

Dear Ms. Goddard,

1/29/76

I'd like to be able to reply at length to your 1/24 but the phlebitis and absence of any help too severely limit what I must do. As you have seen, this is what others have not. Talk accomplishes nothing. Work does. I can't attribute a single distribution of the new evidence in my last two books to any of these talkers. They would rather be showmen and get attention. But all the half-truths and deceptions do kick back.

I've had no contact with the Assassination Information committee. While I don't doubt their sincerity I do question if they can distinguish fact from fiction and thus whether what they can distribute is "information." For newcomers to talk about doing research now is little more than big talk. They'd be lucky to begin to duplicate part of what has been done and they don't know about. These kinds of projects provide an outlet for people of good intention, as they provide a forum for the nuts and self-seekers. But I've never known a single bit of good to come from any of them and do know of much harm. The end product is propoganda and we'll not accomplish anything with that on this subject. The problem is not turning people on. It is ending the turning of the key votes and people in Congress and the already corrupt media off. There are countless examples for which I can't take time. I can only spend so much time typing because I have to keep my legs horizontal and because I can't sit for more than 30 minutes.

Collar: there is no question. It was done by a nurse and with a scalpel and under a doctor's orders and directions.

Wecht is a real Billy Sunday. But as you recognize he lacks the basic knowledge even of the material, is promoting himself and his malpractice business with paid public appearances that are never based on his own work and commonly are based on error. It hurts us worse because of his reputation.

If the inference about Smith is that he is an agent I don't think so. I've had contact with him. He has failed to do anything worthwhile therefore he assumes there is nothing. Otherwise he has to tell himself that will all the time and facilities he was an utter failure. He can't be reasoned with and is incapable of absorbing or even perceiving the evidence in this kind of inquiry. I've been through it with him and his former associates, none of whom is really informed or a dependable source. Except Lear, who says when he does not know ~~xxxxxx~~ instead of improvising.

I don't think publishing is required of everyone and those not prepared to do solid factual work ought not. One of our major problems has been the publishing of the undependable to the irrational. It, besmirches all, destroys all credibility. As I said above, it harms to spread what isn't factual, minor an industry as it has become. Deperman is a prime example. He represents the views of the unfactual Weberman, who was one of the best friends the Rockefeller Commission had. What he symbolizes has ripped of the minds of a college generation and done irreparable harm in Congress.

Thanks for the comment on Post Mortem. I regret I can't get it around more.

Sorry about the typos. Time really does press on me and I can't now keep the hours I used.

Best regards,

214 Durkee Lane
East Patchogue, N.Y.
11772

Jan.24, 1976

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

I hope very much that you are feeling better.

I wanted to send ^{extremely} this note to say that I've just finished reading POST MORTEM and find it a valuable book. I find a good deal important to me in the text and among the documents. It's good to have these documents published. My thanks and appreciation for what you do and have done.

I had not really considered the matter of the slits in the shirt but you've converted me - that is I agree with you on the higher location of the throat wound and that the slits came not from a bullet, or fragment of some sort, but from a scalpel or razor cut. I think, however, that the slits and the nick on the edge of the tie all occurred at the same moment from the same single slash as a nurse cut the tie loose.

The confusing, contradictory accounts of the autopsy results now take better shape for me.

What I am most concerned about today is the fact that Dr. Cyril Wecht has hired Robert Smith. I'm enthusiastic about Wecht even though I realize that he hasn't done research etc. But a practising County Coroner and Director of a Forensic Sciences Institute just doesn't have the time and extra energy to do a lot of research. And the fact that he does hold these positions adds of course, to his value as one of the critics. But I have been uneasy about Robert Smith for some time. Don't like to be suspicious about an individual - and hope I'm wrong - but one must be in this work, and for me his contribution to the general effort doesn't have quite the right ring to it. Wecht is a very good lecturer, so whoever feeds "intelligence" to Wecht has a special leverage.

I live in a glass house I know and wouldn't blame anyone for wondering which side I'm on in view of my long association with the Dallas case and nothing published. But there has to be a "third ear" on these things. In any event, the matter doesn't worry me. I am worried about Robert Smith though - always in a cat-bird seat.

Enclosed is a bit of news about the New York group. Dare say you know of the matter. I have recently withdrawn from the group as I can't get to their meetings and it looks as though this infiltrating element is out for mischief. Better to keep in touch with those I trust than be dragged into trouble by people I disagree with, whether or not they are "agents provocateur"

as ever,

Madeline Sadder

P.S. I read in the NYTimes today that Yuri Nosenko said that Sam Jaffe had been a Soviet intelligence operative!