

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW,  
GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNICATION  
(IJLGC)**[www.ijlgc.com](http://www.ijlgc.com)**MANAGING THE PANDEMIC – EASING THE CRISIS**Noor Fariah Mohd Noor<sup>1\*</sup><sup>1</sup> College of Law, Government & International Studies, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia  
Email: fariah@uum.edu.my

\* Corresponding Author

**Article Info:****Article history:**

Received date: 09.11.2020

Revised date: 15.11.2020

Accepted date: 10.12.2020

Published date: 31.12.2020

**To cite this document:**

Mohd Noor, N. F. (2020). Managing the Pandemic-Easing the Crisis. International Journal of Law, Government and Communication, 5 (21), 228-239.

**DOI:** 10.35631/IJLGC.5210018.This work is licensed under [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)**Abstract:**

We have been under MCO since Jun 2020. All due to the unwanted spread of the deadly pandemic Covid 19 originated from Wuhan China. When the order was about to be lifted came the new Covid super spreader that has the impact of affecting those within the vicinity of the infected person. These phenomena are expected to continue hence the new normality need to be adopted. The movement had to be restricted in some way or another. The question thus arises to what extent does restriction to movement is allowed as freedom of movement is rights guaranteed in our constitution. Restricting movement during MCO is similar to restricting fundamental liberties provided under Art 9 freedom of movement of the Federal Constitution. Though morality is something personal but law-making may be influenced by morality standards. Despite law having the force of law yet no sensible people would tolerate immorality. This paper will discuss how morality can be aligned to legality as well as how legality can pose the opposite. The rationale of both sides can give us some views of how the line is treaded and provide guidance in combatting the pandemic in a correct way.

**Keywords:**

Pandemic, Freedom Of Movement, Morality, Legality

**Introduction**

The relationship between law and morality have been debated in the past. While some believe that law and morality should be independent of each other, others believe otherwise. John Austin established a doctrine that for the purpose of the jurist, law is absolutely independent of morality, while Aristotle was of the opinion that there must be a relationship between law and

morality (Feinberg, 1963). According to him, Aristotle believed that politics or political science must pursue and preach virtue and morality because political science is the science of police (Felltham Owen, 2016). The main concern of political science is the realization of “human good” which includes virtue and morality. Human good does not mean the attainment of material satisfaction- fulfilment of material needs. Virtue, morality or precepts of good life are all known to everybody and, since man is reasonable, he will spontaneously and enthusiastically follow the principles of virtue and morality (Locke; Hart; A. W. Price, 2011).

Austin was also influenced by Bentham legal positivism (Jeremy Bentham, 2008). Although law and morality have their own characteristics that set them apart, it has been proven that law and morality have a close connection of mutual understanding between each other (Quinn; Sidgwick, 2014). The drink and drive is one example where morality and law is adopted. Drunk driving is a contributor road trauma in Malaysia. No matter where you are in Malaysia, drunk driving is treated as a serious offence and any person who is found to be operating a vehicle over the legal limit, may face penalties ranging from the suspension, disqualification or cancellation of their license, fines, or imprisonment for more serious drink driving offences (Malay Mail, Jun 11th 2020).

The divide between law and morality past and current are never resolved clearly. The fact remains, more often than not law is created for its own reason quite slippery to the need of morality unless the consequence is so rigorous that warrant its intervention. This paper attempt to discuss how morality can be aligned to legality as well as how legality short of morality can pose a problem of its own. The rational of knowing both side can provide guidance in combatting the pandemic in a correct way as restricting movement is contrary to the constitutional guarantee of fundamental freedom and how could morality be used in situation like MCO.

### **Morality versus Legality**

According to doctrine, morality can be defined as something that represents a set of concepts and rules about good or bad, right or wrong, and what is allowed and not allowed. It was society and social groups that created the norms of morality. It is a set of beliefs, values and principles and behaviour standards which are created and enforced by society (Wong, David B, 2006).

