whole or any part of the state. If any state law is inconsistent with a federal law, the federal law shall prevail and the state law “shall to the extent of the inconsistency, be void.” Parliament may extend the legislative powers of the state. It has done that under the Muslim Courts (Criminal Jurisdiction) Act 1965. This law extended the criminal jurisdiction of state Shari’a courts to punish offenses up to a term not exceeding three years or with any fine not exceeding five thousand ringgit or whipping not exceeding six strokes.

Islam is an important feature in the state list. The state legislature has power to make laws on Islam and to establish state Shari’a courts. Its law-making power includes *inter alia* “Islamic law and personal law and family law of persons professing the religion of Islam,” the “creation and punishment of offenses by persons professing the religion of Islam against precepts of that religion,” “the organization and procedure of Shari’a courts which shall have jurisdiction only over persons professing the religion of Islam,” but “shall not have jurisdiction in respect of offenses except in so far as conferred by federal law, the control of propagating doctrines and beliefs among persons professing the religion of Islam; the determination of matters of Islamic law and doctrine Malay custom.” There are thus two parallel systems of law in Malaysia; federal civil law and state Islamic law. Malaysia has federal civil courts and state Shari’a courts to reflect the dual legal system.

The third arm of the government, the judiciary, mentioned in the Federal Constitution upon independence, is the federal civil court structure. The state Shari’a courts are constituted under any state law by virtue of Islamic law being a matter in the State List. The Shari’a court is nevertheless a creature of the Federal Constitution as its existence is provided for under the State List in the Ninth Schedule to the Constitution. State Shari’a courts are not courts inferior to the federal courts as the term ‘inferior court’ is understood in terms of appeal and judicial review by superior courts over inferior courts. The state Shari’a courts are in a separate hierarchy to that of the federal civil courts. There is no right of appeal from the state Shari’a courts to the federal civil courts. There is no power of judicial review by the federal high court over the state Shari’a court. However, this does not mean that the federal courts are not empowered to deal with Islamic law.

The power of the Shari’a court is limited by the State List and limited by the state law which creates it. It has no power similar to the federal high courts which have powers of judicial review and power to determine fundamental liberty challenges and such other issues as determined by the Constitution and by federal law. “Islamic law” is all state laws relating to

the administration of Islamic law, both substantive and procedural laws. In the 1980's the government with cooperation from government departments overseeing the administration of Islamic law in the states embarked upon codifying family laws and related matters as allowed under the State List. State Islamic laws sets out the fiqh opinions to be applied as well as restricts the discretion of the state Shari'a judges under siyasa Shari'a. Codification of fiqh applies talfiq and takhayyur principles to codify fiqh of the Sunni (predominantly Shafii) school. This was intended to systematize the application of laws and to establish the system of precedent. There are variations among state laws, but these are minimal (Ahmad, S. 2005, 'Islam in Malaysia: Constitutional and Human Rights Perspectives', *Muslim World Journal of Human Rights*, Berkeley Electronic Press website 2:1, pp.7-9 <http://www.bepress.com/> – Accessed 4 November 2005 – Attachment 1).

A current assessment of the relationship between Malaysia's civil and Islamic laws, and their respective applications, is provided by a paper which was recently delivered by Professor Shad Saleem Faruqi, of Malaysia's Universiti Teknologi MARA. Faruqi's paper notes the following with regard to the issue of the application of Islamic law to Malaysian citizens:

As Muslims are not allowed to marry under the civil law of marriages, and must marry under syariah law, non-Muslims seeking to marry Muslims have to convert to Islam if the marriage is to be allowed to be registered (p.7).

...All Muslims are subjected to Islamic law in matters of succession, testate and intestate, betrothal, marriage, divorce, dower, maintenance, adoption, legitimacy, guardianship, gifts, wakafs, zakat, fitrah, baitulmal or similar Islamic religious revenue. A Muslim cannot opt out of Islamic law (p.6).

...Schedule 9, List II, Item 1 is quite clear that non-Muslims cannot be subjected to the syariah. They cannot be compelled to appear before the syariah courts (p.8).

...It could be argued that [apostates] should, therefore, be no more subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the syariah courts. The civil and syariah courts have both rejected this line of reasoning...It is not exceptional to hold that status cannot be self determined. Status is almost always otherdetermined (p.8).

