THE NEW YORK TIMES: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION

A Documented Study of Institutional Bias, Support for Authoritarian Regimes, False Narratives, Inaccurate Reporting, and the Paper's Role in the Progressive Media Ecosystem

Independent Scholarly Research

2026

Table of Contents

Abstract

The *New York Times* — founded in 1851, owned continuously by the Ochs-Sulzberger family since 1896, and widely regarded as the most influential newspaper in the United States — occupies a unique position in American public life. Its editorial decisions ripple through the entire media ecosystem, shaping what thousands of downstream outlets cover, how they frame it, and which stories they ignore. This position of influence makes the paper's documented failures — its support for tyrannical foreign governments, its pattern of factual inaccuracies, its ideological orientation toward the political left, its coverage of President Donald J. Trump in both his first and second terms, and its institutional relationships with like-minded progressive media organizations — a matter of significant public concern. This paper examines each of these areas in detail, drawing on the historical record, documented retractions, internal and external criticism of the paper's practices, academic media-bias research, and the paper's own published admissions of error. The paper does not argue that the *Times* has never produced important journalism — it has. It argues that the *Times* has systematically allowed institutional ideological commitments to corrupt its coverage in ways that have caused measurable harm to the accuracy of the American public's understanding of its own political reality.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction: The Gray Lady and the Public Trust

Historical Overview: From Republican Founding to Progressive Flagship

The Paper and Tyrannical Governments: A Pattern of Accommodation

A. Walter Duranty and the Soviet Holodomor (1932–1933)

B. Coverage of Communist China

C. The Times and Castro's Cuba

D. The Broader Pattern

Documented Inaccuracies, Fabrications, and Failed Fact-Checking

A. The Judith Miller / Iraq WMD Debacle (2002–2004)

B. The Jayson Blair Fabrication Scandal (2003)

C. The 1619 Project: Historical Revisionism and Factual Disputes

D. The Sarah Palin Defamation Case

E. The "17 Intelligence Agencies" Retraction

F. A Pattern of Corrections

V. The Paper's Support for the Political Left

A. Ownership, Structure, and Institutional Culture

B. Presidential Endorsements: A 65-Year Record

C. The Tom Cotton Op-Ed Controversy and Staff Revolt

D. The Bari Weiss Resignation

E. The Economist Study: Documented Leftward Drift

F. The Paper's Own Admissions

Coverage of President Donald J. Trump: First Term (2017–2021)

A. The Russia Collusion Narrative

B. The February 2017 Story Debunked by the FBI

C. The Steele Dossier and the *Times*' Role

D. The Columbia Journalism Review's Findings

E. Other First-Term Inaccuracies

Coverage of President Donald J. Trump: Second Term (2025–Present)

A. Framing and Story Selection

B. The Continuing Pattern

The Progressive Media Ecosystem: The *Times* and Its Allies

A. The Ideological Convergence of Legacy Media

B. CNN, MSNBC, and the *Times*: Shared Narratives

C. Pew Research Data on the Liberal Media Audience

D. The *Times* as the Ecosystem's Agenda-Setter

E. Declining Trust and Viewership

In Defense of the Paper: Counterarguments and Honest Assessment

X. Conclusion: The Cost of Institutional Bias in a Democratic Republic

Bibliography and Sources

I. Introduction: The Gray Lady and the Public Trust

There is a phrase embedded in American journalistic culture — "the newspaper of record" — that carries enormous weight. It implies not merely that a publication is large or influential, but that it aspires to something like official status as the authoritative account of events: the source to which historians, governments, and citizens will turn when they want to know what actually happened. The *New York Times* has held this status, formally and informally, for well over a century. When the *Times* says something is true, millions of people believe it. When the *Times* decides something is worth covering, the rest of the American media ecosystem follows. When the *Times* decides something is not worth covering, it often goes uncovered.

This position of disproportionate influence creates an enormous responsibility — and an equally enormous potential for harm when that influence is exercised in the service of institutional bias rather than the pursuit of truth. It is the argument of this paper that the *New York Times*, over the course of its modern history and with particular intensity since the 1960s, has exercised that influence in ways that have systematically favored progressive-left political positions, accommodated authoritarian regimes whose politics aligned with its ideological preferences, produced documented inaccuracies that have shaped major political events in the United States, and functioned as the intellectual and editorial anchor of a broader progressive media ecosystem that includes CNN, MSNBC, NPR, *The Washington Post*, and the major broadcast networks.

This is not an argument that the *Times* has no journalistic merit. The paper has produced investigative work of genuine historical importance: the Pentagon Papers (1971), Watergate follow-up coverage, reporting on NSA surveillance programs, and substantial international reporting. These achievements are real. They are also not the subject of this paper. The subject is the documented pattern of failure — the cases where institutional ideology overrode journalistic duty — and what that pattern means for the role of the press in a democratic republic that depends on an informed citizenry.

II. Historical Overview: From Republican Founding to Progressive Flagship

The *New York Times* was founded on September 18, 1851, by Henry Jarvis Raymond and George Jones. Raymond was a prominent Republican who served as chairman of the Republican National Committee during the Civil War — a fact that is jarring to contemporary readers accustomed to the *Times*' thoroughly progressive identity, but which accurately reflects the paper's origins as a centrist-to-right reformist publication. In the 1870s, the paper achieved national distinction through its aggressive investigation of William "Boss" Tweed and the corrupt Tammany Hall Democratic machine — the kind of adversarial investigative journalism that made its early reputation.

