

Did Lee Harvey Oswald shoot at General Walker on April 10, 1963?

Greg Doudna

March 11, 2023

www.scrollery.com

Witness Kirk Coleman saw two men in two cars leaving an adjoining church parking lot immediately after a shot was fired into the Dallas home of General Edwin Walker said to have narrowly missed Walker on the night of April 10, 1963. Neither of those two cars and persons were identified by police, the FBI, the Warren Commission, or researchers to the present day. The following represents a breakthrough in the case: a solid identification of one of those two vehicles and individuals seen by witness Coleman. The solution to this identification has been missed in all studies until now. This breakthrough is not minor but critical, going to the heart of what happened that evening of April 10, 1963 and the role of Oswald.

What has been known about the two cars seen by Coleman until now

Kirk Coleman, fourteen years old at the time, heard the shot, ran out his backyard, stood on a bicycle to climb up and look over a fence, and saw two men leaving in two cars from the end of a church parking lot adjoining Walker's house. Coleman gave descriptions to the police and FBI of the two individuals and vehicles, known as man No. 1 and man No. 2. Coleman described man No. 1 as age 19 or 20, long or bushy dark hair, 130 pounds, skinny. No. 1 drove away in a 1949 or 1950 light-colored Ford. An odd detail is Coleman saw the car of No. 1 had its engine running and its headlights on, with no one else in the car, *before* man No. 1 walked toward it, got into that car and then drove out of the parking lot. Coleman saw man No. 2

walking toward a parked car in a direction which looked like he had entered the parking lot from an alley which ran behind the Walker house, later determined by police as from where the shot had been fired. Coleman described man No. 2 as about 6'1" and 200 pounds, age unknown. Coleman said the car of man No. 2 was a 1958 Chevrolet black-over-white two-door sedan, parked next to a Renault. Although Coleman did not focus attention on man No. 2 until after seeing No. 1 drive away, when Coleman did turn attention to No. 2 he saw No. 2 leaning into the two-door car with the seat forward as if he was putting something on the floorboards in the rear, although he could not see what it was. Coleman said he did not notice either man carrying anything before they got to their respective cars.

Fact #1: Extensive informal inquiry among the church people using the parking lot failed to identify either of the cars of No. 1 or No. 2 as belonging to people of the church. On the other hand the "Renault" was identified; it turned out to be a Karmann Ghia owned by a young man who attended the church and parked his Karmann Ghia at the location where Coleman saw what he mistakenly called a "Renault". But the cars of No. 1 and No. 2 seen by Coleman were not identified with any church person despite efforts. Those negative results, and the location of the activity in the area of the parking lot away from the church and near the neighboring Walker house, suggest the cars of No. 1 and No. 2 were associated with the Walker house, not the church.

Fact #2: On the other hand, and oddly, there is no record that General Walker or anyone working with Walker was asked by police or the FBI if they could identify the cars seen by Coleman. In the Warren Commission testimony of General Walker, he was not asked. In the Warren Commission testimony of Walker aide Robert Surrey, he was not asked. There is no record *any* of Walker's people were asked that question by Dallas Police, the FBI, or the Warren Commission.

Fact #3: Man No. 2 with the black-over-white car (hereafter called Coleman's "car No. 2") appears to represent either a reaction from the Walker house to the shot or involvement with the shot, one or the other. First, car No. 2 was parked away from the church and nearest the Walker house where it was known Walker people parked. And second, witness Coleman believed the two men and vehicles he saw were associated with the shot due to the timing—only seconds following the shot combined with the closeness of the men and cars to the Walker house.

Fact #4: Given that man No. 2 either came from the Walker house in response to the shot or was involved in the shot, one or the other, it is further odd that there is

no record General Walker was asked by police, FBI, or the Warren Commission whether he, Walker, was alone in his home at the time of the shot. As the story is usually told it is assumed Walker was alone. But I have not found any statement from Walker or anyone else in a position to know actually *saying* that. It is practically inconceivable that police would not have asked Walker that question. Yet there is no known record in writing of that question having been asked or its answer.

On June 10, 1964 the Dallas FBI office reported to FBI headquarters in Washington, D.C. that the two cars Coleman saw remained unidentified, over a year after the shot:

“[T]he two automobiles and the two individuals described in the interviews with Walter Kirk Coleman **have not been identified. It appears only logical these two individuals are (1) either accomplices of the individual shooting at General Walker; (2) are witnesses to the shooting who are reluctant to divulge their identity, or (3) they are associates of General Walker.** If further investigation is desired to identify these individuals and these automobiles, it would appear necessary to interview General Walker who, it is pointed out, is a most controversial figure, who will, undoubtedly, immediately alert the press or call a press conference and publicize the inquiry.”

(<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=59602#relPageId=21>)

The above confirms that as late as June 1964 General Walker had not been asked by the FBI if he could identify either of the cars seen by Coleman. Nor is there record any persons associated with Walker had been asked, in addition to no record of Walker having been asked if anyone else was in his house at the time of the shot. In the closing line above, FBI Dallas may be signaling that it will not conduct interviews of Walker people concerning that line of inquiry unless instructed by headquarters to do so. There is no record that FBI headquarters instructed FBI Dallas to question Walker or Walker’s people for the purpose of attempting to identify the two cars seen by Coleman, and it did not happen.

In 1979 the House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA) said that their investigation also had been unable to develop any leads related to the witness testimony of Kirk Coleman:

“With respect to the Walker shooting, reports of the Dallas Police Department produced at the time of the shooting, and referred to in the Warren Report, reflected that there was **one witness who stated he saw** more than one person leaving the scene after the shooting. The committee conducted a limited investigation to see **if leads could be developed** that might assist in developing these possible associates. **No leads were developed, and this line of inquiry was abandoned.**” (HSCA Final Report [1979], 61)

However I am going to identify one of those two vehicles Coleman saw right now.

Identification of the black-over-white sedan of man No. 2: it is the car of Walker aide Robert Surrey

The car of No. 2 seen by Coleman was the car of Walker right-hand aide Robert Surrey, pure and simple, not previously identified. First will be shown the evidence, then its significance which can hardly be underestimated in understanding what happened with the Walker shot and Oswald’s role in that shot.

The key detail is the color. The car of No. 2 was described by Coleman as a black-over-white two-door sedan. From a Dallas Police interview of Coleman, 4/11/63:

“[Kirk Coleman] heard a noise. He thought it was a blowout ... Kirk stated that he then ran out back and climbed the back fence and saw a man getting into a 1949 or 1950 Ford, Lt. Green or Lt. Blue and take off. This was on the parking lot of the Church next to General Walker’s home. Also on further down the parking lot was another car, unknown make or model and a man was in it. He had the dome light on and **Kirk could see his hand over the front seat as if he was putting something in the back floorboard.** The only description Kirk could give on this car was the fact that it was **black with a white stripe** ... This boy made me promise him that this would not get out in the newspapers. His name is already in the newspaper and he is scared to death that the assassin will attempt to do away with him.”

(<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=217818#relPageId=70>)

FBI interview of Coleman, 6/3/64:

“No. 2 was about ten yards behind No. 1 at a point about twenty-five feet inside the church property, or parking lot, from the alley entrance to this

parking lot ... **No. 2 was walking in a direction away from the alley entrance and towards a 1958 black over white, two-door Chevrolet sedan** ... Coleman stated he was able to observe this even though it was nighttime, as the church has a floodlight which was on at the time, and which lights up the parking lot. Coleman then looked back towards No. 2 and observed that he was, by this time, at the driver's side of the Chevrolet. He had the door open and the front seat pushed forward. He was leaning through the car door and into the back seat area of this car. Coleman then returned to his residence and **did not observe how or when No. 2 left the parking lot** ... He stated that neither man resembled Oswald..."

(<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=60410#relPageId=118>)

FBI interview of Coleman, 6/4/64:

"Concerning the foreign-made car he had observed parked next to the 1958 **black and white** Chevrolet, Coleman stated he believes this was a Renault but it could have been some other make of automobile as he does not know what a Renault looks like ... He returned to the house because he did not think that a shot had been fired and there was no other reason for him to continue observing the man near the 1958 **black and white** Chevrolet."

(<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=60410#relPageId=122>)

Although one could never know this from any Warren Commission testimony or exhibit, Walker aide Robert Surrey's car, which was a 1961 Ford Galaxie Sunliner two-door convertible, was **black over white**. That evening it had its top up, and was mistakenly called by Coleman a 1958 Chevrolet two-door sedan. The distinctive black-over-white color of Robert Surrey's car revealing the identification match is not found in the Warren Report, the Commission's exhibits, or any known law enforcement report or later document release. It was not revealed in Surrey's Warren Commission testimony. In his testimony Surrey said he was not at the Walker house at the time of the shot but was called at his home two miles away by Walker after the shot. Then, Surrey said, he drove to the Walker house arriving ca. 15 minutes later, after police were already there. Surrey was asked what kind of car he drove that evening. But he was not asked the color and he did not volunteer that.

Mr. JENNER. ...Were you at General Walker's home the evening of the attempted assassination, or attempt on his life?

Mr. SURREY. Yes, I was. After the shot. **I was not there at the time.**

Mr. JENNER. How soon after the shot were you there?

Mr. SURREY. About 15 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. **How did you become aware that there had been an attempt on his life?**

Mr. SURREY. He called me on the telephone at my home.

Mr. JENNER. And how far did you live from General Walker's home?

Mr. SURREY. About 2 miles.

Mr. JENNER. And you immediately drove over there?

Mr. SURREY. Yes.

Mr. JENNER. What kind of an automobile do you own and drive?

Mr. SURREY. **A 1961 Ford convertible.**

Mr. JENNER. And did you arrive at his home in that convertible?

Mr. SURREY. Yes, I did.

Mr. JENNER. What time of the day or night was this?

Mr. SURREY. This was about 9 to 9:30 in the evening.

The detail that Surrey's convertible was **black over white** became first known to history on page 218 of Gayle Nix Jackson's book, *Pieces of the Puzzle: An Anthology*, published in 2017.

Pieces of the Puzzle: An Anthology (2017), by Gayle Nix Jackson with Doug Campbell, Steve Roe, Chris Scally, and James Wagenvoord (<https://www.amazon.com/Pieces-Puzzle-Anthology-JFK/dp/0991302079>), is an important discussion of the Walker case going beyond the primary documents accessible on the Mary Ferrell Foundation website (https://www.maryferrell.org/pages/Main_Page.html). The contribution in that volume of Steve Roe, "Welcome Mr. Kennedy to Dallas" (pp. 46-117), is particularly informative as a narrative description of the local context and facts of the Walker case. In no small measure the present study can be regarded as building upon the work of Gayle Nix Jackson and her coauthors in *Pieces of the Puzzle*. (Another major secondary source on Walker which should be mentioned is Jeffrey Caufield, *General Walker and the Murder of President Kennedy* [2015].)

Gayle Nix Jackson in *Pieces of the Puzzle* reports the detail about the color of Robert Surrey's car from what at the time was a privately-circulated videotape of David Surrey, the oldest son of Robert Surrey, produced in 2012. This video was first (I believe) made publicly available on YouTube only in 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4NtOITQ1kzA>).

In this 25-minute videotape, David Surrey, who was 12 years old at the time, tells of being *with his father in Walker's house at the time of the shot*, then *leaving with his father in his father's car immediately after the shot*. In the process of telling that, David mentions (with no awareness of the significance) that his father's car was *black over white*. The videotape was produced in 2012 at the urging of David Surrey's neighbor and friend Allen Trent in the last year of David's life when David had been diagnosed with a fatal condition. (David Surrey passed away in 2013. An obituary and tributes is here, <https://obits.dallasnews.com/us/obituaries/dallasmorningnews/name/david-surrey-obituary?id=20003946>.) In this video David tells a different account of his father's movements that evening than Robert Surrey told to the FBI and Warren Commission. The following is my transcription, David Surrey speaking:

“My father became a PR man for Edwin Walker. At that time <...> I think I turned 11, or maybe 12 at that time. And one evening we were at Edwin Walker's house. He was making a run for the governorship of Texas. And my Dad was actively campaigning for him, and my brother, my two brothers, my sisters Karen, Julie, both stepsisters, and my real brothers Bill and Richard, were with me. We were all at a house, General Walker's house, who had a nice beautiful house on Turtle Creek here in Dallas.

“And we're stuffing envelopes to send in the mail. And as we were doing this, a shot rang out! Very loud! **'BAM!'** Echoed through the house. **And my Dad was there, screamed 'Everybody hit the ground!'** Which we all did, and they dove. Even though we were kids, we knew what a gunshot was.

So as things went on, my Dad said—no more shooting—my Dad jumped up and goes, “It came from right out front!” And he goes, “Come with me David!” **And we jumped in my father's car. And we took off down the alleyway**, and he circled the block, and another gentleman—

Question off camera, interrupting: What kind of car was it?

David Surrey: Well my Dad had a Sunliner. Ford Sunliner.

Question off camera: What color?

David Surrey: **It was white with a black convertible top. A pretty car!”**

No Dallas Police, FBI, or Warren Commission document tells that black-over-white color of Robert Surrey's car (I have checked), which exactly agrees with Coleman's car No. 2. *It was Robert Surrey's car to which Coleman saw man No. 2 go immediately after the shot*, told independently by David Surrey who left the Walker house with his father in that car immediately after the shot that evening!

Coleman's identification of Surrey's 1961 Ford Sunliner as a 1958 Chevy

Then-14-year-old Coleman showed fallibility with respect to make and model of the parked Karmann Ghia which he mistakenly called a Renault. Coleman similarly erred in the make and model of car No. 2. What matters about Coleman's testimony with respect to car No. 2 is the shape (sedan), number of doors (two), and color: *black over white*. Coleman saw Robert Surrey's two-door black-over-white convertible with the black top up that night. Because the black top was up and Coleman could see it was a two-door, Coleman called it a black-over-white two-door sedan. But why did Coleman say it was a 1958 Chevrolet sedan, if it was a 1961 Ford Sunliner?

I am not expert in classic automobiles but in checking I see the 1958 Chevy sedans have a similar profile to a 1961 Ford Sunliner looked at from the side. There is also a prominent single horizontal stripe running most of the length of the sides on both the 1961 Ford Sunliner and 1958 Chevy sedans, whereas that stripe was not the case with most other models in the year 1958 and other years. I see that Ford, Chrysler, Cadillac, and Rambler models in 1958 do not have such a lengthy stripe on the side similar to that of the 1961 Ford Sunliner. The 1958 Chevrolets and Plymouths do, but the 1958 Plymouths have *extremely* pronounced, oversized tailfins which would not be confused with a 1958 Chevy sedan or 1961 Ford Sunliner both of which had more modest or subdued tailfins. The point being: if someone saw a 1961 Ford Sunliner with its distinctive stripe on the side and did not realize it was a Sunliner, one could associate that stripe with the 1958 or 1959 Chevy sedans which had similar stripes. Even the Chevy sedans themselves dropped that stripe by 1960, then a partial return in 1961, but then gone again in 1962 and 1963.

In fact the similarity in the distinctive long stripe on the side between Surrey's Ford Sunliner and the 1958 Chevy sedans could be why Coleman thought car No. 2 was a 1958 Chevy sedan. An echo of this might be in Coleman's first statements to police, if police misunderstood Coleman's descriptions. The original police

offense report for the night of the incident, written by officers McElroy and Van Cleve 4/11/63, reported of Kirk Coleman:

“He then noticed what appeared to be a w/m with the door open on a 58 Chev., blk with white stripe down side, said this person had the right seat pushed up and was leaning over as if he was putting something into the floorboards.”

What if a comma was left out of the officers’ handwritten notes in typing up the report, and Coleman *actually* said **“blk and white, stripe down side”*? The presence or absence of the comma changes the meaning!

And then what if the next day’s investigator misunderstood Coleman describing the car the same way Coleman had the night before, Coleman describing the car (correctly) as **“black and white with a stripe”*, which became (mistakenly) → *“black with a white stripe”* (DPD, report of Tucker and Norvell, 4/11/63). (Also, the report of Tucker and Norvell could have been influenced by McElroy and Van Cleve’s report.)

The evidence that something like this happened is that Coleman was later reinterviewed on multiple occasions and in all cases after these original two police reports, without exception, Coleman is reported as saying the car of man No. 2 was either “black over white” or “black and white”, i.e. a two-tone (not an all-black car except for a white stripe). That indicates the “white stripe” on an otherwise black car envisioned by the original police report of Coleman’s description was a mistake. But that mistake would not have been on the part of the witness but of the officers writing down and reporting the words of the witness.

If counts of surviving classic cars for sale represented on Google Images in 2022 are any indication, two-tone black-over-white was not common for 1958 Chevy sedans. For the search term “1958 Chevrolet two-door sedan” I counted only 7 black-over-whites out of 315 color photos of such 1958 Chevys. That is an incidence of less than 3%—about a *3 percent chance* that a *random* 1958 Chevy two-door sedan observed parked where Robert Surrey is known to have parked his black-over-white Sunliner on an earlier occasion, *also* would be *black-over-white*, just as Robert Surrey’s car.

The most important point is that the black-over-white color is no coincidence. Coleman’s car No. 2 was not some unknown *different* car that looked *like* Robert

Surrey's car—*also* black over white and two-door; parked where Walker people parked; *parked in the same area of that church parking lot where Robert Surrey by his own account parked his black-over-white two-door only two nights earlier*; and seen by Coleman about to drive away at the exact time David Surrey, who was with his father that evening, said his father drove *his* car away, immediately following the shot—that *was* Robert Surrey's car.

According to Robert Surrey, only two evenings earlier, before the evening of the Walker shot, on April 8, 1963, Surrey said he parked his black-over-white convertible in the same area of the church parking lot where Coleman told of seeing the black-over-white sedan the evening of April 10, 1963.

“On Monday night, **April 8, 1963**, at about 9:00 to 9:30 p.m., [**Robert Surrey**] arrived in the area of the residence of General Edwin A. Walker, 4011 Turtle Creek Boulevard. Surrey **proceeded around the block and entered the Mormon Church Parking Lot, located on the property adjoining the Walker residence to the north, and parked his car in this lot.**” (FBI, 6/3/64, <https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=60410#relPageId=116>)

Despite publishing the color of Robert Surrey's car for the first time in 2017 in *Pieces of the Puzzle*, Gayle Nix Jackson came close but did not go that one step further and make the connection that Robert Surrey's car was Kirk Coleman's car No. 2. That identification is first made now.

