

2/6/70

Dear Paul and Gary,

As you can see from the enclosed copy of a letter to Moo, we talked by phone today and he is interested in the CD75 Ferrie stuff on the chance it may lead to their current interest. He has promised to check their files for the names, to send me duplicate copies of anything they have, and to send me duplicates of anything they develop. He also reports that to his knowledge the copying of the transcripts has been occupying some time, but he does not know the status of it, for he has nothing to do with it.

He agrees there can be significance in the high frequency of reference to Gill (they have always believed Gill has never completely levelled with them, at least on his knowledge of Ferrie), and he cannot conceive of any real investigation of Ferrie, especially not one of this magnitude, without reference to Banister, particularly with so much reference to Jack Martin.

You will note the listing of the Thornley documents I have. If either of you has or has reference to any others, I'd like to know as quickly as possible. Moo believes that when Thornley is brought to trial, he/they will attempt to make it one of me, which I consider a distinct possibility. If Thornley and Lifton have their way, I would anticipate this. So, I would also like to be as prepared as possible for it. Paul: would you please remind Hal that long ago he was going to seek out and speak to Jeanne Hack for me? However, the date of the Thornley trial is not certain because, apparently, Thornley is without a lawyer, and as long as he is within reason, I suppose, they will not press him. If Gary has located the comparison of the Thornley testimony, edited and unedited, he has not so informed me.

I suggest this interest in the Ferrie stuff, which is overdue but proper for their perjury case, may yield things that interest us. So, I hope if JS is checking the indexes, I can have it soon. The duplicates that I have been promised will go to PH promptly, but unless otherwise specified, for him, JS and GS only. It is always possible this can lead them to do some of what they should have done before and didn't. If they do, and if I can be in on it, the possibilities are rich. At least we do not now have those with rings in Jim's nose leading him in the wrong directions only. The problem that remains is great, but more limited. And I presume the sycophants and self-seekers have long since abandoned him, as I also presume the friendship between him and Mort is sincere and not helpful. If either of you has any names that might in this context be checked out, I'd like to have them. I should have gotten the docs I ordered last week, but haven't. Several of them just might be relevant. I'll send to PH when I get. But not the pix (by the way, Bishop would seem to confirm Paul on that "bullet fragment" in Gurry being a button). Now that we know there is absolutely no reason for the withholding of the 11/63 O'Sullivan interview, every reference to him becomes more important. Moo does not seem to recall that they have proof his testimony about Ferrie's plane not being in condition to fly was false. I am saving that for a persuader if and when needed, for this angle has some of the rarest possibilities once they get over their hangup on him being a nice guy, which he may be, but it is utterly irrelevant... Whether or not the original case against Shaw was valid, I have no doubt at all about the fact that he committed perjury (I have doubts about the adequacy of their perjury indictment, as I do about all their indictments), and I cannot conceive of some of the perjury being innocent, so I do hope that there may be some decent investigation (confessing it is only a hope and that if I am not there, I have no good reason for it), which might produce worthwhile info. Best regards,