

Dear Howard,

5/7/77

Your 5/2:

Priscilla Johnson: I'M unclear but think here original NANA story on LEO was published in the 26.

There is significance in the Soviets having told LEO not to grant interviews as there is in its suppression by all US officials. It is entirely in accord with what Nosenko said and entirely opposite their capitalizing on a defection.

There need be no significance in her trying to talk Oswald out of what he said he was doing. If ordinarily this is not the function of a reporter it represents the typical anti-Soviet and patriotic reportorial stance in the USSR.

Earlene Roberts: No need to check the 26. I used what you refer to in WW. She did make a statement and it was published in the 26.

I think this reduces to what is journalistically acceptable today. ^{It}act in and of itself is not. Newness or the appearance of it in documentary form is. The newness here, as I've made clear to my friend Bill, lies not in the fact but in the form of the Roberts' info, to-now suppressed Secret Service records.

If they are interested this permits the use of the not-new but factual, the time reconstruction, the Bowley affidavit and the Hoover letter, which was also suppressed.

I would not argue with out over whether or not the police tapes had been listened to. I would point out that police keep other records, in writing, logged. One of these would be the phone call on Tippit, which preceded the radio broadcast. I wish I could remember my source and how it is filed on this!

By now you are aware that I agree with you on my and all other misreadings of the Hoover letter on the Oswald voice. You alone perceived this correctly. I have not only written others about it, carbons to you, but I discussed it at some length yesterday with ^{Ms.} Whitten.

If he is ever in touch with you, you can depend on his keeping his word. He also does not run the column. He was unaware of the content of this one, probably because he was off making a speech somewhere when it was filed. He had not gone for it when Mark spoke to him about it. I had told him truthfully when he asked that Sprague used it in his final press conference and that it was on coast-to-coast TV as well as the wires. But here again you have Anderson going not for the fact but for the form, as above.

What I proposed to Bill is legitimate and is by prevailing standards newsworthy. It is ~~the~~ the only way this information can be printed today, too.

Thanks and best,