

## Chapter Summaries

# **The Shot Reported Fired at General Edwin Walker of Dallas, Texas, of April 10, 1963: What Happened That Night?**

**A revisitation of the case in the light of new information**

**Six decades later, new information establishes that the shot fired into the home of General Walker on the night of April 10, 1963 was staged for publicity, not a genuine assassination attempt**

**Exoneration of Lee Harvey Oswald from the finding of the Warren Commission that he attempted to kill General Walker**

*by Greg Doudna*

*May 26, 2026*

*Bellingham, Washington*

[gdoudna@msn.com](mailto:gdoudna@msn.com)

[www.scrollery.com](http://www.scrollery.com)

*(This is a chapter-by-chapter summary of the argument of a finished 140,000-word manuscript looking for a publisher)*

## Preface

### What this book is about and why it matters

*This study establishes that, moments after a shot was fired into the home of General Walker of Dallas, Texas on the night of April 10, 1963, a right-hand man to General Walker was seen going to his parked car in an adjoining church parking lot having walked out of the alley behind General Walker's house from where the shot had been fired.*

*The presence of that Walker aide, at the location from which the shot was fired, at the moment the shot was fired, casts that shot in a very different light than has been assumed.*

*The aide was Robert Surrey, Walker's friend and publicist.*

*That aide of Walker was one of two men seen going to their cars and leaving the scene moments after the shot, by a 14-year-old witness, Kirk Coleman.*

*The Warren Report, in its narrative, findings, and conclusions, made no attempt to identify or explain the two men seen by Kirk Coleman. The Warren Report did not contest their existence or the credibility of the witness. Instead, the Warren Report opened its discussion by acknowledging the existence of those two men, then proceeded to ignore them thereafter as if their presence was of no evidentiary significance. Nor did the Commission call Kirk Coleman to testify, despite the Commission considering the shot fired at Walker "of probative value in its investigation [of the assassination of President Kennedy]".*

*Who were those two men Kirk Coleman saw that night? Until now, that question has never been answered. That question is answered in this study.*

*The identifications of those two men yield a true solution to the case, including the role of Oswald.*

*It is an amazing story. It involves no rejection of physical evidence. And yet it exonerates Oswald from having tried to kill General Walker.*

*For on that night in Dallas, the truth is: no one tried to kill General Walker.*

## Chapter I: The General Walker Case: The Facts

### Summary

General Edwin Walker (1909–1993), a Texas-born West Point graduate who served in World War II and the Korean War, became a right-wing cause célèbre when he resigned from the U.S. Army in 1961 after being reprimanded for distributing John Birch Society literature to his troops in Germany. Backed by money from Texas oilman H.L. Hunt of Dallas, Walker toured the country denouncing communism and Kennedy liberalism. He ran unsuccessfully for governor of Texas in 1962. In September 1962, Walker traveled to Oxford, Mississippi to oppose a court-ordered enrollment of Black Air Force veteran James Meredith at the University of Mississippi. President Kennedy had sent in five hundred U.S. marshals to enforce compliance to the court order. Walker appealed to conservatives nationwide to rally in support of the sovereign right of the state of Mississippi to remain racist. Walker gave an incendiary speech which was followed by a riot leaving two dead and six marshals shot. Attorney General Robert Kennedy ordered Walker arrested on sedition charges and controversially held for psychiatric evaluation. The charges were eventually dropped. Walker is believed to have been the inspiration for General Jack D. Ripper in the Stanley Kubrick film *Dr. Strangelove*.

On the night of April 10, 1963, just after Walker's return to Dallas from a nationwide "Operation Midnight Ride" speaking tour with firebrand preacher Billy James Hargis, a shot was fired into the Dallas home of General Walker. The bullet was reported as having narrowly missed him. Fourteen-year-old witness Kirk Coleman saw two men in two cars leaving an adjacent church parking lot seconds after the shot, but they were never identified by police, the FBI, or the Warren Commission. The Warren Commission found that Lee Harvey Oswald had attempted to murder General Walker, citing evidence including photos of Walker's house in his belongings and his wife Marina's account.

However, the FBI, which conducted the investigation for the Warren Commission, concluded that its investigation "did not establish whether Oswald did or did not make the attempt on General Walker's life"—a statement of non-incrimination filed internally but not disclosed to the Warren Commission or the public. The Warren Commission reached its guilty finding of Oswald on the basis of access to less information than the FBI possessed. This divergence—the FBI refusing to endorse what the Warren Commission, on the basis of less information, asserted—is the starting point for the book's central argument that the Walker shot was staged.

## **Chapter II: The Key to the Case: 14-Year-Old Kirk Coleman's Man No. 1 and Man No. 2**

### **Summary**

Kirk Coleman's eyewitness account is the pivotal evidence in the Walker case. Seconds after the shot at about 9:00 pm, Coleman climbed a fence and saw two men departing in two cars from an end of a church parking lot next to the Walker house, called by the FBI man No. 1 and man No. 2. Man No. 1 was a young, thin man hurrying to a running car with headlights already on. Man No. 2 was a larger man walking calmly having come out from the alley directly behind Walker's house. Coleman later confirmed neither man was Oswald. There was enough light to see because there was a full moon that night.

Three striking facts are noted. First, inquiries with church members failed to identify either of the two men's cars as belonging to church people. Second—astonishingly—there is no record that anyone associated with Walker's house was ever asked whether they could identify the cars or persons of Coleman's description, even though that end of the parking lot was where Walker people parked. And third, the movements of the two men are so consistent with involvement in the shot that no reasonable alternative explanation exists.

The FBI's own June 1964 report noted the two men remained unidentified and offered three possible explanations of the two men—accomplices, reluctant witnesses, or Walker associates—yet deliberately chose not to seek their identifications because, the Dallas field office of the FBI explained to headquarters in Washington, D.C., doing so might produce a negative reaction from General Walker. Therefore, not wanting that to happen, it was not pursued. The fact of that conscious, in-writing FBI decision *not* to attempt to identify those two men, and the reasoning behind that FBI decision, was not, however, disclosed to the Warren Commission, which appears never to have learned or known that such a decision had been made by the agency doing its investigating for it.

Subsequent investigations such as the House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA) in 1979 also failed to identify the two men, who remained unidentified to the present day, with pessimism that their identities would ever be known, though that changes with this study.

Kirk Coleman did not notice either of the two men carrying a gun. There was a gun somewhere close by because a shot had just been fired from the alley. But no gun was found abandoned in the alley or nearby woods either. By default, the gun must have left the scene with another man who was in the alley in proximity with man No. 2. This

other man in the alley went a different direction with the gun after the shot was fired. This means there was a third person involved in the shot, unseen by Coleman who was unable to see in the alley from his vantage point, in addition to the two that he saw: three persons involved in the shot that night, two of them seen by the witness, Coleman.

The chapter emphasizes that solving the identities of the two men Coleman saw is the key to the Walker case.

## Chapter III: The Breakthrough: Identification of Man No. 2

### Summary

The book's central breakthrough is identification of man No. 2. The identification became possible with disclosure of a particular car description in a video first made public only in 2019. The video had been made in 2012 by David Surrey, the oldest son of Robert Surrey, at the initiative of David's friend Allen Trent.

Robert Surrey testified to the Warren Commission that his car on the night of the shot was a "1961 Ford convertible" but he was not asked its color, nor was its color otherwise known. In his video David described his father's car at the time: it was a Ford Galaxie Sunliner, "*black—with a black convertible top!*" That precisely matches Kirk Coleman's description of man No. 2's car as "black with a white stripe down the side"—the chrome stripe on the Sunliner.

That information identifies Robert Surrey as Coleman's man No. 2—the man who walked out of the alley behind Walker's house seconds after the shot, walked to and got in that car to drive off.