Two Boy Scouts see the same black-over-white car the evening of the Walker shot: “a pretty good looking car”

Scott Hansen was a 15-year old member of a family of the Latter-day Saints church next to the Walker house, the church of the parking lot. He and a friend saw the same car Coleman saw the evening of the shot:

“Hansen stated that he recalls observing a 1958 **black over white** Chevrolet parked along the fence next to Major General Edwin A. Walker's property on the night of April 10, 1963. He stated that he recalls seeing **the same automobile parked along this fence on a previous Wednesday**, but **has not seen the car in the church lot since April 10, 1963**. He stated that he was talking to another Boy Scout by the name of David Clemens concerning the appearance of the automobile and remembered that he thought it was ‘a

pretty good looking car’.” (FBI, 6/4/64,
<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=60410#relPageId=126>)

That Hansen is reported as referring to the No. 2 car of Coleman as a 1958 Chevrolet—instead of (accurately) a 1961 Ford Sunliner—should be interpreted as Hansen’s response to an FBI agent asking if he had seen a black-over-white car of that make and model, with either Hansen or the FBI agent in reporting echoing the year and make of the FBI inquiry.

Note that those two young men not only saw the same black-over-white car Kirk Coleman saw, but they admired the car in practically the same words David Surrey used in the video of his father’s black-over-white convertible: “*A pretty car!*” (David Surrey). “*A pretty good looking car*” (the Boy Scouts). It is the same car!

Physical descriptions of man No. 2 and Robert Surrey compared

According to an FBI report of 6/3/64 Kirk Coleman estimated man No. 2 (= Robert Surrey) to be about 6’1” and about 200 pounds, age uncertain (CD 1124, <https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=11520#relPageId=12>).

The only physical description I have been able to find for Robert Surrey is attributed to a redacted name of source—a source who did not know Robert Surrey’s exact age or exact weight, suggesting a human informant’s estimate, not measured or vital statistics from a document—reported in an FBI document dated 10/27/64: there Robert Surrey is said to be 5’10” and 150-160 pounds (<https://archive.org/details/SURREYRobertA.HQ9456242AndDallas10012834/mode/2up>, at p. 44 of 46). The closest I can find to a standing photo of Robert Surrey as an adult is at *Pieces of the Puzzle*, p. 191, showing Robert Surrey kissing his wife Mary at an airport. Although only the upper half of his body is shown and that in profile, he looks in agreement with the FBI height and weight, maybe two inches taller than Mary (of unknown height), and solid, not a thin man. A photo of Robert Surrey sitting in a chair is here:

<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=109189#relPageId=24>. There is a full-length standing photo of Robert Surrey as a teenager at *Pieces of the Puzzle*, p. 212. In that photo his height is hard to determine though he does not seem to be short. He looks neither lean nor overweight but “solid” and healthy in that photo.

The height and weight estimates differ but not dramatically beyond range of error of a truthful witness. Note that Coleman did not call man No. 2 “skinny” or about

130 pounds as was Coleman's description of No. 1; if that had been Coleman's description of No. 2, that would be a dramatic difference.

Given that the Coleman height and weight estimates for man No. 2 were only first reported obtained from Coleman on June 3, 1964, fourteen months after the event, and allowing for the brief viewing Coleman had of No. 2—according to description mostly from the back with the man leaning into the car and not upright—witness Kirk Coleman's height and weight estimate is judged in satisfactory agreement with a real sighting of Robert Surrey by Coleman the evening of April 10, 1963 as Coleman's man No. 2.

Kirk Coleman at the Walker house

According to Robert Surrey's Warren Commission testimony, he and arriving officers, pulling up at the same time, parked at the front of the Walker house on Turtle Creek Boulevard. He and they entered the Walker house through the front door and went to the rear of the house, where General Walker was in the room into which the shot had been fired. After Surrey assisted Walker with tweezers getting small slivers of metal out of Walker's right forearm police took some information, then Surrey with police went out the back door into the back yard and back alley. At this point reporters were showing up.

It appears Kirk Coleman, seeing the activity and police officers behind Walker's house, walked over to the rear of the Walker house, spoke to officers and volunteered what he had seen. The officers noted Coleman as a witness in their report and what he told them. The next day the Dallas Police sent out an investigator to interview Coleman more closely; that interview was written up 4/11/63 by Norvell and Tucker. If Robert Surrey heard what Coleman told the officers the night of April 10, as Surrey may well have since he was there and reporters heard it, he would have realized one of the cars of which Coleman was speaking was his own, whether or not he heard Coleman misidentify its year and model.

What Robert Surrey did *not* do was volunteer clarification to the officers that one of the cars Coleman saw had been his, and inform officers of the correct year and model and identification of Coleman's car No. 2. Why Surrey did not do so may be an open question. But *that* he did not do so, *that* he let an erroneous report of Coleman stand concerning the make and model of car No. 2, which functioned to have it remain unidentified, has the status of a fact. Because even if Surrey had

missed hearing what Coleman told the officers that night (not very likely that he would not have heard or the officers would not have told him), Surrey would have read it in the newspaper the next day and certainly have heard about it. Yet he did not disclose.

If upon his return to the Walker house after the shot Surrey had parked in the rear of the house, Coleman would have seen and probably identified Surrey's car as car No. 2 on the spot. But that did not happen, because Surrey parked out front on Turtle Creek Boulevard. Surrey to the Warren Commission:

“When I pulled—I pulled up in front on Turtle Creek, got out of my car. A police car was there ... I parked and got out of my automobile, and walked up the front walkway into the house ... There were several policemen in the house, just arriving. Mr. Walker was sitting at his desk in this back room.”

But why would Coleman not recognize Robert Surrey himself in the back yard as man No. 2? That is not too hard to understand. Coleman said he never saw the face of man No. 2 (“Coleman advised he never saw No. 2's face”, FBI, 6/4/64). Coleman said when he did pay attention to looking at man No. 2 he saw him only from the rear. Then, the back yard and alley area of Walker's house was either dark or semidark. A backyard floodlight on the Walker property was inoperable that evening. The police officers would have been moving around with flashlights (flashlights in the alley may have been what drew Coleman's attention to the police activity). According to a NOAA-ESRL (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration-Earth Systems Research Laboratories) historical sunrise/sunset calculator, sunset that evening in Dallas was 6:53 pm with total darkness at Texas's latitude occurring ca. 70 minutes after sunset in Texas or ca. 8:03 pm.

Mr. JENNER. When does it get dark in Dallas, Tex. in this area in the spring?

Mr. SURREY. I would say 7.

Mr. JENNER. Do you have daylight saving time in Dallas?

Mr. SURREY. No; we don't.

But there was a moonrise of a full moon that night at 8:30 pm from 103 degrees southeast which would have shone on the back yard and alley behind the Walker house as the moon rose enough to be over any buildings or landscape, depending on whether the southeast horizon was clear or cloudy that night (according to this

moonrise historical date calculator,

<https://www.timeanddate.com/moon/usa/dallas?month=4&year=1963>).

There may not have been much moonlight at around 9 pm, the time of the shot, but in the ca. 9:30-10:00 pm time frame, when Coleman may have spoken to the officers, there probably would have been some light from the full moon at that point.

But whether or not there was moonlight, if Coleman did see Surrey among the officers and reporters and perhaps a neighbor or two mingling around in the semi-darkness, Coleman would not have recognized him because Coleman never saw the face of No. 2 to make a facial recognition possible. And Coleman would have had no reason to expect to see man No. 2 there. These circumstances account for Coleman not recognizing Surrey that evening as the man No. 2 he had seen less than an hour earlier leaving in a car from the parking lot, even though one of the two mystery men Coleman was describing could have been among those listening to Coleman as he spoke. And Surrey for whatever reason was not making known, to either Coleman or the officers, that Coleman's man No. 2 was he.

David Surrey's younger brother William's memory of the night of the Walker shot

Gayle Nix Jackson reports from a dialogue in which she engaged with William "Bill" Surrey, about 10 years old at the time, David Surrey's younger brother, a correction to David's account on a point, while corroborating that he and his brothers and sisters stuffed envelopes at the Walker house that evening.

"Bill [Surrey] also shares a slightly different remembrance of the night at General Walker's home. He says that yes, the whole family was there stuffing envelopes and they ran out of something they were putting in the envelopes, so **Robert Surrey sent his wife Mary, the girls, Bill and Richard home.** They weren't home very long when they got a call from their Dad (not General Walker as he testified to the Warren Commission) to quickly come back over. After the phone call, **Robert and David went searching for the 'shooters'. By the time David and Robert got back the police began to arrive.**" (*Pieces of the Puzzle*, 222)

And again,

“William Surrey states that this [father Robert and older brother David at the Walker house at the time of the shot] did indeed happen, but it was after his Dad had sent he, his younger brother Richard, his stepsisters Karen and Julie and his stepmom home. Karen Surrey says she wasn’t there either but remembers the evening.” (*Pieces of the Puzzle*, 410)

On July 29, 2022, David’s friend Allen Trent posted on YouTube a 33-minute video from David Surrey’s younger brother William Surrey produced in 2013, apparently for the first time: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u5R4Yz5ML3E>. (Nearly four months later, on Nov 21, 2022, when I first noticed it by accident it showed zero YouTube views. I viewed it that date, following which it now showed one total views, mine.)

(Also, whereas William Surrey confirms David’s memory of the family stuffing envelopes at the Walker house that evening, David erred in his video in saying those mailings were for Walker’s gubernatorial campaign since that campaign ended the fall of 1962. Robert Surrey was General Walker’s campaign manager in an unsuccessful run for governor in 1962. The envelope stuffing on April 10, 1963 therefore was for something else. Gayle Nix Jackson notes that Walker in Dallas was greeted with placards that read “Walker for President in 1964” and asks if it might have been fundraising letters for Walker’s hoped-for presidential campaign [*Pieces of the Puzzle*, 410].)

David Surrey leaving with his father after the shot

According to David Surrey he left the Walker house with his father in his father’s black-over-white convertible immediately after the shot. However witness Kirk Coleman saw no second individual with man No. 2 corresponding to 12-yr old David. Coleman said he paid little attention to man No. 2 at first. Coleman said he first saw man No. 2 (= Robert Surrey) walking by himself toward the black-over-white car, coming from the direction of the alley, but then focused his attention on man No. 1 until he saw car No. 1 drive out of the parking lot out of sight. Only then did Kirk turn his attention to No. 2. According to the police report Kirk saw man No. 2 had now reached the car, the driver’s side car door was open, the seat was pushed forward and the man “had the dome light on and Kirk could see his hand over the front seat as if he was putting something in the back floorboard”.

It has not been clear what that activity of No. 2 involving the rear floorboard was about. That has given rise to all sorts of speculations that that could be a shooter stashing a weapon after firing the shot, etc. But Coleman never claimed to see man No. 2 carrying anything when he first saw him walking, nor did Coleman see man No. 2 with a weapon or package in the car—only the man leaning into the car in that posture, with Coleman viewing the man’s backside without seeing what the man was moving or arranging in the car. Coleman said he quit looking after that point, climbed down from the fence and returned to his own house without seeing car No. 2 drive away. That is, man No. 2 “as if he was putting something in the back floorboard” was Coleman’s *last visual* of man No. 2 and his car (= Robert Surrey). From an FBI interview of Coleman referring to after car No. 1 drove out of the parking lot:

“Coleman then looked back towards No. 2 and observed that he was, by this time, at the driver’s side of the Chevrolet. He had the door open and the front seat pushed forward. **He was leaning through the car door and into the back seat area of this car. Coleman then returned to his residence and did not observe how or when No. 2 left the parking lot.**” (CE 2958, FBI, 6/3/64)

It hardly seems possible that Kirk Coleman could have failed to notice young David in the car if, say, David had run out to the car in advance of his father before Coleman climbed up the fence to look over. Therefore by default (and because the match of Coleman’s black-and-white car No. 2 as Robert Surrey’s convertible is the non-negotiable fact here), David Surrey will have entered the car *after* Robert Surrey went to the car *alone*, *after* Kirk Coleman left off looking.

In other words, Robert Surrey went to his car by himself, out the back door of the Walker house into the back yard and through the alley entrance into the parking lot and to his parked car. Then, Robert Surrey will have driven the car out of the parking lot and picked up son David. There are only two possibilities how that could have worked: either David went out the front door to his father’s car or he went out the back door to his father’s car. Theoretically Robert Surrey could have left the parking lot by driving out the driveway to Turtle Creek Boulevard, turned right, and picked up David running out the Walker house’s front door to get in his father’s car. However, there is reason to know that is *not* what happened: a witness named David Richards, a young man who was part of the church next door, walked to the front of the Walker house immediately after hearing the shot, arrived within about a minute, and said he saw no person or movement at all at the front of

Walker's house. This witness was found and interviewed by Steve Roe in 2015. Roe writes:

“Parking for the congregation was built behind the church in an elevated parking lot due to the hill incline from Turtle Creek. There were two accesses to the parking lot, one driveway leading up from Turtle Creek Blvd. and another through the alleyway that leads from Avondale behind Dr. Jackson's and General Walker's home. Concrete steps were also built along the Turtle Creek driveway access and led to a sidewalk that led to the front entrance.

“On the warm night of Wednesday, April 10, 1963, David Richards was attending the regularly scheduled youth meeting at the church with his father. The youth meetings on Wednesday were usually dress casual with teenagers ranging from 12 to 18 years old. On that evening, it was estimated that 15-20 people including teens, parents and counselors, were in attendance for the youth meeting. The youth services were typically held from 7:00 to 9:00 every Wednesday. Sometime around 9:00 pm as the meeting began to break up, David left out the front entrance to the church to get some fresh air. As he stepped outside, he heard a loud report.

“From growing up in Texas and hunting, he recognized immediately that it sounded like a rifle shot and close by. Alarmed, he left the church front entrance on the sidewalk [the church-installed sidewalk that went to the driveway] and immediately ran down [turned left, downhill] the driveway to Turtle Creek Blvd. From there he walked over [turning right], clearing the trees in front of General Walker's home [trees separating Walker's home from the driveway] and stood in front of Walker's home for a few minutes to see if he could figure out what was happening. From his ear-witness account, David thought the shot originated from the Walker home.

“According to David, the lighting on Turtle Creek Blvd. was poor and basically dark ... **Looking around, David could see nothing unusual.** This author [Roe] asked him **if he ever saw anyone** crossing or walking along Turtle Creek Blvd. and the reply was **negative**. Seeing nothing and hearing nothing else, David went back inside the church and told his father that he heard a gunshot. After telling his father, David and a few other kids stood out front of the church on the elevated lawn. In just a short time, he heard a siren and watched as the police arrived at the Walker home. Going back

inside the church, David’s father told him to remain inside and not to get involved in whatever was happening next door.” (Roe, in *Pieces of the Puzzle*, 90-91)

David Richards told Roe that he estimated it did not take him longer than about one minute (sixty seconds) to get to the front of Walker’s house where he then stood and saw no person moving or anything unusual (personal communication on the one-minute detail from Roe).

Therefore Robert Surrey did *not* drive out the driveway on to Turtle Creek Boulevard and pick up son David from the *front* door. That means that David Surrey exited the same door his father did, the *back* door, went out into the alley, and Robert Surrey drove the car out of the parking lot into the *alley* that went behind Walker’s house and ran into Avondale. And that is exactly what David Surrey said in his video—that he got in his father’s car and they *left in the alley*. Again David Surrey in his 2012 video telling what happened after hearing the shot:

“[M]y Dad said—no more shooting—my Dad jumped up and goes, ‘**It came from right out front!**’ And he goes, ‘Come with me David!’ **And we jumped in my father’s car. And we took off down the alleyway...**”

And so it becomes clear what happened. Robert Surrey went out the back door alone and told David to wait at the door or on the property until Robert got the car. Robert went out the back of the house into the back yard which was dark that evening (a floodlight on the Walker property which usually lit up the back yard was out), to the back alley, then a few steps through the dark alley (exactly from where the shot had originated moments earlier with a shooter at large), then into the lighted church parking lot to get to his parked car which is where Kirk Coleman picked up sight of him walking (seen by Coleman). Robert gets to his car and then moves something—could be mailing envelopes, packaging supplies, anything—off the front passenger seat to the back of the car to make room for David in the right front passenger seat (seen by Coleman). Coleman leaves off looking. Robert Surrey drives out the parking lot into the alley behind the Walker house (unseen by Coleman). David runs to the car, jumps in, and they drive off down the alley (unseen by Coleman). Coleman saw the part in which Robert Surrey got to his car in the church parking lot, before Surrey drove out into the alley and picked up David behind the Walker house.

Note the curious detail, as David Surrey tells it, that Robert Surrey told his son David that the shot came from the *front* of the house—which was *not* true (the shot came from the alley in the rear). But (as David Surrey tells it) his father saying the shot came from the front reassures David that the safest exit is by the *rear* door which is what Robert Surrey *did* have *both of them do*. Did Robert Surrey really mistakenly think the shot had been fired from the front of the house? Unknown. But according to David, that is what Robert Surrey *said* as he and his father at his father's direction left *by the back alley*, going out to *exactly where the shooter had actually stood and fired*.

And this raises a question: would Robert Surrey knowingly risk a 12-year old boy's life—his son—by having the two of them run out into the night to exactly where a shooter at large had just fired? Yet that is *what happened* at Robert Surrey's direction. And why immediately run out of a house into the open at all with a 12-year old boy moments after a shot? Would it not have been wiser and more prudent to remain inside the house and wait until police arrived?

Or did Robert Surrey know there was no actual danger to his son and himself from the shooter in the back of the Walker house?

Explanation of man No. 2 putting something on the rear floorboards of the car

The reconstruction just worked out explains Coleman's seeing man No. 2 setting or relocating something to the rear of the car. That is Robert Surrey *preparing the front seat for a passenger*, young David. If there were no passenger about to sit in the right front seat, Robert Surrey would not have been seen doing what Coleman saw. What Coleman saw was a clearing of the front seat for a passenger which supports David's story that he left the Walker house in his father's car just after the shot that evening. What Coleman saw indicates that *two* persons were going to leave in car No. 2 even though Coleman *saw only one* person. David Surrey's firsthand account of that evening identifies *who* the second person was picked up by Robert Surrey's car out of Coleman's sight.

The behavior witnessed by Coleman at car No. 2 is what drivers do with the front seat so a passenger will be able to sit there. I have done that in my cars countless times readying the passenger seat for a passenger. Robert Surrey after finishing clearing or relocating something to the rear of the car (seen by Coleman) preparing the passenger front seat, then drove out of the parking lot into the alley (unseen by

Coleman), and picked up David in the alley (unseen by Coleman). The pickup was not at the front door of the Walker house, because of the David Richards witness account and because David Surrey said they drove away in the alley in the rear. The pickup of David Surrey happened out the back door in the alley, with Robert Surrey stopping in the alley just long enough for David to dash out and get in the car and they drove off as David said happened.

Something seriously not right with Robert Surrey's story

This analysis not only explains the movements of man No. 2 at his car but also is sufficient to dispense with the notion that man No. 2 was putting a rifle into the back of the car or that man No. 2 had taken the shot. Man No. 2 was Robert Surrey and Robert Surrey did not take the shot. He was inside the Walker house at the time of the shot. The witness of David Surrey, also the testimony of Marina Oswald, supports that Robert Surrey was not the shooter that night.

Nevertheless, although Robert Surrey was not the shooter, *something* is not right about Robert Surrey in the story of the shot taken at Walker. The witness accounts of Kirk Coleman and David Surrey leave little room for a conclusion other than that Robert Surrey spoke falsely to the FBI and in his testimony under oath to the Warren Commission concerning his whereabouts that evening.

