

Harold Weisberg

December 23, 1987

CHRISTMAS BLACKENED

Did I not know Roy Meachum better I'd believe the heading "Christmas Black" on his column of December 23 to be a typographical error.

Not since the day of petty fascists, William Dudley Pelley, George Deatherage, Gerald Winrod (also known as "the Jayhawk Nazi), Gerald L. K. Smith, W. J. Cameron and their ilk, all of whom slunk back into the slime from which they came, have I known any American who would so misuse Christmas, to corrupt the holiday of peace and good will toward men into an excuse for preaching hatred and Hitler-like anti-Semitism. Only Roy Meachum in our area is capable of and indulged in such desecration and the journalistic dishonesties it required.

In 27 column inches, 23 of them solid type, devoted to preaching hatred and anti-Semitism, he included still another defense of the terrorists who kidnapped and abused innocent Americans - preachers and educators who went to the Muslim world to be helpful and journalists who went to inform the rest of the world.

These Muslim terrorists, he says, are not criminals.

But in all this space, for what does Mr. Meachum not find space, not find time, not find interest?

For a single word about what started the newest of the endless tragic slaughters in the holy land; for what public authority everywhere does when faced with rioting.

Can it be that nobody dares edit his bile? No editor asks or can ask any question?

As those who do not depend on Meachumite regurgitation of what is in all the metropolitan papers are aware, Arabs in the Gaza Strip began a campaign of violence to coincide with Christian religious visits to the holy land.

But in this newest Meachumite debasing of the glorious traditions of American journalism which he repeatedly claims he typifies, it came out as Israeli shooting at Arabs for no reason at all. When they searched for those responsible

for this continuing violence which lasted through Christmas, in his version Israeli authorities were only being nasty and abusive. Such is his devotion to our great journalistic tradition, his creed of honesty, his love and practice of fairness, of which he boasts that Mr. Meachum makes no mention at all of the Arab fire-bombing the Israelis tried to stop.

Instead, he uses all this space to lie once again to his readers. He pretends that all of this is Israeli imperialism, "the pursuit of an empire." How great an alleged empire? "To Irag's Euphrates River."

How "imperial" is Israel? After conquering all of Egypt to the Nile and some on the other side of the Nile, when Egypt agreed to peace, Israel returned it all, an area ever so much greater than tiny Israel. Without payment for the many improvements added.

This is imperialism?

The territories involved in this Meachumite practice of Goebbels journalism are called "the west bank" and "the Gaza Strip." The latter is a small and narrow area south of Israel on the Mediterranean coast, not part of either Egypt or Israel.

What is miscalled "the west bank" is what is actually Judea and Samaria in the Bible. This is where Jews come from. From "Judea" comes "Jew."

This territory was never part of Jordan. Jordan merely took it by force of arms and Israel took it back the same way. It is on the west side of the Jordan River.

When England created Jordan out of the larger eastern part of Palestine, it was properly called Trans-Jordan because it was the part of Palestine across the Jordan.

When Britain, which took Palestine and other lands controlled by the Ottoman Empire, now Turkey, after World War I, it did not keep its promise, embodied in the Balfour Declaration, to establish a Jewish state in the rest of Palestine.

When the Israelis themselves established this state, Jordan, then financed and its armies supplied and controlled by the British, along with the rest of the Arab world, attacked Israel. Jordan captured Judea and Samaria.

Abnormally, in the 40 years since Israel won that war, none of the defeated Muslim world agreed to a peace treaty until, under Sadat, Egypt did. It remains Arab policy, enunciated and persisted in by Arafat and his PLO, to drive all Jews into the sea. Their refusal even to discuss a peace treaty perpetuates this stated policy.

This is the actual boast of those Arabs Mr. Meachum loves so much, in whom he can find no fault. Their terrorists are not criminals to him even when they kidnap, torture and kill Americans. They are "patriots," his word, and for their crimes and abuses, he tells his readers, Jews and United States policies are responsible.

Despite his Goebbels journalism, the actuality is that, except for Egypt, the Muslim world continues in a state of war against Israel and terrorism and murder remain terrorism and murder.

Sadat signed a peace treaty with Israel and sought to lead the Middle East into an era of peace. But any recognition of the State of Israel or its right to exist is so abhorrent - to those Mr. Meachum says are not criminal when they are, are patriots when they are terrorists - they assassinated him.

