

Js, HR Shaw Civil Suit CONFIDENTIAL 12/26/72

The small NYTimes clipping of the 20th HR sent me impels me to make this brief memorandum, from recollection, of what is in my files, on tape and duplicated on tape, relating to whether or not Shaw committed perjury. Not the hasty Garrison allegation, and entirely different perjury.

I never investigated Shaw. I never cast him in the role in which Garrison did for very simple reasons, some of which are in O in NO. I never through if Russo was truthful that the real LHO was at Ferries. I had doubts about Russo you will also find in O in NO..

I found out by accident, not design, that rather than being anxious to retire to manage his properties, Shaw was fired by the late Lloyd Cobb, who hated Shaw. Shaw inherited the hatred, so to speak, by being the protege and I understand bedmate of his mentor and benefactor, who was Cobb's original enemy.

As it turns out, I am happy I was not at the trial. I wasn't because I could not be under the existing conditions. I was there and left without entering the courtroom, leaving during the jury selection. I was asked to return several times and refused. This did not endear me to any of "them", nor did it to those who pretended to know the facts and were caught lacking that knowledge.

Had I been there when Shaw testified -and I had been supposed to be a technical adviser and sit at the counsel table - I'd not have been silent when Shaw and Cobb both lied in context probably perjury - about the great loss Cobb felt when he resigned.

(The story is that after I think his name was Breck died and a reasonable time passed. Cobb called Shaw in and said, "Wlay, when yu resigned w~~ereix~~ we're going to give you the damnedest party and the highest honors ever. And if you don't resign, I'm kicking your ass out." I have this on ~~friend~~ tape from a friend of all named+ Garrison, a man who was there.

Shaw and Cobb both testified that Shaw was indispensable to the success of the new project, the new Trade Mart building, because he was in charge of and renting the space, and if he failed to rent the space, the whole thing would go bankrupt. This is false. I have earlier, for other reasons, never anticipating this, sent Garrison the proof. With typical genius, he ignored it, perhaps for the best as things turned out. There is an FBI report in my Oswalf-Lit Dist file of an interview with one James Lawrence and then others with Nick Palmisano, then of the Roosevelt Hotel, and Dolores Neeley, then Jesse Care's secretary, all because they are in the WDSU footage.. This was one of the FBI's more skillful operations. There is one slip: Lawrence said he was there to rent the space, representing Bloomfield.

Garrison sent Boxley to Memphis to investigate Bloomfield. You'll recall what I have on that name in O in NO. Boxley could get nowhere on that so he returned empty-handed. I was in Memphis 2/71 and I didn't forget. In looking for Lawrence, who had left Memphis, I found Ronald Hanover, who had left Bloomfield. How Boxley could have missed either I don't know. It was no sweat. I found Lawrence with no trouble. I interviewed both by phone. In brief, their stories check just enough short of perfectly to be more than credible. They had the contract to rent the space (and here I note that Jerry Policoff could do nothing when I asked him to check out the New York Suit in which Shaw was a witness and one litigant Tamar, an obvious contraction.) They did rent the space. Contrary to the claims of Shaw and Cobb, with which they were not familiar, there never was any sweat or worry. Things ran beautifully. They oversubscribed. The one disagreement between them is the amount of space rental required for the loan and the amount of oversubscription. It was considerable in both versions. And both sets of figures are close enough.

So, this being quite germane, being Shaw's only alibi against the really persuasive testimony of the very solid Clinton witnesses (who could have made an honest mistake but could not have been more serious or more persuasive), I think it is real perjury and makes me wonder why there is this persistence in a civil suit where, if it is won, there will remain the amount of damage that could be done to a very prominent homosexual. Getting real damages will depend on the jury. I don't think the Wegmann firm is looking for a token victory, and they know there is nothing to collect from Garrison. They are after the money fellows who backed him.

I have no interest in giving this to Garrison and I have not. However, I also have no interest in the innocent being hurt, even if they are rich! And as you can now see, there always was basis for my saying Shaw did perjure himself, more after 2/71. What, if anything, I will do I don't know. Should I ever get to N.O. I may see. If before 6/73. HW