

Dear David Larsen,

6/26/92

I'm not offended and I do not have the time for a full response to your letter. I take this time not expecting it to make any difference because basically you look for confirmation of nonsense instead of trying to refute it. And you treat all the wild rumors as "evidence."

You can imagine there is significance in the supposed Ruby call to Connally. As you can imagine it, Ruby would have warned him to "duck." You say that Connally had much to do with the motorcade route and that LBJ and JFK argued about who would be where in the motorcade and you imply that LBJ wanted JFK out of the line of fire. Wow!

Connally had not a thing to do with the motorcade route. The whole thing vaporizes there. But then there is the argument about seating. That was actually over the internal fight among Texas Democrats, who would look better. Had nothing to do with LBJ having any knowledge of the coming shooting.

If you want to investigate the report that the world is flat, OK. But don't expect others to agree with you. And that is what your letter is, a treatment of all the nonsensical inventions and imaginings as "evidence" and then you invent a reason and then....on and on.

Best wishes,

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg  
Route 12, Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

Please excuse my hand-written missive - I am temporarily indisposed by the malfunctioning of my typewriter (and still sans computer). Nevertheless, after our brief telephone conversation of June 17<sup>th</sup>, I felt constrained to include this note along with my request for the xerox editions of Whitewash and Oswald in New Orleans.

Let me state initially that I hold you and your years of dedicated investigation - against the tide - in the highest esteem. I currently own the remainder of your books (in addition to most of those by Penn Jones, Mark Lane, Jim Garrison and many, many others).

Nonetheless, I found it somewhat disconcerting that you were so apparently willing to dismiss so lightly the possible evidence that Ruby telephoned Connally at his motel on the morning of the assassination. (By the way, I misspoke in saying "Dallas." I believe that the evening before the assassination Connally was staying on the 17<sup>th</sup> floor - incidentally, along with Yarbrough - of the Rice Hotel in Houston.) The ability to so readily dismiss "inconvenient" (or, even inexplicable) evidence is something that you, yourself have long ascribed to the Warren Commission and its supporters (and even, at times, to the FBI).



It struck me that when you said, "Why would Ruby call Connally?" that that was an unanswerable question - and certainly without the contents of any message, must remain so. Yet, in the past - at least through your writings - I have never known you to dismiss evidence out-of-hand because, on the surface, it seemed implausible. You have been tenacious in tracking down leads - inexplicable or not! Something that the Warren Commission certainly avoided! Certainly, if the event in question did happen (and I grant you that the evidence is slim at this point - although I'm inclined to think it did), it may have significant implications.

For instance, let me give you one possible scenario (there are many possible - some perhaps "innocent," some not so). Many witnesses and much evidence have linked Jack Ruby to the mechanics of several aspects of the assassination (including the possibility of dropping off one of the gunmen, receiving and/or distributing money, possibly planting CE 399, and, of course, silencing at least one very key witness - Lee Harvey Oswald). Ruby himself later implied that the plot went all the way to Lyndon Johnson - and evidence has surfaced that Johnson and Ruby were personally acquainted years before the assassination (Johnson's mistress, Madeline Brown, et. al.). Connally clearly - being close friends with Johnson - could have known of (or even known) Ruby. Connally certainly played



a key role in keeping the motorcade routed through Dealey Plaza (that alone does not make him a knowledgeable conspirator, but it may indicate he was at least acting as an instrument of others).

I have also seen it reported (though I do not believe it can be authenticated) that on the eve of the assassination, one of the things that Johnson argued with Kennedy about (the fact that they argued, I do believe has been verified), was the seating arrangement in the motorcade. If Johnson was trying to switch positions for Senator Yarborough and Governor Connally, then perhaps he was trying to remove Connally from the line of fire (and even to place Yarborough into it?).

There certainly had been documented problems earlier with the seating arrangement of Yarborough with Johnson.

I also find it quite telling that Connally's own statements indicate that on hearing the first shot, he immediately knew it was a rifle shot and an assassination attempt on J.F.K. If so, it is apparent from the testimony of most other witnesses that Connally was quite alone in his rather prescient assessment. Most witnesses with no foreknowledge of the event, initially believed they had heard a backfire or even firecracker.

So, why would Ruby call Connally? Again, I don't know. But, in lieu of the preceding information (and speculations), one possible explanation would be to warn him to duck! (since he would be almost directly



in the line of fire). Of course, no such warning would be necessary if Johnson had been successful in his efforts to move Connally - and furthermore, it would be highly unlikely that Johnson would risk directly warning Connally and thus revealing his own foreknowledge. Ruby, of course, would not have known that his own name would soon become a household word - as he likely did not anticipate being forced two days hence to kill Oswald.

Obviously, none of this indicates that Ruby's call of Connally did - or did not - happen. Only a thorough investigation of the source (which, by the way, has not been done by me - or you - or anyone else) could begin to shed light on whether or not the event took place. Then, and only then, could the meaning and/or significance begin to be properly evaluated. Maybe you - having "completed" your work - are no longer interested in "new" information (or you believe everything has been discovered?), but I know that you did not always use the same criterion ("believability"?) for either accepting or rejecting information in your previous areas of research. You let a thorough investigation decide veracity of each event in turn - and then tried to ferret out the possible implications.

In any case, I hope that I have not offended you in pointing out a "concern." In the end, I believe that we are very - much interested in the same thing -



the truth! With warm regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,  
David Larsen

P.S. I know that you are quite busy and I am not writing this in order to solicit a response. However, if you could find the time to autograph the two "books" I ordered, I would be most appreciative. ☺ Just thought I'd ask...

P.P.S. One final aside on Beverly Oliver. She, herself, does not claim to have "found religion" or even "become religious." She does claim to have "become a Christian." The difference is that many "religious" people try to achieve "religion" on their own (even "Satanism" is a "religion"), but a Christian claims no perfection or "righteousness" of their own accord. Most say, "I am not perfect, but I do have a perfect God." Of the many Christians I have known, I can assure you that they were - to a person - far more likely to tell the truth after their "conversion" than before (and Beverly Oliver's story did not make any change with her "religion"). To dismiss her story because she became a Christian is to dismiss it for entirely the wrong reason.

P.P.P.S. This is the longest book "order" that I've ever written!... ☺