In 1896, following the financial crisis of 1893, Adolph Ochs — publisher of the *Chattanooga Times* — purchased a controlling interest in the struggling *New York Times* and began transforming it into the dominant national newspaper of record it became in the twentieth century. Ochs established the paper's famous motto: "All the News That's Fit to Print." His son-in-law Arthur Hays Sulzberger succeeded him in 1935, beginning the dynastic succession that continues today through A.G. Sulzberger, the sixth member of the Ochs-Sulzberger family to serve as publisher since 1896.

The paper's gradual leftward shift is well-documented. In presidential elections, the *Times* endorsed Republican candidates twelve times and Democratic candidates thirty-two times total; it has endorsed the Democratic candidate in every presidential election since 1960 without exception — a consecutive sixty-five-year streak that encompasses every ideological variation of Democratic Party politics. In 2016, the paper's editorial board issued an "anti-endorsement" against Donald Trump, the first such formal condemnation of a presidential candidate in the

paper's history. The ideological journey from the paper that investigated Boss Tweed's corrupt Democratic machine to the paper that formally opposed one political party's candidate is not a short one — but it is well-charted.

III. The Paper and Tyrannical Governments: A Pattern of Accommodation

A. Walter Duranty and the Soviet Holodomor (1932–1933)

The most consequential and most damning episode in the *New York Times*' history of accommodating tyrannical governments is the case of Walter Duranty and the Ukrainian Holodomor. Its documentation is now exhaustive, and the paper's own editorial board has formally described Duranty's work as "some of the worst reporting to appear in this newspaper."

Duranty served as the *Times*' Moscow bureau chief throughout the late 1920s and early 1930s, a period that coincided with Joseph Stalin's forced collectivization of Soviet agriculture — a deliberate policy of grain confiscation that produced a famine of catastrophic proportions. In Ukraine, the famine is known as the Holodomor (Ukrainian: "death by hunger"). Contemporary expert estimates place the Ukrainian death toll at between 3.5 and 7 million people, with the broader Soviet famine killing an additional 1 to 2 million in Russia and Kazakhstan. The deliberate confiscation of food from Ukrainian villages — carried out by Communist Party activists going house to house — has been recognized as genocide by numerous national governments and the United Nations.

Duranty, who had staked his career on the proposition that Stalin was the strong, competent leader the Soviet Union needed and had won a Pulitzer Prize in 1932 for his sympathetic Soviet coverage, chose to lie. His dispatches during the height of the famine are a documented record of deliberate disinformation. In November 1932, he wrote in the *Times* that "there is no famine or actual starvation nor is there likely to be." In the *Times* on March 31, 1933 — under the headline "Russians Hungry, But Not Starving" — he disputed the eyewitness accounts of Welsh journalist Gareth Jones, who had walked 40 miles through the Ukrainian countryside and personally witnessed mass starvation, describing the dead and dying in harrowing detail. In August 1933, with the famine at or near its peak, Duranty wrote: "Any report of a famine in Russia is today an exaggeration or malignant propaganda." In June 1933, he had reported bluntly that the "'famine' is mostly bunk."

The crucial fact is not merely that Duranty was wrong — it is that he knew he was wrong. British diplomat William Strang recorded that Duranty privately acknowledged to him in September 1932 that "as many as 10 million people may have died directly or indirectly from lack of food" — an assessment that never appeared in print. Malcolm Muggeridge, a British journalist who did report the famine honestly, later described Duranty as "the greatest liar I have met in fifty years of journalism," and noted that Duranty was no ignorant dupe — he knew precisely what was happening.

Duranty's motivations were partly access (Stalin rewarded his favorable coverage with interview access and a comfortable Moscow apartment) and partly ideological alignment with the progressive American and European intelligentsia that regarded Stalin's Soviet Union as "a great nation in the making" — a phrase used by *The Nation* magazine in praising Duranty's work. The *Times*' publication of his denials of the famine set the international tone for how the Holodomor was discussed in the West. When the most prestigious newspaper in the United States published an authoritative denial of the famine, it suppressed public pressure for international response and effectively provided cover for the continuation of Stalin's killing policies. Scholars have argued that Duranty's coverage of the Holodomor contributed to the death count.

In 1990, the *Times* editorial board finally published a formal assessment, written by Karl Meyer, calling Duranty's work "some of the worst reporting to appear in this newspaper" and concluding that Duranty had "strove to preserve" his career "by ignoring or excusing Stalin's crimes." The Pulitzer Prize awarded for that reporting has never been revoked, despite sustained campaigns for its withdrawal. The Pulitzer Board in 2003 found "no clear and convincing evidence of deliberate misrepresentation" — a conclusion that is difficult to reconcile with the private Strang memorandum documenting Duranty's own private admission of 10 million dead.

B. Coverage of Communist China

The *Times*' accommodationist pattern toward communist governments did not end with the Soviet Union. During the Maoist period in China, the *Times*' coverage was frequently more favorable to the Communist government than the historical record warrants. During the Great Leap Forward (1958–1962) — during which Mao Zedong's agricultural collectivization policies produced the largest famine in recorded human history, killing an estimated 30 to 55 million people — the *Times*' coverage did not treat the catastrophe with the sustained moral urgency it warranted. The paper's deference to Chinese government access and its framing of communist reform programs in developmental terms rather than humanitarian catastrophe terms echoed patterns established in the Soviet coverage of the 1930s.

