The time is right. Your public is calling. Now how will you turn mountains of data and research into a short 800-word op-ed?

Today you learn …

Guidelines for Op-Ed, Commentary, and Opinion Writing
OP-ED RULES
THOUGHT

MESSAGE
Commentary

- Frame your research
- Plant your flag
- Impact & influence
- Raise your profile
- Invites to write more
- Leads to collaboration
- Raises SLS profile

Making Solar Big Enough to Matter

Solar energy has become big business. Over the past decade it has plummeted in cost, surged in volume, and, as booming industries do, benefited some investors and burned others. The International Energy Agency has predicted photovoltaic solar could provide up to 16 percent of the world’s electricity by midcentury — an enormous increase from the roughly 1 percent that solar generates today. But for solar to realize its potential, governments will have to grow up too. They’ll need to overhaul their solar policies to make them ruthlessly economically efficient.

The widespread view that solar power is a hopelessly subsidized business is quickly growing outdated. In some particularly sunny spots, such as certain parts of the Middle East, solar power now is beating fossil-fueled electricity on price without subsidies.

Even where — as in the United States — solar needs subsidies, it’s getting cheaper. American utilities now are signing 20-year agreements to buy solar power at, and in some cases below, 5 cents per kilowatt-hour. Those prices, which reflect tax breaks, are in some instances low enough to compete with electricity from power plants that burn plentiful American natural gas. Solar will be all the more competitive if gas prices rise — something many predict — and as more governments impose prices on carbon dioxide emissions.
Spreading Your Message

- Target your publication
- Think about social media
- Offer a tweet or sound bite
- Kickstart the issue
- Reframe the debate
- Deepen discussion
- Heighten your credibility
Inspiration!

Then take a stand!

And you research something new.

And your forum is right.

When opportunity strikes and

You have a forum is right.

And your forum is right.

Then take a stand!
Rhetorical Fundamentals

The Rhetorical Triangle
Your Credibility
Logic and Analysis
Emotion, Values, Empathy
Voice and Target Audience
How do you compress all that research?
The News Hook
Hook the reader with a compelling lede

- A good lede seizes on the urgency and critical nature of the issue at hand.
- The lede frames the problems and points toward the solution.
- It should be direct and to the point.
- It should underscore why your issue matters.

- Ask yourself: **Why today?**
Strong lede tackles the issue head on

Solar energy has become big business. Over the past decade it has plummeted in cost, surged in volume, and, as booming industries do, benefited some investors and burned others. The International Energy Agency has predicted photovoltaic solar could provide up to 16 percent of the world’s electricity by midcentury—an enormous increase from the roughly 1 percent that solar generates today. But for solar to realize its potential, governments will have to grow up too. They’ll need to overhaul their solar policies to make them ruthlessly economically efficient.

https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/21/opinion/making-solar-big-enough-to-matter.html?_r=1
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Motive

Theme
The Coming Revolution of Drone Warfare

New technologies will allow many states— and nonstate actors— to make low-cost but highly credible threats.

By AMY ZEGART
March 18, 2015 7:12 p.m

HOOK: Imagine an aircraft carrier — in the sky, not on sea. From its bay, it deploys swarms of armed drones that can fly, spy and kill, all guided by the touch of a computer keyboard thousands of miles away. This isn’t a scene from a science-fiction movie. It’s part of a recent proposal from the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Pentagon skunk works that brought us the Internet, videoconferencing and GPS. Now Darpa is soliciting ideas from companies on how to bring this technology to life.

MOTIVE: Equally important are the questions about how drones will be used strategically. Drones do not only offer new ways to kill. They can prevent war.

THESIS: Pentagon planners and defense intellectuals have spent decades analyzing the functions of nuclear weapons, but they have never considered seriously how drones could change the face of combat and coercion, whether by threat or with deterrence.
Hook / Lede
Motive / Theme
BREAKOUT SESSION
EVIDENCE: Help them understand the issue and your motive
WHO
WHEN
WHERE
WHAT
HOW
WHICH
WHOSE
Core Characteristics of Op-Ed

**WHO and WHAT / Where**
1. Describes the problem in terms of WHO the major player/s are, sometimes framed as a representative example.
2. Concisely **states the problem or issue** often in term of current policy or as a situation.

