

# **Sample Letters**

# **EXAMPLE #1** (published letter)

Herald News (Northern New Jersey) June 3, 2012

The article, whose source is The Associated Press, states that settlers near the settlement of Yitzhar set fire to Palestinians fields. The AP story claimed that Yitzhar is "one of the most militant in the West Bank."

This last comment by the AP reporter is obviously very prejudicial. I am curious if that statement was the author's own personal opinion or if the AP has actually assembled a real list of "militant settlements." And I wonder how such a list might be obtained and shared with the readership.

Was there a poll conducted? Who commissioned the poll? Who got to vote?

Has there been even one village in the Palestinian territories that the AP has ever described as being militant, or is that characterization solely reserved for settlements in Israel?

In a perfect world, readers should be able to trust that the information provided by their newspapers is acquired through the highest standards and from the most professional news outlets. I think that in this case, these standards fell well short of the mark.

Jonathan Gold Clifton, NJ

# **EXAMPLE # 2 (published letter)**

Boston Globe June 7, 2012

The most divisive issue with regard to Israel today, for Americans and Jewish Americans in particular, is the so-called two-state solution ("Israel's rocky reputation," Letters, May 30). It's a marvel of a solution. Israel gives in some, the Palestinians give in some, and we have peace -- and two co-existing, peaceful states. It's beautiful.

However, this solution isn't so simple at all. Not as long as any partners Israel might have to sit with at the table are in league with other states, countries, and assorted terrorist organizations whose stated purpose is to destroy Israel. The reality as they see it isn't two states, but one -- one without Israel, and under Muslim and Arab control.



The Palestinian Authority sent a delegation to Gaza last month to prepare for elections that are intended to unite the two warring factions of Fatah in the West Bank and Hamas. To realists in Israel and elsewhere, that isn't the way to start off peace negotiations. Instead, the Palestinian Authority should divest itself of any connections with Hamas. If and when that happens, negotiations for true peace would soon be underway.

Boaz D. Heilman West Newton, MA

#### EXAMPLE #3

### **Letter before editing**

Oshkosh Daily News October 1, 2012

A colleague of mine forwarded your article below written by Reporter Elyse Chen. I was very frustrated and upset to read what Ms. Chen had to say.

Why must the Israeli population continually have to put up with terror from their neighbors? The Palestinian Arabs continue to unleash attacks on Israel. And when Palestinian Arabs are inconvenienced because of a response of terror they're responsible for, how do they respond? They respond with more terror!

Chen claims that long lines at Israeli security checkpoints provoke Palestinian outrage, and she seems to validate their violent responses to the inconvenience. This is not the way to react! If it were true that it is okay to react violently to such an inconvenience, all travelers would start hitting people or worse when waiting online at the airport. And it is ironic because we're waiting on line because of terrorism! Yet long lines at U.S. airports, which are necessary security measures to prevent further terrorist attacks, fail to provoke murderous attacks by Americans."

I have to mention another point, too. Chen neglects to tell her readers something extremely important and crucial to their understanding. Prior to the launch of the "Second Intifada" in 2000, there were relatively few checkpoints. Israel was only forced to build them when waves of terrorists began murdering its citizens."

How can this reporter make lame excuses for the Palestinian Arabs yet ignore such important context? Such a baffling attitude escapes my comprehension. And how can your paper publish such an inaccurate article? Perhaps one of your esteemed editors or an enlightened reader can explain this to me.

Eve Jacobs Oshkosh, WI



## Letter after editing

Oshkosh Daily News October 1, 2012

I am writing in reference to the article by Elyse Chen on 9/29/12, "Palestinians Provoked."

Chen claims that long lines at Israeli security checkpoints provoke Palestinian outrage, and she seems to accept violent Palestinian responses to the inconvenience. Chen neglects to tell her readers that prior to the "second intifada" (starting in 2000), there were relatively few checkpoints. Israel was forced to build them only when waves of terrorists began murdering its citizens.

Unfortunately, due to global terror, we now must stand in long lines at U.S. airports before boarding an airplane. We understand this to be a necessary security measure to help prevent terrorist attacks in our country. I am sure that Americans don't like standing in line any more than Palestinian Arabs, so please tell me, why does this inconvenience fail to provoke murderous attacks by Americans?

Eve Jacobs Oshkosh, WI