Because: Kirk Coleman's same-night eyewitness sighting of Robert Surrey getting into Robert Surrey's car, and David Surrey's years-later firsthand account of leaving the Walker house in that car with his father immediately after the shot, establish that Robert Surrey *was inside* the Walker house *at the time of the shot*. But Robert Surrey *told the FBI and the Warren Commission* that he was two miles away at his home, and only first arrived to the Walker house about 15 minutes after the shot!

Perjury in Robert Surrey's testimony—why?

Robert Surrey to the FBI:

“On the night of April 10, 1963, Surrey **stated he was not at Walker's residence**, but received a call from General Edwin Walker shortly after the shooting incident, or shortly after 9:00 PM. He stated he proceeded from his residence directly to Walker's residence, arriving there at about the same time as did the first police car.” (CD 1124. FBI Letterhead Memorandum of

10 Jun 1964 re: Walker Incident,
<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=11520#relPageId=10>)

Robert Surrey to the Warren Commission:

Mr. JENNER. Thank you, sir. Were you at General Walker's home the evening of the attempted assassination, or attempt on his life?

Mr. SURREY. Yes, I was. After the shot. **I was not there at the time.**

Mr. JENNER. How soon after the shot were you there?

Mr. SURREY. About 15 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. How did you become aware that there had been an attempt on his life?

Mr. SURREY. He called me on the telephone at my home.

These statements of Robert Surrey to the FBI and Warren Commission *were not true*. They are not true because Kirk Coleman *saw* Robert Surrey's car parked near the Walker house and Robert Surrey walking to his car moments after the shot; and because son David Surrey, who *was there*, supports the witness of Kirk Coleman, *confirming* the presence of his father in the Walker house at the time of the shot and that his father left the Walker home immediately after the shot.

Although Robert Surrey did not fire the shot, Robert Surrey, for unknown reason, gave false information to the FBI and false, perjured testimony under oath to the Warren Commission rather than disclose that he was at the Walker house at the time of the shot; *why?*

At this point the identification of Coleman's car No. 2 as Robert Surrey's car, and man No. 2 as Robert Surrey, should no longer be in question. The question now has become a different one: why did Robert Surrey dissemble concerning his whereabouts that evening?

What happened next after Robert Surrey and David left the Walker house

From the David Surrey video, my transcription:

“We jumped in there [into his father's car after the shot] **and we took off, after this gunman**, looking for a car or something out of the ordinary, it was a nice neighborhood. And anyway, we circled around four or five blocks, six or something, didn't get anything.

“And after a what—my father pulled up on the curb—we were about three blocks away—behind another car. And I was in the front seat of the car. And supposedly we had not found this gentleman, whoever shot at him. And my Dad got out and he went up to this car. And the guy got out of the car, and I couldn’t see, it was dark, it was night. And he says, uh, ‘Did you get him?’ And he said, ‘No I missed. No I didn’t see him.’”

“‘No I missed’ is what he *said*. And at the time I *thought* he meant, he didn’t *see* the guy who shot at him. They looked for him and they just missed him. He didn’t know where he was. And my father didn’t know either. So anyway, the police came, took a report, and they dug the bullet out which missed General Walker from behind his head.”

Was this some memory of David Surrey of his father arriving to the Walker house and speaking to a police officer? There is this from *Pieces of the Puzzle*: “Warren Bosworth, Dallas Times Herald reporter, was sitting at the press room desk at the Dallas Police Department, when he heard the call about the shooting. Riding out with the police he was met by Robert Surrey and granted access into the Walker home. Police immediately interviewed Walker upon arrival” (Roe in *Pieces of the Puzzle*, 91, citing a Sixth Floor Museum Oral History interview of Bosworth).

However, David’s mention of his father pulling up behind a stopped car several blocks away, if David is correct on that detail, suggests this may have been something else. The other possibility is David’s father may have been meeting up with car No. 1 that Coleman saw leave the church parking lot, or some accomplice in the shot other than Car No. 1.

If so, one interpretation might be that man No. 1 in his car was an accomplice of Oswald taking the shot, perhaps assisting in conveyance of Oswald and the rifle that evening. After the shot—which according to Marina, Lee told her later that night he had fired—car No. 1 might have tried to find or meet Oswald to pick him up and drive him. In this case the exchange David overheard between his father and the man in the other car could be the man of car No. 1 telling Surrey (No. 2) that he had “missed him”, meaning Oswald after the shot—Oswald on foot wasn’t to be found. Oswald then stashed the rifle in undergrowth somewhere where it could later be retrieved and made his way home on his own late that night, as he was capable of doing, by bus, which is how Marina says Lee told her he got home that night.

In short, David Surrey's account is compatible with a possible implication of what witness Kirk Coleman saw, that there may have been two men and automobiles connected to and leaving immediately after the shot that evening in addition to a third person, a shooter on foot (Oswald as told to Marina). Kirk Coleman saw two cars in the parking lot as they were leaving, and David Surrey may tell of those same two cars meeting up a few minutes later after circling the neighborhood—both perhaps looking for Oswald—meeting and agreeing they had missed him.

After that, the person David Surrey saw his father meet would go on his way. In light of Robert Surrey's testimony to the Warren Commission that he went to the Walker house from his own house after the shot with no mention of his son David with him, it is likely that Robert Surrey next took David home, dropped David off, and drove back to Walker's house by himself. Mary Surrey then in a separate larger family car will have driven the rest of the family, three boys and two daughters of her own, including David Surrey, over to the Walker house where they stayed in a big room near the front door while police and reporters talked with Walker and Robert Surrey in the back (this from the video of William Surrey). The stop home by Robert Surrey after the shot and dropping off son David, then returning alone in his convertible to the Walker house, makes sense and gives better agreement with Robert Surrey's testimony than if he did not do so. In any case police and reporters arrived at the Walker house to find Robert Surrey helping General Walker pull a sliver of metal out of Walker's forearm with tweezers, as reported in the press.

Fortuitous circumstances for the shooter

Following the shot and a phone call from the Walker house, Mary Surrey and the kids went back to the Walker house, described by William Surrey in his video. William recalls the kids were kept in a room at the front of the house to the left going in the front door, separate from the police activity in the back where police were taking their reports from Walker and Robert Surrey. "Neither of them [David and William] remembers seeing police officers at the Walker home" (*Pieces of the Puzzle*, 222).

Later, after the police had gone, William tells of the kids being taken back, shown the bullet hole in the wall, and having explained to them what had happened. There appears to have been no occasion for police to discover or interview 12-year-old David Surrey as a witness concerning his and his father's presence in the house at the time of the shot. Years later in his video William Surrey still seemed puzzled

over why the kids were kept away from the police activity in the back of the house and assumed it must have had something to do with adults shielding children's ears from talk of violence. Whatever the reason, it meant 12-year-old David Surrey did not hear what his father told police and it minimized the chance that David would volunteer some contradiction to what his father said or that David would come to the attention of and be questioned by police as a witness himself.

Late that night the Surrey kids were taken home again by Mary Surrey. Robert Surrey remained and stayed in the house with Walker that night. General Walker himself was reported by police and reporters as showing no fear, expressing no plans to increase security or alter his activities or daily routines. Walker blamed the shot on the domestic communist threat and blamed the Kennedys for denying the domestic communist threat as evidenced by the shot. "Walker proclaimed to a newspaper the night he was shot that the Kennedy Administration should be blamed because, 'They were soft on communism and were allowing communists to run loose and shoot at people'" (*Pieces of the Puzzle*, 198).

There was a dog belonging to a woman who lived on the other side of the Walker house, a border collie named Toby owned by a Marion Ross Bouve. Toby, a notorious barker at anyone in the alley near the Walker place, which is from where the shooter took the shot, became seriously sickened the next day after the evening of the Walker shot. As it happened, on the night of April 10, the night of the shot, Mrs. Bouve took Toby inside the house and confined him to a laundry room earlier that evening (to stop the barking "at the numerous people coming and going from the Walker residence", as well as people arriving to the church, she said), such that the dog was not an issue by the time the shot was fired. But Mrs. Bouve "advised her dog 'Toby' became very sick on April 11 and 12, 1963 ... vomited extensively". Mrs. Bouve believed Toby had been poisoned with intent to silence him the evening of April 10, related to the shot

(<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=60410#relPageId=132>). A contemporary police report of April 12, 1963 has a report of Toby being "very sick" on April 11th

(<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=10484#relPageId=15>).

It may be objected that the delay before Toby began vomiting argues against the sickness being related to the shot, since it would not have stopped the barking at 9 pm if Toby had been outside as normal that evening. However if the mechanism for the intended silencing of Toby was something tossed into Mrs. Bouve's backyard for Toby to eat before the time of the shot but after Toby had been brought

into the house, Toby would still be healthy at 9 pm because he had not yet had opportunity to have eaten that in the yard which was going to make him sick. At some point that night or the next morning when Mrs. Bouve let Toby back out into the yard Toby would find and eat and react to what had been tossed there for him, and that would account for the delay in his starting to vomit. The timing of Toby becoming sick would correspond to his first opportunity to eat something bad thrown into the yard after Mrs. Bouve brought Toby inside.

The mechanism of the poisoning could be petals or leaves from one of a number of flowers and plants known to be toxic to dogs baked into a dog biscuit and tossed into Toby's yard from a person walking by or a car driving by in the alley. The tainted treat could have been tossed in Toby's yard at a time after Toby had been taken inside but without knowledge on the part of whoever wanted Toby silenced that Toby would not be let back out in the yard before 9. From the motive and timing, the poisoning of Toby does appear to have been part of the carrying out of the Walker shot.

There was also a floodlight at the back of the Walker property which would have made for a well-lit back yard but it was inoperable on the evening of April 10 ("a large flood light in the rear area of the General's home was burned out on the evening the offense occurred", <https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=1140#relPageId=60>). That certainly was helpful to the shooter in giving cover of darkness when the shot was taken from the alley. Dallas Police officer John Toney, who interviewed General Walker as part of the police investigation, speaks of Walker referring to the alley behind the back yard as dark at the time of the shot (Sneed, *No More Silence*, 311), consistent with the floodlight which did not light up the Walker back yard. It is not known how long before April 10 that floodlight had been out of commission.

Another thing helpful to the shooter that evening was that although it was dark outside, the window of the room through which the shot was fired did not have curtains or blinds drawn down. This meant Walker, if he was at his desk at that time of night, would be lighted up like a fish in a fishbowl for anyone outside to see in (not my preference when home at night, though tastes can vary). And here arises one of the discrepancies in detail that a careful investigator will notice: General Walker told the Warren Commission, in explaining how the shot had happened, that "the shades were up". But Dallas Police Detective Gus Rose, who interviewed Walker and other Walker staff the next day after the shot, had a different version in his written report of 4/11/63. According to officer Rose, the

shooter had “a clear view as *there are no window shades*” (<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=10484#relPageId=13>). One of these two claims is mistaken, but which? (Concerning whether the window did or did not have shades.) If Detective Rose’s report is accurate on this point, that is odd: why would a window have no shades? What a fortunate shooter—to find Walker that evening sitting lit up behind a window that *had no window shades* to be possible to draw down! A John T. Martin home film footage shows the window frame being raised on that window (no sign of shades), in August 1963 (about 40 seconds in at <https://emuseum.jfk.org/view/objects/asitem/items@:36908>). It would be interesting if that window normally had blinds which had been removed before the night of April 10, but that is not known.

A non-barking Toby in the neighbor’s back yard; an inoperable floodlight not illuminating the back yard of the Walker house; and a window with no shades pulled down at night, were not simply advantageous but *essential—all three of those*—to the successful carrying out of the shot. Each of those three are out-of-the-ordinary phenomena. Any one might be a fortuitous accident through mundane causes ... but all three? And to those three may be added a fourth, the (alleged) presence of General Walker himself in that lit-up room after dark on April 10. That is *four* requirements for that shot to work, *all* of which must be operable and in alignment that evening for it to have worked as it did.

The picture of Oswald planning meticulously, taking a bus out, retrieving his rifle from a previously stored location nearby, then going to the Walker house during the time of the church meeting next door, quietly in the darkness taking up his position in the alley, drawing a bead and shooting at Walker ... that *is* what Marina related Oswald told her, and Oswald did do something close to that (Oswald was there and fired the shot) ... but: *how could Oswald have ensured all four of those phenomena* necessary for the shot when he got there? And not have gone to all that work for a wasted trip if any one of those had been different? Sheer good luck? Or is some other interpretation called for?

The most important point here is this: it is not reasonable that all of the four factors just named can have been brought about by a person not involved with or part of the inside workings of the Walker house itself. Did Walker have assassins plotting or assisting an attempt to shoot him, working inside his own house? Or could it have been a setup designed to have the appearance of an attempt on the life of General Walker but really it was not?

The Surreys and the church next door

Gayle Nix Jackson reported another detail of possible interest in *Pieces of the Puzzle*. According to William Surrey, just weeks before the shot at Walker the Surrey family joined or began attending the Latter-day Saints church next to the Walker house, which was unusual according to William:

“Bill Surrey also shared a strange story to me, but even stranger to him. As his parents were never religious in that they never attended church services of any denomination, **he found it odd that in March of 1963, his father and step-mother joined the Mormon church that was on the next lot,** approximately 400 yards from Walker’s home. This is the church that figured heavily in Marina’s story about her husband Lee Oswald, shooting at General Walker. Bill said that the family attended the church a few times, he remembers getting Kool-Aid and cookies there, but **after the Walker shooting they never went back again.** Why the sudden conversion to Mormonism and the even more sudden departure from the church?” (*Pieces of the Puzzle*, 224)

The question is raised whether the timing of the involvement with the church was related to the Walker shot, whether his parents’ lack of interest in the church after April 10, 1963 as remembered by William Surrey—and William’s surprise at the churchgoing in the first place—could have been because the involvement with the church was for utilitarian reasons related to the shot, more than solely interest in the teachings of the church. Among other things church attendance legitimized use of the church parking lot, as well as gave knowledge of patterns and timings of church activities. Compare Marina Oswald’s account of Lee telling her of activity in that church parking lot affecting the timing of the shot.

“Marina was more closely questioned concerning the events surrounding the attempted assassination of General Walker. She said he had confessed to her on the same night of the attempted assassination that he had attempted to kill General Walker by shooting him with a rifle. On the following evening, they again discussed the attempted assassination. On that evening Oswald told her he had originally gone to the Walker house three days or more prior to the actual assassination attempt to try to shoot Walker but had changed his mind. **While he was in the vicinity of the Walker house on a bus en route there or in some manner he had heard there was to be a gathering at a nearby church** to the Walker residence and he preferred to do the shooting

of Walker when more people were around and it was for this reason that he eventually made the assassination attempt on Wednesday night, April Ten.” (FBI, 12/12/63, <https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=10145#relPageId=20>).

“She [Marina] does recall Oswald mentioned on one occasion, when they were discussing the Walker incident, a gathering at a church near the Walker house. He told her he had postponed his assassination attempt until the evening of the gathering at this church.” (FBI, 6/4/64, <https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=59614#relPageId=101>)

Marina to the Warren Commission:

“[Lee] told me that even before that time [April 10] he had gone also to shoot, but he had returned. I don’t know why. Because on the day that he did fire, there was a church across the street and there were many people there, and it was easier to merge in the crowd and not be noticed.”

Both the Surreys and Oswald reflected interest in that church’s activities in the runup to the shot. Oswald told Marina he had learned about the church’s scheduling although he did not tell Marina his source for that information. Is it possible Robert Surrey was the source of that information for Oswald?

Early suspicions that the Walker shot was staged by Walker

James Hosty, the agent of the Dallas FBI office tasked with investigating General Walker in 1962 and 1963 concerning riots at the University of Mississippi of Oct 1962 which Walker was accused of inciting, was reported as suspecting Walker arranged the shot himself.

“[FBI Special Agent James] Hosty suspects the shooting [at General Walker] might have been an inside job ... **Hosty also suggests the shooting was arranged by Walker himself as a publicity stunt--in fact, the Dallas Police considered these as possibilities and were working on them.**” (Gus Russo, *Live by the Sword* [1998], 539)

Prominent Dallas socialite, petroleum geologist George de Mohrenschildt, said similarly in questioning at the US embassy in Haiti in Dec 1963:

“[George de Mohrenschildt] added that ‘it sounds serious now but we all believed the Walker incident was a publicity stunt’. He said **‘everybody in Dallas’ thought Walker had staged this himself for publicity**” (12/19/63, US State Dept, <https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=5946#relPageId=11>)

An FBI confidential informant described Walker as “very much an egotist who would do almost anything for publicity” (<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=145523#relPageId=105>).

Captain O. A. Jones, one of two Dallas Police officers assigned to be in charge of the Walker case, did not regard General Walker as credible. An FBI report of 12/7/63 noted that “Captain Jones ... stated that it is difficult to investigate any type of matter where General Walker is involved since **Walker apparently does not know the truth from fiction** and leads the police up many blind alleys” (<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=1142#relPageId=789>)

In fact it may not be far from the truth that the idea that Walker staged it was the leading largely-unspoken law enforcement suspicion or surmise concerning the Walker shot prior to the post-assassination revelation of the role of Oswald, which altered that perception.

Allegation that Walker tried to arrange a fake kidnapping of himself for publicity in 1962

This startling allegation comes from Robert DePugh, founder of the violent right-wing militia group, the Minutemen, told to author Jeffrey Caufield:

“Minutemen leader Robert DePugh told the author that he visited Walker at his Dallas home during the primary campaign [for Texas governor in 1962]. **Walker asked DePugh to have his men kidnap him in a publicity stunt, which DePugh refused. Walker had planned to blame the kidnapping on the Communist conspiracy, in an effort to help his campaign.**” (Jeffrey Caufield, *General Walker and the Murder of President Kennedy* [2015], 327, citing interviews of DePugh of Dec 17, 1999 and May 11, 2000)

There is no way to securely verify that this allegation is true, but it is a report of a sober firsthand allegation from someone in a position to know. If true, it is cause

for considerably heightened scrutiny and skepticism concerning the shot reported fired at General Walker on April 10, 1963.

Was the shot reported to have been fired at General Walker staged by Walker?

Nov 25, 1992, NEW YORK — Curtis Sliwa said Tuesday that he faked his 1980 kidnapping and five other exploits to help the Guardian Angels survive its early years as a volunteer crime-fighting group.

“I was wrong, but we were in a sprint for survival,” Sliwa said. “We were just little people trying to get recognition for doing good work. In a sense it was like being Don Quixote.”

But he admitted that the constant media attention played a part in the deception. (<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1992-11-25-mn-1060-story.html>)

Although Curtis Sliwa and the Guardian Angels have no connection to General Edwin Walker of 1963, the above is cited as a possibly instructive parallel. In the case of Sliwa, the story of his 1980 kidnapping and other fabricated exploits enhanced public sympathy for the work of the Guardian Angels. Before Sliwa confessed, the status of the 1980 kidnapping of Sliwa was comparable to the public impression of the shot taken at General Walker.

