

David Saulsbury  
1220 McCurley Ave.,  
Catonsville, MD 21228

11/27/94

Dear David.

It was good to see all of you again and to see you are all well and ~~happy~~ happy and that the boys are <sup>o</sup>growing so well. Hope you can do it again soon.

I'm most of the way through the Widows book and find it interesting and entertaining. But with too many serious factual errors in it. They make me wonder more about what <sup>we</sup> have to take on faith, what is not source noted, and such sources as cannot be checked as the alleged records of the Austrian police.

And there are many too many inferences that lack substantial proof or reasonableness. Like that Paisley was KGB. Of the many reasons to wonder I mention just one: with all the ~~alleged~~ preparation required do you think they'd have let <sup>Shadrin</sup> him jeopardize the whole thing and his own life by taking that small boat through that violent storm? When he could have done the same thing when the storm abated?

These people are not as well informed as they present themselves and they make ignorant errors. It is not that some of these errors are so serious <sup>and</sup> as much as what it reflects that we cannot in all cases check if we want to. For minor example, they say ~~of~~ Harry Bridges was a Communist and led the Seafarers union. He was not a Communist and ~~he~~ led the longshoreman's union. We knew him socially and when late <sup>by</sup> I was in California both kinds of "eds opposed him, Communist and Trotskyites, because of his basic union policies. One was I think socially good and farsighted. He got the employers to agree not to fire any men with mechanization and in return agreed not to strike over it. That did have the effect that would have come to pass anyway, of new employees not being hired. But mechanization was here to stay and he did keep any of his members <sup>from</sup> being jobless. Both kinds of ~~ed~~ fought him on that.

Every reference to Oswald is in varying degrees inaccurate and proven to be that by what is public and was available to them.

Because you did not tell me you were giving me the books I assume that you were lending them. So the only mark I've added to the Widows book is in the index, where a reference to Oswald was omitted. In some of the other places I've used 3M stickone that come off easily. These will call those errors, not all, to your later attention.

They picked an interesting subject and write it interestingly but I believe they began with what they wanted to prove and were not able in any instance <sup>to</sup> make a real case.

Fensterwald was not as they say, a young lawyer just starting when he represented Mrs. Shadrin. He'd been <sup>an</sup> a law professor, I think at Yale, and an assistant general counsel at State and then was general counsel of a Senate subcommittee. They did not try to find out, as they could have easily. They just said what they wanted to say.

Thanks and best,

Harold