

Is the 'New York Times' Really Sorry?

Over the weekend, *New York Times* columnist Nicholas Kristof penned an article titled "A Confession of Liberal Intolerance" that, if read by any evangelical Christian, would likely elicit a "Gee, you're just now figuring this out?" kind of reaction.

The article itself focused on the liberal bias—which has now become intolerance for anything resembling a conservative or Christian world view—found on college campuses today. It laments, dripping with pity for evangelicals, the fact that institutions of higher learning have gone from being sounding boards for a diverse array of opinions to echo chambers for liberal-socialist-progressive-statism with a smattering of globalism.

Kristof's conclusion:

Should universities offer affirmative action for conservatives and evangelicals? I don't think so, partly because surveys find that conservative scholars themselves oppose the idea. But it's important to have a frank discussion on campuses about ideological diversity. To me, this seems a liberal blind spot.

Universities should be a hubbub of the full range of political perspectives from A to Z, not just from V to Z. So maybe we progressives could take a brief break from attacking the other side and more broadly incorporate values that we supposedly cherish—like diversity—in our own dominions.

This, of course, comes on the heels of the *New York Times'* publisher, Arthur O. Sulzberger Jr., writing an open letter to his readers where he pledged to rededicate the newspaper to

more honestly reporting the news. Some took that to mean the liberal bias would soon disappear from its pages.

Don't bet on it.

In fact, what Sulzberger actually wrote was:

As we reflect on the momentous result, and the months of reporting and polling that preceded it, we aim to rededicate ourselves to the fundamental mission of Times journalism. That is to report America and the world honestly, without fear or favor, striving always to understand and reflect all political perspectives and life experiences in the stories that we bring to you. It is also to hold power to account, impartially and unflinchingly. You can rely on The New York Times to bring the same fairness, the same level of scrutiny, the same independence to our coverage of the new president and his team.

In other words, they will continue to scrutinize every little thing the Trump administration says or does in the hope of undermining his presidential mandate. They'll just do it now under the veil of "impartiality" and "honest journalism" we all know was lacking for the past eight years of the Obama Administration.

It was the ultimate "sorry not sorry" moment. And it couldn't come at a more perilous time for the *Times*—and the liberal mainstream media in general.

As Sulzberger also noted, the *Times* can't do what it does without its "loyal subscribers." That's a group whose number has dwindled for years. Print circulation for the *Times* is down more than 6 percent from last year, and while digital circulation has grown, operational profits are down 14 percent.

So even if the *Times* were really "sorry" about its reporting of the 2016 election, one has to wonder if they're sorry for

their own liberal intolerance, or if they're just sorry it's costing them revenue.