By the time this review appears in a scholarly Canadian publication it cannot be a sales factor of any consequence for Bantam. The author is a professor of classics and one of the best JFK assassination amateur experts. Where he writes of uncredited primary sources he really means cloaked literary thievery, what your people probably believe is paranoia. I am hardly into the book because it isn't worth the time required by reading. When I get more of it read I may be tempted. I have enough now to make a case that, with Lemkin's record in the Ray hearing, could embarrass Bantam. Why they are impelled to this kind of rotten stuff where the government is involved I do not know. On balance Anson= disinformation, more because of what Bantam is in a position to do. Whether or not this did more than contribute to it at a crucial time.

HW ~~12x~~ 4/12/76

"THEY'VE KILLED THE PRESIDENT!": THE SEARCH FOR THE MURDERERS OF JOHN F. KENNEDY. By Robert Sam Anson. New York, Toronto, London: Bantam Books, 1975. Pp. xii + 408. $2.50 (paper).

The best that can be said of Anson's book is that it presents a clear and convincing summary of the evidence proving that the late President John F. Kennedy died as the result of a conspiracy to assassinate, and that Lee Harvey Oswald, the alleged killer, had nothing to do with the murder, except to serve as the unwilling patsy for the true conspirators. Moreover, the book delves into some of the unsettled, and still unsettling, issues that beset the questions, who killed Kennedy and why.

The worst that can be said, even by one who elects to overlook its occasional errors of fact and often serious lapses of judgment, is that the book is entirely counterfeit, dependent throughout on the original, strenuous researches of others more devoted than Anson to the monumental task of discovering the truth, and not merely to the simple, and often profitable, task of disclosing it in print. Anson is simply a discloser in print, a good one, but simply a discloser, for his book relies on other people's work. And he is bound to profit mightily.

Actually, Anson's greatest liability may at one and the same time be his greatest asset, for his dependency is on the more reputable and reliable researchers of the assassination, not on the "kooks", the unreasonables. Indeed, it is remarkable that he managed to distinguish between the reasonable and the "kooky" in the short span of time he devoted to his book, for this murder provokes issues that tend to attract "kooks", and the serious examination

of its bizarre outcome, the investigation and Report of the Warren Commission, turns even reasonable persons at least a trifle "kooky", and sometimes even more than a trifle.

A publisher's note reveals that Anson undertook the project in April, 1975, and delivered his manuscript to the publisher in August of that year -- five months in all, and all on matters that any knowledgeable person will say can hardly be grasped in five years, or even twice five years. But Anson tried it. His typewriter must have been hot and smoking in hand when he set a dot after his last sentence: "We need to know why." Why the unofficial murder; why the official cover-up?

We surely need to know the "why", for we already know enough of the "what" to establish, reasonably and conclusively, not only that the Report of the Warren Commission is wrong in all of its major conclusions (a point that Anson catches), but also that it is wrong deliberately (a point that Anson misses), that it is a monstrous hoax perpetrated by all too many seemingly honorable men doing all too many demonstrably dishonorable things. Why, indeed?

Anson is ostensibly generous in citing his sources. Most of his citations refer, quite honestly, not to the very documents and other evidence that bear on major questions (for it appears that he did not use these extensively, if he used them at all), but to the published, and sometimes unpublished, works of the original researchers. Anson thereby provides a valuable line into the now sizeable bibliography that applies to the assassination.

Anson's chief shortcoming in regard to citing sources is that he neglects to give proper credit to the one writer whose efforts have spearheaded, and continue to spearhead, the presentation of evidence most damaging to the Warren Commission's attempt to cover up the truth. The writer is

Harold Weisberg, whose books Anson refers to only in passing and incompletely, perhaps because he failed to read them all, or, having read, failed to understand, or, having understood (as, for example, he understood Weisberg's account of a telling incident involving a Cuban exile named Sylvia Odio), preferred to set forth the material as though it were he himself who first examined the evidence and first understood its importance. Anson does this too often, even with researchers other than Weisberg, but his dishonesty is most conspicuous in his treatment of Weisberg, the source of many of Anson's own sources. That forms a loss not only for Weisberg and the others, but also for Anson, for his book, and for his readers.

The early chapters of Anson's book seek to establish that the Report is wrong. They do so, and quite successfully, for the evidence against the validity of the Report is massive and convincing.

The latter chapters point to connections between the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Mafia, and big oil interests -- all with the implication that somehow some or all of them had something to do with the assassination of Kennedy. Maybe so. But in a matter as important as the murder of a head of state, a head of state whose decisions affected the state of the world, implications are not enough. Evidence is required. Anson does not provide it.

His last chapter, entitled "Toward a New Investigation", calls for no more than what most people now want: a fresh, honest, and open inquiry into "who done it" to Kennedy. It calls not at all for what we really need to know: "who done it" to the official investigation of the assassination? Who "done" the hoax, and why? Why is the official truth so far removed from the truth? Anson fails to acknowledge that the issue may now be nothing but academic, that if another official investigation is instituted, the public of the world could well be in for another whitewash and another round

of critics expending their minds and efforts on the whitewash of the white-wash.

It may be time to admit that the government is bigger than the people. What a pity!

RICHARD BERNABEI
Queen's University