Before the release of that video, a 2017 book, *Pieces of the Puzzle*, by Gayle Nix Jackson and coauthors, had described the contents of the privately-held videos of two sons of Robert Surrey, David in 2012 and William in 2013, but unfortunately incorrectly reported David's description of his father's car as "black and white", two-tone, and never made the connection to the car of Coleman's man No. 2. In fact David said nothing about "white" with reference to his father's black Sunliner. Correction of that error to the actual description given by David of his father's car as single-tone all-black, with the Sunliner's chrome side stripe—the accurate color description of Robert Surrey's car, first reported here—transforms the identification: Coleman's "black with a white stripe" car of man No. 2 is an exact description of Surrey's Sunliner seen in the dark parking lot at night.

The identification is supported by Surrey's Warren Commission testimony that he had parked his car—the all-black Sunliner—a few days earlier in the same location where Coleman saw the car of man No. 2, and by a recollection of a Boy Scout who was at the church on the night of the shot who remembered the car of man No. 2, had admired it from a distance, and said he had seen the same car parked there before, where Walker's people were known to park.

The chapter addresses and refutes potential objections, including Coleman's initial misidentification to police of the car's year and make (a '58 Chevy), which he corrected the next day (he retracted the '58 Chevy claim and told the police he could not say what make it was, he only knew for certain it was all black except for a white stripe); his describing the car to the police as a "sedan" when Surrey's Sunliner was a convertible (with the top up the Sunliner's profile at night from Coleman's vantage point was like that of a sedan); and an issue about a "dome light" Coleman said he saw turned on (the Sunliner had an under-dash light rather than overhead dome light, but the illuminated cabin was what Coleman observed).

The identification of man No. 2 as Robert Surrey changes everything about the case. The importance of this identification to the case can hardly be overstated. It is the foundation of what follows, and the Walker shot can never be looked at in the same way again.

## Chapter IV: Physical Description of Man No. 2: Robert Surrey

### Summary

Chapter IV examines the physical description evidence and confirms that Surrey's known description does not contradict his identification as man No. 2. Coleman's description of man No. 2—a white male about 6'1" and 200 pounds, in dark long-sleeved clothing—was given fourteen months after the event, and Coleman said he never saw the man's face. An FBI informant (identified as ATF agent Frank Ellsworth) described Robert Surrey in October 1964 as a white male about 40, 5'10", 150–160 pounds with light brown or blond hair and stooped shoulders. While Coleman's height and weight estimates are slightly higher, it is within margin of error for an observation made from behind at night, over a year earlier. (The dark shirt is taken up in Chapter VII.)

Another related FBI informant report from October 1964 describes an encounter with a man in Fort Worth—identifiable through description and context as Robert Surrey—said to be driving at that time a black-and-white 1963 Ford Galaxie 500. That appears to be the next car Surrey acquired after his all-black 1961 Ford Galaxie Sunliner.

The description of this newer car of Surrey (black and white, two-tone) oddly mirrors the FBI's strange June 1964 misreporting of Coleman's car No. 2 description, changing it from "black with a white stripe" (Coleman's description to the Dallas Police the night of the shot, April 10, 1963, and again to the police the next day, April 11, 1963) to—now, fourteen months later in the FBI reporting—reporting Coleman of June 3, 1964, "black over white" (i.e. an all-white car body with no stripe under a black top!), and then only a day later, reporting Coleman of June 4, 1964, "black and white."

The chapter raises the question whether these FBI reporting anomalies of June 1964 were deliberate to obstruct potential identification (the FBI used those mangled later reported descriptions in car identification questions asked of church witnesses, instead of Coleman's originally reported description to the police), though no conclusion is reached.

## Chapter V: Movements of Robert Surrey on the Night of the Shot

### Summary

Robert Surrey was home when General Walker called to report the shot. Both Surrey and Walker testified to this, and a *Dallas Times-Herald* article confirmed Mary Surrey said Walker called her husband at home immediately after the shot. That established Robert Surrey's alibi.

However, General Walker did not call immediately after the shot fired at 9:00. Walker said he first went upstairs for a pistol, then went out into his back yard with his gun looking for the shooter (whom he did not find), and only then came back inside his house and called the Dallas Police and Robert Surrey. The Dallas Police reported Walker called at 9:10 pm.

It is noted the driving distance from the Walker house to the Surrey residence at 3506 Lindenwood Avenue was 1.1 miles, with a Mapquest estimate of three minutes driving time to get there. Walker's call to Surrey at about 9:10 pm allowed time for Surrey to drive home from the church parking lot, after the shot at 9:00 pm, in time to receive Walker's call at home.

In 2017 Gayle Nix Jackson reported new information to the case, not known to the Warren Commission or any prior study, establishing that Robert Surrey drove his black Sunliner from the Walker home to his home before Walker called and reached him there.

This was learned from William Surrey and confirmed with two other Surrey family members: earlier that evening, the Surrey family—Robert, his wife Mary, and their five children—had been at Walker's house stuffing envelopes for a political mailing. William said that when a particular piece of printed material ran out, his father had sent everyone home earlier than expected. The rest of the Surrey family went home in a car driven by Mary Surrey. Robert drove home separately in his black Sunliner.

That is exactly what Kirk Coleman witnessed of Robert Surrey as man No. 2—Coleman saw man No. 2 get in his car to leave Walker's place, which was Surrey leaving Walker's place to drive home where he was when Walker called at 9:10. They are two accounts of the same movement of Surrey that evening.

That Robert Surrey drove home from the Walker place before he received the Walker call was not known prior to 2017. It was not disclosed in Robert Surrey's Warren Commission testimony. If the Warren Commission had been aware of it, some members

of the Commission or staff might have wished to drill down on exactly when Surrey's drive home from Walker's place occurred—whether before or after 9:00 pm, the time of the shot. But the Commission never knew to ask, and that possibly sensitive question never had opportunity to come up.

In retrospect an allusion to Robert Surrey's presence at the Walker property before Kirk Coleman saw him leaving in his black Sunliner may be seen in an FBI interview report noting that a neighbor, Mrs. Marion Bouve, referred to "numerous people coming and going" from Walker's house earlier that evening; however the FBI had not pursued identifying them. Also, when the previously-mentioned Boy Scout at the church told the FBI he remembered seeing and admiring the car of man No. 2 at the end of the parking lot, that sighting would have occurred earlier in the evening when it was still daylight, before the church meeting began. That also is consistent with Robert Surrey parked there as part of his presence with his family at the Walker house that evening.

As reported by Gayle Nix Jackson in *Pieces of the Puzzle* on the basis of the videos of David and William Surrey, after Robert Surrey received his call from General Walker at 9:10 pm, Robert immediately left his home for Walker's neighborhood, taking twelve-year-old David, his oldest son, with him, a detail William Surrey confirmed was not unusual, as Robert often singled out David to accompany him apart from the other children. But upon arriving to the vicinity of Walker's house, Robert oddly did not immediately park and go inside Walker's house. Instead, he had driven circling around the surrounding residential streets. He told David they were searching for the shooter. However the chapter suggests that, unknown to young David, Robert's actual purpose was to stall for time to avoid arriving at Walker's house before the police did, so that he could be seen by the police arriving, rather than be seen already there when they arrived.

During this circling in the neighborhood, David said his father had pulled over to the side of a street at one point upon recognizing another car. David, who remained in the car, saw his father get out and heard him speak briefly to the driver of the other car, who was also aware that a shot had been fired. David heard an exchange in which the other man said he had "missed" him, understood by David as the other man saying the shooter had not been found. In a later chapter it is argued that other man was likely Coleman's man No. 1, after No. 1 drove out of the church parking lot. He was hunting for their accomplice who fled south from the alley on foot, in order to assist but had missed him.

After Robert Surrey saw a police car had arrived and was parked in front of Walker's house, Surrey too parked his car on Turtle Creek Boulevard in front of the Walker house and went inside the front door to join Walker and the police officers in the rear of the house, where police were taking a report.

