

vice providers to the American telecommunications industry and to U.S. law enforcement agencies. The two companies are Amdocs and Comverse.

Amdocs was first identified in the Aug. 31, 2001 *EIR* expose of the Mega Group as part of the Israeli “inside” apparatus in the Clinton White House, that tapped the President’s phone conversations with Monica Lewinsky, and used the tapes as blackmail leverage against the U.S. peace efforts in the Middle East.

Amdocs was incorporated in 1982 on the notorious off-shore British financial safe-haven of Guernsey. It provides a wide range of top-end telecommunications services, including phone billings and fraud detection, to the 25 largest telephone companies in the United States and to companies in 50 other countries around the world. The overwhelming majority of its 9,000 employees are Israelis, and the top management are largely former high-ranking officers of Israeli military and intelligence bureaus.

Comverse, along with the Canadian company, JSI International, handles the majority of contracts, worldwide, for wiretaps, including in the United States. Comverse is a major sub-contractor for both the FBI and the Drug Enforcement Administration. Comverse, too, primarily employs Israeli military and intelligence veterans. The company is a leading manufacturer of facial-recognition and voice-recognition technology, employed by American law enforcement and intelligence.

Both firms have also been linked to the Israeli “art students” and toy vendors.

Where It Stands

To summarize the *EIR* investigation as of this moment: The same billionaires’ club, called “Mega,” which was pointed to as the orchestrator of the 1997-99 operations against U.S. President Bill Clinton, is multiply linked to the authors of the current Israeli killing operations. It is situated in a network of U.S.A., Canada, Israeli, and other business organizations at the center of the Israeli military intelligence service’s international operating capabilities. These businesses, like those involved in the Clinton White House message system scandal, represent wiretapping and other espionage capabilities beyond the means enjoyed by most leading governments.

These connections should have been shut down totally, even for no other reason than U.S. interest in protection of its citizens against foreign and other spying, and in the protection of the secrets of our sovereign government, and integrity of our intelligence and law-enforcement functions. While this Israeli-linked spying against the United States and its most sensitive military, intelligence, and law-enforcement agencies continues, the United States has no real national security. As long as this is not cleaned up, the drug-traffickers, including those tied to international terrorist operations, often have more authority in criminal matters than properly constituted law-enforcement and related official agencies.

Congress’ Warmongers Seek War With Iraq

by Suzanne Rose

Underscoring the correctness once again of Lyndon LaRouche’s characterization of Congress as massively corrupt, on Dec. 20 the House of Representatives passed another resolution seeking confrontation and war with the Arab and Muslim world. Less than 48 hours before adjourning for the year, they passed a resolution targetting Iraq, signalling their willingness to provide cover for deranged circles within and without the Bush Administration who want to immediately engulf the United States in a religious war in the Middle East.

House Joint Resolution 75, “Regarding Inspection And Monitoring To Prevent The Development Of Weapons Of Mass Destruction In Iraq,” was introduced by Reps. Lindsay Graham (R-S.C.) and Porter Goss (R-Fla.), chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, on Dec. 4. It was rushed through a mark-up in the International Relations Committee on Dec. 12, and passed the full House by a vote of 392-7, with 12 abstaining, on Dec. 20, after approximately one hour of debate the day before.

The Opposition Speaks Out

This resolution, unlike so many others which Congress has rubberstamped, had some real opposition. Some lawmakers, in response to a nationwide mobilization by supporters of Lyndon LaRouche, understand that this is no time for business as usual. Supporters have bombarded their congressmen with the message that a “religious” war against the Arab and Muslim world is being orchestrated as part of an attempted coup d’état against the U.S. government, by rogue elements within the U.S. military and security apparatus. It was recognized by the opposition that this resolution was not just another attempt to force Iraqi President Saddam Hussein to comply with inspections, but rather, represented Congressional support for expanding the war in Afghanistan to the Middle East, possibly becoming World War III.

“Why the rush?” asked Rep. Jim McDermott (D-Wash.). “Why are we passing this 48 hours before we adjourn? We authorized the President to do what was needed to be done against the terrorists. I think he has done reasonably well. But India has problems now, problems precipitated by our actions.”

“We are going too fast,” McDermott said. Referring to the start of the Vietnam War, he added, ask ourselves, are we back in 1964 when the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was brought out? Only two Senators voted against it. A third raised a ques-

tion as to whether it authorized ground troops. Senator Fulbright asked President Johnson, who said he had no intention of putting troops on the ground; 55,000 American deaths ensued. McDermott said he didn't want to go home for the recess, giving the administration *carte blanche* in Iraq.

