

11,

11. Serious Criticism- Aguilar and Mantik

Gary Aguilar and David Mantik are both medical doctors. Mantik is also a physicist. Aguilar, in addition to his private practice is, as we have seen, fully occupied with several hospitals and he also teaches ^{medicine.} His field is the eye. The time ~~take~~ ^{both} take for their research and thinking about the assassination seems to be impossible for them.

^{However,} but they have devoted much ^{to it} time. Both are Fetzer's Part III, "The Medical Evidence" (Pages 175-298). Aguilar's essay is titled, "The Converging Medical Case for Conspiracy" (pages 175-218), Mantik's is

"Paradoxes of the JFK Assassination" (pages 219-298). Mantik has ^{two} other contributions: "Paradoxes of the JFK Assassination: the

19/A → here

~~Zapruder Film Controversy" (pages 325-60; "Paradoxes of the of the JFK Assassination" (Page 361-9); and an appendix "Deposition of J. Thornton Boswell M.D., on 26 February, 1996" (pages 440-4); and "Conversation with John Ebersole, M.D., on 2 December 1992, Transcriber by David W. Mantik, M.D., Ph.D." (pages 433-440).~~

Mantik has five other contributions. ^{Two} Two are of text, three ^{are in} of Fetzer's appendix. In Part V, ^{Hoax,} "The Zapruder Film," "Paradoxes of the JFK Assassination," "The Zapruder Film Controversy" (pages 325-60), in Part VI, "Righting the Record," "Paradoxes of the JFK Assassination," "The Silence of the Historians" (Pages 371-411); ^A and in the Appendix, "Conversation with John Ebersole, M.D., of 3 December 1992, Transcribed by David W. Mantik, M.D., Ph. D.; Deposition of Thornton Boswell, Md.D., on 26 February, 1996, ^E edited by David W., Mantik, Md.D., ^{Ph.D.} Deposition of James J. Humes, M.D., on 13 February, 1996, Edited by David W., Mantik, M.D., Ph.D." (pages 444 ~~442~~-52).

Between the two of the, Aguilar and Mantik contributed 324 of Fetzer's 468 pages, most of his book by far.

But ^{perhaps} while it can be considered the most seriously critical of the

Yet ~~for~~ ~~all~~ the time they have devoted to their assassination work they lacked the time required to master all they had to know to be able to make real and meaningful studies of such complicated and misrepresented information and more, they did not have the time, in their busy professional lives, to learn so much that is relevant to what they intend doing. Sometimes this resulted in their duplicating what was already established but by other and usually more dependable means. In terms of ~~making~~ ^{disclosing} information that was not known, ~~what~~ ^{inhibition} they did not know was a significant ~~consideration~~ in their ability to ~~xxx~~ produce what is really significant and is new.

^{they have}
 essays, ~~it has~~ the major flaw^{o/} of which I sought to caution them
 long before they wrote ^{these} their essays: by not considering the record that
^{or being able to -} existed, ^{significantly} they added nothing new to that existing record, except the
 form of what they concluded, ^{and} ^{if true,} and what they developed is weaker because
 it has no confirmation ^{and} is in part serious^{ly} wrong on fact.

Some, and this includes what they treat as most important in their ~~ess~~
 essays, ~~is~~ entirely wrong and to a ~~ade~~ degree it was known to be
 wrong, sometimes they refer to knowing what they knew made what
 they said false, but they ignored the proofs that they were saying
 what is not true. There ^{to them which they} is also what was readily available, ~~that~~
^{when it} did not consult, ~~that~~ proved what they were working on to be wrong.

This is not serious^{c/} research, no matter how serious the one
 making the inquiry feels he is, no matter how serious he may look
 or sound.

Take the Mantik essay, Paradoxes of the JFK Assassination, with
 the subtitle "The Zapruder Film Controversy."

Beginning with and including his title ~~is~~ this not factual, so
 it is not honest. One^o side is and always has been ~~entirely~~ entirely
 fictitious. It is not new with Mantik, but again, he ignored the
 caution because he wanted to say what he did say and he was not
 concerned that it was not legitimate ^{and} because he felt he was ~~was~~ right
 he had no interest in what proved it wrong. Even when he ~~had~~ had that
 proof, ^{in his} in part, ~~on~~ ~~his~~ hands.

For it to be a legitimate paradox, ~~both~~ both sides need to be true.
 The definition of paradox in the Oxford American dictionary is, "a
 statement, etc., that seems to contradict itself or to conflict with
 common sense but which ^C contains a truth ("as more haste, less speed")

To simplify this until ~~we~~ we have more detail, he makes a big deal
 out of what he says is the faking of of the Zapruder film ~~in~~ (in which

he is very far from alone) ^{while} ~~while~~ and all of ARRB had the ^{applying} proof that the alleged ~~faking~~ ^e was impossible. There are other proofs but one is all it takes.

First what Mantik says, preceded ^{by} the "editor's note" that Fetzner adds ^{in which} ~~as obviously~~, beginning with his first sentence he does not. The rest of Fetzner's ~~s~~ pretending he is knowledgeable when ~~he~~ ^{is} not is largely false. Note also that he treats the falsities about the film as unquestionable fact, as, largely, Mantik also does. ^{Fetzner's actually} ~~His words, at one point,~~ refers to "the lack of authenticity of the film."

This alleged lack ^e of authenticity is the baseless fabrication of some critics who find making up what they want to be true when ^{it} ~~this~~ is not true, more congenial and ~~never~~ so much less trouble than legitimate research in the great volume ^{of} ~~of~~ readily available and ^{pertinent} ~~relevant~~ official information.

There is nothing wrong with official information if it is true. One of ~~Mantik's~~ ^{Fetzner's} essays, ~~is~~ attributed to Douglas P. Horner, consists entirely of copies of official records ^{ARRB} only (pages 299-³¹⁰ ~~310~~). ^{Fetzner's} ~~Not~~ only is Mantik's very first sentence false ^{is}, subject-matter ignorant ^{is} that he is, ~~is~~ this is pretty much true of the rest of it:

indent
single
space

[Editor's note: In this essay, David W. Mantik, M.D., Ph.D., who has undertaken the most extensive and detailed studies of its internal content and other properties—including comparisons of the film to other copies, of the film to other photographs and films, and of the film to eyewitness reports—in the history of the study of the assassination of JFK, provides a framework for understanding and exploring the questions raised by the lack of authenticity of the film, which has been extensively edited using highly sophisticated techniques. Those who wish to pursue this issue in greater detail should see the studies on this topic in *Assassination Science* (1998), which includes Mantik's transformational work.] ^(page 325)

In addition, all of this depends on when Mantik did whatever he did in the Archives and with which of the films there. For many years pursuant to its agreement with Zapruder, ~~Life~~ Time, Inc. held the *original* film.

A few pages later Fetzter has another "editor's" not ^{e/but} that he does not know enough to be honest in it. He says, "To avoid confusion between the out-of-camera original and the current film in the Archives - which are not identical in my view - I shall use the 'extant' to describe ~~the~~ the film currently ^{held} ~~held~~ by the Archives" (page 327).

