JL: FEE referrals in C.A.75-1996; FEE 9/12/78 letter on BW 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 FMI'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 comevmient 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 extreordinary 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 FMI 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 sake me a different kind of tabulation based on the PMI's table, to tabulate what the PMI avoided tabulating and what I was continually complaining to the FMI about, the time required by the referrels. 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 admitional 25.1%, while these figures are distorted by my wife's inclusions of the duplicates provided with the 9/12/78 (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 begun the previous September. Thus the FBI's can figures octually 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 reformals 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-lonf PRI delay in making the referrals. The first itemized records originating outside the Department show this. All three are in the earliest fections processed, 4, 6 and 7. The time of processing them is approximately deptember 1976. The time of processing them is approximately deptember 1976. The time worksheet notation that they had been referred to the CIA then in fact they were not referred until the following farch 17. The first CIA response was not until the mext year. I received these records June 6,1976. And this date coincides with the CIA's need to make some response because we then had it in court 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 Yell avoids mention of the time I asked for information on the processing of the referrals in its 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 I have received from the FBI, its 9/13/78.

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

Why the time of the request is not stated is apparent to only those who have intinate knowledge of the request. At souls not be apparent to anyone else reading this latter that my actual request, accompanied by a check, was about 1/1/68 or more than tan years ago.

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

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

Of course it also would not be apparent to acycse in the Espartment reviseing the FRI's file of correspondence that it had provided copies of this one picture to those who made recent requests without complying with my such earlier request for it. I received this print after I sent guin 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 end in its compilations of statistics the Fal accomplishes much more than the apprent objective of stonevalling and with regard to me wasting my time and presoluting 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 FOLA 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.

muse	Tumber	Port .	Refore	after		81	and he	13	the	Just 1			
1 . 1	7		17,	177	178	16	8/78	2	8/28 10	Keleous 10		themale	1
50	S	32.8	15	1	4	74	21 955			20	300		
18	00	11.9	7	1		4	100	13			1		
State	77	25.0			-		- 1			8	00		
		23.0		7	,		7.	3	3 65.8	2	300		
NS A	7	3.0		N		-	5	1					- 1
ATE	`	1				-				n	33		
		0.		\			383	9			3		
Army	3	4.5	R		0.0	9					100		
100	r				3				11	9	3		
	1	0		N	4							3	
581	1	0		1						N	ł,		
1		No.			Y					ſ			
	1	1.5			3				5 ·	Y		ſγ	1,2
	60	-						/	r_		7.		
		2 20	118	1	0			1	-				

			23 /ke / 24 / 25 / 25 / 25 / 25 / 25 / 25 / 25	1
			31.6	
3				
NN	m '	Ν	111	`
10 mg/	13 ma	9 me.	1 5 7 7 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	16 m.
NSA Army	ATF	B Pr.	1.95	AF
30		*		
1 m m	1 ' 1	100	i / m/2	
DJ / me. 2 185 mg.	Nu.	100	Stole 1 me. 133	