

Mr. Mike Powell
News-Post
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Mike,

While what I say in the enclosed has to ~~its~~ stand on its own, because Meachum's personal attack on me is personal and is false I ask that you consider using the two proposed open pieces I have done in haste.

If there is any question about what I represent as fact I will be happy to answer any such question.

In this column there is no Islamic responsibility for anything according to your ~~wazier~~. All terror is Israeli and all terror against Israel is "retaliation" according to him.

This is outrageous, it is false and it is in context thinly-disguised anti-Semitism.

Meachum is also a rank ~~amateur~~ amateur in more than what I say at the end of the second piece and in context that also is prejudiced.

He refers to the manner of Shakaki's "licensed" murder ~~as~~ as "thoroughly professional." It in fact is also thoroughly amateur and has been widely practised, including by the rankest amateurs with no government collection, throughout the world.

We have no way of knowing who did it and it may well be that the Mossad was behind it, remembering so much about those it lost in all those terrorist acts against so many civilians. But it is no less apparent that revenge against Shakaki for all the hundreds of Arabs ~~it~~ killed by other Arabs, not by Jews, is a possible if not a probable ~~murder~~ cause. *or motive.*

As also could be the internecine warfare ~~not~~ unommon to those groups.

No matter how he seeks to hide it, this is another of his anti-Semitic and anti-Israeli diatribes.

I believe the papers owe the community the refutation and exposure I enclose.

It should not put itself in the position of being considered anti-Semitic.

Best, Harold

Meachum on Meachum

Roy Meachum has given us to understand that ^{by} his coming to our blighted community and writing his columns he is imparting what he refers to as his "knowledge" for our enlightenment. He is, in his self-portrayal, expert on everything but especially on things Islamic and of them particularly the tragedy of the holy land. In the course of his giving us his wisdom and the benefit of his great knowledge he has systematically rewritten history and in his "November 3 column" he rewrites his own history.

He uses that ^{column} ~~column~~, on the murder of the head of Islamic Jihad - which he describes as an a "aggressively bloody group" dedicated to prevent peace in that tortured area - as an excuse ^{for} ~~to~~ a personal attack on me.

Typical of him, even that is not in accord with the facts.

If cowardly falsifications can be taken as a manifestation of manhood, then for all I have written about his columns all of which, including this one, are anti-Israel, this is the first manifestation of manhood from him because he has not undertaken, ever - including in this ~~column~~ ^{column} to attribute factual inaccuracy to me.

And I did write quite a bit about his "knowledge" of that area.

I say "cowardly" because he continues what is in his ~~column~~ ^{column} and those of us he attacks cannot reach the minds of those he influences.

Because this is a personal attack on me and because it is not in accord with the fact, I hope the papers will give me the space to make full response and let its readers know what he describes as his "knowledge" of the holy land conflict really is. It is, in plain English, his returning to gross misrepresentation that led to what I wrote earlier about his columns.

He says of what he chooses to refer to as my "complaints" when in fact ^{they} ~~that~~ were exposure of him that "the least of them" was because those columns were "anti-Semitic."

Even this is not true. It was not by any means "the least" or even close to that.

And again, that is true of the thrust of this newest cunning anti-Semitism of his.

If this was not the primary thrust of ~~these~~ what I wrote it was second only to his ~~mis~~ misrepresentations about Israel and the holy land. ("misrepresentations" is politeness).

Using the killing of Dr. Fakhri Shakaki as his ^{newest} ~~newest~~ peg for hanging all the horrors of the holy land on ^{it} he attributes ~~that~~ to "employees of the Israeli government." And, "inevitably," he says, "retaliation will follow."

In this he says that Israel triggers all the killings. He says also that the only killings of Jews is in this "retaliation."

This is not true now and it has never been true.

For those who do not know the history of that area, what is ^{it} not called "the West Bank" is the part of the Palestine Territory Great Britain took from the Ottoman empire as ~~its~~ booty from World War I ^{It} ~~that~~ was to have been ^{it} ~~the~~ part of that territory that was to become ~~Israel~~ Israel. All the rest, about ^{it} ~~the~~ three-quarters of it, was made into the Arabs state and King Hussein's grandfather, Abdullah, not a Palestinian, was put at its head.

