

## **1MDB, which part of WSJ's allegations recycled?**

**MalaysiaKini.com**

**Dec 31<sup>st</sup>, 2015**

**Yoursay**

YOURSAY | 'WSJ has more credibility than 1MDB by a long shot.'

### **WSJ still recycling unproven allegations, says 1MDB**

**Guna Otak:** Is this the best 1MDB can answer to the allegations made by the Wall Street Journal (WSJ)?

As an organisation backed by the Finance Ministry, I would expect 1MDB to engage a group of corporate lawyers to answer the claims one by one and based on facts.

Then I would expect 1MDB to launch a lawsuit to force WSJ to apologise and withdraw its news article. That would be the minimum expected of a reputable corporation.

Instead, 1MDB can only weakly and meekly describe the news article as "unsubstantiated allegations"?

I can only conclude what WSJ wrote is quite true and 1MDB could not issue a credible reply. So, the likely approach now taken is to "beat around the bush" by declaring the article as recycled "unsubstantiated allegations".

**ACR:** WSJ has more credibility than 1MDB by a long shot. Suing may not be vogue given that this is an example of investigative journalism and media outlets would typically allow the affected party the right to respond.

Hence, it is best for 1MDB to rebut each point raised by WSJ and have it published by the newspaper. Till today 1MDB has not done this.

And some of the things I am reading now is new such as Jho Low managing the election funding of Umno. Therefore, 1MDB's "recycling unproven allegations" accusation does not hold water.

**Kingfisher:** Malaysians generally may be quite puzzled or even baffled as to whose version is more credible.

Based on available facts and a rational examination, it has not been impossible to ascertain the huge losses incurred by the 1MDB "business" operation nor is it credible to refute that Najib did not receive huge amounts of money in his personal accounts.

Neither is it possible to ignore that he took certain measures that can be viewed as "suspicious" of being protective of his personal interest.

One version of reality as articulated by some support the notion that there is nothing amiss or legally improper and that Najib bears no blame, while yet some others argue that certain fundamental laws have been breached.

The contention as felt by many neutral observers is who has the persuasion to impose a perception of reality which is the actual truth in a convulsive atmosphere.

**Saya Pun Nak Cari Makan:** If WSJ were to splash such wild rubbish, as claimed by 1MDB, against Tamasek of Singapore, there is no question that Tamasek will just let the allegations go unchallenged.

It will sue WSJ in New York or Singapore, you name it, before the sun rises tomorrow. The allegations are very serious, and just rubbishing the report does not prove 1MDB's innocence.

So many negative reports have gone by, and yet 1MDB has not found its balls to take on WSJ. Our national dignity is at stake.

**Anonymous\_84431449544259:** 1MDB is right. The fact is that there is no real news in this article.

For reasons best known to its management, the WSJ appears happy to have become a noticeboard for conspiracy theories propagated by the Malaysian opposition.

**WDA:** Note that 1MDB did not use the key words "we strongly deny". Indeed, if these continuous allegations from WSJ were indeed rubbish, 1MDB should gleefully sue the newspaper.

Every financial reward from the courts can only lessen the burden of 1MDB, especially in its current debt situation. But all 1MDB is doing is recycling the "recycled allegations" statements.

Grow a backbone, 1MDB. Go and gallantly sue WSJ. It's money for the taking, no?

**Yellow Bird:** The only thing that seems to be recycled is... 1MDB's replies. Please get a better PR (public relations) consultant.

**Maplesyrup:** I would think, truth is of paramount importance and PM should not be distracted by the likelihood of not being able to extract maximum compensation.

Until WSJ is sued, ordinary citizens like me may be led to believe that WSJ has the truth behind them going by how bold they are at their reporting.

**Najib sacked former 1MDB auditors, says WSJ editor**

**Jaycee:** So the "cat is finally out of the bag" - that the PM paid money to buy votes.

And of course, those who did not vote for this minority government already knew that. And the PM has the audacity to preach about honesty and integrity of the government to us.

**Mosquitobrain:** WSJ has reported 1MDB's alleged misappropriations time and again. How come no "jaguh kampung" in Umno dare sue this tabloid?

WSJ is snubbing your party president. Where have all the barking dogs gone?

**Hibiscus:** It looks like Najib has a habit of purging people for asking questions he is not willing to answer.

How can one in their right mind entrust such a man with practically dictatorial power in the NSC (National Security Council) Bill?

Copyright © 1999-2012 Mkini Dotcom Sdn. Bhd  
Source: <https://www.malysiakini.com/news/325010>