

nation. Such reports appeared regularly in the press. The Commission's perturbation was because there was apparent confirmation of it.

Another very real problem is the assurance to me by the head of the National Archives that there was no such session.

Admittedly, Congressman Ford should know, because, presumably, he was there. He says he was. Likewise, the head of the Archives should know because he has all the records; or, in a possibly more precise formulation, he is supposed to have all the records. I know and have proved that he does not, and I am not suggesting this is his fault. He has only what was transferred into his custody and has not since been removed.

However, according to his records, the Commission appears to have had but an even dozen meetings during its ten months of life prior to issuance of its Report. This seems to me a rather inadequate number of sessions for work of this volume and significance unless, what is possible, the Commission members just did not do any real work. The dates the Archivist identifies as those on which the members met are December 5, 6 and 16, 1963; January 21 and 27, February 24, March 16, April 30, May 19, June 4 and 23, and September 18, 1964. This means that, during the most crucial three months, while the Report was being composed, it met not once.

Was Goldman doing the lunatic?

July August  
Sept. NOT

If study of the Report itself can be taken as validation of this lack of meeting by the members, a rudimentary knowledge of traditional bureaucracy gives pause. Without meeting, the members abdicated entirely to their staff control over what would appear under their names in the Report until after it was written and set in page proof. Casual examination of the Report can be taken as confirmation of this, yet I still doubt it.

In any event, here again we have the epitome of honor and integrity

P. from Hal's "E Sess"