That ^{it} "west bank" of the Jordan River is the homeland of the Jews. ^{Most} ~~They~~ were driven from it from time to time, the last time ^{in mass and} systematically was I believe ^{by} Mohammed in the ^N ~~seventh~~ ^N century.

Applying this standard to ~~Israel~~ Israel alone has been world policy. There has been no clamor for the return of the South ~~to~~ Tyrol to Austria from ^{which} ~~whom~~ it was taken after World War I and given to Italy. None after World War II for the return to Poland of what was given to the then USSR. None for the return to ^G Germany of what was given to ^P Poland in compensation.

The west bank is what was until then the British created ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Trans-Jordan, ^V ~~shortened~~ by Hussein ~~is~~ into Jordan, Judea and Samaria. They had always been Jewish going back to well before the time of Christ. ^{He} ~~as~~ a Jew from Bethleham, now part of that "west bank."

The demand to drive the jews from their homeland has been the ^{division} ~~historical~~ ^{division} ~~division~~ of Arab tyrants, to divert their people from their suffering and lack of freedom.

There never has been a time when this was not the cause ^{of} ~~to~~ Arab murders of Jews. For meachum ^{to} pretend the opposite is not unreasonably described as "anti-Semitism."

As he presents it in this column, "retaliation" began with Israeli "murders" in foreign lands, "in subc far-off places as London, the French Rivera and Scandinavia."

From this he gets to, the connection only implied, his attack on me:

"Here we go again. His columns brought greater hate spewed on my bald head than my early observations on the Arab-Israeli problem."

If exposure of his one-sidedness and inaccuracy is hate, so be it. But I say again he never saw fit, which really means he could not, refute a single word I wrote.

He then says, referring to me but not by name, that I "organized a concerted attempt to get me fired. .. In the process he ^{hounded and} badgered others to write letters attacking everything about me. My wife was not exempt."

I have never spoke or written to his wife, ~~he~~ never sent her any word of any kind by anyone else, never ~~badgered~~ "badgered" or "hounded" others and to the best of my recollection never ~~promoted or organized~~ took any initiatives. If there was any such campaign I did not know about it. I suspect this is part of his effort to present himself as persecuted.

When his first abuses of history and of Jews appeared and the papers printed my response, that did lead to some phone calls thanking me for them and making complaints about him without end and including what I did not know. Without doubt, although I have no recollection of it, I may well have told some of those people, many strangers to me, that they should speak to the papers rather than to me.

This is an old and shabby trick. All that is surprising about it is that he waited so many long years to pull it to make himself appear to be the abused rather than the abuser.

Full and free discussion is the basic need of a democratic society.

To the degree the papers used some of what I did write, and I refuted all his essentially anti-Semitic columns, they ^{practise} this essential freedom.

But Meachum, who cannot stand on his own record, resorts to the dirty trick of accusing me of victimizing him. That simply is not true and he knows it.

1
Meachum's "responsibility" and "knowl dge"

In my previous response to Roy Meachum's column of November 31, to his personal attack on me that was not true, I said he rewrote his history along with that of the holy land. In this I address a few of his rewritings of history other than his false claim that Jews started that slaughter about which he has written only one-sidedly.

When the United Nations decided that Jews were entitled to the homeland they were to have gotten at the end of World War I, when they were denied it and an Arab state was created out of about seventy-five percent of what had been the Palestine territory, virtually the entire Arab world went to war to prevent creation of Israel. Enormously outnumbered and not beginning with any state and what most states have, a military and a government and means of mobilizing, especially its people, the Jews fought back and defeated virtually the entire Arab world.

That military defeats of the Arabs led to greater terrorism against the Jews in what had been their homeland by the Arabs. Inflammation against them may well have been greatest from the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. He had spent the war years in Berlin propagandizing for Hitler. Despite this he was turned loose to continue his campaign to get all Jews killed.

In this column it all begins, according to Meachum, with what he says is "starkly obvious," the "1978-80 eliminations [sic] willingly [sic] ~~attained~~ ^[sic] accredited to Mossad (Israel's CIA)."

It is odd that somehow Meachum indicates that nothing preceded these alleged "eliminations." He also says he was "reminded" of "the string of PLO officials killed... in London, the French Riviera and Scandinavia." He was not reminded of anything else.

He also says, and I quote this for context, that from his years in Egypt Arabs there treated him with and he observed, "the kindness, gentleness and general courtesy that prevail naturally in an Islamic culture. Excesses and violence are blatant contradictions of Qu'ranic teaching."