...Some judges have gone so far as to hold that Muslims cannot renounce their religion at all...A majority of judges handling apostasy cases have said that renunciation must be done through the syariah courts. Till the syariah court determines the issue according to Islamic law, the apostate remains a Muslim and can be subjected to the syariah court's criminal jurisdiction

(Faruqi, S.S. 2005, 'Jurisdiction of Federal and State Authorities to Punish Offences against the Precepts of Islam: a Constitutional Perspective', Friedrich-Naumann-Foundation website, 30 July, pp.6-8 <http://www.fnfmalaysia.org/article/Presentation%20paper-%20Prof.%20SHAD%20-%20jurisdiction%20of%20federal%20and%20state%20authorities%20to%20punish1.pdf> – Accessed 1 November 2005 – Attachment 3).

Faruqi's paper observes a growing trend, in present-day Malaysia, in which "state laws on Islamic matters seem to have administrative ascendancy over conflicting federal laws". Some pertinent passages follow in detail:

Article 75 [of Malaysia's Federal Constitution] provides that "if any State law is inconsistent with a federal law, then the Federal law shall prevail and the State law shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be void". In actual practice, however, state laws on Islamic matters seem to have administrative ascendancy over conflicting federal laws.

...In the last few years a number of State Assemblies, as part of their quest for an Islamic state, are enacting “hudud laws” – i.e. laws relating to crimes, punishments, rights and duties that are mentioned in the Holy Qur’an...The federal-state division of legislative power has broken down in relation to matters of Islamic law. The residual criminal law powers of state assemblies are being used expansively in disregard of the supreme constitution and (in the case of hudud laws) with total indifference to the relevant federal law on jurisdictional limitations of state assemblies

(Faruqi, S.S. 2005, ‘Jurisdiction of Federal and State Authorities to Punish Offences against the Precepts of Islam: a Constitutional Perspective’, Friedrich-Naumann-Foundation website, 30 July, pp.10, 15-16 <http://www.fnfmalaysia.org/article/Presentation%20paper-%20Prof.%20SHAD%20-%20jurisdiction%20of%20federal%20and%20state%20authorities%20to%20punish1.pdf> – Accessed 1 November 2005 – Attachment 2)

Catholic groups have recently voiced concern about the growing power of Islamic law in Malaysia; and the legal requirement that a non-Muslim must convert to Islam in order to marry a Muslim. “More and more, young Catholic men and women are falling in love with Muslims and in order to get married, they accept to become Muslims”, writes Paolo Nicelli in a recent article published by the Catholic news service *Asia News*, reporting that “the Catholic bishops of Malaysia have sought to “warn believers of the gravity of such a choice, which has radical outcomes not only on the level of faith, but also on their legal and civil status”. Nicelli’s article provides an interview with “Leonard Teoh, a member of the Association of Catholic Lawyers”, in which the concerns of the Catholic church are discussed. Pertinent extracts follow in detail:

[Teoh:] In many areas of Malaysia, if a person decides he no longer wishes to be a Muslim, his declaration must be approved by the Sharia court. It is the court which will decree whether you are a Muslim or not. Once you are Muslim and your father and mother were Muslim, you will always be a Muslim, you will live and die as one. For example, in the state of Sabah, if a Muslim declares he is no longer such, the Sharia court can detain him for months to re-educate him, after which time he may be sentenced to a year in prison if he has not repented as yet. In the state of Malakka, a six-month imprisonment term has been fixed for the same crime. Other states like Kelantan, Terengganu have promulgated similar laws which punish apostasy cases in the Islamic faith.

...Once you convert to Islam, your conversion will be registered in your identity card and in the national register. Through digital technology, your adherence will be put online, computerized, that is, made public. This causes no end of problems. If you want to get married only by civil rite, the authorities will check the register and they will tell you: “No! You are a Muslim so you cannot marry only civilly.” If former Muslim women with children want to marry a non-Muslim, they risk being accused of *zina* (illicit sexual relations). In the case of *zina*, a woman could even be condemned to a prison sentence. Islamic authorities are becoming very strict and they are handing down prison sentences even in cases of *khalwat*. *Khalwat* means closeness, nearness. The crime is committed when, according to the Sharia, a woman and a man are found in a solitary place and comporting themselves in a close and familiar manner.

The reality is that one may convert to Islam, knowing little or nothing about the Islam faith. But once converted, for the state you will always a Muslim, in so far as your civil status is registered as such.

