

'Get LaRouche' force reeked of corruption

Documents released in mid-October by the FBI repeatedly demonstrate that Virginia Attorney General Mary Sue Terry was fixated on using the prosecution of political leader Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. and his associates for her own political benefit. While the entire multi-jurisdictional, federal-state "Get LaRouche" task force carried out a politically motivated persecution of LaRouche, the FBI documents provide a glimpse at the political motivation of one of their fellow task force partners.

The documents, released under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), contain a blow-by-blow account of Terry's obsession to take credit for the Oct. 6, 1986 federal-state paramilitary raid on companies associated with LaRouche in Leesburg, Virginia. They cite no fewer than six pre-raid meetings between federal and state prosecutors where Terry astounded U.S. Attorney Henry Hudson and other federal prosecutors with her insistence on taking the political credit, no matter what risks it created for the prosecution. (Such political motivation violates the constitutional requirement of an impartial prosecutor.)

The emphasis in the following excerpts is added:

"On September 25, 1986, representatives of the FBI, Secret Service, IRS, Virginia State Police, Loudoun County Sheriff's Office, U.S. Attorney's Office, and U.S. Marshal's Office, met. . . . The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the joint service of the State of Virginia and federal search warrants on two locations of the LaRouche organization on October 6, 1986. . . . By the end of the day, an operational plan which was agreeable to all parties concerned had been worked out to the mutual satisfaction of both state and federal officials. A subsequent meeting was scheduled for Thursday, Oct. 2, 1986, to discuss final details concerning implementation of this search.

"U.S. Attorney Hudson had earlier taken Ms. Terry to see William Weld, [head of the] Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice, to discuss this issue. *During their conversation, Terry could not be dissuaded from her position that the Virginia State Police should be the lead agency.*

"On Friday, September 26, 1986, it was learned through the U.S. Attorney's office that the operational plan which had been agreed upon the previous day was not acceptable to Mary Sue Terry. . . . *After further discussion between the various agencies concerned, it became apparent that the Virginia State Police had been mandated to assume the lead agency role in the implementation of the search.* . . .

"It was subsequently determined that the State Attorney General's office was adamant in being the lead agency for the purpose of entering and securing of the two locations, which was construed to be for politically motivated reasons on behalf of the Virginia State Government Administration, rather than for the successful prosecution of state and federal cases for the mutual benefit of all agencies involved.

"On Sept. 29, 1985, U.S. Attorney Henry Hudson traveled to Richmond in an effort to work out an acceptable solution to the differences between the State Attorney General and federal authorities concerning the service of the two search warrants on the subject. . . .

"U.S. Attorney Hudson telephonically advised Alexandria at 12:30 p.m. that the State Attorney General's office desired that entry teams composed of federal and state agencies would enter both locations simultaneously. The Virginia State Police would be in charge of entering the building and securing the premises at which time the federal agents would then enter and serve the warrants and lead the search of both premises. . . . It was explained to Mr. Hudson that a high risk of potential civil liability was present, inasmuch as there was no designated team leader at each location who would be in control of all of the state and federal team members. . . .

"On Wednesday, Oct. 1, 1986, a meeting was held at Virginia State Police headquarters in Richmond, Virginia, where members of all interested agencies involved in the search were present. . . . *Disagreements were again discussed concerning the desire of the State Attorney General's office to be the principal agency in serving the warrants and implementing the searches.*

"Inasmuch as discussions were at a complete impasse over the manner in which the warrants should be served, a personal meeting was arranged with the State Attorney General by Acting Special Agent in Charge, FBI Alexandria, and Assistant Special Agent in Charge, U.S. Secret Service, for later that afternoon.

"During that meeting, the State Attorney General, as well as her legal assistants, were afforded a historical overview of the extensive federal case in three federal judicial districts. . . . *It was emphasized to the State Attorney General that there was much more involved in this case than just mere temporary political mileage to be gained from favorable publicity deriving from this case.*

". . . For the information of the Bureau (FBI), the Loudoun County Sheriff, John Isom, is extremely interested and concerned about the activities of the LaRouche organization, *which includes both criminal and political interests.* In that regard, he anticipates and expects federal involvement in this matter. He has expressed his concern over the level of federal participation and involvement, and has made arrangements with his investigator to meet on May 1, 1986, with Democratic Representatives in Congress to discuss the LaRouche problem."