

Nancy Stephane Stone

November 28, 1975.

Dear Mr Weisberg:

Well, I'm still waiting for "official" approval of my dissertation topic from the powers that be. Part of the reason for the delay, however, was due to the fact that I had some difficulty in framing a proposal in a manner suitable to my faculty advisor's wishes. While he liked the idea of studying the Executive Session transcripts, he wasn't really quite sure what I was planning to do with them. And to be truthful, I wasn't exactly sure what my focus was going to be. Fortunately, as I was struggling with this problem, a summarized version of the transcripts came out in the New Republic, so I got a rough idea as to what was in the transcripts and could summarize them for my proposal. Another part of the problem was that my advisor also wanted a comparison of my proposal with other books in the field. So I have been busily reading Mark Lane, Jim Garrison, etc., so that I could write little paragraphs of each book, indicating the differences between what they have written and what I intend to write. While reading every book I could get a hold of in the field, I got a copy of Howard Roffman's Presumed Guilty, and found it both enjoyable and helpful. Since I haven't heard anything further on my proposal, I think it will be returned to me shortly for a clearer rewrite on the focus and purpose of studying these transcripts. If possible, I'd welcome some advice and help from you on this matter.

During the last two weeks, there has been a lot of activity around Cambridge/Boston concerning the assassinations.

I heard a very slick lecture from Mark Lane at Boston University. He was all show, dancing around the speaker's podium with a mike on a long wire (rather like a quiz show M.C.), telling clever one line jokes and ~~talking~~ funny stories emphasizing the stupidity of everyone involved in the assassination investigation. Interestingly, he gave the impression to the audience that he had sued the government for the Executive Session transcripts. At the end of his performance (which was entertaining), he trotted out Jim Garrison. But Mark Lane was too tough an act to follow, and Garrison just couldn't communicate with the audience. They left in droves. In listening to Garrison, I got the impression that at one time he had something important to say but that now he was burned out.

A far more interesting lecture that was part of the week long series was given by Allard Lowenstein on RFK's assassination. It was attended by possibly forty people versus four hundred or so that Mark Lane drew. He spoke on how he became involved in the effort to reopen the RFK case and what were in his opinion the major reasons as to why the case should be reopened.

I wonder if all the rekindled interest in the assassinations will create enough pressure to have the cases reopened.

Interestingly, this morning I was in the Government Printing Office bookstore in Boston and three people either called or came in personally trying to get a hold of the Warren Commission Report. And among my friends, people whose last interest is in political science, there seems to be a new interest in political assassinations. I found myself running a private