

FEDCOP

Washington Grabs For Police Power

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets* — a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ IT WAS during the quadrennial madness of 1968 that Conservative political candidates began thundering against criminals and radicals and calling for "law and order." Apparently the cry was popularized by the tough little governor of Alabama who calls a spade a spade. But when his charges were found to have mass political appeal, the demand for "law and order" was Spiroed away by the Republican wing of the Establishment. During the ensuing two years crime in the streets continued to proliferate like Mrs. Hasenpfeffer on Welfare.

By the time of the recently concluded plebiscite, even candidates of the Establishment's Democratic wing were trooping about calling for "law and order." Which seemed very odd, indeed, since as late as August of 1970, they had been characterizing "law and order" as code words for "racism." Pragmatism had drowned ideology when the polls indicated that millions of Americans feel themselves threatened by a continuing mugathion in our streets, and revealed

that many more millions have simply had it with the campus terrorists. As *Time* magazine indicated in its issue for July 13, 1970:

Millions of Americans in 1970 are gripped by an anxiety that is not caused by war, inflation or recession — important as those issues are. Across the U.S., the universal fear of violent crime and vicious strangers... is a constant companion of the populace. It is the cold fear of dying at random in a brief spasm of senseless violence — for a few pennies, for nothing.

The statistics tell the story. Serious crime rose by 148 percent in the turbulent Sixties while the population increased only thirteen percent. This means that crime is increasing eleven times as fast as population. Robberies are up 180 percent over the past nine years. While crimes of plunder and passion continue to increase, a new dimension has been added in the form of crimes of political terrorism aimed by revolutionaries at the police. "Kill the pigs" has become their battle cry. In its issue for October 26, 1970, *U.S. News & World Report* provides a statistical box score:

The cold statistics are in themselves frightening. The F.B.I. reports that in 1969 a record high of 86 law-enforcement officers were killed by felonious criminal action. This is a 34 percent increase over the previous year, when 64... officers were murdered...

And 1970 proved even more terrible than 1969. By the end of July, some sixty-seven policemen had been killed in the line of duty — sixteen of these murdered from ambush by revolutionaries. And the killings are escalating seriously. Recently United Press International quoted an F.B.I. spokesman commenting on revolutionary racism:

Since January 1, 1970, there have been 190 reported instances of racially motivated attacks against policemen, including 17 ambushes. As a result, 21 police officers have been killed and 159 others have been injured [in attacks by black militants]. During August alone, there were 23 attacks by black extremists against police. These caused the death of five officers and injuries to 56 others.

F.B.I. reports show a total of 35,202 assaults on police in 1969, or 16.9 attacks per hundred officers. In 1960, the F.B.I. said, there had been only 9,621 such assaults, or 6.3 per hundred officers. In September an Associated Press survey indicated that this year policemen had already been victims of fatal, apparently unprovoked, attacks in Philadelphia, San Francisco, Berkeley, New York, Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, Montgomery, St. Paul, San Jose, and Omaha.

California has been particularly hard hit. Chief deputy attorney general of California, Mr. Charles A. O'Brien, testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in October of 1970:

It is patently clear that law officers have become a special target for the terrorists and anarchists in our society.... Murders of California police officers have increased 100 per cent in 1970. During the past 10 years, from 1960 through 1969, an average of one peace officer was killed every

two months — a rate more than 4 times that of the general population. In 1970, an average of two peace officers have been killed every month — 15 in the first seven and a half months of this year.

The *Los Angeles Times* for October 7, 1970, quotes Mr. O'Brien as informing the Subcommittee that assaults on police are up 350 percent in the last three years. (As of October twenty-fourth, seven policemen had been slain in the San Francisco-Oakland-Berkeley area, alone, four of them clearly terror killings.) Charles O'Brien continued:

Since January, 1970, there have been 12 bombing incidents against police buildings in California and 16 bombing incidents involving police automobiles. Twenty-six persons have been injured as a result of these bombings.... We should also not ignore the fact that other public officials and agencies are now being singled out as targets for violence. The terrible incident on August 7 at the Marin County Courthouse in San Rafael which resulted in the murder of Judge Harold Haley — his head was blown off — plainly revealed that black terrorists had turned their attention to the courts.

In Berkeley there were fifty-eight assaults on policemen in 1968 and eighty in 1969. In the first eight months of 1970 there have been eighty-eight such assaults. In Detroit, there were 412 assaults on police officers last year, 230 of them in the first eight months. In the first eight months of 1970, there were 410 such assaults on police officers there. Twelve Detroit officers were shot last year; in the first eight months of 1970, fifteen have been shot.

Police officials in New York City reported that in the first eight months of 1970 some 985 policemen had been so

badly assaulted they required medical attention, compared to 591 in the same period in 1969 — a sixty-seven percent increase. Thirty-four City policemen were shot in the first eight months of 1970; eleven in the first eight months of 1969. Four New York City policemen, including a transit patrolman, had been killed this year by the end of August.

