

~~TOP SECRET~~ [REDACTED]

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REVIEW TEAM
ON THE HANDLING OF THE
LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY INVESTIGATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: (U) INTRODUCTION, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY,
MISSION STATEMENT, METHODOLOGY, AND
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A. (U) Introduction	1
B. (U) Executive Summary	2
C. (U) Mission Statement	14
D. (U) Methodology	18
E. (U) Acknowledgments	19
F. (U) Several notes about this report	21

CHAPTER TWO: ^(u)~~(S)~~ THE 1982-1984 INVESTIGATION OF WEN HO LEE

A. (U) Introduction	23
B. (U) The Relevant Facts	24
b1 1. (S) [REDACTED]	24
2. ^(u) (S) The initiation of a full FCI investigation of Wen Ho Lee	26

~~TOP SECRET~~ [REDACTED]

b1 |

3.	(U) (S) The background re-investigation and personality profiling of Wen Ho Lee	28
4.	(U) The interviews of Wen Ho Lee	31
5.	(S) [REDACTED]	36
6.	(S) [REDACTED]	37
7.	(U) (S) The January 1984 polygraph of Wen Ho Lee	38
8.	(U) (S) The March 1984 closure of the full FCI investigation of Wen Ho Lee and notification to DOE	39
9.	(U) (S) DOE formally learns in 1989 of the results of the full FCI investigation of Wen Ho Lee	43
C.	(U) Conclusion	45

b1 |

CHAPTER THREE: (S) [REDACTED]		
A.	(U) Introduction	47
B.	(S) [REDACTED]	49
C.	(S) [REDACTED]	53

CHAPTER FOUR: (U) OVERVIEW OF THE FBI'S HANDLING OF THE WEN.HO LEE INVESTIGATION		
A.	(U) Introduction	55

B. (U) Did the FBI assign a sufficient number of agents to the investigation? 59

C. (U) Were the assigned case agents the "right" agents for this investigation? 62

1. (U) SA [REDACTED] 63

 a. (U) The 1992 Inspection 64

 b. (U) Why SA [REDACTED] was assigned the Wen Ho Lee investigation 68

 c. (U) Consequences 71

2. (U) SA [REDACTED] 75

3. (U) SA [REDACTED] 84

4. (U) Conclusion 87

D. (U) The diversion of two agents 88

 1. (U) Introduction 88

 2. (U) The diversion 89

 3. (U) National Security Division's ("NSD") reaction to the diversion 98

 4. (U) Conclusion 99

E. (U) Were foreign counterintelligence investigations a high priority in the Albuquerque Division? 100

FBI
b7C
b6

F. (U) Was the case pursued aggressively and given the priority it deserved? Were there unnecessary delays? 104

- 1. (U) Introduction 104
- 2. (U) Prioritization of the Wen Ho Lee investigation 104
- 3. (U) Delays 107

G. (U) Were supervisory personnel in the FBI's Albuquerque Division appropriately engaged in directing and managing the case? 110

- 1. (U) Introduction 110
- 2. (U) Supervision at the SAC and ASAC level 113
 - a. (U) SAC Kneir 113
 - b. (U) SAC Weber 114
 - c. (U) SAC Kitchen 119
 - i. (U) Introduction 119
 - ii. (U) The Lueckenhoff briefing 120
 - d. (U) ASAC Dick 124
 - e. (U) ASAC Lueckenhoff 126
- 3. (U) Supervision at the Supervisory Special Agent level 129
 - a. (U) SSA [REDACTED] 130
 - b. (U) SSA [REDACTED] 138

FBI
b7c
b6

H. (U) Were supervisory personnel in FBI Headquarters' National Security Division appropriately engaged in providing guidance and direction to the field and in ensuring that the case was pursued aggressively and with the proper commitment of resources? 144

