

Mr. John W. Masland  
5530 Eastbourne Drive  
Springfield, VA 22151

10/24/92

Dear John,

What is with your 10/8 looks interesting. I'll be reading it in odds of ends of time and if I see anything to call to your attention I'll try to remember to make notes. I'll have this in a separate file folder or envelope marked "confidential." Meanwhile I respond to your letter,

I do not recall Stern's questioning of Bookhout and agree with you that it is interesting, well, more than that. I do not recall that it was known the afternoon of 11/22 that Oswald had been to Mexico and I wonder, as you do, how Hosty knew. In this regard I have two indices that may interest you, one is the Dallas index of documents and the other of records. I caution you that I am certain these are selective and were created, at considerable time and other costs, to provide an out-of-Washington control over what the Commission got from the FBI. So, you may want to check these when you are here again. *(So FBI would know what it had given W.C. - and what it had not given it.)*

The index itself duplicated entries in the general indices. The FBI did this on some major cases and I decided long ago it was a control device for their special interest in control.

I have no recollection of CD 349 except, possibly a very dim and vague one. But if that Hosty business interests you as I went over the records on delivery I made duplicate copies of all that relate to it and they are in what I call my ~~"subject"~~ "subject" file.

I wondered at how the testimony was printed when I first saw the 26. To a degree it is roughly by subject of one kind or another. I have no idea why they departed from the norm. Perhaps there was another motive but I did not think of any then and have not thought of it since. Have you thought of phoning Howard Wellens and asking him? Or writing him if you think he might be unwilling to talk? He is practising law in DC and is one of Weinbergers lawyers now.

The first of the volumes of testimony hold the witnesses who appeared before members of the Commission. The staff depositions follow. This accounts for the Hosty (DC) and Bookout (Dallas) testimony being in different volumes.

I noticed by accident in handling the enclosure in taking them from the envelope that Adams deposited only a single witness. He has long been rather a mystery to me. He was the first to leave and deposing O'Brien was not to the best of my recollection the area of the work he was in charge of, the work that very soon became Specter's. So, I wondered whether he left as early and as quietly as he did because of a basic disagreement with what he perceived. As Leon Hubert did. I don't know whether he left a deposit of records. He had, among other things, been New York City's police commissioner. It might be interesting if

we could learn. I've made no effort and would not know where to start. But he did begin with the most important part of the Commission's work assigned to him and I've not seen any one thing he did on it.

I'll mark the folder for what you sent Database. If you have a name for it please let me know and I'll use it.

To the best of my recollection Hosty is still alive, living in Kansas City, if you'd care to call him and ask him. His son is security director for a large outfit. Same name.

Hosty is not a conservative, which I regard as a respectable thing. He is an extremist of the fatherest-out right extreme. You might want to bear this in mind if you do phone him.

At this point you phoned.

Thanks and best wishes,

*Harold*

Harold Weisberg

*1st FBI No know LHO had gone to Mexico - it did know he'd left D.C. -  
Hosty had just gotten the record file from N.C. 11/22/63*

5530 Eastbourne Drive  
Springfield, VA 22151  
9 October 1992

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

This was started on the 9th and I'm rushing out the door on Tuesday morning without proofing it - am rushing to airport and wanted to get it to you - apologies for any mistakes...

As I was doing some reading this morning (letter started on 9 October) I came across what I thought was an interesting comment contained in James Bookhout's testimony at 7H311:

Mr. Stern. During the first interview was he asked whether he had ever been in Mexico, and if so by whom?

Mr. Bookhout. Yes; I recall Hosty asking him if he had ever been in Mexico.

Mr. Stern. What did he say?

Mr. Bookhout. He said he had not. I believe he mentioned he had been in Tijuana, Mexico, I believe, but I believe the question was whether he had ever been in Mexico City.

How did Hosty know about Mexico City at this stage of the questioning - the afternoon of 22 November? Have I missed something? I am presently doing some research regarding Hosty based on what I found in CD349 regarding SS Agent Patterson and what Hosty told him on 11/22/63 - it is similar to what Revill said - seems to possibly corroborate Revill. This peaked my interest in the sequencing of the testimony. Accordingly, I went back to my database and discovered that I had only inputted the dates for those witnesses who actually testified to the Commission proper. I then went back and inputted the data for those who were deposed. The attached printouts provide different views of that data. Additionally, I sorted the data by the lawyers who conducted the depositions and those printouts are also included. Also included is an errata sheet for the database printouts I provided to you earlier - my ham-fisted style of entry has apparently permitted some erroneous data to corrupt the integrity of my database. However, as you will note, not all of the errors are mine - a small consolation. I'll probably find other entry errors - ought to shoot the piano player.

One thing which came immediately to attention was the fact that the depositions do not seem to be printed in any readily identifiable date linked sequence, nor are they printed according to which lawyer took the deposition. Accordingly, this raises the whole issue of *what did they know and when did they know it* with respect to information provided by witnesses. Printing them in a less than structured sequence does not permit one to view the data with that question in mind. I'm not suggesting that there was any ulterior motive but it does raise an interesting

prospect - I have never seen this issue discussed in this fashion, particularly as it would relate to the questioning of any given witness. In the case of Bookhout, 4/8/64, and Hosty, 5/5/64, there was a month difference - did they question Hosty regard this issue? I don't remember but will check it later.

I've also included some graphic representations of the data set regarding witnesses. I've not concluded it but I will develop a set graphing the attorneys and their deposition work.

I would appreciate your not providing copies of this material to anyone as it is germane to my research and should I proceed to publication it may prove to be an important facet of my work. Accordingly, I'd rather not spread it around. You, of course, are free to use it in your work as you deem appropriate. I'd be interested in your views on this material - is it a new way to look at this data and/or have you seen the data represented in this manner previously.

Also included a breakout of what agencies provided WC CDs - this list is a little suspect in that some of the documents have inclosures, tabs, and the like. Accordingly, the numbers should be viewed as representative rather than precise - it's close but it needs some work.

Anyway, not certain that all this is of value, but it does provide one a different view of the data.

Regards to Mrs Weisberg.

Sincerely,



John W. Masland