

Dear John Judge,

1/21/75

I have a very clear recollection of the strength of my reaction when a young know-it-all phoned me from Md. to appear with Skolnick. I am without doubt that I was outraged and explicit enough about Skolnick and offended that anyone could pretend the most rudimentary knowledge of the field and still think I would share a platform with a charlatan simply because he calls himself a "researcher" and because from lack of scruple and incredible guts he can command publicity.

Under the rocks there crawl many self-styled "researchers." Their self-description and the acceptability they can achieve for it does not make it factual or honest.

If of these vermin I were required to select one who most perfectly fits the role of an agent provocateur, what he calls others, VIA, Skolnick has virtually no competition. I know the rascal, only too well.

His entry into the field was by an overt theft. He embellished on this, manufactured the impossible, filed a spurious suit that had to be thrown out of court (he calls himself a "legal researcher" but hadn't even troubled to learn the minimum requirements of the law) and became accepted simply on his own noise.

The theft had to do with Vallee. He obtained my work from a friend who was following it up for me on the false pretense that he had facilities to carry it forward and would do this. Instead he quite literally stole it and made the wildest charges based on it. They were so excessive that he generated streamer headlines of sympathy for Sgt. Daniel Groth just when he needed it, over the Hampton killing. I have the papers as I have the exchange of correspondence between my friend and Skolnick on the unconscionable and unethical personality cult Skolnick thereby launched.

What he did in the Dorothy Hunt case helped United Airlines and served as a cover for the real investigation that should have been made. Legitimate and dependable reporters who covered the resultant hearing, honest people, tell me it was a debacle. All Skolnick had was bullshit and unkept promises. He produced nothing. Do you think that if he had the records he claims he'd not seek the widest possible publicity for them? Or that one would merely float down from the skies? Or that it is possible to jump from a commercial airplane 500 feet up - at all - and be unseen over a major metropolitan area?

Do you think it is right to steal, as his gang tried to steal Robert Eroden's work at Georgetown? Or to start disturbances at such a meeting simple because they had not been invited - and should not have been. Not that I was not opposed to that meeting.

I could go on and on. But as I told you I'm ill, restricted in what I can do and the time I can spend on it and none of this is worth anything. I have no recollection of your name or any other being mentioned. I recall that this intellectual snotnose was offended when I dared suggest that the faker Skolnick is less than God and that gave me a double block. He had a closed mind, entirely closed. He did not ask me anything about the man whose sole success so far has been in destroying all credibility. He worships Skolnick and therefore fact is irrelevant.

Rivalling Skolnick in serving disinformation purposes is Schoenmann. The damage he did with cribbing, exaggerations, manufactures and other such endeavors we may never overcome. I know him and the state of his knowledge when and can and did evaluate what he has said publicly. He laid the best basis of all the self-promoters for the Rockefeller Commission whitewash. When he forgot and came close to reality it wasn't his own work. So, if you consider these scum researchers you have my evaluation of your judgement. I have no way of knowing what work you have or have not done. Or of mentioning you.

I appreciate your offer to distribute flyers. Even though I can't connect an order with the broadcast I not only appreciate it but welcome the chance to get the meager message they hold out. I'll have to see what my supply is. If I do not have enough I'll have more printed. Sorry I can't justify the time to read and correct this. There is real work to be done and I'm ill and want to be detached from all this sick business. Best,

Harold Weisberg
Route 12, Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

First of all, please find enclosed \$10.75 for a copy by insured mail of your new book, Post Mortem. I am looking forward to reading it.

As we discussed in the past, I would like to make your advertising flyers available to my readers on the list of people who get my articles in the mail. I picked up several hundred of your printed ads for Whitewash IV before they were thrown out, after the NYU Law School Conference. I mailed them out to as many people as I could, but they ran short of my list. I would like to finish sending that flyer out to those who missed it, and I would like to send the enclosed flyer out to my entire list. Please send the following to me for distribution:

Flyer for Whitewash IV	200 copies
Flyer for Post Mortem	500 copies

Finally, when I attended a conference recently at the University of Maryland, I gave the organizers your name as a possible speaker. Your declining to come, I was given to understand by them, was a conflict you have with another scheduled speaker, Sherman Skolnick. But in addition, the organizer told me that when he mentioned my name to you, you responded that I was "a paranoid nut". When we spoke on the phone recently, you told me you have never had the time or wherewithal to read my mailings, due to your long work day and failing eyesight. We have only met twice, once in a short visit to your house, and again in Washington DC at the conference organized by Bud Fensterwald. I'm hard pressed, then, to comprehend why you have such a view of me and my work. There is an aspect of all our work that borders on being "paranoid", as hard as we work to overcome that by documentation and good research. Unless the conference organizer was mistaken, I'd like you to explain to me why you said such a thing about me. Is it an opinion you garnered from others? I am not as thorough in my work as you have been, but I am sure of what I print and have evidence to support it--much of it original work on my own. I am not yet published--but you, of all people, can judge the significance of that. If you can't provide me some explanation, can you then please stop telling people I'm a paranoid nut? Even if I am, you haven't given me any evidence that you would be in a position to know that.

Following the reading of your letter at the NYU Conference, Ralph Schoenbrun asked whether we had learned yet not to throw our comrades to the "wolves of the liberal press", knowing from the McCarthy era that it can never appease their taste for scandal. While I share your concern for the danger of shoddy research, we cannot but benefit in the serious research community from a sense of solidarity, a commitment to truth, respect for one another, and even criticism--but not on stage. Your actions are those of a painstakingly principled man in the instances I have known them, I trust you understand the principle involved in open criticism of another's work before you vilify them publically.

Thank you for your time and attention. Please send the materials, I'll get them out this month or next, as they complete the pieces necessary for me to do a ~~mailing~~ mailing. Thank you again for your kind acquiescence to appear on our radio show interview, which was aired with good response to date on Thursday, January ~~17~~ 16. Keep up your excellent work, we are all closer to the truth this year than we suspect.

Sincerely,

John Judge
447 Grafton Ave.
Dayton, Ohio 45406

(513)277-4506

500 pages 1/27/76