Arab assassination is what made Hussein king of Jordan. When his grandfather, Abdullah, dared to speak to Israelis, Abdullah was assassinated.

In all the Meachumite Hitlerian verbiage in so many, many columns, his readers have no way of knowing, not from him at least, what the actualities are, including the continuing Muslim state of war after 40 years and its inevitable consequences.

When there is a state of war, when there is violence and terrorism, there is, as there always has been, response, and, as always, the danger both sides may cause harm, including deaths.

For the three years of Mr. Meachum's local column his virtual plagiarism of Mein Kampf is probably their most repeated subject. I can't remember a single time when he was honest, truthful or fair on this subject. His voice of hate has not informed his readers, most of whom are not experts on foreign affairs (nor is he, except in his self-concept) that there is this state of war and that the only reason it still exists is that his Muslim friends insist upon it, or that they started the war in which they were all clobbered by tiny Israel.

For years England was known as "perfidious Albion." This was never more justified than for what it did with the Palestine Territory after World War I. England promised Palestine to both Arabs and Jews - but gave territory only to Arabs, Trans-Jordan, the eastern, larger part.

Both Arabs and Jews can make claim to the land now known as Israel, Jews because it is their homeland, the land from which, going back into farthest antiquity, they came. Arabs took the lands from which the Jews were driven and on this basis they claim it.

Jordan, shortened from Trans-Jordan by Hussein to obscure this history, is and was intended to be the Arab part of Palestine. Not so long ago, Arafat and his PLO tried unsuccessfully to depose Hussein and take over Jordan. When they failed and were expelled, they moved into Lebanon where they followed the same policies, leading to that country's many agonies. Great people, Mr. Meachum's friends!

It is worse than indecent to blacken Christmas by misusing it for the preaching of any kind of hatred but I guess there is little Mr. Meachum will not do for either hate or money.

It is utterly shameless that, for more than 30 pieces of silver, he contorts the time of peace on earth and good will toward men into preaching hatred.

He blackened Christmas as nobody has since the days of those other American Hitlerians I name above. Better the grinch. He only stole Christmas.

Meanwhile, I challenge him to print the proof he claims to have of planned Israeli expansionism and imperialism. It not only does not exist, it does not make sense, except in copying Hitler for hate and propaganda.

Roy Meachum

Christmas black

12/13/87



There will be little joy in Bethlehem this year. The singing of carols and prayers at the scene of the Manger have been disturbed by the killing shots of the army which has maintained its occupation by repression, brutalities, and legalized murders for over 20 years.

The few determined pilgrims who make their way to the town where Christ was born will be greeted by swarms of soldiers with ready weapons, positioned for foreigners' protection. The same troops in the past 15 days have bathed the Holy Land with blood, some of it Christian.

Not all the Palestinians killed and wounded, beaten and jailed the past 15 days were Muslims, not by any means. But when a 10-year-old girl is shot in the stomach, does her religion really matter? Did the Israeli riflemen select only non-Christians for their targets before firing into the backs of youths running away (as witnessed by Western reporters)?

To keep matters in perspective, not all the fingers on those triggers belonged to Israeli Jews. Among the fiercest persecutors of the Palestinians are members of the Druze sect, a radical branch of Islam. They are the only Arabs permitted to serve in the Israeli Defense Force, because of their antipathy to traditional (Sunni) followers of Muhammad.

It is very wrong to categorize the problems of the occupied territories as Jews against Muslims. It is not even accurate to portray Israel's majority as approving its army's persecution of the Palestinians. According to surveys in recent years, most Israelis favor shedding Gaza and the West Bank, in exchange for the promise of peace.

Premier Yitzhak Shamir is not among them. The man who once ordered the assassination of U.N. observer Swedish Count Folke Bernadotte remains dedicated to the proposition of an Israeli empire, a dream that has prevented the nation from ever naming its boundaries. In that dream, one day Jerusalem would extend its rule to Iraq's Euphrates River, imitating the conquest of an ancient Jewish king, as outlined by the modern nation's Founding Father David ben-Gurion.

Here is the root for the anguish that spoils this season's promise of Peace on Earth: The men, women and children on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip

have no hope for the dignity of freedom. After 20 years of watching helplessly as their land, their leaders and their lives were stripped away, they no longer believe they will ever know the joy heralded on Christmas Day for much of the world.

