

"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