

12 December 2007

**Mr. John Worsley**

**31 James Ruse CI Windsor 2756**

**Luke's spirit will be happy if Media doesn't hide the truth about my letter**

Dear Sir,

On 25 November 2007 I called you to extend my sympathies to you and your family for the sadness and hard time you had in those days and you said thank you to me on the phone. I asked you whether or not I am allowed to send you a letter to express my feelings more for the sympathy and you gave me permission. I told you that I had found your address from white page and I read the address for you to make sure it is correct. On the same day I wrote you a letter of sympathy to you to comfort you and your family because I thought a short phone conversation was not enough.

In our culture when we send a sympathy card or letter, usually we receive a thank you card or letter. I thought you would send me a thank you card or a reply letter to appreciate for my sympathy letter. Suddenly I was shocked when I read in Daily Telegraph 5 December 2007 that you had said to the news limited that you were hurt by my letter. Now I have few questions from you:

1. The news limited, both Daily Telegraph and The Australian, have not published the truth about my letter, they have written something that I have never mentioned in my letter. When I noticed that both these two newspapers are liars I was thinking that maybe their report about Mr. John Worsley who had said he was hurt was not true, so I decided to write a letter and ask you first because I don't trust those two newspapers anymore. My first question:  
Have you said such a thing to Daily Telegraph? Is it true that you said you were hurt by my letter?  
If the answer is negative please ignore this letter. If it is true and you have said you were hurt please answer next question:
2. Did anyone ask you directly or indirectly to say that? Or it was your own decision and choice? If anyone has advised you to commend such a thing, please ignore my other questions.
3. Would you please explain that you have been hurt by which part of my letter?
  - A. Were you hurt by this part?  
*"I am so sorry for the very difficult time you and your family have had in these days"*  
I don't think so because there is not anything negative here.
  - B. Were you hurt by this part?  
*"23 November 2007 like many other days is a tragic day for the family of all innocents who have been killed unfair and unjust by the oppressors."*

I don't think so because of course you support the innocents who have been killed unfair by oppressors.

**C.** Were you hurt from this part?

*"I am concerned about you and your family. I am also concerned about the family of three innocent civilians who have been killed possibly by the Australian soldiers unjustly as the Defence spokesman Brigadier Andrew Nikolic said that it was not clear if the civilians were killed by Australian gunfire or by the Taliban (Sydney Morning Herald, 24 November)."*

I don't think so because I have expressed my concerns about your family and the family of the civilians who were killed in that operation. So there is not any negative issue in this part as well.

**D.** Were you hurt by this part?

*"23 November like many other days is wake up call for all Australians to think more about the value of the life of innocent people, about the operation which many types of damages it causes in the society, about an oppressed system that takes human being to the wrong direction of the future, about the evil we do while we think it is good and blessing, about killing innocent while we are proud of it, about satanic politics that encourages innocent young soldiers to go to the unjust battles."*

I don't think so because all these words are the words that Australian Government has announced them. Australian Government says that the life of innocent is valuable, and says that is against evil and killing innocents, and says that is not good to incite young people to go to the unjust battles.

My words have been exactly what the Australian Government has already expressed them.

**E.** Were you hurt by this part:

*"I extend my deepest sympathies to the family of all innocent people who were killed by Afghani Government, American Government, Iraqi Government, Australian Government etc.*

*It is not possible to send letter to all families that lost their son, daughter, father, mother, brother, sister or even their baby in Afghanistan and Iraq and other countries because they are not a few, they are not few hundreds, they are not even few thousands. How can I express my feelings for all these families around the world. It is painful for any human being to hear from the news that almost every day a family loses a member because of the unfair war.*

*It was nice of Chief of Defence Force Air Chief Marshal Angus Houston that has extended his sympathies to your family on the website of Defence but I don't know why he has not had any comment for the family of three innocents who were killed in that operation"*

I don't think so because you also support the life of innocents, don't you? I don't see anything offensive in this part as well.

**F.** Were you hurt from this part?

*“I am wondering whether or not the Australian Government will arrange a ceremony for those three innocent civilians who were killed possibly by Australians. I think the Australian Government should arrange a ceremony for the respect to innocent civilians whether they have been killed by Australians or not, because Australian Government always has expressed its supporting for human rights and now the Government should show that cares about human being without any racism or discrimination whatever nationality or religion it is. I think it is nice that you request the Department of Defence to arrange such a ceremony if you like.”*

I don't think so because I have asked you to request the Defence Department to arrange a ceremony to express the respect of Australian Government for the Afghan civilians who were killed. Also I have mentioned “if you like”. So I don't see any negative thing in this part too.

**G.** Were you hurt by this part?

*“It is painful to see innocents are killed. No, I am not proud of evil. It is painful to see the life of one man is more valuable than the life of another equal man just because of the race. No, I am not proud of such a policy. It is painful to see that the Governments say things which they do not believe in them. No, I am not proud of Governmental hypocrisy”*

I don't think so because you are not proud of evil, are you? You believe that the lives of all human beings are equal, don't you? You like that all governments in the world believe in what they say and you believe that they should avoid the policy of Hypocrisy, don't you? So there is not any negative thing or offensive issue in this part too.

**H.** Were you hurt by this part?

*“Dear Mr. John Worsley it is painful but we should be proud when we lose our dear kids for defending our country while we are unjustly attacked by another country but it is more painful and we can't be proud when we lose our dear kids for nothing! We lose our dear kids for nothing If we unjustly attack to another country and our kids are killed while the other country is defending itself.”*

I don't think so because there is not any negative matter or offensive comment here:

I have mentioned two “General formulas” for two “General Conditions”:

Condition one: If we are unjustly attacked by another country.

