

10118 63rd Ave North
Seminole Fla 33540
15 Sept 68

Mr M S Aronzi
TMO

...etc
HAROLD WEISBERG
MARK LANS
HELEN HARTMAN
SYLVIA MORGAN :00

Dear Mr Aronzi,

I do not think you are aware of ~~the~~ the unconvincing nature of TMO's recent (since Oct '67) anti-Garrison position. While your editorials and articles relating to Garrison must be clear to yourself, or you wouldn't be printing them, I do not think that they are equally clear to many of your readers.

I am left with the feeling that you are finding yourself obliged to omit references to the primary thing or things which prompted your change in sentiment re Garrison - thereby leaving you with the problem of having to scrounge up "supporting" details wherever you can find them. Please understand that I am not questioning the integrity or honesty of TMO here. What I am doing, I think, is calling your attention to the conspicuously poor case you have been building against Garrison in your pages.

But more important than that: Most of all I am wanting to remind you of something which you certainly know quite well. But we all need reminders: Be always suspicious of whispered things. Whispering can take many forms - especially when it is very important, and when Money Ain't No Object. As I see it, all you need to turn anybody into a dupe is the resources required to do it. And pardon an additional reminder: A dupe is not a dupe except when he does not suspect that he is one. (What an awesome thought, huh?)

Owning a TMO subscription doesn't give me the right (dammit) to run your magazine, but anyway let me make a suggestion or two. If you print more anti-Garrison articles, look them over a couple of times before going to press - making sure in your own head that they will be read, and can be read, the way you would want them to be read. If you can't do that much, better maybe you should leave some lily-white blank columns rather than print what you had had in mind to print. Another suggestion is that you might make an invitation to some genuine pro-Garrison critic to write a pro-Garrison article for TMO. How about Mark Lans, for instance, who used to write TMO articles? While I don't know A from B any more, at least I can still tell that Lans makes a far, far better pro Garrison case today than TMO makes an anti Garrison case. And I would say the same for Harold Weisberg, to name another candidate.

An incidental feature of a real, genuine pro-Garrison article appearing in TMO would be your advantage of being able to print your own reaction to it in the same issue. And, for that matter: if you should provide an invitation to a guest article under such terms and then have it refused, it would be a thing you could crow about in an editorial. It would further your own case, I mean - and what more could you hope for? And as for us readers, I guarantee that it would hold us spellbound.

I enjoy TMO very much, and I am happy to live in a land where TMO can be published and sold. And I hope this situation will continue to last. To pick out a rule of thumb to go by, perhaps TMO could be an indicator for us. We, the readers, could decide for ourselves the validity of your articles and editorials as based upon the arguments provided within them. Then, if we noted some sharp upward trend in the failure of articles to support themselves - we would then know when we ought to drop everything fast and run for the hills.

Pardon this critical letter. I hope you will understand that it is a friendly one.


Sincerely,

Staffen Sorensen

Staffen Sorensen

STEFFEN SORENSEN
10118 - 63rd Avenue N.
Seminole, Florida 33540

Tenants
35 Castle Rock Drive
Hill Valley, Calif
94941



26 September 1968

Mr. Steffen Sorensen
10118 63rd Ave. North
Seminola, Fla. 33540

Dear Mr. Sorensen:

This is to thank you for marking us in on your letter to Mr. Arnoni. You express very well our feeling that neither Mr. Arnoni nor Mrs. Meagher have spelled out their full reasons for criticizing Garrison.

As a newsman I would have to be the last to say that Garrison or any other district attorney is above criticism, being aware to the point of jaundice how the zeal with which these avenging angels pursue ~~the~~ mad dog criminals in our midst never is altogether unalloyed with self-interest.

The self-interest in Garrison's case, while seemingly clear at the start, has dwindled to what looks like less than nothing as he has run into more and more opposition. And as he himself says, if this is such a hell of a goldmine for an ambitious politician, why has no other politician worked it?

It seems to us that Mr. Arnoni only muddies the water even more in the September TMO with his article on demonologists and eunuchs. He accepts at face value Epstein's extremely skillful attack on Garrison, without raising a single question as to the validity of the various points Epstein purports to raise, yet Arnoni himself goes on to delineate what he calls Epstein's lack of intellectual integrity. His failure to apply this yardstick to Epstein's criticism of Garrison is, to me, a glaring omission.

Actually, the Epstein article in the July 13 New Yorker may provide a clue to why both Arnoni and Mrs. Meagher -- along with many thousands of others, thanks to Epstein's incredibly slick job, -- find Garrison and his approach intolerable. The Epstein piece is exquisitely trimmed to the limited amount of information the press and other media generally have carried on what has been going on in New Orleans. The stark fact is that unless you take a New Orleans paper and clip it religiously there is no way on earth for anyone not living in New Orleans to know just what and how much has gone on there. The New York Times, for instance, is one of the worst offenders in this respect. It carries a story now and then, but the continuity and interrelationships of the various news items are totally lacking. I think Mr. Arnoni and Mrs. Meagher simply don't know what has been happening, except in the general way they are intended to know, which of course makes little sense indeed. I'm not saying Garrison hasn't made mistakes; he has. But he also has learned all along the way and he has, after all, done what no other public official has done.

I'd be ungrateful indeed if I did not say here, too, that as far as Mr. Arnoni and Mrs. Meagher are concerned, none of us ever can begin to repay what we owe both of them, and anything I have said about them is in spite of that.

Thank you again for thinking of us.
Sincerely,

James D. White
35 Castle Rock Drive
c: Mrs. Hartman Mill Valley, Calif. 94941