

In bragging about Manchester's work on its table of contents page of the January 24, 1967 issue, Look describes it as "then most personal, the most detailed and the most unexpected" account".

This is commendably honest journalism, whether or not so intended. It is a personal account, so personal those who know the fact of the assassination cannot recognize it from the official evidence. It is the most detailed, and in each and every one of its ~~details~~ details it is wrong in the most ~~exquisitely~~ exquisitely fine and "detailed" way.

And in describing Manchester's work as "unexpected" the editors of Look have subtly understated the truth, for "unexpected" is hardly the word to apply to a work with this seeming auspices and in such a respected publication when it turns out to be a skilful and uninhibited blend of fiction, falsehood and slander.

Unfortunately, at this point the journalistic and editorial integrity, no matter how accidental to the promotional requirements of a \$665,000 initial investment, disappear, to be followed by first by a selective Look introduction and then by Manchester himself.

"In the weeks that followed President Kennedy's burial in Arlington", the introduction ~~begins~~ opens," his survivors were approached by several authors who wanted to write versions of the tragedy. Remembering the President's deep interest in history, the family decided that although such a book would be a further trial for them, one must be done. However, they wanted to name the writer. Jacqueline Kennedy chose William Manchester".

Each of these statements is true, but together they do not tell the truth. Only because of its own vast investment in Manchester's book does Look pretend that the story of the assassination could not be properly written without the approval of the Kennedy family. By this pretense Look says that it alone has the fact of the assassination. Whatever you read elsewhere cannot be right because whoever wrote it was not "chosen" by Mrs. Kennedy.

is

There ~~was~~ no information of any significance about the assassination it-
self or about that jet-set style slush Manchester pretends is breathtaking
history that is not in the public record with the exception of what he taped
in his 10 well-advertised hours with Mrs. Kennedy but did not use. Mrs. Kennedy
is the only close eye-witness in the world of her husband's murder. The
Presidential Commission chose, on its own, to suppress this part of her testimony,
and the suppression persists. As recently as February 17, 1967 I was denied
access to it, not for the first time. If Manchester has her observations on
tape - observations the significance of which she may not understand - there is
no reflection of it in the writing.

Most of the witnesses he ~~interviews~~ exploits as though through Kennedy grace
they spoke to him alone were Commission witnesses. The Commission's printed
evidence totals an estimated 10,000,000 words. Its files take up about 300
cubic feet of space. The printed material, of course, is entirely public; so
are most of the files to these writers who qualify for access to them.

If Manchester elicited any valuable information from those he interviewed
in the touted "1000 interviews", he is keeping it secret. It is not in his
writing.

The political stuff, for which he dipped his typewriter ribbon in
spitting-cobra venom, really does not relate to the assassination, aside from
the inherent suggestion that President Johnson or his associates are in some
way responsible for the assassination. It is not at all new, save for the
point at
special twist Manchester gives it to/President Johnson, having in one form or
another appeared in the news and commentary columns of papers and magazines.

~~By presenting in the pretentious history of the assassination,~~
converted into a semi-
these political slanders, Manchester ~~and~~ ~~look~~ ~~at~~ ~~the~~ ~~book~~ ~~into~~ ~~semi~~ ~~xxxxx~~

dignified blending of True Confessions and Screen Gems

3

But by exaggerating this political slander and pretending it is the real inside hitherto-untold story of the assassination, Manchester blends it into a semi-dignified, pseudo-historical, advertisedly historical mixture of True Confessions and Screen Gems. By his and the publishers' promotions and advertising the average person was led to believe this is a work of scholarship that at once ~~was~~ impartial and accurate, expressing the knowledge and beliefs of the Kennedys (who wanted every American to buy it to ~~read~~ "their side" and to finance the Kennedy Library) and a kind of acceptable banned-in-Boston divulging of national scandals.

Nowhere does Look indicate anyone other than Manchester was considered by the Kennedy family. Yet he was ~~not~~ ^{enither} the first nor the only writer considered for the "appointment". Theodore White, a justly respected Journalist would accept no such commission. Neither would Lord. Manchester ~~rw~~ was not the candidate of any member of the family. He was proposed by former Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger, apparently on the basis of his overly-flattering biography, "Portrait of a President".

To this inferred exclusive access to inferred exclusive information ^{the} with/semi-official auspices of the Kennedy family, especially the widow and former Attorney General, Look's ~~interview~~ introduction added the implication that Manchester ~~was~~ really had government sponsorship by dragging a government agency in without warrant: "Operating out of headquarters in the National Archives...", the next sentence begins. Manchester alone did have this additional special privilege, a private room in the Archives building. He was not part of its headquarters or anything else. That room was near the one in which the duplicating machines are installed. He had a cot in it. The most rudimentary knowledge of the material in these files compared with the total lack of reflection of their content in Manchester's writing, leads inevitably to the conclusion that Manchester used this space either to save office rental or for taking naps.

