

Dear Jim,

3/4/84

It appears that I have ways of getting letters from the FBI, which is to put on paper what they can see as embarrassing to them, and to give Metcalfe something he cannot deal with easily. It is transparent that Hall sent me the enclosed after getting my letter to you, with a covering letter to him and one to Metcalfe. There are other unanswered letters he could have pretended to respond to but he managed to pick the one that underscores the deliberateness of their dishonesty and intent not to be responsive.

And isn't it nice for Metcalfe, when he has something he can't handle, to abdicate and transfer the appeals function to the agency whose failures are the subject of the appeals?

It is necessary, with the FBI and its need to lie to follow policy, to examine each and every word. In their effort to make it appear that they could not understand what I wrote they had to make a change in what I did write and to quote what I did not write. They just made referrals "from" the CIA into referrals "to" the CIA.

They have still another problem in this and that is the FBI records referred back from the CIA include JFK assassination records, the FBI's letter to me so describing them, and you have it, that the FBI did not disclose in its general disclosures and that without much possibility of doubt at all will include and/or refer to Dallas and New Orleans records not disclosed. It is for this, among other reasons, that you may want to cue Lynch in. Please try to remember FBI investigative practice: the office of origin is the funnel to FBIHQ. Dallas was office of origin and New Orleans was a virtual second OO.

I keep rubbing the KGB disclosures in because they not only withhold from me whatever they gave Oglesby for the specific purpose of having him give it to the KGB but because they have argued to the Congress that they need relief from FOIA to keep the KGB from getting FBI and CIA records.

As of now I'm sending Metcalfe no covering letter, only a xerox of this to Hall. How hamhanded he is, to let Hall reply for him a second time!

I have not reminded them of it recently because they may fix upon another lie in the appeals office but I filed a number of Nosenko appeals and as I recall it, with attachments of FBI records. I have no record of any action on those appeals. I also never got any further word after the FBI notified me in 1978 that there was \* then an ongoing review of Nosenko records. One of my appeals, which I did not read but caught my eye as I was retrieving only the most recent correspondence, refers quite specifically to the Hart testimony that the CIA had authorized the disclosures to which he testified, so as of then there has been no basis for withholding any such records.

At least one other Nosenko request was for the information disclosed to Epstein. As I now recall it the FBI turned that down as requiring it to do research for me. Not only is obviously false, these being copies of what was disclosed in the FOIPA separate file (and I'd guess in the reading room), but I also appealed that, again without response.

While it may be that I did not respond to Hall's 8/24/83 when I wrote you about it the next day, if it does not take more than a moment for you, would you please check your file for that day and see if I did? But this is not important enough for you to take more than a moment. The rest is overwhelming enough.

It may be that they are just stonewalling but I'm inclined to suspect that they have their own reasons for withholding what the CIA referred back long enough ago for it to have been processed and disclosed.

Best,