



ISRAEL MATTERS!

Publication of the Israel Affairs Committee of Temple Beth Sholom
1809 Whitney Avenue, Hamden, CT 06517-1401



Issue Number 134
June 2019

The New York Times – Anti-Semitism and Anti-Zionism

The New York Times editorial board said in an editorial that the newspaper’s recent publication of “an appalling political cartoon” [right] is “evidence of a profound danger — not only of anti-Semitism but of numbness to its creep.” The newspaper also acknowledged its own historical contributions to the rise of anti-Semitism. “In the 1930s and the 1940s, The Times was largely silent as anti-Semitism rose up and bathed the world in blood,” it wrote. “That failure still haunts this newspaper.”

The editorial said that “anti-Semitic imagery is particularly dangerous now,” citing the attack on the Poway of Chabad synagogue and the contemporaneous release of the Anti-Defamation League’s annual audit of anti-Semitic incidents, which shows that the number of assaults against American Jews more than doubled from 2017 to 2018. “Jews face even greater hostility and danger in Europe, where the cartoon was created,” the editorial also said.

The editorial also acknowledged that criticism of Israel can be couched in anti-Semitic terms. “This is also a period of rising criticism of Israel, much of it directed at the rightward drift of its own government and some of it even questioning Israel’s very foundation as a Jewish state. We have been and remain stalwart supporters of Israel, and

believe that good-faith criticism should work to



Editors’ note: Since the first issue of *Israel Matters!* your editors have assiduously strived to maintain a hard break between providing information about Israel as separate and distinct (as reasonably possible) from information about Judaism and/or anti-Semitism. In this issue, however, we break with tradition to report on one of the premier news reporters itself, The New York Times. For many years the paper has been assailed by supporters of Israel as frequently, if not consistently, biased against it in its news reporting. Recently, it published the above cartoon, which appeared in the opinion section of the newspaper’s international print edition that depicted Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu as a dachshund-breed guide dog wearing a Star of David collar and leading a blind, yarmulke-clad President Donald Trump. The backlash was fierce and immediate; that the Times had crossed the line by printing a characterization that at once called into question an Anti-Zionist and anti-Semitic bias. Herewith, we print information about the publication, the Times’ response, and some of the backlash it engendered.

strengthen it over the long term by helping it stay true to its democratic values. But anti-Zionism can clearly serve as a cover for anti-Semitism — and some criticism of Israel, as the cartoon demonstrated, is couched openly in anti-Semitic terms,” the editorial said.

It also accused President Donald Trump of doing “too little to rouse the national conscience” against anti-Semitism. “Though he condemned the cartoon in The Times, he has failed to speak out against anti-Semitic groups like the white nationalists who marched in Charlottesville, Va., in 2017 chanting, ‘Jews will not replace us,’” the paper wrote.

The newspaper in a first statement acknowledged that the image was “offensive” and “included anti-Semitic tropes.”

After issuing an editor’s note that called the cartoon “an error of judgment,” the Times put out a second statement with a more forceful apology.

“We are deeply sorry for the publication of an anti-Semitic political cartoon ... in the print edition of The New York Times that circulates outside of the United States, and we are committed to making sure nothing like this ever hap-

(Continued)

pens again. Such imagery is always dangerous, and at a time when anti-Semitism is on the rise worldwide, it's all the more unacceptable. We have investigated how this happened and learned that, because of a faulty process, a single editor working without adequate oversight downloaded the syndicated cartoon and made the decision to include it on the Opinion page. The matter remains under review, and we are evaluating our internal processes and training. We anticipate significant changes."

In response to this event, the National Review published the following article entitled, "The New York Times' Anti-Semitism Is Shocking, but Not Surprising," together with the sub-heading, "They've been anti-Israel and anti-Jewish for years."

This week, the New York Times got itself into hot water for printing a blatantly Jew-hating cartoon in its international edition. The cartoon depicted Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu as an elongated dachshund, a Star of David hanging around his neck, leading a fat, blind, yarmulke-wearing Donald Trump through the streets. The implication: The nefarious, animalistic Jew is in control of the Jew-perverted president of the United States.

The image is nothing new. In 1940, the *Lustige Blatter*, a weekly German humor magazine, printed an image of a tall, ugly, bearded Hasidic Jew taking a tiny Winston Churchill by the hand and leading him across the surface of the globe.

So, what would tempt the New York Times to print an illustration directly from the mind of Julius Streicher? The fact that the Times, like many of today's mainstream media outlets, has been completely and utterly willing to cover for and, indeed, engage in anti-Semitism, so long as it is disguised as anti-Zionism. Undoubtedly, the editors at the Times believed that the cartoon was merely a criticism of Israel, not a criticism of Jews. That excuse found its logical apotheosis in a 2014 German regional-court ruling that characterized a firebombing of a synagogue as merely a protest against Israel, rather than act of anti-Semitism.

The Times isn't far behind that court. In the past few months alone, the Times ran a long piece praising the terrorist-backed Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement against Israel — a movement whose founders explicitly describe it as an economic attempt to destroy the Jewish state. The author of that piece, Nathan Thrall, had previously praised Hamas's violence against Israel, calling its terrorism the "direct result of the choice by Is-

rael and the West." Unsurprisingly, the Washington Free Beacon has reported that Thrall is "tied to a large network of BDS supporters that are funded into the millions by the Qatari government." The Times made no mention of his affiliation.

The Times ardently defended Representative Ilhan Omar (D., Minn.) against charges of anti-Semitism, even suggesting that her anti-Semitic attribution of American support for Israel to Jewish money was an important consciousness-raising exercise. Their headline: "Ilhan Omar's Criticism Raises the Question: Is AIPAC Too Powerful?"

The Times suggested that information about Palestinian payments to families of terrorists was "far-right conspiracy programming." The Times ignored Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas's calling U.S. ambassador David Friedman "son of a dog," didn't report Abbas's comments about Jews "falsifying history," and omitted coverage of Hamas leader Yahya Sinwar telling Palestinians about to storm the Israeli border, "We will take down the border, and we will tear out their hearts from their bodies."

Back in 2015, the New York Times printed a list of lawmakers who voted against the anti-Israel Iran deal — listing them by the percentage of Jews in their districts and noting which ones were Jewish themselves. Back in 2014, the public editor of the newspaper advised reporters to cover the Palestinians as "more than just victims," thanks to the paper's insanely one-sided coverage.

The Times' ugly record of anti-Semitism goes all the way back to 2000, when the newspaper printed a photo of a Jewish student beaten by Palestinian Arabs and defended by an Israeli soldier — but captioned the photo by labeling the beaten man an Arab.

In actuality, the Times cares about anti-Semitism only when it can be used as a political weapon. The Times admitted in November that it had neglected to cover anti-Semitic hate crimes in New York City specifically because such anti-Semitism "refuses to conform to an easy narrative with a single ideological enemy," explaining that "when a Hasidic man or woman is attacked by anyone in New York City, mainstream progressive advocacy groups do not typically send out emails calling for concern and fellowship and candlelight vigils in Union Square."

The mainstream Left has engaged in self-flattering blindness when it comes to Jew-hatred. And all too often, that blindness veers into outright anti-Semitism.

[Article combined from JTA.org and nationalreview.com]