The rest of the Surrey children were also brought back to the Walker house by Mary Surrey, following Walker's phone call. They were kept in a room at the front of the house and effectively isolated from the police activity taking place at the rear until after the police were gone. Then the adults took the children back, showed the bullet hole in the wall and explained that someone had shot at General Walker. Mary drove the rest of the family home while Robert Surrey remained overnight with Walker who made phone calls and readied for a press conference the next morning.

The chapter notes an unusual memo written by Warren Commission counsel Leon Hubert on June 2, 1964 saying that Surrey had stated refusal to appear before the Commission under any circumstances, giving as his reason that he had a poor opinion of it. Surrey, who claimed he had no attorney, was reported willing to be interviewed by and give information to the FBI but only on condition that it not be shared with the Commission. This arrangement, if it had been accepted, would have allowed Surrey and the FBI to legally keep whatever information Surrey/FBI wished concealed from public scrutiny and the Commission's investigation. It raises the question whether Surrey had been advised to pursue that attempt, and whether the FBI was aware and involved; this is not known. Whatever further negotiations took place or alternative deal was reached or not reached, Surrey was interviewed by the FBI the next day and testified to the Warren Commission two weeks later.

## Chapter VI: Staged Shot, Part 1

### Summary

Chapter VI introduces the case that the Walker shot had involvement from inside the Walker house and was a staged publicity stunt, not a genuine assassination attempt. Key evidence includes the fact that Toby—a border collie belonging to next-door neighbor Marion Bouve, notorious for barking at anyone in the alley behind Walker’s house—did not bark the night of the shot. The dog had been taken inside earlier that evening by Mrs. Bouve because of his barking, but then became ill for the following two days. Mrs. Bouve suspected someone had poisoned him in connection with the shooting.

A floodlight on the roof of the back of Walker’s house that should have illuminated the alley where the shooter stood was inexplicably inoperable that night. Walker was in the right room for the shot to happen at the opportune time when the church services were beginning to be let out. The window blind of the lighted room was raised at night through which the shot had been fired from the alley.

According to Edward Heath, a member of and caretaker for the neighboring Latter-day Saints church in addition to being a full-time Dallas Police officer, interviewed by the FBI fourteen months after the event, a second floodlight—this one on the church building that lighted up the church parking lot—also had been intentionally turned off in this time frame including the evening of the shot, even though it was in good working order, because, Heath explained, unspecified neighbors to the church had complained that the light was too bright at night. Apparently the church, wishing to keep good relations with its neighbors, had complied.

Although there is no information in the FBI reporting of the source of that neighbor complaint which, on its face, was an unreasonable request that the church not have its own parking lot on its own property lighted at night for the safety of its people walking to their cars (the FBI showed no sign of attempting to find out who), the only obvious neighbor property adjoining the church was the Walker house itself. Was the Walker house the source of that request?

(Kirk Coleman told the FBI in an interview fourteen months after the shot that the church floodlight had been on, on the night of the shot. One possibility is Coleman remembered the ambient light of the full moon without remembering that the light had been from the full moon, not from the church floodlight, and mistakenly attributed it to the floodlight. The other possibility is Coleman was correct and whatever Heath

remembered had not applied the night of April 10. It is not clear which of these is the correct explanation.)

After police and reporters left the Walker house the night of the shot, and with Surrey probably standing by, Walker phoned Rev. Billy James Hargis of Oklahoma. According to Hargis, Walker had said, ‘Billy, let’s begin another tour (Midnight Crusade) immediately.’”

The next morning, holding a press conference, Walker smiled broadly for news photographers, coffee cup in hand, and publicly asserted, without any evidence, that the shot was evidence of a domestic Communist conspiracy targeting him personally for which the Kennedys were responsible because they had not prevented it. This was mixed with language sounding like Walker was floating a possible run for the presidency in 1964, assisted by the publicity over the shooting at him. In answer to a reporter’s question in the press conference, Walker said he would not be increasing security at his home after the shot or otherwise making any changes. He did not install better lighting, took no protective measures for himself or his staff, and showed no concern over police warnings that the would-be assassin might return—behaviors which appear inconsistent with belief that a real assassin had shot at him.

The chapter documents early Dallas Police suspicions: Dallas Police Detective Cunningham, one of the original investigators, suspected it was a publicity stunt. Writer Jeffrey Caufield in the course of research interviews for a book on General Walker turned up an allegation that Walker had previously considered staging a fake crime against himself for publicity. In interviews in 1999 and 2000, Minutemen founder Robert DePugh told Caufield that in 1962 Walker had asked DePugh to stage a fake kidnapping of Walker to be blamed on communists, to generate publicity during Walker’s 1962 gubernatorial run.

In *Pieces of the Puzzle* in 2017, Gayle Nix Jackson reported another item of possible interest, learned by email from William Surrey. According to William, his father and Mary had briefly had the family start attending the Latter-day Saints church adjacent to General Walker’s home, the church of the parking lot, shortly before the time of the shot. William said they started attending in March 1963, attended a few times, then abruptly stopped following the April 10 shot at Walker. William thought it unusual in retrospect because, according to William, the family had no other history of church attendance of any kind before or after. In light of the identification of Coleman’s man No. 2 as Robert Surrey, we may ask whether this report of Robert Surrey’s attendance at the church of the parking lot might have been related to the logistics of the shot carried out on April 10.

Even without having made the identification of Robert Surrey as Coleman's man No. 2, Gayle Nix Jackson by 2017 had learned enough to propose, perhaps the first to do so in print, that, "In reference to the Walker shooting, there is though, another and more logical explanation: Walker staged it himself with Robert Surrey's help."

With man No. 2 identified as Robert Surrey, that is confirmed correct.

## Chapter VII: Staged Shot, Part 2

### Summary

Chapter VII continues the staged-shot argument. Most striking was that the shot had missed. But if the shot was staged, the miss would be expected, as happened. The chapter explores the questionable plausibility of a shooter missing a target seated at a desk in a lighted window at only 35–40 yards with a scoped rifle. General Walker gave contradictory explanations for his extraordinary good fortune in surviving the shot virtually unscathed: that he had suddenly leaned forward for a tax form; that he had suddenly bent down to pick up a dropped pencil; or that the bullet grazed a window frame. The sudden-body-movement explanations were abandoned in favor of the window-frame deflection theory. It is suggested Surrey may have advised Walker to adopt the deflection narrative and even personally phoned a newspaper to correct Walker's initial and, it may be said, more skepticism-inducing sudden body-movement claims. In his Warren Commission testimony, despite having told many political allies of the sudden body movement, Walker testified under oath that he did not remember making any body movement at the moment of the shot.

The chapter examines Walker's oddly cavalier reaction to supposedly nearly being murdered. Rather than fear, Walker said he went out into his open back yard armed with his pistol looking for the shooter somewhere among the trees out there in the dark, ready for a shootout. His explanation to Detective Toney—that parachute training made him fearless of lone shooters—strains credulity. It is suggested Walker went outside not because of bravado but because there was no live shooter to fear, and the time spent doing so gave Surrey enough minutes to drive home before Walker called Surrey at home to report the shot.

The chapter reconstructs how the staged shot may have been done. Man No. 1 functioned as a signal relay mechanism that ensured Walker would not be hit. The car of man No. 1 with its engine running and headlights on was aimed toward the church building and served to blind any church people looking that way from easily observing movements of man No. 1 behind the car's headlights. The position where man No. 1 was standing at the moment of the shot was near the stockade fence where Kirk Coleman looked over seconds later, such that man No. 1 would have simultaneous line of sight to two men in the alley (Surrey and another, who ran with the rifle afterward), and Walker through his north-facing window behind the chair of Walker's desk. Man No. 1, with line of sight to both, was in a position to relay signals. When the men in the alley were ready

to fire, man No. 1 would signal Walker through the window. Walker would drop to the floor. The shooter—who may have been Surrey himself—would also confirm Walker was safely not in the line of fire, then fire through the window frame above the now-empty chair directly at where Walker's head had been. Walker would rise, self-inflict minor and virtually painless injuries on the back of a forearm, call the police, and report that a shot had been fired at him.