He pointed out that an earlier, more bellicose resolution — declaring that if Iraq were to refuse to admit inspectors, it would be an act of aggression against the United States — was the one circulated in the debate, despite the fact that the language had been modified before the mark-up of the legislation on Dec. 12 to read “mounting threat.” “We may agree, but not at 100 miles an hour. . . . You don't care about the process,” he charged the resolution's sponsors.

House Joint Res. 75 demands that the United States and the UN reimpose a weapons inspection and monitoring program on Iraq. Iraq must then accept immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to any and all areas, facilities, equipment, records, and means of transportation which the inspectors wish to inspect. It says that nothing short of this approach will be acceptable; that Iraq should now be considered in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations, and if it refuses to allow such access as is demanded by the UN weapons inspectors, it should be considered a “mounting threat” to the United States, its allies, and international peace and security.

Opponents of the resolution pointed out that there is fierce international opposition to further attacks on Iraq. The Russians would not accept it, and neither would the majority of Arab nations, which see the effects of the embargo and previous attacks as unjust.

Nevertheless, International Relations Committee Chairman Henry Hyde (R-Ill.) and his collaborator and ranking member Tom Lantos (D-Calif.) represented that Iraq is the major threat to world peace and security. “Nobody is safe from Saddam's designs,” Lantos ranted. “The world cannot live with him.” Hyde intoned, “It is dangerous to remain silent.”

‘We Should Promote National Sovereignty’

Strongly opposed to the resolution was Rep. Ron Paul (R-Tex.), who said that it does harm, is jingoistic, and invites conflict. “With all the problems in the world, why are we singling out Iraq?” he asked. “We should promote peace and national sovereignty.” He criticized the recent drift of U.S. foreign policy. Countries to which we supply weapons often turn against us. We seem to be weaker because of what we do overseas. He recommended dialogue as the way to solve problems. “We dialogued with the Soviets during the height of the Cold War, why can't we dialogue with Iraq?”

Paul rebutted the assumptions of the resolution. There has been no evidence produced that Iraq was connected to the events of Sept. 11, he said. Rather, this resolution was put together to provide a pretext to go into Iraq. The evidence about anthrax suggests it may be from the CIA — and not, as Hyde had suggested, from Iraq. He argued that the intent of

the resolution was to go to war. Nothing in existing resolutions gives us the authority to go back in, he said. He denied that there have been no inspections in Iraq since 1998, as alleged by Hyde and Lantos. He cited the International Atomic Energy Agency inspection to inventory Iraq's nuclear material, and its report of 2001, that Iraq had cooperated. And, he pointed to interviews given by former UN inspector Scott Ritter, where Ritter has stated that Iraq constitutes absolutely no military threat (see article, p. 66). They have not reconstituted weapons of mass destruction. The level of disarmament, according to Ritter, is 90-95%. In terms of a national security threat, Iraq is none.

That the intent of the sponsors is to provoke war, was underscored by the performance of an unhinged Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.). “Now is the time to finish the job. He [Saddam] is at war with us. If we permit him to have weapons of mass destruction, he will kill millions of Americans. . . . We should liberate Iraq like we did Afghanistan.” Paul asked him to consider the consequences of his statements. “If the gentleman were to find out that China were much more involved in the Taliban and in Sept. 11, than anything Saddam Hussein has done, would the gentleman be willing to do to China what the gentleman is willing to do to Iraq?” What about Pakistan, Paul asked, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Egypt? Rohrabacher said yes to all: but one at a time, after Iraq.

The questioning of the sponsors' motives was picked up by Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.). “Is this a way to expand the war to Iraq? Is there some reason there have been no hearings and no witnesses?” he asked. “It is the exact opposite,” Lantos lied. “The resolution demands that [Saddam] obey what he agreed to ten years ago. It gives him one final chance.” Conyers referred to the original language of the resolution, which the sponsors had been forced to modify, that failure to comply would be considered “an act of aggression against the United States.” Conyers said that Rohrabacher's statement, “Now is the time to finish the job,” introduces a new concept. He said he was under the impression that nations declare war on each other.

Paul said that, contrary to the sponsors' intent, there is no authority within existing UN resolutions for the use of force against Iraq. “This is support for expanding the war,” he said. The Secretary of State is being overruled, because of the “fantastic success” of the Afghanistan war, against a country, probably the poorest in the world, which has no airplanes.

In response to Paul's truthful statements, Hyde ramped up the hyperbole. He compared opposition to the resolution to British Prime Minister Chamberlain and the appeasement of Hitler during the 1920s and '30s. Perhaps placing himself in the Hitler camp, Hyde argued, “In today's world, our borders are everywhere. That's why we have to do it [against Iraq]. We are the strongest.”

Representative Graham concluded the proceedings ranting falsely that, “We must take immediate action to support the President. . . . Act now or pay later. We are the target of Saddam Hussein. . . .”