...Our civil law says that a Muslim person cannot ask to marry a non Muslim. If you have a Muslim name, or if you converted to Islam, the department for the registration of marriages

will not give you the permission to marry a non-Muslim person (Nicelli, P. 2005, 'Malaysia bishops worried: the shadow of the Sharia extends over non-Muslims too', *Asia News* website, 22 September <http://www.asianews.it/view.php?l=en&art=4169> – Accessed 2 November 2005 – Attachment 3).

A research response on the subject of “mixed marriages and relationships between Muslim women and non-Muslim men” in Malaysia was recently completed by the Research Directorate of the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, and this is supplied as Attachment 4 (Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2004, *MYS42737.E – Malaysia: Update to MYS38913.E of May 2002 on societal and governmental attitudes towards mixed marriages and relationships between Muslim women and non-Muslim men; police protection or legal recourse available to a non-Muslim male who is threatened by family members of his Muslim girlfriend; reports of police discrimination based on the religion of the complainant (2002-2004)*, 24 June – Attachment 4).

3. Do Muslim groups in Malaysia act in ‘an outrageous and borderline illegal manner’?

The sources consulted could provide little information in regards to the practice of forcing non-Muslims to convert to Islam because they have been discovered to be in a relationship with a Muslim person. Nonetheless, there have been reports of controversial behaviour on the part of religious authorities who have taken action – sometimes with the aid of Islamic vigilante groups – against members of the Muslim community deemed to be in contravention of Islamic law. Further to this, the information provided by the sources consulted suggests that Muslim women could be at risk of adverse treatment such as being charged with improperly associating with a man with whom she is not married (an issue broached in Teoh’s discussion of *khalwat* and *zina* in the response to Question 2). In what follows, relevant source information is presented under the following headings: *Forced Conversion in Malaysia*; *Outrageous and Borderline Illegal Behaviour*; and *Islamic Law and Unmarried Relationships*.

Forced Conversion in Malaysia

A search of the websites of faith-focused persecution monitors and Malaysia’s principal news agencies provided no reports of comparable incidents of forced conversion. One incident of alleged forced conversion was reported, in February of this year, by the Malaysian news service, *Malaysiakini*, but the circumstances surrounding this incident are very different (according to *Malaysiakini*’s correspondent, members of Malaysia’s indigenous Orang Asli community claim that they were “duped” into converting to Islam by representatives of Kelantan State’s Islamic and Malay Customar Council (MAIK), a claim which MAIK has denied) (Theophilus, C. 2005 ‘Orang Asli cry foul over ‘forced’ conversion’, Yahoo Groups website, source: *Malaysiakini*, 3 February <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/beritamalaysia/message/75243> – Accessed 4 November 2005 – Attachment 5).

The US Department of State’s most recent report on religious freedom in Malaysia lists “no reports of forced religious conversion” for the preceding year (US Department of State 2005, International Religious Freedom Report for Malaysia – 2004, 15 September <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/irf/2004/35405.htm> – Accessed 17 September 2004 – Attachment 6).

Outrageous and Borderline Illegal Behaviour

On 20 February 2005, Malaysia's *The Sunday Times* reported that authorities in some Malaysian states had enlisted "youths to spy on couples and report their findings to religious authorities". The "deputy president" of Malacca is reported to have told *The Times* that "some 50 youths had been roped in to join the squad". According to this report, the strategy "scored its first success by reporting on two couples who were later caught by religious enforcement officials for khalwat". On 25 March 2005, *Dow Jones Newswires* reported that Malaysia's federal government had "moved to limit the powers of its Islamic morality watchdogs, saying their overzealous work is violating civil rights and could turn the country into a Taliban-era Afghanistan". According to this report, "Nazri Abdul Aziz, a minister in the Prime Minister's Department, told reporters Thursday that the religious department officials will now have to obtain approval from the police before conducting raids"; and "[t]he government has also told a Muslim youth vigilante squad to stop spying on couples for the religious affairs department" (Singh, S. 2005, 'Morality squad starts snooping', *Sunday Times*, 20 February – Attachment 7; 'Malaysia Govt Curtails Pwrs Of Islamic Morality Watchdogs' 2005, *Dow Jones Newswires*, 25 March – Attachment 8).

