

The Kennedy Book Deluge

By Lawrence Stern

Washington Post Staff Writer

WHATEVER MAY BE THE REASONS of the Dow Jones Industrial Index, the Kennedy Literary Industry keeps moving along its bullish course—the average blue chip of them all.

In the beginning there was the Warren Commission Report, comprised of 28 steady and painstaking volumes. Then in an unprovoked bibliographic deluge came the editors and the appreciators and the memoirists.

Finally there arrived on the shelves the book that, so we were led to believe, would be definitive in both a literary and perhaps also a judicial sense. It was William Manchester's "The Death of a President."

Alas, by the time "The Death of a President" made its debut much of its essential juices had been wrung out by magazine serialization as well as by newspapers and news magazine stories. Hardly a day went by without publication of a paragraph or so from the book that was to make publishing history.

Moreover, the public appetite for the book had been killed by the book's subscription by the Kennedy family's announcement that it would suppress publication of any book that was in lock magazine. The book, it was said, it was called, certainly came in some shape or form to modern America's most celebrated pseudo-event.

But the deluge continued. Within a few months after Manchester's book landed on the Nation's discount shelves, it brought two more books: "The Manchester Affair" by John Garry and "Why the Kennedy Lost the White House—the United Story" by Lawrence Sanders (Award Books, 128 pp., 75 cents, and which is not worth reviewing).

Even Corry's book seemed to get another book at least an article in *Life* magazine by another New York *Times* man. *Life* talked about Corry's problems with its book. *Life* also called the *Times* piece with a chapter of Corry's book about Manchester's book about the assassination.

Manchester tried to face the art form of history and the novel in "The Death of a President." It was a brilliant and polished affair because of his inability to control the love and awe he held toward the subject.

Corry's aim is somewhat easier to high, but could it be. It is a story of a man in the Kennedy circle viewpoint of the fact that he became a perfectly respectable newspaper by his media. "As a reporter writing about the argument, I know that even the remotest circle could be exhilarating," Corry writes in his introduction.

Later he says: "Mrs. Kennedy, like F. Scott Fitzgerald's very rich people, is different

Book Reviews

"The Manchester Affair"

By John Garry (New York: Award Books, 1964)

love you and me. This is not to say she is better or worse than the rest of her own. As is Robert Kennedy, she is surrounded by people who are obscure and obscure." Vice-Handwriting, deeply impressed Fitzgerald, the rich and different, they have more money. The Kennedys had luck, of course, which set them apart from people who merely had more money.

Corry's portrait of the Kennedy family in the throes of the book controversy differs little from the already received public version. Jack is impulsive, wild and utterly frank. Bobby is kind and distant. Ethel is unaccountably friendly. Lyndon Hall got of it.

And so, in all the time will publisher from the papers, the Kennedy—Jack and Bobby—should be an excellent and Harper & Row and John Garry, to suggest the book. Why Corry needs to suggest the book.

The publisher of the book, however, by the family and the public, is a well-known one. It was not until the publication of their unknown that Lyndon Johnson would get so angry he wouldn't consider Sen. Kennedy as a presidential candidate. The historical record would show a conclusion.

The publisher of the book, however, by the family and the public, is a well-known one. It was not until the publication of their unknown that Lyndon Johnson would get so angry he wouldn't consider Sen. Kennedy as a presidential candidate. The historical record would show a conclusion.

Corry's political involvement is a well-known one. It was not until the publication of their unknown that Lyndon Johnson would get so angry he wouldn't consider Sen. Kennedy as a presidential candidate. The historical record would show a conclusion.

True enough.