

LEONARD L. STEINMAN  
COUNSELLOR AT LAW  
210 WEST 89TH STREET  
NEW YORK 24, N. Y.

WESLEY TOWERS

January 31, 1964

TRAFALGAR 7-6786

Mel Belli, Esq.  
722 Montgomery Street  
San Francisco, California

Dear Mel,

Since writing you and getting your note, I've made it my business to read two original case studies -- one by a leading German psychiatrist, the second by an outstanding Danish psychiatrist and lecturer at the University of Copenhagen. The Danish case study includes a detailed description of a third case which occurred in Denmark also. Every one of these cases is virtually on all fours with the picture presented not only by your client, but Oswald as well. Bill Woodfield's series on his interviews with Ruby completely corroborate the theory -- which is now an absolute and earnest conviction in me -- that Jack Ruby was in fact hypno-conditioned.

I hope that in some way this letter will communicate to you the depth of my conviction which admits of no doubt at all. If anything, I began my study of the Oswald and Ruby cases through the facts reported in the Press with the eye not only of a lawyer but of an American with liberal political beliefs, incensed at both the assassination and the killing of Oswald. If anything, I was prejudiced against Ruby. As the pattern began to emerge, I checked the psychiatric texts, read Schilder and other first-rate sources. The theory was beginning to take shape in spite of my prejudice; yet there was no willingness in me to take this theory seriously until every source confirmed the pattern. I then got off my letter to the Special Commission, every word in it based on the facts and the documented sources. I must tell you, in all honesty, that I never received an acknowledgment from the Special Commission of my letter; but that does not matter, for I am thoroughly convinced of Ruby's innocence, that he was the robot of another.

You have probably never heard of "locking suggestions", Mel. This is the problem Ruby is up against -- and the tragedy is that Ruby doesn't even know it. I don't know what, apart from "Fugue or dissociated state", the diagnosis of Schafer and Bromberg was, but I will bet my last dollar that they found him to be an obsessive-compulsive neurotic with psychopathic and schizoid components, that the picture of brain damage was in the results of the Bender Gestalt, the Bellevue-Wechsler, the Rorschach and

other association tests they administered. Please believe me, Mel -- the brain damage picture is not the result of previous concussion and physical trauma, but of hypno-conditioning, of induction by suggestion through deep hypnosis of an artificial psychosis. Unlocking of this psychosis, of establishing the identity of the hypno-conditioner, requires a dedicated hypno-therapist with an exhaustive knowledge not only of Freudian but of Pavlovian principles. Please believe me also that Ruby's explanation of what gave rise to his act, of his feelings of depression and overwroughtness at the President's death, of his feelings for Mrs. Kennedy and the further torment Oswald's trial would cause her, of his chagrin at the ~~History~~ anti-Kennedy ads and hate posters -- these are all confabulations and rationalizations similar to those found in Korsakoff's Syndrome; all caused by the hypno-conditioning he was subjected to. In all of the cases, the hypno-conditioned victim shows the symptoms of an obsessive-compulsive neurotic with psychopathic and schizoid components; one even showed symptoms of schizophrenia paranoia with the delusions, the hallucinations, the whole bit -- all the result of the conditioning process. See P.J. Reiter (M.D., Lecturer on Psychotherapy and Psychosomatic Medicine at the University of Copenhagen), "Antisocial or Criminal Acts and Hypnosis: A Case Study", English Ed., Munksgaard - Copenhagen, 1953.

You must understand that the question of the hypnotic induction of criminal acts and behavior is one which has a long history going back to Charcot, Freud, Janet, Bernheim. It has a complex and learned literature which involved the ~~2~~ <sup>the</sup> best minds in psychological medicine from 1895 onwards. The Salpetriere (Charcot) and Nancy (Bernheim) schools had controversial opinions regarding the question. Liegeois, Professor of Law at Nancy, considered the question of tremendous importance to jurisprudence. Himself ~~an~~ a distinguished jurist, he sided unreservedly with Bernheim that hypnotism can be misused for criminal ends -- a question which subsequent experimental work and actual cases established as indisputable fact. The use of hypnotism for criminal ends takes up four long chapters in his monograph ("De la Suggestion et du Somnambulisme dans leurs rapports avec la Jurisprudence et la Medicine legale", Paris, 1889), and he cites a number of such cases appearing in the French courts from 1830 onwards.

<sup>Don't</sup>  
~~Do not~~ think for one moment that because this literature and discussion appeared in the '90s, it is outdated. On the contrary, all of the most recent studies support its illustrations and theses. When Reiter (supra) refers to Karl du Prel ("Das Hypnotisch Verbrechung und seine Entdeckung", Munich, 1889), it is only by way of re-stating what his own study, treatment and method of uncovering the evidence in the actual case assigned to him showed.

Karl du Prel (a psychoanalyst of the late nineteenth century, a contemporary of Freud's) was "not only in firm support of the

theory but realizes that there is an obvious possibility that it may create an entirely new type of criminal and one of a particularly dangerous type. The criminal who makes use of hypnotism has unrivalled opportunities of wiping out all traces of his action and, moreover, of avoiding discovery, since even if he comes under suspicion it will be extremely difficult, and often quite impossible, to produce any evidence against him."

Now, perhaps, you have some idea of what "locking suggestions" are and why it takes a truly dedicated hypnotherapist with good understanding not only of the problem but an excellent grasp of Freudian and Pavlovian theory. A run-of-the-mill psychiatrist could never unlock Ruby -- for he would have no understanding of what is involved.

Do you want more ?...Describing the nature of the subject-victim's reaction, Reiter gives us du Prel's simple explanation. Thus, "...the hypnotizer can take advantage of the loss of memory which the medium suffers after a deep hypnosis regarding everything that has passed between his subject and himself. This includes the recollection of those suggestions made to him, under hypnosis, about actions which he is to perform not during his hypnotic state but after his awakening, after a longer or shorter period of time has elapsed. The effects of such suggestions may take place at a certain prescribed time or on receipt of a signal fixed upon under hypnosis (note: Bernheim reports a case in which the post-hypnotic suggestion was carried out to the very minute exactly a year after it was given, without recollection by the subject). Such suggestions are known as post-hypnotic suggestions and it is a well-known fact that when the subject comes to carry them out, and has no recollection of what occurred under his hypnotic state, he regards them as spontaneous impulses on his part. They may be felt as imperative, inner compulsions, inexplicable in themselves. But more often it appears that the subject tries to 'rationalize' them, improvising pseudo-motives to account for them. Outwardly, therefore, such actions may seem to resemble strongly the compulsory actions of obsessive-compulsive neurotics."

Do you want to know why Ruby shows a brain syndrome picture ? Probably because some toxin was used together with the conditioning. Alcohol. Peyote. Mescaline. LSD-25. To lock the post-hypnotic suggestions firmly in, to prevent Ruby from clearing, from being re-hypnotized by anyone other than the Conditioner. Sound like something out of a piece of fantasy-fiction ? Then see "The Manipulation Of Human Behavior", 1961, (John Wiley & Sons, compiled under the auspices of and sponsored by Uncle Sam's own USAF); *Bebermeyer & Fanning, eds.*; for a paper *Review of 3 existing documents* see, *et. pp. 157-171.*

I tell you, Mel, this case is insidious. The theory isn't really a second-line defense. It's what actually happened. I would love