

1/16/70

Dear Paul and Hal,

I write you both about the same thing to ask different things of each. To each is a copy of my today's letter to Moo about it and to Hal a marked copy of what Paul sent me of his work and Jim's on the CD75 index.

First, Hal: If you girl friend could take this list and make me a 3/5 card on each, by name and with citations, I think it may come in handy. Do not send it to me when it is finished, for Paul may have other similar things I should go over. I am absolutely satisfied of several things: this reflects a really large investigation of Ferrie, which must have some meaning, I have solid proof-a copy- that they withheld whatever they thought they could get away with, including what cannot, under any guideline or interpretation. More than I do not here go into. If Paul can do this with the other relevant docs, I'd very much appreciate four copies, one for my working file, one for my suit file, one for Moo and one to mark up and return for further carding.

Connecting Hardy Davis (at least Friends of Democratic Cuba) with Ferrie, and maybe Rebel (CRC), may be significant.

This also shows much more contact with the Garrison office than the available files indicate-and how can that be withheld unless there is scurrilous data in these docs, which I doubt.

I had planned to include Ferrie in the suit, Bud agreed, and this makes it even more important that a) I do and b) continue going over such files, rather indexes to indexes, by page.

Instinct tells me this is likely an important area, aside from what I say and indicate to Moo. Therefore, I suggest it go to no one else other than Jim. Because I know of no others who have any knowledge of this area, I am writing no one else.

The Wohlmann references are to an assistant DA. There are also two new TV newsmen on this list, having no known connection with the LHO lit dist bit, one with the ABC station, which did not cover that. If any of the marked names appear in any other files, this would be good to look into. Paul, does NR mean no record in the indexes? There is also indication of a Ferrie check with the State police, not indicated elsewhere. There are other possibilities I did not mark, like 319. Sorry parts of copy are not clear. I had to use light-exposed paper. Paul: in going over this I find interest in 249 and 340. If you do not have, would you please get? Hal, if you kept N.O. clippings, when Ferrie's name came up, the Archives was quoted on the docs they had. I cannot find my copy. If you can get this for me, I'd appreciate it. There is a discrepancy, so you may have two versions. One doc was in two CDs. I'd appreciate two copies of each, one (249) for Emory Brown, the other for Moo. And on that provision of the Freedom of Information Act dealing with material that have become largely public, I'd appreciate the benefit of your cautious and bend-over-backwards approach, the more conservative one. That Ferrie was homosexual is public. That those named men who lived with him did is public. Their connection with him is very public, complete with pictures. His connection with the CAP and its members, likewise. His connection with Cubans and threats against the President, too. ...Is Bringulier's book on sale out there? Bud told me last night he had had no response from his order to the manufacturer, Hallberg. He has ordered one for him, one for me, and what you cite to me is intriguing, for there is no doubt Garrison has reports of LHO hanging out in that Thompson's where Quiroga was. And why did Liebler omit this, and why did not Bringulier go back to the ITM and do his bit again (what one who knows anything about him would expect of him)?...Did I ever tell you that I saw a display of what Hargis would call dirty books in his window? Not only Hargis. Best,

*Ferris docs*

Not having your promised reply to my letter of April 7, which I believe has to do with my initial request of more than four months ago, I do not know what your response is or will be. However, based on the record you have conveniently made so clear, I think it not unreasonable to anticipate a denial. Therefore, I ask you to send me the papers and any necessary instructions for asking for this under the "Freedom of Information" Act. I want to be in a proper position to carry this through, and to exhaust all the administrative possibilities.

You write, "The two pages bearing 'notes actually made in the room in which the examination was taking place' that are mentioned in Dr. Humes' testimony are reproduced in XVIII hearings 48-49." This cannot be the case, unless Dr. Humes perjured himself. He testified to his notes, made in the autopsy room by "myself", during the autopsy. These are not his. One is by Dr. Boswell, the other by Dr. Finck. It is not only reasonable to assume that Dr. Humes could not make an autopsy without notes, it is also his sworn testimony. The files you have made available to me contain no such notes. You do have the receipts for those very notes, from the autopsy bench to the Commission. If you do not have them in your files, you can obtain duplicates from the Secret Service, which did have them and provided some of the receipts you do have. I think you are obliged to. I do request it.

You ask for a copy of the Allen-Scott column referring to the declassification of documents relating to the interception of Oswald's mail. The clearest copy I can make is enclosed. The paragraph under "Letter Intercepted" reads: "An FBI report on file in the National Archives, which has been recently declassified, notes that the agency started its investigation immediately on intercepting Oswald's letter after it was mailed November 18 in Irving, Tex."

The copy I have appeared in the Shreveport, La. "Times" November 20, 1967. Federal origin of the information in this column seems probable. Other parts are relevant also.

On the subject of declassification, at your suggestion I wrote Attorney General Clark last year about those withheld documents in the David Ferris file that could not properly be withheld, one of which is in my possession and clearly establishes this. Under date of November 7, 1968, Assistant Attorney General Vinson wrote me, "...as periodic review is now (my emphasis) being conducted...We expect this review will be completed in a short time." Therefore, I ask what was declassified and if nothing was, a statement to that effect, a record

If you do not maintain a list of what was restricted and then becomes available, you are severely restricting research, for the volume of material is, as you note, extensive, and it is a physical impossibility to go over the same files again. Also, the bibliography indicates what is withheld and becomes a deception. I would like to think that when a President is murdered, the government does not feel impelled to pinch pennies, to thus interfere with inquiry into it. In the past when I have alleged this archive was understaffed, the Archives assured me this was not the case. If it is not, then there should be a list of what was withheld and is then made available. While I welcome your renewed assurance that you are keeping a list of what I have asked for, I note that after a year I am still without explanation of violation of your own regulations with regard to precisely this and as it relates to me.

*HW to Richard 5/17/69*