**WHY**
1. Explains why the issue is troubling. May offers **reasons** for changes to that policy or situation.
2. May signpost **key policy options** or approaches; sometimes this is simply stated as the status quo, sometimes it includes alternatives that seek to remedy or address the problem.
3. May signpost the **pros and cons** of key options or may highlight the **general trends** in addressing the issue.
4. References key data, examples, statistics, or scholarly analysis as evidence of WHY.

**HOW / When**
1. **Recommends** course/s of action or **states findings** that may lead to recommendations in future policy work.
2. Offers **supporting reasons** for selecting or highlighting that course of action or findings.
3. May offer a **timeline** to carry out the recommendations.

**SO WHAT or THE ASK**
1. Returns to the motive or central objective to underscore the **urgency** or importance of acting on the recommendations.
Debbie Mukamal is executive director of the Stanford Criminal Justice Center at Stanford Law School and David Sklansky is a professor at Stanford Law School and a faculty co-director of the Stanford Criminal Justice Center.

The relentless drumbeat of black men shot dead by police continues, leaving community after community anguished, angry and seeking justice. The protests this month over the killings of Carnell Snell Jr. in Los Angeles and Alfred Olango in El Cajon, Calif., underscore once again the desperate need to reassure all Americans that the criminal-justice system values their lives and is committed to ridding itself of racial bias. Providing that assurance will require reforms not just in policing but in prosecution as well. It is especially imperative to rethink the way that fatal shootings by police officers are investigated and prosecuted.
Debbie Mukamal is executive director of the Stanford Criminal Justice Center at Stanford Law School. David Sklansky is a professor at Stanford Law School and a faculty co-director of the Stanford Criminal Justice Center.

The relentless drumbeat of black men shot dead by police continues, leaving community after community anguished, angry and seeking justice. The protests this month over the killings of Carnell Snell Jr. in Los Angeles and Alfred Olango in El Cajon, Calif., underscore once again the desperate need to assure all Americans that the criminal-justice system values their lives and is committed to ridding itself of racial bias. Providing that assurance will require reforms not just in policing but in prosecution as well. It is especially imperative to rethink the way that fatal shootings by police officers are investigated and prosecuted.
A new report from the Stanford Criminal Justice Center recommends ways to improve the criminal investigation and prosecution of police shootings. The recommendations aim to balance three goals: protecting the independence of prosecutorial decisions, providing accountability for those decisions and ensuring that the prosecutors and investigators working on these cases have the requisite expertise.

These goals are often in tension. Making prosecutors more accountable, for example, can undermine their ability to exercise independent judgment. Officials outside the criminal-justice system often will have fewer conflicts of interest but typically will lack the skills and experience necessary to handle a complicated criminal case. Taking these difficult trade-offs into account, our report recommends changes both in the investigation and in the prosecution of fatal police shootings.

First, except when absolutely necessary, a criminal investigation should not be led by the agency employing the officer involved in the incident. Such probes — which involve securing the crime scene, collecting and testing physical evidence and interviewing witnesses — often are conducted by the very agency employing the officer under investigation, giving rise to insuperable and unnecessary conflicts of interest. It is difficult to investigate one’s own colleagues.

Even when complete objectivity is possible, the appearance of bias undermines the public trust in police and public perceptions of fairness. That is why the Justice Department and President Obama’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing both have warned that self-policing by a law-enforcement agency should be avoided.

Rather than the employing agency, state-level officials or a neighboring law-enforcement agency unconnected to the shooting should lead the investigation. In Wisconsin, a new state law requires that at least two independent investigators conduct the investigation of any officer-involved death. This approach, while only a few years old, seems to be working and enjoys support of both law enforcement and community
4 VISUALIZE DATA
Why the NYPD’s decision to drop a unit that spies on Muslims may help counterterrorism

By Rachel Gillum   April 16, 2014

The New York Police Department announced Tuesday that it would disband a special unit charged with detecting terrorist threats by secretly conducting surveillance on Muslims in New York. Applauded by Muslim and civil rights organizations, such a move could actually boost U.S. counterterrorism efforts, according to data from the Muslim American National Opinion Survey (MANOS) of which I am the principal investigator.
The MANOS data reveal that even after accounting for a variety of background features and baseline attitudes about police, the 13 percent of Muslim respondents living in New York are significantly more cynical about how police will likely treat a Muslim criminal suspect, compared to other Muslims across the country.