For Israel to give back their birthright to a people who have lived on that earth since before Jesus was born would kill forever the chance for further expansion. Mr. Shamir and his cohorts resisted the return of the Sinai to Egypt. It should be noted that they opposed the Camp David accords, aligning them with Libya and other extremist Arab states.

As for his nation's present problems, the premier has announced his government will not alter its treatment of the Palestinians for the sake of "a better image abroad." Backing that line, an IDF spokesman told a British reporter that "the relative restraint the Army has shown has been misinterpreted as weakness."

If I had my way, in every home this season, the cheerful mix of red and green would give way to black . . .

What "restraint?" The number of admitted dead (20, at this writing) continues to climb as more wounded die, and each day brings new shootings. One hospital alone reported treating 175 Palestinian casualties last week. To any known figures must be added those unknowns severely beaten or shot who refuse to seek treatment, knowing that they can be pulled from their beds by soldiers, as many others were. A number of doctors and nurses received rifle butts for trying to protect their patients.

The sources for these crimes against humanity are not Arab, but Western

reporters and diplomats, as well as U.N. officials on the scene. The Security Council is considering a motion of censure, which the Shamir government is counting on the U.S. to veto, following its customary practice of protecting Israel, no matter its offenses. If that happens, then the American hostages in Lebanon will certainly pay. Make no mistake.

Bethlehem is not the only Christian community where Christmas this year is very dim. Think of the homes of those Americans still held captive, as much to the failure of this nation to implement a Middle East policy based on human rights, as to their kidnappers. They are political hostages: Their captors are not simply criminals. There is a difference.

When many of you go to church tomorrow evening, I ask that you remember in your prayers those forlorn Americans chained and locked up in darkness, somewhere in Lebanon. And if you have a moment left over, and the thought occurs, you might ask that One God, sacred to Muslims and Jews, as well as Christians, to have mercy on the Palestinians and their oppressors. The Israelis may need more prayers than their victims.

In the pursuit of an empire, lost in the Biblical past, that small nation has sacrificed its just claim as a refuge and a sanctuary for a people who taught, by lesson and example, as the ancient Greeks never could, humanity to all mankind.

If I had my way, in every home this season, the cheerful mix of red and green would give way to black, for the dead and maimed Palestinian men, women and children, but also for those young men and boys in uniform who pulled the triggers: They are also victims. We must forgive and pray for them, because as soldiers of an earlier occupation army, "... for they know not what they do."

In truth, Good Friday suits more my mood these days. I cannot, therefore, wish a Merry Christmas, but trust that you, your family and friends will share the peace of the season. Love one another.

Would like Meachum to clear up comments made in his column

2/3/88

A recent column by Roy Meachum was titled "A Right, A Duty," and Mr. Meachum returned to his favorite topic — events in Israel. I would like Mr. Meachum to clear up several points in future columns. The first was caused by this quote from his article:

"If much of the world has forgotten the killing and dying in 1943 Warsaw, I have not. A ragtag collection of men and women, buttressed by children and a few aged, stood off the might of the surrounding Nazi army for months. The ghetto fighters refused to surrender because life no longer held hope for them. Were they alive, those men and women would understand today's Palestinians."

Yes, those men and women would understand the Jews of Israel and their fear of extermination by hostile, hateful people. They would fight for Israel. They would applaud the restraint that Israel is showing. Yes, too, a people who were surrounded by an enemy willing to kill all Jews of all ages, nationalities and circumstances would understand the position of Israel.

Did Mr. Meachum mean the interpretation I have given his words or did he mean that the Jews of Warsaw would be on the side of the Palestinians? There are survivors of the war against the Jews in Europe during the 1940s. If there are some who are now with the Palestinians, let Mr. Meachum identify them.

It would be impossible to claim that all Israel does is right and all the Palestinians do is wrong. And many in Israel as well as the U.S. are critical of some of Israel's actions. But not of Israel's right to survive. Let any Arab — or anyone else — walk quietly down the streets of Tel Aviv at any time. And let it be known that this is going on. Do you, gentle reader, believe that the Jews of Israel will kill the Arab? Now change the person to a Jew and the city to, um, we have a problem here.