The behaviour of Malaysia's state religious enforcement authorities, in this particular regard, has been much discussed in the media of late as a consequence of a number of aggressive operations; most notably, a raid on a disco earlier this year which resulted in the arrest of a large number of Muslims for being in contravention of Islamic law. Information on the controversy engendered by this raid, and other actions, is discussed in detail in a report recently published by *The Economist* (see Attachment 9) and program recently broadcasted by Australia's SBS network (see Attachment 10) ('Debating Islam' 2005, *The Economist*, 2 June http://www.economist.com/displayStory.cfm?story_id=4033968 – Accessed 1 November 2005 – Attachment 9; Lewis, A. 2005, 'Moderate Modern Malaysia', SBS TV Australia – *Dateline*, 26 October <http://news.sbs.com.au/dateline/index.php?page=archive&daysum=2005-10-26#> – Accessed 28 October 2005 – Attachment 10).

According to Human Rights Watch (HRW), 18 July 2005 saw a small religious community, known as "the Sky Garden", attacked by "a mob composed of 30 to 35 individuals...[who] reportedly tossed Molotov cocktails, slashed car tires with machetes, broke the windows of several homes, and partially scorched religious structures". In its most recent report in the incident, published on 4 August 2005, HRW states that "Malaysian police have failed to arrest anyone involved in the attack"; and that, "[i]nstead, 58 members of the [Sky Garden], including 30 women and five children, were arrested on July 20 by the state religious affairs department and the local police"; "Forty-nine members of the Sky Kingdom are charged with violating Islamic precepts under section 10 of Malaysia's Shariah Criminal Offenses Enactment 2001". The attack took place in the conservative Malaysian state of Terengganu. HRW's latest report on the affair is supplied as Attachment 11; for a more detailed account of this incident, and the larger issue of deviation, see *The Age* report supplied as Attachment 12 (Human Rights Watch 2005, 'Malaysia: Respect Rights of Religious Community', 4 August http://hrw.org/english/docs/2005/08/04/malays11587_txt.htm – Accessed 7 November 2005 – Attachment 11; Levett, C. 2005, 'Bulldozers etch boundaries of religious freedom', *The Age*, 20 August <http://www.theage.com.au/news/world/bulldozers-etch-boundaries-of-religious-freedom/2005/08/19/1124435143759.html#> – Accessed 7 November 2005 – Attachment 12).

Islamic Law and Unmarried Relationships

Malaysia's Women's Aid Organisation (WMO) provides a detailed overview of the offence of *khalwat* as it is typically regulated by Malaysia's state Islamic laws. According to the WMO, a Muslim woman caught in a relationship with a non-Muslim man could be "subjected to a fine, or be imprisoned or both"; the non-Muslim man would "be released, as he is not subjected to the Syariah Law". The WMO's advice may also prove of interest in that it provides extensive information on the agents empowered to enforce *khalwat* and the rights of persons caught committing such an offence. Finally, the WMO advises that "[y]ou cannot be forced to marry as a result of the arrest". Relevant extracts follow in detail:

Siti is sixteen. She recently heard from her classmates about a Muslim friend who was caught for *Khalwat* with her boyfriend. There were speculations about them having to get married because of the incident. This brought about a lot of discussions about what activities are allowed. Some thought that going to the cinema is not allowed, and some were of the opinion that only being in a confined bedroom is not allowed. Siti has a non-Muslim boyfriend, and she was not sure if she could be caught for *Khalwat* if she was in the company of him, and if so, in what circumstances?

The conditions for *Khalwat* is provided under the Syariah Criminal Provisions Act, and the circumstances differ from state to state. Generally, as provided by the Syariah Criminal Provisions Act (Federal Territories), Section 27, it entails:

"Any man who is found together with one or more women, not being his wife or mahram; or any woman who is found together with one or more men, not being her husband or mahram, in any secluded place or in a house or room under circumstances which may give rise to suspicion that they were engaged in immoral acts shall be guilty for an offence and shall on conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding three thousand ringgit or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or to both."

This means that if you are with a man or woman who is not your legal spouse in a secluded area or confined place, being engaged in "immoral" activity, you can be caught for *Khalwat*. If convicted, you can be subjected to a fine, or be imprisoned or both. This only applies if you are a Muslim. In the case of Siti, if she and her boyfriend are caught for *Khalwat* her boyfriend will be released, as he is not subjected to the Syariah Law.

Who has the authority of enforcement?