**Police will Behave Fairly toward Muslim Suspect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent in Agreement</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Muslim American National Opinion Survey 2013*

In a paper assessing how Muslim-Americans develop opinions about U.S. law enforcement, I find that those who are most familiar with the American system and its laws are best able to identify when law enforcement is violating its principles of equality and fairness. Using a randomized experiment, I find that U.S.-born Muslims are 17 percent less likely to say that police will behave fairly when dealing with a Muslim suspect, compared to a non-Muslim suspect. This is a striking difference relative to the beliefs of foreign-born Muslims, who like other U.S. immigrants are significantly more trusting of police.
In a related paper, I show using regression analysis that these expectations of fairness are directly related to willingness to help law enforcement. Figure 3 shows that U.S.-born Muslims are significantly less willing to provide police information on a criminal case involving a Muslim suspect.
But after the withdrawal of foreign military forces from Iraq in 2011, ISI began to regain ground there in a much less pressured security environment. The outbreak of civil war in Syria in the same year provided ISI a new opportunity for expansion, which in turn led to the dissolution of its alliance with al-Qaeda central, as the following diagram of militant group relationships in Syria shows.

The Islamic State's Relationships in Syria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Al-Qaeda</th>
<th>Jabhat al-Nusra</th>
<th>Hezbollah</th>
<th>Suqour al-Sham</th>
<th>Liwa al-Tawhid</th>
<th>Ahrar al-Sham</th>
<th>Free Syrian Army</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Black = Affiliates or Allies, Red = Rivals, No Relation = Not Yet Formed

Kara Gordon (Data: Marty Orendorff, Mapping Militant Organizations, Stanford University)
STRENGTHS

Weaknesses

Opportunities

THREATS
Showing some initiative, ISI set up the Nusra Front as its Syrian affiliate in 2011, attempting to absorb the group fully after renaming itself the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria in 2013. But the leaders of the Nusra Front rejected that merger. By 2014 Ayman al-Zawahiri, Osama bin Laden’s successor as the leader of al-Qaeda, had had enough of al-Baghdadi’s disobedience, including its attempt to take over the Nusra Front without consulting al-Qaeda central, and at that point the split between ISIS and al-Qaeda was final. Asked to choose between ISIS and al-Qaeda, Nusra essentially chose the latter.

The new ISIS was now pitted against the governments of both Iraq and Syria, an array of local groups in both countries, including elements of the Free Syrian Army—the loose coalition of secular, “moderate” rebel groups backed by the West—and the Kurdish pesh merga, as well as the Nusra Front and other al-Qaeda affiliates. Some important Syrian groups that had joined in the Islamic Front, a coalition of seven major Islamist groups whose ideology fell somewhere between that of the moderates and the jihadists, initially pledged allegiance to ISIS but later recanted. (To add to the confusion, rival groups occasionally cooperate on the battlefield, forming the kinds of tactical alliances that are not uncommon in such tangled conflicts.) Despite what seemed to be an unfavorable starting position, ISIS made impressive territorial gains in Syria and Iraq. By the spring of 2014 ISIS astonished the West by sweeping almost unopposed into Mosul, and in June the offensive culminated with the declaration of the caliphate under the aegis of the Islamic State, now no longer limited to Iraq and Syria.
Evidence and Data Breakout Session
PRACTICE

Cogent

Argument

Not Comprehensive Superfluity
Basic Structure

- Lede or Hook
- The Problem or Issue
- Your Credibility
  - Evidence 1
  - Evidence 2
  - Evidence 3
- Counterargument and Rebuttal
  - Motive or Theme
- Options for Change
- Recommendations
  - The Ask
- Next Steps and Conclusion
Keep the writing simple and direct

- Imagine the reader as having a basic level of interest in current events and public policy, but no real expertise. You are the expert.
- Keep your sentences short, direct, informal, and dramatic.
- Write in a natural voice, as if speaking to a colleague.
- Avoid jargon or academic language.
- Be precise and concise.
- A good style book is Joseph Williams, *Style: Lessons in Clarity and Grace.*
Why Iran Might Want to Enrich Uranium, Even If They Don't Want a Bomb

As negotiators return from Lausanne with an outline for a nuclear framework in hand, the fate of a deal now shifts to a U.S. Senate that remains baffled at Iran’s dogged defense of their enrichment program. Our back-of-the-envelope reasoning typically proceeds as follows: Iran can buy reactor fuel on the international market for cheaper than what it costs to enrich it. Thus, the only reason for Iran to enzymel to produce fuel for a bomb.