Even if he means what he does not say, Fetzter, knowing nothing about what is in the Archives, and I doubt he has ever done any work in that archive - ~~hints~~ (hints at the original not being the original film in that ~~video~~ deposit. Using "original" and "copy" is easier and less confusing and it means that what the Archives says is the original is not that, then he could say "fake original." Besides which the Archives should have a number of copies of the film, those made for and used by other agencies. 1944 here

As neither ^{Fetzter} ~~he~~ nor Mantik ^{o,} bother to tell their readers, at the moment of the initial processing of the exposed original film three copies were made and all wound up with federal agencies. The Secret Service copy left Dallas a little ~~before~~ ^{at} midnight the day of the assassination. Mantik should have known this from Whitewash II, published in December 1966. Along with that I published, in ^{illegible} ~~illegible~~ facsimile, what Mantik could have used, that Zaprude ^{to} told the Secret Service that the first shot came from over ^{his} ~~his~~ shoulder, as he ^{testified} ~~testified~~ when, belatedly, he became a Commission witness.

Along with the unsupported claim that the ^{original} original film was not the actual film and the claim that the ~~original~~ original was altered, had either Mantik or Fetzter been an authentic scholar, as each pretends, they could have found support in the Warren Commission's testimony. And if they would have been ^{om} uncomfortable citing the Commission, they could have found it in the very first book on the subject, 1956's Whitewash. It cites the best authority on the Zapruder camera,

the man who used it, Zapruder himself, making an unintended statement that ~~what~~ was said ~~in~~ this film did not hold what he knew should be there and isn't:

multiple single space

Zapruder was explaining how he took his pictures. I was shooting through a telephoto lens ... and as it (the Presidential car) reached about - I imagine it was around here - I heard the first shot and I saw the President lean over and grab himself ... (7H571). Lawyers know very well that such words as "here" in testimony relating to a location reflect nothing on the printed page. When they want the testimony clear, they ask the witness to identify the spot meant by "here". Zapruder was not asked to explain where "here" was. But the startling meaning of Zapruder's testimony is this: He saw the first shot hit the President! He described the President's reaction to it. Had the President been obscured by the sign, Zapruder could have seen none of this. Therefore, the President was hit prior to frame 210, prior to frame 205, the last one that shows the top of his head, and the exact point can probably be reconstructed from another unique quality of the Zapruder footage the Commission saw fit to ignore entirely. (7H572)

The ~~man~~ Fdtzer praises Mantik as the premier scholar on the film, but he prefers conjecture to actual sworn testimony, a new kind of scholarship for those with the endlessly boasted of Ph.D.s.

There is more but this is far from all:

Zapruder even informed the Commission that he saw the President's waving motion with his hand turn into a grasping at his neck (7H571). He even called to the attention of the Commission something wrong at this precise sequence in the footage (7H573). He had been shown a few frames beginning with 185 and was testifying about them when he said, after looking at 185 and 186, "Yes; this is before - this shouldn't be there - the shot wasn't fired was it? You can't tell from here?"

The lack of response from Assistant Counsel Liebeler was noted by the court reporter: "Mr. Liebeler. (No response)."

Zapruder then continued, "I believe it was closer down here where it happened. Of course, on the film they could see better but you take an 8-mm. and you enlarge it in color or in black and white, you lose a lot of detail. I wish I had an enlarger here for you" (7H573) (page 48).

The foregoing is not an unfair characterization of most of what passes as scholarship on the Zapruder film. It also is not unfair to what Mantik shows of his scholarship.

Mantik next tells us that "without the Zapruder film, we would be forced to rely on the reports of eyewitnesses" (page 327).

Not really. And with Zapruder's film both the government and critics do use eyewitness testimony.

Zapruder's is the best film but there are others that would

The real reason the FBI declines ^{Free} (copies of Bronson's films is that ~~That is all the FBI wanted of pictures~~) they did not show Oswald with a smoking gun. The rule seemed to be no ~~Oswald~~ Oswald, no good. In addition, parts seem to be exculpatory, and no agent who wanted to hold his job ^{in Dallas} dared bring anything like that in. Moreover, those ~~films~~ ^{of the films} could have been used to identify a large number of witnesses and to pinpoint where those witnesses were ^{at} ~~the~~ "precisely the time the shots were fired," But that also did not interest the FBI.

(Mentik was in touch with me but he never asked me for any of the information I had on the Zapruder or any other films.)

valuable information in any real investigation.

have been used more than they were and there were also others that the FBI avoided and would have been brought out earlier had there been a known need.

One that the FBI suppressed I learned about in an FOIA lawsuit against the Dallas FBI office (DL 89-43-518). When the FBI was forced to examine the ^{Charles} Bronson film the agents reported that "While the "Film did depict the President's car at the precise time the shots were fired, however the pictures were not sufficiently clear for ^{pictures} identification purposes" (DL 89-493).
 "Do the FBI decline a copy of it and of Bronson's still pictures"
 -43-

When Friend of mine saw these reports they found Bronson protected all his rights, got his film, and the film proved that the FBI agents did not file an honest and accurate report on Bronson's films 1964 here

~~Rather than not being used for identification purposes, it was used in identifying at least 50 witnesses, along with more in one still picture they got from Bronson. What these agents mean is that neither film could identify Oswald. No Oswald, not good to the FBI. And rather than not showing the TSEB at all it had close to a hundred frames with that very window included in them. If the FBI had not succeeded in avoiding Bronson, his film would have been an important part of the investigation. It shows the limousine and the people in it from the side other than Zapruder's film does.~~

This also addresses Fetzner, his scholarship and his opinion of the scholarship of others, as well as his judgement.

After saying that "If the Zapruder film is authentic yet displays such profound disagreement with eyewitnesses," Mantik goes back to the beginning of World War I, to Sarajero as he stretches to make an invalid point (page 327). We skip that and his other malarky until, "Millie Cranor reminds us that because of the prospects of photographing tampering eyewitnesses have legal priority over

This is another case where fact is not material when the assassination nuts ^{make} were ~~making~~ up their tales in which they had such strong ~~the~~ belief that ~~in~~ they ignored all disproofs. For the time ^{1971 B} ^{here} period of this ^{Manick-Peterson} impossibility that Zapruder camera original was in the Chicago photo labs ~~of~~ Time, Inc. where that corporation was making ~~copies~~ of the frames ^{its} intended for use. It was then, when ~~the~~ ^{Manick-Peterson} ~~Manick-Peterson~~ ¹ ~~wants~~ it believed that the ~~camera~~ ⁱⁿ original was in Washington, ~~that~~ ^{- in Chicago -} the camera original was damaged when a black-and-white copy was being made of it, that black-and-white copy ~~to~~ be used in the Life issues where color pictures were not to be used and to have available for sale to ~~top~~ others, from which Life did profit.