- Enforcement officer from the Unit Penguatkuasaan Pejabat Agama (The Enforcement Unit of the Religious Office)
- Religious officer or public officer, in example the police.
- Nazir and Imam if the Religious Office is geographically inconvenient due to distance.

There can be no citizen's arrest made for *Khalwat*. However, the public can make a formal complaint to the Religious Office if they have any suspicion of *Khalwat*, much like the way a member of the public can make a police report if they have any suspicion of robbery or abuse.

...You cannot be forced to marry as a result of the arrest. For further information, contact your nearest Religious Office (Isa, R. & Kee, J. (undated), 'Know Your Rights: Caught in Close Proximity for "Immoral" Acts (*Khalwat*)', Women's Aid Organisation website http://www.wao.org.my/news/20030104knowrights_khalwat.htm – Accessed 3 November 2005 – Attachment 13).

The Malaysian media carries regular reports of persons being arrested for the offence of *khalwat*, or a related charge, throughout the various states of the federation, including the

state of Penang (*Pulau Pinang*; which is the only only state of Malaysia in which ethnic Chinese form the majority of the population). Reports of persons being recently charged with *khalwat* in Penang are supplied as Attachment 14 and Attachment 15. Penang is reported to have strengthened its penalties for *khalwat* in late 1996: “offenders can [now] be fined up to M\$3,000 (S\$1,650) or jailed not more than two years or both” (‘Sports commentator fined for *khalwat*’ 2005, *New Straits Times*, 26 October – Attachment 14; ‘Three grads fined for “*khalwat*”’ 2004, *New Straits Times*, 11 August – Attachment 15; ‘Penang Amends Syariah Laws with Stiffer Penalties’ 1996, *Straits Times*, 6 December – Attachment 16).

In a footnote to her study of Islamic law in Malaysia, Salbiah Ahmad states that “[s]ome state Islamic laws draw a distinction between *khalwat* and cohabitation”. The relevant extract follows in detail:

Some state Islamic laws draw a distinction between *khalwat* and cohabitation. In the latter, the word ‘*zina*’ is not ever used in these *ta’azir* laws because of the requirement of proof under *hudud* and perhaps the stigma of *zina*. In any case state legislatures are limited in the prescription of sentencing by the Constitution and federal law (Ahmad, S. 2005, ‘Islam in Malaysia: Constitutional and Human Rights Perspectives’, *Muslim World Journal of Human Rights*, Berkeley Electronic Press website 2:1, p.11 <http://www.bepress.com/> – Attachment 1).

4. Do the authorities protect people from forced conversion to Islam as a consequence of a relationship with a Muslim partner?

No information could be provided by the sources consulted which addressed the need for protection from forced conversion to Islam as a consequence of a relationship with a Muslim partner.

Information of a more general nature is provided in a recently completed research response on the attitude of the Malaysian authorities towards Buddhists and the ethnic Chinese community. This research response is supplied as Attachment 17 (RRT Country Research 2005, *Research Response MYS17628*, 27 October – Attachment 17).

List of Sources Consulted

Internet Sources:

Government Information & Reports

US Department of State website <http://www.state.gov>

United Nations (UN)

UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) website <http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home>

UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR) website <http://www.unhchr.ch>

Non-Government Organisations

Amnesty International website <http://www.amnesty.org/>

Asia News website <http://www.asianews.it>

Friedrich-Naumann-Foundation (FNF) – Malaysia website <http://www.fnfmalaysia.org>

Human Rights Watch (HRW) website <http://www.hrw.org/>

International Christian Concern website <http://www.persecution.org>
 International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) website <http://www.icj.org>
 Jihad Watch website <http://www.jihadwatch.org/>
 Faith Freedom International website <http://www.faithfreedom.org/>
 Voice of the Martyrs website <http://www.persecution.net/>
 Women's Aid Organisation (WAO) website <http://www.wao.org.my/>

International News & Politics

BBC News (World Edition) website <http://news.bbc.co.uk/>
 The Age website <http://www.theage.com.au/>

Region Specific Links

The Malay Mail website <http://www.mmail.com.my/>
 Malaysiakini website <http://www.malaysiakini.com>
 The New Straits Times website <http://www.nst.com.my/>
 The Star website <http://thestar.com.my/>

Search Engines

Google search engine <http://www.google.com.au/>
 StaggerNation website's Google API Proximity search engine
<http://www.staggernation.com/cgi-bin/gaps.cgi>
 Internet Archive WayBackMachine search engine <http://www.archive.org/>