- 1. (U) Introduction 144
- 2. (U) NSD personnel 144
- 3. (U) What went right at NSD 145
- 4. (U) What went wrong at NSD 147
 - a. (U) NSD's unreasonable reluctance in 1995 to become involved in the investigation 148
 - b. (U) NSD's undue deference to DOE 151
 - c. (U) NSD should have recognized the flaws of the AI 156
 - d. (U) NSD personnel never appropriately addressed its problems with FBI-AQ's handling of the investigation 159
 - e. (U) NSD contributed to some of the delays in the investigation 164
 - i. (U) July 1995 to May 1996 164
 - ii. (U) June 1996 165
 - iii. (U) August 1996 166
 - iv. (U) August 1997 to December 1997 168

v. (U) February 1998 to April 1998 172

vi. (U) September 1998 to December 1998 172

f. (S) NSD's failure to contest [REDACTED] 176

 i. (S) Initial planning for the [REDACTED] 176

 ii. (S/NF) [REDACTED] 176

 iii. (u) (S) A problem arises 178

 iv. (S/NF) NSD's response to [REDACTED] concerns 179

 v. (S/NF) [REDACTED] 180

 vi. (S) The search [REDACTED] 181

 vii. (U) Discussion 182

g. (u) (S) NSD's problematic handling of matters related to FISA 184

 i. (u) (S) June 1997 184

 ii. (u) (S) December 1998 184

h. (U) NSD's mishandling of the computer issue 185

 i. (u) (S) NSD's exclusive focus on FISA and its unreasonable reluctance to take other critical actions 187

b1

- i. ^(U)~~(S)~~ The exclusive focus on FISA 187
- ii. (U) Consequences 189
 - a. ^(U)~~(S)~~ Failure to conduct a comprehensive financial analysis 190
 - b. ^(U)~~(S)~~ Failure to conduct selective interviews 190
 - c. ^(U)~~(S)~~ Failure to conduct trash covers 193
 - d. ^(U)~~(S)~~ Failure to conduct physical surveillance 194
 - e. (U) Failure to develop a plan or strategy for the interview of Wen Ho Lee 194
- iii. ^(U)~~(S)~~ Concerns about alerting the Lees 196
- I. (U) The impact of FBI personnel changes on the investigation 199
- J. (U) Communication problems within the FBI 202
 - 1. (U) The knowledge of senior NSD officials 203
 - 2. (U) Information provided to Director Freeh 206
 - 3. (U) Where the briefings failed 213
 - 4. (U) Where the briefings succeeded 217
- K. ^(U)~~(S)~~ NSD's failure to recognize and address the danger posed by Wen Ho Lee's continuing access to nuclear weapons secrets 219

~~TOP SECRET~~ [REDACTED]

(U)
CHAPTER FIVE: (S) THE FBI'S CONDUCT OF THE PRELIMINARY
INQUIRY ON WEN HO LEE: APRIL 1994 to NOVEMBER 1995

b1

- A. (U) Introduction 222
- B. (S/NF) [REDACTED] 222
- C. (S) The preliminary inquiry 225
 - 1. (U) (S) Full investigation versus a preliminary inquiry 225
 - 2. (U) (S) The time period covered by the preliminary inquiry 226
 - 3. (U) (S) What was done in the preliminary inquiry 227
 - 4. (U) (S) What was not done on the preliminary inquiry 229
 - 5. (U) Lack of supervision 231
- D. (U) (S) Conclusion of the preliminary inquiry 232

CHAPTER SIX: (U) THE PREDICATE

- A. (U) Introduction 234
- B. (U) (S/NF) OERI'S initial concern that the Chinese were achieving
rapid progress in their nuclear weapons program 238
 - 1. (U) (S) The April 25, 1995 [REDACTED] memorandum 238
 - 2. (U) (S) The May 25, 1995 [REDACTED]
memorandum 239

DOE
bb,
D7C

~~TOP SECRET~~ [REDACTED]

DOE
b6, b7C

~~TOP SECRET~~

3. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) OEI reacts to the [redacted] memorandum 242

C. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) OEI's formation of a working group to evaluate the Chinese intelligence and assess whether United States nuclear information had been compromised 244

D. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) KSAG's review of the Chinese nuclear weapons program 250

 1. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) The July 10, 1995 KSAG meeting 250

 2. (U) A round of briefings 253

 3. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) The July 26, 1995 KSAG meeting 255

 4. ~~(S/NF)~~ ^(U) The August 16, 1995 KSAG meeting and the walk-in document 259

 5. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) The September 7, 1995 final KSAG meeting and the September 8, 1995 bullets 264

E. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) OEI's inaccurate portrayal of the working group's conclusions to the FBI 269

 1. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) OEI's reaction to the KSAG bullets 269

 2. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) OEI's September 13, 1995 meeting with the FBI 275

 3. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) DOE's September 25, 1995 letter to the FBI 275

 4. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) OEI's October 31, 1995 briefing to the FBI 278

F. ~~(S)~~ ^(U) OEI'S own counterintelligence section received the same inaccurate briefing on the KSAG's conclusions 283

~~TOP SECRET~~

(u)
G. (S) DOE's investigative plan and OEI's misrepresentation of
KSAG's conclusions 289

(u)
H. (S) Missed opportunities to discover the inaccuracies in the
OEI briefing 297

1. (U) Missed opportunity #1 298

2. (U) Missed opportunity #2 300

3. (U) Missed opportunity #3 302

4. (U) Missed opportunity #4 304

5. (U) Missed opportunity #5 305

I. (U) KSAG's briefing of Deputy Secretary Charles Curtis on
May 17, 1996 308

(u)
J. (S/NF) The reexamination of the predicate in light of the CIA's
withdrawal of the walk-in document 313

K. (U) The FBI's inadequate review of the investigation's predicate 317

(u)
L. (S) The CIA's independent assessment of the Chinese nuclear
weapons program 325

1. (u) (S) An NSC request for a CIA assessment 325

2. (u) (S) Background and limitations of the CIA assessment 326

DOE
b6, b7c 3. (u) (S) [REDACTED] to the CIA 328

4. (u) (S) The CIA assessment paper 330

DOE
b6, b7c

5. ^(u)~~(S)~~ The FBI addendum to the CIA assessment 332

6. ^(u)~~(S)~~ [REDACTED] 333

7. ^(u)~~(S)~~ The October 15, 1997 NSC briefing 334

8. ^(u)~~(S)~~ The FBI's failure to recognize the significance
of the CIA's assessment 335

M. ^(u)~~(S)~~ The impact of the inaccurate predicate upon the FBI's investigation
and current developments 336

**CHAPTER SEVEN: (U) THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S ADMINISTRATIVE
INQUIRY: SEPTEMBER 1995 TO MAY 1996**

A. (U) Introduction 339

B. (U) The FBI's undue deference to DOE 343

1. (U) Notification to the FBI of the decision to conduct
an Administrative Inquiry 345

 a. ^(u)~~(S)~~ DOE's first notification of the compromise
 to the FBI 347

 b. (U) DOE's second notification of the compromise
 to the FBI 349

 c. ^(u)~~(S)~~ DOE's third notification of the compromise to the FBI 350

2. (U) Discussion 350

- C. (U) The purpose of the Administrative Inquiry 351
 - 1. (U) The FBI's understanding of the AI's purpose 352
 - 2. (U) OEI's understanding of the AI's purpose 353
- D. (U) The Administrative Inquiry's investigation 355
 - 1. (U) Interviews conducted during the AI 355
 - a. (U) [REDACTED] 357
 - b. (U) [REDACTED] 358
 - c. (U) [REDACTED] 361
 - 2. (U) Records reviewed during the AI 362
- E. (U) SA [REDACTED] contribution to the AI 363
 - 1. (U) Question #1 366
 - 2. (U) Question #2 366
 - 3. (U) Question #3 367
 - 4. (U) Question #4 368
 - 5. (U) Question #5 368
- F. (U) The draft AI reports and the two complete AI reports 369
 - 1. (U) The draft AI report on March 13, 1996 370
 - 2. (U) The draft AI report on March 22, 1996 370

DOE
b6, b7C |

DOE
FBI |
b6, b7C

DOE
b6, b7c

- 3. (U) The draft AI report retrieved from [REDACTED] computer disk 371
- 4. (U) The complete AI report, marked "Pending," and signed by [REDACTED] 371
- 5. (U) The complete AI report, marked "Closed," and transmitted to the FBI 373
 - a. (U) The removal of the investigative plan 374
 - b. ^(U)~~(S)~~ The Lees' selection as "the most logical suspects" 374
 - c. ^(U)~~(S)~~ The removal of [REDACTED] name 375
- G. (U) Consequences 376
- H. (U) The recent racial and ethnic allegations against the Administrative Inquiry 381
 - 1. (U) How Wen Ho Lee came to be identified as a suspect 382
 - 2. ^(U)~~(S)~~ [REDACTED] June 1995 investigative plan 385
 - 3. (U) The AI's acquisition of names 386
 - 4. ^(U)~~(S)~~ The final AI report transmitted to the FBI 386
 - 5. (U) Other indications of a lack of racial bias 387