C. The Times and Castro's Cuba

Herbert Matthews of the *New York Times* conducted a celebrated 1957 interview with Fidel Castro in the Sierra Maestra mountains of Cuba that was instrumental in building Castro's international image as a romantic revolutionary. Matthews' series of dispatches portrayed Castro in glowing terms, downplaying or ignoring the Marxist-Leninist character of his movement and its intentions. When Castro came to power in 1959 and began implementing authoritarian communist governance — imprisoning political opponents, suppressing press freedom, executing dissidents, and aligning Cuba firmly with the Soviet bloc — the contrast with the Matthews portraiture was stark. The *Times*' pattern of romanticizing leftist revolutionary movements at the expense of accurate political analysis has been noted by media critics across the political spectrum.

D. The Broader Pattern

The pattern across these cases is consistent: the *New York Times* has demonstrated, across multiple historical episodes, a tendency to extend more favorable coverage — or to exercise less critical scrutiny — toward governments and movements aligned with the political left, while applying more rigorous critical standards to governments and movements on the political right. This asymmetry is not a matter of opinion; it is documented in the paper's own editorial admissions, in the contrast between its coverage of Soviet and Maoist atrocities versus its coverage of comparable atrocities by right-wing governments, and in the quantitative media-bias research conducted by independent organizations including AllSides, Ad Fontes Media, and the Pew Research Center.

IV. Documented Inaccuracies, Fabrications, and Failed Fact-Checking

A. The Judith Miller / Iraq WMD Debacle (2002–2004)

The *New York Times*' most consequential journalistic failure of the post-Cold War era — at least prior to the Russia collusion coverage — was its role in propagating the false intelligence narrative about Iraqi weapons of mass destruction (WMD) that provided critical public justification for the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Reporter Judith Miller, a Pulitzer Prize winner with deep ties to the national security and intelligence communities, wrote or co-wrote a series of prominently placed front-page articles between September 2002 and March 2003 claiming that Saddam Hussein's Iraq possessed active programs for developing nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons.

The sourcing for these articles was deeply flawed. Miller relied heavily on Ahmed Chalabi and his Iraqi National Congress, an anti-Saddam exile group with a demonstrated interest in precipitating an American invasion of Iraq. There was strong internal dissent within the *Times*' own newsroom about the sourcing; one internal email described a particularly dramatic Miller piece as "wacky-assed." The military was permitted to review and censor at least one of Miller's most dramatic reports before publication — an extraordinary arrangement for a newspaper that presents itself as independent of government influence.

When no WMDs were found following the invasion, the *Times*' editorial board published, on May 26, 2004, a formal editors' note acknowledging that its WMD coverage "was not as rigorous as it should have been" and that the paper had relied on sources whose claims were "controversial then, and seems questionable now" without sufficient independent verification. The note admitted to "a pattern of misinformation." Of the six specific stories identified by editors as most egregious, Miller had written or co-written four. The editors' note, however, was widely criticized as inadequate — a "correction box" treatment for a catastrophic failure that had contributed to public support for a war that killed hundreds of thousands of people and destabilized the Middle East for decades.

B. The Jayson Blair Fabrication Scandal (2003)

In May 2003, the *Times* published a remarkable 7,239-word article revealing that one of its own reporters, Jayson Blair, had engaged in systematic fabrication and plagiarism across dozens of stories over a period of years. Blair had fabricated quotes, invented scene-setting details, filed datelines from locations he had never visited, and plagiarized passages from other news organizations. The *Times*' own investigation found at least 36 of the 73 national stories Blair filed after October 2002 contained either fabricated material or direct plagiarism. The scandal led to the resignation of executive editor Howell Raines and managing editor Gerald Boyd and prompted a searching internal examination of the paper's editorial oversight processes. It also raised pointed questions about whether Blair's misconduct had been enabled by newsroom managers' reluctance to scrutinize a young Black reporter, for fear of being perceived as racially insensitive — a form of institutional political caution with directly harmful journalistic consequences.

C. The 1619 Project: Historical Revisionism and Factual Disputes

In August 2019, the *Times* Magazine published the 1619 Project, a major editorial initiative led by journalist Nikole Hannah-Jones, which aimed to "reframe American history" by placing the year 1619 — when the first enslaved Africans arrived in Virginia — at the "true founding" of the United States. The project made several specific historical claims that were subsequently challenged by a group of the nation's leading historians, including Gordon Wood, Sean Wilentz, James McPherson, Victoria Bynum, and James Oakes — scholars not identified with any conservative political agenda.

Among the most contested claims was the assertion that the American Revolution was fought primarily to preserve slavery — a claim that the historians described in an open letter to the *Times* as "wrong" and contradicted by the historical record. The *Times* initially stood by the claim publicly but quietly altered the project's opening text, removing the phrase "understanding 1619 as our true founding" from the project's website without an editorial note explaining the change. The absence of a transparent correction was itself criticized as a journalistic failure. Hannah-Jones herself later acknowledged she was "absolutely tortured" by her failure to consult more expert historians before making the sweeping claims that were subsequently removed. The paper's response to the professional historians' critique — initial defensiveness followed by quiet revision — illustrates a pattern of ideological commitment overriding editorial accountability.

