

# **Persuasive Letters to Editors**

***Damn! Why Didn't I Write A Letter to Help Pakistan?***

***Darn! Why Didn't I Help America To Understand Pakistan?***

***Wow! Letter Writing Is So Simple.***

David Khan, MBA

Member

**Association Of Pakistani Professionals**

<http://www.aopp.org>

**Permission to Photocopy and Email:** You can photocopy, download, or email this book, but you can not sell or profit.

**Copyrighted Material:** David Khan is the sole author and he owns the 100% copy rights of the contents of this book. He can be contacted at [david@aopp.org](mailto:david@aopp.org)

**Edition:** First edition/July 2004

## Persuasive phrases:

- **But there's a problem**
- **It is mind boggling**
- **Put simply**

## Example:

Letter to the editor The Los Angeles Times

Dear Editor LA Times:

Josh Meyer ("2 Allies Aided Bin Laden, Say Panel Members"/The World/LATimes/June 20, 04) says that Pakistan and Saudi-Arabia helped set the stage for the Sept. 11 attacks by cutting deals with the Taliban and Osama bin Laden . . . . **But there's a problem:** In his opening paragraph, Meyers glowingly blames Pakistan and Saudi-Arabia, but buries the role of the U.S. in the last paragraph of his article. During the Afghan war against the Soviet, the U.S. provided billions of dollars, military hardware, and training to Taliban (then Afghan Mujahidin), and Saudi fighters such as Osama. **So it is mind boggling** that Meyer will pin the blame on Pakistan and Saudi-Arabia without

accurately explaining the role of the US who created the mess of Islamic religious extremism in Pakistan and Saudi-Arabia.

Now that the Taliban are history and Al-Qaida is on the run, Pakistan has arrested and handed over more than 500 Al-Qaida members to the U.S. Recently, Islamabad has launched a military action in the tribal areas to flush out the foreign religious extremists. **Put simply**, Pakistan is doing the dirty work of the U.S. without the loss of any GIs.

Regards,  
David Khan

## **Persuasive phrases:**

- **Forgive us if we don't jump up and down with joy**
- **But what did Pakistan get**

## **Example:**

Letter to the editor of The New York Times

Dear Editor:

**Forgive Pakistanis if they don't jump up and down with joy** over the recent declaration (“U.S. Will Celebrate Pakistan as a ‘Major Non-NATO Ally’” by David Rohde dated March 18) of secretary Colin L. Powell that the U.S. would designate Pakistan a “major non-NATO ally.”

Pakistan had been an ally of the West when Islamabad joined SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization), CENTO (Central Treaty Organization), and helped wage a war against the Soviets in Afghanistan. **But what did Pakistan get** after the main goals of each of these alliances were achieved? Not much. In fact, Pakistan was abandoned, sanctioned, and left to rot by the West until 9/11 when the forgotten Islamabad was approached with a stick and carrot.

Therefore, many Pakistanis see this new designation of Islamabad as a “major non-NATO ally” nothing but another Western gimmick to use and then ditch Pakistan.

Sincerely,  
David Khan

## **Persuasive phrases:**

- **But you forget to mention**
- **There is another factor**

## **Example:**

Letter to the editor of The New York Times

Dear Editor The New York Times:

Steven R. Wiesman (“For 2 Ex-GWiesman, a Common Language”/ March 1, 2004) says, “. . . the intensity of the Pakistani-American relationship. It is one defined by mutual suspicion, mutual need, awkward disclosures about Pakistan's nuclear activities and a range of

urgent issues from tensions with India to the drive to crush terrorism and find Osama bin Laden.”

**But Mr. Wiesman forgets to mention** that the Pakistani suspicion arises from the fact that Pakistan was ditched, abandoned, and sanctioned after it was used by Washington in its war in Afghanistan against the Soviets. Pakistanis are very bitter about that sour experience. Pakistan’s suspicion also arises from the fact that the many pro-Israeli and neo-conservative think tanks in Washington propose a policy of ‘Constructive Disengagement’ for Pakistan. This so called policy of “Constructive Disengagement” recommends increasing friendship with India and keeping Pakistan at bay. In a nutshell, this policy asserts that treating Pakistan like a ‘dog on a tight leach’ is appropriate.

