

638 Royal Street,  
New Orleans,  
La. 70130  
June 10, 1968

Dear Sylvia,

The L.A. Free Press arrived today; many thanks.

I have been able to glean a little bit more information for you about Lane's latest dishonesty. In the first place, I have been unable to confirm that there is any truth at all to what Lane says from those I have spoken to in the D.A.'s office, namely, Jim Alcock, Louis Ivon, and Andrew Sciambra. They all said that they knew nothing about it, but did not categorically state that there was no truth to it.

anti- I called Epstein on Friday, (to inquire about the New Yorker piece, which he says has been postponed two or three weeks by the latest assassination,) and he was able to shed more light on the episode. He said that two RFK aides did go and see Garrison, but not in connection with the Warren Commission; according to Epstein, RFK was looking for political support in Louisiana, ie ~~an~~ Humphrey support from within the Democratic structure in Louisiana. These two aides, apparently approached Garrison with this end in view. Epstein did not say who these two were, and I am not sure if he knows. It also appears quite doubtful if Garrison was approached at RFK's request; Epstein said that when Walter Sheridan heard that Garrison had been approached, he (Sheridan) was displeased.

I received a phone call from the editor of the New York Free Press today, and he said that they are about to run an article by Lane, describing this episode. The editor, understandably, wanted confirmation from the D.A.'s office, which I did not give him. I simply told him that I knew nothing about it, and that no-one else in the office seemed to either. (I did not repeat the info from Ed.) He then added that Mark Lane had told him that he (Lane) had called Garrison on Saturday and told him of his plan to write this piece, to which Garrison (according to the editor, who has it on Lane's word,) gave his consent. Meanwhile, Garrison is in Miami, "raising funds", he told me on Sunday.

When I saw Garrison briefly yesterday I did not specifically question him about the story; (he would undoubtedly have given me an evasive answer.) Nor did he mention it. He made some remarks which indicated that he regarded the JFK & King - RFK assassinations as all being linked, eg. "They've done it once too often," etc.

Speculating, I would say this: On the one hand it is quite possible, in the context of a political approach which Ed says 2 aides made, that they might have made some conciliatory remarks to Garrison such as, "Jim, we want you to know that the Senator is much more interested in what you are doing than his ~~public~~ public statements would indicate," (pure guesswork, but I would be prepared to bet that something like that was said.) On the other hand, it is a virtual certainty that they did not say what Lane alleges. Epstein specifically said they said nothing about a conspiracy, etc. Also, from my knowledge of the way Garrison treats red hot information, there is no doubt at all that no such remarks were ever made to him. For one thing, if they had been, Garrison would have been perfectly justified (for once) in calling a press conference and delivered the startling message to the world. In fact he has made no public statement about RFK's death.

Meanwhile, the whole situation seems to become more and more unreal and deplorable. I am aghast at the make up of the President's ~~Crime Control~~ Violence Commission, from whom we can expect optimistic re-assurances, and vacillation on the gun control problem, (rapidly becoming a private cause of mine.)

Best wishes  
Tom