

Editorial

Doing the FBI's dirty work

In 1976, U.S. Attorney General Edward Levi imposed a set of guidelines on federal law enforcement agencies. The "Levi guidelines" were designed to curb abuses against the constitutional rights of freedom of speech, assembly, etc., of U.S. citizens committed by federal agencies, abuses which were revealed in testimony before Congress.

These abuses included illegal "eavesdropping," such as widespread use of wiretapping and bugging; infiltration of organizations by agents who served as "agents provocateurs," who initiated illegal acts and incited violence to discredit the organizations; theft of documents, membership lists, etc., as well as planting of incriminating evidence, the so-called black-bag jobs.

Much of this was done by the now-infamous "Coin-telpro" section of the FBI, set up by its cross-dressing director J. Edgar Hoover. Targets of these actions included President John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King and numerous other civil rights activists, and anti-war protesters. Among those subjected repeatedly to such illicit FBI activity was Lyndon LaRouche, who was a target of an assassination scheme run by the FBI through one of its top-level operatives in the Communist Party of the United States in 1973.

In the case of LaRouche, such illegal actions by the FBI did not cease with the introduction of the Levi guidelines. Attorneys for LaRouche have compiled a lengthy paper trail which demonstrates continuous FBI violations, especially after the written request in August 1982 by Henry Kissinger to FBI Director William Webster that the FBI act against LaRouche on his behalf. Deputy Assistant FBI Director Oliver "Buck" Revell was deployed by Webster to coordinate the "Get LaRouche" task force.

In a speech at a conference cosponsored by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) on "Hate Crimes: Progress and Problems" delivered in Austin, Texas on Oct. 16 of this year, Revell spilled the beans on how the FBI is evading the constraints imposed by the Levi guidelines.

Revell, who is presently FBI station chief in Dallas, said there are limits to what the FBI can do to enforce "hate crime" laws. The FBI, he said, faces "significant constraints in looking at rhetoric, in listening to, collecting, analyzing and in any way taking cognizance of rhetoric. . . . We are prevented by the guidelines of the attorney general from collecting any information that relates to speech."

He continued: "That means that much of the collection of information which ultimately leads to investigations is done by nongovernmental entities. The ADL collects information, the NAACP collects information, even the ACLU collects information. All these entities . . . have brought to us facts and circumstances which they believe do in fact constitute violations of federal law. *We encourage that*, because we must be blind and deaf in the process until there is an ongoing conspiracy. . . . We cannot act until we have that basis" (emphasis added).

For starters, Revell is lying. From Revell's active involvement with private entities, such as the ADL, NBC-TV and the Cult Awareness Network (CAN), in the LaRouche case, it is clear the FBI did not wait for evidence before it acted against LaRouche: It worked hand-in-hand with these entities to manufacture a case to railroad LaRouche to jail.

To use such private entities so that federal law enforcement agencies can claim to be "blind and deaf" is terribly wrong. The criminal investigation into ADL spying in San Francisco, and revelations of CAN operatives' role in the ATF raid against the Branch Davidians in Waco and the subsequent slaughter of 85 people due to the FBI's final assault demonstrate the danger of encouraging such private entities to do the dirty work once done covertly by federal agencies.

Organizations such as the ADL and CAN have private agendas. It is clear that, in the case of CAN in Waco, and both CAN and the ADL in the persecution of LaRouche, their private agendas were adopted and furthered by federal agencies, resulting in horrific injustices. This was not the intention of the Levi guidelines, and is a practice which must be ended.