**There is another factor** in Pakistani psyche that feeds suspicion. This suspicion arises from the fear that Americans (read Jews and Christians) are after the nukes of the only nuclear capable Muslim country. Moreover Pakistanis complain that many - Jews, Christians, Hindus, and Buddhists – already have the nuclear capability, so why can’t Muslims (read Pakistan) have it too?

Any move to implement the “Constructive Disengagement Policy” or force Pakistan to curb its nuclear program would further create suspicion in the minds of Pakistanis who were once been abandoned by the US in the not so distant past.

Sincerely,  
David Khan

## Persuasive phrases:

- **Damn you do and damn you don't**
- **Why blame Pakistan**
- **Pakistan has made mistakes like any other country**
- **If America can learn from its mistake, so can Pakistan**

### Example:

Letter to Mr. Arnaud de Borchgrave, an editor at The Washington Times

Dear Mr. de Borchgrave:

**Damn you do and damn you don't** - Western media is strange. First it wants truth then it says it is not enough. Where do you draw the line?

**Why blame Pakistan;** why not blame many other European countries that supplied high tech crucial nuclear instruments and laser devices to Iran.

When Pakistan was sanctioned and left to rot after the Afghan war, where were these Western media think tanks (septic tanks) that did not raise their voices to engage Pakistan?

**Pakistan has made mistakes like any other country.** For example, America has made many mistakes. America (my adopted country) has gone through a bloody civil war. America has gone through a period where its military killed its own people (American-Indians). America has gone through a period when the West was lawless. America has gone through a period when it jailed its own citizens (Japanese-Americans).

American has gone through a period when it nuked two Japanese cities killing thousands of innocent men, women, and children. American has gone through a period when it attacked Iraq under the wrong (unfounded) premise of WMD.

**If America can learn from its mistakes, so can Pakistan.** Pakistan is going through its 'growing pains.' America and the West need to engage Pakistan, not curse Pakistan.

Did you read the news about 'Hammer-and-Anvil' action happening with the help of Pakistani and American soldiers on Pak-Afghan border to kill the remaining Al-Qaida? Pakistan is shedding blood and is helping the US. Yet, the US journalists like you still curse Pakistan. Why?

Regards,  
David Khan

## **Persuasive phrases:**

- **This is a nasty insinuation**
- **Bait and switch**
- **Piggy backing**
- **Agreed . . . but**
- **I ask Barry Bearak to apologize to Pakistanis.**

## **Example:**

Letter to the editor of The Washington Post

Dear editor:

Barry Bearak's article "Pakistan is. . . ./December 7) **is a nasty insinuation against Pakistan.**

Barry Bearak's article blends his personal anti-Pakistan views with the remarks of gullible citizens, crooked politicians, and extremist mullahs. He uses a tricky journalistic approach called '**bait and switch.**'

If you read carefully, you will find that Barry Bearak first interviews the murderous Maulana Azam Tariq and then uses Maulana's absurd remarks as a plank to inject his venom against Pakistan. This is called '**piggy backing**' in the field of yellow journalism.

"Bait and switch" and "piggy-backing" do not suit a Pulitzer ward winning journalist like Barry Bearak.

Barry Bearak sees all the bad stuff in Pakistan, but he does not any good thing at all. How come he does not mention that Standard and Poor's Rating Services has recently revised Pakistan's sovereign credit rating from "stable" to "positive?" How come he ignores 5.8 percent economic growth rate in Pakistan? How come he does not mention recent Pakistani peace gestures towards India? May be because these types of positive developments do not fit into the anti-Pakistan mental mold of Barry Bearak?

**Agreed that Pakistan does have more than its own share of problems, but** I find it highly unfair that Barry Bearak would label the entire Pakistani nation as dishonest, duplicit, and deceptive. This does not speak highly of Barry Bearak's journalistic credentials.

