## JL: FRI referrals in U.A.75-1996; FBI 9/12/78 letter on IN 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 analysis a hasty glance at the covering letter and the FBI'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 FBI statistics is an answer to almost anything and a componient 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 gits the fourth item in the chart, one of the curliest Serials in the burkin 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 than required another 15 months for the FRI to write as - after my repeated complaints - that I would receive direct response from the CIA. This means, assuming that I have received the record, that it took almost two additional years.

So I asked by wife to sake me a different kind of tabulation based on the Fil's table, to tabulate what the FBI avoided tabulating and what I was continually compleining 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 weaks I received an adaptional 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 sand this to you I'll ask her to make the convection and will attach it.)

I broke the time at before and after june 1977 because the processing of the Burkin record was about completed them. The processing is to have began the previous September. Thus the FBI's can figures ectually usan that as of the time of the completion of the processin. I had received only about a third of the refervals. Of the 106 reformals I had received 59.

Throughout the period of processing I was asking about these refermals. The FAI 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 FEI's statistics disclose an additional reasonalds the Department show this. All three are in the carliest fections processed, 4, 6 and 7. The time of processing them is approximately September 1976. "emptte the worksheet notation that they had been referred to the CDA them in fact they were not referred until the following "arch 17. The first CDA response was not until the maxt year. I received these records June 6,1976. And this date coincides with the CDA'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 Vol avoids mention of the time I asked for information on the processing of the referrals in its  $\frac{9}{12}/78$  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 1 have received from the FBI, its 9/18/78.

Aside from stating that a print is enclosed this letter reads, in full, "Reference is made jo Freedom of Information Acts request (FOIAEA) request for Sx10 color copy of the photograph of the Taxes School Jock Depository as taken by Mr. James Powell."

Why the time of the sequest is not stated is apparent to only those who have intinite knowledge of the request. "I would not be apparent to anyone else reading thi latter that my actual request, accompanied by a check, was about 1/1/68 or more than the years are.

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

It also would not be applint that the Fit led Figley to assure Judge Genell in C.4.77-2155 that it would comply promptly with all two dogen long-overage JMM requests mine months prior to the 9/18/78 latter and had not done so with regard to any of the requests. (I provided the Separtment with a list when I testified to these long-overdue requests in 9/76 in C.4. 75-1996.)

Of nourse it also would not be apparent to acycae in the Espartment reviseing the FBI's file of correspondence that it had provided copies of this one picture to those who made recent requests without complying with my much sarlier request for it. I received this print after I sent Wuin Shea a copy of the sost 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 tos Sol accomplishes much more than the apprent objective of stonewalling and with regard to me wasting my time and prealuding work it does not like. It wastes enormous amount of time and money of which it keeps careful if not inflated track so it can complaint about the cost of FOIA to it. The FAI 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.

+ 1 vi regenere to	67	I-BI	Referrald	40	÷
--------------------	----	------	-----------	----	---

gency	Thember Referred	no of Totab	Before	after elgg	Bifore 6/8/78	2 %	Qn 6/8/78	120	after 6/8/78	70	Intal Released	: 70	Kenial	10 1
DJ	22	32.8	15	7	1	4.5	21	95.5			22	1000		
-1A	8	11.9	7	1			8	100.0		1		100 0		
itate	24	35.8		24	1.1			4.2	and the second second second second	q5.8		100 0		
VSA	2	3.0		2		1	2	100.0		45.		the second se		
9TF	1	1.5		1		1	and the second sec					100.5		
rmy	3	4.5	2			1.0		1000		-ceneral d	1	1000		
Pr.	2		~		3	100.0				1	3	1.4 0		
RS		3.0		2	2	100				3		100		45.
100	4	6.0		4	2	51.0		1						
F	1	1.5		1						1		50 <sup>3</sup>	2	5
	67	1000	24	43	9	13.4	324	2	24 3	10	65 1	i ce 9		
DJ CIA		by Age 8 13 22 7 8	N A A B	Pr.	13 ma	2 1 1 1 1 1		C	Combin	1 2 7	Mc	42213	2 6.0 3.0 3.0 1.5 4.5	3
state	1 me.	/	IR	15	2 m.	1				11	1.00	22	16.4 34.3	

\* An additional to referred for direct response