

5/4/84

Your Supplemental Memorandum in 82-1229 and your letter to Hubbell, both good, came today.

If experience told me that decisions are based on the law I'd have no apprehensions about the Reagan-appointee panel we have. As a matter of law there is no real question.

However, I can see this panel holding against us on some of the government's lies that you entirely ignored. In fact, I anticipate it.

If you have another occasion for a similar letter I suggest you include another possibility coming from disclosure of JFK assassination records that are withheld: support for parts of the government's position. Thus benefit to the government of that kind.

An illustration from the King case is what Chastain dubbed the Eggs and Sausage Man, his assassin or co-conspirator. There was absolutely nothing to this but from his point of view it was reasonable and probable. That story got wide public attention after he wrote it. But in fact there was no such personage in the case, even if he did eat at Jowers' at a time that attracted Jowers' attention. He was only a college student, as the withheld FBI files I got leave without any doubt at all.

Disclosure is necessary without regard to the belief or point of view advanced by the information. It works both ways.

The more the government discloses the less mistrust of it there will be. People keep asking if the government has nothing to hide, why does it hide so much? Can't tell you how often I heard this from collegiate and other audiences, including business and professional.

Best,