

Posner "suggests",  
earlier first shot  
Drip it gave Oswald  
"plenty of time" to hit  
JFK twice. The photo  
caption is not easily read.  
It is black on gray. In the  
text Mantik is less than  
honest and as he knows too  
little to understand this,  
was one of the plagiarisms  
attributed to Posner and  
heard not even a pro forma  
denial from him. It is  
from a work of propaganda  
by Fair Use Analysis  
to interest lazy ears in  
the sciences. Posner hid  
what it really was and  
pretended he had found  
that supposed study




Figure 1. This astonishing photograph, from Newsweek (22 November 1993), shows the final headshot at 30-40 feet further down Elm Street than frame Z-313 (the supposed final headshot). This downhill location is strongly suggested by early reenactments as well as data tables and documents, all of which the Warren Commission ignored.

FBI

Mantel p 220

"controversy" some said LHO  
not guilty, some other domestic  
conspiracy

220

argues that disproving medical  
evidence begins with them, is new  
ignorance of all before them

Just words do this better because  
they do not depend on interpretations or  
observations than can have other mean-  
ings than Mantel gives them by book, for  
if any is based entirely on the official evidence,  
with no experiments or tests

221

hang up on our concepts, his experiments  
& his ideas, say that the false autopsy is all  
the medical evidence. But he makes  
associates are ignorant of the existing work that  
is not confused or confusing

"They would not have known who  
fired the fatal shot" without Dealey  
Plaza. They also would not - could not with  
Dealey Plaza. Still again without end,  
subject-matter is an anecdote. Besides, Mantel  
does not know the real "Dealey Plaza  
evidence"

Mentik - 2

If we had "reviewed" all the photos, that could not have told them who fired the fatal shot, again, subject matter, ignorance or their origin.

Mentik says he begins largely confused to the medical evidence. It would be more accurate if he had said his concept of a very small part of the medical evidence in which he adds not hing to what was known of that part and he adds no knowledge to what was known about the crime. For other parts of the medical evidence or to what was known about it. He reveals regularly his belief that it all starts with him when no fact does. He says what is false, that the medical evidence "can yield no meaningful conclusion about Oswald's ultimate guilt or innocence." It can and it did and he is ignorant of it "while talking down to all others including those who did the work he is ignorant of."

238

Mentik on Zed film P+5: Does Mentik know enough of the basic fact to have a defensible opinion

245

Recollection after decades prove future doctrine sort of conclusion

Mantik - 3

But I recall no stated conclusions. It is obvious that, in addition to believing all film is 'doctored' and hence useless, they argue against pathologists' and Commis in conclusions. But none of them question what observers say is their recollection - of such an unusual & shocking event - and after so much time has passed, no real questioning of eyewitness statements

256

through around they all knew that James had spoken to Perry about 10:30 from the anteroom room that Perry later referred to but go a point where we on Radio and TV learn nothing a little he said it the way that James had phoned Perry on Saturday is in the book on the subject, 1965's White House no sinister purpose attributed to Frick. Frick makes so much about. But in saying that Perry does not say anymore Frick does not report that it is after 35 years of endless badger by those who generally subject matter ignorant on eye tips

260

an example of how these people are all wrapped up in what go Jimmy come to at his interest in him only and likewise display their subject matter ignorance as their might that the hole in Frick's chest could have been from a jagged fragment when there was more that big from the whole hole and it would not have left the fragment fragments in the chest all info available to them years before assassination but let them but it does not help with their dream of fame so for them it does not exist they know about it, so use other info.

272

from that book best most are credited partly credited and not credited. Their problem is that for all their work they add no new fact about the assassination and no other really new about its investigation about which from their writing they are ignorant. They have not yet caught up with what was known before. He started on expertly unnecessary work that added nothing essential - if it is accurate & means what they say it does

283

Mantik & some do not know of James private destruction although James testified to it and it is in the part of PM they use! ignorant of official fact even though they draw what they think they see from a publish account of this official fact, so they conjecture always  
When Mantik first saw NAA results that is when the lone assassin theory began to disintegrate for him

Mantik 4

guess he never read the first (1945) book, or he did not understand it.

In this and following parts Mantik flaunts his subject matter ignorance and that for him all that exists is what his sick ego tells him is important and is not in any sense - when it is not also pathetic and stupid as well as not correct - or true. Exp 283  
For Baum what is not their modern human existence. Nothing worse afflicted before him.

The Zap Film Controversy 325//  
Rona/Eyewitnesses: he claimed authority does not say that eyewitnesses are always more dependable & accurate than photos & movies the way Mantik uses what he says, she says & has a subhead "Eyewitnesses in the (339)

"Professional Literature" but not one on "Eyewitnesses in The Court Room

343 "head snap" not at time of head wound from the front. When was she shot, then?