

January 11, 1967

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I have read the first of Manchester's opus and he's the silliest ass I've ever come across. It is amusing to me that his obvious reading of his own tender rejection fears into Oswald should have culminated in his own rejection by the cruel and beautiful Jacqueline. It's no wonder that sent him to the hospital. I haven't have such a good laugh since envisioning General Walker as he led the singing at the wedding of Michael Paine's friend. I guess that set the seal of sanctity on that wedding all right. And now here is Master William setting his boyish seal of approval on Gerald Ford's pitiful expedition into Oswald's psyche. It is further amusing to note that it is the soap operax and true confessions fans who are snapping up this issue of Look. I had to borrow a copy from a kind soul who, to my certain knowledge, has read nothing more serious than Dear Abby in the last five years. Moreover, it is terrible to think how great a villain Mrs. Kennedy may prove to have been Before this is all over: No telling who Manchester may go slowly insane and shoot.

This book is a nine day wonder. It's hardly likely to say "This fur and no fu'ther" to any serious critic. I suppose you heard Mr. Johnson last night. I have my own opinions about the State of the Union.

I was pleased by your last little letter, in that you said I had raised your spirits. It is an infinitesimal recompense for what your books have given me.

I have never mentioned my anger at the early injustice of the reviewers. They're not worth the stamp: I felt deeply from the first that your book was strong enough to make its way. And I was right. The right, proud proportion of intelligence and imagination has the power to move a world, in this case the sham world of the Warren Report and its supporters.

I feel sure that the assassins and their perhaps unwitting confederates after the fact are, beneath their smugness, more afraid of you than of any other man in the country, for the simple fact that your books, each of them, and each chapter of each book sheds further light on the case; and this relentless approach of the light drives them deeper into the dark that remains. They do not and cannot know where this light ~~will~~ will stop; and whether, one day, there will be any dark left for them at all. They will understand your books better than anyone.

Sincerely,

Beverly Brunson  
Box 296  
Baxter Springs, Kansas 66713

I am going to write an ~~article~~ article embodying <sup>all</sup> my views on the mechanics of the assassination. Then I don't know what I'll do with it; but I will send it to you first in hopes that you will discover any fatal flaws in it & warn me. It will involve quite a struggle between me & the art of prose and I don't look forward to it.

I saw the Bell's Edition of the other day - only one copy left on the news stand. I hope it is selling well & that you were paid in ~~the~~ honorable proportion to your work. It may be the only Breast money being made in this country today.

1/16/67

Dear Miss Brunson,

I like your psychiatry much better than Manchester's.

It makes good sense.

And there is nothing wrong with your prose!

Sincerely,

January 6, 1967

Harold Weisberg  
Hyattstown, Md.  
20734

Dear Sir:

*the cross mark:  
it is just below  
and at an angle to  
the white light in  
front of the windshield.  
A  
→*

I do not think you have the untouched Altgens, after all. On both the one in Whitewash I and the one in Whitewash II, the white object on the hood of the Vice-President's car, to which I have drawn your attention, appears as a straight swordlike white object. A very sharp and clear white mark crosses this in the reproduction in the Saturday Evening Post of Dec. 14, 1963. This cross mark is visible even in the tiny reproduction Yarborough A at the very end of Vol 21. Yet it does not appear in either of the larger reproductions which you have published. This is a very striking mark, obviously part of the object. *and, S.E.P.*

Needless to say, its removal makes the ~~white~~ white object look much more like a windshield wiper and less like what I conceive that it could be. Why would they tamper with it? Unless it's what I suggest?

There is also a black shadow or object coming off the left headlight of the VP car, projecting past the end of the car. I wonder what it is.