Small shell fragments from the shot were embedded in the back of one of Walker's forearms—injuries so minor that Walker seemed to take no notice of them until after the police arrived and bleeding on his arm was pointed out to him. These injuries can easily be understood as self-inflicted, consistent with staging an apparent narrow escape.

A discussion is taken up of Coleman's report that man No. 2 wore a dark long-sleeved shirt. News footage from later that evening shows Surrey at Walker's house talking to reporters wearing a light-colored short-sleeved shirt. It is concluded Surrey changed into black during his activity in the alley with the shot for better concealment at night, then changed out of black into the lighter-colored shirt before entering his house when he drove home. A parallel is suggested to the black clothing Oswald wears in the Backyard Photos, items of clothing which were never found among Oswald's belongings.

## Chapter VIII: Surrey's Pre-April 10 Two Suspicious Men

### Summary

Robert Surrey told police on the night of the shot that he had seen two suspicious men prowling at Walker's house four nights before. Surrey's accounts of this event changed across multiple tellings, with inconsistencies on the date, location of the parked car, and what the men did. Surrey initially told police on April 10 that on Saturday, April 6—when Walker was still on tour and not back to Dallas—he, Surrey, had gone to Walker's house late that night, no reason specified. As he arrived he saw a car with two unknown men who had also just arrived, parked behind Walker's house. Surrey said he watched as the men got out and walked around the Walker house. When they left, Surrey said he also left in his car and followed their car to try to get the license number, even though he told the FBI later he had seen the other car had no license plates before he drove after it to try to get the number.

The date Surrey told police on April 10 that this had happened—April 6—conflicted with Walker who on the same night, April 10, told reporters that the same event had happened Monday, April 8, after Walker had returned to Dallas that day. When Surrey testified to the FBI and Warren Commission fourteen months later, he quietly abandoned his Saturday April 6 date and without explanation now testified in agreement with Walker's Monday April 8.

The location of the men's car also changed across tellings: originally parked behind Walker's house (April 10 report), then in the alley not on Walker's property (April 11 report), and finally—only in a 1964 FBI interview—parked on Avondale Street, not adjoining or in sight of the Walker property at all and thereby removing reason for Surrey's claimed original suspicion in the first place. Above all, in all of his tellings, Surrey never explained why he—while also outside the house himself—would watch two men eying Walker's house for an extended period of time without taking the obvious action of asking the men what they wanted and who they were.

In his 1964 account to the FBI, Surrey for the first time claimed he had opened the passenger door of the men's car when it was parked on Avondale in order, he said, to inspect its glove compartment as part of his investigation. Surrey gave the FBI generic, nondescript physical descriptions of both men which were so non-specific they could describe millions of young men. Surrey told the FBI he would not be able to recognize either of the men if he saw them again and assured the FBI he had never seen them before.

It is argued Surrey's story is an alibi version of a planning meeting of Surrey with the two other men involved in carrying out the staged shot, in case the meeting had been seen and reported by witnesses. That explains why Surrey went there that night, why the two men would arrive in a separate car about the same time Surrey did, why they would all be in proximity around the outside of the Walker house on the property, and why they would then leave in separate cars at the same time, which to an external observer could look as if they were together. The three were meeting. Surrey crafted a narrative to explain what a witness could have seen of this, in which Surrey claimed he had no idea who the two men were who had arrived to the house the same time he arrived. It is even possible that, by the time of its investigation of the Walker shot, the FBI could have hinted to Surrey that they actually had such a witness without telling Surrey how much the witness had seen. Most pointedly, Surrey may have felt the need to provide a benign explanation of how he might have been seen getting into the passenger side of a strange parked car at night whose occupants were supposedly the prowlers Surrey had claimed he did not know.

General Walker's claim in his Warren Commission testimony in 1964 that he had made a separate police report of this earlier incident of the allegedly suspicious men, supposedly filed with the Dallas Police a day or two before the shot of April 10, 1963, was a claim not previously made or known to anyone before, and for which no Dallas Police record, paperwork, or police officer memory exists. That claim of Walker, sworn under oath, is examined and concluded to be entirely fictitious.

Surrey was not questioned by the Warren Commission about any of his contradictions in his tellings of the pre-April 10 "two suspicious men" story. It is not that Commission counsel Jenner, who did the questioning of Surrey, did not try. But when Commission counsel Jenner began to lay a foundation for pointed questioning of Surrey concerning the pre-April 10 two suspicious men, Jenner was literally interrupted by Commission Chair Earl Warren personally. Warren, in front of the witness, objected to Jenner that he was going too far afield in his questioning, informed Jenner they were limited on time, and Jenner's intended questioning of Surrey never happened. It was an interruption of a Warren Commission counsel's questioning of a witness which appears unparalleled in the record.

## Chapter IX: Surrey's Accomplice in the Alley Identified

### Summary

Chapter IX makes the argument that Oswald was indeed present at the Walker shot, but as an accomplice in the staged event, not as a genuine would-be assassin. The evidence for Oswald's presence comes from Marina Oswald's accounts to the Secret Service and FBI after the Kennedy assassination, consistent with physical evidence (photos and a note).

Marina said Lee confessed to her that he had fired at Walker using his Mannlicher-Carcano rifle, had run from the alley after the shot on foot, hidden the rifle near some railroad tracks about a half mile south of Walker's house, and returned home by bus. She also said Lee had told her that on one prior occasion (she said "three days or more" before April 10), he had gone to the Walker house for the same purpose but found conditions not right and turned back, and that Lee cited forthcoming church activity as the reason he chose Wednesday, April 10.

Marina's account of Lee going to Walker's house on the prior occasion corresponds to Surrey's account of the two men at Walker's house before April 10. One of those two men told a version of that night—Oswald to Marina. The earlier event told by Surrey to the police and the earlier event told by Oswald to Marina are one and the same, simply told different ways. One of the supposedly suspicious two men had been Oswald, and they were meeting. The other man with Oswald, the driver, would be man No. 1.

On the night of the shot neither man No. 1 in the church parking lot, nor man No. 2—Surrey, who had just walked out of the alley into the church parking lot—had a rifle. This means there had to have been another man with Surrey in the alley, at the location from which the shot was fired, at the moment the shot was fired, who left with the rifle in a different direction after the shot was fired. That person in the alley with Surrey who left with the rifle is in agreement with what Oswald told Marina of his movements at the time of the shot.

The actual shot may have been fired by Surrey, not Oswald, in the interests of Walker's safety, after which Surrey could have handed the rifle to Oswald to run with it as they left in opposite directions from the alley.

## Chapter X: A Suppressed Avondale Witness

### Summary

A witness account which has been largely ignored by researchers places a running man heading south emerging from the alley behind Walker's house on the night of the shot. Shirley Stallard (correct spelling), in a 1978 FBI interview, relayed information she had received from her parents: Edgar and Ruby Boggs, who were live-in housekeepers at 4344 Avondale in 1963. This address was directly across from where the alley behind Walker's house meets Avondale. The Boggs, on the night of the shot, saw a man running out of that alley across Avondale continuing through the driveway of their house heading south. This aligns precisely with the FBI's reconstructed escape route for Oswald—south through the alley, across Avondale, then southeast through a wooded park area near Turtle Creek Boulevard to railroad tracks where Marina said Lee hid the rifle. Bugliosi erroneously claimed in his book that no one saw Oswald on the night of the shooting; the Stallard report contradicts this. The running figure seen by the Boggs corresponds to Oswald telling Marina he fled the scene with the rifle after the shot.

