[illegible]

I do not think you are aware of [illegible] the overwhelming concern of [illegible] anti-Garrison position. While your editorials and articles [illegible] to Garrison must be clear to yourself, or you wouldn't be printing them, I think that they are equally clear to many of your readers.

I am here with the feeling that you are finding yourself obliged to [illegible] to the primary thing or things which prompted your change in position [illegible] leaving you with the problem of having to explain why I suppose [illegible] wherever you are that from. Please understand that I am not questioning [illegible] or honesty of the here. What I am doing, I think, is telling you what [illegible] consequently your case you have been building against Garrison in such a [illegible]

But more important than that: Most of all I am wanting to remind you of [illegible] thing which you certainly know quite well. And == all good reporters == [illegible] suspicions of whispered things. Whispering and [illegible] are very important, and when Manny Ain't No Object== As I see it, all you [illegible] anybody [illegible] a dupe is the reverence required to do that. And remember one [illegible] number: A dupe is not a dupe except when he does not suspect that he is [illegible] an extreme thought, huh?)

[illegible] a TAC subscription doesn't give me the right [illegible] to run [illegible] but anyway let me make a suggestion or two. If you print [illegible] look them over a couple of times before going to press -- [illegible] that what I'll be read, and how can be read, the way you would want them to be [illegible] don't do that much, better maybe you should leave [illegible] them reflect what you had had in mind to print. Another suggestion is [illegible] make an invitation to some genuine pro-Garrison critic to write a pro-Garrison piece for TAC. How about Mark Lane, for instance, who used to write TAC articles? I don't know a free E any more, at least I am [illegible] will have been named a few better pro-Garrison case today than TAC makes no such Garrison case. And I would like the name Jon Harold Goldberg, to name another candidate.

An [illegible] feature of a real, genuine pro-Garrison article appearing [illegible] would be your advantage of being able to print your own [illegible] to it in the [illegible] issue. And, for that matter: if you should receive an invitation to a [illegible] under such terms and then have it refused, it would be a thing you could [illegible] as evidence. It would further your own case, I mean -- and what more would you [illegible] for? And as for my readers, I guarantee that it would [illegible] considered.

I enjoy TAC very much, and I am happy to live in a land where [illegible] and exist. And I hope this situation will continue to [illegible]. We [illegible] to go by, perhaps TAC could be an indicator for us. We, the readers, could [illegible] ourselves the validity of your articles and editorials as based upon the [illegible] vided within them. Then, if we noted some warp upward trend in [illegible] to support themselves -- we would then know when we ought to [illegible] run for the hills.

Pardon this critical letter. I hope you will understand that it is [illegible]

Sincerely,

Steffen Sorensen