

10/6/77

Dear Sidney,

Because he knows it is impossible for me to examine all the records I have of which you have copies and because he knows that long ago I theorized the drugs were being used in connection with some stimuli (I asked him repeatedly about psycho-acoustical before there was any public mention of it) Mike has sent me copies of several news accounts of the CIA's work and records and a few pages relating to MKULTRA Subproject 68.

I had read the Washington Post 9/23/77 story that includes scanty mention of Gottlieb's testimony without a possible interpretation I now suggest. Apparently the committee believes the toy dog used in animal experiments "was a companion for one of the subjects," an animal. On rereading this I wondered immediately if this might be an effort at imprinting some time after birth rather than at birth and as my own work leads me to believe, beginning prior to live birth.

Then I came to what is later repeated in the copies Mike sent me of a few pages. This is headed DRAFT, of a memo for the record on Continuation of MKULTRA, Subproject 68, dated 27 March 1959. This appears to be the first of several pages. The first sentence is:

"1 Subproject 68 is being continued as a means to support a research program, the effects upon human behavior of the repetition of verbal signals."

I see no conflict between this statement and the notion I found myself wondering about on reading about the toy dog for the second time. I also do not pretend that this means what I'm only asking if it might mean.

On what appears to be page 5 of the same memo, after mention of "methods of signal production" and then of "breaking down the ongoing patterns of behavior" there is a repetition, not the last in these pages, of "amenability to change in consequence of the repetition verbal signals..." This is followed by a procedural discussion, about the use of patients "suffering from extremely long-term and intractable psychoneurotic conditions." The last two parts I quote I note were marked in the original records.

On page 2 of a January 21, 1957 Application for Grant there is:

"1. By continued replaying of a cue communication, a persistent tendency to act in a way which can be predetermined with respect to its general characteristics can be established.

I've not been able to organize all my thought and lacking your professional training and experience I do not pretend that they all have scientific validity with humans. I began to read what Mike sent while awaiting my weekly prostate test, continued it while the technician had me wait to be certain I did not continue to bleed, and later completed them while walking in my lane. So please understand that I'm not making great pretensions and that I'm not with the time to put it all together ~~and~~ and then reorganize it. It is too much off the top of the head.

With animals none of this is new. I did have extensive experience with it and have no reason not to believe that I did basic behavioral work. I'll explain. It was not new then, although it may not have been well known.

I find myself wondering if this business of verbal signals is not a small part of a much larger interest and research. With humans, I mean. My original theorizing to Mike and questioning was not limited to verbal signals. It is not difficult to visualize other and even other forms of audible signals.

For some years I was a farmer. My farming was ruined by the conditioning of my poultry by low-flying military helicopters. During the years of my effort to cope with what I ultimately established as a trespass and ~~thus~~ (establishing a principle of law in noise I) thought much and I tried much. I was imprinting years before I heard of Lorenz. In an

attempt to survive I had to change behavioral patterns and I was able to, if not to persist economically and emotionally. It became apparent to me that the chickens, drawing upon survival instincts, were conditioned by the overflights, both to the first and more to those that followed. My experiences cover many flocks and breeds.

I wound up rearing young egg-layers in a fairly completely controlled environment in which I had complete control of illumination and other factors. This part worked wonderfully well. But I could not keep them forever, as forever is for chickens, that way.

I believe Ualhoum drew upon my work in his that followed and have heard that he cited it prior to his work with mice and population at some international scientific gathering.

Helicopters ( read hawks) were "a cue communication." Etc. With geese, to digress into what may interest you, with wild geese I was able to tape record what amounts to the "continued replaying of a cue communication" before the eggs hatched, for a couple of days before they hatched.

All these things of which the CIA pages have references to humans are within my experiences with fowl and as of a date earlier than is in these pages. I was engaged in "breaking down the ongoing patterns of behavior." My chickens were "suffering from extremely long-term and intractable psychoneurotic conditions." Based on my observations of them and other efforts, which included drugs, I learned much and was able to have some influence. I did learn how to raise non-psychoneurotic chickens in an environment in which it was rampant and the stimuli were present. I was, with reserpine, able to diminish cannibalism in relatively old chickens who were extremely cannibalistic. And a certain amount of what might have been imprinting or its equivalent often resulted. I can show you pictures, still and motion, of wild chickens who were other than wild with me, who treated me in a special way, even flying up onto my shoulders and hitching free rides while I tended the flocks. These are chickens that, were they humans, would have been as crazy as any you've ever seen.

It is not nearly the trick it is assumed to be to make basic behavioral changes in even the wild. I did it with hankers, wild Canada geese, to a degree that surprised me even if I undertook to do it. They'd bring their young to me, some when I called, even trust the young to me. They all ate from my mouth without biting me.

These and other such things prior to the dates in these records. Of course in my mind one question is how the professionals in the field seem to have reflected so little knowledge of it in these references to work to be done with animals.

I take for granted that technical words do not mean to me what they do to you so when I use conditioning and imprinting you may read into them other than I intend because I do not know their meaning as you professionals in the field do. However, I'd like to know if you think it is possible for what I regard as more than conditioning, something like imprinting, could have been what they were working on, something that would impart meaningful control.

I hope this is comprehensible and that it may be of some interest. I've been interrupted several times, including by my lawyer who wants me to take a quick tour through more than 6,000 pages the FBI has just dumped on me in an FOIA case. I can't ask my wife to read and correct this because I do not dare recall to her what she lived through and was much influenced by. I hope I find the time. Otherwise, please excuse the typos.

Sincerely,