P 209

Brilliant reasoning:

The question — "Could this have been an incident (accident is undoubtedly meant) is used as premise for conclusion. "Surely it was prearranged".

Ruggles States P 443

century Jan 1, 1890

"The scow was on the other side —

Then the 3 Couped soldiers did not arrive before Booth and were not waiting for him and the meeting was not pre-arranged — If such a character as Ruddy had existed and been sent ahead to make arrangements the meeting could not have ~~been~~ taken place as planned due to the delays

Crossing the Potomac

p 210

~~Starting with a~~

~~Coincident~~ a

Yes, Jett, Bombridge and Ruggles met Booth & Herold at the Ferry but since the facts as given in their statement do not corroborate the imagination of Mr Bates we cannot arrive at the conclusion that a third party, Ruddy, arranged for this purely accidental meeting.

p 210 ~~on 211~~

The War Dept has been bothered to death with various types of Fakers, clairvoyants, those having dreams, about John Wilkes Booth!

Refer Baker History secret service

newspaper

And here was another "nut"

The case was closed in 1869 as far as War Dept was concerned.

Absolute mistatement that "War Dept. fully advised that there was no ~~direct~~ positive or direct proof on file as to death of John Wilkes Booth.

John P Sunderton, ~~an evidence~~ a clerk in War Dept. wrote as a private citizen who had access to records

P 220—221
(How strikingly like St Helen)

~~Compare tinty~~
Not when one compares the tintype with pictures of John Wilkes Booth or the description of John Hays with Granbury statements of St Helen

---

Refer to 3rd mans statement

John Hay makes no prophecy here - merely moralizes on what might have happened had Booth not injured his leg

---

~~If "prophets of old" were no better than this~~ It is a far fetched ~~let us trust that there is no~~ Parallel ~~no parallel exists~~ between John Hays "It Might have been" the prophets of old" and Mr Bates' St Helen -

c) It is quite amusing to note that after adding this line Bates got "cold feet" and did not have it copied into the book but altered the copy above to prove that George did not die until the 14th.

When questioned about this Feb 8 and 9th Bates insisted that he had never altered this appendix but could not explain how it had happened.

(b) had broken the paper. In the attempt to write through the seal the ink spread notice (letters)

X

~~a thing~~ This would not have occured if the line had been added before the seal was placed on the affadavit.

Here with are photographic samples of Mr Bates hand writing, a careful comparison shows the similarity to the added line—

256
of Jan 13 and not on 14th
as he would lead us to
believe —

Picture of the dead body
shows it as considerably
bloated — Doesn't look at
all like tintype.
but of course recognition
after 28 years "was instant-
aneous" p 260

Page 261
Thirty-two years — not
28 — Bates left Granbury before
burning court House 1875
and did not see St Helen
afterwards — ackn Feb 9, 1921

He knew him ~~so well as~~
instantly and absolutely as
John St Helen — but cannot

P 262

The attendant W. H. Ryan —
who embalmed the body says
they did not recognize the
Indian as the man he had
embalmed —

The high thumb joint
and the scar on the right brow
were not noticeable enough
to have mentioned in any
of the current newspaper
descriptions of 1866 — or the various
descriptions given out
at that time and does not
show on his pictures —
What about the Noticeable
scar on St Helen's neck that
was so noticeable to the
other Granbury friends
as the indentation on the
leg — Wrong leg and too high

Page 266

It is quite kind of Mr Bates to give Brown, the hotel Clerk one time line —

that George registered at the Hotel Dec 3, 1902,

George did not remain "in reading room and office most the time", but in his room — Boyd.
Wilson —

He was not "~~was~~ a reasonably early riser" but was usually in bed at 9 A.M. —
Boyd —
Wilson —

"Am I better than the dog etc"

This paragraph ~~show~~ is another wonderful flight of the imagination —

4 years no notes

Separate Page

In conversation Feb 9, 1921
Mr Bates attempted to explain
the wire he claims to have
received by saying that he
thought it was Brown, the hotel
clerk, who wired him ~~that~~
that the wire was sent to
Greenville, Miss., the place
to which he (Bates) had just moved
from Granbury, Texas, and
Consequently ~~that it~~ did not reach
him until several days
after it was sent. That
~~Brown~~ George had addressed
a letter to him (Bates), but did
not mail it - That Brown
got the Greenville address
from having seen this letter.
He claimed the letter was stolen
from the body of George at the Morgue.

P 277

Statements here not true as Penniman had already decided on preserving the body — before Bates came —

Sunnyside —

Smith —

Smith had already deposited last statement and two wills of D.E. George at Probate Judges Office — found there was not estate and left — Penniman had visions of exhibiting the body and took out papers of administration on the estate (Sensthan 50.00) so as to have possession of the body —