

Newspaper

New Straits Times

Date

6 March 2016

Dr Mahathir just cannot let go of his past grandeur

NST-6/3/2016

VENDETTA: Former PM has done the unthinkable by conspiring with his political rivals



TUN Dr Mahathir Mohamad has effectively negated all that was accorded to him as a statesman.

Sitting in the same row as his political rivals — or should we say “former” — whom he had regarded as pariahs in the past, revealed an individual who simply cannot let go of his past grandeur.

Fighting a losing battle with Prime Minister Datuk Seri Najib Razak has spurred Dr Mahathir to do the unthinkable, especially for someone who once prided himself as a man of principle.

Allowing himself to be used by opportunists such as DAP adviser Lim Kiat Siong and his ilk for personal gains has turned Dr Mahathir into a spectre of his nemesis, Datuk Seri Anwar Ibrahim, who ran into the bosom of enemies after his fall from grace 18 years ago.

Dr Mahathir’s personal vendetta has provided a platform for hypocrites to thrive on. He claimed

that the signing of the declaration to depose Najib was apolitical, but surely he himself knows the truth, which is the tangent taken by Bersih not too long ago.

Precipitating a campaign that leads to the joining of hands among politicians is not an apolitical manoeuvre. How could it be when politicians are the ones leading a rebellion to remove the prime minister?

How could it not be without political distinction, when Dr Mahathir himself had strongly suggested the formation of a “council of elders” (with him as a member, of course), which is supposed to be an advisory set-up for the prime minister?

The mere proposal for a political authority, has effectively debunked claims that the declaration was not a self-serving initiative. It is in fact mind-boggling to claim that the declaration-signing event was neutral in nature.

Lim was all smiles on Friday, as he found himself sitting in the

same row as Dr Mahathir. A rare show of “unity” indeed.

Apparently, the Gelang Patah parliamentarian had forgotten that it was under Dr Mahathir’s administration as prime minister that his son, Guan Eng, was slammed behind bars under the Internal Security Act in 1987 and Sedition Act in 1994.

DAP is fond of portraying Malaysia’s first prime minister, the late Tunku Abdul Rahman, as a moderate and just leader.

Have they not read what Tunku had said about Dr Mahathir in 1988 during an interview with *The New York Times*?

Here’s an excerpt on the judicial crisis: “He (Dr Mahathir) then imposed his rule of despotism or tyranny on this country, at the expense of law and order.

“They set up a dictatorship. To be a complete dictator, you’ve got to take control of everything. But the judiciary is still independent. There’s only one thing blocking his way, the independent judiciary. Now he wants to compromise that independence.”

It was also said that during the interview, Tunku “was at pains to avoid calling Dr Mahathir by name”.

Dr Mahathir is, or was, a man who stands by his words and actions right until the end of his reign

as prime minister, much to the chagrin of detractors. Was DAP’s respect for Tunku farcical as well?

As for PKR, everyone knows its deputy president, Datuk Seri Azmin Ali, and Dr Mahathir shared a history together.

Prior to the attacks against Najib, there were rumours that they had met a few times, including overseas.

Ironically, Azmin was among the few in PKR who coined a number of derogatory terms reserved for Dr Mahathir, which were generously spewed during ceramah.

And on Thursday, both men were holding each other’s hands, raising them in the air to symbolise unity against aspects of tyranny.

Again, how ironic and awkward it must have looked.

Alas, political expediency takes precedence over integrity and principles. Perhaps, he is no longer the “Mahazalim” (great oppressor) or “Mahafiraun” (great pharaoh) as once labelled so fervently by the opposition?

It is difficult to withhold the same “admiration” for Dr Mahathir, after he reneged on his words about staying true to his former party and principles. He is among those who justify the reason why many politicians cannot be trusted.