

GE vs. the NYT: dispatches from the battlefield of tax ...

Published: January 13, 2026, 1:35 pm

I could [reproduce an excellent Tax Justice Network blog](#) with the above title here.

Just go to their place to read it instead.

Who is winning in the [GE v NYT](#) debate so far. Well look at what the Business Insider says:

"Wow, just when we thought it was over... The NYT may be off the hook, at least on the "federal income tax" assertion. No sooner had we published our conclusion that the NYT's statement was "flat-out wrong" than the NYT came right back and said there wasn't a single factual inaccuracy in its article, which was why GE hadn't asked for a correction. And, more importantly, the NYT sent us an AFP article in which GE spokesperson Anne Eisele--the same spokesperson who wrote the comment below--said the following: "GE did not pay US federal taxes last year because we did not owe any." It suggests that GE is still trying to find a way, any way, to talk its way out of this, even if that means giving out false information. . . . We have asked Anne and GE, once again, to explain themselves. They're working on getting us a response."

We didn't pay any tax because we didn't owe any.

I seem to recall that was the Philip Green defence for the fact he hadn't done tax avoidance. He claimed there was no avoidance because there was no tax due. He ignored the steps taken to ensure that was the case...which was all very convenient, and exactly what this GE debate is about.