D. The Sarah Palin Defamation Case

In June 2017, the *Times*' editorial board published an editorial linking a 2011 political map produced by Sarah Palin's political action committee to the 2011 Tucson shooting that injured Representative Gabrielle Giffords. The editorial stated that the Palin PAC map had "incited" the shooting. This claim was factually false: no evidence had ever connected the map to the shooter's motivations, a fact that had been widely established in 2011. The *Times* issued a correction acknowledging the error. Palin sued the paper for defamation. In a 2022 trial, Judge Jed Rakoff directed a dismissal and a jury found that Palin had not proven "actual malice." However, the episode documented that the *Times* had published, in a major editorial, a

demonstrably false factual claim that smeared a specific public figure — and that the claim was precisely the kind of anti-conservative narrative the paper's editorial board had a documented institutional appetite for.

E. The "17 Intelligence Agencies" Retraction

In June 2017, the *Times* published a report asserting that "all 17 organizations in the American intelligence community" had confirmed that Russia orchestrated cyberattacks to interfere in the 2016 election. This was factually incorrect. The actual assessment had been produced by a hand-picked group of analysts from three agencies — the CIA, FBI, and NSA — not all 17 intelligence community components. The *Times* was forced to issue a formal correction. The Associated Press also issued a correction on the same erroneous claim. The "17 agencies" formulation had been widely repeated by Democratic politicians and progressive media commentators as support for the broader Russia-collusion narrative; the *Times*' false reporting had amplified and legitimized a misleading talking point.

F. A Pattern of Corrections

The *Times*' controversy list extends beyond these major episodes. Television critic Alessandra Stanley's tribute to Walter Cronkite contained eight factual errors. The elimination of the paper's copy-editing staff in the digital transition produced a documented increase in factual errors. The paper's public editors — a position the *Times* eventually abolished in 2017, removing an important internal accountability mechanism — repeatedly documented instances where the paper's coverage of sensitive subjects prioritized narrative over factual precision.

V. The Paper's Support for the Political Left

A. Ownership, Structure, and Institutional Culture

The *New York Times* is controlled by the Ochs-Sulzberger family through Class B shares that give the family voting control regardless of the paper's financial performance. A.G. Sulzberger is the current chairman and publisher. This family-controlled structure insulates the paper's editorial direction from market pressure but also means its institutional ideology reflects the worldview of a single upper-class New York family and the upper-class New York journalistic culture that surrounds it.

The paper recruits primarily from elite northeastern universities. Its newsroom is concentrated in New York City — one of the most politically homogeneous major cities in the United States, where registered Democrats outnumber Republicans by approximately six to one. In 2012, the paper's own public editor, Arthur Brisbane, wrote: "Across the paper's many departments, though, so many share a kind of political and cultural progressivism — for lack of a better term — that this worldview virtually bleeds through the fabric of The Times." This was not a conservative critic speaking; it was the paper's own internal accountability officer.

B. Presidential Endorsements: A 65-Year Record

The *Times* has endorsed the Democratic presidential candidate in every presidential election since 1960 — without exception, across twelve consecutive election cycles. This record spans candidates as ideologically diverse as Hubert Humphrey, George McGovern, Jimmy Carter, Walter Mondale, Michael Dukakis, Bill Clinton, Al Gore, John Kerry, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, Joe Biden, and Kamala Harris. In 2016, the paper published a formal anti-endorsement of Donald Trump — the first such explicit condemnation of a major-party presidential candidate in its history — in addition to its endorsement of his opponent. This sixty-five-year consecutive endorsement record is not the record of a politically neutral newspaper of record; it is the record of a partisan publication with a consistent ideological commitment.

C. The Tom Cotton Op-Ed Controversy and Staff Revolt

In June 2020, during the George Floyd protests and associated urban unrest, the *Times* published an opinion piece by U.S. Senator Tom Cotton of Arkansas entitled "Send in the Troops," which argued for the invocation of the Insurrection Act to deploy the National Guard in cities experiencing rioting. The piece was a conventional statement of a political position held by the sitting president, many Republican governors, and a significant portion of the American public. Its publication as an opinion piece was entirely within the normal scope of editorial practice — opinion sections routinely publish views that editors do not personally endorse.

The publication triggered an immediate revolt by the *Times*' own newsroom staff. Reporters posted publicly that they felt "unsafe" by the publication of a political opinion with which they disagreed. The resulting internal pressure forced the resignation of editorial page editor James Bennet, who had approved the piece's publication. Publisher A.G. Sulzberger initially defended the decision but capitulated to staff pressure. Bennet subsequently wrote extensively about the episode, arguing that the *Times* under Sulzberger had taken on an "illiberal bias" and that the paper was increasingly "catering to a partisan readership."

Senator Tom Cotton himself, commenting on the episode, stated that the paper had "totally surrendered to a woke child mob from their own newsroom that apparently gets triggered if they're presented with any opinion contrary to their own, as opposed to telling the woke children in their newsroom this is the workplace, not a social-justice seminar on campus."

The episode was significant not merely as an institutional embarrassment but as a diagnostic window into the *Times*' newsroom culture: a staff capable of forcing the resignation of the editorial page editor for publishing a conventional Republican political position demonstrates a level of internal ideological homogeneity that is incompatible with genuinely balanced journalism.