There is also the fact that the "Secret Service print of the Zapruder film was a copy made in Dallas and flown to Washington the night of the assassination. And, as none of these self-styled experts even hints at, it would have been criminal negligence if the Secret Service did not immediately seek the ~~help~~ ^{help} of the country's outstanding experts ~~at~~ the National Photographic Interpretation Center, which it did. ⁴ And the official ~~rear~~ ^{eight} reports of the ~~ANPIC~~ included nothing ~~like~~ ^{directions,} proof of six to ~~both~~ ^{eight} shots coming from at least three different ~~locations~~.

It is simply ~~insane~~ ^{money} to believe that with all that ^{Time, Inc.} had ~~ties~~ up in the camera original of the Zapruder film that it would let that film out of its possession. ~~It~~ ^{then} ~~even~~ sued the published ~~who~~ published drawings made from copies of some of those frames.

The film meant a fortune to Time, Inc., which ^{then} ~~owned~~ all the right. A ~~glimmer~~ ^{Time's} of what ^{can profit from} it was worth is that after ~~three more than~~ three decades of ~~the~~ exclusive ^{then} right to that film, when Time reverted the rights to the Zapruder heirs, the government, which could have confiscated the film, ~~paid~~ ^{then} a reported eighteen million for it and ~~the~~ ^{then} heirs still got paid for the uses of it.

Time bought and got his film directly from Zapruder the day after the assassination, Saturday, November 23, 1963,

photographic evidence" (page ³231). He might as well have said that according to Millicent Ceranor, perjury has to be accepted by the courts as superior to photographic evidence, especially ^over such photographs as ^{are} ~~are~~ taken by the police.

Next he says what he was told but is a complete impossibility, a proven impossibility, but these who indulge in what they dignify by referring to them as theories and are really conjectures, most of the time with ^{not even} ~~no~~ factual basis at all, (as conjectures, ^{official} although he had the ^{includes} proof that it was impossible added to by the ARRB records he has and ~~Fetzer~~ ^{includes} he next actually says that "a Secret Service agent who had flown ~~it~~ the camera original) ^{to} Rochester ^{NPIC (CIA) in Washington} for development before bringing it to the ~~NPIC~~ ^{NPIC}: (page 331) ¹⁹⁷⁴

We do come to what Fetzer tells us to see and we do see there;

Recent releases by the ARRB, however, suggest otherwise. The Homer McMahon interviews, in particular, suggest a broken chain of possession. [Editor's note: See the NPIC reports by Douglas Horne elsewhere in this volume.] McMahon was head of the color lab at the National Photographic Interpretation Center (NPIC) in 1963. He describes receiving the film (without a doubt, the Zapruder film) from a Secret Service agent who had flown it to Rochester for development before bringing it to the NPIC. McMahon's recollections were corroborated by one of his assistants, Bennett Hunter, who was also interviewed by the ARRB.

As best these two could recall, they received the film on the weekend immediately after the assassination (almost certainly before the funeral). McMahon recalls seeing the film projected at least 10 times that night. It was his opinion, based on this viewing, that JFK was shot 6 to 8 times from at least three directions, but the Secret Service agent told McMahon that there were just three shots, and that these all came from the Book Depository. McMahon and his assistant were told to keep their work secret and were prohibited even from telling their supervisors (who were not present) (page 331). ^{see} 1974

*indiv
single
space*

We do come to what Fetzer tells us to see and we see there what Fetzer did not include here and what does not buttress his boastful claim that Mantic is the most.

Mkantik swings farthure away from fact and, as he argues instead of citing fact, he gets ^{more} and more irresponsible and unfactual. There is no ~~re~~levant argument in what follows and what he pretends is fact is not fact:

*Mantik
single
space*

The chain of possession argument relies critically on the memories of those who handled the film that day. Those skeptics who disparage the recollections of the Dealey Plaza witnesses nonetheless insist that the memories of the film handlers that day were flawless. Why those who handled the film that day can be trusted, while those who witnessed the assassination are not credible, is known only to disciples of film authenticity. Besides this reliance on the memory of the film handlers, however, the chain of evidence argument relies on sworn affidavits—to the effect that only three copies of the film were made at the Jamieson laboratory on 22 November 1963. (p 294 332).

The actual chain of possession, firmly proven. proven beyond reasonable question ~~it does seem more appropriate~~ rational question

was far away from Washington or Rochester. Mantik is off on this ^{irrational} kick, which is not at all scholarly, on the basis of what he attributes to others, a lapse in memory of one Secret Service agent, who is offset by the clear and accurate recollection of others and with much else that is factual and is confirmed, officially. *And by*

contemporary records.

As, if either Fetzer or Mantik knew what they should know to be publishing and writing ^{their} corruption of history that ^{to} Fetzer makes Mantik the best assassination scholar.

Mantik is careful not to name those he refers to as "film handlers," but the film ~~was~~ never in the possession of mere "film handlers" from the camera to Time ^{Inc} magazine. When it got to Time and where in the Time organization that ^{was} ~~was~~, when and where it was developed and how many copies and what happened to each of those copies if beyond rational questioning, its well known, and this ~~is~~ pre-eminent scholar, ^{Mantik,} the best of all assassination scholars, ~~according~~ according to Fetzer, makes no mention of any of that. Because it is amply and solidly ⁴ confirmed. Mantik is reduced to argument, which is not ^{fact and not} scholarship and ~~is~~ is the dirtiest kind of silly argument in which, without any reason at all, he slurs those who did what proves his line of conjecture is false and he knew that, or should have known it, before he started off on this kind of the phoniest

false retense of scholarshio.

In his next disparagement of sworn-to truth ~~he~~ Mantik, in effect, argues ~~that~~ with regarto the Zapruder film, what ~~he~~ wants the evidence to be and is ^mpossible must be credited and the sworn-to, first-person affidavits, perjury ~~is~~ not true, cannot be believed while his hokum must be believed,

This and more like it is what Fetzer proclaims is the best assassination scholarship when it is not scholarship at all.

Next ^{Mantik} he actually argues that what is acceptable to the ~~of~~ courts is no good while the faulty and obviously impossible memory, un-sworn, must be credited above it:

indent
single
space

For the credibility of these affidavits' ultimate reliance must be placed on human honesty—there is no movie film that documents the preparation of only three copies of the film. How do we know that the affidavits were honest, or even that the signatories were actually in a position to witness everything they claimed to see? Is it even possible that the affidavits were deliberately prepared—possibly at the suggestion of the Secret Service—merely to cover up the existence of additional copies? Paul Rothermel, head of security for H. L. Hunt (Twyman 1997, p. 552; Harrison Livingstone, *Killing the Truth* 1993, p. 522 and p. 533) has long claimed that he received a copy of the film on the day of the assassination.

(page 332)

Affidavits, as even thiphony assassination scholar should know, what is sworn to in realife, not in dreems of being Sherlock Holmes returned from the grave, ~~does~~ require and ~~does~~ depend on "Human Honesty." Without that honest, those who attest to what is not true face jail and disgrace. All of Mantik's irrational conjecture^s are false and he offers not a single reason to believe the conjectures with which he wants the sworn-to and obvious truth disregarded.

