

Mr George Delaplaine  
News-Post  
Frederick, Md. 21701

1/3/88

Dear George,

Under our system - a system to <sup>the viability of which I</sup> ~~which~~ have devoted the equivalent of an unpaid <sup>working</sup> lifetime-you and your family have every right to be unfair, biased and even dishonest. Our system has the abuse of <sup>itself</sup> ~~israel~~ built-in. This, I believe, amounts to subversion because it deceives and misleads the electorate.

You have every right to pay a Roy Meachum to be a virtual adjunct of the PLO and its multitudinous terrorists. The nature and extent of his abuses, especially the anti-Semitism and Anti-Israeli columns, are your (pl) responsibility because you paid for them and persisted in paying him to continue them. And, of course, because you paid no one to present the other side.

When Mike Powell supervised the editorial and oped pages, he made an effort to be fair. This effort disappeared when he no longer edited those pages.

After demonstration of both his editorial incompetence in editing a submission and his failure to use a letter I phoned before ~~taking~~ <sup>trying</sup> more time when I am of limited energy and have vision that is more impaired from surgery on my better eye, ~~and~~ was encouraged to continue to make further submissions. None has appeared since then, no offering for the oped page and no letter.

I do not question the right not to use anything at all. I do question to decency of misleading me and the honesty of not using what I was encouraged to submit. If these were not preserved in your office I can provide copies if you have been told such things, if you were told anything, as that this material was not up to your editorial standards. One was on the ACLU, some time before the election, and I think that unlike what it was intended to address that you published it was factually correct and lacking <sup>in</sup> bias.

Your papers ~~does~~ not require experts on foreign affairs and you have none. Thus there is no reason to believe that your staff could recognize in the Stein mishmash you publish today the factual <sup>and</sup> prejudicial error in it.

It happens that in one of the letters I sent that was censored and did not appear I addressed in advance one of the basic ~~factual~~ <sup>the State of</sup> errors in Stein's superficiality. It is quite simply this: the PLO did not ~~recognized~~ <sup>recognize</sup> Israel's right to exist and, despite the misrepresentations of it, Arafat didn't either, while he pretended to, ~~and if he~~ ~~and~~ he does not have the power to make binding decisions for the executive committee. The only state Arafat mentioned by name as having a right to exist is the one state that does not exist, Palestine. Other than this he actually referred to people, not states.

I think it is in that letter that I pointed out how meaningless any promise by Arafat is when immediately after it was pretendedly made we had the Christmas present

of the subhuman murder of about 260 people, mostly American and mostly more than five miles in the air. If Arafat really wants to end terrorism it is, I believe, more than merely apparent that he cannot. So, what good is his promise?

You empower your employees to make judgements, which does not absolve you from the ultimate responsibility.

Stein also lied, whether ~~or not~~ he did this from ignorance only or not, and his letter was worthy of publication so your readers could read what he wrote. (One of the examples is "the military right of all <sup>the</sup> Arab nations cannot match that of Israel." This has never been true and today there are individual Arab states that have greater military might. Iraq, for example, which also has and used ~~poison~~ poison gas. Another is that Israel has been "changing the rules of the game" although it has, at considerable cost, lived up to the Camp David accords that the Arab states do not abide by.) Whether or not you ordered it, your papers have refused to publish the other side that I submitted.

I do not question your right. I do question the honesty, the fairness and the propriety under our system and the obligations it imposes on those it enables to get wealthy under it. More so when there is the monopoly you enjoy.

This is your responsibility. Maybe you do not care but you deceived yourself if you ~~for a minute~~ <sup>do not</sup> believe that many people in this area regard your record as I do, as deliberately dishonest and intendedly unfair - as what ~~one~~ <sup>many</sup> some ~~issues~~ it certainly is, like on anti-Semitism and anti-Israelism. A not insignificant number of gentiles, including some who have written in opposition to what I wrote, have taken the time to tell me this.

I do regret that your policy is unfair and dishonest and I regret also that you are responsible for it.

Sincerely,

*Harold*  
Harold Weisberg

## Give Palestinians a chance

1/3/89  
The United States historic first step towards direct talks with the PLO has certainly ruffled the feathers of the Israelis. Let us examine the current situation.

Over the past year the Palestinian uprising in the occupied Gaza Territory has raised the eyebrows of the world community. Over the last 12 months we have collectively witnessed Israeli troops employing overwhelming force to quell the Infitada. Not long ago the American television audience watched as Israeli soldiers broke the arms of rock-throwing protestors. We have continually witnessed the occupying forces blowing up refugee housing in response to civil unrest. We have seen the faces of the aged Palestinian women weeping for the loss of their children. And now we have heard the words of Yassir Arafat.

These words have renounced the use of terrorism as a means of forwarding a political agenda. These words have explicitly recognized the right of Israel to exist as well as seeking peaceful coexistence between a Palestinian state and Israel. Yet the Israeli government emphatically states that these words are not enough. Israel says that a paragraph renouncing terrorism in a United Nations speech does not demonstrate an abandonment of terrorist activities.

However, the uprising in Gaza should not be equated with terrorism. While the refugees are not practicing the Ghandian method of civil disobedience how many movements for independence have? Surely Israel needs only to search its own recent past.

The current and some former Prime Ministers of Israel have used certain elements of terrorism in order to establish a Jewish homeland. Why are not the Palestinians entitled to their own state? Not in Jordan but in a newly created state called Palestine.

Moreover, has the Israeli response to the Infitada been proper and proportional? The closing of schools, interment camps, the cutting off of news from the outside world and the destruction of housing seems to be excessive.

Of course Mr. Arafat's words must translate into deeds. If the PLO violates the precepts set forth in Arafat's proposals then they forfeit their right of statehood. The PLO has come a long way in moderating their views toward Israel. They have accepted the contents of the two UN resolutions which Israel said was a precondition to any type of negotiations. Is it not time for Israel to work for peace in the Middle East?

Israel's major concern is security and properly so. However the military might of all the Arab nations cannot match that of Israel. Moreover, the United States would not allow the Israel state to become endangered. It is truly ironic that the very concept that Israel fought so proudly for, freedom and sovereignty, is something they seek to repress and deny. The world, including the United States, is beginning to see the unfair rigidity of the current Israeli stance.

Finally, we must challenge Mr. Arafat's statements. He has accepted the preconditions to negotiations. Israel cannot keep changing the rules of the game. Give the Palestinians a chance at self-determination. If peace is to prevail the strong and secure (the United States and Israel) must initiate

and further it. The United States has taken a major step in the interest of peace. Israeli reciprocity is now appropriate.

SETH F. STEIN  
Thurmont