

## Defending Meachum but offering no proof 9/22/91

Roger Heusser's letter on Sept. 10 is a classic case of misrepresenting to contrive anti-Semitism and Israel bashing.

He pretends to be defending Roy Meachum's column, offers no proof at all, including that "Meachum did not lie," and says not a single word that addresses, let alone refutes, my Op-Ed page article, and misuses his supposed defense for what is 100 percent non-responsive to what I actually wrote: that the primary and unquestionable obligation for preparing a defense of our Marine barracks near Beirut was that of their commander. Nothing is more basic in the military. If the commander had not failed to meet his primary obligation, for which he needed no information from anyone else, we'd not have sustained that great tragedy.

Whether any Israelis had "advanced knowledge of the truck bomb" is not relevant, as anyone who has ever served in the military knows, I challenge Mr Heusser to present his allegedly "documented" proof to this and of what I believe is one of several propaganda rather than factual statements, that Israel "did not tell the U.S. the location of William Buckley, a U.S. citizen held hostage in Lebanon, even though Israel was officially asked about it by the U.S. government . . . later Buckley was tortured and killed. Why should the Israeli government withhold the facts?"

William Buckley was the CIA's station chief in Beirut. I believe that not a single word Mr.

Heusser says about this irrelevancy is true. I call upon him to provide proof of this, too.

There is no reason to believe that anyone knew where Buckley or other hostages were held. There is every reason to believe that tortures began as soon as he was captured, to obtain those secrets he had that his captors wanted very much, not "later."

Mr. Heusser did say that what he says is "documented."

HAROLD WEISBERG  
Frederick