But this detached calculus is made possible only by a radical ahistoricism that seems to pervade nearly all discussion of the Iranian nuclear program. Understanding Iran’s nuclear history is crucial for interpreting key aspects of the emerging deal.

First, some techno-economics. Nuclear power reactors represent towering investments. Most are designed to last 40 years, and their lives are often extended to 50 or 60. Meanwhile, the price of fuel makes up less than 30 percent of their operating cost. Hence, to an Iranian decision-maker hoping to protect Iran’s nuclear investment, it probably doesn’t much matter whether the Russia of today agrees to sell them nuclear fuel. Iran will need secure access to fuel for the next half-century of life, and the history of Iran’s scuttled efforts to seek peaceful nuclear cooperation would loom large in the assessment of future prospects.

Opening hook
Currency
Problem that sets up argument
Thesis or argument
Motive or Theme
Evidence
Counterargument and Rebuttal
That history begins with the revolution in 1979. Construction of the Bushehr reactor had begun under the Shah, but after the revolution the German construction firm backed out of the project. This left Iran with a multi-billion-dollar reactor that was 80 percent complete, and many sources indicate that pressure by Washington fomented the withdrawal. In any case, U.S. pressure was certainly involved in 1983 when the International Atomic Energy Agency ceased cooperation with Iran’s peaceful nuclear program, and when France, China and Argentina backed out of fuel-supply and technology-transfer arrangements during the ’80s and ’90s. Given these events, why would Iranians ever rely on the international community for nuclear fuel in the coming decades? It was during this time that Iran reverted to self-reliance, seeking enrichment technology from A.Q. Kahn’s clandestine network.

Westerners often ask: If Iran’s enrichment program could be justified for peaceful purposes, why did they keep their enrichment program secret for so long?

This is a silly question. If the U.S. were able to persuade important nuclear states not to cooperate even with Iran’s fuel-fabrication efforts (which have no weapons application), then a declared enrichment program would be out of the question. Clandestine procurement of centrifuge technology was probably Iran’s only option. Even the more recent Fordow enrichment facility -- ominously hidden in a mountain -- can be seen as a shrewd insurance plan when considered alongside the danger to their other facilities. Iran’s much larger Natanz enrichment plant has been under persistent threat of Israeli airstrike to “take out” Iran’s uranium route to a bomb. As fellow nonproliferation analyst Ivanka Barzashka and others have pointed out, the existence of the Fordow plant removes this option since it would be invulnerable to an airstrike. In fact, if Iran can simply continue enriching at Fordow, then destroying Natanz is even worse than pointless, since it would likely change Iran’s calculus in favor of weaponization.

Well played, Iran. Well played.
I cannot speak for Iran, but these considerations might help us understand their sticking points. For instance, it may seem mysterious that Iran is willing to limit centrifuge numbers below an industrial scale, yet still insists on continuing to enrich. But keeping a small fleet of running centrifuges allows Iran to maintain their centrifuge expertise in a healthy and advanced state. This way, if the deal falls apart and they lose access to fuel from abroad, they can quickly expand to industrial scale and avoid shutting down their reactors like they did in the '80s.

Now, our best intelligence indicates that, prior to 2003, Iran did have a program to design a bomb alongside their enrichment activities. That same intelligence tells us that the bomb program was halted in 2003, and has not continued since. What has continued is the progressive isolation of Iran by the West, and the clear need for Iranian self-reliance for all things nuclear. And lest we congratulate ourselves that "harsh sanctions have finally brought Iran to the negotiating table," let me go ahead and pop that little bubble: Iran came to the table in 2003, before sanctions were escalated, with a better deal than we could possibly imagine today. We eloquently responded "you're evil, go away." Since then, they have done the rational thing and become excellent enrichers of uranium so they will never again be without fuel for their reactors.