With this in mind, this chapter examines a puzzling reference in a December 7, 1963 FBI cover memo by Dallas agent Vincent Drain accompanying Walker case documents being forwarded to headquarters, which refers to a witness who saw “two men in an automobile about 30 minutes prior to the time of the shooting some distance away from General Walker's house.” This does not match any document among the ones Drain forwarded or any other known Dallas Police document or FBI report. It is concluded the Drain note indeed appears to reference a now-missing, now-disappeared witness interview—likely an Avondale Street witness who saw a parked car with two men (Oswald and man No. 1, the driver) on Avondale approximately 30 minutes before the shot. It is suggested Surrey may have later changed his pre-April 10 “two suspicious men” story to relocate the car of the alleged two suspicious men to Avondale (in his 1964 FBI interview) partly to cover for and absorb the description in this witness report.

The identity of this inferred Avondale witness of the Drain note may or may not have been one of the Boggs. If it was one of the Boggs, a possible contributing reason for the suppression ironically could have been unrelated to the Walker shot, but rather with the fact that the homeowner for whom the Boggs were live-in caretakers was a very close friend of Jack Ruby and also knew David Ferrie of New Orleans. (The study finds no connection between that homeowner and General Walker, despite their homes being located near one another.)

## Chapter XI: Identification of Man No. 1

### Summary

This chapter proposes an identification of man No. 1—the young, thin man Coleman saw hurrying to a running car with headlights already on, moments after the Walker shot.

The chapter notes that the FBI stated it was “only logical” that the two men seen by Kirk Coleman were either accomplices, witnesses, or Walker associates. No physical evidence, testimony, or investigative finding has ever been produced showing cause to exclude those two men as accomplices. (Marina’s testimony at best reflects her knowledge; it is not probative for Oswald.) The Warren Report never claimed the two men were not accomplices. Given this, the chapter wonders if anyone today would actually disagree, from an evidential point of view, with the FBI assessment that the two men seen by Coleman could have been accomplices.

Based on witness Kirk Coleman’s account, man No. 1 was in the church parking lot adjacent to Walker’s property at the moment of the shot, positioned near a fence with line of sight into the alley where Robert Surrey and Oswald carried out the shot. Man No. 1’s car was running with headlights aimed toward the church to obscure movement, while man No. 1, out of the car, was in a position to serve as a visual relay between Walker and the shooters. After the shot, man No. 1 drove out of the parking lot and may have attempted to find and rendezvous with Oswald but missed him, as partially witnessed by 12-year old David Surrey riding in his father’s car when his father drove back to Walker’s house after the phone call from Walker. David said he saw his father meet another car by the side of a road who spoke of having “missed him.” That other man may have been man No. 1, after he left the church parking lot and failed to find and assist Oswald fleeing on foot.

Therefore a profile of man No. 1: he is a car owner and driver, known to Surrey, likely known to General Walker, with knowledge of Oswald and the planned shot.

The lead toward the identification comes from a 1977 letter from *Dallas Morning News* reporter Earl Golz to General Walker, in which Golz wrote that a source—identified as an unnamed friend of Larrie Schmidt—had told Golz that “Larry Schmidt and his brother, who he says was then associated with you, had accompanied Oswald in the brother’s car to the scene of the shooting.”

Larrie Schmidt was a young, then-26-years-old, very ambitious Dallas political activist in conservative circles, an Ayn Rand aficionado with a flair for the dramatic (a staged Walker shot being just the kind of drama Larrie Schmidt would have found appealing).

He knew Robert Surrey. Larrie's older half-brother Robert "Bob" Schmidt was employed by General Walker as a driver and all-purpose helper in 1963, a connection Larrie had arranged through Surrey.

The chapter cross-references this with a record of an earlier 1967 anonymous phone call from Dallas to New Orleans Police Detective Charles Jonau. The caller had named Bob Schmidt as having been employed by Walker but fired after the shot fired at Walker, with the implication that Bob Schmidt may have had something to do with the shot.

Golz did not name his source, the friend of Larrie Schmidt, in Golz's 1977 letter to Walker. But a Dallas businessman and socialite, Bradford Angers, told writer Dick Russell in 1992 that an unnamed young man identifiable from description as Larrie Schmidt had told him, Angers, at an early stage that he and that man's brother, identifiable as Bob Schmidt, had been involved with Oswald in the Walker shot. Therefore Golz's source in 1977 sounds a lot like Bradford Angers.

Bob Schmidt's age (28 in 1963) and appearance roughly match Coleman's description of man No. 1 (described as about 19–20 years old, though Coleman's estimate of age of the thin, long-haired man No. 1 may have been off). Notably, a curious descriptive detail of Coleman, in which he said man No. 1 had a "thin face", is consistent with the only known photograph of Bob Schmidt, a high school yearbook photo from Lincoln, Nebraska in which Bob Schmidt's strikingly long, narrow face stands out among the photos of his classmates. The specificity of this detail is cited as confirmation of the identification: man No. 1 was Bob Schmidt.

Bob Schmidt died in 1981 at age forty-seven and was buried in Lincoln, Nebraska, never having been interviewed by a law enforcement investigator, private researcher, or anyone. He left behind no known wife, children, or friends. Not even any employment history is known for him apart from military service and his employment with General Walker in 1963.

Golz told Walker his source claimed Larrie Schmidt had hidden evidence of his and his brother's involvement with Oswald in the Walker shooting in safety deposit boxes nationwide. Whether read as self-protection or an intended message of blackmail, this information makes no sense as a threat of release if the shot had been a genuine assassination attempt, since as the story stands, the only people such a released confession would incriminate would be Larrie Schmidt himself and his brother. It only makes sense with the shot understood as staged. The threat was exposure of Walker's complicity in orchestrating with his own people the fraudulent claim of an attempt on his life.

General Walker's response to the 1977 inquiry from journalist Golz informing Walker that a source was claiming Walker's former employee Bob Schmidt was involved in the

shot is curious. Walker's handwritten reply to Golz commented on other matters with, oddly, no comment on the report of the Schmidt brothers' involvement in the shot on him. Walker made no known attempt to obtain further information from Golz, to seek to learn the source's identity from Golz, or to make contact with the source through Golz. Walker never forwarded the tip to the police, the FBI, or the House Select Committee on Assassinations. He never commissioned a private investigation to follow up on that lead. He never is known to have spoken of that tip to associates or political allies.

Similarly, Walker never made the slightest known attempt to contact or speak to Kirk Coleman, the eyewitness who saw two men leaving the scene of the shot fired at Walker, moments after the shot. Despite Walker publicly complaining that his legal counsel's access to Coleman was being blocked, when Walker's counsel was asked by the Warren Commission directly, the counsel said no attempt had been made to contact Coleman. Walker's pattern of inaction concerning investigation of information that the shot may have been carried out by his people has the appearance not of negligence but intention, because Walker already knew who the men were whom Coleman had witnessed and needed no investigative assistance to know that—Robert Surrey being one of them—and that was not something Walker wanted to become known. Pursuing either lead (what Coleman witnessed the night of the shot; Golz's later information coming from Larrie Schmidt) risked exposing the truth. Walker's surprising lack of further curiosity (if he was truly the victim of an unsolved assassination attempt), far from being puzzling, becomes understandable in light of the staged shot.

## Chapter XII: Blackmail

### Summary

Going back a little earlier, in December 1969 General Walker wrote to his supporters describing a blackmail attempt by a man who introduced himself to Walker as Bradford Angers—a Dallas public relations man. As Walker told it, Angers had demanded a \$10,000 donation (equivalent of about \$100,000 today) from Walker to support distribution in South America of a book Angers claimed he had co-authored with former Dallas Police Chief Jesse Curry about the JFK assassination. Angers twice pointedly mentioned “we have your police file at Chief Curry’s house”, and bluntly implied that the “open case” of the April 10, 1963 shot could be closed in a way that either impugned or spared Walker’s reputation, depending on Walker’s generosity to the worthy cause of the book distribution in South America.

This claimed blackmail attempt makes no sense if Walker had been an innocent target of an assassination attempt. It becomes explicable if the shot had been staged. A genuine victim cannot be blackmailed over having been shot at.