**I ask Barry Bearak to apologize to Pakistanis.**

Sincerely,  
David Khan

## **Persuasive phrases:**

- **In short, your article amounts to**
- **You seem to forget**
- **Are we not practicing . . . that hurt the U.S. taxpayers**

## **Example:**

Letter to Leon Hadar of CATO Institute

October 20, 2003

Dear Leon Hadar:

I read your article "The Real War On Terrorism Is In Pakistan, Not Iraq" with lots of skepticism. **In short, your article amounts to Pakistan-bashing and fictional writing.**

Pakistan has to defend itself from six to seven times bigger nuclear arch rival India, who already has numerical superiority in conventional

warfare against Pakistan. Therefore, Pakistan has a fundamental right to keep and maintain a sizable arsenal of nuclear weapons and delivery systems as deterrence. You should understand this and refrain from chastising Pakistan for maintaining a nuclear program for self defense.

**You seem to forget** that Pakistan was a very moderate country back in the 70s until the CIA started to funnel guns and dollars in the early 80s for the Afghan Mujahideen [Islamic Freedom Fighters!] who were fighting with the Soviets in Afghanistan. Then the US 'cut and ran' after the Soviets were defeated leading to the rise of the Taliban and the Al-Qaida. If you want to blame Pakistan, be my guest, but a major part of the blame has to be put on the shoulders of Washington. Therefore, the US needs to go back and gently help Pakistan rid itself from extremism that was injected in that area by Washington.

In your article you talk about the US trade practices. We [U.S.] speak of a global economic system based on nondiscriminatory free-trade principles. Then how come we, as taxpayers, provide 3.5 billion dollars in subsidies to the U.S. cotton farmers who produce cotton at a cost of 60 to 80 cents per pound when it could be produced at a much reduced cost in Pakistan? **Are we not practicing protectionism and subsidization that hurt the U.S. taxpayers and the poor farmers of Pakistan?**

Sincerely,  
David Khan

## **Persuasive phrase:**

- **Where are you getting your numbers**

### **Example:**

Letter to the editor of The Washington Times

Dear editor:

Letter to editor/ Madrassa alert –Published October 30, 2003

In “Madrassa alert: editorial dated October 30,” it says, “There are currently up to 1 million madrassas in Pakistan, a minority of which, perhaps 15 percent, indoctrinate their pupils with Islamic vitriol and militancy.”

**Where are you getting your numbers regarding Madrassas?** When you say “up to 1 million madrassas,” do you mean 10 or 100 or 1 million madrassas? When you say, “perhaps 15 percent,” it begs a question: Where does this figure of 15 percent come from? Have you done a survey? Or, are you making these numbers up?

I tend to believe that you meant 1 million madrassas. If this is true and say we assign a population of 250 pupils in each madrassa then the total population of madrassa going pupils would be 250 millions. But the total population of Pakistan is close to 145 million people! So, these numbers don't add up, do they?

Next time, please do not hedge besides phrases like “up to” or “perhaps”.

Instead, do verifiable research to back up the numbers you quote in your editorials. Otherwise, the integrity of the The Washington Times would go down.

Sincerely,  
David Khan,

## **Persuasive phrase:**

- **Mr. Jones has committed a fallacy**

## **Example:**

Letter to the editor of The Washington Times

October 30, 2003

Dear editor:

Re: Saudi Nukes by David W. Jones/"Week in Review" – The Washington Times /Published on October 30, 2003

To support the questionable assertions of Mr. Arnaud de Borchgrave, Mr. David W. Jones presented the claims of Mr. Simon Henderson and reports from an Israeli radio.

**Mr. Jones has committed a double fallacy here.** First, Mr. de Borchgrave's claims should be supported by reasons. But, Mr. Jones supported Mr. de Borchgrave's claims by citing the claims of Mr. Henderson. Mr. Jones can not support a claim by another claim. A claim has to be supported by reasons. But Mr. Jones presented no supporting

reasons. Second, Mr. Jones used the claims of an Israeli general to support the claims of Mr. de Borchgrave. Duh! Mr. de Borchgrave's pro-Israel article was anti-Pakistan and anti-Saudi-Arabia. So what did Mr. Jones expect from an Israeli general to say? Of course, the Israeli general agreed with Mr. de Borchgrave.

Sincerely,  
David Khan

## **Persuasive phrases:**

- **The Non Proliferation Treaty's future is doubtful**
- **While inducting Israel would require the resolution of the knotty Arab-Israeli issue, the induction of Pakistan and India into the NPT would be less complicated**

## **Example:**

Letter to the Director of the International Atomic Energy Agency

June 26, 2004

Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei

Director General

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

P.O. Box – 100

Wagramer Strasse 5, A – 1400 Vienna

Austria

Re: NPT's future doubtful without India, Pakistan, and Israel

Dear Dr. ElBaradei :

**The Non Proliferation Treaty's future is doubtful without India, Pakistan, and Israel.** To the dismay of those who want to see this world free of atomic weapons, the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) may soon be in an awkward position.

