

Crime and Cover-Up by Peter Dale Scott

Another appropriate title could be Onward and Upward With Mythologies.

It is too dishonest to be considered a serious philosophical study.

It also is inaccurate.

And irrelevant. Even if its links were links, as they are not.

Why these flaws characterize Scott in this field I do not know. But I also know of no exception, going back to the first contact with him. Then he said one thing that interested me, that Nixon had been counsel in the Key case, defending revanchist/CIA Cubans. I asked him to send me what he had on this, he agreed, I had to keep after him for it and finally there was an apology. He had interceded, not been counsel. The sixth-hand source, through a verbal conveyance from Bill Turner, was an obscure and notorious undependable minor Washington journal of the far right.

In this work Scott flogs Nixon the same way, without basis. Even reason. And with the same kind of fact. To read Scott's footnotes is to appreciate Mark Lane's. In this pseudo-scholarship the footnotes are half the volume of the text, measured in pages. I checked a number of the more provocative. In not a single case did the footnote relate. While I have no doubt that some do, as in accurately giving a newspaper's date, in a dozen or more cases the footnote was not even on the subject referenced to it. The casual or careless reader is thus led to believe that there is a source for some of the extreme statements that are Scott's opinions, no more.

From Nixon to deMohrenschildt this is true. DeM is to his Oswald's "baby-sitter." From across the Caribbean. What the CIA did not do to update voodoo!

There is no end to the exaggerations. The cover proclaims "With a foreword by Sylvia Meagher." This means a two-graf dust-jacket blurb. Her tongue is not in her cheek when she describes Scott as "the unchallenged expert political, underworld and labor union interrelationships in the complex framework of the assassination in Dallas and elsewhere...and the whole shabby interlinkage of conspiracy within conspiracies." It is /an"illuminating view of hidden aspects ... that reaches compelling verdicts..."

Well, she did say complex. And hidden.

With enemies like these friends are wasted on the real conspirators.

With critics like these the errant federal agencies are secure from legitimate criticism.

One footnote that interested me I was unable to check not having "vid Demaris' Captive City. This also is typical of Scott's technique with footnotes. On Page 29: "At least once, and possibly twice, Giancana's lawyers (who included Robert Kennedy's enemy Edward Bennett Williams) were able to use this 'CIA immunity' to save their client from prosecution by the Kennedy Justice Department." When he has his references only at the ends of sentences and has four or five ideas in each sentence it is impossible to know which if any is included in the note. I was interested in the immunity alleged between Williams and Kennedy. I'm certain this is not the thrust of that Demaris work. From the rest of these notes I'd be surprised if "emaris has even a statement of this if even a reference to it.

What is most appropriate about this work is that there is so little to it. It also is appropriate that he had to reword the Meagher blurb on the back cover, shared with Pink Thompson. Three-fourths rearranged Meagher and nobody other than Thompson with both inside cover blank.

Where does Scott come from? Or where should he go?

BN 4/19/77