

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 interpretation 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 confessed 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 Comm's 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. That Perry later referred to it as a point where we on Radio City 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 Frach. Frach makes so much about. But in saying that Perry does not say anymore Frach does not report that it is after 35 years of endless badgering by those

260

who generally subject matter ignoramus on eye tips 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 holding Frach's chest could have been been from a variety of fragments when there was more that big from the whole held 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. 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

272

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 published account of the official fact, so they

283

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?