In the case of the Walker shot: although a shot fired into the study of General Walker’s home the night of April 10, 1963 is a fact, that Walker was *at his desk in that room when* that shot was fired is known solely on Walker’s sayso. If it was a staged shot, Walker would not have been in the room when the shot was fired, though he would claim he had been. There would be no serious injury, which was the case. The shot would be reported to have missed, which was the case. That a shot allegedly aimed at General Walker missed hitting General Walker is the first red flag. With a focused sniper and a sighted-in rifle and a man at a desk in a lighted room through an open window 35-40 yards away, the shot *should not* have missed. How did the shooter *not* hit Walker, if everything was as reported?

Walker’s reported injuries that night were extremely light. There were three or four slight flesh wounds or scratches on his right forearm which required no medical attention. Supposedly Walker had been hit by metal shards from the bullet shell casing on the back of that right forearm and nowhere else such as on the neck or

head. Walker was wearing a long-sleeved shirt with the sleeves rolled up that night. Walker's injuries could have been self-administered by gently pressing the back of a forearm down on broken glass or metal shards enough to have broken skin in three or four places without serious pain.

Mr. SURREY. And then a policeman asked him a question, and I noticed that his arm was bleeding.

Mr. JENNER. General Walker's arm?

Mr. SURREY. General Walker's arm, was bleeding in four or five places. (...) His right arm, yes; on his forearm. And—

Mr. JENNER. Was he bleeding profusely?

Mr. SURREY. No. (...) So I went over and looked at his arm, and there was a piece of metal in one particular spot in his arm, that I noticed, in addition to the other scratches, and I went looking for some first aid equipment and found tweeze[rs] upstairs, and came back downstairs and picked that piece of metal and two others out of his right forearm.

The fact is General Walker's slight injuries to his right forearm are not distinguishable from self-infliction of near-painless and harmless scratches breaking skin on the back of that right forearm and specks of metal in the skin, the nature of Walker's injuries that evening.

General Walker gave conflicting versions of the moment of the shot in explanation of his extraordinary good fortune in not having been hit. According to Lieutenant Elmo Cunningham, one of the original Dallas Police investigators of the Walker case, Walker told him he had reached across his desk for a tax form, and the shot would have hit him in the head if he had not fortuitously moved.

“General Walker said that just as he **reached across the desk for a tax form**, a bullet went right behind his head ... **The bullet would have gone into his right ear and out his left** if he hadn't reached for that tax form.”
(Cunningham, at Sneed, *No More Silence*, 276)

Officer John Toney was also part of the original Dallas Police investigators of the Walker case. He said General Walker told him the shot had missed because Walker had reached down to pick up a dropped pencil:

“As I recall, I interviewed him [General Walker] three times. My first interview was after the reported shooting at him in which he told me that

after the shot was fired from a darkened alley, **the reason that he wasn't killed** was that he **dropped a pencil** while filling out his income taxes and, as he **bent over to get it**, the bullet hit right where his head had been as he bent over to pick it up." (Toney, in *No More Silence*, 311)

But under oath to the Warren Commission General Walker said he made no sudden movement.

Mr. LIEBELER. Now did you make any sudden movement on or about the time that shot was fired?

General WALKER. **None that I was aware of; no.**

In this account reflected in his Warren Commission testimony Walker noted that the bullet had grazed a wooden piece on the window frame (true). Walker interpreted that as having deflected the trajectory of the bullet *slightly upward* just enough to go over his head and by that means his life had been fortuitously spared (no sudden movement required). However, Walker misunderstood the direction of deflection of the path of the bullet that would have been caused by the grazing of the wooden piece in the window. The bullet grazed the wooden piece from *underneath* and any trajectory deflection, if there was any (it is not clear there would have been any, but if there were), would have been a little *downward*, not upward. A bullet deflected a little *downward* from an aim at Walker's head would have hit Walker lower in the head or in the area of his upper body, *not* deflected the bullet *higher* to pass *over* his head through his hair!

Therefore there is this question: *if* the shot was an attempt to murder General Walker aimed at General Walker's head, *how* did the bullet go *higher* (miss) rather than *lower* (*hit*), if the grazing of the lower part of the piece of wood altered the trajectory? There are really only two alternatives if Walker did *not* suddenly move at the moment of the shot as he testified he had not. First, the shooter was an extraordinarily poor shot. The second possibility is that Walker was not hit because he was not in the room when the shot was fired

As for the change in Walker from "I did suddenly move" to "I did not suddenly move", here is an interpretation in explanation of that. When officers identified the place in the fence in the alley where the rifle had rested that took the shot and calculated the trajectory, they told Walker the trajectory passed straight through where he said his head had been, such that a somewhat awkward question (even if unspoken) might occur to at least some of those present: how was it Walker was

alive and whole speaking to the officers that moment? Realizing that, Walker may have invented some explanation off the cuff—a sudden leaning forward for a tax form; a sudden bending over for a dropped pencil—rather than disclose the true reason which was he was not in the room when the shot was fired.

But later, upon learning of the grazing of the lower part of the wood by the bullet, Walker mistakenly thought that offered a deflection explanation which allowed for an iteration of the story in which he could remain upright with no need for a sudden movement, and the bullet was imagined as going higher through Walker's hair without hitting his head. (That dramatic touch appears in some published accounts of the Walker shot—the bullet went *right through his hair!*) Now, it was no longer necessary for General Walker to have suddenly *ducked* coincidentally at the moment the shot was fired, to account for his being alive and talking to officers. The sudden movement or ducking was dropped, and Walker changed to saying he had not moved at the time of the shot even though any deflection from grazing the underside of the wood would have been lower, not higher.

And so the question of how the shooter missed a sitting-duck stationary target—if the shot had been an actual assassination attempt—remains a live question in the Walker case to the present day. There is no good explanation *if* the shot was a real assassination attempt. But the anomaly disappears if Walker was not in the room when the shot was fired. That would be the simplest explanation why Walker was not hit by that shot.

To the Warren Commission General Walker recalls expressing surprise when a police officer said the shot looked like somebody had tried to kill him.

General WALKER. The police asked me to sit down when I got there and they went through the motions of lining up the shot from inside and outside. And one policeman said, "**He couldn't have missed you.**" And one said, a lieutenant I believe it was, said, "It was an attempted assassination." And I said, "**What makes you call it that?**" And he said, "Because he definitely was out to get you." And I said, "Your remark sounds like a natural remark."

Dallas Police officer John Toney also tells General Walker's account of what seems not a very smart response to an unknown gunshot fired through a window after dark which, by Walker's account, involved shrapnel hitting him:

“He [General Walker] further stated that after the shot rang out and he knew for sure that he’d been shot at, he ran upstairs, got a pistol and ran out into the alley looking for this attempted assailant. I asked him, ‘Weren’t you kind of leery about running into a darkened alley after someone who shot at you and not knowing where, who, or what was out there?’ And I remember his comment to me; he said, ‘Mr. Toney, if you had made (x-many jumps) in a parachute into combat as I have, that one shot wouldn’t deter you from going out and looking for the assailant.’” (Toney, in Sneed, *No More Silence* [1998], 311)

(General Walker’s comments on the shot to reporters the next day, April 11, 1963: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yCjahRnkQfk>. General Walker on a later occasion telling of the shot and his injuries: 0:44f, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mLjxSzRTFE>.)

Key items in combination (so far) suggesting the General Walker shot of April 10, 1963 agrees with a profile of a staged shot

- publicity-seeking public figure
- credible allegation of a previous solicitation to have a fake kidnapping of himself done and blamed on communists for publicity
- reputation among police that, politely put, the figure had difficulties distinguishing truth from fiction
- one shot fired (missed)
- no serious injury (scratches on the back of a forearm)
- blamed on communists (no evidence)
- the window through which the shot was fired either did not have the blinds pulled down (according to the figure) or had no blinds on the window possible to pull down (police report)
- backyard floodlight inoperable
- the figure failed to disclose that present with him in the house at the time of the shot was his aide and publicist
- the aide and publicist falsely denied his own presence in the house at the time of the shot
- no known change in habit, heightened home security measure, installation of security cameras or lighting, or employment of a bodyguard, following the shot

- “the smile” (photo the morning after, to reporters—smiling, drinking a cup of coffee, looking chipper and in good spirits:
<https://www.gettyimages.com/detail/news-photo/dallas-political-activist-former-major-general-edwin-walker-news-photo/515283472?adppopup=true>)

Robert Surrey’s involvement in the Walker shot means the shot was staged

Robert Surrey’s movements the night of the shot—his presence in the Walker house at the time of the shot and his opposite claim to authorities concerning that—strongly suggest an involvement in the shot even though he was not the shooter. It has already been noted that there are indications the shooter had assistance and coordination from inside the house. Surrey because of his presence and movements that evening, and his dissembling concerning those movements, becomes indicated as complicit in the shot. Robert Surrey was *involved in that shot*, because *some* insider to Walker and his house was and *Surrey was there* and sought to *conceal* that he was there.

But Surrey’s involvement with the shot will not have been as part of an intent to kill General Walker, his friend whom he supported. The friendly relationship between Walker and Surrey make the chances so unlikely that Surrey would plot to assassinate the general that that possibility can be rejected out of hand. Surrey was, however, skilled at publicity; that is why Surrey was Walker’s campaign manager. At no time in Surrey’s life did Surrey appear to show ambitions or designs to become a public figure himself. Surrey’s *modus operandus* was as a functionary in right-wing causes he supported, and backing of others who were public figures in those causes. If it can be rejected that Robert Surrey would be party to an attempt to shoot and kill General Walker, what cannot so easily be rejected is the other alternative, that Surrey was involved in staging a harmless shot on Walker’s behalf for publicity. This can be expressed in the form of a syllogism:

If the Walker shot involved General Walker aide Robert Surrey, then it was staged.

And:

Robert Surrey’s *presence in the house* with General Walker when the shot happened, and his prevarication under oath *about* that presence and his movements, *indicates* Robert Surrey’s involvement.

And the conclusion of this syllogism, the most important conclusion of this study:

Therefore the shot was staged.

That is, the shot involved at least a shooter (= Oswald) and an inside man (= Surrey), carrying out with General Walker's cooperation a shot intended to look to the world like Walker narrowly missed death, for publicity purposes, without any necessity for General Walker to be in actual danger, in agreement with the suggestion of Gayle Nix Jackson in 2017: "In reference to the Walker shooting, there is though, another and more logical explanation: Walker staged it himself with Robert Surrey's help" (*Pieces of the Puzzle*, 201).

Oswald as shooter

Following the John F. Kennedy assassination in November 1963 authorities and the public learned that Oswald was the mystery person who had fired the shot into General Walker's home on the night of April 10, 1963. Photographs of Walker's house and surroundings were found in Oswald's belongings. Those photographs were forensically identified as having been taken using an Imperial Reflex camera of Oswald's which also turned up in his belongings and was confirmed to have been Lee's camera by his brother Robert. The infamous "Backyard Photographs" (BYP) also turned up in Oswald's belongings, showing Oswald posing in the backyard of Lee and Marina's Neely Street duplex in Oak Cliff in the spring of 1963 with a rifle, revolver, and holding up copies of two leading American communist publications published by rival groups opposed to one another.

Analysis found that the Backyard Photographs had been produced only a little over a week before the date of the Walker shot, with those photographs also forensically identified as having been taken by the same Imperial Reflex camera belonging to Oswald as the photo of the Walker house. A House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA) panel of experts in photographic evidence found no evidence of forgery in the Backyard Photographs, contrary to some claims (https://aarclibrary.org/publib/jfk/hasca/reportvols/vol6/pdf/HSCA_Vol6_1_Introduction.pdf). Marina told that she had operated Lee's camera in taking those photographs at Oswald's direction and that the photographs were genuine. Marina, who knew that Oswald had taken the Walker shot (because Lee had told her) but had told no one, knew the Backyard Photos looked incriminating to Lee. With the assistance of and at the urging of Lee's mother Marguerite Oswald, Marina hid in one of her shoes she was wearing, and then destroyed by burning by fire, two

prints of those photos the day after the assassination, Saturday afternoon or evening Nov 23, in a hotel room (this from Warren Commission testimony of Marina and Marguerite Oswald and HSCA testimony of Marina).

A print of one of the Backyard Photographs turned up years later in the belongings of Lee and Marina's friends George and Jean de Mohrenschildt, claimed by George de Mohrenschildt to have been a belated discovery in their belongings found by George and Jean after they returned from Haiti in Nov 1966. On the back was an inscription in handwriting authenticated as Oswald's reading, "To my friend George from Lee Oswald 5/IV/63", that is, a date of April 5, 1963 using European reversal of numbers of month and day—only five days before the Walker shot. Another inscription on the back of that same print reads in different ink in Cyrillic letters (Russian), looking like Marina wrote it, "hunter of fascists ha-ha-ha!!!"

However according to author Edward Jay Epstein, on March 29, 1977, George de Mohrenschildt told a different story when Epstein interviewed de Mohrenschildt in Florida the morning of the same day de Mohrenschildt ended his life with a self-inflicted gunshot wound to the head. (At least it can be said suicide is what all the evidence looked like and police concluded, and de Mohrenschildt had a recent history of depression, commitment to a hospital for mental issues, and talk of suicide, although the timing looked suspicious, occurring just as HSCA investigator Gaeton Fonzi had located him and HSCA intended to subpoena de Mohrenschildt's testimony, and other high-profile witnesses of interest to HSCA were turning up dead too.)

According to Epstein, de Mohrenschildt now said, to Epstein that morning, that he, de Mohrenschildt, had actually been given that Backyard Photograph by Marina sometime in early April 1963. De Mohrenschildt not only told Epstein his knowledge and receipt of the photo had happened at that time but that he had reported it to a contact at the time in the CIA's Domestic Contacts Division in Dallas, both before and after the shot at Walker, and he (de Mohrenschildt) rued having done so, blaming his reporting of Oswald's apparent involvement in the Walker shot as having been the ruin of him. The head of the CIA's Domestic Contacts Division in Dallas, J. Walter Moore, quietly denied some of what de Mohrenschildt claimed but was never interviewed by the FBI nor called to testify by the Warren Commission or any other investigation (Edward J. Epstein, *The Assassination Chronicles: Inquest, Counterplot, and Legend* [1992], 557-569).

In support of the truth of de Mohrenschildt's last-day-of-his-life disclosure concerning when he had first knowledge of the Backyard Photograph which emerged years later out of his belongings, Epstein noted, "two of De Mohrenschildt's friends told me that he had discussed the photograph, and the problems it raised for him, before he returned from Haiti [Nov 1966], and Marina Oswald subsequently testified that she had seen the photograph in De Mohrenschildt's house in 1963". Concerning Marina's testimony there is a discrepancy: according to Epstein, de Mohrenschildt said *Marina* had given that Backyard Photograph to him in April 1963. Marina, on the other hand, claimed she saw de Mohrenschildt had the photograph and was "surprised" to realize *Lee* must have given it to de Mohrenschildt. If the "hunter of fascists ha-ha-ha!" written on the back of the photo is from Marina, then that supports the de Mohrenschildt version and would be one of Marina's prevarications along the way, distancings from certain details. For her part, when shown the "hunter of fascists ha-ha-ha!" inscription, Marina said at first she thought she had written it but then explained to the Warren Commission that as she studied it more she saw the handwriting was not her way of writing, so she came to realize she had not written it by that logical deduction ("at first I thought it was maybe my handwriting, but after I examine it, I know it is not").

Most importantly, a lengthy note from Oswald to Marina written in Russian, authenticated as in Oswald's handwriting by a handwriting authority testifying before the Warren Commission with no handwriting authority in contradiction then or since—known as the "Walker Note" even though General Walker is not named in it—was found by the Secret Service on Dec 1, 1963, hidden in a book of Marina's. In this note Oswald gives Marina a checklist of instructions what to do if he is arrested. From internal analysis the contents of the note agree with the circumstances of Lee and Marina in April 1963. When the note was discovered by the Secret Service and Marina was confronted with it, Marina confessed everything about the Walker Note and the Walker shot which prior to the assassination she had kept secret: how Oswald had left the note for her the night of the shot; how she had kept and hidden the note in the pages of her book in which it had now been found; how Lee had prepared for the shot at General Walker; how he had gone out the evening of the shot and returned late that night and told her he had shot at Walker.

According to Marina she told no one about Lee shooting at Walker until she told Marguerite Oswald, Lee's mother, on the evening of the assassination, Friday Nov 22. Marina to the Warren Commission:

“Friday evening [Nov 22, 1963]. I met [Marguerite Oswald, Lee's mother] at the police station. From there we went to Ruth Paine's where I lived at that time. And she [Marguerite] remained overnight, stayed overnight there. I had a photograph of Lee with the rifle, which I gave. At that time I spoke very little English. I explained as best I could about it. And that is why I showed her the photograph. And I told her that Lee had wanted to kill Walker.”

Marguerite confirmed the photograph part of the story, which she and Marina colluded in destroying the next day, but Marguerite did not confirm being told by Marina that Lee had shot at Walker. Under repeated questioning Marguerite insisted she first learned that Lee was said to have shot at Walker only later when reading the allegation in the newspapers.

The bullet recovered from the home of General Walker the night of April 10, 1963, likely was fired from Oswald's Mannlicher-Carcano; that was found plausible on ballistics grounds and markings of officers on the bullet supporting chain of custody (see Steve Roe, “The General Walker Bullet – Real or Fake?”

<https://steveroeconsulting.wixsite.com/website/post/the-general-walker-bullet-real-or-fake>). Early reports that the misshapen bullet was steel-jacketed and a 30.06 may derive from some police early mistaken identification, since the bullet in evidence is copper-jacketed and 6.5 mm in agreement with Oswald's Mannlicher-Carcano which Oswald told Marina he had used to fire the shot. It has been noted that “anyone unfamiliar with Carcano ammunition could, and would most probably, initially confuse old Italian Carcano ammo as being ‘steel jacketed’ as the cupro-nickel jacket almost favors some form of stainless steel”

(<https://educationforum.ipbhost.com/topic/13150-question-regarding-walker-shooting-kleins-carcano/>). In testimony to the HSCA, Vincent Guinn stated on the basis of INAA (neutron activation) analysis that “it is highly probable that the Walker bullet is a Mannlicher-Carcano bullet”

(<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=95#relPageId=532>). The Mannlicher-Carcano with which Oswald had himself photographed days before the time of the Walker shot agrees with Marina's account that Lee told her he used that rifle to take the shot at General Walker. That Oswald used the Mannlicher-Carcano (as opposed to some different rifle lent to him) is not strictly speaking a necessary

finding to the present argument but is in agreement with all known evidence apart from the original steel-jacketed (in police written reports) and 30.06 (in press reporting drawing from a police source but not in police written reports) description discrepancy of the bullet which in light of the rest of the evidence may have been a mistake.