No Jew can even enter most Moslem countries. So I can't pick any city at all in Saudi Arabia, Abu Dhabi, etc. But let's suppose the Jew did find a city in a Moslem country. In how many would he be killed? Yes, Mr. Meachum, many of them. Even non-Moslem countries have seen the indiscriminate killing of Jews by dedicated Moslems.

Mr. Meachum seems to feel that the only people in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict who count are the Palestinians. Perhaps the last sentence that I quoted of his means he does indeed understand the desire of the Israeli enemies to wipe Israel out completely.

Perhaps he can address that issue.

Secondly, I'd like to ask Mr. Meachum why he has started to use phrases like "the occupation power" or "the occupation regime" rather than "Israel." Is he attempting to recognize that citizens of Israel are divided on the matter of Gaza, the West Bank, the treatment of Palestinians, etc? And so, rather than use the word "Israel," he is separating the country of Israel into parts? Or is he trying to avoid the word "Israel" for another reason?

Perhaps Mr. Meachum will not directly answer these questions and the remarks of other letter writers. But at least let him say that he won't answer his critics. The lives of Jews as well as non-Jews are equally important simply because they are both people. Mr. Meachum should not leave "hanging" doubts that he believes that.

VINCENT J. MOONEY JR.
Frederick

1/27/88

Glad News-Post provides forum for free exchange of ideas and opinions

I can't believe that I am writing to you for the second time in as many days, but I was so flabbergasted by the letters sent in by Julia Hanna and Paul Jorgensen, requesting the removal of Harold Weisberg's commentary from your paper that it compelled me to write again.

While Ms. Hanna's purpose may seem innocent and well-meaning, and while there may be an element of truth in the content of the disclaimer he (Mr. Jorgensen) feels should be added to Roy Meachum's column regarding Harold Weisberg's opinions of their content, don't they both realize that this would amount to nothing less than censorship by the News-Post of free speech and the free exchange of ideas and opinions? Don't they also realize that if this form of censorship was exercised by the paper, it may very well prevent the both of them from expressing freely their disagreement with Mr. Weisberg's views, which in fact is the real purpose of both letters?

They should both be thankful that they live in a society which not only allows, but encourages, the likes of Mr. Weisberg to disagree with Mr. Meachum (justifiably, I might add), but also allows both Ms. Hanna and Mr. Jorgensen to disagree with Mr. Weisberg. They should also be very thankful that they live in a city which has such an open forum such as the News-Post which is always willing to print the views of all concerned individuals, regardless of their position. For this position, the News-Post should be highly commended.

Perhaps Ms. Hanna would have been happier living in Nazi Germany which certainly would not have not allowed the gentle-Jew feud between Mr. Meachum and Mr. Weisberg to continue, much less be made the subject matter of a public forum such as yours. As to her opinion of, and friendship with Mr. Meachum, I guess there's no accounting for taste.

ROBERT E. ALLISON
Frederick

'The man you love to hate'

Camelot falls to the spite of Modred. Conway loses Shangri-la to the demands of a trite reporter. Frederick has Roy Meachum.

Your venomous resident fish monger in his Jan. 13 good wishes to the "mayor's success," fully justifies the American perception of the cheap journalist as the moral and social equivalent of a pimp.

No facts, of course. Roy solely presents innuendo suggesting that Ronald Young has financed his business venture through corruption and will run it by thoroughly taking advantage of his position as mayor while shirking his public responsibilities.

What vile tripe! What absolute trash!

One is tempted to ask how Roy financed his illegal picket fence. Did that "red headed quaker lady" whom we read about, ad nauseam, launch her enterprise by a government grant? Is it possible to honorably enter business? Instruct us, Roy, for we are ignorant.

Still, one is grateful for Meachum. He has locally replaced the silent screen villain Eric Von Stroheim as "the man you love to hate." The difference being that Von Stroheim, a gentleman, had, even as an Austrian immigrant, a far better command of the English language.

JAMES ALEXANDER
Frederick

1/25/88

1/23/88

Reid entitled to his opinion, but he should check his facts

I have read Robert C. Reid's column in the Jan. 12, Frederick News, and found it to be one of the most inexact accounts of current Mid-East affairs I have ever read. He accuses Israeli soldiers of "firing randomly and indiscriminately into groups of Palestinian youths," and of "murdering defenseless civilians." Admittedly, Israel has little experience in dealing with civil unrest, but according to the press reports I have read, including a few in *The News*, Mr. Reid's "defenseless" victims have been attacking soldiers and civilians with weapons ranging from knives to Molotov cocktails.