b1

DOE
b6, b7c

CHAPTER EIGHT: (U) THE FBI'S INVESTIGATION OF WEN HO LEE AND SYLVIA LEE: MAY 1996 TO APRIL 1997

A. (U) Introduction 389

B. (U) The full investigation begins 389

C. (U) The July 1996 meeting 391

D. (U) June 1996 to March 1997 investigative activities 391

E. (U) A shared responsibility 394

F. (U) Conclusion 395

CHAPTER NINE: (U) THE SEARCH OF WEN HO LEE'S COMPUTER

A. (U) Introduction 396

B. (U) The relevant facts 399

 1. (U) Wen Ho Lee's access to, and movement of, some of the nation's most sensitive nuclear weapons information, using his LANL computer 399

 2. ~~(S/NF)~~ Wen Ho Lee's [REDACTED] and the opening of the 1994 preliminary inquiry 404

 3. (U) Waivers, banners, booklets, and other documents bearing upon the expectation of privacy of computer users at LANL 407

b1

DOE
b6
b7c

- 4. (U) SA [REDACTED] discussions with [REDACTED] and the advice from NSLU 414
- 5. (U) SA [REDACTED] learns of the significance of Wen Ho Lee's access to computer files, and nearly discovers Lee's waiver 428
- 6. (U) The investigation is re-assigned to SA [REDACTED] who gathers more information on the significance of Wen Ho Lee's computer access 431
- 7. (U) SA [REDACTED] assembles information concerning Wen Ho Lee's computer for use in the FISA application 435
- 8. (U) SA [REDACTED] arrives at the Albuquerque Division and is assigned to be the FBI's liaison with LANL 439
- 9. (S/NF/RD) [REDACTED] 442
- 10. (U) Banners remain the focus into 1999 until Wen Ho Lee's LANL computer is finally searched, with Lee's consent 444
- 11. (U) The discovery that Wen Ho Lee had taken the "crown jewels" 446
- 12. (U) The discovery of Wen Ho Lee's April 1995 "Rules of Use" waivers 447
- 13. (U) The LANL computer systems used by Wen Ho Lee 450
 - a. (U) The open and secure systems 451
 - b. (U) The logs generated by LANL computer systems 453

FBI
b6, b7c

b1

c. (U) LANL's NADIR System 455

d. (U) LANL's help desk and Lee's questions 457

e. (U) Electronic mail 459

C. (U) Legal analysis 460

CHAPTER TEN: (U) THE FBI'S INVESTIGATION OF WEN HO LEE AND SYLVIA LEE: APRIL 1997 TO JUNE 1997

A. (U) Introduction 472

B. (U) The April 15, 1997 meeting 474

b1 C. ~~(S)~~ Discussion of the [REDACTED] 476

(U) D. ~~(S)~~ Preparation for a FISA application 478

CHAPTER ELEVEN : (U) THE DRAFT FISA APPLICATION: JUNE 1997 TO AUGUST 1997

A. (U) Introduction 481

B. (U) A brief chronology 484

C. (U) Draft #3 met the "probable cause" standard 491

 1. (U) Introduction 491

 2. (U) The governing law 494

a. (U) Probable cause 494

b. (U) Agent of a foreign power 496

3. (U) The contents of Draft #3 499

 a. (U) The factors supporting probable cause 500

 b. (U) The factors not supporting probable cause 509

 c. (U) Analysis 510

4. (U) The principal arguments against probable cause 515

 a. (U) The "matrix" was inadequate 515

 b. (U) Wen Ho Lee's affinity was for Taiwan, not
 the PRC 516

 c. (S) [REDACTED] 516

 d. (S/NF) [REDACTED] 517

 e. (S/NF) [REDACTED] 518

 f. (U) Lee's visits to the PRC and the IAPCM were
 not clandestine 518

 g. (S/NF) [REDACTED] 519

b1

h. (U) Lee's efforts to bring a PRC national into LANL
were innocent 519

5. ^(U)~~(S)~~ Draft #3 included serious, if unintentional, misrepresentations
of fact 520