An unrelated later claim in the late 1970s by General Walker that the evidence bullet was a substitution for the original bullet can be disregarded as baseless since Walker's claim was founded on a mistaken belief on Walker's part that the evidence bullet of the shot into his house looked pristine which the evidence bullet certainly did not (Walker: "The bullet used and pictured on the TV by the [HSCA] is a ridiculous substitute for a bullet completely mutilated... [with] no resemblance to any unfired bullet in shape or form ... there has been a substitution" [Walker to the HSCA, Sept 12, 1978]).

Assessment of Marina's testimony

There is always the question concerning any specific aspect of Marina's testimony: whether it is true, and if it is true is it the full truth. Marina was not scripted or coerced or requested to tell lies by any agency or by police or federal investigators questioning her or by the Warren Commission; there is no evidence or plausibility for that. Any prevarications of Marina were generated by herself for purposes of her own. Despite denials, the FBI probably did utilize a threat concerning Marina's deportation/residency status in the United States as leverage to get her to cooperate in talking to them, but they *wanted* her to *tell* them *the truth* of what she knew, *not* lie to them. In the case of the Walker shot, Marina's testimony is probably largely true in reflecting what she saw and was told by Lee. The degree to which details of Marina's testimony are true or reflect unwitting or witting errors or material omissions, remains an open question. But Marina's testimony that Lee told her he took the Walker shot is surely true, and the Walker Note was not forged or planted—those two facts can be taken to the bank.

Marina said she did not call the police or tell anyone at the time that Lee told her he took the shot because Lee was her husband and she was scared of being alone in a strange country without him, though she said she had been upset about it and made Lee promise he would not shoot at anyone again. She told of how fearful she was of arrest of Lee and herself in the days following, and that she had urged him to move to New Orleans which they soon did, where Lee had relatives, in order to put distance between them and the Walker episode in Dallas.

The late David Lifton knew Marina well in later years and said Marina was truthful in relating that Lee had told her he shot at General Walker. As Lifton recounts, Marina never wavered from that concerning the Walker shot even after Marina came to believe that Lee was innocent of the Kennedy assassination. Lifton in 2012:

“One other thing: I have believed—for decades—that LHO was ‘gaslighting’ Marina, on a number of issues, most notably Walker. This is a term from my parents generation (and comes from a famous film starring Ingrid Bergman) ... If Walker was **a staged event**, as some think (**and I know the local FBI thought so**), then this terminology is important to understand ... Again let me repeat what I told Myra, based on the 14 years during which I knew Marina (I first met her in Jan 1981, when *B[est] E[vidence]* was published) and spoke to her often: **you can ignore/discount those who subscribe to the false notion that ‘Marina is lying’ or that ‘Marina made it up.’** She did neither. This was the reality, as presented to her by Lee—and with which she had to deal.” (5/21/2012, <https://educationforum.ipbhost.com/topic/2544-edwin-walker/page/11/>)

How did a German publication know of Oswald’s role in the Walker shot before the Secret Service and FBI?

In an article dated Nov 29, 1963, before the Secret Service and FBI learned of or the press reported Marina’s confession of Oswald’s involvement in the Walker shot, a right-wing German newspaper, *Deutsche National und Soldaten-Zeitung*, reported without citing a source that Oswald had been the shooter at General Walker and that Oswald had been arrested at the time but Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, head of the Justice Department, had intervened with the Dallas Police to stop a prosecution of Oswald. The article said:

“The Remarkable Oswald Case. Oswald, Kennedy’s slayer, **is said** to have carried out, in the early summer of last year, an attempt on U.S. General Walker’s life by taking a shot at him while the General was in his own work studio. The shot passed over General Walker’s head by a very scant margin. Oswald was arrested, but his prosecution, **according to certain statements**, was stopped at the request of U. S. Attorney General Robert Kennedy. If that had not been the case, Oswald would be in jail serving a long sentence and above all, he would not have had a chance to assassinate Robert’s brother, John F. Kennedy.” (“National Zeitung [National Newspaper]”, Nov 29,

1963, vol. 13, no. 48, Munich, Germany, p. 1, col. 2,
<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=9910#relPageId=331>)

Note the “is said” and “according to certain statements” for the claim that Oswald took the shot without specifying *who* said and *who* had made “certain statements”. The claims that Oswald was arrested in April 1963 and that Robert Kennedy intervened to have a prosecution of Oswald stopped have no support from any Dallas Police Department record or witness and can be dismissed as untrue. One possible explanation of the unsourced nature of the claims associated with Oswald in the German newspaper article could be they were told as background to the author of the article, Helmut Muench, by General Walker not for attribution, and Muench was protecting his source.

General Walker himself denied under oath that he was the source of any information about Oswald in that publication’s story, although he admitted he had talked to the author of the article and furnished other information that appeared in the story. But Walker falls under suspicion as having been the source with respect to the timing of the story’s publication of both the true information and the false information (the false information: that Walker’s personal nemesis, Robert F. Kennedy, knew Oswald had taken the shot and interfered in a prosecution of Oswald in Dallas, piggybacked on to the correct information that Oswald had taken the shot). The obvious question is: if General Walker was the source for the German publication’s Oswald information, how did Walker know before the Secret Service and FBI?

Mr. LIEBELER. In point of fact, it would be correct to state that, to your knowledge, **you never saw or heard of Lee Harvey Oswald at any time prior** to the time that his name was announced after the assassination on November 22, 1963?

General WALKER. **That is correct.**

Mr. LIEBELER. You had no connection of any sort whatsoever with him prior to that time?

General WALKER. **None at all.**

Mr. LIEBELER. Well, now, **did you tell anybody from this newspaper that Oswald had shot at you** and that this had been known prior to the time of the assassination of the President?

General WALKER. **No; I did not. I wouldn’t have known it.** It was much later that they began to tie Oswald into me, and I don't even know it yet.

Mr. LIEBELER. And you certainly didn't know it before November 22?
General WALKER. Or the morning of the 23d, certainly not. **I was very surprised to see the article.**

Mr. LIEBELER. So the best of your recollection is that you never provided them with the information?

General WALKER. **I did not.** I didn't know it at the time of this conversation at all. I didn't know it until I started reading the newspaper, which would have been later than then.

Mr. LIEBELER. I think that is right, so that you only had two conversations with these people, is that correct?

General WALKER. In connection with this incident, as I remember, there was a call back to verify something on the original conversation? I don't remember how the conversation came about. There were two telephone conversations; right.

Mr. LIEBELER. They both took place while you were down in Louisiana, the 23d and the 22d of November?

General WALKER. The first one was 7 o'clock in the morning the 23d, and it woke me up.

Mr. LIEBELER. You didn't have the faintest idea that Oswald had taken a shot at you and you didn't make a statement to that effect to the newspaper?

General WALKER. **No; I didn't know.**

Mr. LIEBELER. You didn't make a statement to the newspaper or anybody connected with it at any other time, isn't that a fact?

General WALKER. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. Is it not a fact?

General WALKER. I might have said that the reports over here had connected Oswald with me some subsequent time.

Mr. LIEBELER. I am somewhat puzzled by the whole thing, because the newspaper in which this apparently appeared is dated November 29, and in fact, that information was not known to anybody that I know of until a later date than that—

General WALKER. Much later.

Mr. LIEBELER. Several days, at any rate.

General WALKER. People began to guess it immediately. I should say guess at it.

In contrast to Walker's denials the FBI had different information:

“A confidential source abroad advised that a source available to it had interviewed a journalist named Helmut Herbert Muench ... At that time Muench said that after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, he had telephonically interviewed General Walker and that the results of this interview had been published in the November 29, 1963, issue of the ‘Deutsche Nationalzeitung und Soldatenzeitung’. Muench stated that during his interview with Walker, Walker informed him that he, Walker, had been the target of an attempt against his life in the Summer of 1963 ... About 24 hours following this first telephonic talk with Walker, Muench had again called him from Germany. **During that conversation Walker had expressed the opinion that Oswald had been the man who had made the attempt on Walker's life.** At the time of this conversation it had already become known that Oswald was believed to have been the assassin of President Kennedy. Muench said that he furnished all of the information from his two conversations with Walker to Dr. Frey, an editor of the ‘Deutsche Nationalzeitung und Soldatenzeitung’. Muench believes that Frey took the references which Walker had made to the attack on him and the expressed opinion of Walker that Oswald had been the attacker and included these in the short article under the title ‘Der merkwuerdige Fall Oswald’, without making any reference to the fact that this information originated with the interviews of Walker which was set out in greater detail in the same issue. Muench expressed the opinion that the second part of the short article which referred to the fact that investigation of Oswald had been stopped by the Attorney General was inserted by Frey on his own initiative.” (FBI to Warren Commission, 5/22/64, <https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=9910#relPageId=331>)

An earlier internal FBI document of 3/30/64 named the confidential source above as a West German government official involved in monitoring far-right activity in West Germany. Muench was identified as the individual Walker talked to in Shreveport at 7 am Sat Nov 23, and then again about 24 hours later, and “the interview was conducted under a pseudonym known to be used by Muench”, the name Walker told the Warren Commission. Muench had been in the United States prior to Nov 22 conducting interviews. The FBI memo mentioned a student contributor to the German magazine who was a student at the University of Dallas

(<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=167578#relPageId=2>). Gayle Nix Jackson adds:

“[D]uring 1963, the editor of the University of Dallas student newspaper was a student from Germany. His name was Dirk Kunert and was rumored to be related to Hasso Thorsten, the German newspaper reporter who called General Walker at the Captain Shreve Hotel at 7:00 am on the morning of November 24th. Strangely, the University of Dallas newspaper ran the same story the same week. Could Kunert have put General Walker in touch with the German newspaper and Hasso Thorsten or was it Dr. Robert Morris or Robert Surrey? ... Hasso Thorsten was the pen name of Helmut Muench, a journalist from Munich, Germany. His boss was none other than the notorious former Nazi editor, Dr. Gerhard Frey of Munich.” (*Pieces of the Puzzle*, 200-201, 407)

In his Warren Commission testimony General Walker repeatedly denied he ever heard of Oswald before the time of the Kennedy assassination. But contradicting that, in 1975 Walker wrote to Senator Frank Church:

“The Warren Commission found and concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald attempted to assassinate the undersigned at his home, at 9 pm. on April 10, 1963. The initial and immediate investigation at the time of the incident reported two men at my home, one with a gun, seen by an eye-witness—a neighbor. Within days I was informed by a Lieutenant on the Dallas City Police Force that Oswald was in custody by 12 pm. that night for questioning. He was released on higher authority than that in Dallas. There were two men, not a ‘Lonely Loner’. Please inform me if the CIA was involved in this attempted assassination? Yours Sincerely, Edwin A. Walker.”

(<https://archive.org/details/19750623ChurchOswaldreleased/mode/1up>)

Walker refers above to the witness of Kirk Coleman but erroneously claims Coleman said one of the two men he saw had a gun, which Coleman never said.

Robert Surrey and Oswald

The basic conclusion arrived at earlier, that the Walker shot was staged with the involvement of Robert Surrey, must be further developed. Analysis will proceed from these three facts:

- *the shot was real*
- *Robert Surrey was not the shooter (inside the house when the shot was fired)*
- *Oswald was the shooter (alley behind the house)*

Synthesis of these facts produces this second syllogism:

If Oswald was the shooter, then Oswald was part of the staged shot in which Robert Surrey was involved.

Fact: Oswald was the shooter.

Therefore: Oswald was part of the staged shot.

We arrive at the conclusion that Oswald was involved with Robert Surrey in the staging of the Walker shot.

Robert Surrey and Oswald practiced shooting together

According to Robert Surrey's son David, his father and Oswald practiced shooting together with rifles. Again from the video of David Surrey, my transcription:

“We went out, my Dad and I, and he introduced me to a guy, ‘Lee’. We just called him ‘Lee’. And we went out to the woods, which at that time was in Richardson, which was a wooded area with nothing on it. And we went out there and **we were shooting some guns.** My Dad had a 30.06, Lee had a 30.30, and another type of deer rifle I can't remember what it was. But we were shooting these guns ...”

From Gayle Nix Jackson, *Pieces of the Puzzle*:

“I decide to start a dialogue with his [David Surrey's] younger brother William that has continued to present time [2017] to see if he could verify or remember dates these things happened. He freely states that he was younger than David and doesn't remember as much as David does about events, but **he did confirm that he too went shooting with his Dad, General Walker, and Lee** in an area that in present day would be where the Owens Sausage Plant is now located in Richardson ... The recollections of shooting with their Dad, General Walker and Lee Oswald and retrieving shell casings is memorable for both the boys though they were never together and both

enjoyed doing it. ... **Both David and William believed it was the man they saw on television the day the president was killed.**" (*Pieces of the Puzzle*, 226)

David Surrey's story continues, as Gayle Nix Jackson narrates from David Surrey's video:

"He [David Surrey] then states that two weeks later [after he was with his father shooting with Oswald] he and his Dad drove to Oak Cliff. It is evidence to me that in this recollection especially, David Surrey is no student of the JFK assassination. He says he met Oswald's wife 'Martina' and that she had a child, a boy, he thought from a previous marriage who wasn't much younger than he. He also states they had a dog ... states that he and his Dad went [t]here twice and he played with the boy and the dog. He can't remember the address but remembers it being a white framed house on a little hill ... As for the 'small white frame house', Allen Trent confirms that **he drove David Surrey to the Neely home before [David] Surrey passed away and he identified the home as the one he had gone to as a teenager**" (*Pieces of the Puzzle*, 225-227)

Although decades later, the claim of a positive identification by David Surrey of the Neely Street address (where Lee and Marina lived March-April 1963), is striking. There is a problem though: Marina had no boy about David's age from a previous marriage nor did Lee and Marina have a dog. These details confirm that David Surrey is not generating this story on the basis of published JFK assassination information. But they do raise the question of whether it is a mistaken identification. The judgment here is that the identification of Oswald is true, *once the objection of implausibility of a Surrey-Oswald relationship is removed*. David Surrey's identification of the Neely Street house supports that the "Lee" involved in shooting with David's father, and "Martina", were Lee and Marina Oswald. The relationship of the boy and the dog is obviously mistaken and is a puzzle; perhaps it reflects some long-ago memory of a neighbor's boy and dog.

From Marina's accounts, Oswald without a car would take his rifle somewhere to practice shooting at times prior to the Walker shot. As Marina told it, she knew only of Oswald going on his own, taking the rifle in a raincoat, travelling by himself by bus, then returning, all on his own. Marina's testimony may be a different version of the same thing told by the two Surrey sons.

“Marina advised Oswald had told her after the Walker incident that he had **practiced with his rifle in a field near Dallas.**” (FBI, 2/17/64, <https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=1317#relPageId=227>)

And to the Warren Commission:

Mr. RANKIN. Did you learn at any time that he had been practicing with the rifle?

Mrs. OSWALD. **I think that he went once or twice.** I didn't actually see him take the rifle, but I knew that he was practicing.

Mr. RANKIN. Could you give us a little help on how you knew?

Mrs. OSWALD. He told me. And he would mention that in passing—it isn't as if he said, “Well, today I am going”—it wasn't as if he said, “Well, today I am going to take the rifle and go and practice.” But **he would say, “Well, today I will take the rifle along for practice.”** (...)

Mr. RANKIN. When you testified about his practicing with the rifle, are you describing a period when you were still at Neely Street?

Mrs. OSWALD. Yes.

Surrey's report of two suspicious men several days earlier casing Walker's house

On the night of the Walker shot, Robert Surrey told Dallas Police that four nights earlier he had seen two suspicious men outside the Walker house.

“We also interviewed Robert Surrey W/M/35 of 3506 Linde Wood LA 6-7741 who was at the scene upon our arrival. This subject is a business associate and aide to the complainant [Walker]. Mr. Surrey stated that last **Saturday, April 6th about 9:00 PM he drove up the alley behind the comp's house** and noticed two W/M/-NOD [white males, no other description] sitting in a 1963 Ford dark purple or brown, **parked at rear of the complainant's house.** Mr. Surrey also stated he observed these 2 men get out of the car and walk around the comp's house. The comp. did not seem to be disturbed about the incident. Mr. Surrey said it was obvious that there were no license plates on the 1963 Ford.” (McElroy and Van Cleave, Dallas Police, 4/10/63, CE 2001)

Note two details in this earliest account: the date, and the location of the parked car, both of which will be changed in later tellings by Surrey. In this first account

of Surrey he goes to the Walker house at about 9:00 pm on Sat April 6, before Walker returned from his nationwide speaking tour with evangelist Billy James Hargis (Walker returned Mon April 8). Unexplained is why Surrey is going to an empty Walker house at 9 pm on a night Walker is not there, just as it is unexplained why the two other men were there at the same empty house at the same time of night as Surrey's arrival. If Surrey is not involved with those men, why is he there at the same time they are? On April 11 another Dallas Police investigator interviewed Surrey again:

“An interview with Mr. Surrey reveals that the two white men in a 1963 Ford, dark purple or dark brown **parked in the alley directly behind the complainant's house** just off of Avondale Street. These persons were witnessed getting out of the car and walking up to the property line and looking the place over. Mr. Surrey became suspicious of these subjects and **followed the car away from the location in an attempt to get a license number**. Mr. Surrey stated that there was no license plate on this car either front or rear, possibly this was a new car.” (Dellinger, Dallas Police, 4/11/63, CE 2001)

Now, it is learned that not only did Surrey arrive to the empty Walker house at 9:00 pm, late at night at the same time two other men arrive, but when their car leaves, Surrey's car also leaves, following them.

Why does Surrey leave in a way which to an outside observer could appear as if he is *with* these men even though driving in separate cars? Surrey claims he followed their car to try to get a license plate number. The problem with that is in a later account Surrey says the car was parked on Avondale for thirty minutes and Surrey not only inspected the car up close on foot but says he even entered the car and inspected its glove compartment. The point being, that is when Surrey would have “attempt[ed] to get a license number” and would have noticed (if it were the case) that “there was no license plate on this car”. There would be no need to follow the car in his own car “in an attempt to get a license number” which Surrey would already know could not be obtained (if the story were true that the car of the two men had no license plates), since he would have seen that before the car left. This leaves unanswered not only why is Surrey arriving late at night to an empty Walker house at the same time as the other two men, but why he leaves at the same time they do, in the same direction they do, as if (it might appear to an outside observer) leaving after meeting them or going with them somewhere else.

