

Do these files -not those still secret, but those open from the first-  
prove that the FBI and the Secret Service both conducted definitive investigations  
and both reached conclusions diametrically opposed to that of the Commission -and  
from identically the same evidence? Yes, they do! Did both federal investigative  
agencies maintain their silence when the Commission concluded what the evidence  
each developed and the conclusions each reached proved impossible. Yes, each did.  
And did each agency report what happened to the Commission without accounting for  
all the shooting? Yes, each did that, too, the FBI failing to account even for all  
the injuries to the President!

But don't look for that in the Saturday Evening Post's apology for the  
federal government in its own whitewashing of how that government came into  
power -through this assassination.

Do these-the unsecret-files contain ~~xxxxxxx~~ proof that they were  
guttled of the most basic evidence of all - evidence that is redundantly required  
to be there and is not - and does the Saturday Evening Post know this. Both are  
true. The files have been gutted and the Post does know about it, havin' learned  
it from me, personally.

What better reason can there be for the total silence of the Post on  
these points than its knowledge of them?

What better proof can the Post have of the integrity of the files and  
"investigation"  
of the ~~xxxx~~ they represent than the unassailable proof that they have been gutted  
of the basic evidence about the assassination.