

MUN 107

23 AUG 63

TO RICHARDSON  
FM SMITH

23/1428.

REUR NYC 107. SORRY TO RETURN AGAIN TO THIS ONE, BUT REALLY AM PUZZLED WHY THIS ITEM WAS REJECTED. WE FULLY AGREE THAT THE ITEM DOES NOT PROPERLY FALL UNDER "(4) MESSAGES AND TALKS," AND COULD ONLY COME UNDER "(5) ALL OTHER BROADCASTS.....WILL REQUIRE PRIOR SPECIFIC APPROVAL FROM THE OFFICE OF THE FEC DIRECTOR IN NEW YORK". MOST OF THE ITEMS ON SUBJECT USED IN PAST PROGRAMMING HAVE COME UNDER THE SAME CATEGORY. SINCE THIS ONE HAS BEEN REJECTED CAN YOU ADVISE US IF SOME CHANGE OF POLICY IS INVOLVED OR WHAT SPECIFICALLY CAUSED THIS STATEMENT TO BE DISALLOWED WHEN OTHERS HAVE BEEN PASSED? ALL OF US ARE VERY CONSCIOUS OF THE CONTINUED NEED TO HANDLE THE SUBJECT PROBLEM WITH UTMOST CARE, HENCE IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THERE IS FULL UNDERSTANDING OF PERTINENT CONSIDERATIONS TO GUIDE US IN FUTURE REQUESTS.

BECAUSE OF PAST EMBARRASSMENTS AND DIFFICULTIES THE PEOPLE ON THE DESK HAVE JUST ABOUT GIVEN UP ANY EFFORT TO MENTION THE SUBJECT, BUT DROPPING OUT ALL SUCH MENTION DOES HURT OUR STATUS AND CREDIBILITY AS YOU FULLY APPRECIATE. THE MORE WE KNOW OF THE REASONS, THE BETTER WE CAN AVOID GETTING INTO FUTURE EMBARRASSMENTS ANY MORE THAN ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY.

END MSG