JL: FEE referrals in C.A.75-1996; FEE 9/12/78 letter on DE 9/24/78

Time required by the House hearings and a large number of reporters who made inquiries about these hearings precluded my making the kind of enalysis a hasty clance at the covering letter and the FM's statistic indicated would be required to make any sense of the two. Long ago I learned that when the avoidance of specificity is apparent in any FBI communication there may be a purpose in it and that for the FSI statistics is an answer to almost anything end a conevnient cover or obfuscation. Thus I noted the absence of reference in the opening paragraph to the time of "your request for a trace of all referrals" to which we received no response until we were in the courtroom for the last calendar call and the extraordinary time lapses represented by the first entries on the FBI's chart. As one example of the latter I eite the fourth item in the chart, one of the corliest Serials in the buildin file, 860. It was not referred to the GIA until most of the large file was processed or about six conths after it was located by the FM and it then required another 15 months for the FRI to write me - after my repeated complaints - that I would receive direct response from the Cla. This means, assuming that I have received the record, that it took almost two additional years.

So I asked by wife to wake me a different kind of tabulation based on the FBI's table, to tabulate what the FBI avoided tabulating and what I was continually complaining to the FBI about, the time required by the referrals. The results are attached.

Briefly, they show that prior to 6/8/78 or long after the Department was again making reference in court to ending the case based on alleged compliance. I had received only 8.3% of the referrals, that with a letter of that date I received 28.7% and that in the next six weeks I received an admittional 25.1%, while these figures are distorted by my wife's inclusions of the duplicates provided with the 9/12/76 (as provided then for the first time) the figures do represent proportions that reflect the considerable time required for any processing of the referrals and the long delays with most of them. (If she has time before I send this to you I'll ask her to make the correction and will attach it.)

I broke the time at before and after June 1977 because the proceeding of the Murkin record was about completed them. The processing is to have begun the previous September. Thus the FM's com figures actually mean that as of the time of the completion of the processin. I had received only about a third of the referrals. Of the 106 referrals I had received 39.

Throughout the period of processing I was asking about these referrals. The FRI persisted in refusing to even ask those to whom it referred records when they would be processed. While I believed and continue to believe that this was part of a general policy of stonewalling, the FRI's statistics disclose an additional reason-long FRI delay in making the referrals. The first itemized records originating outside the Department show this. All three are in the earliest Sections processed, 4, 6 and 7. The time of processing them is approximately September 1976. Deaplie the worksheet notation that they had been referred to the CTA then in fact they were not referred until the following Parch 17. The first CTA response was not until the next year. I received these records June 6,1976, And this date coincides with the CTA's need to make some response because we then had it in sourt for its own King records in G.A.77-1997 in which it also was stonewalling and continues to stonewall.

It is not by accident that the You avoids mention of the time I asked for information on the processing of the referrals in its 1/12/78 letter or can't state when it provided about a third of the referrals that are provided. It has a policy of building confusion and indefinetness into all correspondence.

I illustrate this with the most receive letter I have received from the FaI, its 9/18/78.

Aside from stating that a print is enclosed this letter reads, in full, "Reference is made to Freedom of Information Acts assessed (FOIAFA) request for Sx10 color copy of the photograph of the Texas School Fock Repository as taken by Mr. James Powell."

thy the time of the request is not stated is apparent to only those who have intinate knowledge of the request. It would not be apparent to anyone else realing the letter that my actual request, accompanied by a check, was about 1/1/68 or more than ten years and.

It would not be apparent that the request also included the relevant reports, still not provided.

It also would not be appoint that the FSU led Figley to as our Judge Gesell in C.A.77-2155 that it would comply promptly with all two dozen long-overage JAK requests mine months prior to the 9/18/78 letter and had not done so with regard to any of the requests. (I provided the Pepartment with a list when I testified to these long-over-due requests in 9/76 in C.A. 75-1996.)

the FM's file of correspondence that it has provided copies of this one picture to those who made recent requests without complying with my much earlier request for it. I received this print after I sent with Shea a copy of the most recent correspondence I had received from a recent requester who had already received the picture.

In all of this and in its compilations of statistics the FBL accomplishes much more than the applient objective of stonewalling and with regard to me westing my time and prealuding work it does not like. It wastes encrease amount of time and money of which it keeps careful if not inflated track so it can complaint about the cost of FGLA to it. The FAL and the Department have already wept this on the Congress and will continue to do so in further effort not to have to comply with the Act that requires it to disclose records of its own flaws and transgressions.

Merriely, 10		***************************************							13, 13v	
63		3	3	الع الع	N 83	200/	3,	ξ.	, Š.,	3
To Record	, ,	1	25	8	7		W	18	N	
60			04	6.5.			**** . <b>.</b>			8- 0
Exterior of 8/1/2			U U							
360	95.5	100.00	7	3 5	2	32				
an le les	8			10		`				(
60	7					9.	3	, c		7
Byon 6/8/28	\		\	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		•	3 6	γ ,	ζ.	0
after	٨	\	7 7	1			\ \	1 1		1
Lefour et 77	15	7		Commence of the control of the contr		R				718
70 of Totals	32.8	11.9	35.8	3.0	7.5	4.5	w. 0	0	7	5
Thember	8	00	24	N	1	w	7	1		67
houses	50	C18	State	NSA	A7F	Army	B.Pr.	185	T. 1	

and the same of th		23 24 24 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	
Forburg.	(6.00.7)	, w w	•
y u /w			
10 mo.	13 ms	1 2 2 7 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	251500327
NSA Army	3 P. F.	198 Demis	direct r
A Sency			ined for
Elapsed Time by Agency.  Du mo is  10 " 13  15 " 13	15 " 18 1	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	* An additional 10 referred for
E/20560	*	State	* An adding