6. (U) How the FBI could have made Draft #3 much stronger 522

 a. ^(U)~~(S/NF)~~ What really happened on February 23, 1994 522

 i. ^(U)~~(S/NF)~~ [REDACTED] 523

 ii. ^(U)~~(S/NF)~~ [REDACTED] 525

 b. ^(U)~~(S)~~ What the FBI could have and should have included
 about the 1982-1984 full investigation of Wen Ho Lee 529

 c. ^(U)~~(S)~~ What the FBI could have and should have included
 from Sylvia Lee's personnel and security files 531

 d. ^(U)~~(S)~~ What the FBI failed to explain about the 1986 and
 1988 trips to China 533

 e. ^(U)~~(S)~~ LANL CCIO [REDACTED] memorandum 534

7. ^(U)~~(S)~~ "The Pink Mouse" 535

8. (U) The matter of "intermission" 538

9. (U) The destruction of OIPR's records 540

10. (U) Conclusion 541

b1

DOE b6, b7C

CHAPTER TWELVE: (U) THE FISA "APPEAL": AUGUST 1997

A. (U) Introduction 542

B. (U) The Seikaly Review 545

C. (U) Analysis 547

D. (U) Conclusion 551

CHAPTER THIRTEEN: (U) THE FBI'S FULL COUNTERINTELLIGENCE INVESTIGATION OF WEN HO LEE AND SYLVIA LEE: AUGUST 1997 TO DECEMBER 1997

A. (U) Introduction 552

B. (U) FBI-HQ 552

 1. ^(U)~~(S)~~ The "take that right off the table" meeting of August 12, 1997 553

 2. ^(U)~~(S)~~ The September 1997 CIA report 557

 3. ^(U)~~(S)~~ The December 1997 teletype 558

C. (U) FBI-AQ 560

CHAPTER FOURTEEN: (U) THE FBI'S INVESTIGATION OF WEN HO LEE AND SYLVIA LEE: DECEMBER 1997 TO AUGUST 1998

A. (U) Introduction 563

(U)
 B. (S) The December 1997 teletype 565

(U)
 C. (S) Wen Ho Lee's March 1998 trip to Taiwan 572

b1 D. (S) The [REDACTED] 573

 1. (U) A brief chronology 573

 2. (U) The scenario 577

 3. (S) What was wrong with the planning of the [REDACTED] 579

 4. (S) Execution of the [REDACTED] 587

 a. (S) [REDACTED] 588

 i. (S) [REDACTED] 588

 ii. (S) [REDACTED] 589

 iii. (S) [REDACTED] 592

 b. (S) Analysis of [REDACTED] 592

 c. (U) (S) Wen Ho Lee's failure to report 594

 d. (S) (U) Wen Ho Lee's meeting with [REDACTED] 596

DOE
b6, b7c

DOE
b6
b7C

~~TOP SECRET~~ [REDACTED]

(U)
i. (S) [REDACTED] 598

(U)
ii. (S) Lack of candor 599

5. (U) Conclusion 600

CHAPTER FIFTEEN: (U) THE FBI'S INVESTIGATION OF WEN HO LEE AND SYLVIA LEE: AUGUST 1998 TO DECEMBER 1998

A. (U) Introduction 601

B. (S) The [REDACTED] 602

1. (U) Introduction 602

2. (S) How did it take eight months [REDACTED] 602

C. (U) The events leading up to the DOE/Wackenhut interview and polygraph of Wen Ho Lee on December 23, 1998 610

D. (U) Discussion 615

b1
|

CHAPTER SIXTEEN: (U) THE FISA RECONSIDERATION BY OIPR: DECEMBER 1998

A. (U) Introduction 619

B. (S) The significance of the [REDACTED] 619

C. (U) The December 22, 1998 meeting 624

D. (U) Conclusion 627

b1

~~TOP SECRET~~ [REDACTED]

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN: (U) THE FBI'S INVESTIGATION OF WEN HO LEE AND SYLVIA LEE: DECEMBER 1998 TO MARCH 1999