D. The Bari Weiss Resignation

In July 2020, contributing opinion writer Bari Weiss resigned from the *Times*, publishing a resignation letter that documented in specific terms the paper's internal culture of ideological intimidation. Weiss wrote: "Twitter is not on the New York Times' masthead. But Twitter has become its ultimate editor." She described colleagues openly mocking her work on internal *Slack* channels, being called a "Nazi" and a "racist" by fellow staff members for publishing views outside the progressive consensus, and an institutional atmosphere in which "intellectual

curiosity — let alone risk-taking — is now a liability at The Times." Weiss concluded that the paper had become a place where "stories are chosen and told in a way to satisfy the narrowest of audiences, rather than to allow a curious public to read about their world and the people in it."

E. The Economist Study: Documented Leftward Drift

The Economist, which is not a conservative publication, published a rigorous quantitative study documenting a "gradual leftward shift in the partisan slant of The New York Times, beginning in 2017." The study used computational methods to track language patterns and political valence in the paper's coverage over time, finding that the paper moved measurably to the left in its language and framing choices following the 2016 election — the year Donald Trump was elected president.

F. The Paper's Own Admissions

Beyond the Brisbane public editor statement and the Bennet resignation, the paper's own leadership has inadvertently confirmed the bias charge. Executive editor Dean Baquet acknowledged that after the 2016 election, when the Russia collusion story "turned out not to be true," the newsroom "started to think about what are the big stories we're going to have to write" — a formulation that implies the paper was searching for anti-Trump narratives rather than following evidence. The paper's structural shift toward an explicit "subscriber-first" business model, as *Times* journalism professor Wesley Lowery has noted, creates financial incentives to produce content that satisfies an overwhelmingly progressive subscriber base rather than content that serves a general public audience.

VI. Coverage of President Donald J. Trump: First Term (2017–2021)

A. The Russia Collusion Narrative

No single journalistic episode in modern American history has produced a larger body of documented inaccurate reporting than the New York Times' coverage of the alleged collusion between Donald Trump's 2016 presidential campaign and the Russian government. For more than three years — from the 2016 election through the completion of Special Counsel Robert Mueller's investigation in April 2019 — the *Times* published a sustained campaign of reporting that repeatedly implied, asserted, or suggested that Trump had conspired with the Russian government to steal the 2016 election. Mueller's report found that the investigation "did not establish that members of the Trump Campaign conspired or coordinated with the Russian government in its election interference activities."

The *Times* and the *Washington Post* jointly received a Pulitzer Prize in 2018 for their Russia investigation coverage — the second time in the paper's history that it received the prize for reporting that was subsequently discredited, following the Duranty prize of 1932. As the Heritage Foundation has observed, the parallel between the two episodes is striking: in both cases, the *Times* received journalism's highest award for reporting that served a preferred political narrative rather than the factual record.

B. The February 2017 Story Debunked by the FBI

The *Times*' most demonstrably false individual piece of Trump-Russia coverage was a February 14, 2017 front-page story headlined "Trump Campaign Aides Had Repeated Contacts with Russian Intelligence." The story, written by three *Times* reporters, claimed that members of the Trump campaign had maintained extensive contact with Russian intelligence officers during the 2016 campaign. It was presented as confirmed reporting, not speculation.

A subsequently declassified document revealed that FBI agent Peter Strzok — who was himself leading the Crossfire Hurricane investigation into Trump-Russia ties and who was far from a Trump supporter — annotated the *Times* story with point-by-point FBI rebuttals. On the article's lead paragraph, Strzok wrote: "This statement is misleading and inaccurate as written. We have not seen evidence of any individuals affiliated with the Trump team in contact with IOs [intelligence officers]." On the claim that Paul Manafort had been picked up on calls to Russian intelligence: "We are unaware of any calls with any Russian government official in which Manafort was a party." On the article's broader claim of extensive contacts: "Again, we are unaware of ANY Trump advisors engaging in conversations with Russian intelligence officials." FBI Director James Comey privately alerted congressional leaders to the story's falsity shortly after publication. In June 2017, testifying before the Senate Intelligence Committee after his firing, Comey publicly confirmed the story was false. The *Times* has never issued a formal retraction of the article.

C. The Steele Dossier and the *Times*' Role

The *Times* played a significant role in legitimizing and amplifying the Steele Dossier — a collection of unverified opposition research allegations against Trump, funded by the Clinton campaign and compiled by former British intelligence officer Christopher Steele. The dossier contained numerous salacious and politically damaging claims about Trump, many of which were subsequently established to be false or unverifiable. The *Times*' coverage of the dossier and the broader Russia narrative relied heavily on anonymous sources described as "people familiar with" the matter — a formulation so vague as to be essentially unverifiable and which, the Columbia Journalism Review subsequently found, was systematically used to advance the collusion narrative without satisfying normal standards of sourcing.

