Dear Jin, Anson/Bantan/Psagiarism 12/17/75
Unexpuctedy I had a call from Dicic Bernabel today. He wanted to check some of hia suapicions about the Anson book, which he has bewn cosmigaioned to reciew, with re. \#is suapicions were exactly what have bien sayiag sad he did not nean suspicions.

There is a pattem of plagiarism. Diok will kaap notes for me, more than he will include in the review.

He finds my work being dram upon regularly without credit.
Ee finds tho work of others used without aredit. In each case it is made to appear as Anson's own worik, more so because of the coplous footnoting.
$\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{E}}$ finde secondary sources being crodited even though thess secondery sources credit the original.

In cne cass be uses rad Hewcomb's work, actually done for me and I have recoris and the originals to prove it, as his own. thm work actual was Newomb's, at my request.
 revian toidgy by accident I notod a roferenco to wo (p.197). I read it snd it eredits
 at this faint the footnotes have been senuabared, which is greciaely what would be necesaary for a lastminute chargo. Hie went baci e lew fotnotes in the same paregraph and added an $E x$ " a " to No. 231 and thus, I tizin't, had a nuabor lesa obvious for the intarestoi deforancs to ces. I haven't chocku this fuliy but I bellive above this ho تitren tho zourco I cited as hiy oristinal vork. Jane grait.
paraebei spetis a petterzi of citing the aourcoa cited by those from whota he crib bed. I find that in this seotion on Hall on p. 197 whero ho has sxtensive formoting he protends to be a ral Ball expert. However, he naices gross arrors ahout idall, not fot tnoted to sources, Jike blaming iall for Gavrison's intervst in Bradley. Pelae, as I learneù witi much anguiah anc 2ifrle wosto.

I do not $t$ ink that thosa whou vould be tajpful, Lice Jerry, will be Rowevar, if othera, ILna Lowari, haven't radi the booic ent wowia wark it up as they go it could bo oí conaiderabla help in doang sonethiug about Bentem, which bad been bastardy in all of this. We owe Temain sorothind

The rehasin of the past, ith ruch egribege thrown in, hurts no government agoncy. The idie theoriging, ir it is no worse, haips them becouses this gorvas the seme purn poses of a black book. Bantan has never published a tough book, it rejected Whitowash over editorial approvel conatdarubly sore than naceasary. (I have it..)

Theroi is nothing in thie suggestion wot consiatont with the wor's of those to whor he exprosses greatest dabt, 3coth and Harris. The ma product is gympativy for the grovernment and others.

Amony tha dead givoanays is his failure to list any of my bocka exoept IV in his bibliograjhy. Yets as Bernahoi noted, that ig whore the odif stomy was first used and whore it was first gut together. He $\operatorname{can}^{\prime} t \mathrm{have}$ used VWII on this without knowing it because I am aure thers are backward roferences.

I have had no time for raoding. I've Juat startad the introduction. But it is evon there and I've baried places. I'li do this as I bet a chance.
after this iram Bernabei, whers it doas not rest on me, and with Jermy involvod, I think it would be good to pusi hins on this. It ha is honest he wili of informative. If he is not too aick or too ambitious, he ehouli ba nilling to bo kelpful. Rut plenss give him the chance ores put him on the spot, however you see it.

Hew Piass got WhiV from me in Pebruary when 1 proposed ancillary uses ta the editor. I have the letter. Wie conversed thercafter but nothing came of it. Anson spoke to me April 2. I wrote you $4 / 22$ about the apparent use of my matarial in the issue dated $4 / 18 / 75$. Obvtously they could have used that tranerript id from any other source much earliex. And this, too, is Anson.

I think I asked Dave to do thin independently. If not and I don't have a carion to send him, please aak/rawnd hir. I haven't even had time to read his articles. Best.

