

June 26, 1968

Dear Sylvia,

Enclosed is a letter from Harold Weisberg which appeared today in Open City.

I received your letter to Shaw's attorney's some time ago. Did you ever get a response on that? I thought it was very well put.

I had exactly the same reaction that you did to Lane's RFK story. The only trouble is that this type of story is hard to "disprove". I was tempted to call Tom Bethel at home and ask him about it. In any event, even assuming that he is one of your "inquiries" mentioned in your letter of 6/7, it is impossible to cite him as "proof" without jeopardizing his position. If there is any way disprove this story ~~XXXXXX~~ that does not jeopardize a particular individual, I would like to know.

About two weeks ago, I had my first telephone conversation with Ray Marcus in about 5 months. I'd like to tell you about some of the details in a future letter, for the way he argues is symptomatic of the way the garrisonites reason. But this RFK incident did come up. He immediately asked me if I could prove it wasn't so; he said that he couldn't prove it was so, as if that proved something. Most of the time was spent by him shouting at me that I was "helping the murderers of John F. Kennedy" by writing about Garrison.

On the RFK incident: it has occurred to me that story might be one shade less than an outright fabrication if there was some individual, totally unqualified to speak for the Kennedy's, who took it upon himself when visiting New Orleans, to approach Jim Garrison and speak for them. Of course, I don't know. I do not believe the incident is valid. I understand that at a citizens committee meeting this week, ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ a tape was played in which Elliot Mintz interviews Jim Garrison, who confirms and backs up Lane's story.

Bill O'Connell is out of town now doing a picture. He won't be back for about 2 months. When he returns, we will be doing a program ~~XX~~ on Garrison, centering on Thornley. I'm sure we'll do anything we can at that time to deal with this story. A few friends of mine are becoming convinced that Lane is simply an outright "tactical" liar. Today, someone pointed out to me the utter absurdity of Lane's first story (which had RFK protecting the assassin, and attacking him for doing so) as contrasted with this story. How could he *write* the first one in the tone that he did, if all the time he was privy to this secret information on RFK's "secret position"? I thought that was a good point.

I'll be writing more as time permits. I'm involved in the printing end of the book project now. (Today, the New York Times called me, as a result of my mailer to Harrison Salisbury, and ordered a copy.)

I also read your article in TMO. Rather prophetic, since you predicted another assassination, and then it happened.

I am also enclosing a copy of ~~XX~~ letter Kupferman sent me. I hadn't realized his position was so "soft". Is this new?

*Re your letter of 6/7:* The fellow who wrote me was Gary Schoener. He has since written me again, and seems quite sincere in wanting to know about anything I have written on Garrison and Thornley. I am going to send him my Open City articles; beyond that, I will have to be quite careful, I well realize.

Sincerely *Conrad*