

Cut Legal Delays, Shaw Urges ACLU NO 3-I 2/19/73

If the most obvious interpretation of this speech and story is that an innocent man proclaims his innocence and laments the slowness of justice, this would be a superficial interpretation based on Shaw's own record. I am not suggesting that it was wrong for him to exploit all the delays the law permitted, but that he did do, delaying his trial with them until two years had passed, approximately. If this was right for him, how does it become wrong for Garrison?

What I also find somewhat provocative is based on my own and absolutely certain knowledge, that Shaw did lie during the trial and upon my belief, that his lying constituted perjury. With this in the case, why does he now make so much public noise and demand an immediate trial of his civil ~~case~~ action? We can't know, but I think of the possible explanations, one of the more obvious is knowledge that can be depended upon and from inside the Garrison camp. How else could he feel secure when he has committed the crime of perjury, whether or not he will now be tried for it? I would guess that this also means the source of information inside the Garrison gang has to be high enough for the Shaw gang to know that I have not given the proof of this to Garrison.

If I were to guess further, I'd expect that the remaining spy or spies are not working directly for Shaw et al, which would provide no real protection at all, but for the feds, which can inform the Shaw side. And protect.

Confidential note: there are two witnesses to Shaw lies, addressing his alibi against the Clinton witnesses, Ronald Hamburg and James Lawrence. Boxley, who went looking for Lawrence after I gave JC a lead for entirely different purposes, found neither. I did not know of Hamburg, but I had no trouble finding both. The FBI had interviewed Lawrence for an entirely different reason, never interviewed Hamburg.

HW 3.12.73