

Rebuttal of the lies and injustices that the Memri website and some of the British media spread about me

[Statement By: [Dr. Hani Al Sibai](#)]

Al-Jazeera channel invited me to participate in a programme called •
(More than one viewpoint) on the 8/7/2005. The subject of the programme was (The London bombings) that took place on 7/7/2005.

The programme was broadcast live and lasted for 50 minutes. The programme is available in audio and written form on the Al-Jazeera website: www.aljazeera.net

I was surprised when two days later I found out that some elements in •
the media translated some extracts of the programme incorrectly and attributed to me words that I did not utter. Moreover, they misunderstood some of the phrases I used and took it out of context .which is evident of the bad intentions of the translator

Below I have given some examples of the inaccuracies in the translation and the grave errors that were unfairly attributed to me by the memri.org .website, Sunday times, Evening Standard and others
:The incorrect translation used by the media (1)

Al-Siba'i: "The term 'civilians' does not exist in Islamic religious law Dr.Karmi is sitting here, and I am sitting here, and I'm familiar with religious law. There is no such term as 'civilians' in the modern Western .sense. People are either of Dar Al-Harb or not
:The translated original text as I said it on al-Jazeera

Hani al-Sebai: First Mr Sami, there is no term in Islamic jurisprudence called "civilians." Dr. Karmi is here sitting with us, and he's well familiar with the jurisprudence. There is a "fighter" and "non-fighters." Islam is against the killing of innocents. The innocent man cannot be killed .according to Islam
:Commentary •

The lies in the former translation was that they stated I said "Dar al-Harb." In reality I didn't use either "Dar al-Harb" or "Dar al-Islam." These are intentional lies. There is a difference between those two expressions and the expressions I used (fighter and non-fighter). My talk is well understood by scholars and Arabic speakers, who know well that people are divided into Muslims and non-Muslims. As for non-Muslims, they are divided into: a) Non-Muslim fighters, b) Non-Muslim non-fighters. Under no circumstances, the latter should be killed or attacked; those who do

that commit terrible crime, because they (non-Muslim non-fighters) are innocent beings. The second expressions is what is described in modern Western terminology as a "civilian (madani in Arabic)." In Arabic, madani refers to the person who lives in the cities. Those who live outside the cities are countryside or desert dwellers. The term "non-fighter" applies, according to Islamic jurisprudence, includes city, desert and countryside dwellers. They should not be attacked or killed. And this is what I wanted to explain. I was hoping the translator would be familiar with those jurisprudence terms. But he didn't and .misinterpreted the real meaning of my talk

My opinion regarding the killing of innocents in the Islamic (2) Jurisprudence: I said more than once during the above-mentioned Al-Jazeera program: "The innocent is innocent according to Islam, and the .killing of an innocent is prohibited in Islam

So why didn't they translate these words? They handpicked what they wanted to translate. Bad intentions are clearly noticed. This is an .incitement to have me arrested by the British authorities

Sunday Times said on 17-7-2005(3)

:My words were once again misinterpreted

A LONDON-BASED Islamic radical has praised the suicide bomb "attacks on the capital. Hani Al-Siba'i, an Egyptian-born academic, described the attacks that killed at least 55 people as "a great victory" .that rubbed the noses of G8 countries in the mud

:Commentary •

I was providing different possibilities as to who could have been behind .this incident

No possibility should be ruled out. We do not rule out the possibility "that it was done by the intelligence agency of another Western country hostile to Britain. We do not rule out countries... or some Zionist Americans who wanted to overshadow the G-8 summit. But at the same .time, we do not rule out the Al-Qa'ida organization

I clearly stated during the program that if al-Qaeda did commit this • attack then it will claim this as a big victory, but this is from al-Qaeda's point of view, not mine. This wasn't not my personal view. I was analysing the event and the fallout from this tragic accident. This is :proved by what I said later

".Hani el-Sebai: I'm not a spokesperson for any group or anything else" .Sami Haddad: OK, you are only analyzing their views"

This was clearly understood by the program presenter, Sami Haddad. I was only analyzing their (al-Qaeda's) views. The attacks in their views constituted a victory, and they would have thought they brought the biggest eight countries in the world to the ground. My talk was in Arabic, and to those who understood Arabic. If it was in English, it would have taken me three hours or more to explain every word I say, so as the .English viewers wouldn't misunderstand it

To conclude, I did not praise, or salute the bombers. I clearly said "The • innocent is innocent according to Islam, and the killing of an innocent is ".prohibited in Islam

:Based on the previous points

I demand from Memri website to publish this entire statement, and (1

correct the errors included in their previous report, and to publish the script of al-Jazeera program broadcasted on 8 July 2005, without any .diversion

The website should publicly apologize for the mistakes it did, which (2 has instigated a hate campaign against me in some British publications, .as mentioned above

I call on the Sunday Times, Daily Express, Evening Standard, and (3 others to publish part of the above mentioned interview, to publish this .statement, and to stop their witch hunt against me

I have the right to file a libel lawsuit against the above mentioned (4 institutions in case they ignore this statement and refuse to issue an .apology

**By
Hani Al Sibai
hanisibu@hotmail.com
18/07/2005**