A five-year statute of limitations for federal false-statement charges relevant to Walker’s Warren Commission testimony expired July 23, 1969. Angers may have done the blackmail attempt before that date. The only date given by Walker for the blackmail attempt was some time in calendar year 1969. Walker claimed he had refused to pay on principle, but it could also be he lacked the means to pay the sum Angers demanded. When the deadline passed, Angers held off on releasing whatever he had. Angers may have calculated that exposure of Walker without payment would eliminate any future leverage, and that a future approach at a different price-point might get better results.

The chapter reconstructs the information pathway. Angers’ source of information concerning the Walker shot was later identified by Angers as Larrie Schmidt. Angers was a friend and benefactor of Larrie Schmidt in late 1963 and early 1964. Larrie Schmidt would know about the staged shot through his brother Bob or from Robert Surrey or both. Larrie Schmidt told Angers, and Angers, motivated by financial opportunism, attempted to leverage that knowledge. (Note: former Dallas police chief Curry in all likelihood knew nothing of Angers’ use of his name. Curry’s 1969 book contains no mention of any role of Angers in its production.)

Twenty-three years later, Angers resurfaced in best-selling author Dick Russell’s 1992 book, *The Man Who Knew Too Much*, offering a bizarre version of the Walker shooting.

In this telling, Oswald is egged on by both Schmidt brothers, and supposedly after an evening of drinking, they all three decide a logical thing to do is to shoot Walker, for the stated reason that Walker was “a son of a bitch” (nothing more specific). Oswald, convinced by the other two, volunteers his rifle to do so. Gus Russo for PBS/*Frontline* interviewed Angers in 1993 and obtained a slightly different or clarified version, in which the drunken car ride of the three men was an earlier occasion, and the actual shot was carried out later only by Bob Schmidt and Oswald.

The 1992 account of the shot contradicts the evidence on many basic points such as from which side of the house the shot entered and from where it was fired. Robert Surrey is entirely absent from Angers’ account. The shot is considered a real assassination attempt, Walker remains an innocent victim, and no staging is suggested. The portrayal of Larrie Schmidt as a reckless participant in a drunken murder attempt is especially implausible: Larrie was disciplined, ambitious, and politically calculating. He expressed respect for Walker as a conservative patriot and was on friendly terms with Surrey, Walker’s right-hand aide. The notion that Larrie Schmidt would casually join an impulsive murder attempt of a public figure after a few drinks, and then freely confess his role and that of his brother, can be dismissed. But viewing it as the three men planning a staged shot is a different matter and the plausibility objection is gone. The story could be a version of Oswald’s recruitment by Walker’s people into the staged shot.

It is argued that the story Angers told in 1992, learned from Larrie in 1964 (Angers claimed he had a tape), reflects Larrie’s information of an earlier planning session—before April 10, 1963—when he, Bob, and Oswald drove together, discussed the upcoming staged shot, and scouted logistics including a pre-positioned rifle near a stone bridge over Turtle Creek, a half mile south of Walker’s house. The plan, as Larrie described it to Angers, involved a front-of-house approach by Bob and Oswald in the woods on the other side of Turtle Creek Boulevard, a shot at Walker visible through his picture window facing Turtle Creek Boulevard, and escape by car. By design the shot would not hit Walker but would miss, to be explained as the shooter mistook a shadow on a wall for a standing Walker and scored a direct hit on the shadow, with Walker unhurt. It was an earlier plan for a staged shot that was carried out differently in the real event, by two of the same three young men.

It is concluded that the published 1992 Angers account in the Dick Russell book represents a successful culmination of the 1969 blackmail effort, in which Angers publicly told a Walker-friendly version of the story likely in exchange for some unknown *quid pro quo* from Walker. The irony is rich—the same man who threatened Walker in 1969 with blackmail for a huge sum of money became, by 1992, the public vehicle of a

version of the blackmailable narrative told in a form that was favorable to and protected Walker.

Dick Russell was astonished when he asked Walker in 1992 for comment on the Angers story. Walker replied that he had already been told the Schmidt brothers had been involved with Oswald in the shot and considered it “rather natural to suspect”—a stunning admission given that neither Schmidt brother had ever been previously named as a suspect by any investigation or previously mentioned by Walker. It is suggested that this response of Walker, combined with Walker’s failure to pursue or report the lead despite receiving it at least twice, in 1977 and 1992, is explained by Walker’s complicity in the staging of the shooting. Walker died in 1993, one year after the Angers story’s publication by Dick Russell.

An unprompted parting remark of Larrie Schmidt to a researcher in 2012 that he “suspected” Walker had staged the 1963 shot is suggested to represent perhaps not suspicion but knowledge, possibly the content of the “scoop of a lifetime” he had originally promised that researcher but then had withheld.

The question of a role of Larrie Schmidt in the planning and design of the staged shot, not simply access to knowledge thereof, is examined. Larrie Schmidt by profession was a publicist and political operative, with a flair for spectacular political theater. In October 1963 he was one of the organizers of the conservative protesters that disrupted Adlai Stevenson’s Dallas appearance making national news. The following month Larrie Schmidt was the driving force behind the inflammatory black-bordered advertisement accusing President Kennedy of treason, published in the *Dallas Morning News* on the morning of November 22. A staged shot generating public sympathy for conservative national figure General Walker would be consistent with Larrie’s methods and ambitions.

The financial and relational context reinforces the case. Larrie’s 1963 letters reveal a persistent need for money for his group of discharged veterans, including coming up with get-rich-quick schemes of questionable legality. Larrie was simultaneously a friend of Surrey and protectively attentive to his less-ambitious brother Bob, whom he actively sought to place in paying situations. The convergence of these factors gives a context in which Larrie could have contributed to the idea of the staged shot as a publicity stunt for Walker. He appears to have played no role in carrying out the staged shot in the actual event.

Larrie Schmidt died in January 2022, in Lincoln, Nebraska, at age eighty-five. To the end of his life he denied the Angers story published by Dick Russell was true (but took

no legal action and is not known to have objected to Angers). He denied that he or his brother had ever met Oswald, and took whatever secrets he might have known to the contrary to the grave. Gayle Nix Jackson, who corresponded with Larrie in his later years, found him a charming and sweet man, yet at the same time suspected he had been conning her all along with some of his denials.

## Chapter XIII: Did the FBI Know?

### Summary

Chapter XIII examines information suggesting the Dallas FBI office may have possessed knowledge of the staged Walker shot. Gus Russo, in *Live by the Sword* (1998), reported that in an early-1990s PBS/*Frontline* interview, Dallas FBI agent James Hosty “suspects the shooting might have been an inside job ... suggests the shooting was arranged by Walker himself as a publicity stunt.” Hosty was uniquely positioned to speak: he had been the lead Dallas FBI agent on both the General Walker case (related to the 1962 Oxford, Mississippi charges) and the Lee and Marina Oswald files.

The chapter reconstructs how the Dallas office of the FBI might have learned the truth. The key conduit would likely be Larrie Schmidt—brother of Bob Schmidt (man No. 1) and friend of Robert Surrey (man No. 2). In late Nov-Dec 1963 or Jan 1964, either Larrie told ATF agent Frank Ellsworth (who was an FBI confidential informant) who told the FBI, or Larrie’s friend Bradford Angers told the FBI as part of what Angers said was an FBI interview of Angers about Schmidt’s role in the black-bordered anti-JFK newspaper ad (there is no known FBI record of that interview of Angers). Either pathway could bring information concerning the staged shot inside the Dallas FBI office by the time it began conducting its investigation of the Walker case for the Warren Commission.

