



Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167 Telephone (617) 969-0100

16 June 1975

Department of Political Science

Dear Mr Weisberg,

Thank you for your rapid reply to my enquiries. As you correctly gathered from ^{my} letter, I am rather new to the subject of political assassination and have yet to formulate a clear and tight thesis proposal. A partial explanation for this lack of focus lies in the fact that most of my graduate work was concerned with Soviet and Asian politics. Indochina was the area of particular interest to me. But with the winding down of the war, there followed a corresponding decline in the availability of research funds, my faculty advisor's interest, and my own interest. Consequently, after surviving the ordeal of comprehensive exams, I found myself in the ^{unevitable} position of not only not having research funds but also, ^{having} no idea what I wanted to research. Then one night several months ago, I heard an old taped interview with several people involved with the murder of Diem when the idea of doing something with the topic of political assassination occurred to me. A few nights later, I heard Allard Lowenstein talk about the events surrounding Robert Kennedy's death and the subject of political assassination gained in its appeal for me. And finally, the recent news regarding the CIA involvement in political assassinations clinched my interest in the topic.

I must admit the current craze of criticizing the Warren Commission brought my attention back to a past interest in John Kennedy's death. The late President was a friend of my

father's, so my interest in his murder was always more personal than academic. After his death, I read the single volume condensation of the Warren Commission findings and was dissatisfied as so many questions seemed both unasked and unanswered. But with time, my interest moved on to other things. Now, as I look about at the number of books on the subject, I see that a lot of people had similar doubts and questions.

Actually, I was quite amazed at the amount of material in print criticizing the findings of the Warren Commission, the events surrounding JFK's death, etc. Since the O'Toole book was the latest and most accessible one out, I picked it up. About a quarter of the way through it, I regretted that I hadn't spent the money instead on a lobster dinner. I did get a second hand copy of Edward Jay Epstein's Inquest. I'm about half way through it and find it most interesting. It seems to merit a second and closer reading.

I made some half-hearted attempts to acquire a copy of Sylvia Meagher's book before you wrote of it to me. Now that I know that it is worth the effort, I will really try to get a hold of it as well as Howard Roffman's book.

Although the Cambridge Assassination Information Bureau makes its headquarters within walking distance of my house, I haven't gotten in touch with any of them. From what I've heard, they are a cocky clique, who amuse themselves with assassination theories now that the anti-war movement has ceased. Possibly, I'm making a premature judgement on them but that's my initial impression. Also, I don't think I'd be able to work with them since I'm a bit too strong-willed to accept pack discipline and

collective intelligence.

Getting back to the subject of my dissertation, my faculty advisor will probably approve of most any aspect of assassination as a thesis topic just as long as it does not come out sounding like a who-done-it. Also since he is more interested in his own work than directing my thesis, that gives me both the advantage of leeway and the disadvantage of little direction. Getting my department's approval may prove a bit more difficult as they correctly suspect my interest in journalism rather than in academics. But I'll worry about all that once I have a clear idea in my own mind of what I want to do. Since my chances of getting funded are nil, I figure I better find a thesis topic that I really want to do, since I'm paying for it myself.

I thumbed through your Whitewash IV but decided not to read it until after I've read a bit more on the Warren Commission- that will probably be⁷¹ next week. I would also like to read the first two volumes in the series and am enclosing a check for the sum of \$12.50 to cover the cost. Could you again please send the two books to my home address: 9 Shepard Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Nancy-Stephanie Stone
Nancy-Stephanie Stone

Route 8
Frederick, Md. 21701

June 20 1975

Dear Miss Stone:

Your instincts about the so-called Assassination Investigation Bureau lead me to believe that you also have good and mature judgment.

I would again suggest to you that there is an excellent thesis and a scholarly and commercially acceptable book in what I proposed to you, a study of the Warren Commission executive sessions. There is nothing like it in scholarly or popular literature; there is no other basis anywhere of which I know for any such study. I have virtually all of them. As you know by now, I have sued for some and I am about to sue for the rest.

Frankly, unless your department is composed of people all born during the days of the councils of kings, they should give the most excited approval.

Remember, I have not proposed a study of the JFK assassination. I have proposed a study of what the most eminent men in our society can bring themselves to do and say when they expect perpetual secrecy - and I have it certified and verbatim.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

C
O
P
Y



Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167 Telephone (617) 969-0100

Department of Political Science

Sunday, August 31, 1975.

