Dear Jim,

11/2/84

"JFK on Aaasassinations" is a clipping that turned up a week or so ago that I wanted to read before sending it to you in the event you have use for it in Hoch's suit. Pldase return it after you read it. I think it is the most credible account of thatperiod and that it is correct in recounting JFK's personal opposition to such means. You may have this and the enclosed Marianne Means column, which I'd also like back, but I'm sending them in the event you can use them and can't locate your copies.

I'd intended writing you along with the copies of my recent exchange with DJ OIP but after returning from the morning therapy I just didn't feel right and still am not back to present norm. I don't know what it is but it involves a kind of unsteadiness and for a week or so I get dizzy easier. So, when I took Lil shopping I just mailed what was in the envelope to avoid Baltimore weekend mail problems.

I don't know that the surveillance item of the King request will be an issue on remand and I do know I've written about some of what has to be behind the record I sent Huff that he and Phyllis ignore, but there is one facet I do not recall saying. All of this has to do with the fabrication that has to be the FBI's own fabrication that I was visited by a Russian embassy official or officials. That may or may not be the same things as the other FBI fabrication, that I had a personal relationship with a Soviet citizen inside their embassy. (What other kind of person is there in that embassy anyway?)

It was all part of State/USIA asking me to invite the Khruschev's to our farm and to go there and help them raise better chickens. Part of the proposed help was introducing them to an adequate feed mill that did not require either the considerable investment of more elaborate and expensive equipment of the big outfits, like Ralston-Purina. I'd won those prizes and had that superior product on a feed mixed for me at the relatively small cooperative here in Frederick, not associated with Agway but then entirely independent. The manager was a friend, Harold Staley, and he agreed to show them around and answer any questions they might have about the equipment, its cost and availability, compounding good feeds, etc. But it turned out that Frederick was a few miles outside the limit Russians were permitted to travel in the U.S. (This may well have been retaliatory because they had imposed such limits on our people, I'm not sure either way.) So the agricultural attache and/or his people never did come up. And I never met him. Because all of this was by phone there is no possible source for the FBI's fabrication other than drawing the wrong conclusions from phone tapping, and I suspect the tap was on them, not me.

I could also have been of use to them in their egg operations because what was most common in the U.S. would not have been what was best for them. Their supply of meats was not as ample as ours, so our larger commercial egg operations used very small chickens that did not have even a decent meat yield. The hens Iuused did not eat that much more feed, produced eggs as well, and when their egg-laying usefulness was over their yield as stewers was fine. Culled pullets were excellent roasters, and even the cockerels, sexed and separated when hatched because they are not needed for egg production, made acceptable fryers, if less effeciently than those bred especially for theit meat yield. They also made decent roasters.

But no Russian ever visited us and I never had any personal relationship with any of them. Still the FBI says both in the records I've sent in. There must be underlying records and the only apparent source of the misinformation is electronic surveillance.

In this connection, I remind you that one of my appeals is from FBI limitation of search to you and me as the subject of surveillance. It did not even claim to have checked any other indices. They have "ow erheard" and "mentioned" indices, too.

Neither State nor USIA produced any relevant records and both had them.

While much has happened to me and much time has passed, I have a clear recollection of the entire matter, from its beginnings at the time of the so-called "kitchen debate," and what I did when the government asked me. It meant serious problems for me, in part because I was still building both my home and my plant, and neither looked very good. While there was nothing much I could do about either of those things, I was able to get help in clearing the overgrown fencerow along the road, about a quarter of a mile of which was heavily overgrown because I worked a very long day seven days a week and still had no time for such unessentials.

I hope that Huff and Hubbell get around to more of those long-ignored appeals because they are a current and powerful response to BJ's lie about not stonewalling me and processing my requests when they came up administratively. I sent you copies of both sides of the relevant correspondence because I think they'll be fine for the case record and you won't have to search for your copies.

In order to eliminate the stairs problem on this I now have an organized file in my office. It was hit-or-miss on the desk because I lacked enougn organizer divides, but XXXXX I've solved that, now that I do not have to open the ventilators, by keeping them in a box next to where I sit, against the ventillator. This file includes all this years' correspodnece and some of the end of last year.

With the denial of stonewalling the issue, I think they were foolish to write me as they did. There is so much they've ignored they'd have served their own wrongful purposes better by continuing to ignore. But telling me to go to the FBI after I'd done it so many times and my letter stated this and my earlier appeals reflect it and arranging for me to get to the bottom of first that list and then their own removes any question about their intent.

Danny Metcalfe also did that and the FBI then sent me a letter. I do not remember what they said but it wasn't responsive. I'll probably get another such letter now. Delegating appeals to the agency whose noncompliance is being appealed is another cube trick that is pretty obvious. You have copies.

I'm pretty sure that the case record includes my attestations to an incomplete surveillances search and where and how the FBI hides the relevant records. Despite what the appeals court said.

Best,