

1/7/68

Dear Miss Brunson,

Thanks you very much . That kind letter in today's mail, coming after a working day of 23 hours and 15 minutes yesterday, with flights toward from Chicago for a TV appearance and a "contrnotation" with the saurrilous Capital record last midnight in Washington, gve it extra meaning and value to me.

Your theory onthe silencerrr is intriguing. I'd never thought of it. It is also logical. On the rifles, ditto. Since the whole campaign to make it seem that the pictures and Xrays of the autopsy can validate the Report among the things I have been emphasizing is that they cannot show the KIND of weapons used.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

January 3, 1967


Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Thank you for your kind letter. I am sure your papers should and will be preserved. You have -almost singlehandedly - given us what the President gave us: hope, when there was none. And you have given us back something that was stolen when he died - our pride. I want to give some credit to your wife too: I know how difficult it must be sometimes to live with someone as singleminded as one must be to work on the great mass (the great wonderland, if not wasteland) of the evidence. And I'd like to give a little credit to Penn Jones, too. He has done a marvelous thing with his little weekly in this age of facile journalism. And the Minority of One has been faithful from the first. They and Penn Jones certainly deserve a Pulitzer Prize. To you, Sir, I personally award the Nobel. Your books have one thing none of the others have, in that measure: passion. And without passion, the intelligence cannot truly function. I believe this. The pure passion for truth and justice.

I want to say one thing about the Ramparts article on "Three Assassins." They have abused Newton's Law, for the simple fact that the Law would apply primarily to Frame 313 where the fatal bullet struck. In that frame the President is shoved forward. You can measure that. From the back of his coat collar to any fixed point on the top edge of the back seat. The distance is measurably greater in 313 than in 312. Thereafter, he fell backward because he had lost the support of Mrs. Kennedy who was trying to cope with his weight and rise. -They also misread Kellerman's testimony but I won't go into that. Their business is to discover the truth, not to abuse Newton's Law. But after all they only jumped onto the band wagon one month before Life Magazine.

I will try in the attached to reduce my ideas about the possibility of some silent shots. You needn't answer. Later on I will send you some more papers from time to time. That is, I will not expect an answer from you automatically; nor sulk if I don't get one. I do understand. To me, lectures and tours would be a nightmare and destroy my concentration. It is just one more sacrifice on your part as I see it; and for which this nation will one day be grateful; already is. The trouble with Lane and Epstein is their harmless plausible establishment manner; their punishment will be swift; they will rapidly become establishment darlings and I can't think of a worse fate.

Sincerely,



Beverly Brunson
Box 296
Baxter Springs, Kansas 66713

Jack Ruby died this morning. "Doesn't register with you, does it, Chief Warren?" Let that be his epitaph; it's already Warren's.

The Silent Shots

1-3-67
b.k.

1. You yourself have discovered that there was a shot before Frame 210 of the Z film, to which the President is reacting in Frame 225. One shot.
2. You have also discovered that something happened in Frame 227, or immediately before it in some perhaps abstracted frames. I believe the President was hit here for in 227 and 228 he seems to be spinning leftward. In addition he shows a more violent movement in 227 than in any other frame including 313. Two shots.
3. I accept that Gov. Conally was hit in frame 234. Three shots.
4. There is the obvious hit at frame 313 to the President's head. Four shots.

Here are four shots recorded by the silent Z film, in a sequence of 1,2,3, -4. (-210, 227, 234 and 313).

The "ear" witness testimony contradicts this sharply. The overwhelming majority of witnesses heard a sequence of 1 -2,3(4). They heard a long pause after shot one. Nor do any of them describe the first shot as a double or triple sound. Also, the sequence recorded on the film shows that these first three shots made their various effects quite close together, but still spaced far enough apart to have been heard separately. (At the very least as a triple reverberation.)

In other words we are faced with the astounding evidence that the shot that hit President Kennedy in Frame 227 and the shot that hit Governor Conally in Frame 234, two shots, were not heard by the overwhelming majority of witnesses, including even those who heard more than three shots. They say over and over again, there was a long pause after the first shot.

Of those near the President only Mrs. Conally and Kenneth O'Donnell heard a sequence of shots, 1,2 -3. Their testimony is vague. Mrs. Connally says things like, "I heard the second shot hit John" and "There was a second shot and it hit John." O'Donnell heard a 1,2-3 sequence but his testimony makes apparaent that even so he did not hear the shot that hit Governor Connally. And he missed hearing one shot that hit the President, at least. Mrs. Connally, even if she heard the shot that hit her husband, did not hear the one that hit the President at 227.

Mrs. Kennaedy is confused as to how many shots she heard, two or three. She is only sure of the first shot which made her turn and the second shot which she heard which struck the president in the head. She did not hear the shot which she saw her husband "receiving" in the neck; nor the shot which hit Governor Conally just after that. If Mrs. Kennedy heard three shots, she missed one; if she heard two shots, she missed two.