~~Somehow~~ I have Arabic friends and relatives, by marriage and of them ^{and of many others} what Meachum says is true. But as there is no government against which legitimate complaints cannot

be made, ^{that is} not without a record of abuse of people, as we, for example abuse ^{d/} the native Americans when we took their land from them, it is not anti-Arab to dispute what ^{u/} eachum attributes to all of them.

When he wrote about all those "eliminations" in "~~foreign~~ foreign lands," he made no reference to the slaughter in Munich of Israelis there to participate in the Olympics.

His "remembering" did not include the bombings also "in foreign lands" of the Israeli embassies and of Israelis in London for example.

He did not ~~remember~~ "remember" the dynamiting of the Jewish cultural ^{center} center in Argentina which killed ~~more than~~ ^{more than} two hundred and hurt ever so many more or that along with ^{innocent} ~~that~~ also destroyed were records of wanted criminal Nazis who escaped to South America and were wanted for their war crimes.

His ^{memory} recollection failed to include those several hundred of our military ^e by massive bomb ~~that~~ killed in Lebanon when they were there solely to keep the ^{peace} ~~police~~.

Also outside his ^{memory} recollection among other unspeakable atrocities aimed at innocent civilians were all those bombings of busses in Israel.

This should be a ^{cataloguing} sufficient ^{"remembering"} cataloguing of his "recollections" and of the sincerity with which, he says, anyway, he condemns all terrorists.

"Gretleness and general courtesy" characterize Islam, he says, and that "excesses and violence are blatant contradictions of" Islamic teaching.

His no doubt accounts for his not referring to the hundreds of Arabs killed by Arabs, ~~Not~~ by Jews, on suspicion ^{d/} and without due process.

He also did not recall the slaughter of 5,000 Syrians in a single day by their dictator for the crime of not supporting him.

Nor what the Turks and others do and have done to the Kurds.

Nor Saddam of recent infamy against other Muslims.

Nor that, if it no longer exists, there was slavery until recently in the Islamic world. ^{of} Some of which denied Jews entrance even when sent by this country to help those countries.

So much are "excesses and violence" ^{the} his "blatant ~~entire~~ contradictions" of Islamic teaching that only recently in Saudi Arabia were both ⁶ hands and heads chopped off without anything that in lands without such "kindness" and "courtesy" would be considered anything like a trial.

That "general courtesy" we find reflected in the same country ^{is} by denying women the right to drive an automobile and punishing those who did!

It is not all that long since we had slaves nor that long since women and blacks and yes, Jews, were disenfranchized. Not that long since Judge Lynch ruled in the south.

We do not lie about these things to ourselves, we do not claim perfection, and we do not need the grossest distortions and misrepresentations that Meachum always practises when as he says in pretended refutation of what I wrote about him and he pretentively ignored, "The best reply I could ~~was~~ summon up was the responsibility imposed by knowledge."

He ^{is} ~~is~~ no "reply" and what he actually refers to as his "knowledge" is in part clear herein. So also is his concept of "responsibility."

"Knowledge" ^{and} "responsibility" led him to predict as caused by ^I Israel and the killing of the Islamic jihad ^a murderer-in-chief that "more innocent women and children" would be killed.

Meachum's "knowledge" ^{is} requires a new dictionary to understand him.

Then there is Meachum the wise, the omniscient, the seer of the future. Referring to Islamic Jihad's determination to prevent peace by ~~its~~ ^{eventually} its "aggressively bloody" acts he tells us that "it could have [sic] wound ^{with} upon a little choice bit to go along ^y with peace."

During and for a few years after ~~the~~ World War II I was an analyst in our intelligence service. Among the ^{is} responsibility of intelligence analysts is making sense of what it ~~is~~ known when much is not known.

What is known is ^{that} ~~the~~ aside from Hamas, which seems to be going along with peace, will be ^{with} ~~is~~ ^{opposed} a major Palestinian group to it; and that there are very many Palestinians who remain opposed to peace. The obvious analysis is the obvious opposite of Meachum the

maven- that Islamic Jihad will be the ^{only} major force opposing peace rather than having no "choice" but to "go along" with it

I solicit Meachum's refutation now, not at some future time when your readers will be at the mercy of ~~his~~ ^{what he "remembers"} ~~recollections~~, even if he says this, too, is "hate spilled on his ~~blat~~ head."

