

Editorial

The New York Times: tactics and strategy

Next month marks the centenary of the opening of New York City's Brooklyn Bridge, the world's first large steel-cable suspension bridge, which proved that non-rigid steel structures could bear heavy traffic loads on spans of over a thousand feet between piers. The bridge generated tremendous enthusiasm in the population—as it does today. But not at the *New York Times*.

The *Times* protested that for all the money poured into the bridge, the ferries could have been offered free for a lifetime. The *Times* complained that among the throngs of celebrators, "there could have been no cause of congratulation, since not one in one thousand of them will be likely to have occasion to use the new structure except for curiosity." The *Times* railed at the fact that "stupid engineers" had modified the design of the bridge in order to allow heavy railroad trains to ride across it in total safety.

The *Times* went on to black out Thomas Edison's invention of the electric light, to campaign against electrical power, and predict that the airplane would never fly. The *Times* supported the "Nordic supremacist" eugenics movement until Hitler made it too unpopular to openly promote, and most recently, complained that Dr. Barney Clark's artificial heart was "dehumanizing" and excessively expensive.

The *Times*'s latest venture into the world of science and technology occurred on March 28, when the Washington bureau of the Associated Press released an extensive interview with *EIR* Contributing Editor Uwe Parpart-Henke, the research director of the Fusion Energy Foundation. The subject was the President's new policy of advanced-technology beam weapon antiballistic-missile defense, a policy which Parpart, as one of the few scientists deeply familiar with the questions involved, endorsed and explained.

The interview was published at once by the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Albuquerque Times*. Parpart-Henke was asked to appear on CBS national network television

the next day, as well as ABC network radio and the Canadian Broadcasting Network. Alarm bells went off in the offices of those who dictate policy to the *Times*.

By mid-afternoon, the Fusion Energy Foundation discovered that AP had sent out an "advisory" noting that the *New York Times* had objected to the Parpart-Henke interview, and promised a "more balanced" story later in the day. AP editors cited to FEF personnel the slanders against the FEF and its board member Lyndon LaRouche as violent anti-Semites—characterizations found slanderous in a Paris court of law in 1981, when the *International Herald Tribune* was fined for reprinting the *Times*'s formulas, which the court deemed lies.

The second AP story on Henke-Parpart turned out to be perfectly accurate, describing the FEF as the leading proponents of the President's policy, while quoting various specialists, who have since declined to engage in public debate on the matter, deploring the dangers of "excessive optimism."

The intentions of the *Times*—which frantically editorialized against anti-missile defense, but restored its façade of objectivity by printing an excellent "op-ed" by Dr. Edward Teller on March 30—are fairly obvious.

The policy faction the *Times* represents, the faction of Henry Kissinger, Cyrus Vance, and former Defense Secretary Harold Brown (who battled for years against beam-weapon programs), cherishes the Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) doctrine, as we document in this issue of *EIR*.

These are the people who created the current economic collapse with the express purpose of permanently lowering advanced-sector living standards and confining the underdeveloped sector to "appropriate technologies," their euphemism for mass murder. These are the people who use arms control as a weapon against progress. These are the people who wanted to torpedo the Brooklyn Bridge.