Within the last few months the killing of police officers has reached a nearly fantastic level. According to Quinn Tamm of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, 26 policemen were killed in the United States and 650 injured in the three month period ending October 23, 1970. Authorities are convinced that this is more than coincidental. In its issue for October 19, 1970, *U.S. News & World Report* asks:

Is there a national conspiracy to kill policemen? Congress dug into this question in early October. One witness after another told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that a pattern of attacks on police indicates a plot.

Eighteen police officers have been slain in unprovoked assaults this year — twice as many as last year — the Subcommittee was told by John J. Harrington, head of the 120,000-member Fraternal Order of Police.

Capt. Joel Honey, of the sheriff's department in Santa Barbara, Calif., told of confiscating pamphlets giving detailed instructions on manufacture and use of weapons to kill police. He said wires have been strung across California highways to decapitate motorcycle policemen. A police undercover agent told of being "trained to kill police" by student revolutionaries in Buffalo, N.Y.

As Carl Parsell, director of the Detroit Police Officers Association, observed in

October: "Public officials keep saying it's just the hazards of the job, but we should face it for what it is: a conspiracy to kill policemen . . . the men feel people with political causes are zeroing in on them to highlight their causes."

Edward Kiernan, president of the New York City Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, says the shootings of policemen are "part of a cold, logical, hard-eyed revolutionary strategy." Philadelphia Police Commissioner Frank Rizzo is of the same opinion. In September he blamed assaults on police in his city on hard-core radicals. As Commissioner Rizzo put it: "This is a national conspiracy. It's treason . . . It must be stopped even if we have to change some laws to do it."

On October 8, 1970, the International Association of Chiefs of Police adopted a resolution calling for a federal investigation of the conspiracy to assassinate police officers, declaring: "The members of this conference actually do believe that a number of these attacks are planned and executed by those traveling in interstate commerce."

California's deputy attorney general O'Brien made a second trip to Washington in October to charge before a Congressional Committee that the Black Panthers and the Weatherman faction of the Students for a Democratic Society have instigated many of these attacks through speeches and published materials. Both groups have distributed manuals which advocate attacks on police and provide instructions for making bombs to assassinate law enforcement personnel. Mr. O'Brien also testified that it would not be long before the revolutionaries out-gun the police. As he told a newspaperman: "Soon it will be machineguns and high-powered rifles against police carrying only shotguns and pistols. It'll be like sending police out to protect us with peashooters."

Militants are staging their own arms race, O'Brien said. Thousands of auto-

matic weapons, bombs, and explosives are being stockpiled. Many are powerful modern weapons and grenades stolen from military bases and from shipments to Vietnam. The extent of thefts from Army bases, he observed, "is beginning to frighten" even the military. For example, police recovered ninety-four pounds of C-4 military explosives and thirty-nine hand-grenades during the recent student riots near Santa Barbara, California. Mr. O'Brien reports in detail:

The seriousness of the problem first hit us about two years ago when we arrested one character selling unstable C-2 plastic explosives stolen from Army bases. Through him, we tracked down 40 Army .45s, which had been stolen from military bases in Colorado. From this investigation we learned of a regular traffic in stolen military materials.

We also found out about supplies headed for Vietnam being stolen in shipment, including guns, grenade launchers, grenades, explosives and ammunition . . .

In September, Senator John McClellan gave a large audience in Akron, Ohio, an idea of how this stolen equipment is being used:

Some 5,000 bombings have occurred in the United States during the past 18 months. More than 1,200 of these were with high explosives bombs; the others were with incendiary devices. These bombings caused the deaths of at least 45 persons, injured more than 400 others, and resulted in property damage in excess of \$25 million.

In addition to these actual bombings, some 35,000 bomb threats have been made . . . (Congressional Record, September 14, 1970, Page H8677 et seq.)

As one must imagine, our police officers are very concerned. John J. Harrington, national president of the Fraternal Order of Police, was quoted by Associated Press on October 15, 1970, as having told a Washington rally that our "police are fed up with being treated like fish in a barrel." He continued:

The thin line between civilization and the jungle — which is us policemen — is being shot to hell and something has to be done about it.

It's time the people of this country face up to it — there is a revolution taking place.

Is it any wonder then that almost everyone — Democrat and Republican, "Liberal" and Conservative — is calling for "law and order"? The cry of the hour is: Do something! And most Americans are now willing to go along with almost anything that promises to relieve the situation.

In America, law enforcement has traditionally been a function of local government, but in the wake of the disastrous Watts riots of August 1965, Washington began coming to the "aid" of local governments. Within a week of the Watts holocaust the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, now known as the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (L.E.A.A.), was set up in the Justice Department to provide federal funds and helpful guidelines to "upgrade" local police departments.

Then, as crime continued to rise and riots proliferated, Congress passed the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. As in other such programs, expenditures began modestly. The budget for fiscal 1969 was \$63 million. But now the outlays are being expanded enormously. On June 30, 1970, the House authorized \$650 million for L.E.A.A. in fiscal 1971, \$1 billion for fiscal 1972, and \$1.5 billion for fiscal 1973. Our federal,

state, and local governments will spend \$5 billion on law enforcement this year. Which suggests that within two years nearly one-third of everything spent in this area will be routed through Washington to be returned with federal controls.