According to the 1992 story of Angers, H.L. Hunt, the wealthy oilman of Dallas, called Angers “several weeks after the assassination” and said, “I’m sending a guy over to you. I want you to put him to work.” That was Larrie Schmidt. Angers found him employment. Then, Angers said, he found Larrie Schmidt and his wife had been injured in what Schmidt told him had been a car accident, but which Angers implied was actually an assault in conjunction with what Larrie Schmidt said had been a warning he received from “the Secret Service” not to discuss the Kennedy assassination in connection with the H.L. Hunt family. Analysis of Angers’ account, however, shows it conflates three unrelated events: a car accident involving Larrie and Barbara Schmidt that did not occur in Denton County; an unrelated assault on an unknown couple in Denton County that had nothing to do with the Schmidts; and a visit to Larrie from federal agents. On the identity of the federal agents who visited Larrie, two possibilities are suggested. The simpler one is that “Secret Service” is a mistaken reference to a known interview by the FBI of Larrie Schmidt about the Hunt family’s funding of a controversial black-bordered advertisement.

The other possibility is that Larrie's visitor could have been an ATF agent (the agency that deals with alcohol, tobacco, and firearms)—perhaps ATF agent Frank Ellsworth—since ATF and Secret Service credentials (both Treasury Department) looked nearly identical in 1963, and Ellsworth said he likely would have said he was Secret Service if asked in November 1963.

Interestingly, there had been a secret, unreported meeting between ATF agent Ellsworth and Oswald at Dallas Police headquarters on November 22, 1963, the afternoon of Oswald's arrest, arranged by Captain Will Fritz, according to an interview of Ellsworth reported in *The Village Voice*, August 23, 1966. It could be speculated that Oswald said something about the Walker shot to Ellsworth in that meeting, and Ellsworth, prompted by something Oswald said, visited Schmidt to follow up or corroborate. This could account for Schmidt's reference to Angers of a "Secret Service" visit, and potentially how information about the staged Walker shot could have gotten to the FBI, since Ellsworth is known by 1964 to have functioned as a formal numbered FBI confidential informant, in addition to his ATF duties. Ellsworth's contact agent at the Dallas FBI office appears to have been Hosty, the same who three decades later told PBS/*Frontline* that he "suspected ... the shooting was arranged by Walker himself as a publicity stunt."

The report of the Dallas FBI office of its 1964 investigation of the Walker shot was delivered to the Warren Commission only sixty minutes (according to the FBI) or twenty minutes (according to Warren Commission counsel Jenner) before the Commission began its scheduled questioning of Robert Surrey. This did not allow time for that report to be read and proper questioning of Surrey to be developed from the report's contents. Perhaps, the chapter uncharitably suggests, that may have been the point.

The FBI's own non-incriminating conclusion of its investigation of the Walker shot ("did not establish" Oswald's guilt), in its own files but not disclosed to the Warren Commission, can be interpreted as institutional self-protection, in case the staged-shot truth were to emerge, without the FBI wishing to interfere with the Warren Commission's publicly pinning it on Oswald as attempted murder.

Following the Commission's finding that Oswald tried to murder General Walker, the FBI would cite and refer to the Warren Commission's conclusion (not the FBI's own conclusion). The FBI cited but would not put its own imprimatur on the Commission's conclusion. The evidence suggests that, at some level inside the FBI, the staged shot was known without being officially known (so to speak). But the narrative that Oswald tried to kill General Walker before he killed President Kennedy was a useful narrative. If the perception of guilt were lifted from Oswald on Walker, more people might question Oswald on JFK, a domino theory effect. Perhaps it seemed better to keep that first domino standing, to protect the second one, may have been the logic.

## Chapter XIV: Oswald, Surrey, and Practice Shooting

### Summary

Chapter XIV takes up the question of where Oswald went practice shooting before the Walker shot. Marina told investigators that Oswald went once or twice to practice shoot with the newly-acquired Mannlicher-Carcano before April 10. She said he went by bus, carrying the rifle in a raincoat, but never told her where and she never knew.

It is noted that Oswald's original mail order to Klein's of Chicago for the Mannlicher-Carcano did not include an order for ammunition, a rifle clip, or cleaning supplies, all of which were essential for the weapon to be used. Yet despite efforts the FBI could not find that Oswald had bought any of those items anywhere. The simplest explanation, it is suggested, is that Oswald did not buy those items anywhere but instead Surrey supplied these items to Oswald, and may have advised Oswald on the mail orders for firearms themselves. This would fit the profile of Walker's extremist circles: in 1962 an anonymous informant letter to the FBI noted that an unnamed subject associated with Walker had "ordered by mail numerous guns, rifles and averages buying one box of shells per month."

Oswald's photos of Walker's house (March 9–10); the mailing of the rifle order (March 12); the Backyard Photographs showing Oswald with the rifle (March 31); and his meetings with Surrey related to the shot (April 6–8 and April 10) are juxtaposed in a timeline suggesting coordination between all of those elements.

Two sons of Robert Surrey—David (age twelve at the time) and William (age ten at the time)—in their respective 2012 and 2013 videos told of their father taking men out to a wooded area in Richardson, Texas for practice shooting in the spring of 1963. The sons remembered the men shooting rifles including a 30.06 and a 30.30. William Surrey confirmed in his 2013 video that their father took him on approximately three such shooting outings. David told of one. William said his brother David was not present on any of his own shooting trips with their father, meaning the occasions were distinct. Their father would take only one young boy at a time to go shooting with the older men.

Accounting for the likelihood that a third Surrey son named Rick would also have been taken on similar outings, the total number of such practice shooting outings may have been perhaps perhaps five to seven, involving different men on different occasions.

David in his video claimed to remember that one of the men his father took shooting on the occasion when he was taken by his father was named "Lee". David said he believed that man had been Oswald. But when journalist Jefferson Morley asked William Surrey

in April 2023 about that, William expressed skepticism. William noted that David had never mentioned the Oswald claim to him in the past and suggested it may have been a false memory development of David, telling Morley “unfortunately, yes”, he thought David had made it up. The present study agrees with William that David’s identification claim can be given no positive weight. However, that only removes positive weight of that specific identification claim. Its rejection gives no actual information concerning the question of whether Oswald was or was not part of the men Robert Surrey took shooting, because it cannot. William, only ten years old in 1963, in his 2013 video said he could not identify or disidentify any of the men present on his three outings with his father. He said he could not remember who any of the men were on those occasions. He was therefore in no position to know Oswald’s presence was excluded even on his own occasions when he was present, let alone on David’s or any other at which he was not.

The central point is that Robert Surrey was regularly conducting practice shooting sessions with unidentified men at the same time Oswald was going somewhere to practice shoot. It follows from Oswald’s connection to Surrey in the Walker shot that Oswald could have been one of those men at some point. The argument does not require or assume more from either William or David from their long-ago memories than that their father was taking men shooting at the time Oswald was going somewhere to shoot.

It is suggested a further reflection of possible contact of Oswald with Robert Surrey may be seen in the names and contact information of two American Nazi Party leaders in Oswald’s address book: George Lincoln Rockwell of the American Nazi Party, and Robert Burros of New York.

Robert and Mary Surrey were closely connected to Rockwell. They helped establish a front organization in 1964 to funnel money to the American Nazi Party, and by 1965 Robert and Mary emerged as open regional leaders of the American Nazi Party, hosting meetings in their home. They hosted Rockwell in their home when he visited. It is possible the Surreys were closeted Nazis in 1963, though most who knew the Surreys at that time would not know that yet. Nazi decals bearing swastikas and the words “We are Back!” were plastered on Jewish-owned businesses in Dallas just four days after the Walker shot in April 1963. A witness’s physical description of the perpetrator seemed to roughly correspond with a physical description of Robert Surrey but that was not clear, and was too ambiguous for the police to go on. Associates of Surrey were arrested for identical acts in 1965.

Of interest is that Rockwell’s name is written in Oswald’s address book as “Lincoln Rockwell”. This was identified by author Jeffrey Caufield as being the familiar form used by Rockwell’s personal friends rather than his full public name, suggesting the name came to Oswald from someone who knew Rockwell personally. Surrey could fit that description in 1963.