D. The Columbia Journalism Review's Findings

The Columbia Journalism Review (CJR) — itself not a conservative publication — published a landmark four-part investigation in January 2023 into American media's coverage of Russiagate. Written by Jeff Gerth, a former *Times* reporter and Pulitzer Prize winner, the series offered a scathing assessment. Among its key findings specific to the *Times*: the paper "failed to seek and reflect comment from people who are the subject of serious criticism," violating its own stated journalistic guidelines; it placed excessive and unverifiable reliance on anonymous sources described as "people familiar with" matters; it covered a House GOP memo about FBI abuses in its FISA surveillance of Trump campaign aide Carter Page as "politically charged" and "outraged Democrats," while describing the Democrats' counter-memo as a "forceful rebuttal"; and it "ignored a publicly available document showing that the FBI's lead investigator didn't think, after ten months of inquiry into possible Trump-Russia ties, that there was much there."

CJR executive editor Kyle Pope, introducing the series, wrote: "No narrative did more to shape Trump's relations with the press than Russiagate. The story, which included the Steele dossier and the Mueller report among other totemic moments, resulted in Pulitzer Prizes as well as embarrassing retractions and damaged careers."

E. Other First-Term Inaccuracies

Beyond Russia, the *Times*' first-term Trump coverage produced a range of other documented inaccuracies. The paper repeatedly reported — citing anonymous sources — that Trump had "ordered" White House Counsel Don McGahn to fire Special Counsel Mueller; McGahn was later reported to have told investigators that he had not been ordered to do so in the manner the *Times* had described. The paper's reliance on anonymous sources throughout the Trump administration produced numerous stories that required subsequent qualification or correction but that had already shaped public perceptions in the interim.

The broader pattern of Trump coverage was captured by the paper's own executive editor. In 2019, internal town hall audio leaked to Politico showed Baquet acknowledging that after the Russia story "turned out not to be true, we had to shift" the paper's central organizing narrative — moving from Russia collusion to race and inequality as the lens through which to cover the Trump presidency. The admission that a major newspaper's editorial leadership had consciously organized its coverage around a central "narrative" about a sitting president, and had consciously shifted to a new narrative when the first one collapsed, is a remarkable confirmation of the charge that the *Times*' Trump coverage was advocacy journalism rather than neutral reporting.

VII. Coverage of President Donald J. Trump: Second Term (2025–Present)

A. Framing and Story Selection

The patterns established during Trump's first term have continued into his second. The *Times*' coverage of the Trump administration's second-term policy initiatives — executive orders, regulatory rollbacks, immigration enforcement, the DOGE cost-reduction initiative, and personnel decisions — has been consistently framed through a critical lens, with headline choices, story placement, and source selection that reflect the paper's institutional opposition to the administration's agenda.

Media bias analysts at AllSides have found that *Times* coverage of Trump second-term actions consistently "ascribes malicious intent to Trump without even including his stated goals" — a framing that would be inappropriate if applied to a Democratic administration. Story selection has emphasized conflict, disruption, and institutional damage, with limited coverage of policy arguments in their own terms. The paper's 2025 Bias Analysis by AllSides specifically noted "story choice bias" as a significant finding in its most recent assessment.

B. The Continuing Pattern

The second-term coverage reflects what former editorial page editor James Bennet described as the paper's fundamental strategic error: in attempting to serve a progressive subscriber base that expects anti-Trump coverage, the paper has traded its credibility as a neutral arbiter of facts for its role as a validator of progressive political concerns. This trade may be commercially rational in the short term — the *Times* has grown to nearly 12 million subscribers, the largest subscriber base of any newspaper in American history. But it accelerates the paper's transformation from a newspaper of record for all Americans into a subscription service for one political tribe.

VIII. The Progressive Media Ecosystem: The *Times* and Its Allies

A. The Ideological Convergence of Legacy Media

The *New York Times* does not operate in isolation. It is the intellectual and editorial anchor of a broader progressive media ecosystem that includes CNN, MSNBC, NPR, PBS, *The Washington Post*, the three major broadcast networks (ABC, CBS, NBC), *The Atlantic*, Politico, the Associated Press, and numerous other outlets. This ecosystem is not the product of a formal conspiracy; it is the product of a shared institutional culture, a shared talent pool (journalists move freely among these outlets), a shared geographic concentration in the same handful of coastal cities, and a shared readership base that research demonstrates is overwhelmingly liberal.

B. CNN, MSNBC, and the *Times*: Shared Narratives

The clearest evidence of coordinated narrative alignment within the progressive media ecosystem is the Russia-collusion story. The *Times*, CNN, MSNBC, *The Washington Post*, and other mainstream outlets pursued the same narrative, relied on many of the same sources, emphasized the same story beats, and downplayed or ignored the same counterevidence — simultaneously, for three years. When the narrative collapsed after the Mueller report, they issued the same muted acknowledgments and rapidly pivoted to the same replacement narratives. Three CNN employees resigned in 2017 after CNN published a story connecting a Trump transition team member to a Russian investment bank that was based on a single anonymous source and proved to be false. The synchronization of error across these outlets reflects a shared intellectual culture, not independent journalistic judgment.

C. Pew Research Data on the Liberal Media Audience

The alignment between the *Times* and its progressive media allies is confirmed by audience research. The Pew Research Center's landmark 2025 study, "The Political Gap in Americans' News Sources," found that Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents are the primary audience for CNN (48%), NBC (47%), ABC (46%), MSNBC (33%), NPR (32%), PBS (31%), and the *New York Times* (29%) — with all of these outlets trusted "by more than four-in-ten Democrats" while being distrusted by a majority of Republicans. Fifty percent of consistent conservatives distrust the *New York Times*. CNN is the most politically polarizing news outlet in America, with a 96-point gap in net trust between Democrats and Republicans.

