

The 26 Volumes.

As otherwise in odds and ends of places noted, the Commission could not have succeeded better in making these 26 volumes and the vast amount of ~~documentation~~ ^{documentation} contained therein inaccessible to anybody who might want to put them to practical use. As one example, the Commission prints the documents in order of exhibit number. Not only do some of the documents have conflicting exhibit numbers, but there really was no need to print them in this order. They could just as easily have been printed by subject and, if the Commission felt it was desirable - and it would have been desirable - to have them listed by numerical order, this could have been done in a table such as was done in the very last volume with exhibits with double identities. As it is, without indexing the entire 26 volumes, which is a tremendously big job, there is no way of knowing whether or not the reader has seen all there is on any one subject. It is quite conceivable that because of this arrangement the Commission will lead people using the volumes into mistakes that may even be of a serious nature.

The Commission's bias is also clearly reflected in these volumes. As an example, whenever there is an Oswald letter that was undated, it goes out of its way to point out that it is undated. It is not consistently so with other documents. This is especially true of the Secret Service report allegedly dealing with the assassination but for the most part dealing with other things at the time of the assassination. If the Commission raises any point about the paucity of information about the assassination itself in these Secret Service reports, I have seen no reference to it. In the volumes dealing with the depositions, there are similar cases, one of which comes immediately to mind. This has to do with the listing of John Abt, the lawyer

whom Oswald unsuccessfully sought, as one of Oswald's political connections. ^{There is} the Contrary is true. /No evidence in the deposition to indicate this, and all evidence is to the contrary. Abt declined to take the case, and of course this is beyond dispute since, in fact, he did not take the case. He denied ever knowing or having even heard of Oswald previously, and if there is any evidence to the contrary the Commission certainly does not indicate it. There can not be any possible excuse for this editorial behavior by the Commission.

The exhibits begin with Vol. XVI. In the preface to this volume, it says they are in "numerical order from 1 to 1053. Next are printed exhibits received in connection with depositions or affidavits, arranged alphabetically by names of witness." and then, "Finally are printed other materials relied upon by the Commission, consisting principally of investigative reports by law enforcement agencies, arranged in numerical order beginning with 1054." What the Commission is saying here is that it considered information that was not under oath. Such a practice is, at best, questionable. It then describes the table of contents of the exhibits volumes as "a descriptive listing", which is certainly the exaggeration of the year. It also says some exhibits "of negligible relevance were not reproduced because of their length or for reasons of taste." Of these, it says, "The omissions are described in the tables of contents," which certainly involves a new meaning for the word "described".