

David Kay: an eco-fascist with a global search warrant

by Edward Spannaus

David Kay, the leader of the U.N. inspection team in Baghdad, has been praised in the western press as a hero who stood up to Saddam Hussein, while being denounced as a "CIA agent" by the Iraqi government. In truth, the Iraqis were too kind. David Kay is worse than they say. He is a raving eco-fascist, a global environmental cop who thinks that his supranational SWAT team should have the right to ransack and pillage any nation's industrial and technological capabilities.

According to the *Washington Post*, the U.N. team "consists largely of nuclear specialists selected for their physical stamina as well as their nuclear expertise." If this is true, then Kay must have a lot of stamina, because he sure doesn't have any nuclear expertise! He has absolutely no scientific or engineering background. His entire career has been as a "political scientist" plotting how international organizations such as the U.N. can use environmental laws and treaties to destroy the sovereignty of Third World countries and their right to develop.

Rockefellers, Mellons, and Carnegies

Over his career, Kay's work has been funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the U.S. State Department. Investigation further shows that one of his books was published in 1977 by Praeger Publishers, a known CIA front.

After getting his Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1967, Kay became an adviser to the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Mission to the United Nations. Over the next two decades, he published numerous books and articles on the U.N. and international environmental regulation, funded by the foundations listed above. In 1978 Kay went to work as a senior evaluations officer for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (Unesco), and in 1983 he became the director of program and project evaluation for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Kay is a close collaborator of Maurice Strong, the Club of Rome genocidalist who is secretary general of the "Eco-92" U.N. environmental conference to be held in Brazil next

June. Strong wrote the introduction to Kay's 1972 book *World Eco-Crisis*, a blueprint for the 1972 U.N. Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm, the forerunner of next year's "Earth Summit."

The 'Stockholm strategy'

Kay has devoted much of the last 20 years to implementing the environmental strategy developed around the 1972 Stockholm conference. Stripped of its academic mumbo-jumbo, the "Stockholm strategy" means suckering the Third World into giving up its aspirations for economic development and national sovereignty, under the pretext of protecting the environment. According to Kay's 1972 book, the best means of doing this is through the United Nations, since the U.N. "offers the best, and only real, opportunity for providing an institutional base with wide participation."

However, Kay wrote, a major problem in building the Stockholm conference was the fear of developing countries that environmentalism would be used against them to limit economic growth. Kay credited Maurice Strong's "lobbying" with overcoming these fears, since Strong "encouraged the developing states to believe" that concern with the environment will not reduce the funds available for development, but rather increase them, and even promised them additional funding from the advanced sector. Kay praised Strong's lies and manipulation for preventing the developing countries from boycotting the Stockholm conference, as had been feared.

Kay's 1983 book *Environmental Protection: the International Dimension* was billed as the first major evaluation of the Stockholm strategy of brainwashing Third World leaders. The book was financed by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to the American Society for International Law. In it, Kay bragged that by the late 1970s, a worldwide consensus for protecting the environment had emerged. "The less-developed countries, originally uninterested in environmental problems and fearful that efforts at environmental protection would brake their progress toward industrialization, had come to adopt a more favorable attitude." The strength of the Stockholm process, he wrote, "was that it mobilized, focused and educated

national governments . . . set an agreed agenda, and established a process for future action.”

Now it is time, he proposed in 1983, “for another intense effort to focus global attention and effort on the next stage of the agenda. . . . This calls for nothing less than a Stockholm II conference.” The nations of the world must put all national decisions on economic growth under the Stockholm umbrella. “It is clearer now that decisions on employment, income, resource utilization, growth, equity, and environmental quality cannot be made in isolation. An important function of a second Stockholm conference would be to recapture a unified conception of the environment and to integrate this view into international environmental protection activities.”

While Kay wants the Third World countries to prostrate themselves in front of the United Nations, he clearly thinks the U.S. government should have the right to override the U.N. whenever it pleases. This was demonstrated by his conduct during the recent Baghdad standoff, which caused intense embarrassment to the U.N. Kay was bypassing the U.N. and sending material seized from the Iraqis directly to the U.S. State Department. In the middle of the siege, he was ordered by U.N. officials to stop sending information to the United States. “Washington was better informed than me, and that’s not the way we should do it,” complained Rolf Ekeus, the head of the U.N.’s Special Commission in charge of dismantling Iraq’s nuclear program.

The Baghdad precedent

Like the entire Gulf war, Kay’s raids on Iraqi facilities are deliberately being orchestrated to set a precedent for the new world order’s global policing operations. On Sept. 27, an unnamed U.S. official was quoted as saying: “It is the most intrusive and extensive inspection regime ever imposed on a sovereign state. . . . When it comes to their nuclear program, they have no sovereign rights at all.” An official of the Carnegie Endowment (where Kay once worked) said that U.N. inspection teams would soon be conducting house-to-house searches in the homes of Iraqi nuclear scientists.

Lest anyone think that these methods are simply a reaction to Iraqi intransigence, it should be noted that last February, the director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency asked the U.N. to expand IAEA’s inspection powers. The director, Hans Blix, former head of Sweden’s Liberal Party, asked that the IAEA 1) have broader access to information and intelligence; 2) have access to all parts of a country for inspection purposes, whether the country agrees or not; and 3) that the mandate be “intrusive” when so authorized by the U.N. Security Council.

Placed in the context of Kay’s close collaboration with Maurice Strong and the Eco-92 gang, it is clear that such “intrusive” methods would not be limited to nuclear facilities, but could include any target which could be considered to be despoiling the environment.

Better lock your doors. Here comes the new world order.

Bush back on hot seat over Gates nomination

by Our Special Correspondent

Bush’s nominee to head the Central Intelligence Agency, Robert Gates, ran into a buzz-saw of opposition at the end of September. This time it isn’t so much the old criminal tales of corruption and abuse of power in the Iran-Contra affair and the so-called “October Surprise” theft of the 1980 election which has thrown Gates’s nomination into doubt. The attack comes from Gates’s peers within the intelligence community and the CIA, who charge a different kind of corruption, as deadly to the process of government as that, like the Iran-Contra affair, which Bush and his momentary allies like Sen. Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.) insist be covered up.

Since Bush has put the weight of his office behind the nomination on more than one occasion, including on the eve of the hearings which began Sept. 16, when he told Republican senators not to be “blushing violets” but to speak up for his nominee, the present trial of Gates also shapes up as a trial of his nominator, George Bush, and the methods that Bush has chosen to employ in the intelligence community.

The charges were put before public hearings of the Senate Intelligence Committee Oct. 1, in testimony by former CIA officials Hal Ford and Melvin Goodman. Their testimony had been previewed during closed sessions the week before.

Tailoring intelligence estimates

In the closed sessions, Gates’s professional reputation was put through the shredder by three former CIA analysts who testified Sept. 25. The analysts included 25-year agency veteran and present contract employee Melvin A. Goodman; Jennifer A. Glaudemans, a six-year veteran of the intelligence section; and Hal Ford, a former senior analyst. They charged that Gates:

- 1) manufactured intelligence to fit administration political campaigns, for example, on Soviet chemical weapons use in Afghanistan;
- 2) ignored intelligence which ran counter to administration political priorities, for example, on Iran;
- 3) falsified intelligence, e.g., permitted an operations division agent in Iran to file his reports as an “Iranian moderate”;
- 4) altered intelligence on the Soviet Union and international terrorism during 1982 to bring it into conformity with a book published by Claire Sterling;
- 5) fired or reassigned agents whose analyses did not fit