Fourteen months later Surrey gave a fuller account to the FBI with some changes:

“On Monday night, April 8, 1963, at about 9:00 to 9:30 PM, Surrey arrived in the area of the residence of General Edwin A. Walker, 4011 Turtle Creek Boulevard. Surrey was proceeding up Avondale Street in order to turn into the alley and enter the Walker residence by the alley entrance. **Prior to turning into the alley, he observed a 1963 dark brown or maroon, four-door Ford, parked on Avondale** with two men sitting in it. **Rather than turn into the alley,** Surrey proceeded around the block and entered the **Mormon Church Parking Lot,** located on the property adjoining the Walker residence to the north, **and parked his car in this lot.** He then went to a position in one of the neighboring yards where he could observe the two men. He observed them get out of the car, walk up the alley and onto the Walker property **and look into windows of the Walker house.** At about this point, Surrey went to their automobile, **where he checked the rear of the car, and observed there was no license plate on the rear.** He then opened the door and looked into the car and opened the glove compartment. He observed nothing in the car or glove compartment which would help identify the occupants. He then went back to his car and drove to a position where he could observe the 1963 Ford leave. About a half hour after first observing this car, the two men returned to it and drove off down Turtle Creek Boulevard, then south to Pacific Street. At this point, Surrey stated he was unable to continue following this automobile.

“Surrey stated **he had never seen either of these two men before or since** this incident, and was of the opinion that neither of these two men was identical with Lee Harvey Oswald. He described one of the men as a white male, in his 30’s, about 5’10” to 6’ tall, and weighing about 190 pounds. Surrey described the second individual as a white male, in his 30’s, about 5’10” to 6’ tall, and weighing about 160 pounds. He stated both men were well-dressed in suits, dress shirts and ties. **Mr. Surrey stated he is not certain he could identify either man** if he ever observed them again.”
(FBI, 6/3/64,

<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=60410#relPageId=116>)

In this later account the location of the parked car has changed again, now no longer behind the Walker house on Walker’s property, or in the alley (not on Walker’s property), but to a third location, on Avondale which is not the alley. Earlier, Surrey told police he drove into the alley and that is when he saw the

parked car. Now Surrey says he did *not* drive into the alley. Could Surrey mistake in his memory the location of the parked car so dramatically? Is that confusion in memory or is it improvement of details in a story for cause?

In this version both the two men and Surrey are present for a half hour. During that time Surrey never once confronts the men walking on Walker's property to ask them who they were or what they want. Why was that obvious step not taken?

For the first time it is learned that Surrey *got into* the two men's car parked on Avondale that night, after Surrey drove to that very location the same time the two men stopped there. If a surprise neighbor witness belatedly were to come forth (another surprise Kirk Coleman so to speak), saying Surrey had been seen getting into the car of the two men that night, Surrey has accounted for that with a benign explanation: it was part of his investigation of that car, an investigation which did not, however, at any point include asking the two men who they were or what they wanted at Walker's house. Note the nondescript physical descriptions of the two men, very generic, nothing distinctive, nothing useful in being able to identify those men. Surrey tells the FBI he is doubtful he would be able to identify either of the two men if he were to see them again, although he assures the FBI he did see them well enough to know he never saw either of the men before or since. This sole eyewitness to the two men is not going to be of much help.

Although Surrey says he studied the two men's car closely, one thing he does not find out as a result of that close investigation which did not include asking the men who they were, is a license plate number, and he has an explanation for that: he says there were no license plates on the car. He now claims that he discovered the license plates were missing when the car was parked, before he drove off in his car following the car when the two men drove away. But earlier, on April 11, 1963, he told Dallas Police he drove off following the car to try to get a look at the license number.

The timing is also changed. Originally it was Saturday, April 8, before Walker returned. Now it is Monday April 10, after Walker returned from his trip and is home. In this latest version in which Surrey says it occurred Mon April 10, Walker will have been inside the house and not notice two men outside peering into his windows for thirty minutes. Surrey, who is also outside, knows the men are doing that but does not speak to the men or ask the men what they want.

Most strange of all, Surrey does not explain why two men sitting in a parked car *on Avondale*, which is not at all behind or adjoining Walker's house, would attract his suspicions in the first place. So what if two men are sitting in a parked car somewhere else by a side of a road removed from Walker's house. Who cares? Why should Surrey care? That violates no law. People sit and talk in parked cars all the time. Why should two men sitting in a parked car in a spot on a street unrelated to the Walker house have caused Surrey to go into spy mode? Why does Surrey assume at that point that the two men have anything to do with Walker or the Walker house? And if the parked car really was on Avondale, why did Surrey originally not *say* that to Dallas police—instead telling police the night of the shot that the car had been parked behind the Walker house, which is not at all on Avondale? Surrey's story does not add up. It has too many discrepancies and contradictions. We know separately that Surrey was not truthful concerning his whereabouts at the time of the shot on April 10. We now realize there is no more reason to assume he was truthful in description of this occasion a few days before April 10.

Surrey to the Warren Commission, June 16, 1964:

Mr. JENNER. Now, Mr. Surrey, was there an occasion preceding October—April 10, 1963, that you noticed an automobile and some people in the automobile in and about General Walker's premises?

Mr. SURREY. **Yes; that was 2 nights before, on Monday evening.**

Mr. JENNER. That would be April 10?

Mr. SURREY. Yes.

Mr. JENNER. I mean April 8, I am sorry.

Mr. SURREY. **April 8; yes, sir.**

Mr. JENNER. What time?

Mr. SURREY. **About 8:30 to 9.** I am not sure about what time it was.

Mr. JENNER. I take it, then, it was dark?

Mr. SURREY. Yes; it was.

Mr. JENNER. And tell the Commission what led up to that, what you said, and what you did. This incident that you have in mind.

Mr. SURREY. I was coming from my home, came down Turtle Creek Boulevard, passed in front of the general's house, and took a right-hand turn on Avondale, to come up to the alley.

Mr. JENNER. Have we put Avondale into your plat? You are now turning to Commission Exhibit No. 1005. [Witness draws.]

Mr. SURREY. The normal route into the parking lot behind the general's

house—

Mr. JENNER. He does have a parking lot?

Mr. SURREY. Yes; this is the parking area back in here.

Mr. JENNER. Now, would you crossline that, so we know it is the parking lot? [Witness draws.] That is fine.

Mr. SURREY. I came up Turtle Creek Boulevard and turned right on Avondale prior to turning again up the alleyway, to go into the parking lot in back of General Walker's house. And I noticed a car parked 30 feet—about 20 yards actually—

Mr. JENNER. You have now drawn a rectangle on the edge of the sheet of paper, Exhibit No. 1005, marked with the letter "N." Would you write the word "car" in there?

The CHAIRMAN. What is this designed to establish, Mr. Jenner? We are getting a little afield, it seems to me.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. Surrey, Mr. Chief Justice, was interviewed and related this particular incident, and we want to dissipate any possibility—I don't want to put it this way—

The CHAIRMAN. If it has some relevancy, all right. But let's don't take too long, because it is getting to be quite collateral. Go right ahead.

Mr. SURREY. Well, the gist of the matter is that two nights before the assassination attempt, **I saw two men around the house peering in windows** and so forth, **and reported this to the general the following morning, and he, in turn, reported it to the police on Tuesday**, and it was Wednesday night that he was shot at. So that is really the gist of the whole thing.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

It is extremely doubtful this claimed police report ever occurred, even though General Walker also testified to the Warren Commission that he had made that police report. There is no Dallas Police record of any such report. If such a call had been made from General Walker's house, it would be expected (especially given who it was, General Walker) that the Dallas Police would send officers out to take a report in person, but that did not happen. None of the investigating officers the night of April 10 or the next day, April 11, noted a claim or reference to Walker having phoned in a call or report to police only one or two days earlier regarding the claim of Surrey of suspicious persons four days earlier of which Surrey spoke. The reporting and investigating officers on April 10 and 11 took down Surrey's story of the earlier suspicious two men as if the police were learning that story for the first time, because they were. Here is General Walker himself to the Warren

Commission making the same bogus claim of having made an earlier police report, prior to April 10:

Mr. LIEBELER. Now, I understand that Mr. Surrey saw two men in the vicinity of your house shortly before April 10, 1963, acting in a manner that he regarded as suspicious. Did he report that to you at or about that time?

General WALKER. He has reported that to me, **and I don't remember the date on which he did.**

Mr. LIEBELER. **Was it prior to the time that the shot was fired at you?**

General WALKER. **I can't recall.**

Mr. LIEBELER. You have no recollection of the fact, if it is a fact, that Surrey had seen two men out there in an automobile that didn't have any license plate on it?

General WALKER. Yes; I do. I knew. He told me that he had come toward my house and **noticed a car, as I remember, parked on Avondale**, and he went on by or backed up or something and got out and came behind the car and saw two men moving around in the area somewhere in the alley in the back part of my house. Then he followed that car. They went down to the center of town, and he lost them. **I would suspect that he told me that the next morning, if not that night.**

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you recall whether or not you reported that to the police?

General WALKER. Yes; that **was called in** to the police. **As I recall, that was.** I believe there is a report at the house that it **was called in** to the police. **As I recall, it was,** and **I told them** what we knew about it.

Mr. LIEBELER. As you reflect on that event, do you recall it was called in to the police prior to the time the shot was fired?

General WALKER. **As I reflect, it must have been called in** either that night or the next morning. I don't recall the exact time, but the police record will show it.

Mr. LIEBELER. Did you make the call yourself, or did someone else do that, if you remember?

General WALKER. **As I recall, I made it.**

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you remember what kind of response you got from the Dallas Police Department?

General WALKER. **Seemed normal. Wasn't upset about it.**

“Seemed normal, wasn't upset about it”? No officers sent out to take a report in person? I have bolded Walker's uses of the passive voice which can be a signal of

distancing from personal responsibility for actions, although Walker finally claims he made the call himself. But Walker's repeated "as I reflect" and "as I recall" modifiers instead of unqualified "I did <abc>" declarative statements suggest Walker is less than certain, as if equivalent to "I suppose I did", or "I have no idea, I must have, right?", or even, "Surrey told me a few days ago I did so yes, I did".

It is odd that, according to Walker's account, Surrey on Tuesday April 9 would tell General Walker that the suspicious car had been parked on Avondale (reflecting Surrey's 14-months-later story), but the next night, on Wed April 10, Surrey told *police officers* his original version in which the car was parked in Walker's back yard, *not* on Avondale. Avondale as the location of the parked car does not turn up in Surrey's account for the first time until June 1964. Walker's testimony reflects a recent briefing by Surrey more than any accurate memory of fourteen months earlier.

If Surrey had been genuinely concerned about two men peering into the windows of Walker's house of whom Surrey was too frightened even to ask them who they were or what they wanted, would Surrey not have contacted Walker and either Walker or Surrey called the police that same night (not wait one or two or three days later)? But these questions are moot, for there has been no record produced or found from the Dallas Police Department of such a call. The absence of a Dallas Police record or other corroboration says it is unlikely any such call happened to the police responsive to what Surrey says was the activity of the two men at Walker's house, and Surrey and Walker simply made up the claim of having phoned police about it before April 10.

If, on the other hand, Surrey's arriving at about the same time as the two men, leaving at the same time as the two men, and being *inside* the car of the two men *in between*, was *not* because the men were suspicious but *because he was meeting them*, all of the incongruities disappear. It would be Surrey meeting those two men to plan the logistics of the shot on Wednesday April 10. If Surrey and the two men were there for the purpose of preparing for the shot on Wednesday, Surrey would not be expected to have made a phone call to the police to tell of it, which is in agreement with Dallas Police records which do not know of any such call.

It is time to draw conclusions. Surrey's story of the two allegedly suspicious men, no matter how uncritically believed by the Warren Commission and repeated in books and articles ever since, is simply not to be taken at face value. It is not believable as it stands.

If Surrey was the organizer of a shot to be made to look like an attempt on Walker's life there would necessarily be planning and a run-through. *Surrey's story of the reconnaissance at the Walker house two to four days earlier*, of himself with men who cannot be identified and whose identities he does not want to come to light, *is that*.

These were not suspicious men involved in the shot of April 10, 1963 of whom Surrey had no knowledge. This was *reconnaissance* of the ones doing that shot *with Surrey*. Surrey was *there* because he was *directing it*. It was not reported to police (despite Surrey's and Walker's first claims that they had done so over a year later) because, *obviously*, a meeting of Surrey on Saturday night or Sunday night or Monday night to coordinate planning and do a dry run of the shot to be taken on Wednesday would not be reported to police. (Surrey did tell his version of it to police Wed April 10, reported it in that sense, but not when it happened.) What Surrey *did* report, starting the night of April 10, was a *benign retroactive narrative* accounting for the potentially witnessed facts of his and two others' presence outside the Walker house doing logistics coordination preparatory to the shot. In the benign interpretation offered to police on April 10 Surrey separates himself from the other two men, claims he had no idea who the two were, while at the same time doing his best to make it impossible for police ever to identify the two men. The story the way Surrey told it was designed to establish a benign explanation in case an unexpected neighbor witness should come forth who might have seen Surrey and the two meeting that night, which was an uncontrolled variable.

The final of the three locations of the parked car told by Surrey, now on Avondale, may be the correct one: it is logical the driver would park away from Walker's house and the men walk to the Walker house if the meeting and logistical planning were clandestine. Surrey's testimony that he *got into that car of the two men on Avondale on that darkened night when the car was parked there*, as part of his investigation of that car, would be the benign explanation in case a witness were to emerge saying Surrey had been seen getting into that car with men in it at a spot away from the Walker house, before going to the Walker house.

The two men peering into windows, etc. for thirty minutes while on the Walker property with Surrey also outside the house and doing nothing to question them according to his story to the FBI and Warren Commission, becomes Surrey's benign explanation of the coordination of logistics of the shot planned for April 10. The coordination would involve matters of timing; who was to be where when;

likely signals from windows; what each was to do, and so on. Surrey was not *surveilling* the two men; he was *coordinating with* them. Although it was at night and dark there was a risk that these movements could have been witnessed. Surrey preempted that on the evening of the Walker shot by transforming the meeting and run-through a few days earlier into a story of spotting and surveilling two suspicious men. People have bought that story hook, line, and sinker, direct from the man who coordinated the shot fired on Wednesday April 10.

The physical descriptions of the two men given by Surrey are not simply so nondescript as to be worthless. They can also be presumed inaccurate and untrue even in their nondescript sense, given that there is motive on the part of the witness furnishing those descriptions that those descriptions not assist in identification of the two men. In fact Surrey will have known the two men he was meeting that night *and one will have been Oswald, who told Marina about it.*

Surrey finessed his role in organizing a meeting at the Walker house to coordinate the Walker shot by claiming he was surveilling the other two. The only specific description Surrey gave was of the car, and that specific description went suggestively toward a person who had nothing to do with the Walker shot but may have been a threat to Walker based on what he knew and whom Walker wanted discredited, a former employee of Walker named William McEwan Duff. The accuracy of Surrey's car description is to be trusted no more than his physical descriptions of the two men; no more than his original claim for the location of the parked car or his claim of where he was when the shot was fired on April 10. The one thing Surrey would *not* be expected to do is give an *accurate* description of the car of the two men.

Oswald tells Marina of being at the Walker house the night Surrey was there, preparing for the shot on Wed April 10

The Surrey-reported story of the two men agrees in timing and genre with what Oswald told Marina concerning his going to General Walker's home ca. 3 days before Wednesday April 10. Although it was not recognized by the Warren Commission, Oswald was one of the two men there that night with whom Surrey met preparing for the April 10 shot. Oswald told Marina it was on that occasion—the same night Surrey was there *because Oswald was meeting Surrey there*—that Oswald took his rifle and stashed it in proximity to the Walker house where he could retrieve and use it on Wednesday night. Oswald simply omitted to tell

Marina of others there that night, one of whom was Surrey, in making the preparations for April 10. From a Secret Service report:

“On Dec. 10, 1963, our Special Agent had an opportunity to question Mrs. Marina Oswald more in detail regarding the General Walker incident and she stated that Lee Harvey Oswald told her that **once before taking the shot at General Walker on April 10, 1963, he had gone to the Walker residence for the same purpose** but he had changed his mind as the place had not looked just right for him and that 3 days prior to April 10, 1963, **he took his rifle out of the house and buried it in a field near Walker’s house.**” (Secret Service to Dallas Police, 12/26/63)

From an FBI report:

“Marina was more closely questioned concerning the events surrounding the attempted assassination of General Walker. She said he had confessed to her on the same night of the attempted assassination that he had attempted to kill General Walker by shooting him with a rifle. On the following evening, they again discussed the attempted assassination. On that evening **Oswald told her he had originally gone to the Walker house three days or more prior to the actual assassination attempt to try to shoot Walker but had changed his mind.** While he was **in the vicinity of the Walker house** on a bus en route there or **in some manner he had heard** there was to be a gathering at a nearby church to the Walker residence and he preferred to do the shooting of Walker when more people were around and it was **for this reason that he eventually made the assassination attempt on Wednesday night, April ten.**” (FBI Dallas to FBI headquarters, 12/12/63)

The story Oswald told Marina, that he (Oswald) had been to the Walker house “3 days prior” to April 10, is the same incident Surrey was there. That Surrey said he had never seen either of the two men before was prevarication. Surrey knew the men he was meeting because he was coordinating them. Surrey’s claim that he would not be able to identify either of the two men if he saw them again and that neither was Oswald, is more prevarication. Oswald was one of the two with Surrey that night, and Oswald’s story to Marina is another version of what Surrey told of the same evening. When Oswald told Marina he learned of the church meeting scheduled for Wednesday April 10 as the best time to take the shot, Oswald’s source for that will have been Surrey that night.

This analysis of the night of the suspicious two men locates Oswald meeting with Surrey and one other man involved in the shot a few days before the shot: an advance meeting at the scene of the crime (so to speak), at the same time of night as the shot that later happened, preparing the crime (so to speak)—preparation of the staged shot scheduled for April 10 under the direction of Robert Surrey, aide to General Walker.

General Walker's attempt to implicate William McEwan Duff

There is no indication that General Walker and Robert Surrey, even though they knew the shot was staged and—Surrey certainly and Walker maybe or maybe not—knew Oswald as the identity *of* the shooter of the staged shot, would have wanted Oswald's role to come to light. If it did, the staging of the shot could come to light which would damage Walker's reputation. All indicators suggest that if Oswald participated in a staged shot coordinated by Surrey it was because Oswald had convinced Surrey that, Oswald's former defection to the Soviet Union and overt Marxist *persona* aside, he was on their side. *We* have Oswald's private writings, of which there is a considerable quantity, and all, without exception, are consistently left-libertarian, none conservative or rightist. The real Oswald never wavered from being leftist or left-libertarian in his views (despite disillusionment with the Soviet Union) and never was a rightist. But the rightist groups which it may be suggested Oswald infiltrated and informed on would not necessarily know that, although some did suspect he was a spy.

The desired outcome, from the point of view of Walker and Surrey, would be that the shot remain forever unsolved (a good outcome from their point of view, since it could be attributed without falsification to communists). But in the meantime, leads were fed to police misdirecting the police in the direction of someone who had nothing to do with the shot and knew nothing of the shot, but who was suspected by a secretary of Walker and whom Walker wanted taken down for other reasons. I believe that is the short explanation of the entire William McEwan "Scotty" Duff saga which occupied law enforcement attention in the days and weeks following April 10, 1963.