Paul Rothermel, who ^I know, is a big a liar as ^{anyone} ~~amantik can~~ ^a saddle himself with. ^{Mantik} He took this canard ^{another mammoth liar who fo mantik is} from his respected assassination expert, Mantik says of him, Harry Livingstons, who went for that Rothermel fabrication when he wanted to ~~mix~~ mix the already mixed-up ^{this man was H.L.} so-called assassination "reseqrchers" up ^{me} Rothermel and ~~Mont~~ did not have any cpy of the film. From what Rothermel told ~~he~~ he then was

very busy learning from the FBI, for which he had worked, when it would be best to take ^{to} H. F. Hint, who was believed to be in some danger. Rothermel told ^{me} that the FBI recommended ^{Washington,} Philadelphia, as I now ^m remember it, ~~perhaps it was Washington,~~ and he ~~also~~ also told me that he kept the old man there for a month.

With no need of the film of which he could not have obtained a copy in any event.

From the official and ^{surely to} credible evidence, not conjectures.

We skip more like this, of which Mantik heaps a great surplus on trusting readers, and atop the earlier corruptions of our history,

(what we skip remains underscored in my annotated copy of the book)

*invalent
single
spec*

If the film was altered, why leave in evidence that suggests a frontal shot? I have previously addressed this entirely sensible objection in some detail (*Assassination Science* 1998, p. 272), but it still provokes discussion and emotion, so several more comments may be useful. Based on a careful review of the eyewitnesses, JFK most likely slumped forward twice, once after the throat shot, and then immediately after the fatal headshot (a motion not seen in the extant film). Between these two events, it is most likely that Jackie (slowly) lifted JFK to an erect position so that she could examine his face closely. In Erwin Swartz's interview with Noel Twyman, this is exactly what he described in the film that initial weekend. It seems likely that this upward movement, in a later version of the film (unnaturally accelerated by excised frames), has come to be seen as the head snap (page 332).

Fictional and self-serving conjecture.

First if all, there is no evidence at all - not a single fact - that the Zapruder film as altered except what I brought to light in 1965

in Whitewash: when the Chicago Time office was making black-and white prints of the ^{color film - the} camera film, the actual original, a film technician made a diagonal tear in it. That was the day after the assassination, Saturday. It was on Saturday that the deal with Time was agreed to and the original went off to be made into pictures to illuminate the ^{Life story and for future uses and sales.} Time story. The original was patched in haste and the film itself remained in that Time office until the immediate editorial need for it was past.

And with what Time paid Zapruder and would later increase,

Some of it is pretty wild and, wild as it is, it has no confirmation. It is merely Mantik letting his mind rush wild, without any restraint, most of all ^{etc} of plain, old-fashioned common sense.

Like :

*wild
rough
fumble* } The bloody ~~spr~~spray now seen at before the first shot to give rise to such a visible spray The bloody spray now seen at Z-313 was probably ^(sic) ~~imported from~~ from the image of the second headshot (which is no longer in the film" (page 334).

At the same point he "provides a rather long time interval (two months) for completion of the alterations."

Conjecturing away ^wildly, uninhibitedly, irrational and without a single fact to support any of his craziness, ^{Mantik} he then says that "it is even possible ^a that no alteration was done within the first few ~~days.~~"

~~This is crazy and~~ has not a single fact to support any of it. Even his conjectures get pretty skimpy and he has nothing else, ~~Not~~ a single fact to support any of this insane wildness, (page 334).

^{This is} (An appropriate illustration, one of many, ~~at~~ that illustrates the reasons that other self-styled assassination scholar, Fetzer, boasts, as we have quoted him as saying, that Mantik is the finest, the greatest of assassination scholars.)

it is for sure that ^{time} ~~in~~ was not going to let anyone outside of the Time organization lay a hand on that original, from ~~the~~ camera film.

All that Mantik says ^{is} here is conjecture and worse, it is conjecture that has no basis ^{real} in ^{fat} fact.

Mantik raises ^{the} ~~new~~ wrong question and he raises it the wrong way.

He and the many ^{other} assassination nuts, and that is what he is here,

If the film was doctored, and the head shot is far from all that disproves the official assassination "solution," if the film had been edited, what ~~it~~ proved ~~the~~ Warren Report wrong would have been removed, as it was not, ~~and~~ ^{it} what tended to confirm it would have been inserted, ~~and that also~~ ^{But neither} was not ~~done~~. In short there is no reason to believe it was altered ^{There is no real} ~~at~~ ^{that} with ~~no~~ reason to believe ^{and} no ~~fact~~ to confirm any alteration. ^{assassination} It is all irrational nut fabrication.

Mantik's "most likely's" and other such conjectures are all made up, as is all ^{of} ~~h~~ ^{fact} ~~is~~ says with no ~~basis~~ ^{for his} ~~that~~ "most likely," which none is at all.

What he says of the body likewise has no basis in fact and it is refuted by the actual, unedited Zapruder film, ^{and other sources, 2 of them} ~~of which if I have had a print made from a copy that was made from the camera original and I have studied the ^{35mm} slides, also made from the original, in the National ^{Archives}. I also have had a distinct advantage over these assassination nut ⁱⁿ that I have seen enlarged and close up ~~at~~ what they know nothing about because there is no ^{real} scholarship among ~~this~~ those who dream of the film being doctored so they have no need to follow legitimate leads that were public and they could have and did not, ^{as} ~~as~~ I could and I did. ~~And~~ not one of these nuts called scholars went to check on what I'd rescued from suppression and was freely available to them as it became to me.~~

What happened is that I caught the FBI in a dirty trick and exposed

it, in Whitewash II.

Which was published in December, 1966.

This is a streamlined account of what is published ~~else~~ elsewhere in this series of book manuscripts.

I caught the FBI holding back nine of the slides Life gave the Commission, color slides ^{of which} that the FBI was making black and white copies, ~~of~~ When I published this ^{the} ~~with~~ Archives was embarrassed. I was invited in to see the color slide, ~~which~~ which were placed with the other slides, accessible to all. Those pictures are so ~~clear~~ ^{clear} ~~to~~ ^{that} on projection to about five feet in width ^h on the screen the Archives used, I saw immediately that ~~two~~ ^{two} frames into those nine the FBI had a good reason ~~to~~ to pretend an accident and to withhold them.

