DEC 5 1972

"Shaw Decries DA's Fund" is the head on Lanny Thomas' States-Item story of,11/21/ 72 35
In the lead Shaw makes a reasonable case, that it is a dangerous thing. As a principle it can be seen, if in his ase I don't know of a penny being used to investigate him. In fact, I know of nothing that ~~xxxxx~~ 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 derving 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:

X "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? Agian 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.

If is quite a coincidence that about a week later there was a disasterous 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, Rauly (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