

Virginia's Terry gets slammed by the press

Fragments of a secret government "national security file" targeting Lyndon LaRouche, suppressed during his 1988 trial, are finally leaking out, and one of the first casualties is the LaRouche-hating Virginia Attorney General, Mary Sue Terry.

Terry, whom LaRouche calls "America's Ilse Koch," for her brutal pursuit of executions even in cases where condemned men have claims of innocence, has also made her prosecutions of associates of LaRouche her political campaign slogan. In the recently released FBI memorandum about the LaRouche prosecution by a federal-state-private task force, Terry was described as politically biased and looking to get political credit for raids on LaRouche-affiliated publishers.

Now these FBI memos, secret for five years and highly embarrassing to Terry, have set off editorial attacks on her by the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*.

The FBI memorandum describes secret federal-state meetings before the 400-armed-man raid on LaRouche publishing offices in October 1986. The section of it quoted by the *Times-Dispatch* says of Mary Sue Terry that "the state attorney general's office was adamant in being the lead agency [in the raids], which was construed to be for politically motivated reasons . . . rather than for the successful prosecution of state and federal cases." The FBI "emphasized to the state attorney general that there was much more involved in this case than just mere temporary political mileage."

By law, although the *Times-Dispatch* does not mention this aspect of the scandal, prosecutors may not conduct prosecutions for political reasons or express political bias against their targets.

Drawing first blood

The *Times-Dispatch* has criticized Terry strongly in recent months on issues of "fiscal chiseling" against pensioners and taxpayers, and for using her influence improperly with the State Supreme Court. But Terry did not respond until she was stung by the newspaper's charge that her prosecutions of LaRouche's movement had been politically motivated.

When the first *Times-Dispatch* editorial, "Terry and the LaRouchies," appeared in the state's capital on Dec. 18, it quoted the damning FBI memorandum for three paragraphs. Terry immediately fired back a 1,000-word reply, claiming that the barbaric 40- to 80-year sentences imposed on the

LaRouche defendants "showed the seriousness of their crime," and complained bitterly that fundraisers for the LaRouche movement would use the *Times-Dispatch* editorial to raise money.

A Virginia weekly which has specialized in slanders of LaRouche, the *Loudoun Times-Mirror*, was also "spooked" by the Richmond newspaper's exposé of Terry, and ran an editorial trying to defend her with the silly claim that in October 1986 there was no federal "get LaRouche" investigation in Virginia. (In reality, U.S. Attorney Henry Hudson was conducting precisely such a "get LaRouche" investigation then, and was one of the federal officials trying to get Terry under control.)

But the *Times-Dispatch* hit back with a second editorial Dec. 21, "Terry and the LaRouchies (II)," carrying a new and stronger charge: not only political bias in prosecution, but selective prosecution and sentencing on a national scale. The newspaper called Terry's response "garbage," and said that it increased the paper's suspicion of improper political motivation particularly because Terry was bragging about the brutal sentences meted out in the Virginia "LaRouche cases."

None of the LaRouche defendants had ever been convicted of anything before. All were charged with "securities fraud," which, as the newspaper said, was "a charge that could be pursued against a political organization only after a special ruling from the State Corporation Commission. Meanwhile, Ivan Boesky of Wall Street infamy was sentenced to three years and served two, for massive securities fraud."

The *Times-Dispatch* noted that, involved in this scandal over the FBI memorandum, is the appeal of LaRouche movement activists Anita and Paul Gallagher and Laurence Hecht, who were sentenced to 30-40 years in prison. On Dec. 4, the Virginia State Court of Appeals accepted the FBI memos as a "proffer of evidence" for the defendants' claim that Terry should never have been allowed to prosecute their cases, because of her clear public bias.

As the *Times-Dispatch* noted, before the FBI documents were released under the Freedom of Information Act, the defendants were basing their appeal on Terry's "copious use of the LaRouche case" on television programs, in political speeches, etc. Clearly, the *Times-Dispatch* regarded the FBI memo as damning evidence. U.S. law and U.N. conventions prompted by U.S. representatives, say that prosecutors should not "publicly prejudge cases" or target individuals for political reasons.

During LaRouche's appeals of his 1988 railroad conviction, his legal team demanded the release of the "national security" files on LaRouche, and asked President Bush to use his power to release the files. The FBI, NSA, CIA, and other agencies refused on "national security" grounds, and Bush did nothing.

LaRouche's attorneys insisted the documents would exonerate him. The scandal now hitting Mary Sue Terry, shows what they have been talking about.