

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 ~~action~~ 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 what 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 JG 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 MAR 13 1973

88

Phone and mail: Olive Crawford, who had earlier discussed it with me by phone, sent us a different contract for the listing of our Hyattstown property for sale. She phoned this a.m. to ask why I had not returned it. We have not received it. She said she phoned at least three different times last week, not early in a.m. or late in p.m., the only times I have not been home. Nor Wednesday a.m., when I was away. Sale of this property would be of considerable help to us now. However, there has not been any ~~unusually~~ unusual delay in mail for some time and no reason to believe any has not reached me. Senator Mathis, however, wrote me last week to say he had not yet received a letter I sent him in January. It has not been returned. It also dealt with what could be helpful to us. Such coincidences!

HW 3/12/73

MAR 13 1973

88

Don't recall if I told you of Cedric Belfrage's current plight or of his past persecutions. Recently I heard from him. He has a book about to appear on The American Inquisition. He has 28 college appearances lined up and is not being allowed in. I took this up with Ian. Cedric is a British subject. Ian wrote him, got an answer today, and plans going further. Makes me feel good. Cedric was co-founder of the National Guardian, with James Aronson, in about 1848. He is a McCarthy victim. For some years he was carried on the masthead as Editor in Exile. From what Ian says he is going to do a second book, a more personal one. HW 3/12/73

MAR 13 1973

88