The President had been thrown violently backward, against the back of the seat. Slowly in the slides but rapidly in actual time, he falls over onto his wife. In ~~these~~ two slides the back of his head is clearly visible. There ~~is~~ ^{is} not a hair out of place, and individual hairs are quite visible in the enlargement. There is no hole ^(in his head) and ~~no~~ blood on the back of his head. There is no blood on the clearly visible back of his collar or on his jacket And that was ~~twenty~~ ^{four} slides after the fatal shot.. 202 A here

~~It is so fast none ^{of} that cock-and-bull stuff ~~the~~ Mantik attributes to unnamed "bystanders" and he described that case ~~stuff~~ falsehood from those bystanders and from what Mantik refers to as his "careful" ~~careful~~ ^w reports total falsehood. Not a word from those "bystanders" is true and the entire Zapruder film could not have been doctored to meet the demands of those sick minds that make up whatever is wanted and is credited as soon as made up-with no basis for any of it.~~

The President fell rapidly sideways on her and he did not rise and she did not even try to lift him. She held him.

It is ^{fast} so ~~fast~~ ^{but} two frames means a ninth of a second - that none of the cock-and-bull stuff that Mantik attributes to his unnamed "bystanders" not only cannot and ^{do} not refute it - they did not even see it in a ninth of a second and made no mention of it. So, with Mantik another of the Fetzers who insist on the legal fiction that eyewitness comment, no matter how false, is legally preferable to confirmed, actual, undoctored pictures, are not even aware of this in that film so they do not have to continue. as Mantik here does, with the sick pretense that doctoring tiny 8mm film, only slightly more than a quarter of an inch in its larger dimension, is as simple and easy as tick-tack-toe.

~~But~~ Mantik's ~~boas~~ boasted-of "~~ex~~" careful review did not detect it so he did not have to make use of his endless conjectures and other inventions he pretends are unrefuted fact. And, not learning of it in that "careful" review of his, he had no need to add this to the other parts of the film his sick mind told him were edited.

And so the ~~the~~ Zapruder film here holds what is destructive of the official invention that became the official "solution." *and it remains in the film*
 In the brief series of frames of which these ^{two} ~~to~~ are part - and all nine of those frames ^{take} ~~comes to~~ but a half of a second - the President falls sideways onto his wife. He did not rise and she did not even try to help him do that, another of the inventions of these would-be ~~is~~
Dick Tracys
 She held him.

This is more of the intellectual and factual garbage that, to Fetzer, makes Mantik ^{the} ~~the~~ outstanding ~~xxxxxx~~ expert on the assassination and

no matter how high ^{an} opinion Fetzer has of Mantik, there is no truth in any of this, no matter how many "seems likely" ~~she~~ invents. "Seems likely," even if it is Mantik's opinion, is not fact and does not and cannot refute fact just because Mantik makes it up. There is, still ~~again~~, no evidence to support what Mantik says.

Nor is there any need to ~~exercise~~ frames of the Zapruder film to hide the alleged limousine stop. The FBI's analysis of the film is that very briefly and very ^{quickly} ~~rapidly~~ ^{Green} ~~to~~ put the brakes ~~on~~ when he heard a shot but before the limousine ^{could} ~~can~~ ^{at} ~~to~~ a full stop he speeded up as fast ~~and~~ that lumbering limousine that, with what had been? been added to it, ~~it~~ could speed up.

And the film, ~~which~~ ^{off w/ fact} about which once again Mantik passes of what is made up, still again, as always, with no basis in fact at all, the "film was" not "hidden from ~~the~~ public view until 1975," ^{as Mantik says here} (page 333). I spent many hours examining it in the ARCFI Archives many days in 1966. Bootleg copies were widely and easily available not long after that, no later than 1967. Nor was it that Manyik's ~~unnamed~~ "editors" who "were not eager to ~~un~~share their product" with anyone. The ~~fact~~ is that time had bought the film and was anxious to make money on it. ~~giving it away, inw's decision, was so that time could make money from th film.~~ ^{not by giving it away}

By the time he fabricates his way this far, Mantik says he "concludes" that "without knowing what the original film ~~was~~ actually showed we can only speculate on the difficulties faced by the forgers" (page 333). In this he assumes as fact what he and other so-called theorists made up with no basis in fact at all, ~~that~~ that the film was forged when there is ^{real} no evidence of forgery at all. There is only what eminent scholars like Mantik make up as they imagine themselves to be Sherlock Holmes reborn.

Mantik brags about his many trips to the national Archives in pursuit of what he also makes a big deal of, examination of film in his effort to prove that there was alteration of it. He could make all those trips for ^{that} purpose but not to see the Zapruder film, which was always accessible at the Archives.

He could not use any of those trips, for example, to see those withheld nine frames after I exposed that in 1966. But of course, if he had, he could not make up what he had about alleged doctoring of that film, as ^{we} have seen above,

And ~~the~~ back to the alleged stopping of the limousine, Fetzer is loaded with it as also is the Warren Commission records. In Palamara's 59 Witnesses, on pages 119-21, of twenty-two witnesses, nineteen said there was a stop. So it was all very open and there was no need to eliminate anything from the ~~film~~ film because of the FBI analysis and that anything was removed from the film is Mantik's fabrication, there being no evidence of it in addition to there being no need of it.

Mantik is full of conjecture he palms off as fact and on the next page he refers to what he makes up as his "interpretation" of the evidence. His first ~~main~~ interpretation is that "JFK was first hit in the head from the rear, ~~while~~ while slumped forward, ^{such} as in Z-312." Aside from the fact that there is no hole in the back of the President's head, he does not say when Kennedy was in such a position and unless it was at about the time the Commission itself made up, ~~it~~ it could not have happened without destroying the Warren Report, (page 334).

As Mantik conjectures gayly away, he invents a second head shot of which he has given no proof, and then he makes up all over again that "The blood spray ~~was~~ now seen in Z-313 was probably (which makes this fabrication the ^{most} scholarly evidence) imported from the image of the second headshot (which is no longer seen in the film).

Despite Mantik's facile invention, which he wants accepted, ^{as fact,} as Metzger did ^{in evaluating Mantik's} as the ~~best~~ best assassination scholarship, all of this in just plain fabrication (page 334).

Without giving and real need for any alteration of the Zapruder film he then says of "the time required" for all that he made up, that his own ^view is that the editing went on for a long time" (page 334). How that could possibly be when there were three official copies ~~the~~ original film and some made from them. There is, at the least, the Time black-and-white copy made for providing other than color pictures for use in Time ^{and elsewhere.}

There were also the ¹still made by the government, particularly ²by the NPIC, and by Time at the least. Other copies can have been made for other agencies to obtain information for those agencies. Playing unseemly games without having ^{by} all faithfully duplicates on all copies was to invite disaster.

There was no official need for such alteration, all of which was made up by assassination nuts, which they all are, even those with Ph.D.s.

No actual need is offered by those nuts and there is no such need for government.

~~Dep~~ despite all of this Mantik fabrication and so much more like it, for which there is no ~~real~~ evidence or need, the fact is that all the film ~~these~~ strange people say was altered, each and every kind, Zapruder's, the ^{ant copy} ~~atopsy~~ still and X-rays, each and every one as it now exists, after all that imagined alteration, defeats the ¹arrest Report. It makes no sense that film be altered, which entails heavy risk, to alter it ~~also~~ so that it accomplishes the exact opposite of ⁴the alleged reason for the alleged alteration.

