0322 - photos

3/9/81

Mr. Thomas H. Areason, Chief FOIPA Aranch FAI Washington, D.C. 20535

Dear "r. Bresson,

With your letter of March 6, 1981, there are 21 not 23 photographs. Your letter states, ". . . 25 photographs of estatial which ware submitted for spectrographic analysis." It does not state that these photographs represent all that was submitted to spectrographic analysis in the JPK assessination investigation and is fact they do not represent all. So while what you have sent may be argued to be responsive "to number 18 of your request," in fact they do not. They also do not on the additional ground that these are not photographs of that was submitted to spectrographic analysis. "Jou have provided photographs of the entire object, like the ulothing, but not of what was analyzed.

In all cause the FM has gent out of its way to wante succey and provide wanecessarily unclear photographs. This was accomplished by not using the existing negatives and instead making photographs of the existing photographs.

I regret that you did not see fit to include a list of these asterials, by their C numbers, so that I would not have to do extensive research to make proper identification.

Some of these photographs are so unclear it is not yossible to identify the points from which maples sere removed for testing, as with Governor Connally's shirt.

One photograph is mostly of what was not tested and includes so much on so small a scale that the photograph of what was tanked is meaninglass. On this even the C mechanic cannot be made out with certainty. Individual objects in it are not easily identified, some can't be at all. I know what a back brace is from having worn one for years, so I dur guess the Fresident's in included in that picture, but I cannot make out the acc bandage, with which I am also familiar from use. The shoes, socks, thousers, belt, comb and other gameents were not tested, from the available records, but the tie yes. Only this particular photograph was selected not to show where the sample was taken. Any comparison photograph at all is missing. There is no picture of either the part of the front of the President's shirt that was tested or even of the front of the saint itself. (ind going clong with this I have received nothing periodning to the additional testing that former SA Robert Frazier testified on deposition he had made by a other SA.) In fact the colliger was tested and in fact the FBI Lab took closeny pictures of that area.

If a the needlessly unclear photo of (1 (Sullate 399) shows one of the points from which metal the taken for apportrographic analysis. I cannot determine this even with magnification. The paint from which the other specimen was removed is included in the picture but nothing can be made out about it. No plate photograph of either specimen Was provided.

This represents the exact opposite of the FHI's protenses in G.A. 75-226. It represents again shy this eldest of all FOIA cases and the first filed under the asanded act is still before the courts. If the FHI's purpose is to perpetuate its stonewalling, then it is pursuing that purpose. But if the FHI intends to do whet it can to end this litigation with compliance, that is in no way reflected in your letter of the sluth and its anchemes.

With regard to C.A. 70-0322 and the agreement reached with the office of the Associate attorney General, I received a latter fine you toward the end of last year, with the dub of a tape. You stated that I would be receiving various photographe. I have not. I an reachded of this by a Dellas news story reporting that the former Mary Moorman has filed said against the Gaugness to get her photograph back. Although the FRI appears to have gene out of its way to not let it be known, the Dallas office did make copies of her pictures. I do not know if they were, more secondly, sent to FRIHQ. I do know they have not been provided to me under this agreement. I would like to be informed when 12 may support the pictures and other tapes to be provided.

Sinceroly,

Harold Weisburg