Given that morality may not be supported if it has no force of law. Clashes between morality and law can be strenuous. We come across issues like this pandemic where restricting movement is contrary to constitutional freedom of movement. But for public health concern, it is much warranted. Likewise killing is illegal but in time of dire situation and self-defence, they are acceptable. There are several actions which prohibits one from doing an illegal activity, but the action could actually result in good outcome for the society or protects a person’s interest. A proper example which is very debatable is killing in self-defense. Murder is a very serious crime and in multiple countries may even result to a death sentence. An eye for an eye. This is the case for normal murder, “normal” as it was done by intentional action, but it is debatable when one committed murder in order to save himself from being harmed or killed. A conflict between two persons could cause a scenario where the atmosphere is escalated to physical contact which may cause an immediate apprehension of death on the side which is being harmed or threaten. The nature of human will cause one to react excessively to protect himself from being harmed disregarding the impact it can bring to oneself. The Malaysian law under the Penal Code has made clear under Section 96 that “Nothing is an offence which is done in the exercise of the right of private defence”. The right of private defence is stipulated under

the following Sections from 97 to 106 which includes rape, kidnapping, robbery or arson. These are some severe crime that could give a victim the free pass to defend himself from being harmed in such ways even to the extent of causing the death of the other person.

The law has certainly been enacted to protect the subjects or citizens from harm and to safeguard their interests in different occasions but there is Section 99 of the Penal Code which gives restrictions to the right of private self-defence. The two subsections which received criticism from some people with differing view is Section 99(3) and 99(4). These subsections states that “there is no right of private self-defence in cases in which there is time to have recourse to the protection of the public authority” and “there is no right of private self-defence to the inflicting of more harm than it is necessary to inflict for the purpose of defence”. To put in simpler words, the law is saying one must not exercise private self-defence if he has the time to call the police or other authorities and one must not exercise his right under private self-defence with excessive infliction of harm and only with reasonable damage.

The pandemic situation is also in the similar vein in the sense that freedom guaranteed under the constitution no longer are applicable. The movement control order was made under Prevention & Control of Infectious Disease (measures within infected local area (No 2) Regulations 2020 (the MCO regulation) were gazetted by the health minister on 31st march 2020 pursuant to powers conferred on him under sub sec 11(2) of Prevention & Control of Infectious Disease Act 1988 (Act 342).

Consequently, The Prevention & Control of Infectious Disease (Declaration of infected local areas) Order 2020 PU (A) 87/2020) declared all states and federal territories in Malaysia to be infected local areas thereby making the MCO regulations applicable to the whole of the country.

The government was able to do this because the Act provides that if the minister is satisfied that there is an outbreak of an infectious diseases in any area in Malaysia and that any area is threatened with an epidemic of any infectious diseases, he may, by order in the gazette, declared such area to be an infected area.

Sec 11(2) only empowers the health minister to make regulations to prevent or control the spread of any infectious disease “within or from any infected local area” it was necessary to give a broad definition to the meaning of “infected local area” so as to enable the MCO regulations to have nationwide application – if only specific areas within the country were named as infected local areas, the regulations could not be used to control movement between areas that were not so identified.

Consequently, The Prevention & Control of Infectious Disease (Declaration of infected local areas) Order 2020 PU (A) 87/2020) declared all state and federal territories in Malaysia to be infected local areas thereby making the MCO regulations applicable to the whole of the country. According to sec 22 of the Act, any breach of the Act who obstruct or assist in impeding any authorised officer to carry out their duties, disobey the lawful order, refuse to furnish any information as required by Act and giving false information, commits and offence. The penalties are fine not exceeding one thousand ringgit or jail not more than 6 months or both.

The law has already shown some impact. Deputy Health Minister, Datuk Dr Noor Azmi Ghazali, who was fined previously for violating the then Movement Control Order (MCO). In April, the trained medical doctor, together with Perak Executive Councillor (Exco) Razman Zakaria and 13 other individuals were fined RM1,000 each by the Magistrate's Court, for defying the MCO by attending a lunch gathering in Lenggong on April 17, 2020 (Malay Mail, August 2020).