Duff was a former personal assistant of General Walker who lived in the house with Walker since Dec 1962 until he was fired by Julia Knecht, Walker's secretary, in early March 1963, when Walker was away from home on his nationwide speaking tour with Billy James Hargis. According to documents which can be found on the Mary Ferrell Foundation website, Walker and Surrey—or Surreys: an

anonymous phone call from a woman was involved in incriminating Duff and it is known Mary Surrey produced anonymous letters on behalf of Walker—tried to have Duff look implicated to police as a suspect in the April 10 shot. As a result Duff's actions and personal character came under scrutiny, and Duff does not come across in the documents as a sympathetic figure. However that is neither here nor there with reference to the relevant issue which is: he had nothing to do with the Walker shot, but Walker wanted police to suspect that Duff did it. Walker may have considered Duff a threat in terms of information Duff possessed about Walker either of a financial-impropriety nature (that is what Duff claimed) or perhaps with reference to Walker being a closeted homosexual.

The Duff saga involved Walker hiring private detectives in Oklahoma to attempt to entrap Duff into participating in a subsequent murder-for-hire contract to kill Walker. If successful, that would have Duff put away in prison and discredit any allegations he might make against Walker. The detectives, wired and ready to pounce if they could get Duff to take the bait of the money offered, got Duff expressing interest on tape which they supplied to the Dallas Police. But in one of the smarter moves Duff did among the wrong turns in his life, Duff had gone immediately to the FBI regarding the murder-for-hire solicitation and reported it, and *he* was seeking to entrap Walker's secret private investigators by pretending to be interested—*both* feigning interest seeking to entrap *the other*, a real-life Keystone Cops drama!

Long story short, the Dallas Police cleared Duff of the false leads pointing his way fed to police by Walker and his people attempting to implicate Duff in the April 10 shot. The clearance was done on the basis of the Dallas Police finding no evidence to implicate Duff and a June 12, 1963 polygraph examination which found Duff to have no knowledge of the Walker shooter of April 10, 1963.

With that as background, let us return to the one description with specifics in Surrey's report of the two men, the car. Surrey told the Dallas Police the car was "a 1963 Ford Four door sedan, either purple or brown", "a 1963 dark brown or maroon, four-door Ford". When the Dallas Police investigated Duff, on April 16, 1963, police tracked a current phone number for Duff to an address of a woman who owned a "1958 Maroon T-bird [Ford]". Meanwhile Duff's recent but now former fiancée told police she had seen Duff driving several cars one of which was "a 1958 model maroon T-bird [Ford]", which would be the same car of the other woman (<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=1140#relPageId=60>). The former fiancée had been in contact with Julia Knecht prior to April 10.

According to Julia Knecht, Duff had originally showed up at the Walker house in a “tan and brown Ford” with all of his belongings in the car.

The best assessment of Surrey’s description of the car of the night of the two men is that the true description and ownership of the car is unknown. Surrey wished to keep it that way, and to assist in that outcome Surrey falsely fed a different, inaccurate car description to police which could look to police like a suspicion of Duff (even though Surrey would have recognized Duff if Duff actually had been the driver).

Kirk Coleman’s man No. 1 in the church parking lot as a signaler

There are two known physical descriptions given by Kirk Coleman of his man No. 1. The first, on April 11, 1963, to the Dallas Police: “middle size and had long black hair”

(<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=10484#relPageId=14>). The second, on June 3, 1964, to the FBI: “a white male, about 19 or 20 years of age, about 5’10” tall, and weighing about 130 pounds ... dark, bushy hair, a thin face with a large nose, and was ‘real skinny’”

(<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=96433#relPageId=19>).

It will be recalled that Kirk Coleman saw man No. 1 walking toward an old car, described by Coleman as a 1949 or 1950 light-colored Ford, *whose engine was running with the headlights on before* No. 1 got to it and drove it out of the parking lot (<https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=60410#relPageId=118>). Unlike man No. 2 (= Robert Surrey) seen by Coleman walking from the alley entrance, man No. 1, when Coleman saw him, was farther in in the parking lot, not having obviously come from the alley. From the fact that the engine of No. 1’s car was running, No. 1 did *not* come from either the alley or Walker’s house but had come from *the running car*.

There are three theoretical possibilities for No. 1. First, that it was a church person, perhaps starting to leave, then getting out of his car to look upon hearing the shot. But as earlier noted, extensive informal inquiry among the church people failed to turn up identification of that car or person as one of their people. The second possibility is it was a random driver who happened to be driving on Turtle Creek Boulevard near the Walker house, who heard the shot, spontaneously turned into the church parking lot, stopped the car in the middle of the parking lot where it was lighted, and leaving the engine running got out to get a better look. The third

possibility, considered here to be the case, is: No. 1 was involved in the shot, not himself the shooter but coordinated with the shooter, with both he and the car in the parking lot at the time of the shot. His function would be as a spotter, to relay signals between the house and the shooter in the alley, and perhaps also to be available as a contingency getaway car if needed which was not utilized.

Coordination in the shot will account for the position of No. 1 when Kirk Coleman saw him: No. 1 was *out of* his car with the engine running, having walked to a position to be in line of sight to the shooter in the alley, Oswald. Now No. 1 was in a position to be seen by and to see both someone in a second-story window in the Walker house, and Oswald in the alley, at the same time. Man No. 1 will have functioned to relay and give “all clear” and “ready to go” signals between the house and the shooter.

Man No. 1 cannot himself have come from the Walker house or the alley because that is inconsistent with the car running with the lights on. The shooter in the alley was Oswald, not No. 1. A man walking *toward* an empty car in the parking lot with its engine running and headlights on means that man was *in* that car in its present location, *before* he was outside the car in the position Coleman saw him.

A possible reconstruction. General Walker may have been upstairs in his room at the time of the shot, such that the part about Walker coming down from his room with his pistol (and seeing car No. 1 driving away out his window on his way down), then going out into his back yard and into the alley after the shot, may be true. Robert Surrey has sent all of his family home except for his oldest son, 12-year-old David. Surrey sees to it that David is in a room separate from Walker, perhaps the room to the left of the entrance on the ground floor as one entered the house from Turtle Creek Blvd.

There would be a mechanism to signal Surrey and Walker inside the house that the shooter was in place and ready to shoot into the empty room on the ground floor, then a signal back from the house—from Surrey or Walker—that the persons in the house are set and the shooter is cleared to fire. The shooter will not shoot until he receives a signal that it is OK to do so. Signaling directly to the shooter out a back window of the house would not be practicable due to the darkness without use of lights, which would not be wanted because that could be noticed. The mechanism would be more effective and disguised with the signaling done via line of sight with a standing No. 1 in the lighted parking lot where visibility was not an issue. This underscores Oswald’s explanation to Marina that the evening picked for the

shot was the Wednesday of the church meeting so that activity in the parking lot related to the shot would look like church activity.

Man No. 1, with the engine running and headlights on, leaves the car and walks to a standing position in the parking lot where he can see straight out through the alley exit into the alley itself, with line of sight to the shooter in the darkness there, Oswald. The shooter, Oswald, now in position, can see No. 1 standing out in the lighted parking lot, and Surrey and/or Walker in the Walker house from the second floor also can see No. 1 in the lighted parking lot. Surrey will have assisted Walker upstairs in the preparation of Walker's "injuries" (scratches on the back of a forearm from pressing lightly over some small jagged metal pieces entering skin in three or four places). (The plaster in the hair could be an added touch by Walker taken from the bullet hole in the wall after he phoned and was awaiting police arrival in the room of the shot.)

With General Walker readied upstairs with his "injuries" made, Surrey goes to David and ensures David and he will be on the opposite side of the house on the ground floor from where the shot will come in. Either Surrey or Walker from a window signals to man No. 1, "ready to go". Man No. 1 with line of sight to Oswald in the alley gives a "go-ahead" signal to Oswald. Oswald fires into the empty room, then runs with the rifle down or across the alley and disappears. Man No. 1 turns back to his running car. Kirk Coleman sees No. 1 walking back toward his car with the engine running and headlights on. Part of No. 1's job also was to check that no one was watching noticeably. Kirk Coleman's witnessing of No. 1 and No. 2 from such close view that he got high-quality physical descriptions (under the circumstances) was not wanted to happen but could not be controlled.

By accident a walled area enclosing trash cans blocked Kirk Coleman's line of sight from seeing the shooter/Oswald in the alley or else Coleman would have seen and described him too. But although Coleman did not have line of sight to the shooter, No. 1 did have line of sight to Oswald taking the shot, because of where No. 1 had walked to stand in the parking lot. Coleman told police that as No. 1 returned to the running car and reached it, No. 1 turned around and looked his way, and Coleman feared No. 1 saw him. Whether No. 1 did see Coleman is not known, but No. 1 looking around would be consistent with his being a spotter.

There would be prearranged codes with basic signals and contingencies which could be done with headlights, body movements or gestures or clothing of No. 1 in the parking lot—movements that would look innocent to an onlooker but would

have meaning as signals to those in the Walker house and Oswald in the alley, both in line of sight with man No. 1 standing in the lighted parking lot away from the running car.

Therefore that is the reason No. 1 was out of the running car. It was so No. 1 could see Oswald in the alley by line of sight for signaling purposes.

Analysis

Until now there has been a basic schematic in which, prior to Nov 22, 1963, the law enforcement view of the unsolved Walker shot focused on it having been a disaffected supporter or insider, if it was a real murder attempt, but with suspicions that it may have been a staged shot. Following the Kennedy assassination and the killing of the accused assassin of the president, on November 22 and 24 respectively, Oswald's widow, Marina, confessed what she knew of the Walker shot. She told how Lee had told her he took the shot and how he did it, in agreement with other evidence which came to light (photos of the Walker house and environs among Oswald's belongings; the Walker Note).

But Marina's story did more: it was regarded as taking off the table the law enforcement suspicion that the shot may have been staged by Walker for publicity. As Marina told it from what Lee told her, Lee had shot with intent to kill the general for ideological reasons—General Walker being the *cause célèbre* for extremist-right groups across the nation, a spectre of a domestic fascism if Walker were to come to power. That became the settled narrative: Lee, acting alone, had shot at Walker with intent to kill but missed. But does *what Oswald told Marina establish* that the shot had been an attempt to kill, as opposed to participation in the staged shot that law enforcement had suspected?

The information brought forth in the present study suggests a different framing of the question than conventionally understood, in which the question becomes not did Oswald take the shot, but was the shot fired at General Walker. Was Walker *in the room* when Oswald fired the shot into the room? Walker said he was (and had some scratches on an arm to prove it), and according to Marina, Oswald also told her Walker was in the room when he fired and supposedly missed. As Marina related, Lee told her he did not know whether he had hit Walker, and the next day professed dismay to Marina to learn from the news that he had missed. But without challenging that Oswald told Marina that, was what Oswald told Marina about Walker's presence in the room, at the time of the shot, *true*?

In a staged-shot scenario, the shot would be real and it would look like attempted murder. That would be the whole idea—for it to look real and be reported as real in the news, as a failed attempt on General Walker's life. Part of staging a shot is pretending that it was real, having the public and the world believe it was real, and in this context, what Lee told Marina would be part of pretending it was real, part of the staged shot. However, there could be more to it than that.

A question calling for explanation concerning the days surrounding the Walker shot is why was Oswald so freely volunteering incriminating information to a Marina horrified at his action? Why was Oswald leaving himself so wide open with incriminating physical evidence which would have been found if Marina had told someone or turned Oswald in?

Did Oswald intend to have himself turned in by Marina and be arrested?

Ironically the brazen way Oswald told Marina that he had shot at Walker could weigh in support of the staged-shot interpretation. The starting point is an observation: it is just *odd* that Lee so openly confessed to Marina—Marina who was appalled and frightened by Lee's actions as she tells it (there is every reason to find that reaction of Marina completely believable and realistic). Marina said Lee had a detailed notebook of his Walker shooting plans, maps, bus schedules, photos of Walker's house, photos of himself with the rifle and holding communist literature. Any police search of the Oswalds' apartment would have found all of that incriminating evidence, everything needed to go into court and have Oswald put away for a long prison sentence, incriminating evidence presented to the police and prosecutors on a silver platter, so to speak. Oswald even told Marina where he had buried the rifle as he made his getaway on foot from Walker's house April 10. If Marina had told that to the police, police could have found Oswald's rifle *in situ*, further incriminating Oswald as the shooter, as well as—broadcast on national news—that that particular mail-order imported foreign rifle, sold by a company under investigation by the Dodd Committee, was the weapon used in the attempted murder of the general, showing the need for stricter gun control.

To put it plainly: if Oswald was *trying* to get Marina to turn him in on her own initiative he could hardly have done more to set that up or encourage that to happen. That did *not* happen—Marina did *not* turn him in or tell anyone before Nov 22—but it could almost be said that was not from lack of trying on Lee's part. That does not come across as expected criminal behavior. (Nor did Oswald have a

prior criminal record.) Admittedly criminal behavior can vary. Still, we wonder *what is going on here really?*

Note closely this fact: according to Marina, Oswald left all of that extensive incriminating documentation among his things at home, and the rifle stashed in association with the Walker shot untouched, *for several days after* the shot (instead of destroying or removing from their apartment the incriminating evidence prior to the shot or immediately upon returning home). Only after several days had passed and no arrest did Oswald *then* retrieve and bring his rifle home and destroy some (not all) of the documentation. And according to Marina, our source for this, even that partial destruction of documents was at her request or insistence because of her fears. Marina had nothing to do with wanting to shoot anyone, but Marina at least knew it was not terribly smart for her husband to have incriminating evidence so blatantly present in one's living quarters, which for some reason Oswald did not seem to realize. It is as if Oswald kept the incriminating evidence when the risk of arrest was highest, and only after that highest window of risk had passed without anything happening did he accede to Marina's wishes to destroy some of the incriminating evidence. Is that logical?

All of this raises a question which sounds unusual but can hardly be avoided: was Lee hoping to prompt his own arrest by means of what he told Marina, with a media spectacle to follow if that happened, as bizarre as that sounds? Bizarre it may sound, but *exactly that* was a serious question to at least one staff counsel of the Warren Commission.

Mr. LIEBELER. But 3 days after the shot at General Walker, you saw him destroy the book [notebook of plans for shooting Walker]; is that correct?

Mrs. OSWALD. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. How did he destroy it?

Mrs. OSWALD. He burned it.

Mr. LIEBELER. Where?

Mrs. OSWALD. In the apartment house on Neeley.

Mr. LIEBELER. Where in the apartment?

Mrs. OSWALD. He burned it with matches over a wash bowl in the bathroom.

Mr. LIEBELER. And you first became aware of this when you smelled it burning; is that correct?

Mrs. OSWALD. I did not see the book, but I saw him writing in this book several times, but after he burns the book he told me what was in that book

and he showed me several photographs. Before he burned the book, he showed me several photographs that were in the book. I asked him what the pictures were and he said, "Well, this one is the picture of the house of General Walker's—his residence."

Mr. LIEBELER. And that picture was pasted in the notebook; is that right?

Mrs. OSWALD. No; it was loose in the book—I really don't remember.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Establish what kind of book it was and the size of it.

Mrs. OSWALD. The size it looked like this size of paper.

Mr. LIEBELER. It was a book something like the reporter is using?

Mrs. OSWALD. No; a legal size paper—it was a legal size notebook—this size.

Mr. LIEBELER. So, the notebook was about the same size as a legal size pad; is that right?

Mrs. OSWALD. [nodding head for an affirmative reply].

Mr. LIEBELER. Did you say anything to Lee when you saw him destroying this book about **why he prepared it and why he left it there in the apartment when he went to shoot General Walker?**

Mrs. OSWALD. No; I did not. No; I never asked him why he left it in the apartment, why he left his book in the apartment while he went to shoot General Walker. I did not ask him why he left it in the apartment. I asked him what for was he making all these entries in the book and he answered that **he wanted to leave a complete record so that all the details would be in it. He told me that these entries consisted of the description of the house of General Walker, the distances, the location, and the distribution of windows in it.**

Mr. LIEBELER. What did he want to leave this record for?

Mrs. OSWALD. All these details—all these records, that he was writing it either for his own use so that he would know what to do when the time came to shoot General Walker. **I am guessing** that perhaps he did it to appear to be a brave man **in case he were arrested**, but that is my supposition. I was so afraid after this attempt on Walker's life that the police might come to the house. I was afraid that there would be evidence in the house such as this book.

Mr. LIEBELER. Did you talk to Lee about that?

Mrs. OSWALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. What did you say and what did he say?

Mrs. OSWALD. What did I say?

Mr. LIEBELER. And what did he say?

Mrs. OSWALD. And what did he say?

Mr. LIEBELER. Both.

Mrs. OSWALD. I told him that it is best not to have this kind of stuff in the house this book.

Mr. LIEBELER. When did you tell him that?

Mrs. OSWALD. At the time he was destroying it—he showed me this book after this attempt on Walker's life, and I suggested to him that it would be awfully bad to keep a thing like that in the house.

Mrs. OSWALD. [T]he day Lee shot at Walker, he buried the rifle because when he came home and told me that he shot at General Walker and I asked him where the rifle was and he said he buried it.

Mr. LIEBELER. He shot at General Walker on April 10, which was on Wednesday.

Mrs. OSWALD. Wednesday?

Mr. LIEBELER. Yes; it was on Wednesday.

Mrs. OSWALD. As I remember, it was the weekend—Saturday or Sunday when Lee brought the rifle back home.

Mr. LIEBELER. What weekend following the time he shot at General Walker?

Mrs. OSWALD. The same weekend of the same week.

Mr. LIEBELER. Had he destroyed the notebook before he brought the rifle back?

Mrs. OSWALD. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. How long after he brought the rifle back did he destroy the book?

Mrs. OSWALD. He destroyed the book approximately an hour after he brought the rifle home.

Mr. LIEBELER. After he brought the rifle home, then, he showed you the book?

Mrs. OSWALD. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. And you said it was not a good idea to keep this book?

Mrs. OSWALD. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. And then he burned the book?

Mrs. OSWALD. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. **Did you ask him why he had not destroyed the book before he actually went to shoot General Walker?**

Mrs. OSWALD. It never came to me, myself, to ask him that question...

Mr. LIEBELER. **Did it seem strange to you at the time, Marina, that Lee did make these careful plans, take pictures, and write it up in a notebook, and then when he went out to shoot at General Walker he left all that incriminating evidence right in the house so that if he had ever been stopped and questioned and if that notebook had been found, it would have clearly indicated that he was the one that shot at General Walker?**

Mrs. OSWALD. He was such a person that nothing seems peculiar to me for what he did. I had so many surprises from him that nothing surprised me. He may have wished to appear such a brave man or something.

Mr. LIEBELER. **Did you ever have the feeling that he really wanted to be caught in connection with the Walker affair?**

Mrs. OSWALD. I don't know how to answer that—maybe yes and maybe no. I couldn't read his mind.

