Dear Mr. Sorensen,

One says so automatically "thank you for your letter of X date, which I enjoyed very much" that it becomes difficult to discover a phrase not yet become stale and meaningless on those infrequent occasions when a letter really gives substance to the mind and pleasure to the heart. I greatly valued a long letter that Mrs. Hartmann sent me a few days after the assassination of Robert Kennedy, because it shone with thoughtfulness, integrity, and courage, but I doubt if my reply really conveyed my feelings. Now I have your marvel of a letter of the 15th, with its many moods and levels of discourse and its pervasive wit, altogether a delight and stuffed with compliments to which I respond, like any Pavlovian dog, with reflexes of gratification and gratitude.

But if I am to justify your hope (and my own) that I am an honest person, I have to disclaim the reasoning which you reconstruct as an applaudable explanation of my position on Garrison. It is close, but not exact. In many respects, my thinking tends to be simplistic rather than convoluted or multidimensional; and on the level of honesty and/or truthfulness, I am especially simplistic. The Warren Report, which tried to be so cunning and manipulative in so clumsy and transparent a manner, and which betrayed such disrespect for the reader's intelligence, incensed me beyond I suspect that a good part of my wrath can be traced to a feeling description. of personal insult, and thus to personal vanity, although I think most of it was objective and impersonal outrage at the falseness and injustice of the damned Garrison, who supposedly is "on our side" in resisting and denouncing the deceit and falsification and injustice, enrages me even more (if that is possible) when he engages and extends still further the obnoxious and despicable practices in which the Commission engaged.

For the WR's Mrs. Helen Markham, Garrison has given us Perry Russo. injected himself into the case by going to the TV news people at Baton Rouge, in the first instance, and telling a story which has little in common with the one to which he testified at the Shaw hearing. That story (of the party in Ferrie's apartment) is inherently without credibility; then, it turns out, it is completely in conflict with the story he gave Sciambra, Garrison's assistant, when he first (This was made public by Jim Phelan in an article in, I believe, Then, Garrison gave us Vermon Bundy. When his own assistants urged him not to put Bunday (or perhaps it was one of the later "witnesses") on the stand because they, the assistants, were convinced he was lying, Garrison replied that if the man wanted to perjure himself, that was his business. Next. Garrison gave the sensational news of the "code" (P.O. 19106), which betrayed his unprofessionality as an investigator (failing to check in Dallas to determine whether there was such a P.O. box or such a real person as Lee Odum) and his clumsiness as a practitioner of the common shell-game, since all he was doing was adding and subtracting arbitrary numbers to arrive at an ultimate number on which he had decided in advance and which he could have reached in one simple step by the same abritrary and artificial manipulation that he performed in multiple stages.

That cumulative record was enough to prove to me that Garrison was a complete charlatan, a manipulator of evidence, and a man who was ready to frame a suspect against whom he had no shred of legitimate evidence. At that point, which was May 1967, I repudiated Garrison as an unscrupulous and dangerous man. I would have done so, on these grounds, no matter whom he was accusing. Conversely, if he had had credible evidence against the same motley assortment of freaks, Cuban exiles, etc., I would accept it, however much it collided with my own prior suspicion of a higher-level or other-colored set of culprits. What it boils down to, however ineptly I am saying it, is that truth is the be-all and the end-all and an imperative in and of itself, unconditionally.

esemin Now, in this particular case, it happens that one effect of Carrison's lies and improvisations is exactly as you diagnose it, to divert and trick the public into accepting a low-level conspiracy by some twilight world kooks and deviates or mercenaries, when the circumstances appear to point to a far more sinister cabal whose implication in a presidential assassination would cause a national upheaval of awesome proportions and unknown destination. This becomes a secondary or consequential reason for "wanting Carrison castrated" (what I had in mind myself was having the tongue pulled out by the roots, but okay, dealer's Another such collateral reason, and again I emphasize that it is not the governing element, is that his loud-mouth fulminations and his sensationalism and his sophomoric and often laughable performance as a prosecutor/investigator or a political polemicist threaten to discredit ALL critics and ALL research and ALL challenges to the Warren Report, and thus to destroy the painfully-won credibility (such as it is) that the serious critics achieved after laborious and cruelly long struggle. Still another reason, but this one emerged only relatively recently, is what I now realize is Garrison's technique of harrassment, entrapment, and prosecution of individuals out of sheer vindictiveness, if they frustrate him in some way, or in anticipation of giant page-one headlines.

But these are, as I say, consequential and collateral to the decisive and cardinal issue of Garrison's dishonesty and fraud, which I would denounce with the same insistence no matter what effect it had in terms of public complacency and even if, through some miraculous twist, it heaped the critics with honors fame and fortune instead of threatening to reduce them to Garrison's own low estate of professional and personal quality.

