

THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC. 155 PENNINGTON AVENUE/P.O. BOX 544, PASSAIC, N.J. 07056, U.S.A./CABLE: TEMO PASSAIC, NEW JERSEY

February 8, 1967

Mrs. Shirley Martin
Box 226
Owasso, Oklahoma

Telephone No.: 201/778-1539

INDEPENDENT MONTHLY FOR AN
AMERICAN ALTERNATIVE
DEDICATED TO THE ERADICATION OF ALL
RESTRICTIONS ON THOUGHT

BOARD OF SPONSORS:

DR. GUNTHER ANDERS
PROF. DANIEL M. BERMAN
DR. JEROME DAVIS
W. H. FERRY
PROF. D. F. FLEMING
REV. STEPHEN H. FRITCHMAN
MAXWELL GEISMAR
BRIG. GEN. HUGH B. HESTER,
U.S.A. (RET.)
AVA HELEN PAULING
PROF. LINUS PAULING
BERTRAND RUSSELL
PROF. FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN
DR. ALBERT SCHWEITZER †
PROF. PITIRIM A. SOROKIN
PROF. ALBERT SZENT-GYORGYI
T. H. TETENS
SIR ROBERT WATSON-WATT
PROF. ERNEST B. ZEISLER †
EDITOR M. S. ARNONI

Dear Mrs. Martin:

With your letter of February 3rd, you have greatly compromised your sense of fairness. To imply that TMO would not publish a reader's letter because "it did criticize TMO rather much" is either to expose one's implied familiarity with the letters published in our pages as a false pretense or to prove terrible judgment when one's vanity is involved. For certainly immensely more critical letters than yours have appeared.

If you were a more careful accuser, you would have noted that our February issue went to press even before you wrote us the letter whose non-inclusion caused you to draw so many conclusions. On p. 2 of our February issue you could have found the notification that "this issue's deadline was December 31, 1966"; your letter was written on January 2, 1967. It so happens, that your letter is scheduled for publication in the very first issue to go to press after its receipt--the March issue. Here enclosed is a galley proof.

May I, please, in return have your apology, with proper notification of it to those to whom you sent copies of your February 3rd letter?

You are writing utter nonsense about the RFK-LBJ deal. Unlike you, we have not heard of that deal from any "sources." Nor have we engaged in "gossip or innuendo." No, we have no "proof, actual physical evidence" at all; but we do have heads, and since we are not Kennedy

sycophants we saw no reason why not to use them for some intelligent dissection of events, speculation, etc., precisely as these intellectual endeavors are practiced in all the rest of political analysis.

Yes, indeed, truth is relative, not absolute. Liars have found great solace in this philosophical conclusion and they misconstrue it to mean that there is no difference between a relative truth and a lie. Well, they should read Leibnitz. Others have a so warped perception of man and life, they are such practitioners of a uniquely American brand of existentialism--which to them is a theory of mind manipulation--that they view truth as negotiable versus great social benefits. It is because the closing questions of your letter incorporate these premises as a presumption that I cannot answer them. First I would have to untie the terrible philosophical knot you made and which prevents a healthy circulation of sound thought that is rooted in morality. But all this is so terribly un-American that you are quite right in discerning a moral-intellectual callousness that the American right shares with much of the American left. The presumptions in your questions make clear that you should have included yourself as an integral part of that peculiar coalition.

Sincerely,

M. S. Arnoni

MSA:mw