On 25th August, police arrested 81 individuals for various offences against the recovery movement control order (MCO) on Tuesday (Aug 25). The total, 22 were held under remand while 59 had been issued compounds for their offences during checks by authorities. "Among the violations committed were failure to provide check-in facilities for customers (31), activities without observing physical distancing rules (24), not wearing face masks (16) and premises operating beyond stipulated hours (four). Anyone who violates the SOP, also had to pay RM1,000. Nobody were let off (Malay Mail, August 2020).

This is how morality were infused in the law. How it can be maintained is yet to be seen and tested over times.

### **Limitations**

Another issues that follows is to what extent, restraining the freedom of movement justifiable. What type of standard used to ensure the limitation imposed were proportionate to the harm caused?

To flesh out the issues, it is important to see behind the reason why the law was enacted in the first place. The law may be enacted in a sense that could put an innocent person's interest at a disadvantage. That's why the court is given the power to interpret the law to determine whether the law is used for greater good and preventing harm or otherwise. Court has already given different interpretation on vague words such as the reasonable harm in terms of right of self-defense. Lord Morris stated in the case of *Palmer* (1971) AC814 that "If there has been an attack so that defense is reasonably necessary it will be recognized that a person defending himself cannot weigh to a nicety the exact measure of his necessary defensive action. If a Jury thought that in a moment of unexpected anguish a person attacked had only done what he honestly and instinctively thought was necessary, that would be most potent evidence that only reasonable defensive action had been taken." – in other words, the right to self defense is justified when in time of emergency and hostile situation where emotion can take over the rational thinking.

Therefore, the act deemed as immoral become lawful self-defence taken in an anguish moment. Another law that is equal to the above is banning of alcohol. Alcohol is not good in many senses, banning it actually are morally warranted. In Malaysia, although we are a Muslim majority country, the selling of alcohol are permitted to the non-Muslims. There are no nationwide alcohol bans being enforced in the country, with the exception of Kelantan and Terengganu. In 2011, Malaysia was named the tenth-largest consumer of alcohol by the World Health Organization. Even with the high sales tax rate, alcohol is readily consumed and accessible in many cafe, supermarkets and mini markets throughout the country. The federal territory of Kuala Lumpur has the highest alcohol consumption in the country, followed by the states of Sarawak in second place and Sabah in third place (The Star, 2013, May 11).

The legal age of drinking for Malaysia is 21 years old and above, which was officially changed from the previous legal drinking age of 18 with effect from 1 December 2017. However, the enforcement on the new legal drinking age of 21 was held back until 16 October 2018 (New Straits Times, June 2016). Also, any vendors, restaurants and retailers need a license to serve or sell beers, liquor and spirits in the country, but bottled and canned beers are exempted from such license requirements which is why it is common to find many vendors and coffee houses continue to serving alcohol in their premises without any license throughout the country. Malaysia also impose a nationwide regulation for vendors to place their alcoholic drinks into separate refrigerators or storage places, although this was opposed by certain vendors (New Straits Times, June 2016).

Moreover, drunk driving is number one contributor to road accident in Malaysia. No matter where you are in Malaysia, drunk driving is treated as a serious offence and any person who is found to be operating a vehicle over the legal limit, may face penalties ranging from the suspension, disqualification or cancellation of their license, fines, or imprisonment for more serious drink driving offences (New Straits Times, June 2016).

The legal limit for alcohol while driving in Malaysia is 80 milligrams per decilitre or 100 millilitres. In addition, it is also an offence for a person to refuse to undergo a breathalyser test for either alcohol or drugs if requested by the police. To test for drunk driving, the driver is given a breathalyser test. To test for substance abuse, the driver is required to do a urine test. The results are then tested in a booth, which forms part of the frequent roadblocks that the police and Road Transport Department conduct in the cities. (Ramon, J, C, USA today 2020).

