5/28/72

Dear Paul,

I've written Bradlee several times recently, not involving you in any way. However, in a letter of today I enclose a carbon of a piece I did in haste for The National Enquirer, not knowing who else would consider it. I don't know that they will, but it is angled for them. I enclosed it because I consider it relevant to the comment I made on today's editorial article and the Hamm piece. It deals with the threat of which, in confidence, I gave you a copy a year ago. On the remote chance he reads it and wonders why you didn't suggest a feature or something, remember that you were under wraps on it. I asked him to give it to you. It embodies only the simpler part of the deciphering that seemed not unreasonable.

You've been busy. I've phoned a number of times, each time with a possible story in mind. It seems less and less likely that we'll be getting together for any length of time in the near future, even more improbable that we'll be able to go over your questions about Frame-up, which I do want, or about Frank's work, which I also want for an entirely different reason.

So, of the possible stories with which I returned from my recent trip, let me tell you of one that I think just might interest the Post. John May was charged with driving the getaway car in a bank robbery. Stoner handled his defense, conducted no investigation, and had more to do with conviction than did the prosecution. In this case, as the result of an acknowledgely illegal search in Portland, Ore., a large sum of money was retrieved. That followed a non-police shootout in which one of the alleged robbers was killed. Another alleged one, not hurt, Ronald Goldenstein (Goldie) ran to the room of the killed one, got his luggage (with which a whore was leaving), and took that to his room, where it was seized. Used in the trial with considerable effect, conspicuously on the table before the jury at all times, it was the basis for reversing the case against Goldie. But as used against John May, who was not in Portland, it was held to be admissible. The court of appeals has affirmed the conviction. I have spoken to the court-appointed attorney, Robert A. Rampe, 727, St. Louis, 621-1701, who finds the decision incredible and precedent. He filed a 50-page petition for cert with the Supreme Court about a month ago. In non-criminal as well as criminal cases the potential of this decision is limitless. Especially, I would think, in political cases, and of them those that might be brought under the new conspiracy law. With Mitchell's rewriting of the Sixth Amendment, the possibility of revolutionizing basic law without enactment or amendment of the Constitution seems clear to me. It is frightening.

From what John claims, he was framed by the FBI in a parallel of the search of the JFK limousine. The police searched his car and found nothing. The FBI then searched it and found a finger of a glove matching the description of one said to have been used by a robber. (Why wear fingerless golves to avoid leaving prints, or cut a finger off afterward?) Planting evidence is not uncommon. The Shaw defense even alleged it to be a Garrison intention.

Best regards,