

Nine Thousand-Plus Words of Anti-Zionist Propaganda

By Phyllis Chesler

I do not enjoy responding instantly, immediately, to every bit of breaking news, braying about the most immediate, the very latest item to cross my screen. But there are patterns. I cannot help but see them.

Thus, sometimes, a consistent, even normalized, outrage calls out to me, demanding a response. So here I go, about to repeat myself; I've been doing so for the last 25 years.

The New York Times

Take today's *New York Times*. It's my hometown newspaper, and I read it every single day, pay for it too. Invariably, on their front page, there is a four-column photo of Palestinian suffering—and there it is, yet again, today. It is not enough. On page 8A, there is an almost full-page story titled "Gazans Face Lethal Risk Getting Food From New Aid Hubs." That's just in case the photo is not enough.

Anti-semitism is also discussed at the bottom of the front page, one that sympathetically features New York City's anti-Zionist, pro-Palestine, pro-Globalize the Intifada candidate, Zohran Mamdani. This piece continues for a full page on A19—actually, it is two stories, one about Mamdani and the inevitable rift between Jews over his candidacy and another one titled "Young Muslims Got Behind Mamdani, and Their Parents Listened."

This is still not enough for the Gray Lady. On pages A22 and A

23, there are two opinion pieces, one full-page opinion piece by M. Gessen titled "The Story of Antisemitism Needs to Be Rewritten," and one by David Brooks titled "Netanyahu Was Right on Some Things."

Even as Brooks spells it out, he feels he must make sure that you know that he "detest(s) Bibi and Trump...but it would be a catastrophe...if we have to be against everything they are for." I guess Brooks is taking no chances in terms of endangering his bully pulpit.

And M. Gessen? She/he/they first focuses on how Mamdani, who is a Shia Muslim, has been suffering in a world of Islamophobes, how he has been falsely attacked as an Islamist "fundamentalist." She/he/they then goes on to admit that antisemitism does exist—however she may define it—but nowhere does she mention the Red-Green Alliance, nowhere does she write a single word about how Islam has historically and theologically persecuted, exiled, and murdered infidels, including Jews, in Muslim countries and that, even more importantly, Muslim countries such as Iran and Qatar have donated many billions of dollars over a sixty-year period to brainwash Americans in the media, on campuses, at the United Nations, and to support terrorism against America, against Israel, against their own dissidents, and especially among their own women.

Where Gessen can, she focuses the reader's attention on alleged Israeli racism, colonialism, and apartheid—but says nothing about Islam's long and still ongoing history of colonialism, imperialism, conversion via the sword, its practice of slavery—and its repeated and ongoing genocides of all infidels, Jews, Christians, Hindus, Buddhists, Bahá'í, Armenian Christians.

You can't call any of this fair and balanced—no, it is not at all, nor objective, not even "proportionate" in terms of its coverage of this particular burning issue.

The pro-Mamdani, mis-definitions of antisemitism, and the outright anti-Zionist articles all add up to 9,258 words in this single edition. My God! Compare that to the coverage of Ukraine in their pages, which today constitutes only 2,517 words.

From this single edition, which is not at all unique, one might conclude that the NYT is endorsing Curtis Sliwa for Mayor—or is it Mayor Adams?

First published in [Phyllis' Newsletter](#)