How is such federal money to be spent? According to *U.S. News & World Report*:

That Act [Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets] requires that most of the money be given, initially, to States in block grants. The States are then required to re-distribute 75 percent of their grants to local and county law-enforcement agencies. But first, plans must be drawn up — and approved — for ways to spend money.

It would certainly seem that the "law and order" men in Washington are on the right track. Surely we shall soon see a sharp drop in crime and the jailing of the revolutionary terrorists now bombing, burning, and killing in our streets.

If you think that, you are being played for a fool. What is wrong with the federal government coming to the aid of our local police is all too obvious. But let us take a hard look.

First we must recognize that the problems which all of this new federal anti-crime legislation is supposed to solve have been artificially created — and by many of those who now pose as friends of "law and order" to offer federal "solutions." The strategy is known as "pressure from below and pressure from above." It is the technique used by the Communists to

take control of Czecho-Slovakia, and it is described in detail by Communist theoretician Jan Kozak in a Communist Party textbook now available in an English translation as a Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.*

The strategy is to produce "pressure from below," by supporting crime in the streets with a cadre of revolutionaries organized to lead bands of looters, marchers, misguided peaceniks, and the like. These are to create a demand from the "silent majority" for the placing of more power and control in the hands of the central government. The "pressure from above" comes when "the Parliament" (Kozak refers to Czecho-Slovakia) or the Congress (in the case of the United States) responds by surrendering to the demands of the radicals in the streets in order to prevent further violence, while at the same time centralizing police authority on the ground that it is necessary to maintain "law and order."

This highly sophisticated tactic creates a pincers movement directed against the great middle-class, which is the target of Establishment conspirators seeking total control in America just as in Czecho-Slovakia.

I do not mean to infer that any but a few of those actually applying either the pressure from above or below understand the scheme in which they are being used. Most of the street revolutionaries are in deadly earnest, and most "Liberal" Congressmen and Senators actually believe they are helping to solve America's problems through increased federal controls and the centralization of law enforcement. But the *Insiders* who manipulate the Establishment know the game very well. And it is they who are calling the signals.

Consider the stimulation of crime in the streets which has resulted from the radicalism of the Supreme Court, an arm of the same government which now claims it wants to help "improve" law enforcement. Thanks to the High Court a law officer today has to speak softly and

*Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, first session, *The New Role Of National Legislative Bodies In The Communist Conspiracy*, reprint of "How Parliament Can Play A Revolutionary Part In The Transition To Socialism" and "The Role Of The Popular Masses," by Jan Kozak, historian of the Communist Party Of Czecho-slovakia, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1962.

carry a big law library. The Court has handcuffed the police and given the clever criminal virtual carte blanche to pursue his trade. It is pressure from above complementing pressure from below.

You have doubtless noted that the enormous growth in our crime rate followed hard on a trail blazed by the Supreme Court. After a series of rulings striking down our laws against internal subversion, its first major "be kind to criminals" decision was the *Mallory* rape case of 1957, which threw out use of confessions obtained before arraignment. Crimes against property showed a major increase in 1958 and the escalation was on! Decisions in 1963 required free lawyers and appeals for convicted indigents. In that year the rate of violent crime had been 166 per 100,000. In 1964, it increased thirteen percent. Crimes against property increased eleven percent.

The *Escobedo* decision in 1964 required the taxpayers to provide a free lawyer for all suspects. The next year crime rates jumped again. The *Miranda* decision, throwing out confessions secured while in police custody without an attorney, was handed down in mid-1966. It was followed by an enormous fifteen percent rise both in crimes of violence and crimes against property. The 1967 *Wade* decision, requiring defense counsel even at a police lineup, was followed in 1968 by an astronomical increase of eighteen percent in the rate of crimes of violence, and sixteen percent in crimes against property. The next year saw jumps of ten percent in both categories. As statistician Louis H. Bean has observed:

The fact that the Supreme Court decisions of the 1960s were each followed by similar increases in both categories of crime is clear evidence that the decisions created an atmosphere of leniency in law enforcement, lowering the probability of apprehension and conviction.

Of course, other factors were present. To blame the crime explosion of the Sixties entirely on the Supreme Court would be an over-simplification, but few will deny that it was a major factor. The Court has contrived "new Constitutional rights" for the accused which have gravely altered evidentiary rules and law enforcement procedures. Many of these changes have served to make the job of our police officers not only more dangerous but increasingly difficult. While the overall rate of crime rose by 148 percent over the last ten years, the rate of crime clearances — that is, crimes solved by our handcuffed police — actually declined by thirty-two percent.

The permissiveness of "Liberal" judges has also been an important factor in the growing crime wave, with upward of seventy-five percent of those arrested today being repeaters. So hamstrung is American justice that according to *Time* magazine, "Of all reported major offenses, the experts say, only 12 percent lead to arrests, only 6 percent to convictions and only 1 percent to prison." You can bet the criminal knows the odds are in his favor.