The only possible reason for the alleged forging of the film is to

after they had been ^{shown} ~~set~~ the autopsy Xrays and photographs.

of the margins of the bone when viewed from the inner aspect of the skull. This is characteristic of a wound of entry in the skull.

Exit

The autopsy report further states that there was a large irregular defect of the scalp and skull on the right involving chiefly the parietal bone but extending somewhat into the temporal and occipital regions, with an actual absence of scalp and bone measuring approximately 13 cm. (5.12 inches) at the greatest diameter. In non-technical language, this means that a large section of the skull on the right side of the head was torn away by the force of the missile. Photographs Nos. 5-10 inclusive, 17, 18, 26-28, 32-37 inclusive, 44 and 45 portray this massive head wound, and verify that the largest diameter was approximately 13 cm. The report further states that one of the fragments of the skull bone, received from Dallas, shows a portion of a roughly circular wound presumably of exit which exhibits beveling of the outer aspect of the bone, and the wound was estimated to be approximately 2.5 to 3.0 cm. (1 to 1.18 inches) in diameter. X-ray Nos. 4, 5 and 6 show this bone fragment and the embedded metal fragments. Photographs Nos. 17, 18, 44 and 45 show the other half of the margin of the exit wound; and also show the beveling of the bone characteristic of a wound of exit. Photographs Nos. 44 and 45 also show that the point of exit of the missile was much larger than the point of entrance, being 30 mm. (1.18 inches) at its greatest diameter. Photographs 5-10 inclusive, 32-37 inclusive, 44 and 45 show the location of the head wound, and verify the accuracy of the Warren Commission drawings (Exhibits 386 and 388, Vol. XVI, pp. 977 and 984) which depict the location of the head wound.

NO OTHER WOUNDS

The x-ray films established that there were small metallic fragments in the head. However, careful examination at the autopsy, and the photographs and x-rays taken during the autopsy, revealed no evidence of a bullet or of a major portion of a bullet in the body of the President and revealed no evidence of any missile wounds other than those described above.

Note the careful game with words under "NO OTHER WOUNDS." Dr. Humes' sworn testimony is that the x-rays revealed no evidence of bullet fragments at any point in the President's body except the head. The official solution of the crime cannot stand unless that testimony is true, for the bullet officially alleged to have wounded the neck, 399, is already impossibly burdened by the requirement that it have produced all of Connally's wounds as well. Here the doctors say only that the x-rays reveal "no evidence of a bullet or of a major portion of a bullet in the body of the President" (as distinguished from the head). What this peculiar language must mean, and as the second panel later confirmed, is that there are indeed "minor portions of a bullet" in the President's body, a negation of the official solution.

206

eliminate what is uncongenial to the official account of the assassination.

Mantik mires himself even more when he writes his imagined alteration was not likely (evidence for Fetzer's pre-eminent scholar) that the work was completed overnight, or even within a few days..."(page 334).

Or, as this ~~intellec~~ ^{made} it all up, not until after copies of the film had been distributed throughout the government and Time, inc., had distributed copies of many frames in several issues of Life.

Mantik also says that those named by Palamara raise questions about the chain of ~~possession~~ ^{possession}. Not really. The questions they actually raise, as we see, have to do with Mantik's integrity.

As Mantik conjectures away we cannot ~~assess~~ ^{address} all that he conjectures, but a few we do, a few ~~the~~ ^{he} and his associates had to know about, had to address and did not address. These ~~are~~ ^{are} from Post Mortem, from a

report by the Navy's autopsy doctors. Notice the cute language that clearly indicates there was more metal in ~~the~~ ^{the} region of the neck wound than is accounted for by those Navy doctors, and this when the first doctors to testify as quoted in the first book, Whitewash, testified that there was more metal missing from the bullet that hit

~~the~~ Kennedy than ~~the~~ ^{its} conjectured weight. I use that entire page and the footnote ^{MISSING} to inform readers more ~~fully~~ ^{fully},

From the ¹⁹⁶⁸ report of the Department of Justice panel of the country's best experts, they confirm ^{bullet} metal ~~where~~ ^{the autopsy} that is not accounted for in the autopsy. ~~And~~ ^{the} this thy report from ^{the autopsy} pictures and X-rays. or, what kind of hanky ^{panky} were Mantik's "experts" and Mantik himself conjecturing away with when the ^{of} allegedly altered film picks up this kind of alteration, if alteration it was, that by ~~itself~~ ^{itself} destroys the

200A

same for a few words at the top

Warren Report by destroying what is ^{is} ~~basic~~ to it, the Specter fabrication of his single-bullet theory that ^{is} ~~was~~ not a theory and ^{is} ~~was~~ a myth.

fundamental ^{is} ~~is~~
 ¶ The 1968 report of these autopsy doctors quoted above also destroys the Report the same way, by destroying that single-bullet fabrication without which no lone and unassisted assassin fairy tale is ~~not~~ possible. ¶ This DJ panel report is in facsimile in Post Mortem, pages 580-95. ¶ Again we use the entire page so the

reader can be ~~certain~~ confident that nothing is changed in any way. ¶

¶ And, small as those bullet fragments in the "Neck Region" may be, they are more than enough to make ^{Specter's} the entire made-up history of ~~his~~ the magic bullet, Exhibit 399, impossible, and with that they also make ~~the~~ the entire mythical official "solution" to the JFK assassination

also completely impossible:

208

67
206

Neck Region: Films #8, 9 and 10 allowed visualization of the lower neck. Subcutaneous emphysema is present just to the right of the cervical spine immediately above the apex of the right lung. Also several small metallic fragments are present in this region. There is no evidence of fracture of either scapula or of the clavicles, or of the ribs or of any of the cervical and thoracic vertebrae.

The foregoing observations indicate that the pathway of the projectile involving the neck was confined to a region to the right of the spine and superior to a plane passing through the upper margin of the right scapula, the apex of the right lung, and the right clavicle. Any other pathway would have almost certainly fractured one or more bones of the right shoulder girdle and thorax.

Other Regions Studied: No bullets or fragments of bullets are demonstrated in X-rayed portions of the body other than those described above. On film #13, a small round opaque structure, a little more than 1 mm. in diameter, is visible just to the right of the midline at the level of the first sacral segment of the spine. Its smooth characteristics are not similar to those of the projectile fragments seen in the X-rays of the skull and neck.

Examination of the Clothing

Suit Coat (CE 393) A ragged oval hole about 15 mm. long (vertically) is located 5 cm. to the right of the midline in the back of the coat at a point about 12 cm. below the upper edge of the coat collar. A smaller ragged hole which is located near the midline and about 4 cm. below the upper edge of the collar does not overlie any corresponding damage to the shirt or skin and appears to be unrelated to the wounds or their causation.