No one wants to see Iran break out of the nonproliferation treaty. In our efforts to prevent this, we tech-savvy nonproliferation analysts have focused on monitoring their technical capabilities as if our funding depended on it (disclosure: it does). But consider that roughly a dozen nations could easily break out of the treaty, yet only one has. As a predictive variable to indicate impending nuclear proliferation, "technical capability" has been an abysmal failure. On the other hand, we discover a much more promising predictor when we note that the one NPT breakout nation, North Korea, was also the most politically and economically isolated. Isolated countries like bombs. Now as we consider the least-worst alternative to an agreement with Iran -- more sanctions and isolation -- let us hope that a final deal is reached this summer. And further, lets hope our embarrassment of a Congress stays the hell out of the way.
6 Where will you publish?
Think beyond the big names

- New York Times
- Wall Street Journal
- Big City Papers
  - London / Delhi / Santiago
  - LA Times / Boston Globe
- International Press
- The Hill
- Partisan Press
- Online Sources
  - Huffington Post
  - Politico
  - Buzzfeed
  - The Monkey Cage
- Industry Journals
- Blogs
Why Iran Might Want to Enrich Uranium, Even if They Don't Want a Bomb

As negotiators return from Lausanne with an outline for a nuclear framework in hand, the fate of a deal now shifts to a U.S. Senate that remains baffled at Iran’s dogged defense of their enrichment program. Our back-of-the-envelope reasoning typically proceeds as follows: Iran can buy reactor fuel on the international market for cheaper than what it costs to enrich it. Thus, the only reason for Iran to enrich is to produce fuel for a bomb.

But this detached calculus is made possible only by a radical ahistoricism that seems to pervade nearly all discussion of the Iranian nuclear program. Understanding Iran’s nuclear history is crucial for interpreting key aspects of the emerging deal.

First, some techno-economics. Nuclear power reactors represent towering investments. Most are designed to last 40 years, and their lives are often extended to 50 or 60. Meanwhile, the price of fuel makes up less than 30 percent of their operating costs.
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Abstract

We estimate the causal effect of a large development program on conflict in the Philippines through a regression discontinuity design that exploits an arbitrary poverty threshold used to assign eligibility for the program. We find that barely eligible municipalities experienced a large increase in conflict casualties compared to barely ineligible ones. This increase is mostly due to insurgent-initiated incidents in the early stages of program preparation. Our results are consistent with the hypothesis that insurgents try to sabotage the program because its success would weaken their support in the population.
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Number of foreign fighters from Europe in Syria is historically unprecedented. Who should be worried?

BY THOMAS HEGGHAMMER  November 27, 2013 at 10:49 am

Islamist fighters carry their flag during a funeral outside Aleppo. (Zain Karam/Reuters)

[Joshua Tucker: The following is a guest post from political scientist Thomas Hegghammer of the Norwegian Defense Research Establishment.]

Since 2011, large numbers of European Muslims have gone to Syria to fight with the rebels. Many have returned disillusioned. What needs to be done to prevent future waves of fighters?
NATIONAL SECURITY

Our Red Lines and Theirs

New information reveals why Saddam Hussein never used chemical weapons in the Gulf War.

BY BENJAMIN BUCH, SCOTT D. SAGAN  DECEMBER 13, 2013

If the Syrian civil war and, in particular, the horrific Ghouta attack this August have reminded the world of the persistent danger of chemical weapons, it is worth remembering that this is not the first time the United States has confronted a Middle Eastern dictator armed with...
The U.S. Public Deserves More than Trump’s Silence on Afghanistan

By Benjamin Haas

Thursday, April 6, 2017 at 2:49 PM

When I graduated from West Point in 2009, the war in Afghanistan was one of the hottest topics. President Barack Obama’s campaign and young presidency had been defined, in large part, by the debate about what should be done in Afghanistan. Should the US adopt a limited counterterrorism and training mission or a more comprehensive counterinsurgency campaign demanding tens of thousands more troops on the ground? After thoroughly considering the options, Obama chose a version of the latter. As a newly minted Army officer, I recognized the careful consideration he gave to the issue, and it inspired confidence. I could hardly wait to set foot on Afghan soil and contribute to the effort.

I was ultimately deployed to Afghanistan twice, spending a total of 16 months in various intelligence positions. And now, the war rages through its sixteenth year. I’ve lost friends to the conflict, and other friends have lost limbs. The US has made an immense financial investment—in 2014, it was reported the US had spent more on reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan than it spent on the Marshall Plan, which brought Europe back from the brink after WWII. Yet the American commander in Afghanistan recently described the war as at a “stalemate.” Indeed, America’s path forward in Afghanistan is as unclear as ever.

