

SFChronicle

MAR 6 1975

Widow Sues

U.S. Over

Chotiner Death

file 18 Feb 75,
with SFC 18 Feb 75 [UPI],
"Nixon's Lawyer Fought
Indictment."

6 March 1975

Donald Reed
News Editor
United Press International
Suite 901, Twin Towers
8585 N. Stemmons
Dallas, Texas 75247

Dear Mr. Reed:

I'm a former APer from San Francisco who has been Watergate-wallowing since retirement and who is having some difficulty with an apparent ambiguity in the lead of the enclosed UPI story from Ft. Worth as handled by the San Francisco Chronicle for Feb. 18, 1975.

First of all, I am all too aware that the Chronicle may have taken liberties with your story. However, as it stands, I would assume its meaning to be that during the month between Nixon's resignation and pardon his attorney, Miller, appealed to Jaworski not to indict Nixon, period.


However the element of propinquity in the lead makes it more than possible to interpret it to mean that Miller appealed to Jaworski not to indict Nixon during that particular period between the resignation and pardon. The trouble with this latter interpretation is that it seems to imply Jaworski's prior knowledge of the pardon. I doubt that UPI intended any such implication, and in any case would think that if Jaworski actually had any knowledge of the coming pardon he'd be the last to admit it now.

Can whoever wrote the story recollect, at this late date, what actually was meant ?

I hope this doesn't seem to be nitpicking, and if it does I can say that if I were engaging in criticism of leads I wouldn't begin with UPI. You'll agree, I think, that the possibility of prior knowledge of the pardon on Jaworski's part would not be trivial.

Sorry for any trouble this may cause, and the customary return cover is enclosed to ease any pain.

Fraternally, and with thanks,


James D. White
35 Castle Rock Drive
Mill Valley, Calif. 94941