The sad reality is that a significant amount of road deaths in Malaysia is caused by drunk driving, so it is essential that the penalties reflect the gravity of the offence. According to a study done by the Malaysian Institute of Road Safety Research, about 23.3% of drivers in fatal accidents were tested positive for alcohol, according to this study done in 2012. A drunk driver is 13 times more likely to cause an accident (Ramon, J, C, USA today 2020).

Section 43 of the Road Transport Act 1987 states that a person who drives “without due care and attention or without reasonable consideration for another person using the road” is considered guilty of an offence. According to this section, drunk driving is punishable, and if offenders are found guilty, they can expect to pay a fine of up to RM 10,000 and a maximum period of imprisonment of 12 months.

Basically, if you operate a motor vehicle in any public place when you are intoxicated to the point where you are unable to control your motor vehicle, or your blood alcohol concentration (BAC) levels exceed the legal limits, you commit an offence under section 44. The section is worded in such a way that the offender will be guilty whether he is drunk and driving, or do not appear to be drunk, but the BAC exceeds the legal limit. Upon conviction under section 44 the offender has to pay a fine of not less than RM 8,000, up to a maximum of RM 20,000 and jail time of a minimum of 3 years.

Besides, a person does not need to be driving the actual vehicle to fall into trouble with the authorities. This is because according to section 45 and 45A of the Road Transport Act 1987, one can commit an offence just by being in the vehicle if the BAC levels are too high. Remember that alcohol impairs one’s ability to control a vehicle. Research suggests that at a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.08%, the risk of being involved in a traffic crash is



double that of a person who has not been drinking at all. There is no absolute safe level of alcohol consumption for competent driving. Even after a few drinks, your driving ability is affected. The more you drink, the higher your blood alcohol concentration, and the greater your chance of having an accident. (Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020).

In February 2020, it was reported by The Star Online that a 34 years old man was killed after his car was hit by another vehicle allegedly driven by a drunk driver. It was reported that Abdul Salam Saad, who was from Bandar Tun Abdul Razak in Pahang, was killed on the spot due to serious injuries. In the 3.20am incident, Abdul Salam had apparently just exited the Pajam toll along KM17.5 of the Lekas Highway and was heading towards Seremban. Supt Mohamad Nor said preliminary probe showed that the 30 years old driver of the other car, a Ford Fiesta, had entered the opposite lane and crashed into Abdul Salam with Proton Persona and three other motorcyclists (The Star, 2020).

To conclude, nowadays there are many cases about drunk driving that has caused road accidents as it is occurring every day. This offence should impose harsher sanction the government is studying the need for stiffer penalties for motorists found guilty of driving under the influence of alcohol and drugs, as well as for dangerous driving and causing death, with a fine of up to RM100,000, besides the fine, the jail sentence for the offender will be increased to 20 years from the current 10 years. The government initiative to help ensuring the safety of people on road is highly welcomed. If the case of drunk driving is not decreasing; alcohol should be ban in Malaysia as it does more harm than good to human life (The Star, 2020).

All these shows that morality is merely included when dire situation like this demands so. This is where the unwarranted control of movement resulting from the restriction order fits in. Wicked as it may sound addressing divergences through this manner would likely endure time and pressure as the bearing it brings to overall public safety is undoubtedly incredible.

### **Cases Regarding Control of Movement Art 9 in Malaysia**

Since the MCO touches on freedom of movement brief explanation on court cases affecting right of movement would be helpful to give better insights. Malaysian case on freedom of movement can inter alia be found in cases below.

In *Pihak Berkuasa Negeri Sabah v Sugumar Balakrishnan & Another* (2002) 4 CLJ 105, was about restricting movement where he was denied entry to Sabah under the Immigration Act, due to alleged immoral activity. He challenged Sec 59a of Immigration Act 1959 as contrary to art 9, freedom of movement. Sec 59a of Immigration Act 1959 stipulate entry to Sabah can be restricted and such decision was final and absolute and cannot be challenged in court. Sugumar appeal and his appeal was allowed where Court of Appeal held that unless for national security reason entry to Sabah should be allowed. However, on appeal, the federal court held that the decision by the Immigration Department was conclusive provided the parties can show there is procedural defect failing which entry can be restricted.