I am not now sure that the red glowing object in the center of the Nix color frame is what I said it was. Two bright marks appear to be in a stationary position here on the small frames in Vol. 18. I do not want to claim these frames have been tampered with just to try to prove an argument so I will assume for the time being that I am wrong. However, I can't figure out what this object could be. Perhaps the round fiery part could be an explosion. Zapruder ought to be in there, somewhere. - However I still feel the man on the car top is in the position I suggested. The rifle, if there were one, would have to be pointing downward and ought to cross the white shirt-like looking part of this man. This was just prior - a few feet - to the headshot. Also I don't think this man could have fired a bullet into the President's neck earlier for at the crucial time the sign would have been in the way - perhaps. Besides, though the Report tried to obscure the fact, the throat bullet passed to the left of the President's tie, to him. This could not have exited through the right side of his back. Apparently there was no hole on the left side of the coat, and Kellerman mentions no scar on the car trunk. - Besides the Dallas cops were in this somehow, and Hargis was on a direct line of fire behind the President for a man on the knoll. Perhaps, he was expendable: I don't think so for the reason of my other researches and some of his conflicting testimony. There has been some mischief with the radio logs regarding him, too. At any rate if the Dallas police were in on it and a man fired from the knoll, they were prepared to sacrifice Hargis if they needed to. He could easily have been hit.

I want to draw your attention <sup>to</sup> one more thing, an evidence perhaps of film tampering. In Willis #5, which you have so brilliantly analysed, just off the corner of the Stemmons sign, where there is the indication of the umbrella, there appears a brownish end of some bushes up against the concrete wall. These brown bushes appear much more vividly in the next Willis slide. They do not

appear at all in the Nix frame as published in the current SEP. This frame is darker and greener than the Willis slides; nevertheless, there should be some contrast along this wall in Nix to correspond with the vivid contrast in Willis.

This umbrella (which for a long time I thought was a reflection in the limosine, until I saw that it covered the wheel and tire in certain frames) could also give you a fix on what ~~xxx~~ Z frame Willis #5 corresponds to, and since in Willis #5, the umbrella seems to just touch the lower line of the sign, this would mean a frame before 207, at least.

I did not positively discover this umbrella myself; I knew it looked like an umbrella and I worried a young artist friend of mine about it until he got disgusted and said, "It's an umbrella." I couldn't recall it in Willis #5. I went home and rechecked.

I still think it may have been tampered with in Willis #5. For in Willis #6, someone sitting on the ground with it appears instead to be holding two balloons. There is also fuzziness around it in Willis #5, in fact you can make out that this fuzziness is round like an umbrella. And the end of the above ~~xxxxx~~ brown bush coincides with where this umbrella might be. The circle of fuzziness goes on around and even extends below the sign. I don't know why that fuzziness is there below the sign. -I can see why someone would have carried an umbrella that day for it showered earlier. I can't see why when the sun was out bright and it was very windy, anyone would be standing there with <sup>one</sup> open. And the fact that it seems to have been suddenly opened at just these crucial frames is too much of a coincidence for me to swallow, taken into consideration with the fact that the assassins had to have a signal to bring off such a well-timed execution.

I read the new issue of Minority of One this morning on Bobby Kennedy in regard to his brothers death. It is very depressing. And I am very glad that you took the time and space in Whitewash II to expose Manchester. It will give us something to hold to throughout the hullabaloo of what will probably be his official line. But sometimes I become very depressed: the people who concocted the official line have so much power. Is it conceivable that they murdered Jack Ruby in so vile a manner? I do not know. One simply cannot have faith in anyone or anything official anymore. It is terribly frightening. But by contrast, it makes people like you so brave - it quickens the heart and charges the energy not to give up, ever.

Beverly Brunson  
Box 296  
Baxter Springs, Kansas 66713

In the Life Magazine Oct 1964 Women Report issue - on one of the big "Z" color frames - has one of the <sup>limosine's</sup> taillights been shot out? My young friend discovered this too - he says the brakes have been suddenly applied & yet only one of the taillights is working. It looks like it. I don't have the magazine here - but it's the frame in which Mr Kennedy is on top of the trunk, I think? They could have replaced that tail light before Kellerman saw the car.

in fact he said  
flippantly "the  
old lady with the  
umbrella shot  
Kennedy" &  
laughed as if  
was supposed to  
but I wonder about  
everything these days.