

*Re: New Orleans to the*

1/16/70

Dear Moo,

I have a call in for you and I am writing you about what may be a major development and may be with little or no meaning. Without time to organize my thought, because of the pressure of the other work to much I must return, I go into this because I think it bears or at least has the possibility of bearing on your current major interest. On the other view, I think it would be foolhardy to conclude out of hand that it does not and cannot.

Herewith several pages of some of the dirty hard work several of our fine boys have been doing with the indexes we obtained from the Archives. These are some of those on CD75, the pages where Ferrie's name appears in the index.

Your charge was against three men, Shaw, Ferrie and Oswald (who I think should have been "Oswald"). Now the most casual scrutiny of this listings of consecutive pages from this file shows that in their investigation, the FBI lumped Ferrie, Oswald and Clay Bertrand, in essence, what you charged. It is possible that these documents just by accident are in this arrangement, but I do not believe the assumption is either warranted or safe.

Among the amazing things this shows is the magnitude of the Ferrie investigation. On these three sheets alone, relating to this one file alone, there are more suppressed Ferrie documents than the government acknowledged it had in all, suppressed or not suppressed, in all files. (And the extent of their connection with FBI agents on the part of Milton Brener's clients is ever so much greater than he indicated.) They really had a very large Ferrie investigation.

This brings me to something about which I wrote Louis before you got rid of Tom Bethell but when it was apparent to me that moment could not be far off. Typically, I had no response. As I wrote Louis, when I first took Tom to the Archives I worked with him just long enough to show him his way through. I turned over my account to him (and was surprised when he didn't tell me of using it to get a single copy of a single document), and they stayed away in order not to associate him too closely with me. Soon I found out the FBI was asking questions about him, and I made the separation lest. However, I also found out that instead of getting copies of those documents he should, he was keeping a notebook, which limits all knowledge reflected to Tom's understanding, which I am afraid is not as great as one might have hoped. Because he then knew New Orleans names I didn't, and because his interest was New Orleans, it may well be he spotted things I did not. Therefore, and so you also would have a record, I asked Louis to get this notebook, for which you paid, and to xerox a copy for me to go over. If this was done, I think I should still go over it and I think another should, so I would like two copies.

As you go over the enclosed, some things will be obvious. For example, the large number of names not in the Commission stuff but in the files and relating to Ferrie (in your thinking, therefore, I presume, possibly also to Shaw). Among those that interested me much and repeats often is Hardy Davis. (Let me note that that the appearance of the name is not to be taken as proof of an FBI interview, for it may have been just mentioned in the report.) Another, in an association with Ferrie, is Rabah. Some of the others I know, some are familiar, some unfamiliar.

I have gone over this and made certain red marks. The X is where I am reasonably confident the withheld documents relates to Ferrie (in almost all cases his name is mentioned in it). The ? is where I think it may be or is possible. The XX in the one case is to call to your attention the possible relationship this has to the two Campbell reports. I have put a line after names where I hope you can now have a girl go over the files and send me (two copies) what you have on them, for me may match it with other things we have or can get (and will). The two lines

after Kohlmann is to remind us both that I never saw any of the reports he left in your files, I have asked for them without response, and we have one of these suppressed documents and it cannot possibly be suppressed on any legitimate ground. I intend to sue for it. There is a provision of the law little known or invoked that may make it possible for me to get much of this suppressed evidence in court or, remotely, on the threat of court action. Also, there are NOPD Intelligence Division Reports you should have, I have never seen, and would like to, including dating to before the assassination. I know from material I have obtained since last I was in N.O. that this file includes Oswald literature with the 433 544 address, and I have a copy of that. (And Rebel's name in an association with Ferrie's?). There should be O'Sullivan interviews, if not reports, and if it is any kind of PD, both. If there is anything that may not be used except for your purposes, please indicate it and it will never be seen by anyone.

There is, of course, no indication here of any interest in this address or in Benister. Yet we now know that the feds and your own PD, both knowing the significance of that address before the assassination, also knew Oswald used it before the assassination, and is not the same true of your second leg, Ferrie?

I do not have time now to carry this further, for the pressures of my own work are great, as are the problems. I now have by far the hottest stuff we have even had, and a really definitive thing on Ray/King completed and more topical than I can tell you, with irrefutable and thoroughly documented proof the FBI did the framing. This is my longest book and it is done, save for some additions I want to make to the final chapter. And JFK stuff I now have more significant than anything you have seen or heard of, and I know you have heard of some of what I have. I now do not know if you will return my call, and I intend mailing this this evening, when I pick Lil up (she has a temporary job, which sets the table). If you do not have time to write a response and do not feel like trusting the phone, please sit down with the tape recorder and, in the little time it will take, tell me what you can, offhand, of what this suggests to you, if anything, and what you know of some of the more obscure names. (I wonder if it would be a good idea to check them in the 1963 directory, or 1963-4, and see if they are all N.O.?) I can then play the tape and get by your thoughts and knowledge.

Meanwhile, I will endeavor to duplicate this for all files. To a degree it is possible. I'll keep you posted.

Imagine, when the so-kind government announced, when his name was in the papers, that it had about 30 documents relating to him, we find in this one part file not fewer than 46 and not fewer than 9 more possible! How kind they were, indeed. It may interest you to know that I have been trying for months to get a copy of the list they used in the announcement, without getting it, and since then a list of all (for they have a separate Ferrie file they will not let be seen), and for months, again, no response, not even a rejection. After the end of your trial, I suggest this, in itself, may have real significance.

Hope Jim is all over his operation. If this interests him and he wants to talk about it over a phone he can trust, let me have the number and I'll call some afternoon about 3:30 your time, when I can be near any number of certainly clear phones here. Best regards,