Police Chief James D. Wright of Sausalito, California, complains that he often hears young burglars say: "Why should I work? I can make more with burglaries." Thanks to the Supreme Court and its "Liberal" courtiers, crime does pay better than ever. One estimate is that it now costs Americans \$51 billion annually.

Naturally the public is appalled, and looks to our local police for a crackdown. But the judiciary tied the hands of the police at the same time it untied those of the criminal. Until this process is reversed, a showering of federal funds on law enforcement agencies can hardly help the situation.

The answer to the problem is not centralized police power, but a reversal of those decisions of the Supreme Court which have created the problem. If the

Justice Department were serious about reducing the growth of crime it would re-submit those cases in which the Warren Court overstepped the bounds of sanity. If the Court were then to refuse to reverse itself, Congress could limit jurisdiction or institute impeachment proceedings (both wholly legal procedures provided for in our Constitution) until such decisions as those of *Miranda* and *Escobedo* are reversed and our local police are again given an even chance with the criminal.

Our police cannot do their job unless they can arrest criminals and get convictions. But, like the rest of us, they are caught in the pincers movement between the Supreme Court "above" and the criminal element "below."

A second area in which the tactic of "pressure from below and pressure from above" is being used is that of general insurrection in the streets. In the last six years no fewer than 114 American cities have suffered serious conflagration and riot. It was these insurrections which did so much to build the myth that local law enforcement is ineffective in dealing with mobs. When riots were quelled by efficient police work, the ventriloquists of the Left shouted through a thousand dummies that the police were brutal. Heads I win, tails you lose. That's the name of the game when you control the media.

Yet, in every case where riots have gotten out of control and had to be quelled by Army or National Guard personnel, it was because the police were *not allowed* to take firm action before things got out of hand. During the kick-off riot at Harlem in 1964, for instance, "Liberal" Mayor John Lindsay kept policemen out of the area for many hours until the rioters had built up a sufficient head of steam to do real damage. Lindsay later asked for federal support.

In the Watts riot of 1965, Chief William Parker was convinced by "community leaders" that order would be restored if "provocative" uniformed

policemen were kept out of the area. Parker later publicly admitted his mistake, but the power brokers in the federal government used the Watts insurrection as an excuse to set up a special bureau in the Justice Department to "improve" our local police.

During the early hours of the Detroit riot of 1967, "Liberal" Mayor Jerome Cavanagh ordered police to do nothing about looters. Finally, troops from as far away as Kentucky had to be brought in to stop the terror. As the fires flickered out, Mayor Cavanagh offered a plan for the handling of future riots. On July 31, 1967, United Press International reported the Mayor's proposal:

Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh called Sunday for a special 1,000-man federal police force in each major city to fight riots like the one which left 40 dead in Detroit.

Cavanagh said the riot policemen should be trained and paid by the federal government and be ready to converge on cities torn by racial strife. He said they should be specially trained in riot control and could be used instead of the National Guard.

America was on the road to a federal police force.

Since the Revolution has shifted gears into an urban guerrilla war against police, the Black Panthers have replaced the roaming mobs in the streets. An avowedly Maoist group, the Panthers have declared war on the police, but they and their friends the "Liberals" would have you believe it is the other way around. As J. Edgar Hoover has observed:

The claim of the BPP that it is an innocent victim of police persecution and genocide is rendered absurd by the fact that since 1967 at least five police officers have been killed by BPP

members and 42 officers wounded. One of the officers was killed by a Panther with a shotgun blast at point-blank range as the officer lay wounded and helpless on the ground

The intelligence data being developed reveal that the continuing activity of agitators and revolutionaries affiliated with black extremist groups plays a large part in the unprovoked attacks against police

The Panthers openly admit that they are Communists, and declare that they mean to have a revolution here and now. On October 10, 1970, United Press International reported:

A California police official charged today the Black Panthers are being "used" by Communists in a conspiracy to overthrow the government by force. Chief E.M. Davis of the Los Angeles Police Department said attacks on police throughout the nation were part of the Communist-inspired conspiracy.

The day before, Chief Davis testified before a Congressional Committee that what we are facing "is revolution on the installment plan The Panthers [are] shock troops that are willing to go in and get themselves killed. The Black Panther winds up being an Uncle Tom to a white Communist."

Chief Davis provided evidence that the Panthers are being heavily supported by "white Marxists" in "silk stocking districts." Without such support the Black Panthers would be just another gang of criminals. But Establishment newspapers give them space and sympathy; fund-raising parties are thrown for them by wealthy actors, composers, and businessmen; Establishment publishers like Dell and Random House publish and promote the books of their chief propagandists; and,

the Establishment magazines treat them like ebony heroes of a Brave New World.

But the "pressure from above" extends even higher. As the Associated Press reported on October 15, 1970:

Testifying before the House subcommittee investigating the Black Panthers, [President of the Fraternal Order of Police John] Harrington said when he wrote Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell about alleged Panther violations, "I got a mild reply from somebody down the line, saying that an investigation was being held."

Harrington added: "This is disgusting to myself and most other police officers. Here we have an administration supposedly dedicated to the bringing about of law and order. But no recommendations to put a stop to the nationwide conspiracy aimed at the police by the Black Panthers and others like them have come from the White House and the Department of Justice."

Attorney General Mitchell, who poses as Mr. Law and Order, has to date refused to name the Black Panthers, self-proclaimed Marxist-Leninists, to the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, or to so much as approve hearings on the Panthers by the Subversive Activities Control Board. Yet the terrorism of the Black Panthers is cited as a prime reason why we must have more federal aid to law enforcement. This when it is the federal government which is already the roadblock. What we need is not federal aid but for the federal judiciary and the Justice Department to permit enforcement of the laws already on the books!

A third area in which local law enforcement has not been allowed to do its job is in the prevention of the continuing campus revolution. Again, we are dealing

with a textbook case of "pressure from below and pressure from above."

The nation's college presidents have allowed the campuses to be used as sanctuaries for revolutionary organizing. Many have refused to allow police even to enter the campus unless a riot is totally out of hand. Some not even then. Campus agitators have been coddled in the name of academic freedom instead of being expelled. Literally hundreds of our student Lenins are on federal scholarships, but the Nixon Administration has done nothing to revoke the subsidies of such revolutionaries despite the fact that Congress has passed legislation requiring it. Instead, President Nixon proposes adding one thousand F.B.I. men to control campus rioting and bombing.

Meanwhile the leaders of the student revolutionaries make no secret of the fact that it is their *purpose* to provoke a federal takeover of local law enforcement, the abolition of civil liberties, and the creation of a Police State. The line was laid down by Ted Gold of the S.D.S. Weatherman Faction, who was killed last spring while making bombs in New York City. He is quoted by the Liberation News Service of January 8, 1970, as proclaiming: "If it will take Fascism we will have to have Fascism." Jerry Rubin emphasizes the same theme in his book *Do It!*

Such revolutionary leaders tell their cannon fodder that a Police State is a first step in driving the middle-class to rebellion. What they do not mention is that there has never been any such thing as a successful rebellion against a modern, well-equipped Police State.

The name of the game is alienation. Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, and their cohorts readily admit that their goal is to alienate youth from their parents. This is, quite naturally, a two-edged sword. The more outlandish the youthful revolutionaries become in their appearance, rhetoric, and agitation, the more violently the "silent majority" reacts.* As Saul Alinsky, a self-described "professional

revolutionary," puts it: "The action is in the reaction."

The whole idea behind the Communist terror on the campuses and in the streets is to bait the middle-class into throwing Br'er Rabbit into the briar patch of a Police State. If the leaders of the youthful radicals were really trying to get them to persuade their elders of the merit of their ideas, would they urge them intentionally to look and act so repulsively? Obviously not. This business is a setup. It is a con game in which thousands of young people who have never heard of the theme "pressure from below and pressure from above" are being used as cannon fodder for a phony revolution designed to so strengthen the federal government that a takeover by the *Insiders* of the Establishment will be possible.

Of course you, Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Brownshoes, are just as important in the strategy as the shaggy hippies. The ultimate strategists of this revolution are counting upon you to become so angry and frustrated and embittered by growing crime and insurrection that you will first demand federal aid for the local police — producing federal guidelines and control, as with your schools. And when even the "guidelines" do not solve the problem you will be expected to accept a national police force to restore "law and order."

It is expected that you will remain ignorant of the fact that this threat would

*During the recent campaign, Richard Nixon always allowed a few radicals to attend his rallies and bait him. Then Mr. Nixon, who had the microphone, would delight his audiences by verbally cutting them to pieces. This was carried to the extent that enough radicals were allowed to form for the purpose of stoning and egging a Presidential motorcade. Mr. Nixon did not come to town on a wagonload of pumpkins with hay in his hair. He arranged a nationally televised speech to speak out against his "assailants," and the next day the front page of the *New York Times* announced: "Mr. Nixon is... expected to approve plans for a new intelligence apparatus by which Federal and local officials will exchange information on extremist groups." Big Brother would be delighted.

not even exist if the Supreme Court had not emasculated our internal security laws; if college faculties and administrations were not permitted to promote or condone revolutionary activity on the campus; if the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Ford Foundation did not provide revolutionary students and organizations with the funds to operate; and, if the Justice Department would just use the evidence already provided it by the F.B.I. to prosecute the cadre of radicals, young and old, who are now in the streets preaching sedition.

Only those who brag about their crimes seem to get on the wanted list these days. We have had only a token crackdown on revolutionaries from the Justice Department — just enough to avoid being accused of doing nothing. Those of the Chicago 7 who were convicted are now being allowed to cross state lines to give speeches inciting to riot — the very crime for which they were convicted. Why is bail not revoked? Why are they not again indicted? Why has a score of revolutionaries wanted by the Justice Department found it so easy to skip the country to Canada, Algeria, and elsewhere?

None of this is the fault of the local police, and it is certainly no justification for a federal police force. The street revolutionaries "below" are being protected by the Establishment *Insiders* "above," so they can be used to create the sort of climate necessary for a takeover. The revolutionaries have no more chance of bringing down our government by themselves than Slippery Rock has of going to the Rose Bowl. Their function is to promote a reaction enabling a *takeover from the top*. The revolutionary movement in this country could be destroyed almost overnight without adding one new law if that was what the Establishment wanted. It isn't.