As his column continues, Mr. Reid showed his sense of history to be as poor as his sense of the present. He notes that prior to 1948, there was no Israel. He ignores the fact that the Arab countries which are Israel's neighbors are also the products of 20th century politics. For centuries, the region was controlled by the Ottoman Empire (Turkey). Ottoman control did not end until 1917.

Mr. Reid further gives the impression that Israel was created out of Arab territory taken as a result of war. The fact is that the United Nations drew Israel's boundaries out of Jewish land. (There was a constant Jewish population in this area going back to biblical days.) The bulk of Palestine was occupied by Arabs and went to create an Arab state — Jordan. Israel accepted this partition, but the Arabs rejected it demanding all the land. Five Arab armies attacked Israel, but were defeated.

The Arab nations and leaders have never accepted their responsibility in creating the Mid-East morass. Their only defense is a revisionist history which Mr. Reid blindly accepts.

Mr. Reid is entitled to his opinion, but before he prints it in a newspaper, he is obligated to check out the facts.

MICHAEL FLEISCHACKER
Frederick

Meachum's actions should be subject to special considerations

A recent editorial in the Frederick News-Post stated that Roy Meachum should not receive any special consideration, either positive or negative, from the Planning and Zoning Board and/or the public at large regarding any determination as to whether his now infamous fence stays or goes.

I disagree with this position completely!!

Mr. Meachum has appointed himself Frederick's resident expert in all matters political, social, moral, educational, etc., and is the self-professed master of all he surveys (or not as the case may be), or reads, or hears, or from whatever questionable sources his information comes. Does he feel that his self-exhaulted position places his actions above reproach? Surely, a man so expert in all city matters would know that the installation of his fence was in violation of a city ordinance. If this is the case, his action is nothing less than flagrant disregard to city ordinances if they are inconvenient with respect to his personal needs or desires.

Is this the same man that we wish to have as the guardian of the people, albeit self-appointed? I think not.

On the other hand, if he was unaware of the ordinance, is this possibly an indication of a chinque in Don Quixote's armour? Lack of such knowledge would be perfectly understandable amongst the ordinary citizenry, such as you and I, but would be deemed unthinkable in Mr. Meachum who considers himself a combination of the Caped Crusader, Masked Avenger, Captain Nice and Mighty Mouse all rolled into one being. Are we now to place believability in his quasi-factual statements or opinions as he seemingly desires us to do, or should we first consider the source and/or motive? Think about it.

In conclusion, since Mr. Meachum has placed himself in the position of guardian of all that is right (or wrong) in Frederick, his actions should be exemplary, and thus his actions should be subject to special considerations, both positive and negative.

Whether the installation of the fence was the result of lack of knowledge of city ordinances or a total disregard for them is not the issue. What is now fact is that the fence is in violation and should come down. If not, who will be next to display such wanton disregard? Mr. Meachum again? Sharon? Ron Young? Chief Ashton?

Yea verily, the mind doth boggle!

ROBERT E. ALLISON
Frederick

Meachum wrong to misuse Dr. King's birthday to endorse violence

Instead of "Dr. King today" you should have headlined Roy Meachum's column "Roy Meachum Self-Exposed."

Although in his apparently endless series of calumnies, his long tirade of unadulterated Hitlerism, his campaign of anti-Semitism and Israel-bashing, there is no depth to which he has not sunk in

101
4/23/88

his preaching of race hatred, nothing too foul for him to invent in his pro-Arab propaganda, this disgusting misuse of Dr. King's birthday is truly the most evil. It also is either his most obvious flaunting of ignorance while he portrays himself as all-knowing or the crassest commercialism or the most telling proof of what I've been saying for years, that for what you pay him he will and does say anything, the first thing that pops out of the murk of his mind that appears to serve his dishonest purposes.

Now he represents the apostle of non-violence as the endorser of violence.

He has Dr. King, with whom he has communed from the grave on which he spits while dancing on it, solidly behind the violence of the misguided Arab children in Gaza.

There is, apparently, nothing too shameful for him. But have the papers no pride, no self-respect, no sense of decency? Doesn't anybody at the papers have any journalistic standards at all? Doesn't anybody there care about his endless lies, his total fabrications, his constant misinforming of your readers and his continual misleading of the young in particular?