Online Subscription Services

Berkeley Electronic Press website <http://www.bepress.com/>

Databases:		
Public	<i>FACTIVA</i>	Reuters Business Briefing
DIMIA	<i>BACIS</i>	Country Information
	<i>REFINFO</i>	IRBDC Research Responses (Canada)
RRT	<i>ISYS</i>	RRT Country Research database, including Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, US Department of State <i>Country Reports on Human Rights Practices</i> .
RRT Library	<i>FIRST</i>	RRT Library Catalogue

List of Attachments

1. Ahmad, S. 2005, 'Islam in Malaysia: Constitutional and Human Rights Perspectives', *Muslim World Journal of Human Rights*, Berkeley Electronic Press website 2:1. (<http://www.bepress.com/> – Accessed 4 November 2005)
2. Faruqi, S.S. 2005, 'Jurisdiction of Federal and State Authorities to Punish Offences against the Precepts of Islam: a Constitutional Perspective', Friedrich-Naumann-Foundation website, 30 July. (<http://www.fnfmalaysia.org/article/Presentation%20paper-%20Prof.%20SHAD%20-%20jurisdiction%20of%20federal%20and%20state%20authorities%20to%20punish1.pdf> – Accessed 1 November 2005)
3. Nicelli, P. 2005, 'Malaysia bishops worried: the shadow of the Sharia extends over non-Muslims too', *Asia News* website, 22 September. <http://www.asianews.it/view.php?l=en&art=4169> – Accessed 2 November 2005.

4. Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2004, *MYS42737.E – Malaysia: Update to MYS38913.E of May 2002 on societal and governmental attitudes towards mixed marriages and relationships between Muslim women and non-Muslim men; police protection or legal recourse available to a non-Muslim male who is threatened by family members of his Muslim girlfriend; reports of police discrimination based on the religion of the complainant (2002-2004)*, 24 June. (REFINFO)
5. Theophilus, C. 2005 'Orang Asli cry foul over 'forced' conversion', Yahoo Groups website, source: *Malaysiakini*, 3 February.
(<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/beritamalaysia/message/75243> – Accessed 4 November 2005)
6. US Department of State 2005, International Religious Freedom Report for Malaysia – 2004, 15 September. (<http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/irf/2004/35405.htm> – Accessed 17 September 2004)
7. Singh, S. 2005, 'Morality squad starts snooping', *Sunday Times*, 20 February. (FACTIVA)
8. 'Malaysia Govt Curtails Pwrs Of Islamic Morality Watchdogs' 2005, *Dow Jones Newswires*, 25 March. (FACTIVA)
9. 'Debating Islam' 2005, *The Economist*, 2 June.
(http://www.economist.com/displayStory.cfm?story_id=4033968 – Accessed 1 November 2005)
10. Lewis, A. 2005, 'Moderate Modern Malaysia', SBS TV Australia – *Dateline*, 26 October. (<http://news.sbs.com.au/dateline/index.php?page=archive&daysum=2005-10-26#> – Accessed 28 October 2005)
11. Human Rights Watch 2005, 'Malaysia: Respect Rights of Religious Community', 4 August. (http://hrw.org/english/docs/2005/08/04/malays11587_txt.htm – Accessed 7 November 2005)
12. Levett, C. 2005, 'Bulldozers etch boundaries of religious freedom', *The Age*, 20 August. (<http://www.theage.com.au/news/world/bulldozers-etch-boundaries-of-religious-freedom/2005/08/19/1124435143759.html#> – Accessed 7 November 2005)
13. Isa, R. & Kee, J. (undated), 'Know Your Rights: Caught in Close Proximity for "Immoral" Acts (Khalwat)', Women's Aid Organisation website.
(http://www.wao.org.my/news/20030104knowrghts_khalwat.htm – Accessed 3 November 2005)
14. 'Sports commentator fined for khalwat' 2005, *New Straits Times*, 26 October. (FACTIVA)
15. 'Three grads fined for "khalwat"' 2004, *New Straits Times*, 11 August. (FACTIVA)
16. 'Penang Amends Syariah Laws with Stiffer Penalties' 1996, *Straits Times*, 6 December. (FACTIVA)
17. RRT Country Research 2005, *Research Response MYS17628*, 27 October.