



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on October 18, 2017

## Project Veritas Videos Continue to Expose New York Times Liberal Bias

With the release of the third in a series of Project Veritas “American Pravda” videos exposing the *New York Times*, the “newspaper of record” may soon find itself in very real trouble. And while the Times may not be in immediate danger of dying from that exposure, the damage will be hard to simply shake off. Each video so far has been damning when taken alone; when seen together, the damage to what is left of the *Times*’ credibility is compounded to the point of catastrophe.



The first two videos — which together have over 620,000 views on YouTube even though they were just released last week — started the process of exposing the flagship of the liberal media armada in much the same way that previous Project Veritas videos exposed CNN. As the rollout continues, one has to wonder how much exposure the *Times* can take.

{modulepos inner\_text\_ad}

When Project Veritas founder James O’Keefe turned his focus on CNN this past summer, [the exposure was devastating](#) for the premier news network. Undercover video showed CNN producers and commentators admitting that CNN’s reports on alleged [connections and collusion between Trump and Russia are “bulls\\*\\*t,”](#) the whole [Russia thing “is just a big nothingburger,”](#) and that [CNN practices selective editing to promote a false narrative to American voters who are “stupid as s\\*\\*t.”](#)

As a result of the exposure caused by those videos. CNN’s ratings tanked. Now that O’Keefe has the *Times* in his sights, the videos coming out are damning.

The first video — published October 10 — shows Nick Dudich, a *Times* audience strategy editor — admitting that he manipulates the news to fit his anti-Trump agenda. Dudich — who describes himself as a “gatekeeper” — is seen on undercover video saying, “my voice is on ... my imprint is on every video we do” and that objectivity plays no part in that process. In response to a point about being objective, Dudich can be seen and heard saying, “No I’m not, that’s why I’m here.”

When asked about making sure anti-Trump stories are given priority in publication and promotion, Dudich answered, “Oh, we always do.” That jibes very well with his admission that he is at the *Times* because of his lack of objectivity.

That lack of objectivity stands out in sharp contrast to the claims of the *Times*’ Ethical Handbook, which says in paragraph 62:

Journalists have no place on the playing fields of politics. Staff members are entitled to vote, but they must do nothing that might raise questions about their professional neutrality or that of *The Times*. In particular, they may not campaign for, demonstrate for, or endorse candidates, ballot causes or efforts to enact legislation. They may not wear campaign buttons or themselves display



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on October 18, 2017

---

any other insignia of partisan politics. They should recognize that a bumper sticker on the family car or a campaign sign on the lawn may be misread as theirs, no matter who in their household actually placed the sticker or the sign.

While the *Times* claims to uphold objectivity as an important part of journalistic integrity, Dudich claims that his lack of objectivity is “why” he is at the *Times*. He told the undercover Project Veritas journalist that he worked for the Clinton campaign (hardly a bright spot on one’s résumé) in 2016, saying:

So I have that background, so when Clinton in 2016 ... they needed a volunteer strategist to do video ... well, they needed someone to help them do video, and how to make it heartfelt, for Clinton.

After the Clinton campaign (for which he had left journalism), Dudich made the decision to get back into journalism to further the liberal agenda. He can be seen on the video saying, “I had to leave my job at Fusion ABC to then take a job at Upworthy where I wasn’t deemed a journalist anymore to be able to work for the Clinton campaign,” but, “after the Clinton campaign, I’m like, no I need to get back into news and keep doing s\*\*t because, like, this isn’t going to change.”

The *Times* responded to the first video, saying that “the video claims to show a junior *Times* editor, Nick Dudich, discussing his political beliefs and mocking the idea of acting as an objective journalist.” Here is a tip for the folks over at the *Times*: Watch the video before you respond to it. Because it doesn’t “claim” to show that; *it shows it!* The [statement](#) from the *Times* goes on to say:

Based on what we’ve seen in the Project Veritas video, it appears that a recent hire in a junior position violated our ethical standards and misrepresented his role. In his role at *The Times*, he was responsible for posting already published video on other platforms and was never involved in the creation or editing of *Times* videos. We are reviewing the situation now.

So, the *Times* — after saying that the video “claims” to show what it actually shows — says that an audience strategy editor “was never involved in the ... editing of *Times* videos.” One would wonder just what it is that an “editor” does if not edit. This writer knows from personal experience (this article will not likely be an exception) that editors edit. That’s why they’re called “editors” and not “posters.”