Can there be anything more ignorant or evil than representing Dr. King as supporting any kind of violence, in this case weeks on end of it, including firebombing?

Anything is possible for Mr. Meachum when he sees a chance for more of his preaching of anti-Semitism, but doesn't any editor know that Dr. King was in Memphis to be killed there only because he was determined to lead a non-violent demonstration after the youngsters there started a riot with only small sticks with which they broke windows — not rocks and firebombs?

The actuality, as is so often true, is the exact opposite of what he writes and you uncritically publish.

When he gets cute in his pretense of omniscience, as usual it is something he just made up because it appears to serve his dishonest purposes. For example, "Certainly, Dr. King never sought to bring justice to Alabama by sitting down with the governor of New York."

Certainly, Ignoramus Incarnate, he did exactly that, and not just once but several times!

Mr. Meachum says that he "defended Dr. King while he was alive." Where? At the bridge in Selma or in some idle chatter, where talk is cheap?

He can and he does say anything, no matter how evil or false or cheap and you pay him for it. Disgusting! And in all of this you portray yourselves as endorsing his propaganda, his lies and libels, his preaching of hatred, in this case along with a report from the National Council of Churches, which found that " 'hate violence' (is) rising." You and Mr. Meachum do your share!

HAROLD WEISBERG
Frederick

Meachum's defenders don't like his writings 'exposed'

In their letters published Jan. 8, Carl Reggio and Meredith P. Davidson say I hate Roy Meachum. Mr. Reggio loves Mr. Meachum because he thinks Mr. Meachum "charmed my little girl in the grocery store." Mr. Davidson says he is a scholar. Therefore — and not because I have written anything that is in any way wrong — I ought not be commenting on Mr. Meachum's virulence.

Neither even suggested I made any factual error or that any opinion I offered is unjustified. They just don't like Mr. Meachum's writings exposed.

With only two exceptions, this has been what I have written about. The two exceptions: his egregious error about the Senate and the Bork hearings and the attitude of superiority and omniscience and his open disregard for the law.

I don't know Mr. Meachum; to the best of my knowledge I've never seen him, I haven't spoken to him, and I have no interest in him personally. I have tried to provide an antidote to his venom and, although it is never possible to catch up on all his glib errors, to correct some of them. No more.

I am glad that the papers published these vacuous letters, whether or not by Mr. Meachum's friends, because they serve to underscore that what I have written, that he is factually incorrect and merely says the first thing that pops into his mind. Otherwise the scholar would have attributed factual error or unjustified opinions to me. I invite them to do so.

I can only wonder what field of scholarship is Mr. Davidson's specialty when he says "there are real villains out there, such as the Ayatollah Khomeini and Colonel Quadhafi" so why do I write about Meachum's columns? First of all *they* are "out there" and we are right here. Second, can it possibly be that Scholar Davidson does not understand that I *have* written about them in that I have said that Mr. Meachum, to this day, persists in regarding their gangs of kidnapers and thugs as true "patriots" and not criminals? Or is Mr. Davidson "out there."

HAROLD WEISBERG,
Frederick

1/20/88

Let's call a truce

1/13/89

Most of us are longing for a peaceful world. That peace must begin on an individual one-to-one basis.

Therefore, I should like to see a cessation on attacks on individuals such as the News-Post fosters on the editorial and sometimes other pages. Such assassination of an individual's character makes most readers uncomfortable.

About a year ago I asked the editor to drop Mr. Weisberg's vituperative attacks against Roy Meachum, telling him that encouraging a gentile-Jew feud was detrimental to our community, where most of us live with one another peaceably. So it should be regardless of race, color or creed.

His reply was that both sides should be presented. However, Mr. Weisberg's venomous articles have been ignored by Mr. Meachum.

Neither did I like the publication of Burkittsville's residents feuding with one another. Surely there can be peacemaking in a small community.

The Latin quotation is so true.

"Ira furor brevis est," anger is a brief madness. I have often observed how hate destroys the hater more than it does his recipient.

Let's call a truce. Our papers are too good to perpetuate the evil.

Personally, whether we always agree with the Meachum column or not, my husband and I appreciate his friendship.

He is a man of compassion, generous and loyal to his friends.