Commenting on the exchange of Marina above, Jeffrey Caufield notes:

“It was not the only time Oswald wanted publicity and expected to get arrested. For example, in August 1963, in New Orleans, Oswald got into a half-hearted fight with anti-Castro Cuban Carlos Bringuier while passing out Fair Play for Cuba literature. Since the fight occurred in front of a police officer, arrest was expected. He spent the night in jail and his wife stated that, afterward, he was pleased with the incident.” (Caufield, *General Walker*, 386)

Marina, to the Warren Commission concerning the New Orleans arrest just named:

“In his [Lee's] wife's [Marina's] words: ‘I only know that his basic desire was to get to Cuba by any means, and that all the rest of it was window dressing for that purpose ... **He wanted to be arrested. I think he wanted to get into the newspapers,** so that he would be known.’ According to Marina Oswald, he thought that would help him when he got to Cuba.” (*Warren Report*, 412-413)

How could Oswald be involved with Walker people such as Robert Surrey with views so different from his own?

The notion that Oswald would work with Walker aide Robert Surrey sounds counterintuitive. Oswald had little in common with the extreme-right views of

General Walker and Robert Surrey. Though Oswald was disenchanted with Soviet-style communism he continued to hold left-libertarian views unchanged. There is no sign in his writings of any conversion toward conservatism or shift rightward. He was opposed to segregation. He was pro-Kennedy, supported Kennedy on civil rights. He was about as far ideologically from Walker's and Surrey's extreme-right politics and what would later become Surrey's overt American Nazi Party advocacy as could be. Although Oswald was a working-class high-school dropout he read avidly and wrote political ideas in his private writings and at least once delivered a well-received public address (Spring Hill College, Alabama, July 1963). In Oswald's political writings there is nothing right-wing or outlandish nor are there calls for violence; it is all sober and reasonably expressed left-libertarian ideas. There is no evidence the real Oswald was other than left-libertarian.

And yet, Oswald's handwritten address book included not only the name and phone number of General Walker of Dallas but also the names of American Nazi Party leader George Lincoln Rockwell of Virginia (personal friend and houseguest of Robert and Mary Surrey of Dallas), and another American Nazi leader named Robert Burros of Queens, New York, who had spun off a different faction after a falling-out with Rockwell. There is no evidence of actual contact between Oswald and either of these two American Nazi leaders. But their names are in Oswald's address book for no known reason and without knowledge how they got there or why they are there.

It is difficult not to see a connection to George Lincoln Rockwell's friend Robert Surrey of Dallas, and a possible interest on the part of Oswald in infiltration of right-wing extremist groups for informant or surveillance purposes. How *could* Oswald be mixed up with Robert Surrey working for Walker? There is really about only one explanation that makes sense.

Oswald as an informant on the radical right

About the only thing that renders Oswald's involvement with General Walker's aide Robert Surrey, and as part of that, participation in a staged shot of Walker, *sensible* is a proposition which has been considered by nearly everyone who has ever studied the JFK assassination, never confirmed on the basis of hard evidence but long suspected on a number of grounds: that Oswald at times was an informant, an infiltrator of groups targeted for surveillance and investigation by federal authorities, prominent among which would be the extreme right-wing activity of circles around General Walker. The idea is that Oswald, poor and working-class,

reading Marx as a teenager, at times went to work for The Man, operating covertly to provide information on groups under surveillance by U.S. agencies and probably paid minor amounts along the way (although as noted, proof is elusive; no agency has ever acknowledged a covert paid relationship with Oswald).

Michael Paine, who knew Oswald and had conversations with him, said Oswald *told him* that he, Oswald, was involved in spying on right-wing groups in Dallas, among whom General Walker was the most prominent *cause célèbre*. Michael Paine:

“We were both interested in the activities of **right-wing groups** in Dallas, which were common, numerous at that time. And **I think he described his activities as spying on them** and thought of himself as doing that. **In that conversation the name of General Walker was raised.**” (Michael Paine, <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/twenty-four-years/>)

Vincent Salandria:

“[H]e told me, Michael Paine told me, in an interview, that he would go with Oswald to right-wing meetings in the Dallas area and that **Oswald would take very careful notes afterwards and he was apparently reporting on the right wing in Dallas.**” (Vincent Salandria interview by David Starks, 1994, <https://www.ratical.org/ratville//JFK/FalseMystery/VJS-StarksInterview1994.html>)

Jeffrey Caufield:

“... [The FBI noted] the discovery of Walker’s name and phone number, LA 1-4115, in Oswald’s notebook, which [the FBI] felt were connected to the murder attempt. However, a man who seeks to assassinate another has no need to write the name of his victim in the notebook. When one saves Walker’s telephone number it is to phone him. Unfortunately, the FBI did not suspect that Oswald might have had the information because the two were working together.” (Caufield, *General Walker*, 392)

Here is Oswald, only three months after the Walker shot, now in New Orleans attempting to infiltrate an entirely different right-wing group (though this group

had Walker's personal sympathy and support), this one militant anti-Castro Cubans:

“While talking with Carlos Bringius [*sic*, Bringuier], an individual whose photograph Geraci advised was identical to Lee Harvey Oswald, came into the store and made inquiry of Bringius regarding anti-Castro literature. Oswald **expressed an interest in learning all about the CSD** [Cuban Student Directorate aka “DRE”, an anti-Castro organization]. Following a brief discussion of the CSD, its purposes and objectives, Oswald became engaged in another conversation with Geraci and his friend, Blalock. Geraci recalls Oswald mentioning that he had in his possession a Marine Guide Book which contained information regarding guerilla tactics, firearms and other subjects. Geraci recalls mentioning to Oswald that he, Geraci, had done a little reading regarding guerilla warfare, after which Oswald informed him that he was familiar with various types of guerilla tactics ...” (FBI, 11/29/63, <https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=10477#relPageId=537>)

Here is seen a parallel to the same paradox of Oswald with General Walker's circle earlier in 1963: an actually leftist Oswald seeking entrée to right-wing activity. Many anti-Castro Cubans, especially of the group named here, the Miami-based “DRE”, *hated* Kennedy, passionately and sometimes with talk of violence, over what was regarded as a betrayal at the Bay of Pigs, whereas Oswald by all credible accounts liked Kennedy. Yet here Oswald cozies up to people so different from himself. What seems so paradoxical in imagining Oswald cozying up to General Walker circles becomes seen in a wider view as that is *the kind of thing Oswald did*—first with Walker's group in Dallas, then attempted with Bringuier's anti-Castro Cubans in New Orleans, in both cases groups surveilled by federal agencies over issues of gunrunning and training camps. Oswald for whatever reason was drawn to radical right-wing groups. It may be baffling to understand fully *why*. But *that* Oswald engaged in this kind of behavior is not in dispute. And so what would be paradoxical or nonsensical to most average people—to want to become friendly with extreme right-wing groups—in the case of Oswald *is the kind of thing he did*. A relationship with Walker aide Robert Surrey does not stand in isolation but falls into a *modus operandus* of Oswald.

Marina in 1998:

“Marina now believes that Oswald was a government agent, at least for a time. ‘Now, looking back at his character, I can see that he had certain traits of professional training, like being secretive, and **I believe he worked for the American government.**’ ... She also wonders if Oswald had rational reasons for actions that seemed inexplicable at the time ... Marina wonders if he had other reasons for his secretiveness. **‘Perhaps he told me so little because he was trying to protect me** ... One time, when we were living in New Orleans, he broke down and cried. He seemed to have such a heavy burden that he wanted to share with me but couldn’t’” (Myrna Blyth and Jane Farrell, “Marina Oswald”, Nov 1988 *Ladies’ Home Journal*)

The mail-order rifle and revolver Oswald ordered and received in March 1963, and the infamous Backyard Photographs of Oswald posing with those firearms shortly after he received them (and holding up communist publications in those poses), photographs produced by Oswald with Marina’s help in the days immediately preceding the Walker shot, can be placed on a continuum with his role in the staged Walker shot, such that Oswald’s involvement with Robert Surrey, and his role in the Walker shot as part of that involvement with Robert Surrey, may be understood as part of a wider picture. Paul Hoch in 1985:

“I [too] am willing to speculate that Oswald might have ordered his weapons using a false name and with obviously false identification on instructions, thinking that he was helping with the investigation being carried out by the Dodd committee of the Senate into mail-order sales of firearms.” (Paul Hoch, “The Final Investigation? The HSCA and Army Intelligence”, *The Third Decade*, 1/5 [July 1985], 1-9 at 3, <https://www.maryferrell.org/showDoc.html?docId=48725#relPageId=6>)

Henry Hurt in 1985:

“In January 1963 hearings began in Washington before the Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, under the leadership of Senator Thomas J. Dodd. The proceedings came to be known as the Dodd Committee. Evidence was amassed to show that there was practically no control over the sale of firearms through the mails—sales that potentially could reach, in addition to children, the most maladjusted, criminal, and even crazed segments of American society. Part of the effort of the Dodd

Committee was to show that absolutely anyone with a few dollars could successfully order weapons through the mails ... Inasmuch as Oswald ordered the rifle as well as the pistol under a false name, the point was demonstrated that there was virtually no control over even *that* aspect of mail-order guns ... Back in New Orleans, he [Oswald] ostensibly continued his pro-Communist activities while also involving himself with anti-Communist fanatics and right-wing nuts. Certainly, a record like Oswald's would lend itself effectively to the Dodd Committee's efforts to show that anyone, regardless of his background and current activities, could order guns through the mails. In the event that Oswald did work for the Dodd Committee, even indirectly, his subsequent notoriety would ensure that the committee—as in the case of any other government agency Oswald may have been associated with—would try desperately to avoid having the relationship exposed.” (Henry Hurt, *Reasonable Doubt: An Investigation into the Assassination of John F. Kennedy* [1985], 300-301)

Peter Dale Scott in 1993:

“To order guns by interstate mail is of course an irrational way for a potential assassin to purchase his murder weapons: it lays a paper trail linking the weapon to the purchaser, or at least his post-office box. Conversely, if one is investigating firms known to sell weapons illegally through the mails, a paper trail is precisely what is needed ... Oswald was interested only in making interstate purchases ... The Warren Report did not mention that in 1963 Seaport Traders and Klein's Sporting Goods were being investigated, by the ATF unit of the U.S. Treasury's Internal Revenue Service, as well as by Senator Dodd's Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Treasury and the Committee sought to demonstrate the need for more restrictive legislation to control the burgeoning mail-order traffic in firearms ... The federal government and Dodd subcommittee, as it happened, were [also] concerned about ‘so-called “junk” guns that foreign governments have found obsolete [such as Italian Mannlicher-Carcanos].’” (Peter Dale Scott, *Deep Politics and the Death of JFK* [1993], 249-250)

In other words, Oswald could have been involved in ordering mail-order firearms using aliases as tests of existing systems and laws, providing information useful to federal investigation of domestic mail-order sales of imported and unregulated firearms. If Oswald was at some level involved with an agency or private-sector

intermediary contributing intelligence to the Dodd Committee, an informant in Oswald's position might be given money to cover the cost of the firearms purchases (and then some), and be allowed to keep personally and do whatever he would with the firearms themselves (keep or resell) as a fringe benefit or perk of the job, in exchange for reporting of information.

There is an unconfirmed report that Oswald during his interrogation after his arrest the weekend of Nov 22-24, 1963 spoke of working covertly for a government agency:

“The wife of one of [Dallas Police Captain Will] Fritz's best friends recently told researchers that Fritz had secretly recorded his Oswald interrogations [Nov 22-24, 1963]. Only one other DPD employee even knew about the recording equipment, which was in a small room or closet adjoining Fritz' office. The tapes are supposedly safe. She added that Fritz was afraid for the safety of his family and relatives, and **that Oswald had admitted being a member of the intelligence community**. There is no known reason to doubt the credibility of the woman or her husband.” (Gary Mack, Editor & Publisher, *Coverups!* May 1984, p. 3, Fort Worth, Texas, <http://jfk.hood.edu/Collection/Weisberg%20Subject%20Index%20Files/M%20Disk/Mack%20Gary%20Cover-up/Item%2019.pdf>)

This report, dating from the time of Fritz's death in 1984, was never subsequently confirmed or disconfirmed to my knowledge—therefore, without attribution or corroboration, is insubstantial—but is in agreement in the sense of plausibility with an otherwise-puzzling fact: in the estimated twelve hours total of interrogations of Oswald during the weekend of Nov 22-24, 1963, before Oswald was killed, with no known tape recording or stenographer present at the interrogations and relying solely on written reports from Fritz and others present of what Oswald was asked and answered, there is not one mention of Oswald having been asked whether he had worked covertly for an agency of the U.S. Government. It is almost inconceivable that Oswald would not have been asked that question unless a request or decision had been made not to ask that question, or to not report Oswald's answer to that question.

Larry Hancock, Dec 4, 2022, Education Forum

[\(https://educationforum.ipbhost.com/topic/28410-breakthrough-in-the-walker-shooting-case-an-inside-job-accomplices-and-the-role-of-oswald/page/2/\)](https://educationforum.ipbhost.com/topic/28410-breakthrough-in-the-walker-shooting-case-an-inside-job-accomplices-and-the-role-of-oswald/page/2/):

“[I]ts important to remember that Oswald himself had two very long term personal views (long term for a short life at least, dating back to his teenage years). He was demonstrably socialist and Marxist in his beliefs and worldview but he was also very anti-racist (if you doubt either, read his public statements in Russia and then read the monographs he wrote in 62/63). Both his socialist and anti-racist views show up consistently as well as in 1963, his writings and the speech he gave in early fall were both solidly against radical nationalism and the ultra right.

“Given that consistency, the thought that he would be ‘infiltrating’ the ultra right in both Dallas (per the statement to Michael Paine) and later in New Orleans would make perfect sense—with the goal of exposing them and their activities (very possibly to the FBI as he was seeking to expose the anti-Castro exiles in NO). Not to mention Marina’s snarky ‘hunter of Fascists’ note on the back of the photo left in the records that the DeMohrenschildts had loaned them.

“Two things that can be said about Oswald were that he marched to his own drummer, and he had no fear about pursuing his beliefs—he also didn’t take orders well at all, not in military, not in Russia, not at work back in the US.”

And again Dec 5, 2022, same discussion, Hancock:

“One of the reasons for my current thinking was a recent, deep dive into primary sources that I had not really paid sufficient attention to previously—after realizing I had based a lot of thinking and writing on what has been written over the decades in the JFK community. The thing that made [this] most clear to me was that Oswald’s thinking, character and personality had remained quite consistent since his teenage years when he applied to the Young Socialists for a membership and to start a chapter. His later experiences in both Japan and Russia certainly refined his view,—as an example he became very negative towards Soviet style communism and even more so towards ‘nationalistic’ thinking and racism ... I see signs he was more than willing to act as a source for the FBI and provide information on the ultra right and on anti-Castro military activities in New Orleans ... As

to his being ‘witting’ and to what extent, I leave that as an open question but if so I see it as being entirely Oswald’s own decision and in line with his personal agendas at given points in time—I don’t see Oswald simply following orders and bouncing from task to task, that was not his nature ... I don’t necessarily expect anyone to following my line of thinking; I do however find this thread innovative and worth a lot of consideration. Kudos to Greg for bringing the scenario forward for consideration.”

Conclusion

By Marina’s account Oswald created meticulous written evidence of his involvement in the Walker shot: maps, notes, photos, notebook, with remnants surviving in Oswald’s belongings supporting Marina’s account. In addition Oswald told Marina that he did it and how he did it, to Marina’s horror. Surely Oswald had to consider that an unsympathetic and horrified Marina would “leak”—would confide in or tell someone who would report it to the police. If so, a simple police search of the apartment would find Oswald’s detailed notebook, spelling out everything plainly. Was Oswald *that stupid*? One way of interpreting this, the default interpretation of the Warren Commission, was in psychological terms: it was part of Oswald wanting to be a major name in history, and in that light he might not care that he would receive a lengthy prison term, even if he had failed in what he set out to do. Is that a satisfactory explanation?

If the shot was a real attempt to kill Walker then Oswald would be looking at a lengthy term in prison if caught and convicted, his life effectively gone. If Oswald was willing to have himself be caught and sentenced to a lengthy prison sentence—in this case for something that within ca. 12 hours he knew had not accomplished anything—he truly would be irrational and a fanatic. But if the shot was staged, then there is another possibility: he may not have minded if Marina turned him in whether directly or by leaking to someone who would—may not have minded for police to find that evidence, not from self-destructiveness but for a rational objective: a takedown of General Walker in another way.

If the shot was staged, all it would take for Oswald’s exculpation if he were arrested would be for that to be shown or explained to prosecutors, information presented by an agency establishing that which was actually true. Presumably this would be shown to prosecutors prior to trial and Oswald would never come to trial. Instead Oswald might become a surprise witness in a prosecution of General Walker and Surrey. In this light Oswald faced no actual risk of conviction for

attempted murder. Oswald would know that people would vouch for him, have his back. In this light Oswald's meticulous documentation and self-incrimination in the Walker shot becomes not the inexplicable and irrational behavior it has appeared, but instead more like a "sting" done by Oswald on the General Walker operation and Walker.

For all we know, an arrest of Oswald, if it had happened, might have ended up with Oswald in Washington, D.C. as a star witness before the Dodd Committee. The dangers of unregulated interstate mail-order firearms sales would be made starkly apparent and exposed to the nation—"the kind of thing that could happen, next time for real" if mail-order firearms were not regulated. The exposure that the Walker shot was faked would discredit General Walker as a charlatan and perhaps subject Walker and Surrey to criminal charges for knowingly making false statements to law enforcement officers. Oswald would regard his cooperation in the faked Walker shot as doing a "sting" on Walker and taking down Walker by that means. It is possible that that "sting" or closure was believed by Oswald still to happen at some point, still operational even in November, only its timing had been postponed.

The central point of this study is that two seemingly disparate lines of evidence, which have been regarded as mutually exclusive, are both true: Oswald fired the shot, and it was a staged shot done for General Walker. They are both true because Oswald fired the staged shot that was done for General Walker. By design the shot was fired into an empty room and could not have harmed General Walker since he was not in the room when the shot was fired. When Oswald returned home to Marina late that night and told Marina he was not sure whether he had hit Walker, that was subterfuge. Oswald knew he had not, because he knew Walker was not in the room when he fired.

All that needs to be supposed is the reasonable proposition that Lee did not tell Marina everything. In this light what Marina told the Secret Service and FBI post-Nov 22, 1963 becomes more or less truthful but *limited*, reflecting only what Lee told her, not the full truth. What Oswald told Marina becomes a valuable but incomplete spotlight on what happened the night of April 10, 1963. The accounts of Kirk Coleman and David Surrey represent second and third spotlights on the same events, glimpses of a fuller story.

The fundamental question is not did Oswald fire the shot but rather the question of the title of this study: did Oswald shoot at *General Walker* the night of April 10,

1963? The answer of this study based on a fuller range of evidence, especially the breakthrough of this study in establishment of the identification of Kirk Coleman's man No. 2 as Robert Surrey, is: no, Oswald did not shoot at General Walker the night of April 10, 1963, even though Oswald fired the shot and even though Oswald did not like what Walker stood for.

[END]