2/24/70

Dear Mary,

Intellectually, few things have fascinated me as much as reading Bonner. That I've read as much as I have (I'm at 164, which is most of the text), is not entirely due to the great curiosity. If you are a country girl you'll undertand that I overuse some little-used muscles on working up about a third of a cord of hardwood yesterday, with a machete and a pruning saw, carrying some of it uphil to rick by the house. I ache more at 5 a.m. than I did at 5 p.m. Achine, I just sat and read. And wondered.

Of course, this could be a lady of the loosest literary morals, which could explain much of it. In her error she is, I believe, unrivalled. But is it all just plain error? Somebody was giving her this stuff. I've mentioned Hill, Alexander, Hensàée. Seems like Fritz, too. (She calls him one of the all-time great!) She knows little about the established fact. She appears not to have read or paid attention to if she did read, any of the more solid critical works. Nor the Report itself. Thus the problem in mind in whether those with fuilty interest got her to make these "mistakes", serving their interests, or whether it was his own untained ignorance, her ego, he police-buff attitudes, her ambition for her business or other personal interests, etc. Few writers are as heedless of fact. In her case, she is absolutely without concern for it or her reputation. Some of it is so glaring one need not know the fact. Exemple: she gives a list of names of those who signed the homicide report, then says Cunningham and McDonald signed it as the "investigating officers", whereas her own cover shows they did as "arresting officers" and the other names are not one it and then, repeating it on what would be p. 213 if they were numbered, she calls the same thing the death certificate, which it, most assuredly, is not.

You told me you tried to get her to correct error. Knowing her attitude when you pointed out such error might help my understanding.

And how provocative some of it is. Oswald had "no scars" (131). She says he gave Fritz his Beckley address at the first inverrogation (124), whereas he did not. What she says of Hosty's knowledged gained from reading and unidentified N.O. FBI report, apparently Quigley's, after the 8/9/63 arrest, is not a reflection ofthe "official" version of this report. In other words, it says more than is warranted by what the Commission got. With this business of the homicide report and her big thing about the arrest and Hill'axx part in it (to say nothing of Alexander's presence), or Carroll's, why does she not include their names as arresting officers? One of the more intriguing things, something I've been trying to keep an eye peeled for, she mentioned (153), in saying Day was checking to see if the rifle had been fired recently. Having check, silence. Which persuades what the answer was. Then there is (151 ff) that mysterious Jim Allen, no longer of any official connection, in on all those top-level deliberations. Or the the-hell-with-your-rights attitude of the arresting police (Hill) because you are a cop-killer. And Alexander's snarling to Wade that he had accomplished his purposes in leaking a story that Oswald was a Communist and part of a Communist conspiracy, so he could retract it if he wanted. Any one of these could be of real significance, with proper knowledge of Bonner, her motives, connections, etc. And how much it mightxx say of those who put her up to this or persuaded her to all thus stuff.

Can it be she is so stupid she actually regards the dim mediocrities as great, the John Rutledges as the professionals and the wise, like him believing what nobody else did, the press conference was "for a damn prisoner"(171). Is she so locked to Dallas she can call it a "typical city", that she really believes there is

any kind of night life? I've had the experience of being with a man who had a sudden asthma attack about midnight. Neither a hotel clerk (several), nor cab drivers nor even those diughty police could d rect us to an open drugstore. It closes up like no city I have ever seen.

Can it be only accident or ignorance that impels her to say of what Oswald said at this prees conference that "his answers could not be heard", or is it simply that they are so opposite her representation of the "fairness" she exults in just ahead of this? They were heard, recorded and reported. Or is it simply another in the unended, contrived defenses of the police?

I am capitvated by her failure to mention Aynesworth once to this point. As I am by her failure to describe the arraignment for the Presid nt's murder. Instead she has Rutledge reporting it was to be.

The first peragraph on 174 is one of her high points. In it the bullets from Tippit (earlier reduced by 25% in number) "matched" the pistol, which is opposite what the FBI lab reported, that the "hulls" from 10 and Patton "matched" with the recovered bullets, which they also did not, and she has the most cher ming argument in her footnote-effort to alter the meaning of the paraffin tests:"...inconclusive because he could have shielded the cheek while firing". His his third and fourth hands, no doubt.

Later. I've (ugh) finished it save for the one place there might be something, the logs, but if there were, how would we know it were so? After THIS? When all the promised new stuff is so old or inconsequential? However, there are other interesting things. The portrait of Alexander is still black and white, with the account of his dismissal for saying Warren should not be impeached-he should be hanged. At two points toward the end, without citation or evidence of any kind, she says there was proof the rifle had been fired that day. If there were such proof, I suspect we'd have heard much of it.(191,194) The "case" against Tippit is probably whey, if she knew better, she kept referring to the three recovered bullets. This says there were three! Ruby's close friend in jail sounded like it might be interesting, but I fogtot to note the page. The case against LHO for the assassination is where the above-~~lixie~~ mentioned officers are listed, not the homicide report.

When I told this lady she is one of a kind, was I ever right? Can there be another like her?

Sincerely,