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I am sorry I have delayed so long in replying to your last letter. I wanted, however, to try and get a hold of my faculty adviser and sound him out on the possibility of writing my thesis on the Warren Commission executive sessions before replying to your last letter. I had been lead to believe that he was in the Soviet Union for the summer. I did, however, run into him in a movie theatre last week and sounded him out there on the possibility of doing work on the Warren Commission executive sessions. He seemed interested, knew who you were when I mentioned your name, and suggested I write up some sort of proposal that could be circulated around the department for its approval. So, I guess what I'm asking you for is a bit more information on the Warren Commission executive sessions in order to write something up as a proposal for my department.

During the past few weeks, I've been doing quite a bit of reading on both the assassination and the Warren Commission. I managed to get a hold of a copy of Sylvia Meagher's book, which you recommended highly to me. Apparently, a lot of other people thought well of it too, as it had been stolen from every library in the area except one. So I decided that it was worth Xeroxing her book as I couldn't get a copy of it

for my own library and it appeared to be one of the best books on the subject. Also, I have been reading various volumes of the Commission hearings, just to try and get an idea of the effort made to solve the crime and cover their own mistakes. I haven't been reading these volumes in any particular order as there does not seem to be any order within the series itself or within any volume. In doing this reading, I discovered Sylvia Meagher's other book-the index. As an interesting side note, I found that my uncle's law partner, then an under-secretary of state, handled Oswald's return from the Soviet Union. His opinion of the Commission is far from flattering.

If you could think of any other books that would improve my background on the subject, I certainly would appreciate their suggestion. Oh, I read your Whitewash IV, and was both fascinated and horrified by its contents. I guess reading that transcript clinched my interest in the executive sessions of the Warren Commission. I started reading volumes I & 2 of the Whitewash series but then decided that they would probably have more meaning to me if I was more familiar with the material in the Report and the various volumes of evidence and testimony. I do plan, however, to return to reading your books shortly. In fact, I also want the one volume in the series which I do not now own, Whitewash III, and am enclosing a cheque for \$6.25. to cover its cost.

I sincerely hope, Mr Weisberg, that you have not taken the time gap between my letters as a measure of lessening interest. Several health problems within my immediate family

as well as a robbery are responsible for the diversion of my attention but not my interest elsewhere.

I do hope to hear from you shortly and would appreciate it if, as before, you would send volume III of the Whitewash series to: 9 Shepard Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

Thank you,

sincerely,

Nancy Stephanie Stone

Nancy-Stephanie Stone.

9/8/75

Dear Miss Stone,

I've been so busy that not hearing from you did not intrude upon my consciousness. I'm trying to get another book ready for printing, one that will be important to you. Someone is due here shortly, I'm regularly interrupted by phone, so if any of this is unclear please let me know.

In my view the executive sessions of the Warren Commission that I have are not only unique, important as that can be. They will never again be duplicated. My view is that Presidents use their commissions for special political purposes and that they will never again make the mistake of permitting a situation in which an investigatory devil loving truth will be able to get copies. (I've just filed suit for the last of those still withheld.)

If you can agree with this assumption, whether or not there is another case, then I think you can understand the importance I attach to these transcripts and their potential as a book, not just a thesis. And to preserving an interest.

There have been other interruptions so let me try to get to what I think is most important. I think you should read the few dependable, basic works first to be able to get more meaning from what you read of the official case. Unless you have had experience in evaluating material of this sort without having the benefit of the holes others have punched you may miss much and would then have to backtrack.

Sylvia's book is great, you were wise to xerox it, but the index is not all-inclusive. Except for the current and hard-to-get Presumed Guilty by Howard Roffman (Fairleigh Dickinson Univ. Press) I don't think the other books are worth the time.

I can, of course, give you an estimate of the content of these hearings sessions almost all of which I now have. However, I'd prefer that you reach your own conclusions from reading them. I would think that any faculty would regard any scholarly examination of what is without precedent is the basis of a unique thesis. To help make this easy for them to understand, add this: that they were in such secrecy no members of the staff other than the chief honcho, the guy who really ran the Commission, was permitted to be present and at two points I can recall the members were assured nobody would ever know. (After printing Whitewash IV I got another transcript in which they actually agree to Dulles' recommendation that they destroy the record. They slipped up on the stenotypist's tape. I have a record of the destruction.)

