

Mr. Les Whitten
1401 16 St., NW
Wash., D.C. 20036

10/20/77

Dear Les,

Thanks for the nice affidavit. A copy came from Jim today. It will not discourage any help I can provide in the future. Which is not to say much because I spend time with papers that refuse to acknowledge the existence of my books, order book reviewers not to review them and even one that hired an avowed partisan also working for the government to to an ax job.

Today is broken up at a bad time, which is a good time to say thanks. I've just returned from the weekly bleeding to determine how much good the rat poison (fol lit) is doing me and am about to see the doctor who seems to think it is not doing enough good.

To return to FBI pages now flooding in- more than two thousand in each of the past two mails and six thousand just before that - I did not shave when I got up. I've changed my life and habits to suit the needs of coping with the medical problems. So I use an electric razor, which means I can also do something else at the same time. Today I was moved after my wife read your column, so I read it while shaving. This was after I had to stop reading the FBI's dirty secrets (also fol lit). A new kind of non-channel, as distinguished from a back channel and a do/-not-file file. I'm not ready to go public but I am getting it all down on paper.

Now about the column and Ellsworth Bunker, who once was younger and of hotter blood. If my recollection is correct after some 40 years the Bolivians paid him back in advance. ~~It~~ Badger game.

If you still have Gary on the behavior-modification story then Cohen's column in the Post this ^{morning} reminds me of what may have been a major CIA mind-bending operation - to condition or "imprint" non-infants. Their interest in circumcision was after infancy. This could account for the outrageous expenditure for the toy dog, an imprinting experiment with adults. I've bounced this one off a west coast psychiatrist I've been giving copies of the records I get. He doesn't have that one because the CIA is stonewalling me again and I don't have the money to pay them for what is withheld, maybe \$2,000. If you know a paper that will lend them I can copy them. They were into much more than has come out. And in time a set of the "destroyed" records will surface. Their content will not die with the perishable Gottlieb.

If the time has come when Jack might go for any JFK assassination stories or if you want to do any magazine pieces I have just put a couple into a court record subject to refutation by the FBI and the DJ. Both have been totally silent after more than two months. One is that by pictures in my possession, contemporaneous news pictures and current official ones and from actual examination of it, which I can arrange for you, the curbstone struck by a bullet or as the FBI suggests a fragment of a bullet was packed before the Warren Commission was able to get the FBI interested, a matter of only nine months. I have established with a live witness who has become a friend that this was by May 1964, when he went back to take movies to show his folks. He is the third person wounded in the assassination. (I've just found an FBI inquiry about him in their secret Memphis file, got Hq.) When the nazi-minded agent most responsible was being deposed by Jim he digressed to try to poison the record about me and his alleged plan to sue me for libel. I did not argue. At the end, after he left, there being another deposition to follow, I told the Assistant U.S. Attorney Michael Ryan and the representative of the FBI Office of Legal Counsel that if he'd now sue I provide a written waiver of the statute of limitations. (Not only was I confident in my own work - I know the FBI will not dare confront my factual knowledge, including of their "investigation.") That bastard went home and sent me a bill as an "expert witness." His testimony was ordered by the court of appeals, no less, and I paid the prescribed fees in advance. My response was to lay his guts open in a long letter in which I included a waiver of the statute and a dare that he sue. Since then I have obtained FBI records that

include their actual consideration of suing me, using him as a front. They decided that even under the New York Times decision he could sue. And they have not sued.

The FBI pretended that the curbstone this character finally had dug up and tested was identical with the condition at the time of the assassination, which shows what was accurately describes as a "scar," a "nick" and a "hole." They knew better. So they went ahead with a test that disclosed the presence of only two of the elements of a bullet that in the core alone had nine elements and I think four more in the jacket. No trace of jacket material so they called it a fragment. Talk about magic bullets! And this one made my friend Jim Tague bleed without leaving a mark on the curbstone from which a spray of concrete gave him a very ~~is~~ slight wound that Hoover tried to ignore but the Commission knew it could not. Thus the single-bullet theory.

Then there is whether or not JFK was shot from the front. I've gotten FBI pictures of the front of the shirt that show that the holes in the neckband do not even coincide. The damage was done by the nurses, with a scalpel, not by a bullet. The bullet hole was above the top of the buttoned collar. I've interviewed the doctor who saw it and told Dulles this, only Dulles also ignored it, as Hoover did. And then there is the White House transcript of this, the first press conference after LBJ was sworn in. It has the doctors who had just examined JFK saying this wound was from the front and they did not know where it exited. I've interviewed that doctor, too. He is uneasy because the feds really pressured him.

This is not only the kind of evidence that stacks up in court - it has. It and even the pictures are in the uncontested records.

Using some of the other stuff might cut down on my yield. Not with this, however, if you are interested. Jim, the court and I have copies of all. Except for Tague's movies. They suffered a mysterious disappearance some time after I started to try to get the withheld records under FOIA.

We do these things by what Jim calls The Battle of the Affidavits. Translation: my sworn head is on the block to disprove their official affidavits. While they always blink, the judges generally prefer not to see. Last September, 1976, Jim put me on the stand to testify to some of this. The government attorney pooped out on cross examination. This was in the case for which Jim asked for the affidavit from you. Again thanks. I've paid for more than 30,000 pages and at my own expense I've provided Jim with a complete set, as you suggested, to have on the east coast, of the entire FBI HQ file. To put this in perspective, my gross income for the last calendar quarter did not quite reach \$650. Not a week or month but for the three months.

In haste and with best wishes,