The next law that regulate freedom of movement is under art 149 and 150. Both provisions relate with subversion and emergency cases. A prominent law in this area is the Restricted Residence Enactment (RRE). It permits the making of orders to exclude citizens from particular area, to require him to reside in a designated area and not to leave that area without priori police permission. The law was enacted in 1933 as part of preventive criminal measures to curb

activities of secret societies and to remove criminal elements from area of harm who could not be banish due to the guarantee of law (Faruqi S.S, 2019).

Whilst in *Assa Singh vs MB Johor* (1969) 2 MLJ the validity of RRE was challenged but the court held that the law was a valid measure to promote public order and security.

Again, in *Cheow Siong Chin v Timbalan Menteri* (1986) 2 MLJ 235, the plaintiff has been arrested under the RRE and detained initially in police custody and then in prison. The grounds of his detention were that as a registered dealer in commodity trading he had cheated the public by giving false promises and making false declaration as a result of which investors sustained considerable financial loss. Subsequently an order was made requiring him to reside in the town of Gua Musang for the period of three years from the date of the order. The plaintiff applied for habeas corpus challenging the order. The application was dismissed in the High Court and subsequently dismissed again at Supreme Court due to public order ground. Yet again attempt to challenge the restriction order failed.

Likewise, in *Loh Kooi Choon v. Government of Malaysia*. Loh had been detained by the Royal Malaysian Police under a warrant issued under the provisions of the Restricted Residence Enactment 1933 (RRE). Article 5(4) of the Constitution specified that any person arrested "be produced before a magistrate and shall not be further detained in custody without the magistrate's authority" guaranteeing him the right of "habeas corpus". Loh was denied this right and sued the Police for damages. However, his claim was rejected on the grounds that the Police had acted in compliance with a warrant issued by a competent authority. Loh appealed to the Federal Court. Raja Azlan Shah FJ (as he then was) followed Lord Macnaghten ruling in *Vacher & Sons Ltd v London Society of Compositors* [1913] AC 107 118: "Some people may think the policy of the Act unwise and even dangerous to the community. Some may think it at variance with principles which have long been held sacred. But, the duty of the court, and its only duty, is to expound the language of the Act in accordance with the settled rules of construction..."

Meanwhile the current case regarding freedom of movement inter alia can be seen in *Tony Pua vs DG Immigration Dept 2017* (Nur Farzana Md Yusof, 2017). In this case Petaling Jaya Utara MP Tony Pua's challenge the decision of the Immigration Department director-general to impose a travel ban on him. Federal Court held that the law is settled in *Loh Wai Kong's* case. As decided by (the then Lord President) Mohamed Suffian Mohamed Hashim, Loh had sought a ruling that Malaysian citizens are entitled to travel overseas as a fundamental right under Article 5 of the Federal Constitution provided the right is lawful (Nur Farzana Md Yusof, 2017).

The federal court reaffirmed the ruling of the court of appeal and held that right to personal liberty under Article 5 was only to challenge the authorities for any unlawful detention and that the right to travel was only a privilege. Federal court reiterated although the right to life and personal liberty were guaranteed under the constitution, any deprivation of such a right was permissible so long as it is in accordance with the law. Judge Idrus Harun unanimously held that Section 59 (of the Immigration Act) is, law enacted by Parliament and this was legal as the law was approved by a competent legislature and was not unconstitutional.

He had also said there was no express provision or implied duty for the director-general under the Immigration Act to state his reason for imposing the travel ban. Pua was issued a travel ban

as he was under police investigation for being involved in an activity claimed detrimental to parliamentary democracy.

Thus, most cases above relate with freedom of movement which come under RRE along with other issues like travel ban for public safety reason. This will give some idea on how Art 9 were applied and the limitations prevailing and its importance to national peace and how best to fit in during the pandemic Covid 19.

