

Dick, Gary, Paul, Howard NO Transcripts HW 2/15/70

I doubt if it is worth the cost of copying those transcripts I have just received and about which I have sent you a memo including a list. I have now read all but the single volume of rebuttal that I have. I have not reread Nichols' direct testimony.

There is not a lot in this for us and what there is, largely, deals with what we should all have passed in our own work. I suggest that before anyone invests in copying he borrow, and we should be able to arrange a systematic means of such distribution. I leave it up to you. I can send all to one person, who can pass it on, or I can provide that which each seeks, if he is not interested in all.

I have written some of you of the Clinton witnesses.

Simmons gave testimony about the fatal wound from a different perspective, the front. Of course, the Commission sought to avoid all descriptions. He was on the Triple Underpass. He testified the reddish halo went to the left and over the left side of the car (T8), which is especially interesting in the light of Mrs. Frances Gayle Newman's testimony that from directly abreast of the President and near the curb, from perhaps the width of a single lane in the street from him, it seemed to go right up in the air. (T31) She could see the wound clearly and it was "not behind the ear". (T30). Simmons and Carr both testified to seeing a shot hit the ground near the curb, each marking the spot on the past. Each was in a position to see the consequences of it as others might not, for each was elevated. The exact spot is belauded by use of such words as "here" where the plat is not reproduced.

I found interests in Shaw's testimony I presume others will not, because of my own inquiries. I am surprised to find him skilfully dishonest where the dishonesty seems to serve no purpose and where error is not probable. Although I never investigated him per se, I did come across a fair amount of information in the course of checking into other things. The single investigation I conducted of him was for Moo and was very limited in purpose. It produced positive answers to the questions propounded and good leads I presume were never followed.

I cannot tell you why he dissembled about the frequency with which he went to Lafitte's Blacksmith Shop, a popular (gay) bar, but he did, saying he went there but 2-3 times a year. That may be now. It used to be otherwise. Or in his responses to inadequate questioning about where he was and what he knew of the ITM picketing. His answer was both false and deceptive where it was not false. It is not consistent with his published accounts of the same thing, which also do not stack up. Or why he didn't answer completely on his car borrowing - or why they let him get away with it when in one case, to their knowledge, that car was stolen. Or on his relations with Lloyd Cobb. Fascinating. Why should he lie? Under oath, knowing how ruinous it could have been if caught at it.

I presume what I now have is all the office in N.O. Mas. If I get others, I'll let you know. I have, as you know, tried to double-check on this.

Another strong impression, despite his contrary reputation, is the rather poor performance by Dymond. His victory is not the product of his courtroom skills or the great job he did. He hadn't even done his homework, wasn't really familiar with the simplest facts of the investigation.