

21 September 1968

Mr. Steffen Sorensen  
10118 - 63rd Avenue North  
Seminole, Florida 33540

Dear Mr. Sorensen,

I have just received the copy of your letter to Mr. Arnoni dated 15 September. It is not clear from the copy whether or not the original will indicate to Mr. Arnoni that a copy was directed to me, among others, but in any event I have not discussed your letter with him and wish, quite deliberately, to comment on it before any conversation as to the contents. I say this in order to make it clear that this letter reflects solely my own views.

Another question which is not clear from your letter is whether your criticism was directed to the editorial in the present and previous issues of TMO, or also to my article "Three Assassinations" insofar as it related to Garrison. I proceed on the assumption that my article was included.

At the outset of our correspondence in March this year, you expressed bewilderment at my position on Garrison and you asked me to clarify my views. After I replied, enclosing copies of letters to editors of various periodicals in which I had given chapter and verse to demonstrate Garrison's lack of scholarship, factuality, truthfulness, and credibility, you wrote to express your unhappiness. You said, in your letter of 30 March 1968, that you "had put Garrison in a class with God, or the next class to it," and that it was not pleasant for you to hear what you did not want to hear. You said, at the same time, that the material I had sent you was edifying. This led me to hope that you had de-deified Garrison and would henceforth regard him with the same sceptical intelligence as you had applied to the Warren Report or, for that matter, to swamp gas.

Your present letter to Mr. Arnoni therefore surprises me enormously, if I may say so. You speak of the "conspicuously poor case" which is being built against Garrison in the pages of TMO. In my article in the current issue, I denounced the story, told by Mark Lane and conditionally corroborated by Garrison, of the so-called "emissaries from RFK." Perhaps you did not consider my arguments conclusive or compelling; but let me point out that Lane's allegations were unaccompanied by any arguments or evidence of any description. Did you write to him and ask him to defend his allegation about the emissaries from RFK? Or is it only the criticism of his allegation that constitutes a "conspicuously poor case"? Let me recall that shortly after Lane's first book was published, he said publicly that a spokesman for RFK had sent a message to Trevor-Reper telling him to keep up the good work; but that Trevor-Reper categorically denied Lane's story. Let me recall also that in the current issue of the Los Angeles Free Press, the editor publicly retracts and apologises for a two-part story by Lane published there about four weeks ago.

My article, in common with Arnoni's editorial in the current TMO, implicitly and explicitly endorses the charges against Garrison in Epstein's article in the New Yorker (while expressly denouncing Epstein's apologia for the Warren Report in that article). Garrison, as Warren before him, found it beneath his dignity to refute the specific charges in the New Yorker article. Will you please tell me why Garrison is relieved of the responsibility of confronting explicit charges, while Warren is rightly branded as bankrupt of any justification for his Report for failing to confront explicit charges against it?

Garrison's clique, on the other hand, did rush to the typewriter to attack the Epstein critique. I have read published counterattacks on the Epstein article by Turner, Richard Popkin, Mark Lane, Shankar Ghosh, Mrs. J. A. Field, Harold Weisberg, and still others. Not one of their vehement articles in defense of Garrison even attempted to deal with the extremely damning charges with respect to Perry Raymond Russo. Not one of them even attempted to exonerate the fabricated evidence of the "code" 19106. Nor the epileptic seizure victim. Nor the so-called destruction of the CIA memorandum by thermofax. Etcetera.

The combined default of Garrison and his acolytes to refute the cardinal charges of subornation of witnesses, falsification of evidence, and persecution or defamation on cynical and self-serving grounds of innocent victims, sustains and corroborates these charges to any impartial observer. But to anyone who places Garrison "in a class with God," mere fact and logic in their inexorability constitute a mosquito bite on the elephant of devout faith.

I do not understand at all your caveat to Arnoni to ~~haha~~ beware of "whispered things." What in the world do you mean? I know Arnoni well enough to be absolutely certain that his position on Garrison is based on nothing except his own independent evaluation of Garrison's own words, writings, and deeds. And I know this especially well because there was a time when Arnoni and I held somewhat differing views on Garrison and I could not move him one inch.

Now it is true that Arnoni or I, or anyone else, while possessing massive and irrefutable arguments and evidence on a particular issue—say, the Vietnam war, or riots in the cities—may nevertheless fumble or falter to the point of making a poor case for an excellently founded position. If you were saying that, in effect, in your letter, I would certainly not shrink from self-examination or realization that I had not presented the facts coherently. But this is not at all the purport of your letter. On the contrary, you commit the presumption of suggesting that Arnoni (and I, by implication) is a "dupe" fallen victim to unspecified "whisperings" from a source to which money is no object. This is patronizing and offensive, in itself, but especially unbecoming from someone who uncritically, naively, gullibly, and avowedly "had put Garrison in a class with God." Apparently you still do so, undismayed by the factual evidence I sent you at your request in March and by the unrefuted, unanswered, and damning charges in the New Yorker article.

As to your opinion that Lane makes a far, far better pro-Garrison case than the anti-Garrison case made by TMO: Any unconscionable liar and demagogue can make a "good" case on any question, constrained only by the limits of his inventiveness and immorality, and assisted by the easy seductibility of an audience only too ready to "believe." Obviously, there are no "genuine pro-Garrison critics" to write for TMO or any other publication—there are "genuine pro-Garrison spokesmen" (who would buy the Brooklyn Bridge if it had not been sold already) and genuine critics, who reject from friend and foe alike colorful fictions about the assassination, violation of fact and logic, intellectual confusion, and the effrontery of answering documented charges with contrary personal conclusions, which are unsupported and insupportable.

Your reproach of a "conspicuously poor case" should have been directed to The Great God Garrison. Insofar as it is intended for me, I will be willing to discuss it only at such time as you demonstrate that the facts I have set forth in personal correspondence or in my published work are incorrect. But facts, please, as I do not kiss Warren's ring, or Garrison's.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher