

News & Features
Editorial
Commentary
Letters
Obituaries
Socials
Sports
Submissions

Washington
JEWISH WEEK
Online Edition

Click
Here To
**SUBSCRIBE
ONLINE**



Jewish Personals

[Click Here](#)

Boycotting the 'Post'

We appreciate your thoughts on our scheduled June 10 boycott of *The Washington Post* ("Considering a boycott, *WJW*, May 9). Your primary points are: (1) it is unreasonable to expect American news reporters to report through the eyes of Jewish or Israeli media and (2) even conceding *The Washington Post* does sometimes engage in biased reporting, in view of the history of the Arab boycott, we should

- **Saving lives**
Judaism encourages organ donations
- **'We can't go back'**
Much of organized Jewry to join women's rights march

take pause before engaging in a boycott, even if that boycott is, as our first action, limited to only one week.

First, we don't expect American media to report with the same perspective as Israeli or Jewish media. The fact that numerous mainstream American newspapers do not report the news with the anti-Israel slant of the *Post* shows that what we perceive as bias is not, as you describe it, news being "written and edited through the prism of American, not Israeli or Jewish, eyes."

While you concede that the *Post's* reporting is at times unfair, you urge us to "bombard the *Post* É drowning the paper in letters to the editor." This we have done, with little effect. You ask: "Do you really want to use the mechanism that anti-Israel activists have so long used and are trying to revitalize in their efforts to hurt the Jewish state?" Your focus should be on the righteousness of the cause of a particular boycott and not on the notion that a boycott itself is off limits to Jews.

The Arabs were wrong in boycotting Israel, not because boycotting itself is wrong, but because their reasons and their tactics in threatening companies into compliance were wrong. We would hate to think that the history of the immoral Arab boycott of Israel has left Jews fearful of utilizing a perfectly legitimate means of protest in support of a correct and moral point, but that seems to be what you are advocating.

ROBERT G. SAMET

Advisory Committee, BoycottThePost.Org, Rockville

Does this make sense?

From a historical perspective, the Green Line should begin to define the boundaries of a new Palestinian state. After all, what could possibly be a better legal basis than an armistice line? Certainly the original division of historic Palestine, into an Arab and a Jewish state, by the League of Nations, which established the original British Mandate, has no legal basis. Why would anyone believe that an equal division -- 75 percent for the Arabs and 25 percent for the Jews -- makes any sense? Clearly a division with the Jordan River as the boundary between Palestine on the west bank and Transjordan on the east bank makes no sense and was properly rejected by the Arabs as being only 75 percent reasonable.

The 1948 division by the U.N. attempted to satisfy the Arabs, while finally creating the Jewish state, by carving out another