

Letters on “The New York Times’ Friedman libels the Iraqi resistance”

10 November 2003

Below we post a selection of recent letters to the World Socialist Web Site on Barry Grey’s November 4 article, “The New York Times’ Friedman libels the Iraqi resistance”

It’s been a long time since anyone I know called Thomas Friedman a “liberal” anything, his markedly pro-Zionist stance undermines any liberal title he may claim and of course his reckless support of the invasion of Iraq did not exactly help his case. In any event, I appreciate your analysis. I am ashamed to share a city with Thomas Friedman and think he is, in fact, a dangerous man.

SD

New York, N.Y.

5 November 2003

Your 11/4 Friedman piece, by Barry Grey, was right on, in both substance and tone.

As for “Next comes one of Friedman’s favorite phrases: “Let’s get real”: As those who are familiar with Friedman’s columns know, this rhetorical flourish inevitably announces an outpouring of even more outlandish and cynical lies. Mr. Friedman does not disappoint...

Sort of like Nixon, who, whenever he said, “Let’s make one thing perfectly clear,” knew least what he was talking about.

TS

4 November 2003

Could not agree more with Mr. Grey’s assessment of Friedman’s views on Iraq—the latter journalist a prime example of so-called “liberal” spokespersons actively supporting the Bush administration’s foreign policy.

With each passing day Noam Chomsky’s and others sustained criticism of our foreign policy and the media establishment that supports it, appears as the voice of a reason amidst an American elite, both conservative and liberal, gone mad, seduced by our nation’s blatant drive

toward global hegemony.

DG

6 November 2003

Excellent Barry. The *New York Times* has been “with the program” since the Reagan administration and no one should view it as a liberal publication or one that is independent of the multitude of lobbies (i.e., advertisers) that run the US.

Thanks for telling it as it is. Friedman is the most disappointing of all because he has the forum to actually oppose US hegemony and has chosen to side with the fascists.

RN

New York, N.Y.

4 November 2003

Obviously Friedman, Cohen et al. get handsomely paid for their propaganda pieces.

The easiest and most meaningless references to liberals (whatever that is supposed to mean) as well as its attendant reference to conservatives (whatever that is supposed to also mean) in the case of our invasion of Iraq is to simply ask the following:

“What is different [sacrosanct] about our invasion of Iraq, from Hitler’s invasions of several nations as well as the invasion of Kuwait by the irrepressible Saddam Hussein?”

Without getting to the oft-quoted BS of moralizing, an invasion is an invasion is an invasion. If moralizing is sine qua non then the dying should be done by the moralizers. Dying is dying. Dying in Iraq is no different than dying in Vietnam, Somalia, Cambodia, Panama, Columbia, etc.

The principal and principled question has to do with “Who the hell are these people whose interest is to propagandize the American citizen into accepting the dying of their sons, daughters, fathers, husbands, et al. as a moral victory in an immoral war?”

Cordially,
AD
4 November 2003



To contact the WSWs and the
Socialist Equality Party visit:

wsws.org/contact