

Insert of Posner's claims about Connally's lapel flapping

Making something out of nothing, a Posner specialty ~~that is~~ an indispensable in his book, is the real story of the big deal he makes of ^{his} ~~the~~ reporting flapping of the lapel on Connally's jacket ^{He says this shows} ~~said to show~~ in a single frame of the Zapruder film. This, Posner claims, times when Connally was struck by a bullet. ^A It is ludicrous.

The time represented by ^{the} a single frame of the Zapruder film in which Posner says this flapping is shown, is one-thirtieth of a second.

If there was such a flap and if in that brief time it was recorded, Posner does not consider any other possible cause of it, like the wind he says ~~existed~~ ^{blasted} at up to 20 miles per hour.

As he also does not tell the reader, the wound in the front of Connally's chest was below the right nipple. That is not where that lapel was, so ~~not~~ ^{no} exiting bullet could have caused any ~~lap~~ flap.

When Posner confronted Dr. Cyril Wecht, the eminent forensic pathologist, on the ~~News~~ November 19, 1993 CNN "Crossfire" ^h show, resorting to his ^h standard practise of attacking rather than responding he accused Wecht of having said the same thing about that lapel flap in 1975. Forgetting that this means that Posner knew that the question had been raised in 1975, not for the first time in his book, as in it he pretends, Posner cited a Rockefeller Commission internal memorandum indicating that Wecht had said that.

In his denial of having ever said any such thing or even believing it, Wecht cited one of Posner's favorite sources, the chairman of the House assassin's committee's medical panel, Dr. Michael ^Baden. Wecht said Baden "dismissed the flapping of the coat lapel" because "The bullet did not go through the lapel." (transcript, pages 2,3)

As, of course, the pictures of Connally's jacket show. ^l Pictures Posner did not use.

This is still another proof that Posner ^{knows} ~~knows~~ his so-called "reconstruction" ^{is} ~~is~~ of the crime ^{is} ~~was~~ a fraud. Without that alleged lapel flap being both true and with the meaning Posner gives it, his entire hoked-up case for his claimed timing of the shot and of his version of the impossible single-bullet theory, his case falls apart.

Without ^{his} ~~his~~ use of what he knew was invalid he had no book on that basis, too.