

Was 1MDB's money used to 'buy' votes?

MalaysiaKini.com

July 5, 2015

By Yoursay

YOURSAY "The issue of the money not being used for personal gain is irrelevant."

'Dr M masterminded claim I stole 1MDB's money'

SRMan: "Let me be very clear: I have never taken funds for personal gain as alleged by my political opponents - whether from 1MDB, SRC International or other entities, as these companies have confirmed," said PM Najib Razak.

It sounds like an admission that the money did indeed flow into his accounts but not for personal gains.

Was the money for Umno-BN to buy votes in GE13? If the money was indeed used for this purpose, then the win at GE13 was in effect Najib's personal gain.

Abasir: Based on the evidence so far, Najib did have those personal AmBank accounts (no denial by him) and funds amounting to billions did flow into them before the last GE (again no denial).

The Wall Street Journal (WSJ) is absolutely correct in its investigative reporting and, as a responsible, credible news organisation, is ready to be sued.

But questions still remain: what was Bank Negara's regulatory role in all this? Were the transfers done with the active connivance of central bank governor Zeti Akhtar Aziz and Co?

Was the cabinet informed of any of this or was it kept out of the loop? Where is the money now? How was it spent?

Did the Election Commission (EC) deliberately look elsewhere as the billions were splurged during the campaigning? Are the results of GE13 valid?

To whom do the people turn to when the law breakers are allegedly the prime minister and the government?

Samah: "Tun (former PM Dr Mahathir Mohamad), working hand in glove with foreign nationals ... is behind this latest lie," said Najib.

Perhaps, with this allegation, Mahathir will now sue the PM. The latter, though strenuously denying the WSJ and Sarawak Report's exposes, however dare not utter the word "sue".

Even if Najib were eventually forced to say "I will sue", will he have the guts to carry

through?

Anyway, it's show time for Malaysians. We have paid dearly for this show. We deserve the front-row seats.

Aries46: Just on account of some cheeky comments about 'what goes around comes around' with regard to his Terengganu MB fiasco, Najib took Malaysiakini to court.

What we have here is a direct accusation by a reputable journal of alleged corrupt practices by Najib, and all that he could muster is his usual stale and unconvincing denial and conspiracy theory that ironically serves to reaffirm the accusations thus far.

Odin Tajué: Consider these points, Najib. If Xavier Andre Justo had indeed tried to blackmail PetroSaudi International (PSI), then the latter must have been involved in shady dealings. You cannot blackmail a party that is guiltless.

Let us suppose the following did happen - when the particular PSI executive met with Justo in October 2014, the latter demanded 2.5 million Swiss Francs or else he would spill the beans.

The executive, who was of course acting on behalf of PSI, refused to be blackmailed. As a result, Justo tampered with PSI company documents and passed them on to Sarawak Report.

Now, if the versions published by Sarawak Report are the altered versions of the original, all you need to do to prove your innocence is to produce the original versions.

Simply claiming that the versions published by Sarawak Report are not the original ones, but the tampered copies of the original ones, is unacceptable. It amounts to nothing more than a bare denial. It amounts to nothing more than your mere word against Sarawak Report's.

Sarawak Report has not been discredited. Not yet, anyway. On what basis did you assert that it was discredited? Simply because Protection Group International (PGI) has claimed that the documents published by the portal were the altered versions of the original?

Be informed that a PowerPoint slide claimed by PGI to have been altered by Justo has been shown to be not true. The slide has indeed been altered, but the alteration was effected by PSI's own lawyers and not by Justo.

Furthermore, PGI has been unwilling to confirm whether certain statements attributed to it by the New Straits Times have indeed originated from it, nor has it been prepared to say whether the published statements were verbatim or they have been altered. Why the reluctance if it has nothing to hide?

We are also told that the person from PGI who responded to Sarawak Report's lawyers had signed off with only her first name. That illustrates either boorishness or her mother could not tell who had fathered her and thus was unable to give her a surname. The credibility of a company that employs boorish people is zero.

If you feel that Sarawak Report and WSJ have defamed you by their publishing of what you claim to be false, you ought to sue either one or both, whichever applies.

Accusing and threatening to come down hard on parties other than Sarawak Report and WSJ will not clear you of the alleged wrongdoings. It only shows you are a cowardly bully. One trusts all this is simple enough to understand.

Oh Ya?: Najib did not deny he had taken the money. He only denied taking it for personal gains. What if the money was channelled, in part or in whole, to GE13? Is his government still a legitimate and democratically elected?

On the other hand, if he is so nigh tepid, why is he still not suing chief villain Mahathir Mohamad. He may be able to nail him for the huge sum that he has hidden somewhere to help pay back 1MDB debts.

Just Don't Talk: PM, you must walk the talk to prove that they are manufacturing lies and fabricating evidence to destroy you.

Otherwise all the allegations thrown at you are seen to be credible in the eyes of the public. Bare denials are not enough and not acceptable in this day and age.

If it is not his money, is Najib holding the RM2.6 billion in trust for someone? Who is that someone?

My guess is that someone is the biggest political party in Bolehland.

Senior Citizen: Najib, you think WSJ will collaborate with Mahathir to write something about a country leader without any evidence or documents?

If the report is wrong, all you have to say is (1) They are not my bank accounts, and (2) I can show you my bank statements.

Nobrain: It is CBT (criminal breach of trust) when money from state funds go into personal bank accounts, whether one uses it or not.