I do not believe that now, rather than at some distant future time, he will "use ~~me~~ as the best reply I could summon [the] responsibility imposed by ~~xxxxxx~~ knowledge."

Not ~~with~~ this deliberately ~~so~~ one-sided and intendedly unfair column ^{2/} his representation of ^{e/} "with his ^{1/} responsibility" of of his "knowledge."

Roy Meachum



Killing begets killing

11/3/98
Another licensed murder in the Middle East seems certain to set off another round of killing.

Dr. Fathi Shakaki was a man with no name as far as the rest of the world was concerned. Police on Malta described his assassination as thoroughly professional, carried out by two motorcyclists with silenced weapons.

The late doctor, it seems, headed Islamic Jihad, a small but aggressively bloody group dedicated to upsetting the accords that appear the best hope for securing peace in former Palestine. His killers are generally accepted as employees of the Israeli government, a notion officials have made no effort to dispel.

Inevitably, as night succeeds day, retaliation will follow. Over the coming months, expect more innocent men, women and children of various nationalities, possibly Americans too, to pay with their lives for what strikes me as the wrong act at definitely the wrong time.

In recent days, reports depicted Hamas, the largest faction heretofore violently opposed to the peace process, as displaying a willingness to lay down its arms and take up negotiations. For all its fiery rhetoric, Islamic Jihad could have wound eventually up with little choice but to go along.

Only last week further parts of the West Bank were handed over to the PLO, producing the magnificent published photo of a Jenin boy, grinning and offering his arms to heaven. In time, it seemed inevitable some form of modus vivendi would have enabled the two chief claimants of the Holy Land to emulate the biblical lion and sheep and build a life together.

It could still happen, of course. But, by whoever's hand, the region's latest political murder in a foreign land reminded me of the string of PLO officials killed in such far-off places as London, the French Riviera and Scandinavia.

The starkly obvious 1979-80 eliminations, willingly accredited to

Mossad (Israel's CIA), touched off vengeful actions, triggering repressions that resulted in the Palestinian uprising; and the intifada obliged abandonment of the old Zionist dream for a greater Jewish state, encompassing all the occupied territories.

Here we go again. No columns brought greater hate spewed on my bald head than my early observations on the Arab-Israeli problem.

The mistake, as others apparently saw it, was my insistence that Palestinians were human beings and as I tried to explain, "not counterparts of those old black and white movies' Indians who could not shed red blood and whose deaths were always unreal."

An illustrious journalist in the community organized a concerted attempt to have me fired. Antisemitic was almost the least of his complaints. In the process, he hounded and badgered others to write letters attacking everything about me. My wife was not exempt, although Sharon rarely was aware

what questions her husband posed editorially.

It was a prolonged un-pleasantness that civilized people wisely avoided. A wise man once asked what I thought could be accomplished by tackling a subject most Fredericktonians neither knew nor cared about. The best reply I could summon up was the responsibility imposed by knowledge.

The several years spent living in and concentrating on Egypt provided me with experience of the kindness, gentleness and general courtesy that prevail naturally in an Islamic culture. Excesses and violence are blatant contradictions of Qu'ranic teaching.

At no point in my writings did I intend, in any way, to defend tactics that resulted in death or suffering by any party in the Israeli-Arab struggle. In my view, both sides had shed blood in complete defiance of their respective religions.

But what angered some folks most was my unwillingness to saddle all Palestinians with the sins of a few who purported to be seeking their people's restoration to their ancestral homes. On my part, I failed to understand how anyone could endorse the machinations by so-called settlers, many American emigrants, who treat Arab men, women and children with cavalier brutality.

Whether they wear the Star of David or a crescent moon on a field of green, terrorists are terrorists, fiends in human form, who deserve neither recognition nor respect. Since the recently murdered man lived for violence by stealth, there is some biblical justice in the manner of his death.

But Fathi Shakaki's assassins committed abomination, whatever their motive, against other people yet to be named. The killers' superiors will doubtless reward them. We can only hope there is enough of this earth's riches left over to comfort the families of future victims, created by yet one more piece of mindless bloodshedding.

The Middle East formula remains intact: Killing begets killing begets killing begets....there is no end.