6/18/71

Dear Gary,

By the time you can get this you will be on your way to friends, fun and stimulation and gratification in your work, with the surprising success of your appearance before the bar glowing inside, so I'll mail nothing until your return. Your letter of the 12th came yesterday. I got the mail at the post office while taking Lil for her annual eye checkup (good) and read it and the enclosures during the course of the day, while waiting, as on several occasions I had to.

First, the letter to Lesar. His inquiry probably originates with me and in different form than that to which you respond. I think I wrote oyu about this. In fact, I am sure I did right after 3/1. Possibly you did not get the letter. It is not, really, a question od deprivation of sunlight and it did have to do with alterations in personality and reaction, particularly if it resulted in increased docility, that interested me. I did some of the basic animal work in this field, and I was able to completely alter the personality of chickens by means of a lighting program when I had severe noise-stress problems and the reactions to cope with.

Jim should have given you a total picture, beginning with the conditions of Ray's london captivity and return to the US with his lawyer first refused permission to see him, then refused permission to accompany him on a plane serving no other purpose than Ray's return, with only unfriendlies. Can you imagine what must have passed through his mind, from being piched overboard and having it sworn that he was trying to escape or committed suicide to having allegations of elaborate confession later made? From the moment he got to Memphis he did not know whether it was day or night. Not the question of sunlight but one of constant illumination. From his steel-windowed cell, which had steel plates placed so that not a flicker of outside light could filter in to the courtroom he never had a glimpse of the outside. He was taken by a tunnel, and the courtroom had no outside windows. This lasted for eight months.

I believe the normal personality would be a factor, and that this would be a fascinating case for study if the object were not so hung up on being considered a man and impervious to any influences (he is a remarkably docile man to begin with, yet determined, perhaps bullheaded would be better, in some areas-yet tractible and very considerate in others).

From my experience with chickens, and the transition is admittedly great, I'd postulate that this would make him more docile, less vigorous, more willing to be agreeable to strong pressures, less willing to fight. I just don't think there can be this kind of major change in external stimulation, this kind of deprivation of external stimulae, this kind of isolation, which can't be comared with that of even a mnan in solitary, leave alone the norm of prison life, with which you equate it, without marked personality and reaction changes. And this is the pointL did it impair his ability to make decisions, did it impair his ability to participate in his own defense, to direct it, to refuse to agree with what was not, in his view, in his interest. (I would also think, again from chickens, that it fattened him, too.)

This entire approach was my idea, not Bud's, and Bob Livingston, the local lawyer, did a fine but limited job of presenting it to an unhearing court. He wisely atuck to the most relevant case and, with the short notice he had, since I did not have the chance to get after him on it until three days before the hearing, could not consult local experts in any meaningful way. Judge Battle as prosecutor had done somethin that went to the Supreme Court, where he got clobbered. He had gone into the cell of a prisoner form whom he wanted a confession. He had bright lights bruning on the man, and for 36 hours he read the bible to him. In the words of the local law, this was held to be "undue rigor" and his conviction was reversed.

And it is the total thing, not just the light problem. For those eight months Ray could not even eliminate his bladder in privacy. There were two stalwart cops in the same

cell block with him. They were heavily armed, ostensibly to protect him, which is as irrational as it was impossible. There were two closed-circuit TV cameras on him 24 hours a day, with two mikes connected to "on" tape recorders. All of this, ostensibly for his protection, could not have been. Any hazard to him came from outside, not inside. So, he knew he was being spied on 24 hours a day. When Hanes was with him, they lay on the floor so no lip-reader could read their lips, and they whispered. When he gave Hanes any kind of note, Hanes had to show that to the guards before he left the cell block. I could go on and on, but I think the business of the unending artificial light and the shutting off of the time clock of the body, added to the environment and its conditions, must have had a serious influence on Ray's attitudes, personality, reactions, etc. This, if incompletely, is the question Jim should have raised. I would hope one of your people would be interested in it. Ray is not. He thinks he is impervious.

With me he was not at all ~~xxxx~~ paranoid. He spoke without regard to the possibility of bugging, was not concerned about the presence of a telephone in the concrete room in which I interviewed him, was unimpressed when I pulled the plug out of the wall receptable so there could be no bugging by phone, and spoke rather openly. There are only two things he put on paper, a volunteered comment in no way relevant to the assassination and a chart in which he (remarkably accurately, for I had previously reconstructed it independently) reconstructed his movements at a particular time. He spoke to me so openly that I have been able to understand enormously more. No paranoia in this interview. He was also remarkably honest, but the details are not here important.

