

## The inaccuracy and unfairness of the article published by news.com.au

5 December 2007

1. The title of the article says: '*Sheikh*' tells dead Digger's dad the loss was for nothing.

This sentence doesn't exist in the letter of Sheikh Haron. Also you cannot find in any part of Sheikh Haron's letter to Mr. John Worsley a sentence which contains such a meaning indirectly.

You might say the following sentence in the Sheikh Haron's letter contains such a meaning:

***Dear Mr. 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 another country and our kids are killed while the other country is defending itself.* (The Bold for highlight is original from the letter)

In the above sentences, two general conditions have been mentioned:

Condition A: In this condition we are defending our country while we are unjustly attacked by another country. In such a condition if we lose our kids for defending our country we must be proud.

Condition B: In this condition we unjustly attack another country and our kids are killed while the other country is defending itself. In such a condition we have lost our kids for nothing and we cannot be proud.

The letter explains about the two categories but doesn't mention that Mr. Worsley's son is categorised in which condition.

Some people say that Sheikh Haron has mentioned the word "unjustly" and the word "attack" and said: "*If we unjustly attack another country...*" So the question is that have we unjustly attacked another country? If you believe that Australia has unjustly attacked Afghanistan, in that case Mr. Worsley's son will be in category B. And if you believe that Australia has sent troops to Afghanistan for help, then Mr. Worsley's son will be in category A.

Please note: Sheikh Haron has not made any comment and has not mentioned whether Pte Luke Worsley was from category A or B, he has only said that the report was inaccurate and unfair.

2. The phrase: "*A MAN purporting to be a Muslim cleric*" is inaccurate and unfair because Sheikh Haron is a cleric and is not purporting to be a cleric.
3. The inaccurate report has stirred up the anti-Islamic sentiment and has caused more problems in the society in this sensitive time that our country needs peace. As a result some encouragement and inciting violence have already started and I hope the publication prevents the possible potential violence by correcting inaccurate reports

and by avoiding publishing the articles which indirectly incite violence between two different religious groups.

4. The inaccurate report of the article has incited many non-Muslims against Sheikh Haron and some other Muslims and has caused inconvenience and danger for both sides.

5. The article says: *“The letter, topped with Mr Worsley’s home address, has been posted on the internet by the mystery Sheikh.”*

Later many people have caused inconvenience for Sheikh Haron that why he has revealed the privacy of Mr. Worsley.

The publication without any check and investigation to see whether or not the address had already been revealed by white page on line, has published an unfair phrase and indirectly has given this wrong message to the public that Sheikh Haron has revealed the privacy of Mr. Worsley. In the correcting article, it is necessary this part to be corrected as well and to be mentioned that the address has been already publicly available.

6. The publication has deliberately mentioned the word “Mystery” before “Sheikh” to stir up more.

7. The article says: *“Former advisor on to John Howard on Islam, Dr Ameer Ali, said that the letter was ridiculous. “(Pte Worsley) did his duty, like any other public servant would, “Dr Ali said. “This man (who wrote the letter)...does not respect the lives of other human beings.”*

Mr. Ameer Ali has had opportunity to make comment about the letter and also has announced that Sheikh Haron did not respected the lives of other human beings, so it is fair if the news.com.au gives the opportunity to Sheikh Haron to say his own views like other people who had right to make comment. Also Sheikh Haron’s answer to Mr. Ameer Ali who says to the public: “This man does not respect the lives of other human beings” needs to be answered by Sheikh Haron as this sentence in the article has helped the author of article to incite non-Muslims against Sheikh Haron. Sheikh Haron should have right to reply to this accusing and offensive comment which has caused potential violence against him and some other Muslims.

### **Sheikh Haron’s Website**