### **Islamic Methods of Dealing with Crisis**

In the light of recent events in the 21st century, it is becoming extremely difficult to ignore the existence of wars, crisis, and disasters, which led us to call the 21st century as a century of crises, given the changes it created in the various political, economic and environmental aspects, including the outbreak of the pandemic of COVID-19, which affected human life within the entire world. Indeed, these crises added major challenges for individuals, institutions and decision-makers, facing them are necessary to avoid more human, material, and moral losses. The crisis is a dangerous and unexpected threat to the goals of individuals, institutions, and nations (Al Eid NA, Arnout BA, 2020).

This part will briefly highlight how Islam manage crisis in time of pandemic. The approach adopted by the government and all parts of the world are rather similar. Islam have always emphasized on morality. The Quran and Sunnah were the divine guidelines Muslims from all generations depend upon to guide their life in all aspects of life be it economic, social, politic, environment etc.

We have been caught unguarded when the pandemic came which affected the human life all over the world. Indeed, these crises added major challenges for individuals, institutions and decision-makers, that are necessary to counter to avoid more losses. The crisis is a dangerous and unexpected threat to the goals of nations.

Islam has provided ways to manage the crisis. The western thinker Bieber define crisis as a turning point from unstable situations, and could lead to undesirable outcomes, if the parties concerned are unwilling or unable to contain them and ward off the dangers (Bieber, R. M, 1988). Islamic thinkers Mustafa, too pointed crisis management is the continuous management process that is concerned with forecasting potential crises by sensing, monitoring internal and external environmental variables generating the crisis, and mobilizing the resource and available capabilities to prevent the crisis or deal with it, with the most efficiency and effectiveness, and to achieve the least amount of damage (Mustafa, J, 2005).

Barton on the other hand determined six features of the crisis, as follows:

1. Surprise: It means that crises occur without warning, or ring bells, but rather suddenly.
2. Lack of information: This means the lack of information on the cause of this crisis, and the reason is due to the lack of information, especially if it occurs for the first time (Barton, L. 2007).
3. Escalation of events: when crises occur, juveniles follow to tighten the trap on decision-makers.
4. Loss of control: all events of the crisis fall outside the ability and expectations of the decision-makers, so they lose control and control.
5. Panic: The crisis causes a state of panic, so the decision-maker will dismiss all those involved in the occurrence of the crisis, or resort to quarrels with his aides.



6. The absence of a rapid, fundamental solution: crises do not give the decision-maker a time or opportunity to reach a careful solution, but rather it is necessary to choose between a limited number of solutions and choose the least harmful (Barton, L.,2007).

Islam was the first to teach man how to handle crisis meticulously. The directives in the Holy Qur'an and honourable hadiths, such as preparing for crises before they occurred and verification of the validity of information, and strength in facing crises, strategic planning for crises, working in teams to face crises, and strategies to face crises are impliedly nor expressly laid down (Abu Farah, Y. 2009).

Izz al-Din (1990) and Maher (2006) determined that there are three phases of crisis management:

1. Pre-crisis phase: It includes all preventive procedures that avoid the occurrence of the crisis.
2. The stage of dealing with the crisis: it includes all procedures to achieve the maximum possible results (Abu Khalil, M. 2001).
3. Post-crisis phase: It includes all the procedures necessary to readapt to the outcome of the crisis, and this adjustment must be achieved in the behavioural, psychological, organizational, and financial aspects (Al-Khudairi, M. 2003).

The Quranic guideline goes way back in Prophet Muhamad's peace and blessings be upon him (pbuh) time, how he manages this crisis, for instance via insulation, The Prophet Muhammad, (pbuh), had established the principles of quarantine 1400 years ago and beyond, when he(pbuh), said: "If you heard about it on a land, do not step on it." (Maher, A. 2006). The Prophet Muhammad was the first to suggest quarantine and personal hygiene in cases of a pandemic, quarantine means isolating the infected people in a specific place and for a specific time with the availability of comprehensive health care until the disease and pathogens are controlled and ordered.