On Shaw (and there are no bbos on this, nobody is getting a copy), let me suggest a somewhat different formulation than you do. As you know, I never shared Garrison's view of him and finally abandoned New Orleans when they were expecting me, not Mark, to be their expert at the counsel table as I had been prior to that date, from the moment the trial was set. However, I also do not share yours or Jackie's, and there are other considerations I raise. I know much about his private life, without once seeking any such things. I may have been wrong, but you should recall that in O in NO I said the issue of homosexuality is irrelevant. Let me be even more explicit in my disinterest in Shaw in the Garrisonian sense: I conducted only one investigation of him, and that by request, on the ple none of their people could turn the witness on. I went to somebody who had knowledge of his real-estate dealings to interview him. In that limited sense it was successful. I got nothing from this man, who had nothing to give, but I did get the kind of leads they ostensibly were looking for. They never followed them, and I think it would have been irrelevant if they had.

However, it is by no means the relatively simple issues of did he perjure himself (I am without doubt that he did and I have to ask myself why-and mine are not Garrison's reason for charging perjury), did he know LHO. There are broad and real intelligence implications, exceeding what is normal for a man in his position. Aside from what you ought to remember about the Gaudet bit from COUP, he housed another CIA outfit (typically, while screaming CIA, Garrison did nothing with it). So, even of we forget the external implications of CIA activity, there remains the fact that he housed two, neither of which could afford the rental, and the fact that his explanation of why LHO picked his place to picket on camera is incredible: the presence of the Cuban consulate there. There were no Cuban consulates in the US then. He had to know this.

Thus, I would like to know what Jackie'd friends might have told her or will. not to hurt Shaw, but to understand what may have been behind all of this. He is not the kind of man who could have been part of the planning of an assassination, least of all of this kind. I never believed the Russo story, as O in NO shows, and my own interrogations of him, improvised on the spot whenever I had access to him, make me more interested in him than in Shaw as a person playing some kind of role. He admitted much to me that shook JG, but not to the point of doing anything about it. He had to haveknown LHO, but not at Ferrie's party, an incredible story for which he was careful to describe a man who could not have been LHO. Thus he disguised his own connection with the real one.

I remain with my original belief unchanged, that Shaw could very well have been Clay Bertrand, but the most that can be made of this fact, if true, is that he tried to befriend a man in whose innocence he believed. He is the kind of man who would likely have rtied to defend other gays when they were hassled by the police, and I can find nothing wrong with that, either. Besides, if anything Andrews said can be believed, and I believe much can be and I here mean of what he told me, Shaw is Bertrand. Don't write Andrews short. He is sharp. Today he remains one of Marcellos lawyers. He has not begun to tell what he can about such people as Ferrie, who he knew pretty well. I can place him at Ferrie's home, which is a bit more than admitting he fixed a ticket for him. Less dependably, I can place him socially with LHO (thanks to my effort to protect that miserable Thornley from himself and JG's wilder imaginings).

So, with the assurance that I would make no misuse of it and have other than the obvuous interest in it, I would like to know what Jackie's friends have said of this acquaintance between LHO and Shaw. The lakefront thing of Bundy's is not as far out as it seems, nor is it, in even that formulation, as sinister as JG tried to make it. A former naval intelligence officerm told me personally of his reporting of a homosexual contact between LHO and one he would not name on the lakrfront. There are pages withheld from the ONI file coinciding with this, and there is a comment by Boggs in the ex sess that can be so interpreted as it relates to Aubert.

One possibility is thatShaw was trying to help LHO establish a cover, and that is one thing that would interest me.

In this connection, Ricardo Davis told me of meeting Shaw at a party and of being so outraged at what he took to be Shaw's pro-Castro comments that he immediately reported it to the FBI and gave them a signed statement on it. (They should have known Shaw better, for they had regular contact with him, chiefly through deBrueys, as an inside source of unquestionable dependability told me, and it need not be considered more than the norm for them and a man in his position, with all the Latin American fascists coming to N.O. through or under the auspicies of the IRM).

You and Jackie have simplified too much. I hope she will tell me what she knows.

Gotta get to other things. Thanks for the planned help with F-U.

Best,