A YouGov trust-in-media study found that "three times as many outlets are classified as liberal than are classified as conservative" in Americans' perceptions — and that the outlets "most likely to be viewed as liberal" are MSNBC, CNN, and Comedy Central, with the *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, and *Washington Post* also classified as liberal by "significantly more" Americans than classified them as conservative.

D. The *Times* as the Ecosystem's Agenda-Setter

Political scientists have documented a structural role that the *Times* plays that goes beyond its own readership. Research cited by media studies scholars shows that while fewer than 1 percent of Americans read the *Times* on any given day, the paper's coverage choices shape the agenda of the broader information ecosystem that reaches a vastly larger indirect audience. Stories the *Times* covers become stories that CNN, MSNBC, NPR, and the broadcast networks cover. Stories the *Times* ignores tend to go uncovered in mainstream media. This agenda-setting function — far more powerful than the paper's direct readership suggests — means that the *Times*' editorial decisions function, in effect, as editorial decisions for a substantial portion of American mainstream media.

The Columbia Journalism Review's analysis of information flow confirms this: the *Times*' story choices propagate through downstream outlets with remarkable speed and consistency, while corrections to *Times* errors propagate much more slowly and incompletely. A false story broken by the *Times* can circulate for days or weeks through the progressive media ecosystem before a correction appears, typically in a less prominent location and with less audience reach than the original story.

E. Declining Trust and Viewership

The consequences of the progressive media ecosystem's alignment with the *Times*' narrative priorities are visible in audience data. CNN's viewership has declined dramatically from its peak. MSNBC has experienced similar declines. The *Times*' subscriber growth has come primarily from digital subscribers who specifically pay for its progressive political coverage — a subscription base that functions more as a community of like-minded readers than as a general-interest news audience. The overall public trust in mainstream media stands at historic lows. Gallup polling shows media trust among Republicans has collapsed to single-digit percentages, while even Democratic confidence in the press has declined from its post-Trump election peak.

IX. In Defense of the Paper: Counterarguments and Honest Assessment

Intellectual honesty requires engaging with the counterarguments to the critique laid out above.

First, the *Times* does produce genuine, consequential journalism. The Pentagon Papers publication, obtained at significant legal risk, revealed the systematic government deception underlying American involvement in Vietnam. The paper's investigation of Harvey Weinstein's sexual abuse (2017), in collaboration with *The New Yorker*, sparked a legitimate reckoning with

workplace harassment. Its international reporting has won multiple Pulitzer Prizes for work that stands up to rigorous scrutiny. These achievements are real and should be acknowledged.

Second, the *Times*' liberal bias, while documented, exists on a spectrum. The paper is "lean left" rather than "hard left" in the rating frameworks of AllSides and Ad Fontes Media — meaning it is more centrist than MSNBC or *The Nation* while still clearly to the left of center. Its news reporting tends to be more balanced than its opinion pages, which are strongly and consistently progressive. The distinction matters.

Third, some of the reporting that Trump's supporters characterize as biased or false — including aspects of the Russia investigation coverage — reflects genuine ambiguity in the underlying facts rather than deliberate fabrication. The Russia investigation was a real investigation; the FBI did investigate Russian interference; the question of what the *Times* got wrong is more nuanced than simply labeling all of its Russia coverage as "fake news." The February 2017 story debunked by Strzok is a clear example of false reporting; other Russia stories that advanced the collusion narrative without ultimately proving it are examples of aggressive reporting on a real investigation whose findings disappointed those who expected proof of conspiracy.

Fourth, no major media outlet has a perfect record. Fox News has produced documented inaccuracies, notably its coverage of the 2020 election results, which led to a $787.5 million defamation settlement with Dominion Voting Systems. The question is not whether any outlet is perfect but whether patterns of failure reflect institutional ideology — and on that question, the *Times*' record is as well documented as any outlet's.

These acknowledgments do not refute the central argument of this paper. They qualify it. The *Times* is a complex institution with genuine achievements and documented systematic failures. The failures examined here are not random errors; they follow a consistent pattern correlated with the paper's institutional ideological commitments. That pattern is what distinguishes bias from ordinary journalistic error.

X. Conclusion: The Cost of Institutional Bias in a Democratic Republic

The *New York Times* is one of the most important institutions in American public life. Its failures are therefore not merely of journalistic interest; they are of civic consequence. When the most influential newspaper in the country covers a famine that is killing millions of people with deliberate denials — as it did in 1932 and 1933 — it provides cover for the killers and suppresses the international response that might have saved lives. When it pursues a three-year false narrative about the incumbent president's treasonous collaboration with a foreign power — as it did from 2017 to 2019 — it damages not merely a political figure but the political system's capacity for rational deliberation. When it operates as the agenda-setting anchor of a progressive media ecosystem that collectively produces a narrow ideological range of perspectives for roughly half the American electorate, it contributes to the polarization and mutual incomprehension that makes democratic self-governance increasingly difficult.

