

urban revitalization shall surely fail. . . .

To begin, certain understandings must be reached. . . .

The nation can no longer assume that cities will perform the full range of their traditional functions for the larger society. They are no longer the most desirable settings for living, working, producing. They should be allowed to transform into more specialized service and consumption centers within larger urban economic systems. The Panel believes that this nation should reconcile itself to these redistribution patterns. . . .

This can be done in a number of ways: by upgrading the unskilled through manpower development efforts so that existing local job opportunities can be exploited, by removing barriers to mobility that prevent people from migrating to locations of economic opportunity, and by providing migration assistance to those who wish and need it. . . .

First, recognition should be made of the near immutability of the technological, economic, social, and demographic trends that herald the emergence of a postindustrial society and that are responsible for the transformation of our nation's settlements and the life within them. These major formative trends are likely to continue, not only through the coming decade, but also well into the next century. Deflection or reversal of these broad-gauge trends is not likely to result from purposive government action. Clearly, on the basis of these trends, a federal policy of active anticipation, accommodation, and adjustment makes more sense than efforts to retard or reverse them. The efforts to revitalize those communities whose fortunes are adversely affected principally by the inadvertent consequences of past public policies are entirely justified, but these instances are judged to be rare. It is far more judicious to recognize that major circumstances that characterize our nation's settlements have not been and will not be significantly dependent on what the federal government does or does not do. . . .

Federal urban policy efforts should not necessarily be used to discourage the deconcentration and dispersal of industry and households from central urban areas. . . .

The energy and environmental implications of continuing trends toward relatively low-density development in new growth areas and the thinning out of existing high-density areas does not unequivocally justify the need for a national effort to encourage reconcentration in historically central locations. . . .

In close partnership with the private sector, *the federal government should develop strategies to assist localities in adjusting to economic base transformation and population shrinkage. . . .* Policy-guided contraction and disinvestment can help ease the impact of economic decline on individuals and local institutions and to position communities for regaining their health at new lower levels of population and industrial activity.

Haig and Kissinger act out London's NATO scenario

by Kathleen Murphy

Throughout his tenure as secretary of state, it was always possible to know what Henry Kissinger would do next by reading the pages of the high-toned London *Economist*. The same holds true today. The chief policy organ of the City of London—and Kissinger—both demand that NATO extend its military arena into the Persian Gulf.

The London *Economist* is also putting forward the strategy behind such a dangerous escalation of NATO's perimeters: a global policy of deindustrialization that only NATO could enforce.

In its latest issue, *The Economist* demands a transfer of industry and employment to the Third World—where workers would be paid at below-subsistence wages. Simultaneously, *The Economist* demands, the advanced sector must be transformed into a “postindustrial society,” which would subsist on the basis of banking, insurance, drugs, and gambling.

This means, *The Economist* explains, the buildup of NATO's conventional forces and its deployment as a police force throughout Europe and the Third World.

Zero growth

Gloating that the current world economic crisis has already thrown 17.5 million advanced-sector workers out of their jobs and forced many industries to either close or flee south, *The Economist* insists that the migration of heavy industry to cheap-labor Third World countries is inevitable.

Because world consumption rates will approach zero growth in 1982, the magazine asserts, the advanced nations should give up any hope of saving their basic industries. Instead they should orient toward a “service economy” based on nonproductive paper-shuffling, as in insurance speculation, real estate, and “leisure” (gambling casinos, drugs, and prostitution).

In its economic program for the United States under the headline, “De-industrializing Is Fun,” the magazine called on Reagan to kill off U.S. steel and auto industries in favor of an “information society,” which fore-

sees the application of cybernetics as the means of achieving urban decentralization and lowered energy consumption.

The journal's strategic and military proposals follow from its vision of "postindustrial" society.