Condition two: If we unjustly attack another country.

I have said that in condition 1 we can be proud and in condition 2 we can't be proud.

These two general sentences are right and everyone agrees with that. If we are unjustly attacked by another country we must be proud if we lose our kids, don't we?

The second general sentence also is talking about the condition that our country unjustly attack another country, in that condition we can't be proud if we lose our kids. So this is a

general sentence for a general condition and of course you believe in that. If Australia one day unjustly attack USA and we lose our kids we can't be proud. Has Australia unjustly attacked any country? Of course you say that Australia has not unjustly attacked any country. So then why were you hurt? If you are hurt by my letter, it means you believe that Australia has unjustly attacked another country. Dear Sir, please make it clear for me: Do you believe that Australia has unjustly attacked another country? If not, so you must not be hurt. That sentence is a general sentence. Looks like if I say for example: "Anybody who rapes a girl must not be proud." Then if a man says to me:

"Hey, wait a minute, why did you say that? I didn't like your sentence. I was hurt by your comment", in that case I will definitely answer: "Are you rapist? If you are not a rapist, nor the supporter of the rape, why did you get hurt when I said a general formula about rape? Do you know that by announcing that you have been hurt you have announced that you are a rapist or the supporter of the rape?"

Dear John Worsley, do you know that by announcing the public that you have been hurt from a general sentence regarding unjust attack, you have announced to public that Australia has unjustly attacked another country? Are you aware that you have accused Australia by pretending that you have been hurt from my letter? Will you apologise from Australians?

Another point is the highlight of the sentence in my letter by **Bold** which clearly shows what the message of the letter is.

**I.** Were you hurt from this part?

*"May God grant you and your family patience. Amen."*

I don't think so because I have been praying for you and your family and this can't hurt you. You believe in God, don't you? So I don't think my pray for you or mentioning the word God in my letter has hurt you unless you are an atheist. To me you appear you believe in God and you won't get hurt by receiving a praying letter.

So tell me please what has hurt you? There is nothing you can find in my letter to claim that it meant to hurt you.

Instead of THANK YOU, you have said to the newspaper that you were HURT. After Daily Telegraph and The Australian published their lies, my life has been threatened by Non Muslim Terrorists in Australia and overseas, ASIO and AFP are watching the sites which incite the public for violence against me and other Muslims but they do nothing! I have received many harassments and life-threatening warnings. As a result of what you have said to the news and what the news has lied, the image of Muslims and Islam has been damaged. These two articles were planned to damage Islam. Did you cooperate with them deliberately or your cooperation was just by mistake?

Were all of these lies in the newspapers about me a conspiracy against Muslims? Was any individual or any group like liberal party was behind this to revenge from Muslims because of the defeat in the election? Was there any political Mafia behind

this? Did all these happen because I had announced that I had a formal evidence to prove that the Government of Mr. John Howard was a terrorist Government?

Was this because I have published a formal and governmental evidence on my website that proves Mr. Philip Ruddock must be charged for terrorist offense? What was the reason for this conspiracy? These are the questions that I will try to find their answers as much as I can.

Dear John Worsley,

I expect you to tell the truth to the Media. If you tell the truth they won't be able to continue this conspiracy and they won't damage the image of Islam more than this. Please tell them the truth about what we talked about on our telephone conversation before I wrote you the letter. Please tell them the truth that which sentence in my letter has been highlighted in **Bold** and which one was not. Please tell them the truth about the reason I wrote the letter.

By telling the truth at least you can make the spirit of your son happy. It is not Islam's fault if you have lost your son, so it is nice of you if you ask the Media not to revenge from Muslims and not to lie about my letter. Please ask Media to print all of the letter, they printed only some parts of the letter to hide the truth. Please ask Media to highlight the sentence that was highlighted. We expect Media to be honest. We expect Media not to be under influence of any individual or any party.

We should not let Daily Telegraph play and use the spirit of your son to have a weapon to hit Muslims. It is not our fault if you have lost your son. We also should not let "The Australian", this newspaper which is supposed to respect the spirit of Australians, spends from the spirit of your son and by publishing lies makes your son's spirit suffer and makes political Mafia against Islam happy. It is not your son's fault if some parts of our Media are not honest today.

Dear John Worsley you say that you are proud of your son. Do you think the spirit of your son is proud of *the Australian* that has said such a big lie against a Muslim priest by taking advantage of Luke's spirit? I tell you one example. The Australian has written in its offensive article:

*A MYSTERIOUS Muslim cleric has written to the grieving family of slain Australian soldier Luke Worsley saying their son "died for nothing" while carrying out an "evil" act.*

Have I said that? Is this what I said? Have I said that your son died for nothing while carrying out an evil act? I thought I was the one who needed to improve my English, now I see that "The Australian" needs to improve its English as well as me to understand what I have written. The fact is that they don't need to improve their English, their English is very good, they just need to improve their spirituality and decide to be honest with their readers.

Do you think that Luke's spirit is proud of the people who spend from him to make some political groups happy? You say your son was brave, don't you think his father also must be brave to request the Media stop taking advantage of Luke's spirit and tell the public the TRUTH.

These two newspapers must apologise from Luke's spirit for what they have done. They have made that spirit a toy to play a political game against Muslims. They have made Luke's spirit a weapon to win in their unfair fight. Luke's spirit now is aware that what the fact is.

**Dear John Worsley you owe us an apology! Waiting for your apology!**

Regards

**Sheikh Haron**

Cc:

- Prime Minister Mr. Kevin Rudd
- Mr. Robert McClelland, Attorney-General
- Mr. Paul Osullivan, ASIO
- Police Commissioner, Mr. Mick Keelty (AFP)
- Australian Labor Party
- The liberal Party of Australia