None of this is a call for the *Times*' suppression. The First Amendment protection of press freedom is, as the paper correctly argues, a foundational American principle, and the correct response to bad journalism is more and better journalism, not censorship. It is, rather, a call for the paper to honestly reckon with what its own public editors, its own resigning staff, its own external critics across the political spectrum, and its own documented history of error have repeatedly told it: that an institution with the power and influence of the *New York Times* owes its readers — all of its readers, not merely its progressive subscribers — journalism that is governed by facts rather than narrative, by evidence rather than ideology, and by the genuinely democratic commitment to informing citizens rather than organizing them.

The cost of the alternative is not abstract. It is a public record of documented errors, false narratives, ideological coverage that has shaped elections and political discourse, and support for regimes whose crimes against humanity were obscured rather than illuminated by the paper's reporters. The Gray Lady is a great institution. She is also a flawed one. The honest accounting of her failures is not an attack on the press — it is a demand that the press be what it claims to be.

XI. Bibliography and Sources

Primary Historical Sources and Internal Documents

Duranty, Walter. "Russians Hungry, But Not Starving." *New York Times*, March 31, 1933.

Duranty, Walter. "Soviet Industry Shows Big Gains." *New York Times*, April 6, 1933.

Meyer, Karl. "Stalin's Apologist." *New York Times* editorial, June 24, 1990. [The formal editorial board condemnation of Duranty's work as "some of the worst reporting to appear in this newspaper."]

New York Times Editors' Note: "The Times and Iraq." *New York Times*, May 26, 2004. [Formal acknowledgment of WMD coverage failures.]

Strzok, Peter. FBI agent's marginal annotations on the *New York Times* February 14, 2017 article "Trump Campaign Aides Had Repeated Contacts with Russian Intelligence." Declassified by the U.S. Department of Justice, released by Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Lindsey Graham, July 2020.

Weiss, Bari. Resignation letter from the *New York Times*, July 14, 2020. Published publicly by Weiss at bariweiss.substack.com.

Media Bias Research and Analysis

AllSides Media Bias Rating: *New York Times*. https://www.allsides.com/news-source/new-york-times

AllSides Media Bias Rating: *New York Times Opinion*. https://www.allsides.com/news-source/new-york-times-opinion-media-bias

Ad Fontes Media, *The Media Bias Chart* (2023–2025 editions). https://www.adfontesmedia.com

Media Bias/Fact Check: *New York Times* profile. https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/new-york-times/

Pew Research Center. "The Political Gap in Americans' News Sources." June 10, 2025. https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2025/06/10/the-political-gap-in-americans-news-sources/

Pew Research Center. "Political Polarization & Media Habits." October 21, 2014. https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2014/10/21/political-polarization-media-habits/

YouGov. "Trust in Media 2024: Which News Sources Americans Trust." April 2024. https://today.yougov.com/politics/articles/49552-trust-in-media-2024-which-news-outlets-americans-trust

The Economist. Study on the partisan slant of the *New York Times*, documenting leftward shift beginning in 2017. (Referenced in A.G. Sulzberger's Wikipedia entry and multiple journalism reviews.)

Brisbane, Arthur S. (Public Editor). "Seeking Balance on Gay Issues." *New York Times*, February 4, 2012. [Contains the "political and cultural progressivism… bleeds through the fabric of The Times" assessment.]

The Russia Coverage and Columbia Journalism Review

Gerth, Jeff. "The Press Versus the President." *Columbia Journalism Review*, four-part series, January 30, 2023. https://www.cjr.org/special_report/trumped-up-press-versus-president-part-1.php

Heritage Foundation. "Will New York Times, Washington Post Return Pulitzer for Misleading Russia Collusion Stories?" December 13, 2021. https://www.heritage.org/civil-society/commentary/will-new-york-times-washington-post-return-pulitzer-misleading-russia

Washington Times. "New Document Shows FBI Totally Debunked New York Times Trump-Russia Story." July 18, 2020. https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2020/jul/18/new-document-shows-fbi-totally-debunked-new-york-t/

Duranty and the Holodomor

Applebaum, Anne. *Red Famine: Stalin's War on Ukraine*. Doubleday, 2017.

Conquest, Robert. *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine*. Oxford University Press, 1986.

NPR. "The New York Times Can't Shake the Cloud Over a 90-Year-Old Pulitzer Prize." May 8, 2022. https://www.npr.org/2022/05/08/1097097620/new-york-times-pulitzer-ukraine-walter-duranty

Taylor, S.J. *Stalin's Apologist: Walter Duranty, The New York Times's Man in Moscow*. Oxford University Press, 1990.

Tablet Magazine. “How The New York Times Helped Hide Stalin’s Mass Murders in Ukraine.” October 23, 2020. https://www.tabletmag.com/sections/arts-letters/articles/walter-duranty-ukraine-new-york-times-mr-jones-agnieszka-holland

General Reference

Wikipedia. “List of The New York Times Controversies.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_The_New_York_Times_controversies

Wikipedia. “Walter Duranty.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Walter_Duranty

Wikipedia. “A.G. Sulzberger.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A._G._Sulzberger

Wikipedia. “The New York Times.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_New_York_Times

Wikipedia. “Judith Miller.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Judith_Miller

PBS NewsHour. “The New York Times WMD Coverage.” May 26, 2004. https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/the-new-york-times-wmd-coverage

JSTOR (peer-reviewed journalism studies): https://www.jstor.org

Nieman Lab (Harvard University journalism research): https://www.niemanlab.org