

New York Times unresponsive to scientists' criticism of Danny Hakim's error-filled article on GMO 'failures'

The New York Times has conducted a decades-long vendetta against the ... techniques of genetic engineering applied to agriculture. Bias and inaccuracy have pervaded its op-eds, columns and even its reporting of "news."

...[I]t's difficult to know which of their failures represent hitting bottom, but a recent [article](#) by "investigative reporter" Danny Hakim and the witless defense of it by his editor and by the *Times*' "public editor" certainly have a claim to the title.

....

...As economist Graham Brookes wrote about Hakim's article, he makes "spurious comparisons that will mislead readers...."

....

...Hakim's article elicited an [avalanche of condemnation](#) from scientists, agricultural researchers and farmers. Many of those critical comments ... were sent to Liz Spayd, the *Times*' "public editor"... who [took note of them](#) in the paper.

....

The public editor's [response] ...:

...I found the piece to be a thorough, educational read on a complex subject. But I thought readers had some interesting feedback. ... In this case, given how many questions that were raised about the methodology, it's clear that the piece would have benefited from more explanation of how the data was [sic] assembled and used.

....

Thorough? Educational? What part of *inaccurate*, *cooked*, *biased* and *misleading* does Ms. Spayd not understand?

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [On 'GMOs', The New York Times Violates The Rule Of Holes: When You're In A Hole, Stop Digging](#)