Ferrie-Cimaler Comeition

Dear Paul, /6/81

In your 9/1 you say that I was sugged ing that N.O. was hiding the link from FBIRQ, the link being between Oswald and Ferrie. You say you can't prove it but you suspect the same with the 544 camp Street angle.

I'm sure I've sent you all I've seen on such things. Not much gets onto paper that is disclosed. The field offices are the FaI's memory holes.

My earlie: beliefs along these and other, similar lines are in my earlier writing, 544 and other such things in Oswald in "ew Tleans.

I've seen nothing to believe that there is any change at any subsequent date. The FBI hides to hide. FBIHQ often knowsh, via some back channel, what is not put ob paper.

What is provocative is theorizing over the inspiration for hiding from FBIRG the pro-assessination Osweld-Ferrie link, of his shootl days.

What I just sent you is a record I got under appeal of three years ago. It had been withheld, I'm sure the record reflects without even a fig-leafof justification.

"e Perez: conjecturing a connection betweeh him and the King job is not unreasonable, thus my inquiry.

Earl has gotten and road the affidavit and is going through the large stack of exhibits. We spoke Friday. He is impressed he has interest in the other records I sent recently, mostly about the tests asked by HCA and what pointed out, the immunity of the "private sector" from FOIA, so it was selected. They've also mastered their Orwell and as a result Alvarez is now impartial.

What we will do, exactly, with the effidents is not get settled. Jim was not able to get to writing until this wedend, although he'd read it and the exhibits several times. Perhaps meat important he will surparise because with it for backstoping he can make conculsory statements. I've not get figured transportation out, or getting there for a press conference. Best reagres,