India, Pakistan, and Israel are de facto nuclear states that are not signatories to the NPT; North Korea, a nuclear capable country, has recently ejected itself from the NPT, and any further pressure from the U. S. and European Union on Iran may force Tehran to follow the suit of North Korea.

There may soon be as many nuclear capable countries outside the NPT as inside the NPT – United States, Britain, France, Russia, and China. Such a scenario would diminish the credibility of the NPT. With the de facto nuclear states – India, Pakistan, and Israel – outside the contours of the NPT, the treaty's future is in question and any hope of stopping Iran and North Korea is doubtful.

Pakistan and India want to be recognized as nuclear powers before joining the NPT; however, the U.S. opposes such recognition. But as the U.S. foreign policy shifts to cultivate friendly relations with Muslim countries – of which Pakistan is an important member - to fight against the global religious terrorism, Washington can put little pressure on Pakistan to join NPT without recognizing it as a nuclear power. India will not submit to the U.S. request because of its regional rivalry with China. Israel is not going to join the NPT without a security guarantee from its Arab neighbors. **While inducting Israel would require the**

**resolution of the knotty Palestinian-Israeli issue, the induction of Pakistan and India into NPT would be less complicated.**

I believe, the inclusion of India and Pakistan into the folds of the NPT is far more important to the world than the ego of the U.S. that opposes to recognize them as nuclear powers. The IAEA and the United States Senate could play an important role in convincing the U.S. government to recognize the de facto nuclear status of Pakistan and India.

Sincerely,  
David Khan

## **Persuasive phrases:**

- **If Pakistan were to blame for supplying nuclear components to Iran, the blame should also be shared with several European countries who also helped Tehran**
- **After all, Washington could have hardly expected a favorable behavior from a country which was ditched**
- **The US should consider Pakistan's past deeds as water under the bridge**
- **Any further pressure on Islamabad would play in the hands of anti-US hardliners**

## **Example:**

Letter to the editor The New York Times

Dear editor:

This letter is in response to “Alleged Iran-Pakistan nuclear tie” Inquiry Suggests Pakistanis Sold Nuclear Secrets by The New York Times/ December 22, 2003 by William J. Broad, David Rohde and David E. Sanger.

**If Pakistan were to blame for supplying nuclear components to Iran, the blame should also be shared with several European countries and Russia who also helped Tehran.** While a tremendous covert US pressure has been put on Pakistan, not much has been said against Russia and European countries.

Past U.S. discriminatory policies that pushed Pakistan away from Washington are also to blame for the alleged cooperation between Islamabad and Tehran. **After all, Washington could have hardly expected a favorable behavior from a country which was ditched, discarded, sanctioned, and cursed after it was used against Soviet Union in Afghanistan.**

India and Pakistan both have long courted Iran for strategic reasons. Any alleged Pakistani cooperation with Iran could have been to undercut Indian influence in Iran. Therefore, Pakistan has mitigating circumstances for the alleged cooperation. Moreover, Pakistan can not be blamed for protecting its strategic interests in the region especially when Washington left Islamabad out in the cold in a tough neighborhood to defend itself.

**The US should consider Pakistan's past deeds as water under the bridge.** Additionally, Pakistan should be praised as it investigates its nuclear scientists and cooperates with the US.

The US should stop embarrassing Pakistan for its past deeds. A heavy handed US approach is making Musharraf's government look like a puppet of Washington. Any further pressure on Islamabad, on this matter, would play in the hands of anti-US hardliners in Pakistan.