Prophet Muhammad said: "If you hear of its presence (the presence of plague) in a land, don't enter it, but if it spreads in the land where you are, don't fly from it". In these noble hadiths, an elaborate medical plan developed by the illiterate prophet at a time when there was no one known as a "quarantine" or others, obliging the Muslim who is present in a country where the plague was rampant not to come out of it even if it is healthy because it may have carried the disease, and whoever is outside the country should not enter it (Bin Al-Hajjaj, M. 2006).

Also, isolation and blocking epidemics are required from a religious point of view. Islam forbade the exit of a person from an endemic environment into a safe environment, and he does not enter into an endemic environment while in a healthy environment (Bin Al-Hajjaj, M. (2006).

Migration is also encouraged to flee from the pandemic. It was also narrated from Kathir bin Murrah that Abu Fatimah told him that he said: O Messenger of Allah, tell me of an action that I may do and persist in it." The Messenger of Allah said to him: You should emigrate, for there is nothing like it" (The Noble Qur'an).

In Surah An-Nisa-verse-97 God said "Indeed, those whom the angels take [in death] while wronging themselves [the angels] will say,"In what [condition] were you? They will say, "We were oppressed in the land. "The angels will say, "Was not the earth of Allah spacious [enough]

for you to emigrate therein? Immigration means moving from one place to another, temporarily or permanently, in residency, whether the migration took place by one person or by a group of people. Migration may be as follows: migration between continents, or migration between countries within a specific continent, or regional migration (within the country itself), and the most important forms of migration are migration from the countryside to cities in search of better life opportunities, and the search for work and safe and secure place in the new country. (Al Eid NA, Arnout BA. 2020).

The bottom line is that escaping from the pandemic and managing it is morally required, it is ordained in Islam and elsewhere. Many scientists above have defined ways to combat it in numerous paradigms, it implies that the crisis has no single method to adopt. As long as it is able to fight the pandemic effectively, they are celebrated. Nevertheless, the risk taking must be calculated so as the maximum impact enjoyed by the whole society can be firmly secured.

### Conclusion

This paper attempted to draw the line that divide morality and law. Findings show that closing the gap between the two is possible though faced with many challenges. MCO is new in the sense that the pandemic has attacked the world off guard with no preparation intact to resist it. The law that governed the freedom of movement is good in fact Malaysia is one of the countries that has effectively control the spread of the disease through its law and control movement order. In moral sense inflicting smaller harm to our freedom is better to prevent the bigger harm. Islam has always followed along this formula to prevent bigger woe which proves to be effective in the long run. The MCO indeed is much in line with what has been ordained in Islam in how the pandemic should be best managed and adopted. In the future not only matters falling under the pandemic should be morally considered but other aspects of life should also be supported and encouraged. The blueprint for success should be to blend both law and morality for only in that sense the peoples wellbeing can be well sustained.

### References

- Al Eid NA, Arnout BA. (2020) Crisis and disaster management in the light of the Islamic approach: COVID-19 pandemic crisis as a model (a qualitative study using the grounded theory). *J Public Affairs*. 2020; e2217. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2217>
- Abu Farah, Y. (2009). *Crisis management, integrated entrance*. Amman, Jordan: Athraa for Publishing and Distribution
- Abu Khalil, M. (2001). The position of principals of basic education schools on some crises and planning to face them. *The Future of Arab Education*, 7(21), 259–318.
- Al-Khudairi, M. (2003). *Crisis management: An administrative economic approach to resolving crises at the level of national economy and economic unity ( 2nd ed.)*. Cairo, Egypt: Madbouly Library.
- A. W. Price, 2011. *Virtue and Reason in Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford University Press, 2011, 356pp, ISBN 978019960961
- Assa Singh vs MB Johor (1969) 2 MLJ
- Barton, L. (2007). *Crisis leadership now: A real-world guide to preparing for threats, disaster, sabotage, and scandal*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Bin Al-Hajjaj, M. (2006). *Sahih Muslim*. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Thebes House for Publishing and Distribution.
- Bieber, R. M. (1988). Clutch Management in a Crisis. *Risk Management*, 35(4), 72. Google Scholar
- Cheow Siong Chin v Timbalan Menteri (1986) 2 MLJ 235