I am fairly confident you'll draw the conclusions I have, but I also believe they should be your beliefs, not mine. What can make this more effective is going farther than I did in Whitewash IV, comparing the secret decisions with the practice.

I really think that well done it can be a best-seller as a book, with years of sales ahead as students use it in studies.

(At some time in the future I'd like to talk to your uncle's law partner. I'm accumulating more of that kind of data and it would eliminate any problem he might feel of conflict of interest.)

What you can do with this is one of the reasons I've always hoped for foundation support, so more students can carry forward while I'm alive and can help some of the many projects I've started and had to lay aside.

I do not think that there are many places in the Whitewash books at which I do not refer to the printed sources, almost all official. So, you can, I think, more profitably check me out this way and learn more about the Commission and its work. Most of the material in its files and that if printed really is not relevant. The key to understanding the overall is this, that the Commission began with a preconception, from whatever motive, and then did what it could to make it appear credible.

If you want further answers, ask. The currently heavier pressures will ease off. I think perhaps a good approach would be to get a tentative ok and then read this one in haste and then discuss it with your faculty people. Best regards. Harold Weisberg

9/8/75

Dear Miss Stone,

I've been so busy that not hearing from you did not intrude upon my consciousness. I'm trying to get another book ready for printing, one that will be important to you. Someone is due here shortly, I'm regularly interrupted by phone, so if any of this is unclear please let me know.

In my view the executive sessions of the Warren Commission that I have are not only unique, important as that can be. They will never again be duplicated. My view is that Presidents use their commissions for special political purposes and that they will never again make the mistake of permitting a situation in which an investigatory devil loving truth will be able to get copies. (I've just filed suit for the last of those still withheld.)

If you can agree with this assumption, whether or not there is another case, then I think you can understand the importance I attach to these transcripts and their potential as a book, not just a thesis. And to preserving an interest.

There have been other interruptions so let me try to get to what I think is most important. I think you should read the few dependable, basic works first to be able to get more meaning from what you read of the official case. Unless you have had experience in evaluating material of this sort without having the benefit of the holes others have punched you may miss much and would then have to backtrack.

Sylvia's book is great, you were wise to xerox it, but the index is not all-inclusive. Except for the current and hard-to-get Presumed Guilty by Howard Roffman (Fairleigh Dickinson Univ. Press) I don't think the other books are worth the time.

I can, of course, given you an estimate of the content of these ~~executive~~ sessions almost all of which I now have. However, I'd prefer that you reach your own conclusions from reading them. I would think that any faculty would regard any scholarly examination of what is without precedent is the basis of a unique thesis. To help make this easy for them to understand, add this: that they were in such secrecy no members of the staff other than the chief honcho, the guy who really ran the Commission, was permitted to be present and at two points I can recall the members were assured nobody would ever know. (After printing Whitewash IV I got another transcript in which they actually agree to Dulles' recommendation that they destroy the record. They slipped up on the stenotypists tape. I have a record of the destruction.)

I am fairly confident you'll draw the conclusions I have, but I also believe they should be your beliefs, not mine. What I can make this more effective is going farther than I did in Whitewash IV, comparing the secret decisions with the practice.

I really think that well done it can be a best-seller as a book, with years of sales ahead as students use it in studies.

(At some time in the future I'd like to talk to your uncle's law partner. I'm accumulating more of that kind of data and it would eliminate any problem he might feel of conflict of interest.)

What you can do with this is one of the reasons I've always hoped for foundation support, so more students can carry forward while I'm alive and can help some of the many projects I've started and had to lay aside.

I do not think that there are many places in the Whitewash books at which I do not refer to the printed sources, almost all official. So, you can, I think, more profitably check me out this way and learn more about the Commission and its work. Most of the material in its files and that if printed really is not relevant. The key to understanding the overall is this, that the Commission began with a preconception, from whatever motive, and then did what it could to make it appear credible.

If you want further answers, ask. The currently heavier pressures will ease off. I think perhaps a good approach would be to get a tentative ok and then read this once in haste and then discuss it with your faculty people. Best regards. Harold Weisberg