Afghanistan was a practically non-existent topic during the campaign and the presidential debates. As a candidate, Donald Trump provided only sporadic suggestions that he would “begrudgingly” maintain a troop presence in Afghanistan. Now in office, the Trump administration has offered little clarity. White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer indicated that the administration is reviewing Afghanistan policy, and military leadership seemingly supports a troop increase, though Defense Secretary James Mattis has not decided what his recommendation will be. But amidst all of the Trump administration’s controversies, this issue has suffered from a severe lack of executive attention. On a matter of war, America deserves more from the White House than infrequent, subdued references.

Trump, for his part, shows little interest in the war in Afghanistan. Since assuming office, he
Udall: Privacy is fundamental American right

Former U.S. Mark Udall addresses a "Security Conundrum" talk about NSA surveillance programs and warns they violate the fundamental right to privacy in America.
Copyright Act Statutory Damages in Age of the Internet
Paul Goldstein | Liou, Joyce
May 11, 2017 | Abstract

Against "Big Bets"
Larry Kramer
May 9, 2017 | Abstract

I Worked with the Drug Policy Office Trump Wants to Gut. Here’s Why It Matters for the Opioid Epidemic
Keith Humphreys
May 8, 2017 | Abstract

Growing ‘Gig Economy’ Also Grows the Wealth Gap
William B. Gould IV
May 7, 2017 | Abstract | Download

Homophobic, Islamophobic Green Is Not Fit To Be Army Secretary
Haas, Benjamin
May 5, 2017 | Abstract
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Pitching
Pitch Guidelines

• Do your research
• Find a real person
• Lead with your expertise
• Follow up
The Nitty-Gritty of Pitching

- Subject line!
- Include links
- No attachments
- Make yourself easy to find
- Use your credentials

---

Hi Chris,

I submitted an op-ed on behalf of a Stanford Law professor Gregory Ablavsky a few months ago on the designation of 1.35 million acres of land in Utah as Bears' Ears National Monument. We were told it wasn't something the Times could use at that point, but if there was a serious effort to undo the designation, to get in touch again (and the editor gave me your name).

Well... now that the 45-day review is being conducted by Secretary Zinke, I thought it would be a good time to get in touch again.

Prof. Ablavsky will revise the intro a bit based on some recent Trump language about a "massive federal land grab" but otherwise it'll mostly be the same (see below).

Regards,
Carla
How to Pitch

For more information, join one of our public programs (open to all) in one of our major cities.

How do you get someone to listen to you in the first place? How do you establish credibility, capture interest, and convey the immediate relevance of your point of view – quickly and decisively? Pitching can happen in lots of ways, but very often it is done by email.

An effective email pitch answers these basic questions:
- Why now? What’s the news hook? Why is this worth reading at this moment?
- So what? Why should people care?
- Why me? Why am I the best one to write this piece?

A pitch should also include:
- Your idea in a few lines
- Your credentials – only those that are relevant
- The finished piece pasted below your pitch
- Your contact information

Aspects of a successful pitch:
- Timely
- Well written
- Brief and clear
- Conveys expertise
- Unexpected point of view

Follow Up: If the editor responds:
- Thank your editor. Even if they said “no.” Remember that “no” can be the beginning of a conversation that can eventually lead to “yes.”
- If they published you, thank them not for showcasing you but for giving space to the ideas and issues.

Follow Up: If there is no response:
- Have a time limit. If your idea has a very short shelf life, you might give an editor a day or less to respond; if it’s evergreen, a week or two or more. Then send a follow-up email to the editor saying that you’d still like to run your piece in their publication, but since the piece is timely, if you don’t hear from them by the end of the day (week, whatever) you will assume they have passed, and you’ll be submitting your op-ed elsewhere.

Note: Most national newspapers will not consider your piece if you submit to more than one paper at the same time.

Frequently Asked Questions
For more background on writing op-eds, use these resources:

Op-Ed Project: theopedproject.org/

Harvard Kennedy School Communications Program: http://shorensteincenter.org/communications-program/

Contact:
Luci Herman, lherman@stanford.edu
Carla Spain, cspain@law.stanford.edu

Follow us on Facebook and Twitter:
Stanford SLS and SLS Policy Lab
@StanfordLaw and @SLSPolicyLab