In describing the all too few x-rays of the "neck region" the panel demolishes the Warren Report and the integrity of the autopsy doctors' testimony. Humes had sworn there were no metallic fragments in the neck visible on the x-rays (2H361). 399 is clearly unfragmented, yet it had to have caused the neck wounds for the Commission's case to survive. Thus, the panel's statement that "several small metallic fragments are present" in the neck region, although lacking the detail and precision that might be expected from such eminences, is sufficient to prove that the Report and the autopsy findings on which it was based are irreversibly wrong.

ON 207 208A

anteriorly and superiorly. None can be visualized on the left side of the brain and none below a horizontal plane through the floor of the anterior fossa of the skull.

On one of the lateral films of the skull (#2), a hole measuring approximately 8 mm. in diameter on the outer surface of the skull and as much as 20 mm. on the internal surface can be seen in profile approximately 100 mm. above the external occipital protuberance. The bone of the lower edge of the hole is depressed. Also there is, embedded in the outer table of the skull close to the lower edge of the hole, a large metallic fragment which on the antero-posterior film (#1) lies 25 mm. to the right of the midline. This fragment as seen in the latter film is round and measures 6.5 mm. in diameter. Immediately adjacent to the hole on the internal surface of the skull, there is localized elevation of the soft tissues. Small fragments of bone lie within portions of these tissues and within the hole itself. These changes are consistent with an entrance wound of the skull produced by a bullet similar to that of exhibit CE 399.

The metallic fragments visualized within the right cerebral hemisphere fall into two groups. One group consists of relatively large fragments, more or less randomly distributed. The second group consists of finely divided fragments, distributed in a postero-anterior direction in a region 45 mm. long and 8 mm. wide. As seen on lateral film #2 this formation overlies the position of the coronal suture; its long axis if extended posteriorly passes through the above-mentioned hole. It appears to end anteriorly immediately below the badly fragmented frontal and parietal bones just anterior to the region of the coronal suture.

Here we learn that the entrance wound in the head, never measured by the autopsy doctors who preferred to locate it merely as "slightly above" the occipital protuberance, was actually 100 mm. above that point. No silly millimeter here. That is 4 inches higher than the autopsy doctors made out, putting the wound high on the back of the President's head instead of near the hairline as the doctors swore to and depicted on drawings. This is how the panel "supported" the autopsy report.

208A

The foregoing observation was struck from behind occipital region 25 mm above the external occipital protuberance. The bone of the lower edge of the hole is depressed. Also there is, embedded in the outer table of the skull close to the lower edge of the hole, a large metallic fragment which on the antero-posterior film (#1) lies 25 mm. to the right of the midline. This fragment as seen in the latter film is round and measures 6.5 mm. in diameter. Immediately adjacent to the hole on the internal surface of the skull, there is localized elevation of the soft tissues. Small fragments of bone lie within portions of these tissues and within the hole itself. These changes are consistent with an entrance wound of the skull produced by a bullet similar to that of exhibit CE 399.

In addition to the foregoing, there is no evidence of projection of the bullet or in the right cerebellum. The bullet passing through the skull. Also, although the fragment of the midline and internal surface of the skull, no bony defect is seen entering or leaving the midline or internal surface. It is reasonable to postulate that the bullet entered in a direction other than that shown.

Of further note is the fact that the panel presented to The Panel of Inquiry the regions by what appears on film #2, a pair of films. Neither film shows the interpretation of the findings.

The panel's non sequitur must have wounded the head on the left side of the head could be such as a frangible bullet impact.

Note also the report was also mentioned by Hume a description of precisely no way of knowing whether the evidence.

57-207
208B

on into the
1.8 cm.
C. on the
2 small, well
ab on the
of the st.
ab 8 cm. ear.

right of the
irradiating
extending
and occipital
are is an
one producing
approximately

ins of the
ab in dilate
stact scalp

ear tempo -

G

parital margin anterior to the st. ear to
a point slightly above the tragus.

b) From the anterior parital margin
anteriorly on the forehead to approximately
4 cm. above the st. orbital ridge

c) From the left margin of the main
defect across the midline anterior-laterally
for a distance of approximately 8 cm.

d) From the same starting point as
(c) 10 cm posterior-laterally.

Situated in the posterior scalp approximately
2.5 cm laterally to the right and slightly
above the external occipital protuberance
is a ~~fractured~~ ~~lacerated~~ ~~lacerated~~ wound ~~tangential to the~~
~~surface of the scalp~~ measuring 15 x 6 mm.
In the underlying bone is a corresponding
~~puncture~~ wound through ~~the bone~~ ~~the table~~ of
the skull which exhibits ~~the presence~~ of
the margins of the bone when ~~pinned~~ ~~from~~
the inner ~~to the~~ ~~aspect of the skull~~ table.
A ~~heavy~~ ~~subtle~~ in the above described
large skull defect and extending from it
is ~~lacerated~~ ~~brain~~ brain tissue which on
close inspection proves to represent ~~the~~

Humes twice omitted the word "puncture" on this page, once actually replacing it with
a word of entirely opposite meaning, "lacerated."

209.

all accessible to all the Fitzgers and ignored by them.

painful not

These are ~~no~~ facts, ~~no~~ conjectures. These ordered changes represent the kind of alteration that were made by the order of top Navy brass in an effort to fortify ~~the~~ ^{its} also made-up official assassination "solution" ~~thq~~ that, with expoure, they can no longer dox.

It would have been much easier to alter these ~~documents~~ documents than te to edit ~~the~~ film and not get ~~vc~~ caught at that, ^{which is not considered by the Fitzgers,} Instead, they ~~were~~ hidden by the Justice department.

I obtained the first two medical reports ^{in 1968} when I was part of the effort to have the ~~basic~~ basic autopsy and assassination evidence available to the jury in the Clay Shaw case in New Orleans. The ^{original} Humes handwritten replacement ^{autopsy} report I found hidden where it would never be looked ^{in the Archives} for, along ~~with~~ with the autosity records and his death certificate that Admiral Burkley had "approved." This Humes holograph was written on a ~~whit~~ white tablet that had pale blue lines that are not picked up by the camera in making ~~copies~~ copies of it. I also have color pictures of this Humes holograph. The autopsy report that I published in Post Mortem is copied from ~~the~~ ^{this} Humes holograph, not from any other copy or version ~~of~~ of it.

What this ^{also} illustrates, ~~it~~ ^{is that} should be understood, in addition to destroying the official and made-up assassination "solution" ~~is~~ ^{is that} before the Katzenbach memorandum was even considered, the Navy, on ~~its~~ ^{its} own, was busiless ~~engag~~ engaged in seeing to it that the nation would never have any real solution to the assassination of the President, a coup d'etat, ~~as~~ ^{and} with that was protecting the actual assassins.

This revised Humes autopsy proctocol was actually written two ~~days~~ days after the autopsy examination. That was the ~~das~~ same day that the Katzenbach memoradndum was written but the Navy's orders, not to do a complete ~~and~~ ^{of} proper autopsy, were the day of the assassination.