- Fazleena Aziz, Minimum drinking age raised to 21, effective 2017, New Straits Times. Retrieved from <https://www.nst.com.my/news/2016/06/149036/minimum-drinking-age-raised-21-effective-2017>
- Feinberg, Joel, Moral Limits of the Criminal Law. Volume 1, Harm to Others (New York ; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984) DOI : 10.1093/0195046641.001.0001
- Felltham Owen. Resolves Divine, Moral, Political. the 9th Impression. Wentworth Press (August 28, 2016).
- Govt mulls RM100,000 fine, 20 years' jail for drunk driving, The Star. (2020, February 15). Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2020/02/15/govt-mulls-rm100000-fine-20-years-jail-for-drunk-driving>.
- Hart, H. L. A., Law, Liberty and Morality (London, 1963)
- Jeremy Bentham (2008). An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation (Clarendon Press) 79.
- Impaired Driving: Get the Facts. Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, August 24, 2020. Retrieved from [https://www.cdc.gov/motorvehiclesafety/impaired\\_driving/impaired-driv\\_factsheet.html](https://www.cdc.gov/motorvehiclesafety/impaired_driving/impaired-driv_factsheet.html)Content source
- Ida Lim, Malaysias drink driving problem how big is it what the numbers actually say, Malay Mail, Jun 11th 2020
- Laws of Malaysia Act 574 Penal Code as at 1 January 2015
- Loh Kooi Choon v. Government of Malaysia (1977) 2 MLJ 187
- Locke, John, Locke on Toleration, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy (Cambridge, 2010)
- Malaysian Federal Constitution as at 1 November 2010
- Maher, A. (2006). General rules for dealing with crises (crisis management). Alexandria, Egypt: Alexandria University House.
- Mustafa, J. (2005). Educational administration new entrances to a new world. Cairo, Egypt: Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi
- Man, 34, dies after drunk driver crashes into car, three bikers. (2020, February 16). The Star. Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2020/02/16/man-34-dies-after-drunk-driver-crashes-into-car>
- Nawal A. Al Eid , Boshra A. Arnout (2020). Crisis and disaster management in the light of the Islamic approach: COVID-19 pandemic crisis as a model (a qualitative study using the grounded theory) retrieve from <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2217>
- Nur Farzana Md Yusof (November 6, 2017). Tony Pua's travel ban challenge fizzles out retrieve from <https://hakam.org.my/wp/2017/11/06/tony-puas-travel-ban-challenge-fizzles-out/#more-16218>
- Palmer v R [1971] AC 814
- Pihak Berkuasa Negeri Sabah v Sugumar Balakrishnan & Another (2002) 4 CLJ 105
- Ramon, J, C, Alcohol policies in Malaysia. Retrieved March 1, 2020, from <https://traveltips.usatoday.com/alcohol-policies-malaysia-108164.html>
- Road Transport Act 1987
- Sabah is 3rd highest in alcohol consumption, The Star (2013, May 11). Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2013/05/11/sabah-is-3rd-highest-in-alcohol-consumption/>
- Shad Saleem Faruqi (2019). Our Constitution, Malaysia: Sweet & Maxwell, pp. 425.
- Sidgwick, Henry, "The Theory of Evolution in Its Application to Practice", in Essays on Ethics and Method (Oxford University Press, 2003) DOI : 10.1093/mind/os-1.1.52
- The Noble Qur'an.

Quinn, Michael, “Popular Prejudices, Real Pains”, in *Bentham’s Theory of Law and Public Opinion*, ed. by Xiaobo Zhai and Michael Quinn (Cambridge University Press, 2014)

*Vacher & Sons Ltd v London Society of Compositors* [1913] AC 107 118

Wong, David B. (2006) *Natural Moralities: A Defense of Pluralistic Relativism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Yiswaree Palansamy, Deputy health minister who was fined for MCO violation calls for equal enforcement, *Malay Mail*. August 2020.