

3/1/74

Dear John,

*Luella  
Newswick*  
This is why I phoned you yesterday:

The morning before I spoke to a friend at the Post, having seen the indications the WG defense would allege the grand jury had no legal right to issue a report, to give him precedent under these defendants. He thought it important and ran to the city desk, from which I heard no more and to which I had offered the records of my obtaining the proof.

It was the Chicago ~~Black~~ Black Panther report. I had obtained the copy I have from DJ in Washington.

Not uncharacteristically and true to the competitive spirit of modern journalism, the story I suggested appears today, properly emasculated.

Three of the seven defendants did or probably did have direct connection with this precedent counsel now claims to be non-existent. Mitchell was AG, Gardner was his Internal Security assistant and Ehrlichman was domestic-affairs WH chieftain.

Naturally, they seek the best of all underworlds.

There are kickers that in my abandoned youth would have been considered news:

The Mitchellists had political objectives, not legal ones, in this report, obviously not drafted by that grand jury (250 pp.), to get at their "enemies" -

The Panthers, who the report falsely claims aborted indictments (of these the most obvious is perjury and obstruction of justice, open and shut) and thus denied themselves justice;

All Illinois Democratic politicians, from Daley to the DA, whose ~~stump~~ <sup>properties who did the</sup> ~~stump~~ <sup>properties who did the</sup> killing and the framing (one is fascinating in my files, the honcho, Ben Groth);

And to hide DJ culpability through the FBI's informer, William F. Seal, Jr., based on whose inside reporting the whole deal was set up.

Further possibility: the claim is that Hampton was drugged. Question: by FBI fink on the inside?

My last week's call was to remind of what you may have forgotten and what was not in the indictments (from the Post's contraction of them), several aspects of 3/21/73 only one of which came up at last night's press conference. I think these were more than news, but I am prejudiced. To me the indictments are more on the Hum Hum side than the Gee Whiz and I solicit holding me to this opinion. I have not seen the story Newswick has been advertising on radio rather heavily. It may see this as the living end. I don't. I can show you old analyses bearing on this, prepared long ago. And scores of pages of official records bearing on probabilities and past records.

My calls have had nothing to do with the negative I expect, if anyone takes the trouble. You know my lack of expectation. Nor were they to embarrass you. There were merely an effort to be helpful with no quid pro quo. However, when you have not returned the last two calls I take this as a sign you'd be just as happy that there be no more. I don't mind the saving of that much time for me.

Nor do I mind not getting the one thing for which I asked that required any effort, Haldeman's notes of 6/20/72. I do not need them for my work. I wrote that stuff last summer and see no need for any revision. I visualized the possibility of being helpful to other by examining his memorable words.

Nor do I mind being cast as a pariah. I have enjoyed that status for a decade.

As I take no offense I intend none. You and Mel work for others.

Sincerely,