

Editor
News-Post
Frederick, Md. 21701

1/15/87

Dear Editor,

I've been keeping copies of the letters that, so faithful to the American tradition of fairness your columnist Roy Meachum inspires in them, they all call for his view alone to be published, and of some of the most incredible and at the same time evil garbage I've even seen from a man who even pretends to be a writer for when I could find time to address them,

However, his January 15 gross corruption of what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., stood, lived and died for to further what was so completely opposite Dr. King's beliefs, racist hatred is so great a desecration I write this letter.

Mr. Meachum, who, as usual, says the first thing that pops into his mind so he can get paid for it, as I am not, pretends to speak for Dr. King who, he actually concludes, is better off dead. How monstrous!

Pretending to be Dr. King's "defender" in what idle conversations in which bars where he worked, I can only wonder, because he is completely absent among Dr. King's actual defends, of which I have some knowledge from my own quite extensive work and overflowing file cabinets of information - he completely misrepresents what was most basic in Dr. King's life, belief and crusades. This cannot be mere ignorance, for which you pay thrice weekly. It is both arrogance and stupidity.

Whoever and whatever is right and wrong in the terrible tragedies of the holy land, what is completely without question is that the Arabs mostly children, are throwing rock and firebombs.

Above all else, Dr. King was non-violent.

And it is this violence that causes the efforts to end it.

Dr. King would not, in his real life rather than in the commercialized fabrications of your paid-for desecrator, be part of any civil rights struggle tainted by any violence.

He fought even suggestions of violence within the civil rights movement.

It your egomaniacal propagandist who in this particular column is utterly without conscience in addition, had read, for example, David Garrow's Pulitzer Prize "Bearing the Cross," despite the ignorance he falunts in virtually all he writes he'd have known this most basic fact of the man ~~him~~ on whose grave he spits when he says "he admired and defended."

How ignorant is this blowhard you pay for propaganda and ~~fabrics~~ just plain making up what he knows you'll pay for? He doesn't even know, or worse, doesn't care, why it was that "r. King was in Memphis to be killed there April 4, 1968.

He'd been there the week before to lead a march of local people supporting the strike of mostly black and frightfully underpaid garbage workers. His people did not control the ^{the} march. Youngsters, about the age of those who started and ~~so~~ continue the violence in Gaza, took up sticks - no, not firebombs, not rocks thrown at people, just sticks - and broke some windows with them. That led to a riot.

Dr. King swas an aghast, shocked. Against the pleadings of most of this associates he was determined to show that the protest could be completely nonviolent, and he sent his own people in to assure that it would be completely non-violent.

And then he returned to lead them - in non-violence when he was killed.

He believed in non-violence, he preached it and he practised it. He did not return blows rained upon him during his career. And he was assaulted.

As I've said often enough, and he lacks even the minimal self-respect to even pretend to justify himself, he just makes it up as he goes, anything at all for your money and to serve his racist beliefs. He made this entire thing up. ^{It} could not be more completely opposite Dr. King's life and beliefs.

It is disgraceful, it is unconscionable and if misleads and misinforms those who read it and lack the knowledge to understand what he is doing. Corrupting the minds of the young is a terrible offense, and the young have no way of knowing the truth.

Doesn't anybody on the papers read his stuff? Or if you do, can it be that

nobody there can eliminate his lies and fabrications? Do you only pay for them and publish them to accomplish his transparent objectives?

It is appropriate that the same editon reports the conclusion of the National Council of Churches, "hate violence" is increasing in the United States.

So, you have this self-proclaimed authority on everything contribute quite regularly, out of proportion by any measurement, preaching race hatred.

He has no shame, obviously, only ego and a skimpy conscience. VBut doesn't any of the rest of you have any shame at all?

Making Dr. King, the foremost exponent of non-violence, into a lover of the most ugly violence -s that your concept of journalism, of decency, of your responsibility to those who trust the words you publish for them?

I've said often enough that he just writes anything at all that at any time weems expedient to him, regardless of fact or truth - and for pay. He begins this Dr. King today" column with "prejudice exists when a people are reduced to 'they' limped together in a faceless clump."

This is precisely what "oy" eachum has been doing for several years in disgracefully dishonest columns to Jews, lumping all together and continuing to do that after being corrected. Ex

How utterly unprincipled he is, to so condemn himself because it seemed expedient for this particular racist propaganda.

There is much else that is very wrong. For example, did you see any account of any vastration in Gaza? e reports it as fact but I'm sure that once he starts making it up he asks himself no questions because he is certain none of you will ask him any.

Talk about ignorance and the stupidity of just making it up as you go, as he does because he is not held to account by any of you. He has the utter nonsense about it being wrong for the Arab countries to be involved in trying to solve those many problems and he concludes that bit of commer paid-for poppycock with these words, "Certainly Dr. King never sought to bring justice to Alabama by sitting down

with the governor of New York.#"

He did precidely that, Roy! More than once and always with success!

For shame, you phony!

Isn't about time that you read something by those who know what they write about, instead of just making it up as you go?

There is a nasty word for this in journalism, a word that does not begin with journalism.