

THE LIE DAVID SANGER TOLD TO SUSTAIN NYT'S NON-STOP CAMPAIGN AGAINST JOE BIDEN

Predictably, the NYT treated President Biden's speech to kick off NATO's 75th Anniversary as if Biden merely invented the date and the event and maybe even NATO itself to cover up a shoddy debate performance. In addition to the subhead that nonsensically complained there was, "no mention of President Biden's political peril," in his speech, in this 25-paragraph story, NYT made this a story about Biden's campaign by:

- ¶1: Asserting Biden was trying to bolster the alliance and his campaign.
- ¶2: Describing Biden's "strong voice, with few errors."
- ¶4: Claiming the delivery of Biden's speech "may have mattered as much as his words."
- ¶5: Falsely claiming that the "faltering" of Biden's campaign "created a test for the alliance that it did not anticipate."
- ¶6: Adopting the passive voice to project its obsession with Biden's delivery onto NATO's leaders: "Mr. Biden made no mention of his political troubles, but he could not

have escaped the fact that every word was being scrutinized for signs of faltering.”

- ¶7: Declaring that, “By all measures, he passed the test,” but then caveating that judgement by explaining what teleprompters are.
- ¶8: Quoting Biden’s comments to George Stephanopoulos about his role in leading NATO.
- ¶9: Mentioning Biden’s attempt to draw a contrast with Trump and derisively adding, “the man he swears he can still beat in November.”
- ¶10: Describing Biden’s goal for the contrast.
- ¶13: Explaining that, “Mr. Biden’s own aides concede that no matter how well the president performs [at NATO] he cannot make Americans unsee his debate performance.”
- ¶14: Falsely claiming that “confidence in its core member” was in doubt only because of Biden’s debate performance, and not Trump generally.

Compare that wildly partisan approach with the WaPo, which said only, “the summit is a moment of intense scrutiny as he faces pressure over

his readiness to serve another four years,” in ¶12 out of 43 paragraphs (though WaPo has since added a story comparable to NYT’s, complete with claims of “defian[ce]”).

To sustain this fairytale – that the NATO summit exists merely as a measure of Biden’s ability to recover from his debate – David Sanger and Lara Jakes lie.

As noted, in ¶15, they claim that no one was worried about whether NATO could sustain its support for Ukraine until Biden’s campaign “faltered.”

The faltering of Mr. Biden’s campaign has also created a test for the alliance that **it did not anticipate**: whether it can credibly maintain the momentum it has built in supporting Ukraine and serving as a bulwark against further aggression when confidence in its most important player has never been more fragile. [my emphasis]

That is a lie. And one way we can be sure it is a lie – and that David Sanger knows it is a lie – is because a guy name David Sanger wrote this article, in February, which the NYT printed on A1 of the newspaper.

NEWS ANALYSIS

An Outburst by Trump on NATO May Push Europe to Go It Alone

Many were alarmed by comments that he would “encourage” Russia to attack U.S. allies that didn’t spend enough on their militaries, but European leaders were already pondering the prospect of an alliance without the United States.

[Share full article](#) [↻](#) [📌](#)



A NATO exercise in Bulgaria last fall. Nikoлай Дочков/Agence France-Press — Getty Images



By David E. Sanger

David Sanger, who reported from Berlin, has written on Europe’s relationship with the United States for three decades.

The February article not only describes that *even before* Trump suggested he would let Putin invade NATO countries, European leaders were already discussing what would happen if Trump withdrew from NATO. And that article explicitly contrasts Trump's threats to abandon the alliance with Biden's vocal support of it.

Long before Donald J. Trump threatened over the weekend that he was willing to let Russia "do whatever the hell they want" against NATO allies that do not contribute sufficiently to collective defense, European leaders were quietly discussing how they might prepare for a world in which America removes itself as the centerpiece of the 75-year-old alliance.

Even allowing for the usual bombast of one of his campaign rallies, where he made his declaration on Saturday, Mr. Trump may now force Europe's debate into a far more public phase.

So far the discussion in the European media has focused on whether the former president, if returned to office, would pull the United States out of NATO.

But the larger implication of his statement is that he might invite President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia to pick off a NATO nation, as a warning and a lesson to the 30 or so others about heeding Mr. Trump's demands.

His statement stunned many in Europe, especially after three years in which President Biden, attempting to restore the confidence in the alliance lost during Mr. Trump's four years in office, has repeatedly said that the United States would "defend every inch of NATO territory." [my emphasis]

Now, five months after setting up that stark contrast, David Sanger suggests that when Biden

made the contrast himself in his NATO speech, it was just politics.

They were largely complimentary as Mr. Biden talked about America's and the West's "sacred obligation" to come to the aid of free nations and democracies under attack. He was clearly drawing a contrast with former President Donald J. Trump, the man he swears he can still beat in November. To drive home the difference between Mr. Trump's Republican Party and the party of decades past, Mr. Biden quoted former President Ronald Reagan: "If you are threatened, we are threatened. If you're not at peace, we cannot be at peace."

Mr. Biden's goal was clear: to establish Mr. Trump, with his "America First" approach and threats to withdraw the United States from the alliance, as a threat not only to NATO nations but also to his own country.

Even as Trump – in the debate that NYT deems such a disaster for Biden – described speaking to Putin about his invasion of Ukraine in advance ...

When Putin saw that, he said, you know what? I think we're going to go in and maybe take my – this was his dream. I talked to him about it, his dream.

David Sanger now ignores his past reporting about the very real threat that Trump posed and still poses to NATO and American security, and rewrites that into a fairytale about Biden's age.

This election was always going to be at least close. As Sanger himself reported months ago, European allies have been anticipating the significance of a second Trump term for months.

Yet now, because the NYT is so determined to

make Biden's electoral chances the cause for everything, Trump's own preferences get a pass and are now caused by Biden's plight.

The cause for NATO's concerns is Trump. Not Biden's campaign. And once upon a time, NYT reported it that way.