

Editor  
News-Post  
Frederick, Md. 21701

1/27/88

Your self-conceived and self-portrayed seer, expert on all matters, particularly the Middle East, firmly astride his wife's wooden bowl and pretending once again that ~~is~~ is ~~Olympus~~, drooled out another fine example of his sophomoric journalism ~~and~~ ~~freshman~~ thinking of ~~pretend~~ pretended self-defense and gave it the suggestive title, not justified by the ~~text~~ of "Name calling."

Great stuff for the unthinking claque but vacuous for those who recall the specifics of the criticisms I have written, none of which, once again, is addressed in any way. Except for the junior-grade "some of my best friends are Jews," his claim that because he supported Steve Sachs he is not anti-Semitic.

When I have time I'll get around to more of those specifics he can't face, but in this goo there is another of those odd things that <sup>popo</sup> emerge from the murk of his mind about journalism: "The first rule . . . if you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen."

In my day the first rule was be accurate and another <sup>w</sup> as be fair. This is another of his silly concoctions in pretended self-justification. Another recent one was no less stupid: there is no limit on free speech. Did he never hear of the Supreme Court, and not just recently - the Supreme Court before he began getting paid for written junk food? It is in the Gitlow decision and it says you can't ~~it~~ cry fire in a crowded theater. <sup>perhaps</sup> Perhaps he didn't just forget that, perhaps it was merely inconvenient, albeit also used in pretended self-justification and feigned tolerance, because he, in effect, in an enormously disproportionate attention to a grossly dishonest portrayal of the actualities of the Middle East, is in effect crying "fire!"

When he pretends moderation he can't quite make it, just as he can't get around to addressing any one of the <sup>considerable</sup> ~~considerable~~ number of factual errors and distortions and misrepresentations he can't deny or refute and hence doesn't try: commentators on the Middle East are going to get the heat "unless virulently pro-Israel." Not merely pro-Israel - they have to be "virulent" to escape criticism.

He criticizes the ~~major~~<sup>major</sup>, "Mr. Young has hunkered down into silence," unaware that this is what he also has done, as observant readers know, because this kind of junk is nonresponsive and irrelevant. Thus he, too, faced with the many specifics he can't face, has hunkered down and remains entirely ~~silent~~<sup>silent</sup> about them.

He concludes by saying that "after all these years I've learned to ~~live~~ live with the heat,"

In Frederick he's had no choice. If ~~he~~<sup>earlier</sup> wrote the same kind of copy he's written here, only ~~Ludifer~~<sup>Ludifer</sup> should have faced more heat.

All criticism of his writing is, from the title, ~~name~~<sup>name</sup> calling," and, unable to do otherwise, he pontificates, "while my practise is not to answer invective, I cannot permit Sharon ~~to~~ be pulled into my differences . . ." My recollection is that it is ~~he~~ who commercialized his wife, in many columns, along with babies that, ~~she~~<sup>one</sup> is to believe, he alone loves.

He not only sits on her wooden bowl, he now hides behind her skirts.

I'm grateful for his shabby device, however, because we also have some old wooden bowls and I ought try and find them if they are antiques.

For younger readers who may not know some of ~~the~~ ways they were used, ~~I used to~~<sup>before World War II</sup> mix the salad at the table in a large one and served it in the small ones, The bowls were rubbed with garlic, so if I now find them I'll be reminded again, I'm certain, even before I find them, of the all-knowing who pontificates, about the major, that "the public has a right to know" while presenting only a propagandistic and distorted single side in his columns ~~while~~<sup>and</sup> pretending now to be moderate and not to ever "discriminate."

<sup>a sample of</sup> For those who have not followed his cowardice and his failures to respond, this is what he describes as "invective" he doesn't answer: he called Abu Nidal, the indicted terrorist, responsible for major murders and other crimes, like bombing the Rome and Vienna airports, a "patriot." ~~I~~<sup>I</sup> called him a terrorist. Calling him a terrorist and asking that he who knows all there is to know retract or apologize is what he means by "invective."

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg



## Faults Meachum for failure to respond to specific criticisms

Your self-conceived and self-portrayed seer, expert on all matters, particularly the Middle East, firmly astride his wife's wooden bowl and pretending once again that it is Olympus, drooled out another fine example of his sophomoric journalism thinking of pretended self-defense and gave it the suggestive title, not justified by the text of "Name calling."

Great stuff for the unthinking claque but vacuous for those who recall the specifics of the criticisms I have written, none of which, once again, is addressed in any way. Except for the junior-grade "some of my best friends are Jews," his claim that because he supported Steve Sachs he is not anti-Semitic.

When I have time I'll get around to more of those specifics he can't face, but in this goo there is another of those odd things that pops from the murk of his mind about journalism: "The first rule . . . if you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen."

In my day the first rule was be accurate and another was be fair. This is another of his silly concoctions in pretended self-justification. Another recent one was no less stupid: There is no limit on free speech. Did he never hear of the Supreme Court, and not just recently — the Supreme Court before he began getting paid for written junk food? It is in the Gitlow decision and it says you can't cry fire in a crowded theater. Perhaps he didn't just forget that. Perhaps it was merely inconvenient, albeit also used in pretended self-justification and feigned tolerance, because he, in effect, in an enormously disproportionate attention to a grossly dishonest portrayal of the actualities of the Middle East, is in effect crying "fire!"

When he pretends moderation he can't quite make it, just as he can't get around to addressing any one of the considerable number of factual error and distortions and misrepresentations he can't deny or refute and hence doesn't try: commentators on the Middle East are going to get the heat "unless virulently pro-Israel." Not merely pro-Israel — they have to be "virulent" to escape criticism.

He criticizes the mayor, "Mr. Young has hunkered down into silence," unaware that this is what he also has done, as observant readers know, because this kind of junk is nonresponsive and irrelevant. Thus he, too, faced with the many specifics he can't face, has "hunkered down" and remains entirely silent about them.

He concludes by saying that "after all these years I've learned to live with the heat."

In Frederick he's had no choice. If earlier he wrote the same kind of copy he's written here, only Lucifer should have faced more heat.

All criticism of his writing is, from the title, "name

calling," and, unable to do otherwise, he pontificates, "While my practice is not to answer invective, I cannot permit Sharon to be pulled into my differences . . ." My recollection is that it is he who commercialized his wife, in many columns, along with babies.

He not only sits on her wooden bowl, he now hides behind her skirts.

I'm grateful for his shabby device, however, because we also have some old wooden bowls and I ought try and find them if they are antiques.

For younger readers who may not know some of the ways they were used, before World War II, I used to mix the salad at the table in a large one and served it in the small ones. The bowls were rubbed with garlic, so if I now find them I'll be reminded again, I'm certain, even before I find them, of the all-knowing who pontificates, about the mayor, that "the public has a right to know" while presenting only a propagandistic and distorted single side in his columns and pretending now to be moderate and not to ever "discriminate."

For those who have not followed his cowardice and his failures to respond, this is a sample of what he describes as "invective" he doesn't answer: He called Abu Nidal, the indicted terrorist, responsible for major murders and other crimes, like bombing the Rome and Vienna airports, a "patriot." I called him a terrorist. Calling him a terrorist and asking that he-who-knows-all-there-is-to-know retract or apologize is what he means by "invective."

HAROLD WEISBERG  
Frederick