Governor Conally's testimony is even more definite. He heard one shot, turned, was hit by a shot he didn't hear, then heard a third shot hit the President in the head. I will grant him his mythology that you don't hear the shot that hits you; of course, you do, if you don't lose consciousness; a recent AP article told of pilot whose arm was blown off; in the article the pilot described precisely the sound of the shot that hit it. But even if Governor Conally did not hear the shot that hit him because it hit him, he still failed to hear

the shot that struck the President at Frame 227, after he (the Governor) had turned toward the first shot and before he was wounded.* Conally heard only two out of four recorded shots. (I'm not counting anything that happened after Frame 313.) And Conally is one of the best witnesses we have.

This is nothing short of amazing to me. I do not dispute that other shots were fired, nor that other shots were heard by a few people. But I simply cannot ignore the fact that two shots occurred on the film which occurred precisely in that long pause that most people noted after the first shot. It seems irrefutable to me that a silencer was used in the assassination.

Bill Turner in an article on The Minutemen in the January Ramparts quotes a Minuteman manual on silencers: -"the advantages of a gun which makes no sound when fired are obvious." Yes, indeed. And right-wing activists (including the CIA) love and use these gimmicks. We have no right to assume that the latest and best could not have been used on the man they hated most. The use of a silencer on the President is far less fantastic than cyanide in the airconditioning system of the United Nations. And much easier to get away with. It only took about 8 seconds. You could do it at the dinner table.


Where was the man with the silencer? What would have been the advantage of a silencer when shots were loudly going off on the knoll and up toward the corner of Elm and Houston? (I didn't mean to suggest in my last letter that a man in the Dal-Tex building couldn't have hit Kennedy. Of course he could have. But an assassin firing from the TSBD bldg. and one in the Dal Tex building should have fired as the motorcade turned the corner. The President was a much better target for them than ~~he~~ was for three men down by the Stemmons sign. Anyone who has seen the FBI re-enactment photos through the scope; and who has fired a rifle will tell you that they would have fired then. They could have got him. The fact that they didn't get him then when they could have got him makes me doubt that rifles were seriously involved in those buildings.)

There is this, too: I don't know that there are any absolutely silent silencers. There is usually, I believe, a whooshing sound involved. Agent Landis thought the first sound was a rifle and looked back over his shoulder. On second thought (and before he heard another shot, he heard only two all together) he decided it might have been a blowout on a tire on the right side of the Presidents car. In other words Landis reacted to one sound, or what he thought was one sound, both over his shoulder and in front of him. A blowout is a bang-whoosh. A rifle sound is a bang with a ringing sound made by the bullet rushing through the air. Suppose Landis heard a bang from over his shoulder and then the ring of a silencer in front of him and took it to be one sound from a rifle? ^{blowout?} Some witnesses were definite that they did not hear rifle sounds. They thought they heard firecrackers, torpedoes, dumbbells, backfires and blow outs. Others were certain they heard rifle shots. One man who heard rifle shots even remarked that the shot didn't hang in the air long enough to be a rifle though. These discrepancies might be explained by assuming that the sound of exploding firecrackers (or shots) was immediately followed by the sound of a silencer. Some witnesses heard the one, some heard both, the primary and the secondary sounds. Governor Conally, for instance heard one shot from a rifle before he was hit, when he should have heard two shots. Suppose he heard one

loud bang from a firecracker and one shot from a silencer; or one loud shot and then another ~~shot~~^{almost silent} one; that would explain the fact that he thought he heard one rifle shot when he should have heard two shots. Other witnesses such as Jean Hill who heard many more shots than the majority might have heard all the sounds, that is, both the bangs and the rushing air sounds.

Another thing: there was too much attention drawn to rifles in this case and much of it before the assassination. Especially the events at the Sports Drome Rifle Range. There, there was absolutely no attempt to incriminate Oswald as a lone gunman with a Mannlicher Carcano. Instead, attention was drawn to men, one of whom resembled Oswald, with rifles - sporterized rifles, rifles passed over the fence, etc. Rifles, rifles, rifles. But if the attempt had been primarily to incriminate Oswald his name could have been left on the register at the range as Mrs. Davis makes clear in her testimony. If the plan was primarily to draw attention to rifles, it succeeded.

It would be painfully ironic if we have spent three years searching for rifles while a murderous pistoleer sat under our very noses. I don't insist that it is so, of course; I am interested in the truth, not my own theories. But I become more and more convinced that the assassins pulled a fast one on us. And that we can discover it, and pull the ground out from under them. For, in spite of the fact that they have got away with it for three years, I don't think they are very smart. There are two sets of elephant tracks in this case; one real and one false. The false conspiracy and the real conspiracy. And the false conspiracy, which was amazingly bold, is also amazingly obvious. They created the false Oswald prior to the assassination and since you discovered him, I believe they have not slept well. The false Oswald was a mistake. Maybe they made another big mistake, thinking they could kill the President with a gimmick and get away with it.



Beverly Brunson
Box 296
Baxter Springs, Kansas 66713

1-3-67

Please understand that the important thing is not where I think the silencers may have been located; but that the evidence that a silencer was located somewhere is, in my opinion, almost proven. If you re-read the evidence - what the witness said, especially those in the president's car & in the follow up car, keeping in mind that a silencer may have been used, you will have a revelation. There could have been two silencers, of course; there were many more seen shots (on the street) ^{hitting} ~~smoked~~ in the trees, ^{scoring the sidewalk -} hitting the turf, hitting the marble - than there were heard shots.