

"Shaw Decries DA's Fund" is the head on Lanny Thomas' States-Item story of 11/21/72. In the lead Shaw makes a reasonable case, that it is a dangerous thing. As a principle it can be seen, if in his case I don't know of a penny being used to investigate him. In fact, I know of nothing that ~~could~~ could be called any investigation of him.

It is what follows that is so interesting.

He is critical of the judicial system because it took so long to free him. Yet he had used the possibility of delay to get delays himself. This is his second trip to the Supreme Court. The call he sounds for speedup in the judicial system seems to be an echo of Mitchell. It is not an echo of his defense.

He complains about a district attorney being advisor to a grand jury but is silent on a federal attorney deriving exactly the same role with two differences obvious: the greater federal power, which no state can equal; and the facilities of the FBI, which no local police can equal.

In the light of these things and others, some of his comment is fit for a shrink:

"Shaw said his faith in the federal government was reinforced by its intervention to protect his rights."

Fascinating, since there is no indication of it and there was earlier and persistent denial. It is that "cumbersome" judicial system that overtly did it, not the federal government.

He is a sophisticated man. He knows the judiciary is the third branch, not the federal government itself. So, was this some kind of slip or what? It wasn't necessary to his saying how happy he was at the decision. Why add what seems like a payoff, and admission, a gratuity? Or, why say exactly what Garrison has been saying and not proving?

He didn't stop here in the favors he passed out:

"Shaw, terming himself a student of the Warren Report, said he does not doubt the commission's findings. 'I say people who say there are unanswered questions have no basis', he said." The rest of the quote, also false, is unnecessary.

Nobody can read the Warren Report, without studying it, and say this seriously.

In his case, he sat through testimony that included official confessions of "unanswered questions" and the further admission that there was official direction that the questions be neither asked nor answered.

So, why does he say this? Again it was not necessary. Again it seems like a payoff.

I don't think it is an explanation to conclude that everyone in New Orleans is a lemming. And I don't think he is a fool.

It is quite a coincidence that about a week later there was a disastrous fire in a property that seems to be the holding of one of the three men who provided most of the fund about which he complained, Raulf (the others, Shilstone and Robertson). And that according to a radio report, the official verdict is arson, based at least in part on the finding of two kerosene cans.

It is all very strange.

HW 12/2/72

'This Is a Dangerous Thing' Shaw Decries DA's Fund

NOV 21 1972

By LANNY THOMAS

Clay L. Shaw today said the "most horrifying" aspect of his trial for conspiracy to assassinate President John F. Kennedy was the contribution of large sums of money by private citizens to finance the prosecution.

"I hope this will never be repeated," he said. "This is a dangerous thing."

Shaw, reflecting on his prosecution that dragged through the courts for more than five years, charged that the private contributions amounted to a conspiracy to deprive him of his civil rights.

"The state has an enormous advantage over individuals, and for private citizens to give it more power is horrifying," Shaw said.

He was indicted in 1967 on a charge he participated in a bizarre conspiracy to assassinate the president. He was acquitted of the charge in 1969.

Yesterday, the U.S. Supreme Court apparently wrote the final chapter in the controversial case by upholding a lower court decision preventing Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison from prosecuting Shaw for perjury.

Garrison accused Shaw of perjury after the acquittal on the conspiracy charge. Garrison said Shaw lied when he denied knowing Lee Harvey Oswald or Dave Ferrie, named by Garrison as Shaw's co-conspirators.

Shaw said he was confident the Supreme Court would uphold the lower court ruling, but "it was a load off my back to hear the decision."

Shaw, project director for the French Market renovation, has a \$5 million damage suit pending against Garrison and Truth and Consequences, a group of private citizens that contributed money to the prosecution of Shaw.

Shaw was critical of the judicial system; but he would not comment on questions about his feelings toward Garrison.

He said he is "delighted" the ordeal is over, but "disappointed" it took the judiciary so long to free him. He said it took a jury 55 minutes to free him, while it took the judicial system five years and eight months to do the same thing.

Shaw said his faith in the federal government was reinforced by its inter-

vention and protection of his rights. "On the other hand," he said, "something has to be done to refine this cumbersome machine. Something has to be done to speed up the judiciary process."

The grand-jury system also drew Shaw's criticism. He said today's grand jury does not seem to be serving

its intended function. A district attorney, by serving as adviser to the grand jury, can present evidence that is certain to result in an indictment, he said.

Although he criticized the judicial system, he offered no concrete proposals.

Turn to Page 4, Column 1

Continued from Front Page

als for improving it. "I honestly don't know," he said, adding that one alternative might be an expansion of the courts.

Shaw, terming himself a student of the Warren Commission report, said he does not doubt the commission's

findings. "I think people who say there are unanswered questions have no basis," he said.

He said "not one accidental fact" has been introduced to disclaim the Warren Commission's findings. "I believe what happened in Dallas essentially is what the Warren Commission said happened."



—States-Item Photo.

Clay Shaw