Sincerely,  
David Khan

## **Persuasive phrases:**

- **First**
- **Second**
- **Third**
- **Fourth**

## **Example:**

Letter to the editor The Washington Times

December 14, 2003

Dear editor/Letters to editor/The Washington Times

The most recent attempt on Pakistani president Musharraf's life ("Assassination Attempt on Musharraf Fails," December 14, 2003) underlines followings four points:

**First**, Pakistani military planners should not have any illusions that their use of Jihadis in the Indian held Kashmir has come back to haunt them. The proverbial Jihadi tiger from which the military planner are now trying to dismount is attempting to kill them. Supporting Jihadis in the Indian held Kashmir but curbing them in Pakistan is a failed policy which must be abandoned. Despite the recent terrorist attack, Pakistan must stay the course to rid itself from the Jihadis – ironically, the very Jihadis Islamabad nourished.

**Second**, the U.S. government must continue to support Pakistani government's efforts against Jihadis. More U.S. support is necessary to train Pakistani law enforcement agencies to combat the terrorists, who wrongly believe that any liberal Pakistani government is effectively a puppet of the U.S. Therefore, the U.S. support to Pakistan has to be covert.

**Third**, it underscores how much danger Pakistan has taken to help the U. S. led war against the terrorism. Now, Washington must stand by Pakistan in its hour of stress and strain.

**Fourth**, Jihadi culture in Pakistan took its roots when Pakistan supported the CIA led Afghan war against the Soviets. Therefore, Washington has

a moral responsibility to help Pakistan rid itself from the Jihadi terrorists.

Sincerely,  
David Khan

## **Persuasive phrases:**

- **After reading your article, I decided to write you**
- **Highly speculative and shows prejudice**
- **True . . . But**
- **He also ignores**

## **Example:**

Letter to the editor of The Seattle Post

June 12, 2003

Dear editor The Seattle Post:

**After** reading Ted Van Dyk's article ("Greatest nuclear threat is Pakistan", dated June 12, 2003), **I decided to write to you.**

Mr. Dyk writes, "Pakistan, a hotbed of Islamic fundamentalism and a country in which Osama bin Laden most likely is and being protected, has a stockpile of nuclear weapons and materials. It soon could be controlled by forces allied with al-Qaida and other groups."

Except the fact that Pakistan has a small stockpile of nuclear weapons to defend itself from India, all other charges made by Mr. Dyk are highly speculative and show prejudice toward Pakistan.

No body knows where Osama is hiding, but speculation (speculation that is!) is that he might be hiding somewhere in the mountains between Afghanistan and Pakistan. However, it is quite possible that he could be hiding in countries like Sudan, Somalia, Yemen (Osama's native country) or may be he is dead. But for Mr. Dyk to single out Pakistan in his article without mentioning other possibilities - where Osama might be - is a pre-judgment against Pakistan and amounts to sensationalization.

**True**, Islamic conservatives have succeeded in winning elections and making democratically elected government in the smallest province – North West Frontier Province – of Pakistan. **But** these conservative Islamist pose no threat in taking over the country as speculated by Mr. Dyk. In fact, the large majority of fun-loving Pakistanis have resented the recent attacks of Islamic conservatives on cinema halls and music stores.

Pakistan is working shoulder to shoulder with the USA to fight al-Qaida, but Mr. Dyk forgets to mention Pakistan's handing over of approximately 500 al-Qaida members to the FBI. **He also ignores** that Pakistan provides strategic military bases within Pakistan to US forces that fight in Afghanistan.

I would hope that Mr. Dyk, in future, would write much more balance and fair articles.

Regards,  
David Khan

## Persuasive phrases:

- **You wrote**
- **You are incorrect**
- **On a separate note**

### Example:

Letter to the editor of The Washington Times

December 3, 2003

Dear editor:

In Sunday's editorial "The Pakistan-India cease fire," **you wrote**, "Pakistan and India have fought three wars since the two states were created in 1949 following British colonial rule." **The year is incorrect.** Both Pakistan and India were created in 1947.

**On a separate note**, I appreciate that you gave proper credit to the Pakistani government for its efforts in the recent cease-fire.

Sincerely,  
David Khan

## Letter Writing Tips

**1): Give your full name, address, and telephone numbers at the end of letter.**

### **Example:**

Robert Aslam  
123 Clinton Drive, Apt # 45  
Lawrence, Kansas 77044  
Tel: (987) 654-3210 day time  
Tel: (987) 456-8593 evening  
Email: Robert\_Aslam@hotmail.com

**2): Be polite.**

**3): Your letter to editor does not have to be eloquent.**

Dear Editor LA Times: