

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

b6

Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2004 8:45 AM

b7C

To: [Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: The threat of animal and eco-terrorism.

UNCLASSIFIED
NON-RECORD

I don't have any additional comments.

I agree with your comment below. FYI, CTD Executive Staff is currently drafting a reply to PETA General Counsel, who complained that 2 FBI SA's mentioned during a speech that PETA funds ALF/ELF (see attached letter), based upon reading a report of the speech on a website. SAC-Chicago interviewed those agents, who denied making the remarks, and wrote a letter to the website requesting a retraction (see attached). I previously forwarded my comments to CTD Exec Staff. This Congressional testimony may cause additional and similar concern if not revised per your comment below. Thanks. [Redacted]

b6
b7C

-----Original Message-----

From: [Redacted]

Sent: Monday, May 17, 2004 11:39 AM

To: [Redacted]

b6

Cc: [Redacted]

b7C

Subject: RE: The threat of animal and eco-terrorism.

UNCLASSIFIED
NON-RECORD

Towards the end of the document, it says: "Finally, it is commonly believed that ELF and ALF are funded by more mainstream, generally law-abiding groups, such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and In Defense of Animals." Using the phrase "it is commonly believed" is very odd in this context. If evidence exists linking PETA and IDA to ELF/ALF, then the sentence should be rephrased accordingly. If such evidence does not exist or is weak, then PETA and IDA should not be mentioned in the sentence. Otherwise, the statement perjoratively associates the two groups with law breakers on the basis of "common beliefs."

b6

[Redacted] See anything else?

b7C

[Redacted]

UNCLASSIFIED
NON-RECORD

OTHER outside scope