

THE MINORITY OF ONE

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

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

October 23, 1967

Mrs. Marjorie Field
1115 N. Beverly Drive
Beverly Hills, Calif.
90210

Dear Maggie:

I have received your letter of October 15th. I may quote it in the Readers' Letters section of a future issue of TMO.

I am, of course, grateful for your favorable opening comment on TMO. I am less grateful for your conclusion that TMO's challenge of Garrison was undertaken dishonestly. I am also unpleasantly surprised at your unwillingness to draw sufficiently consequential conclusions from the finding that "Mr. Garrison has developed some seemingly questionable witnesses and evidenciary material."

I am surprised that you discuss your own relationship with Garrison, or the absence of it, to exemplify his attitude towards assassination researchers. If I am not mistaken, at least at the time you wrote Mr. Garrison, he had no reason to treat you as someone who has published anything on the case. You were at the time a "private" researcher, so to speak, by which I mean to say a researcher who had not established herself as such in any public sense.

I regret that you found untruthfulness in the editorial under discussion. I may not be in the position to judge with ultimate knowledge whether I was right or wrong on one point, another point, or all the points. But I am in a position to judge the truthfulness of what I wrote. I am certain that you are utterly wrong in questioning that quality of the article.

Your letter has not changed my thinking. I stand by everything I wrote in that editorial, and I wonder at which point you will stop being so very forgiving towards Garrison's "questionable witnesses and evidenciary material."

Sincerely,

M. S. Arnoni

MSA:mw