

Me. John Masland
134 Curtis Ave.,
Williamstown, NY 00094

8/10/93

Dear John,

As I wrote you as soon as I got your database printout I do not have time to go over it now so I am not familiar with it. From what you said about it I have the impression it is a valuable research tool.

I think there is a high probability of reaching an invalid conclusion from what you suggest 8/6 because very often the shortened period between notification and deposition had little if any relationship with the witness or the subject matter. The counsel had their own problems and often shifts were necessitated. I do not recall anything that justifies believing it was from some kind of hankypanky.

I therefore do not believe that for the stated purpose that much extra work is ~~with~~ worth the time.

For different reason, the key persons file might be. For the content of some of it. And for what is not ~~here~~ there and should be.

As best I recall the few records I saw relating to the less than three day notice I recall nothing that looked wrong.

But after all these years my recollection may not be dependable.

I also think there were more staff memos in those unnumbered files and they can be valuable. Some of which I got copies years ago I've just used.

The cost is something I can't guess but that may be a factor. My hunch is that the KP file will ^{have} ~~enrich~~ the copies of the ~~PCDs~~.

Lil joins me in wishing all goes well with you

Acord

134 Curtis Ave.
Williamstown, NJ 08094
6 August 1993 2:15pm

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

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

The purpose of this letter is to solicit your advice.

I expect that you received my last post with the database printout. If not the following will make little sense.

I believe there may be some value to combining the data in the printout with other measurements. For example, a dataset based upon the Commission's three day witness notification rule could be overlaid on the witness timeline material. From this one might obtain a view of the mechanics of witness depositions. The Commission had a three day notification rule which they seemed to violate more often than not. To date, I've been able to determine that 160 deposition witnesses waived the *three day rule*; 130 did not require waiver; and, 172 are uncertain, i.e., cannot be determined from the public record in the 26 volumes.

I believe that one can, in turn, overlay that information on the material provided by the various agencies as codified by the collection of *Commission Documents*; some of this material I have provided you previously. From this might emerge a more coherent view of the information acquisition architecture and strategy, or lack thereof, of the Commission. What they knew, when they knew it, how they pursued it, etc.

I believe this may objectively supplement the argument that no substantive investigation was ever conducted. Accordingly, my questions are two:

1. Do you think this is a worthwhile project?
2. To do so will require access to the *Key Persons* file because the record contained in the 26 volumes is insufficient. The *Key Persons* file is available on microfilm. I believe you have reviewed much of that index. As I am no longer within ready driving distance to the Archives, is purchase of the microfilm worth the expense?

Any opinion you could offer in this regard would be very valuable to me.

As always, please give my regards to Mrs. Weisberg.

Sincerely,



John W. Masland