In its lead editorial, the magazine calls on the new U.S. President to bludgeon our Western European allies into a military buildup and the expansion of the alliance beyond its present boundaries, especially into the Persian Gulf. *The Economist* demands that the Reagan administration concentrate on two main objectives. "One is to remove the danger of Russian nuclear superiority without trying to replace it with a new American superiority. That means asking the Russians to start talking, some time in 1981, about a revised SALT treaty which accepts the principle of 'parity,' but cures the defects of Mr. Carter's SALT II."

At the same time, states *The Economist*, the United States should pressure NATO members to accept a much higher level of spending on NATO conventional and theater nuclear forces.

"The second objective is to make it clear that the containment of Russia is now a two-front affair. The line drawn through Europe since 1945 has to be extended south-eastwards into a line which protects the oil-producing Gulf. The road to the Ruhr, and to Tokyo, lies through the Strait of Hormuz. One way or another," *The Economist* warns ominously, "America's allies will have to accept that."

Its call for reaching strategic arms agreement is by no means intended to ease tensions between the superpowers, as its strident calls for greatly increasing conventional arms production makes clear. Instead, it is intended to place a cap on Soviet high-technology development. This will then be used to justify placing a cap on Western science and industry.

Policy of Kissinger?

Their recommendations would, if adopted even in part by the Reagan administration, mean a total break with Western Europe, inevitable military confrontation with the Soviet Union, and the disintegration of the world economy. For these reasons, sources close to the Reagan team are wondering why Henry Kissinger and Secretary of State-designate Alexander Haig are promoting similar proposals.

Kissinger's British pedigree extends at least to the early 1950s, when he attended British intelligence's Wilton Park brainwashing center. He has spent the last week in the Mideast and northern Africa pushing *The Economist's* policies. Trying to palm himself off as an unofficial emissary of the Reagan administration, Kissinger has repeatedly called for the United States and its NATO partners to increase military presence in the Mideast, the Indian Ocean, and the Horn of Africa.

In Somalia, Kissinger told reporters that he would urge the incoming administration to prevent a "free rein" for Soviet "expansionism," by strengthening alliance forces in the area. He repeated the same formulation in Jerusalem, where he also launched into a diatribe against Western Europe for its attempts to negotiate a settlement of the Middle East conflict. European intervention, Kissinger warned, could only "create obstacles."

Despite Kissinger's claims to want to create a "zone of stability" in the Middle East, his real objective is permanent instability, exactly what Europe is working to prevent. According to the French newspaper *Le Figaro*, Kissinger says that his Mideast policy is based on British policy in the Balkans during the late 19th century. That policy, as World War I demonstrated with brutal clarity, was a British strategy against continental European prodevelopment forces. Britain's policy now is to use continued instability in the Mideast to threaten Europe with a cutoff of oil supplies.

Haig in tow?

While Kissinger's political protégé Alexander Haig has been keeping a low profile since he was named as secretary of state to the Reagan cabinet, his previous public statements show his agreement with *The Economist's* line.

During his short-lived presidential campaign last year, Haig made speeches stressing the need for NATO to transform itself from a military alliance into an integrated political, military, and economic supranational institution.

In a recent article for the *Washington Quarterly*, published by the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies, and excerpted in the Jan. 4 *Boston Globe*, Haig converges with *The Economist's* perspective on all major points. "Washington must inspire, persuade, urge and cajole other NATO nations to make decisions that will neither be straightforward nor easy," writes Haig. These decisions include "recognizing that NATO's problems do not stop at the Tropic of Cancer"; creating "a great power directorate" to oversee the "greater integration and coordination" of all alliance institutions, including the OECD and the EC; and committing NATO members to step up their monetary contributions to NATO to build up conventional and theater nuclear forces.

Like both Kissinger and *The Economist*, Haig is highly critical of Western Europe, particularly West Germany. "Bonn has disagreed with American policy regarding such issues as the transfer of nuclear technology to the Third World and nuclear power, and in general, energy, economic, and monetary affairs." It should not be allowed to fill the vacuum in NATO leadership left by the Carter administration, says Haig.