The *Times* — clearly rattled by being exposed to the cold, harsh light of truth — went even further in trying to discredit the Project Veritas video. Executive Editor Dean Baquet [described Dudich](#) as “a kid — a guy in his twenties” with a “very entry-level job at the *New York Times*” and went on to say “to give you an idea — they portray him as a very powerful figure in the *New York Times* — I had never met him.”

The second video goes a long way to laying the denials of the leadership at the *Times* to waste. Because that video shows Earnest Pettie, the Brand and Diversity Curation Lead at YouTube, describing the way YouTube works with “media partners” to manipulate the platform and lead people to videos that YouTube bosses see as “legitimate news.” In explaining that process, Pettie describes Dudich as “one of the people I think who has more knowledge about YouTube as a platform than probably anyone else that I know.”

In the first video, Dudich can be seen telling Project Veritas journalists:

Let’s say something ends up on the YouTube front page, *New York Times* freaks out about it, but they don’t know it’s just because my friends curate the front page. So, it’s like, a little bit of mystery you need in any type of job to make it look like what you do is harder than what it is.

Pettie’s remarks — coming from the leader of Brand and Diversity Curation at YouTube — seem to



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on October 18, 2017

---

confirm Dudich's claims. But the leadership at the *Times* would have us believe that Dudich is a "kid" with a "very entry-level job" who "was responsible for posting already published video on other platforms and was never involved in the creation or editing of *Times* videos."

The third video, released Tuesday, may be a little harder to try to explain away. Because one thing Project Veritas does very well is build upon previous videos. The third video features *New York Times* London Senior Home Page Editor Desiree Shoe talking about how the liberal agenda of the *Times* drives what stories are reported and how they are reported.

Echoing the sentiments of Dudich — who said he got back into news to "keep doing s\*\*t because, like, this isn't going to change" — Shoe can be seen telling Project Veritas journalists that during the presidential election, it was par for the course for liberal journalists to play the political game. She said:

I think one of the things that maybe journalists were thinking about is like...Oh, if we write about him, about how insanely crazy he is and how ludicrous his policies are, then maybe people will read it and be like, oh wow, we shouldn't vote for him.

And that is far from the only thing she said that confirms Dudich's claims of biased reporting and manipulation of the news. She was forthright when she told Project Veritas journalists the *Times* is "widely understood to be liberal-leaning," adding, "But, American newspapers are not supposed to claim a bias, they're supposed to be objective." When asked to clarify, Shoe said, "I'm not saying that they're not. I'm saying it's widely, widely understood to be left-leaning." She went on to say, "Our main stories are supposed to be objective. It's very difficult in this day and age to do that."

She blames the lack of objectivity on the basic business model of the *Times*. Their readers want a liberal slant, so the *Times* provides it. Just to put in the for-what-it's-worth column, a lack of objectivity (or even a presence of bias) is not a bad thing all by itself. Where it becomes a bad thing is when one of two things happen: (1) the publication claims to be objective when it is not, or (2) the slant is itself bad. For example, *The New American* does not claim to be free of bias. We are biased. Our bias can be seen in our logo and tag-line: "That Freedom Shall Not Perish." Our agenda is pro-God, pro-Family, pro-Liberty — and pro-Truth! So we feel no need to hide our beliefs by claiming to be unbiased.

The *Times*, on the other hand (as this latest video shows clearly) has another agenda. That agenda is anti-God, anti-Family, and anti-Liberty, so they do feel the need to hide it by claiming an objectivity they do not possess. Nor are they scrupulous regarding Truth.

Shoe is unapologetic in her disdain when she tells Project Veritas journalists that as much as she hates Trump (whom she describes as "an oblivious idiot"), she hates Mike Pence worse. She says that Pence is f\*\*\*ing horrible" and that the downside of a possible Trump impeachment would be a Pence presidency. Why does she hate him so much? She says it is because "He's extremely, extremely religious. Extremely religious." She said that as a result of his being "extremely religious," Pence "at one point backed a bill that hinted at conversion therapy for homosexuals."

So, being *that* religious is apparently a bad thing at the *Times*. But the perversion of homosexual behavior is apparently good and fine. At least the *Times* is not biased.

It will be interesting to see the leadership of the *Times* try to spin this video. They will probably try to say that Shoe — a senior editor — doesn't edit anything. Or maybe — since she can be seen having a drink in the video — they'll just say she was three sheets to the wind and didn't know what she was talking about.



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on October 18, 2017

---

This writer is certainly looking forward to the next installment in the “American Pravda” series.

*Photo of New York Times building at top of article: [By Haxorjoe - Own work, CC BY-SA 3.0](#)*



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

**Subscribe**