208 ~~209~~

From that same ²⁵ panel of the country's best ^{there is also} experts, ~~you're id side~~
the unequivocal statement that that the President's head wound was
four inches higher than the Navy doctors placed it in their autopsy
(Post Mortem, ~~page~~ page 530). 208A here

After Humes buried ^{my} ^{his} first autopsy proct^{cc}ol He wrote another one,
~~He wrote~~ a replacement of it. He testified that the changes in it
were ordered by his ~~at~~ ^{these} ^a ^{on} ^{page} ^{seven} of this ~~fr~~
draft. Before that ordeed change, Humes had written of that head
would that it was "tangential ~~to the surface of the~~ ^{the} surface of the
scalp." Changing that to one word, ^{"lacerated"} ~~"had wearw"~~ makes an enormous change
in the fact,
(In what Humes had writtne before being orderd to make the change by
top brass. (Post Mortem, page 515, ^{page seven} autopsy holograph, ~~page seven~~.)
^{these ordered changes})

208B here

These facts, not conjecture, ^{are} represent the kind of alteration
that would be made by someone seeking to fortify the ^{official "solution."} medical records.

209 here →

~~With more than we can take room for we skip ahead to page 341, where
Mantik subheads his writing, "The Chief ~~xxxxxx~~ Arguments Against
Authenticity " (page 341).~~

~~Let us see if Mantik included these disproof, not qarguments.~~

~~A wound "tangential to the surface of the scalp" cannot be at the
back of the head, at the level of the occiput, and this in itself
destroys the made-up official assassination "solution" and with it,
as to the totwo preceding examples, dsdestroys all the film-alterong
fabrication of the Fetzerw and their like, particularly Mantik, beca use,
among other things, they eliminate any useful purpose done by the alleged
alteration, wqich could have been only to make the official "solution"
viable, which it is not and never was.~~

extra space

There is more, much more, very much too much ^{more of} ~~for~~ that is on, by or related to Mantik and while there should be a commentary on it for the nation's history, doing that when I am now eighty-eight and have much more to ^{do} ~~is~~ is now beyond me if I am to do anything else.

I believe that what we have seen of Mantik and his scholarship, of how his mind, ^{that} ~~to~~ of ~~a~~ both a medical doctor and a physicist works, is ~~here~~ more than enough for evaluating anything he says and does on this subject, the ~~subject~~ subject of the ^{SEK} (assassination and its ^{official} investigations).

He has no credibility at all and anything he writes or says must bear his lack of credibility in mind when it is considered.

~~Of~~ Of what remains ^{of} this second ~~adventure~~ of Fetzer adventure into the assassination in his efforts to get attention from it, to build himself a reputation he neither has nor deserves, ~~considering~~ considering Aguilar remains.

^{necessarily} Not for retyping, for consideration. ^{extra} ~~of~~ retyped, after a single hand ^{level}
^{report on Charles Bronson and his films}
 In this chapter we refer to two ~~Dallas FBI Bronson reports~~. If they
 are not used in the text, they should be appended at the end of

this chapter preceded by

^{extra space}
 Here are those two suppressed Dallas FBI reports on ~~the~~ Charles
^{and his} Bronson ^(of which) film that FBI office refused free copies of. This information
 did not leave Dallas. I obtained it in an FOIA lawsuit for the
 JFK assassination records of the Dallas and New Orleans offices.

if not used, please just return

~~Harold Weisberg~~

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

SAC, DALLAS (89-43)

DATE: 11/25/63

SA MILTON L. NEWSOM

SUBJECT: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. WALTER BENT, Sales Service Manager, Eastman Kodak Company, Processing Service Division, 3131 Manor Way, telephone FL 7-4654, Dallas, telephonically advised his company had received two rolls of 8 millimeter Kodachrome and one roll of 35 millimeter film in a package from Mr. CHARLES BRONSON, Chief Engineer, Zarel Mfg. Company, 9230 Denton Drive, Dallas, Texas.

Mr. BRONSON enclosed a letter with his film, stating that the film had been taken at the instant President KENNEDY was assassinated. BRONSON also advised in the letter that from the position he was stationed when he took the film, he feels quite certain the Texas School Book Depository building was clearly photographed and he feels that the window from which the shots were fired will be depicted in the film. He stated for this reason he believes he may have a picture of the assassin, as he fired the shots.

Mr. BENT stated Mr. BRONSON's letter indicated he desired to be cooperative regarding the film with proper authorities and BENT is of the opinion that BRONSON will have no objection to turning the film over to proper authorities in the event it is of value to the investigation.

Mr. BENT stated that he would make arrangements with Mr. BRONSON to view the film at the Kodak Processing Center and would arrange this so that FBI Agents could be present at the same time interview BRONSON concerning his film of the scene.

Mr. BENT assured his full cooperation regarding all film received of a like nature that may possibly be connected with this matter and arrangements were made with him to immediately notify SA NEWSOM of any film of possible value.

2 - Dallas
MLN:rmb

89-43-518

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
NOV 25 1963	
FBI - DALLAS	
Newsom	

DL 89-43

The Eastman Kodak Processing Service Division receives all color film made by 8 millimeter Kodachrome in this area and also most other film for the area is processed by this division. Mr. BENT explained that his employees have not worked since Saturday and they are due back to work at 10:30 AM, 11/25/63. When processing of recent film orders begin, he expects other films taken at the approximate time of President's assassination.

He said that BRONSON's film should be processed and ready for viewing by 3:00 PM. He was told that SA NEWSOM would meet with him at that time.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : SAC, DALLAS (89-43)

DATE: 11/25/63

FROM : SA MILTON L. NEWSON

SUBJECT: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

210
O F 11/25/63

Mr. WALTER BENT, Sales Service Manager, Eastman Kodak Company, Processing Service Division, 3131 Manor Way, and Mr. CHARLES BRONSON, Chief Engineer, Zarel Manufacturing Company, 9230 Denton Drive, were contacted by SAS MILTON L. NEWSON and EMORY E. HORTON on 11/25/63.

Films taken by Mr. BRONSON at the time of the President's assassination including 35 mm. color slides which were taken with a Leica Camera, and 8 mm. Kodachrome film were reviewed. These films failed to show the building from which the shots were fired. Film did depict the President's car at the precise time shots were fired; however, the pictures were not sufficiently clear for identification purposes.

One of the 35 mm. color slides depicted a female wearing a brown coat taking pictures from an angle, which would have, undoubtedly, included the Texas School Book Depository Building in the background of her pictures. Her pictures evidently were taken just as the President was shot. Approximately five other individuals in the crowd were taking pictures at the time.

Arrangements have been made with Mr. WALTER BENT whereby each package of film received for processing by that company, will be returned to the owner of the film with a slip of paper attached requesting the individual to notify the local FBI Office in the event pictures in the package reflect the scene when the President was assassinated. Mr. BENT advised this company does the processing for all the southwestern states. An airtel is being furnished southwest offices notifying them of the above arrangements in the event they receive calls of this type.

2 - Dallas
MLN/SS
(2) ss

89-43-493

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
NOV-25 1963	
FBI - DALLAS	

11/25/63