

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

former director William Casey's policy agenda;

6) diluted the quality of agency analytical product with a large-scale hiring of inexperienced recruits, while concentrating areas of special concern to the former Reagan administration and Casey in the hands of a trusted few.

The charges, backed up by informal submissions from 22 serving CIA employees, have re-focused the confirmation hearings while adding explosive material to testimony presented Sept. 24 by Acting Director Richard Kerr and senior analyst Charles E. Allen, on what Gates knew, and when he knew it, about the Iran-Contra affair.

In the public hearings, it became clear that the issue is the political corruption which permitted the CIA to be used by those associated with Bush who cooked up the Iran-Contra affair and the October Surprise, including manufacturing the existence of a "moderate faction" within Iran and rigging the intelligence estimates and briefing process to push that evaluation through against the opponent view. The changed evaluation was what helped make possible the deals with Khomeini and his mad mullahs who took U.S. hostages, and blew up marines in Beirut.

Goodman charged, "A question remains. Was the President himself a victim of CIA misinformation, or even disinformation?" for when President Reagan insisted he was dealing with "Iranian moderates," no such group existed.

A second, equally devastating case was applied to the investigation of the 1981 assassination attempt against Pope John Paul II, when singleminded pursuit of the Soviet connection helped cover up the trail of the criminals.

Public hearings on the closed-door evidence were scheduled after Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) asked Goodman to identify which parts of his testimony were classified. Goodman replied that none was. The testimony has reportedly triggered a shift in attitude of some senators who had previously been assumed to be supportive of Gates's nomination, among them Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) and Warren Rudman (R-N.H.). Cranston told interviewers that "if the charges are accurate, they could jeopardize the nomination."

Bush had demanded back in July that the nomination process be conducted with dispatch, intending originally to see his candidate appointed before the summer recess. Independent Counsel Lawrence Walsh's continuing investigation into the Iran-Contra affair stopped that dead in its tracks. But it didn't stop Bush from continuing to back a candidate so tainted.

The question that continues to come up is, what does Bush himself owe to Robert Gates, to stick thus as he has with such damaged goods? London's sometimes scurrilous *Private Eye* magazine pointed out that Gates, like present ambassador to South Korea Donald Gregg, is a Carter administration National Security Council holdover, situated to have been one of the insiders for Reagan-Bush during the 1980 election. That certainly ought to be an area that any investigation of political corruption should look into.

Commentary

Oliver Wendell Holmes causes Thomas deadlock

by Edward Spannaus

Up until the day before the vote on his confirmation, Clarence Thomas was expected to easily win a majority of the votes in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Yet, when the committee voted on Sept. 27, the vote tied 7-7, and the nomination was sent to the floor of the Senate without a recommendation—the first time in history this has occurred. Suddenly, the success of President Bush's nomination was in question.

What had happened? Opposition from the liberals—Sens. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), Paul Simon (D-Ill.), Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio), etc.—was a foregone conclusion, particularly on the politically popular abortion issue. The most important "swing" vote was that of the influential Sen. Howell Heflin (D-Ala.). (Heflin is the former chief justice of Alabama, former chairman of the National Conference of Chief Justices, and now heads the Senate's sleaziest unit—its ethics committee.)

On Sept. 26, Heflin announced his opposition to Thomas. Without Heflin's vote, no Democrats on the Judiciary Committee other than Sen. Dennis DeConcini (D-Ariz.) would be likely to support the Thomas nomination.

Immediately after the committee vote, a commentator for Pacifica Radio reported that Heflin had turned against Thomas because of Thomas's attacks on Oliver Wendell Holmes. Readers of *EIR* were already well aware of the significance of the Holmes issue for the hearings. (See *EIR*, Sept. 13 and Sept. 27, 1991.) More than any other single jurist, Holmes is responsible for eradicating any notions of natural law and morality from American law, in favor of radical positivism and pragmatism.

Kennedy starts the Holmes issue

Virtually all press commentary on the hearings was confined to the sterile ideological framework of "liberal-conservative" issues. Press coverage was dominated by the predetermined issues of abortion, affirmative action, and "natural law," and Thomas's pre-programmed attempts to avoid a forthright statement of his own views. As to those portions of the hearings in which Thomas broke out of the straitjacket imposed by his Bush administration handlers—reflected in