

Umno-style judges crawl out of the woodwork

MalaysiaKini.com

Feb 2, 2014

YOURSAY 'It is a pity that we seem to have former judges now entering the political arena.'

'Understand law before debating on Allah issue'

Proarte: Former Court of Appeal judge Mohd Noor Abdullah is showing his stupidity and ignorance of the law.

Article 11 of the constitution guarantees freedom of worship and to do so in peace and without interference or harassment. Article 11(4) stipulates that propagation of non-Islamic religions among Muslims is forbidden.

Let this numbskull judge understand that clause 4 does not give the state or Muslims the right to enact laws to curtail non-Muslim method of worship - that would be a clear breach of Article 11.

The constitution forbids Muslims from interfering with how Christians worship or what words they use to refer to God. It is simply none of their business or the business of state players.

Regulation of non-Muslim religions is simply illegal, period. Catholic weekly The Herald is a publication for internal circulation within the Christian community only. It is not for public sale or distribution, and Muslims have not been invited to read it.

Similarly, the Bible is a Christian book which is not distributed to Muslims. If Muslims want to read The Herald or Bible of their own volition, then that it is their choice because there is freedom of worship and Christians cannot be blamed for Muslims' actions.

If Christians are proselytising to Muslims then they should be dealt with according to the law because they are in breach of clause 4 of Article 11.

In summary, state enactments curtailing the Christian right to worship in a manner of their choosing is seditious. All state enactments doing so must be repealed immediately and an apology be made to the public.

Let Muslims understand that the word 'Allah' was used by Christian Arabs long before the advent of Islam. The state therefore owes the Christian community an apology for falsely claiming that 'Allah' is exclusive to Islam.

Negarawan: Mohd Noor, you do not sound like a man of justice and reason. You are just paraphrasing the statements of Umno and Perkasa, thereby clearly exposing your political bias and religious bigotry.

Justice has to be based on indisputable facts, and not on fear of riots by Umno/Perkasa followers. Justice has to be based on a judiciary with high integrity and impartiality, not a panel of judges comprising Umno extremist Muslims delivering a judgment on a matter concerning Christians.

You correctly mentioned that these words are of Arabic origin. Unfortunately you have not been intelligent and hard-working enough, as a true judge should be, to delve into the true history of these words.

The truth is all these words predate the birth of Prophet Muhammad for centuries and have been used by other faiths before Islam. Many of these words are also common Arabic nouns like 'injl', 'mubaligh', 'wali', etc. That is why no other Muslim countries in the world have banned the usage of these words.

P Dev Anand Pillai: It is a pity that we seem to have former judges now entering the political arena with their skewed views of how the people ought to think.

Yes, we know that non-Muslims can't preach their religions to Muslims, but who is doing that? There hasn't been any evidence to that effect.

The word 'Allah' appears in the holy book printed in Indonesia, so the great former judge perhaps should advise the government to tell the Indonesians to stop printing it and selling it to Malaysians since the majority here are "easily swayed" and "confused".

Aries46: Mohd Noor is merely 'beating around the bush' for his vested interest but reveals nothing more than what most laymen are fully aware regarding state enactments, federal laws and the ongoing 'Allah' controversy.

The High Court decision of 2009 that establishes the supremacy of the constitution is common knowledge. The constitution provides Muslims a wide berth to practice and propagate their religion while non-Muslims are given the rights and freedom to practice their religion without interference and hindrance. Has any court disputed this fact thus far?

Can state enactments deprive non-Muslims their religious practices or words that have predominantly been in use for decades?

And the fact remains that this exclusivity is purely a Malaysian phenomenon, religious or otherwise, and what about communities other than Christians that use the term 'Allah' in their scriptures and prayers?

Tholu: Very interesting - the Johor enactment bans the use of any "words of Islamic origin". Any words of Islamic origin? This phrase in the enactment by itself should render the enactment ultra virus the constitution and therefore null and void.

Despite all the unequivocal and unchallengeable empirical and historical facts of the origins of the so-called "words of Islamic origin", the Islamic authorities and the legislators alike have deliberately and illegally turned their conscience and soul away from them.

And this former judge seems to be talking chicken and duck when the issue is about Titanosaurs and Prosauropods (different species of dinosaurs).

Why elaborate at length something that no one is denying - that the constitution clearly states that non-Muslim missionaries cannot preach their religion to Muslims?

But the contention is: 'Can Islamic state enactments run contrary to the constitution which does not inhibit any individual from professing and practising his religion or belief?'

Odin: Mohd Noor, you are correct only in the sense that one ought to be aware of the existence of laws that prohibit certain actions.

But one does not need to have a doctorate in law nor a terminal degree in law to know that:

- 1) There are bad laws;
- 2) Christians have been falsely accused of proselytising to Muslims.

Anonymous #039163649: How did this man become a judge? In the first place, nobody is propagating anything to the Muslims. They have been practising their own religion the way they have been doing all this while.

Peacemaker: Mohd Noor should know that the law is not the exclusive purview of

the judges but actually the common property of every Malaysian.

He's trying to imply that only "learned" men like him know the law. Even ordinary people know the know by the way it affects them.

Copyright © 1999-2012 Mkini Dotcom Sdn. Bhd
Source: <http://www.malaysiakini.com/news/253341>