I have not knowingly held back in anything I have written about Garrison nor concealed or diluted my thinking. I have written as fully and as openly as I was able what I think and feel about Garrison, and have limited myself in one respect only--That is, I have made my arguments solely on the public record and excluded information which came to me confidentially or information which I could not document or whose source I could not specify. All such information will be published, and soon, but by those who elicited and developed it and were good enough to share it with me. I do not think that I have merely speculated on whether certain witnesses were good or bad, as you put it: what I did, or at least what I intended to do, was to repudiate them as undeserving of credence and to be dismissed out of hand. I do not think there is the smallest possibility of Garrison turning out to be "right" (although I see the real danger that he will convince juries, since he has succeeded in convincing an arch-sceptical groups of critics that his feverish inventions and improvisations have some real Nor do I want to argue about the effects of his speculations if they are publicly accepted as true, and which effects you pinpoint quite rightly, since that shifts the area of contention away from the inherent wrongness and inadmissibility of lies over to their positive or negative implications for a particular point of view or a particular hypothesis. Philosophically one can argue (as some of my former colleagues in fact did argue) that a lie which leads us into a golden age of peace and brotherhood is a small price to pay, etc. I can only counter with my simplistic notion that no genuine good can ever come from falsehood and immorality or compromise of what is true for some illusory end.

Enough, enough! I don't know if I have even said clearly what I tried to say, so let me revert to Hartogs...I am dying to know if you, too, came up with T---'s G---- A--. DID YOU? Arnoni vacillated about printing it (it was explicit in my original ms.) and finally decided to be provocative and make readers figure it out for themselves---but I haven't met one yet, except you, who was curious enough to try. He is away on avvisit to Israel but I will let him read your letter when he gets back next month, for the great delight I feel sure it will give him. He is a person of unnamenable unparalleled spirit and brains

--with a ferocious and unyielding independence, a great zest for life, a forcefulness which can be overwhelming, and an awesome adversary. He also has some faults and imperfections, but they aren't worth mentioning.

I have gone on much too long, and will have to leave the light pulbs and other durable subjects for a later time. If you have not defrocked me (???) meligible subjects for a later time. If you have not defrocked me (???) (hell with it) for my unsatisfactory Carrison judgment, I year and the content of the

But there are, as I say, consequential and colleteral to the decisive and certinal issue of leaveron's disponently and frame, which I would decounce with the same lastificate on author what effect it had he read of cubic complanents and even if, through some after addoubt triet, it heard to access with hunors fame and furture before all the continue to reduce the indicate one law estate of or formal as the same and college.

I have not knowledge lead leads the anythicker I have rait on about here were nor concessed or scluston of Scienting. I have writing as Saliv and an engager p. 10 opro bedimil oval has antalexal take level to the latt T anda Ada as I as ons respect ordy---Mark as There asks say sayurents within the public report one excluded the cuttoristic reports on se contitue the contraction actions to the contraction actions and excluded the contraction actions. could not document of any and I could not operate. columnated formally will be published, and each, but by times who eld about an developed in and wear good enough to show if with we. I do not think that I have appeals you taked on whether correct when I ald, or the self what I intended to do, who he regulated them has been draged declines and all examples to the final term of the constant so the solutions and the constant solutions and the constant solutions and the constant solutions are constant to the constant solutions and the constant solutions are constant to the constant solutions and the constant solutions are constant to the constant solutions are constant and constant solutions are constant to the constant solutions are constant and constant solutions are constant and constant are constant and constant solutions are constant and constant are constant and constant are constant and constant are constant and constant are constant are constant and constant are constant are constant and constant are constant are constant are constant and consta persibility of the rate terming out of he dight? (Attempt) I was the rail damper that he will convince judges, slade has succeeded in convincing an arch-scaptions here omce eyed sanitive transmit has each losted as transl of their entities to sanows in anomala de la la la grante edit tuore degene de l'in l'al en l'in l'al en l'acharhenoi they are publically consequed as enter and which effects you purpoint quite rightly, since that shirts the area of contention away from the inherent wrongeess and insdached bility of item to the contider or negative isolications for a partiacular point of read or a purthardar byrectionals. Initiosophically one can និងនៅ មាន ប្រធាន ប្ ប្រធាន and the first of the state of t Above groupe in the second of the second of the second of

្នុទ្ធបានក្នុងស្ថិត ប្រធិន្តិសំខេត្ត ប្រើប្រធានការប្រជាជា ប្រធានការប្រជាជា ប្រែការប្រើប្រាប់ ប្រធានការប្រើប្រ ខេត្ត ប្រជាជា មានប្រជាជា ប្រែក្បាន សេចប្រើប្រឹក្សា ប្រជាជា មានប្រើប្រឹក្សា ប្រធានការប្រជាជា ប្រឹក្សា មានប្រើប សេចប្រជាជា មានប្រើប្រើប្រឹក្សា សេចប្រើប្រឹក្សា មានប្រឹក្សា ប្រើប្រឹក្សា ប្រឹក្សា ប្រឹក្សា ប្រឹក្សា ប្រឹក្សា មានប្រឹក្សា មានប្សាស មានប្រឹក្សា ម

Meagher 302 West 12 St NYC NY 10014 Mr. Steffen Sorensen

10118 - 63rd Avenue North
Seminole, Florida 33540 VIA AIR MAIL