

12/26/69

Dear Moo,

We sure are having the kind of weather you say you want to see. I think we are snowed in. It is too early to tell, for it is still an hour before daylight, but the lane is drifted and the last report I heard before going to bed was for up to a foot of snow (don't think we had that much, but with the pines to act as windbreaks, I can't tell).

I have two immediate purposes in writing. First, to ask you also for Mrs. Garner's testimony, if you have it, or for at least that part dealing with the visit by federal agents and, fascinatingly enough, Ferrie, as soon as Oswald's credit for the assassination was published. I was reminded of this by Brener's book, my second purpose in writing. Having finished it, I am fairly confident it was not done by Rick Townley (what is he living on, do you know?). I am reasonably certain he had little or nothing to do with it. I base this on my own analysis of contents, style, etc.

However, I find myself even more interested in the book, why he did it, whether or not he or others had special purposes in it and what interests are really served. The dishonesty permeates. It is much more than an attack on Jim. That, it seems to me, is its excuse only. I really would like to know what you all think, especially Jim, if he has read it, for his own analyses are sometimes brilliant.

Hoke may have some notions or picked up some rumors.

I know your reluctance to write, but do, please, keep me posted. If my hunches are even close to correct, it may be very much in your interest.

Shrewd and slick as he is, Brener is still a blabber, so I find things of interest in the book. The problem is knowing when he is lying, when he doesn't know what he talks about, when he was conned by his sources. And when he is just plain wrong, perhaps without intended dishonesty.

After all these years, Bringuier's almost simultaneous appearance with the book he is supposed to have done so long ago is a remarkable coincidence, if that is what it is. I haven't seen it yet, but someone is getting it for me. I want very much to see it, believe me! I give him some attention in COUP D'ETAT and I plan much more for AGENT OSWALD.

It is now academic, but until reading Brener's quotes of Jim's attacks on Bobby Kennedy when he was in New York, I had no idea of their virulence. This may explain some of the reluctance of some of Bobby's former friends to interest themselves in what happened. What Jim said is logical enough, the kind of conclusion easily reached and justified, but I am certain it is not correct, that Bobby was the victim of his advisers, for I now know what he did and didn't do, who he turned this chore over to, what he was told, and I have a double check on it, a confirmation from the guy himself only a week ago. That genius hasn't yet changed his mind, uses the identical words today, with this embellishment, "What difference would it make if there were three Sirhans?" Bibby had assigned him the task of reading all the critics and reporting back. I doubt he took or had the time, but he told Bobby there was nothing to it.

Hope you are having a nice holiday, if without snow, ice and sub-freezing temperatures. And please get on those transcripts. It can be done now.

Sincerely,