

The inaccuracy and unfairness of the article published by the Australian

6 December 2007

1. The title of the article says: '*Sheikh*' *offends grieving family*.

This sentence is inaccurately reporting about the letter and you cannot find any phrase in the letter which has offended grieving family.

The reason for this inaccurate report by using these specific words in the title was inciting the public particularly non Muslim Aussies against Muslims, and to stir up anti-Islamic sentiment.

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 word Sheikh is written between the two marks to add to the weight of defamation as shown: '*Sheikh*'

It was written like this not only in the Australian's article on 6 December 2007 but also in the article of news.com.au.

3. The article starts with: “*A MYSTERIOUS Muslim cleric*” for two reasons: A. For defamation. B. To stir up more and to incite the ill feelings. The word has not been typed in lower case deliberately.
4. 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 we 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.
5. 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.
6. One of the most important part of the article which is obviously an inaccurate report and shows that the author has deliberately decided to incite the public against Muslims, is the following part: “*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.*”

In the letter of Sheikh Haron to Mr. Worsley, the word “evil” has been mentioned twice in the different part of the letter but the author has moved that word to another paragraph and has stuck it to different sentence which doesn’t exist: “their son died for nothing”. The word “evil” in the letter has been mentioned for killing innocent people in the paragraph 5. Also it has been mentioned in paragraph 10 for the same subject. The author borrowed the word “evil” from those paragraphs to use it for paragraph 11. Also he has created the following phrase which doesn’t exist: *their son “died for nothing.* The author needed to have some suitable words for his own created phrase, so he decided to create the word “act” and “carry out” to make his inaccurate sentence completed. Mr. Richard Kerbaj really deserves to get a reward, he is very professional to create inaccurate stories and therefore he can be very useful for some parts of Media.

7. The third paragraph is inaccurate: *The letter, also posted on Sheikh Haron’s website, urges Mr Worsley not to “be proud” of his son.* As it has already been mentioned, you cannot find in any part of letter, a sentence which indicates directly or indirectly that urges Mr Worsley not to be proud of his son.
8. In the article there is another inaccurate report: *Muslim leaders last night condemned the letter....*

The author has not written: “Some of Muslim leaders”, but has written a general word: “Muslim leaders”. This means “all” of the Muslim leaders have been questioned by the Australian and “all” of them have condemned the letter, and “all” of them on the same night (5 December 2007) have condemned it. Firstly this is inaccurate because the Australian has not contacted “all” of the Muslim leaders, secondly even if the Australian would mention “some Muslim leaders” instead of “Muslim leaders”, still there would be a question mark about the accuracy of such a description: “leader”. If the Australian contact one or two Muslim scholars, it doesn’t

mean that has contacted a LEADER, and also it doesn't mean that has contacted ALL of the leaders.

9. The article says that Mr. Khalil Shami questioned the identity of Sheikh Haron and condemned him for spreading hate.

So Sheikh Haron also should be given the opportunity to say his views and specially to answer Mr. Khalil Shami about what he has accused Sheikh Haron regarding "spreading hate".

10. We read in the end of the article: *The Australian contacted Sheikh Haron through his website last night, but received only an auto-reply email saying: "We regret to say it is not possible to reply to all comments."*

The Australian is not honest about TRYING TO CONTACT Sheikh Haron because from July 2007 the Australian and the Daily Telegraph has repeatedly received the letterhead of Sheikh Haron which contains the phone number, the fax number, the postal address and a direct email address of Sheikh Haron. The point is that "The Australian" preferred not to talk to Sheikh Haron before publishing the article because if Sheikh Haron would explain what he meant in his letter to Mr. John Worsley, all these plans and set up for inaccurately reporting could be cancelled. At the same time The Australian needed to mention in the article that HAS TRIED TO CONTACT Sheikh Haron, so the best way was sending an email through the website and few hours later start publishing the article. Good on you!

Sheikh Haron's Website