

This Year's Pulitzer Prize Award to RussiaGate Infowar Agenda

By [Andrew Korybko](#)

Global Research, May 06, 2020

Region: [Russia and FSU, USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#)

The Pulitzer Prize Board awarded its eponymous prize for “International Reporting” to The New York Times “for a set of enthralling stories, reported at great risk, exposing the predations of Vladimir Putin’s regime”, which not only further discredited the so-called “Fourth Estate”, but also stands as proof that it harbors an anti-Russian infowar agenda.

The Russian Embassy in the US condemned the Pulitzer Prize Board’s awarding of its eponymous prize for “[International Reporting](#)” to The New York Times “for a set of enthralling stories, reported at great risk, exposing the predations of Vladimir Putin’s regime”, [describing](#) it as “a wonderful collection of undiluted Russophobic fabrications, which can be studied as a guideline on creating false facts.” The six articles and two videos that were responsible for the outlet receiving that “recognition” shared the theme of military-intelligence intrigue, be it accusing the country’s GRU intelligence agency of involvement in several shadowy assassination attempts across Europe or claiming that businessman Yevgeny Prigozhin had a hidden hand in election meddling in Madagascar, for example. Other assertions that were made by the “journalistic” pieces in question also include the Russian state’s complicity in carrying out war crimes in Syria.

As has become the norm in the Western Mainstream Media’s reporting about Russia, an abundance of unnamed sources, fabricated recordings, and disreputable sources were relied upon to push fearmongering narratives about the Eurasian Great Power. The conclusions that were reached — or rather, “reverse-engineered” after first determining the meta-narrative and then subsequently fleshing it out from a variety of geopolitical angles — were predictable enough because they perfectly conformed to the “politically correct” interpretation of President Putin’s global intentions. It’s for that reason why The New York Times’ pieces were “celebrated” by the Pulitzer Prize Board with this supposedly “distinguished” award in an attempt to “legitimize” them for posterity. The Russian Embassy in the US therefore did the right thing by condemning this charade as Russophobic and describing The New York Times’ work as “a guideline on creating false facts.”

That said, the success of the Pulitzer Prize Board’s efforts to manage global perceptions about Russia as part of the West’s ongoing Hybrid War against it is dependent on whether their targeted audience even cares about what that institution says. In theory, the Pulitzer Prize is supposed to be one of the most distinguished awards that any journalist or outlet can ever receive, but it’s actually more akin to an elite club commending its own members. To explain, the [Pulitzer Prize Board](#) counts among its ranks representatives from The Washington Post and even The New York Times itself. It also includes other professionals as well, such as those from Bloomberg, National Public Radio, and a few folks from academia. Prior to Trump’s rise, these figures might have been almost universally respected, but the

American President has since opened the eyes of a broad swath of the country and even the world more broadly to the so-called “Fourth Estate’s” insidious political agendas.

Trust in traditional media is dwindling by the day, meaning that the awards ceremonies that they preside over are becoming similarly less prestigious as well. This holds true for the Pulitzer Prize, which is only meaningful inasmuch as someone respects the “Fourth Estate”, the Pulitzer Prize institution itself, and the latter’s particular members of the board. It can be argued that a considerable proportion of people don’t care all that much for any of them anymore, which further diminishes the soft power sway that they hold over the population. In fact, it can even be said that their awarding of the Pulitzer Prize for “International Reporting” to The New York Times for its blatantly obvious infowar attacks against Russia actually erodes whatever “credibility” those said pieces might have previously held among some of their targeted audience since it’s natural to suspect them of having a political agenda nowadays that secretly influenced their decision.

That’s precisely the problem with any journalistic award given to a piece that even remotely has any relevance in the political sphere since it’s all but impossible to convince the public that it was independently decided for purely apolitical reasons. This is especially so in the context of the ongoing [New Cold War](#), the US’ “deep state” divisions, and the active efforts of the latter’s media surrogates to undermine Trump’s promised “New Detente” with Russia over the past few years. Interestingly the US and Russia made some unexpected progress on improving their relations last month after Moscow [urgently dispatched counter-COVID aid](#) to America and their leaders closely cooperated to [revive OPEC+](#), making one wonder whether the “Fourth Estate’s” attempt to “legitimize” their anti-Russian fearmongering narratives might have also been partially intended to offset this positive development.

Looking forward and keeping in mind the Pulitzer Prize Board’s adherence to the top fearmongering narrative of the past year, it’s entirely predictable that next year’s winner of the “International Reporting” award might have something to do with disparaging China in a similar fake news-driven manner as they did with Russia. Of course, that also depends on whatever else happens across the next 12 months since it’s entirely possible that the Russiagate narrative might once again be resurrected ahead of the November elections, especially in the event that Trump is re-elected. Nevertheless, the takeaway is that the Pulitzer Prize and other similar ones awarded to those whose work is even remotely political can’t be said to have been decided independently since they’re inextricably connected to the “Fourth Estate’s” “politically correct” considerations. For this reason, they shouldn’t be taken seriously by any objective observers and should continually be called out for what they are.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

This article was originally published on OneWorld.

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China’s One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to *Global Research*.

Featured image is from OneWorld

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Andrew Korybko](#), Global Research, 2020

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Andrew Korybko](#)

About the author:

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China's One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca