

5/6/71

Dear Madeline Goddard,

I'm very tired, snowed under with the accumulation of correspondence alone, have to go away again in the a.m., so I respond to but part of your April 28. I fear I'm going to have to seriously curtail correspondence where it does not contribute to my own work, which suffers from the time it takes. I get neither younger nor less impoverished, and I would like to complete it.

Check on Bevel, Black Star. Roger Craig's claim to the alteration of his testimony are false, as are other things he has said. You believe it or not. He is sick and undependable, not a man of evil intent (and his colleagues proliferate).

Bradley is a wretched man by any civilized ~~test~~. But that does not in any way incriminate him. You say nothing that you have any backing for. You refer to what you "understand" and things like that, but I believe it impossible that you have what I regard as a single dependable source on all of this. We must learn to separate what we may want to believe from what is reasonable. That entire "tramp" thing has been made into a tragedy by well-meaning Sprague. I wish he had the ~~great~~ cost of every kind to which it put me, and either the slightest concept or the ability to conceive the enormous damage he has done us and the ever greater he almost did-all in the fact of what he could never and never did refute. Whoever told ~~that~~ you that Hall was the "principal witness" against Bradley is nuts, as in anyone who says Hall could be a dependable witness on anything.

The story originated with Bradley's political enemies of the right in Calif., was embroidered upon by Turner and Boxley, each supporting the inventions of the other. A large part of Garrison's (loyal) staff were on the verge of resigning over it. I know what I am telling you in all details of this and an enormous part of what I cannot. This is why Garrison fired Boxley.

If this is the kind of stuff to which you are devoting yourself, in what I tell you intending friendship, you are wasting your time.

Sorry to have to be hasty and abrupt.

Sincerely,

12 Rogers Avenue  
Bellport  
New York 11713

April 28, 1971

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

Thank you very much for your letter and enclosures. Local bookstore now has FRAME-UP and I got my copy yesterday. It's marvellous that you've been able to do the book. I saw a good ad on it in the NYTimes a while ago. Hope it got good results. I can only scan the book now - but with hopes of finding more time and a freer mind later on to give it due attention. Meantime I am glad to see that Rev. James L. Bavel figures in it, as I have long felt he is extremely important to the solution. Have a fat file on the case, but must devote myself to Dallas.

Following your lead, I wrote to Black Star and this morning have a reply. I am told they can probably find the negatives of that bullet gash picture but, before sending them, they want to know what purpose I plan to make of them. I told them that I had no present plans for reproduction of the picture in any form of publication. Also told them that I planned to send a print to you. Will let you know if they ask me for a statement from you prior to allowing me to send along a print.

As for my work - I don't plan to try to publish. It will all be a playing it by ear. You are so right (don't like the expression but fall into it) about the necessity for accuracy, accuracy, accuracy. It's wearisome as you well know, but essential.

Yes, I have felt that perhaps Roger Craig's claim that his testimony was falsified in 14 instances was an over-statement that needed further investigation, discussion, qualifying. Little points aren't really worth the fuss. But on the Bradley matter - my present position is in disagreement with yours. I have understood that E.E. Bradley has a brother - a younger brother who may have been the "tramp". Also I think that false testimony can sometimes be given (MG) in order to discredit something that may be true, in order to discredit the true evidence. I have heard that Loren Hall is dead - that "the principle witness against Bradley" was now out of this world.

Returning to Craig - he's good in police work, I think - good memory for people, for physical detail, but has no particular training as a scholar, not enough experience with the precision and disciplines of research.

Will be in touch again soon.

Thanks again -

Sincerely,

Madeline Soddard