Imagine that you wanted to be a dictator in this country. How would you go about it when there are in the United States 40,000 separate police departments

and sheriffs' offices, and an average of more than one gun per household? Obviously, you must figure out a way to confiscate those weapons and to centralize control of the police. Like all would-be dictators, the masters of the International Communist Conspiracy understand this principle. That is why the Communists have for years pushed anti-gun legislation while carrying on an attack against the independence of our local police. As J. Edgar Hoover has testified:

Law enforcement has long been a target of communist attack Lenin taught that it was essential for every "real people's revolution" to destroy the "ready-made state machinery." Wherever communists have been able to exercise any measure of control, their first step has been to hamstring and incapacitate law enforcement

W. Cleon Skousen is a former assistant to F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover. In his authoritative book, *The Communist Attack On U.S. Police*, Skousen observes:

The official Communist Party hate campaign against the police of the United States is now reaching a full crescendo in many parts of the country It is a concerted, well-organized broadside of unmitigated venom against those who have the responsibility of protecting life and property and preserving the peace.

Such defectors from the leadership of the Communist Party as Joseph Kornfedder, Manning Johnson, Dr. Bella Dodd, and Leonard Patterson have all told how they were taught by the Communists to give top priority not to just discrediting the local police, but to discrediting the very *concept* of local police. One of the major attempts by the Communists to discredit and neutralize our local police forces has been their agitation

for establishment of civilian review boards. Mr. Skousen recalls a conversation with former Communist Bella Dodd about such boards:

I spoke at length with Dr. Bella Dodd, former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party who defected in 1948. During this conversation I brought up the subject of police review boards and she stated that she was appalled at the success of the Communist Party and its cadre of fellow travelers in persuading New York politicians to accept the idea of a civilian police review board.

I asked her how the idea originated and she said it was invented by the Communist Party in the 1930's when it was felt that the country was ripe for revolution. The idea was to somehow get the police out from under the control of elected officials and subject the police to the discipline of a "civilian" group which the Party could infiltrate and control. She stated that by this means they intended to mete out harsh and arbitrary punishment against the police until they were intimidated into a benumbed, neutralized, impotent and non-functioning agency.

The Communists and those traveling a parallel course ran into heavy resistance against the establishment of the civilian review boards. Cities which had them paid a high price. According to an F.B.I. report for September 18, 1964:

The investigations also revealed that where there is an outside civilian review board the restraint of police was so great that effective action against the rioters appeared to be impossible. This restraint was well known in the community and the rioters were thereby em-

boldened to resist and completely defy the efforts of the police to restore order. In short the police were so careful to avoid accusations of improper conduct that they were virtually paralyzed.

Director Hoover opposed civilian review boards as a threat to the independence of local police, and spoke of their "inherent political overtones." But, the coup de grâce was delivered when the voters of New York City, following an all-out campaign by the Support Your Local Police Committees and others advocating efficient local law enforcement, overwhelmingly rejected Mayor Lindsay's attempts to establish a civilian review board. This contest attracted so much nationwide publicity that it effectively buried other such attempts. Despite all the propaganda about "police brutality," the major rationalization for such boards, the public bought neither the brutality pitch nor the boards.

The *Insiders* changed tactics. Neutralization and control over our local police is now to be accomplished through a maze of federal "guidelines" attached to federal aid. The conspirators "above" are fully aware that the Supreme Court has ruled in *Wickard vs. Filburn* that "It is hardly lack of due process for the Federal Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." Subsidy and control are two fingers in the same glove.

Cleon Skousen is now editor of *Law And Order*, a professional journal for law enforcement personnel. He warned in that magazine for April 1969:

"I am old enough to remember all the protestations of innocence of intent which poured out of Washington when the early bills for Federal aid to education were being considered. Yet on October 6, 1969, *U.S. News and World Report* stated that the U.S. Department of Justice, through acting Attorney General Ramsey Clark, had notified the House Rules Committee that the federal

government felt it had complete power to order the reassignment of teachers, professors or members of the staffs of any educational institution receiving federal assistance if it did not follow the guidelines issued out of Washington.

"Note, of course, that not at any time did the Federal government pretend it had taken over the local schools. It had simply acquired the admitted power to control them because of the massive aid on which the schools had gradually become dependent.

"In the breakdown of national law and order the police became the most harassed, maligned and neglected profession in the entire American culture. But gradually Americans became angry and the politicians knew they were angry. They knew there had to be some kind of program to make it look as though something was being done to clean up the mess. So they came up with the same formula they have used on everybody else. Money.

"Well that was something law enforcement desperately needed. Just like the schools. And exactly like the schools we began to get the 'local control' treatment. It was not only promised verbally but written right into the fabric of the bill. Just as it was in the school bills.

"All of which we wish were a reality. But it never was and never can be. There is not one single, isolated case where massive Federal aid was not followed by massive Federal control.

"It is immoral to pretend otherwise. When a government spends the people's money it is responsible for those expenditures. That is as it should be. Eventually, that government, no matter how sincere its intentions to remain aloof from the local use of those funds, is compelled to move in, to supervise, to lay down rules, to control. It happened with the farms; it happened with the schools; it happened with government-contract industries. What makes us think law enforcement will be an exception?"

Of course, such controls are seldom introduced at the inception of a federal program. During the first few years an army of federal bureaucrats beats the bushes to sell its scheme to local officials. The controls come only after the local government has become financially dependent upon the federal program. But once the federal camel gets his nose in the local tent it's over. Writing in *Law And Order*, Chief Skousen explains:

All of us recall that Federal aid to local law enforcement started out in a most modest and humble fashion. Hardly enough to frighten anyone. But that is not the case today. Federal aid is no longer merely for planning and experimenting. It has moved over into the fields of paying for facilities, paying salaries on broad and comprehensive programs, providing essential equipment. This is the same old well-worn path to Federal aid in every other field . . .

. . . this generation is likely to see the creation of a Federalized police system whether we intended it or not.

As a matter of fact this is exactly how Sweden was saddled with a federal police force. The September 1964 issue of *Public Management*, published in Chicago by the Rockefeller-financed International City Managers, reports:

Local Police in Sweden on January 1, 1965, were transferred to the central government in accord with action taken in 1962 by Parliament. Smaller towns and rural districts have for many years received national grants for the maintenance of police service and since 1954 local police personnel salaries have been regulated by the national government. The National Police Service will be administered by the

central board, large police districts will be established and better technical equipment will be provided.

J. Edgar Hoover is among those who have warned against such a takeover in the United States. Writing in the *F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin* for February 1968, Director Hoover declared:

America has no place for, nor does it need, a national police force. It should be abundantly clear by now that . . . effective law enforcement is basically a local responsibility. In the great area of self-government reserved for States, counties, and cities, the enforcement of the laws is not only their duty but also their right. Law-abiding citizens and local officials should vigorously oppose concerted attacks against law enforcement and the devious moves to negate local authority and replace it with Federal police power.

Hoover was quoted earlier, in *U.S. News* for December 21, 1964, as observing: "... I am inclined toward being a States' righter in matters involving law enforcement. That is, I fully respect the sovereignty of State and local authorities. I consider the local police officer to be our first line of defense against crime, and I am opposed to a national police force. . . . The need is for effective local action, and this should begin with wholehearted support of honest, efficient, local law enforcement."

The cry of the federal bureaucrat is always neutralize, federalize, and centralize. The ize have it, so to speak. Which is exactly what the Communists have been advocating for years. Those local officials who think the police will be more effective with the help of federal funds, despite the controls, should remember that the "war on crime" will be directed by the same federal government that has

run the wars in Korea and Vietnam. In those "no-win" wars the hands of the commanders in the field were and are tied — just as those of our police chiefs will be if Fedcop becomes a reality.

Among the major steps towards centralization that L.E.A.A. is already promoting is the consolidation of local police departments on a "regional" basis — crossing city, county, and sometimes even state lines. These regional departments, now springing up like toadstools after a rain, are no longer responsible to, and controllable by, local voters. They are under the thumb of state and federal bureaucrats, funded by the federal government and obedient to its guidelines. To regionalize your local police the federal government will now pay ninety percent of the planning costs and an average of sixty percent of the costs of implementing the regional scheme — a very juicy carrot indeed.

The federal dollars for law enforcement are dispensed from Washington through state planning commissions which must first submit suitable plans to L.E.A.A. for approval. The man selected to approve such grants was Patrick V. Murphy, described by nationally syndicated columnist Edith Roosevelt as one who "epitomizes the so-called 'sociological' or 'permissive' approach to crime." Doling out of federal funds for the regional law enforcement groups already looks like the old War on Poverty game all over again, with radicals in control of the purse strings.

The *Oakland Tribune* of June 6, 1969, reveals that the Bay Area's regional police units are the prototype of this federally supported operation, noting that "the 24-member committee that will administer the ABAG [*Associated Bay Area Governments*] is headed by San Francisco Supervisor Terry Francois."

Who is he? Mr. Francois is a longtime radical activist who is so committed to the revolution that he listed the Communist W.E.B. DuBois Clubs as one of his en-

dorsers in a newspaper advertisement. He has been connected with S.N.C.C., C.O.R.E., the National Lawyers Guild (cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a top Communist Front), and the A.C.L.U. He has participated in radical sit-ins (for which he was jailed twice), regularly marches in Vietnik anti-war rallies, and even signed a petition supporting the notorious Berkeley Free Speech Movement. An advocate of violence, Francois was elected in 1966 to the board of directors of the Fabian Socialists' Americans for Democratic Action. *This* is the man who controls federal funds to "help" law enforcement in the San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley, and San Jose area.*

But regionalization under local radicals is just a beginning. Bigger and better plans are in store. The American Telephone & Telegraph Company has prepared a law enforcement study for the federal government recommending a system under which all intelligence and communications for our local police would be handled through a dozen regional centers. Wouldn't Big Brother like to get his hands on *that* kind of a setup! Coincidentally, perhaps, the *Oakland Tribune* revealed on May 6, 1969, that President Nixon has already selected a dozen cities to serve as federal "sub-capitals." As the *Tribune* notes: "The reorganization and decentralization [*sic*] was started under a little-noted executive order signed by President Nixon on March 27."

*California requires regional (metro) government before releasing any federal funds for law enforcement. Butte County Supervisor Donald Maxon told your reporter: "Governor Reagan claims to be against metro government, but then creates the California Council on Criminal Justice which in turn required a regional setup to get federal funds. The Governor is either very naïve or he is just not on our side."

The federal government could not get a requirement for regionalization through Congress as part of the Omnibus Crime bill, but the bureaucrats administering it in the states have let it be known that they are more likely to provide such funds if the states include regionalization in their plans.

Big Brother cometh on little cat feet.

The big-domes of Washington have many such clever ideas for shackling the local constabulary. For instance, L.E.A.A. is very big on establishing "human relations commissions" which turn out to be civilian review boards under a different guise. "Sensitivity training" is also being pushed under some two dozen different names. Another program which makes the boys at L.E.A.A. all soft inside is for police to improve their education by taking college courses. Which sounds commendable, except that the courses recommended are in sociology rather than police techniques.

If a police-control program is yet too radical for L.E.A.A., funding can be obtained from the Ford Foundation, which has recently allotted \$30 million for the purpose of "helping" law enforcement. For the Ford Foundation, a cornucopia of funds for every conceivable radical project, to want to help our local police is as plausible as W.C. Fields bankrolling the W.C.T.U. Running the "pressure from above" for the Ford Foundation is Charles Rogovin, who until this spring was the lord high pooh-bah at L.E.A.A. On October 1, 1969, Rogovin told the International Association of Chiefs of Police: "If local law enforcement fails, then something else will replace it." And as you might suspect, he quickly added, "local law enforcement has failed to do its job." The Ford Foundation has another Redder Idea.

And Washington's interference in local law enforcement is already a matter for serious concern. The *Oakland Tribune* of July 31, 1970, reported that three California police chiefs have complained to Attorney General John Mitchell about the intrusion of federal investigators before local police have even had time to complete preliminary investigations. One of these investigations concerned the handling by police of a riot in Berkeley. The *Berkeley Daily Gazette* for August 4, 1970, noted that the Berkeley Chief of Police had written to Attorney General Mitchell:

"These investigations" — in this case civil rights violations — "bring incredible complications to local issues. They put a police department and its officers in an impossible situation . . . this precipitous intrusion by the federal government is incredible to me — almost unbelievable."

Berkeley has endured attacks by revolutionaries on troop trains, riots, bombings, burnings, and large-scale destruction of property on and off the campus of the University of California, but it took a hippie minister who claimed his civil rights had been violated during a riot to get the Justice Department to do something — and even then it came in on the side of the hippie Left!

Doubtless many local police officials are accepting federal funds against their better judgment because they are desperate. An average of only 4.5 percent of local budgets is now spent on police protection, while Welfare, which is not even a legitimate function of government, is in most cases gobbling up over half of local tax revenues. According to *Time*, "local police forces now cost the average citizen only a bargain-basement \$14.48 per year." (Take a look at your property-tax bill and see how that compares with the total you are paying!)

If Fedcop is to be stopped, Americans must prove to their local police that they support them and want them to remain independent. We must be willing to pay the tariff for doing so. After all, this thin blue line of police officers is all that stands between us and the armies of criminals and revolutionaries in the streets. Already they are wavering from the assault on the one side, and the lack of support on the other. If that line ever breaks, our coun-

try will be so irretrievably lost that no army will ever be able to restore the freedoms we now have. We must see to it that our local police have the local funds they need to do their job!

All Americans must be brought to understand that L.E.A.A. is treating the symptoms rather than the causes of growing crime and insurrection. We must expose the fact that those most active in promoting the federal takeover of our local police are the politicians and bureaucrats who have long supported the radicalism of the Supreme Court and backed legislation which puts the blame for crime on "society" and not on the criminals and revolutionaries behind its escalation. The answer to our problem is to take the handcuffs off our local police and put them back on the criminals where they belong.

But keep in mind that the issue at hand is not law and order. All Communist nations, every dictatorship, has law and order — enforced by a national police force. No, the question is *who* is going to enforce law and order, our local police or the federal government. Fedcop must be stopped. As Dan Smoot has reminded us: "At the end of that road is the instrument for total control that all dictatorships require: a national police force. Then, the character of American law enforcement will undergo another, and this time a rather abrupt, change. When a national police force becomes a recognized, accepted, operating reality, it will no longer be ineffective and permissive. It will be ruthlessly efficient and repressive. Its mission, however, will not be to protect the public, but to protect entrenched political power against the public."

Now, more than ever before, it is vital that we support our local police, and keep them independent. ■ ■

Reprints of this copyrighted article are available at the following prices:
One to 99 copies, seven for one dollar; 100 to 999 copies, twelve cents each;
1,000 or more copies, ten cents each. Order from:

AMERICAN OPINION
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178