

Count and go into the footnotes. They are not footnotes of references, not means by which the accuracy of Manchester's work can be checked. This is the opposite of all the critics of the official account of the assassination, who do give meaningful references and whose interpretations can thus be checked. His are crediting of copyright on poems and songs he finds appropriate, having nothing to do with the assassination but with his taste and use of the novel, both in form and content, a latter-day "In Cold Blood"; venom he failed to fang in during the original writing; argument in futile defense of criticism of his Look ~~written~~ appearance, and a mishmash of goo and trivia. It is conspicuous of Manchester, as it is of Charles Roberts, that he does not give his reader his source references. But where sources are really needed, such as, to cite a minor example, on Manchester's charts in his appendix, they are not present and where his charts might have meaning - not of the funeral cortege but of the scene of the assassination, they are woefully incomplete and inaccurate. They do not even reproduce the fixed structures with either accuracy or completeness. In all the thousands of words and hundreds of pages, there is not a chart showing where the witnesses to the assassination were standing. But there is, in his puffery-headed "unpublished Documents", proper credit to Joseph Gawler for the "Diagram showing where Jacqueline

and Robert Kennedy sat in road ambulance ride from Bethesda Naval Hospital to the White House, November 23, 1963" (pp 670-1). Thus we learn the real truth of the assassination, of "The Death of a President", from William Manchester.