A. (U) Introduction 629

B. (U) The December 23, 1998 interview and polygraph of Wen Ho Lee 631

C. (U) The suspension of Wen Ho Lee's access to classified material 633

D. (U) The 30-day deadline 635

E. ^(U)/~~(S)~~ The FBI's failure to obtain the polygraph charts 636

F. (U) The January 17, 1999 interview and January 21, 1999 signed statement of Wen Ho Lee 640

G. ^(U)/~~(S)~~ The January 22, 1999 communication from FBI-AQ to NSD 641

H. ^(U)/~~(S)~~ The FBI Polygraph Unit's review of the DOE polygraph 644

I. ^(U)/~~(S)~~ The February 10, 1999 FBI polygraph of Wen Ho Lee 647

J. (U) The March 5, 1999 interview and the March 7, 1999 interrogation of Wen Ho Lee 648

K. (U) Conclusion 651

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN: ^(U)/~~(S/NF)~~ WEN HO LEE'S CONTINUING ACCESS TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS SECRETS THROUGHOUT THE COURSE OF THE FBI INVESTIGATION

A. (U) Introduction 653

B. (U) An "Access" chronology 654
C. (U) Discussion 679
D. (U) Conclusion 687

CHAPTER NINETEEN: (U) THE STATE OF KNOWLEDGE, AWARENESS AND PARTICIPATION IN THE INVESTIGATION BY DOJ'S CRIMINAL DIVISION

A. (U) Introduction 688
B. ^(U)~~(S)~~ A goal of the investigation was prosecution 689
C. (U) The Attorney General's July 19, 1995 memorandum and the FBI's notification obligations in the Wen Ho Lee investigation 692
D. (U) OIPR should also have notified the Criminal Division 696
E. (U) Notification 697
F. (U) Why the Criminal Division was not notified 700
G. (U) Consequences 701
 1. ^(U)~~(S)~~ Verification of the predicate 702
 2. ^(U)~~(S/NF)~~ The source of the walk-in document 702
 3. (U) The case against Wen Ho Lee 703
 4. ^{b1} ~~(S)~~ The [REDACTED] 704
 5. (U) The interviews of Wen Ho Lee 705

H. (U) Conclusion 706

CHAPTER TWENTY: (U) "PRIMARY PURPOSE" AND THE SHARING OF INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION AMONG THE FBI, OIPR, AND THE CRIMINAL DIVISION

A. (U) Introduction 707

B. (U) The relevant facts 711

 1. (U) The "legislative history" of the Attorney General's July 19, 1995 memorandum 711

 2. (U) Interpretations of, and compliance with, the Attorney General's July 19, 1995 memorandum 721

 a. (U) The notification provision of the July 1995 memorandum 723

 b. (U) The advice provision of the July 1995 memorandum 727

 i. (U) The so-called "negative advice" limitation 727

 ii. (U) "Negative advice" and "primary purpose" 728

 iii. (U) "Negative advice," when applied to the entire investigation, inevitably means "no advice" 730

 3. (U) Meetings with the Criminal Division 732

C. (U) Legal analysis 734

- 1. (U) The Criminal Division need not be excluded from an FCI investigation in order for the "primary purpose" of the FISA surveillance to be to obtain foreign intelligence information 735
 - a. (U) The primary purpose certification applies to the FISA coverage, not to the underlying investigation 735
 - b. (U) While the primary purpose of FISA coverage must be to obtain foreign intelligence information, criminal law enforcement may be a secondary purpose, although, for prudential reasons, this is not where the line should be drawn for fashioning policy on the giving of advice 738
 - c. (U) The Criminal Division may give affirmative advice and guidance concerning issues relating to the FCI investigation 743
- 2. (U) The test is "primary purpose," not "direction and control" 745
- 3. (U) There is no reason for an unduly apprehensive application of the "primary purpose" standard 751
- D. (U) Recommendations 753
 - 1. (U) The AGRT's interim recommendations 753
 - 2. (U) Additional recommendations 755
- E. (U) Proposed revisions to the Attorney General's July 19, 1995 memorandum 759

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE: (U) RECOMMENDATIONS

- (U) Recommendations 763
- (U) A note concerning these recommendations 779