JULIA E. HANNA
Frederick

Print a disclaimer and drop the drivel

Why do you continue to waste editorial space so that Harold Weisberg can vent his personal hatred for columnist Roy Meachum?

The only apparent theme in Weisberg's ramblings is that he despises Roy Meachum and everything Meachum says or does.

Rather than devoting more column space to such drivel, it would be easier on Post readers if you printed the following disclaimer at the end of every Meachum column: "Harold Weisberg disagrees with all of the above on the grounds that Roy Meachum's existence is racist, sexist, and bigoted, and constitutes high crimes against humanity."

Think about it.

PAUL VICTOR JORGENSEN
Middletown

1/12/88

Do fence him in

Having just returned to Brigadoon from the wilds of Arizona, I see that Frederick's answer to Joan of Arc — that courageous crusader Roy Meachum — is yet again under seige by the local war lords! A vicious triumvirate consisting of city hall, the county commissioners and Harold Weisberg is trying to tear good ol' Roy's picket fence down on the flimsy pretext that it is a flagrant violation of the zoning laws. Not only spiteful, but, in my opinion, a tactical error.

If Roy wants to box himself in, he should be encouraged rather than frustrated — a point on which even all his friends agree. I've spoken to both of them.

Let's have a referendum.

I'm confident that the voting public will fully support Roy, provided, of course, that his redoubt is at least 8-foot high, constructed of electrified barbed wire and welded shut from the outside. As a public service, Mayhem Kennels of Boonsboro is fully prepared to patrol the perimeter with attack pit dobermans should Roy attempt to pole vault his way back to a newspaper desk.

JAMES ALEXANDER
Frederick

1/8/88

Suggestion to Weisberg: Burn venomous letters and dance on the ashes

I cannot, for the life of me, understand how any individual — for whatever reason — could build up such acrid hate for another individual as Harold Weisberg obviously has for Roy Meachum. Sometimes it sounds almost scary and, when sizzled into print — over and over again — it becomes downright boring. What a pity it is for Mr. Weisberg to waste such abominating criticism on the views and opinions expressed (and, yes, even with a few errors, here and there) by a columnist when there are real villains out there, such as the Ayatollah Khomeini and Colonel Quadhafi who — by their contemptible deeds — have earned such criticism.

I have a suggestion for Mr. Weisberg: The next time he gets that uncontrollable urge to spew venom and hate at Mr. Meachum, go right ahead and write his long, rambling and execrating letter about his personal and self-conjured-up villain — but, instead of sending it to *The News-Post* — just take it into his back yard and burn it and then dance all over the ashes.

He might not only find this to be highly therapeutic for himself, but I can assure him that he would be doing all of us scholars here in Frederick, and in the surrounding areas, a great favor. (yes, I said scholars — not yokels — as he seems to enjoy dubbing us.)

MEREDITH P. DAVIDSON,
Frederick

Writer entitled to opinion even if others don't agree

1/8/99
Many months ago, an older, bearded, grandfather-like gentlemen charmed my little girl in the grocery store. For a while, my little girl wanted to see him again; however, I had no idea who he was until several weeks later when I was reading the newspaper and discovered who he was. It was exciting to see who the gentleman was who had charmed my little girl that day.

This was my first impression of this man, and, subsequently, I began to read his columns and all the articles written by and about him. Thoughts that constantly came into my mind when reading these articles stemmed from: If you don't have anything nice to say about somebody, don't say anything at all; you shouldn't throw stones at people if you yourself live in a glass house; love your neighbor as yourself; to, do unto others as you would have others do unto you. What this boils down to is that some of his writings I may or may not agree with, but he is entitled to his opinion as he sees the situation.

The gentleman who was so nice to my daughter was Roy Meachum.

I recently read an article about him in the Jan. 4 issue of the Post, Opinion/Commentary section, by, again, none other than Harold Weisberg. These kinds of articles are getting out of hand again.

To Mr. Weisberg, I stand corrected. A feud does take two people. However, he seems to be on a one-man crusade against Mr. Meachum. It's obvious that he doesn't like him, his house, his fence or his opinions, and I think he is going overboard in his article about him.

To Mr. Meachum, I'm proud of the manner in which he is able to turn the other cheek. And again, while I don't always agree with his ideas, it does give me something to think about and ponder.

CARL REGGIO
Monrovia