Oswald had no ideological common ground with the American Nazis, making his possession of these contact details otherwise puzzling (there is no evidence Oswald ever had contact with either of the two names). It is suggested the most coherent explanation is what Michael Paine understood, that Oswald was engaged in undercover surveillance of right-wing extremist activity in Dallas.

## Chapter XV: Marina

### Summary

Chapter XV is analysis of Marina Oswald's testimony as it bears on the Walker shot. The chapter opens by acknowledging Marina's centrally problematic role: she was the primary witness to Oswald's alleged confession, and her account was foundational to the Warren Commission's finding on Oswald. Yet the House Select Committee on Assassinations found, as the earlier Warren Commission also knew, that Marina had given, as HSCA put it, "incomplete and inconsistent statements at various times."

It is argued that Marina was essentially truthful in retelling the basics of what Oswald told her concerning the shot at Walker—that Oswald had told her he had run from the alley on foot, hid the rifle, and came home late from that. This aligns with physical evidence. Photographs of Walker's house were found in Oswald's belongings. A handwritten "If I am arrested" note in Russian from Oswald which Marina said he had left for her the night of the shot, which Marina hid and kept, was found. What Marina said he told her is consistent with the Boggs' witness account of seeing a running man crossing Avondale headed south after the shot, and the FBI's reconstructed escape route. It is concluded that Marina did not fabricate what Lee told her of the core narrative.

However, the chapter argues Oswald did not tell Marina the full truth about the shot. A number of facts support this. Oswald told Marina he did not know if he had hit Walker but he would have known Walker was never in the gunsights since the shot was staged. Lee would have listened to the radio that night and gone out to buy newspapers the next morning to read the reporting as Marina said, but it would not have been to find out whether the shot had hit Walker, no matter what Lee told Marina.

Oswald told Marina he had gone alone on a prior occasion (concealing the pre-shot planning meeting with Surrey). Marina's account has Lee telling her a random bus passenger's conversation was how he learned about the church schedule (an obviously implausible claim, the real source being Surrey at their planning meeting). Most important of all, Oswald did not tell Marina the shot had been staged, and was not a real attempt to kill General Walker.

The chapter notes Marina's account of Oswald's reaction after the shot: he roared with laughter at newspaper reporting that the police were "chasing a car" while he escaped on foot, and laughed at their misidentification of the caliber of the bullet. It is argued this response—pride and hilarity at a "successful escape" from a supposedly serious

assassination attempt—is incoherent as a response to having failed to kill someone you believed was a contemporary Hitler. But it is coherent as a response to a successful prank. From the chapter:

*Did the German officers who, at great personal risk to themselves and their families, were part of the failed conspiracy to kill the real Adolf Hitler of July 1944, “roar with laughter,” proud of getting away without being caught, after learning Hitler had survived and would be coming after them? Just a barrel of laughs and fun, how they got away with failing to kill Hitler without being caught, wasn’t it! Just a real knee slapper there! ...*

*No, even for any who escaped safely, the failure of that attempt, Hitler’s survival, from the point of view of the plotters, was a terrible disaster, no laughing matter. What about failure in a serious attempt of Oswald to kill Walker would there be for Oswald to be, as Marina put it, “pleased with”? The notion that Oswald would be “proud of his escape,” pleased that he “got away with it,” like getting away with a schoolboy prank, is the false note.*

*But once the Walker shot is correctly understood as having been staged, the humor and mockery of the police falls into place, no longer incongruous but natural. It was a prank, and it came off successfully. In this light, what Marina said about Lee being in stitches of laughter over his successful getaway, after the shot that missed, now makes sense.*

## Chapter XVI: Did Oswald Want to be Arrested?

### Summary

This chapter proposes what at first sounds deeply counterintuitive: that Oswald, following the staged shot of April 10, sought to provoke his own arrest for the shot, an arrest which would be presented as a communist activist who had tried to murder the nation's most visible anti-communist.

The argument that Oswald wanted to be arrested begins with his immediate confession to Marina the night of the shooting. Returning home late, he told Marina openly and immediately that he had just taken a shot at General Walker. Marina was horrified: she had objected to the gun in their home, they were fighting over many things, it was a marriage on the rocks, and Marina knew what Lee had just told her was wrong to do, beyond the pale. To say Oswald could anticipate a hostile reception to telling that information is putting it mildly yet he did so. If Oswald was trying to get her to turn him in he could hardly have done so more effectively short of asking her directly—but if he did that she could tell the police he had asked her which would destroy the subterfuge.

In addition to the seemingly irrational confession to Marina, Oswald had created a notebook containing meticulous documentation of his role in the shot. According to Marina, Oswald's notebook had maps, bus schedules, photographs of Walker's house, and photographs of the spot near Turtle Creek where the rifle was hidden, which would have enabled police to find the rifle *in situ*, all helpfully left at the apartment for police to find. Marina, afraid the police could be showing up at any minute, could not understand why Oswald did not hide or destroy those incriminating materials. Warren Commission counsel Liebeler noted all that documentation Oswald had in their apartment waiting to be found and asked Marina directly: did she think Oswald had wanted to be caught? Her response was "maybe yes and maybe no. I couldn't read his mind." Marina's guesses why Oswald had created all that documentation—"he may have wished to appear such a brave man," "perhaps so he would know what to do when the time came"—come across as clueless, reflecting she had no idea why.

But Marina did not turn him in by confiding in someone who would do that. She had friends and support in the Russian exile community who would have helped her if she had told, but as she later explained, out of fear and dependency upon Oswald as her husband to remain in America, she did not do so. Distraught as she was, Marina did the next best thing: she made Oswald promise he would not shoot at any more people and warned him if he did she would report him to the police, hoping that would deter it from happening again.

A sequence of further attempts can be traced after Marina's initial failure to report the first-night confession. George de Mohrenschildt—Oswald's mentor and likely witting to Oswald's infiltration of Walker people and the staged shot—confided to the Russian émigré couple Igor and Natasha Voshinin within days that Oswald had fired the shot. One possibility is that could be de Mohrenschildt attempting to assist Oswald in bringing about the desired arrest. But Mrs. Voshinin told that information to the FBI rather than the Dallas Police, the FBI did not forward the information to the police, and no arrest followed.

The "Nixon incident" of April 21, 1963 is the next case study, which has long been a puzzle to investigators but which becomes sensible as a further attempt of Oswald to provoke Marina into turning him in. Marina, after the Walker shot, had told Lee an ultimatum: if Oswald ever shot at any more people, she promised him she would go to the police and tell on him about the Walker shot too. Only eleven days later, in the most flagrant and brazen breach in the face of Marina's threat and promise, Oswald dressed formally, let Marina see him arming himself with his pistol, and ominously told Marina he was going out to "take a look" at Richard Nixon, the former vice president, whose name had appeared that morning in a headline on the front page of a Dallas newspaper in connection with Cuba policy. Nixon was not in Dallas but Marina would not know that if Oswald showed her the headline and said Nixon was in town and that is where he, Lee, with a loaded gun, was now headed. Marina was terrified Oswald was going to shoot Nixon, and told investigators she had physically prevented him from leaving the apartment.

The Warren Commission dismissed Marina's account of the "Nixon episode", implying that Marina had fabricated it—very different from the Commission's acceptance of Marina's account of the Walker shot, which was the basis for the Commission's conclusion that Oswald had attempted to assassinate General Walker—on the grounds that Nixon's absence from Dallas made the story implausible, and doubts that the smaller, pregnant Marina could have restrained the physically stronger Oswald as she claimed she had.

But the Commission erred in dismissing Marina's claim that it happened, once the incident is understood. Marina's account has been consistent across decades that the incident happened, even though she never claimed to understand it. Notably, as Marina told it, Oswald did not seriously resist Marina's distraught prevention of him from leaving the apartment out of fear he was going to make a second murder attempt of a public figure. She told how she lured him into their bathroom, closed the door on him, blocked him from getting out, made him remove his clothing, hand her the pistol, and then kept him there for three hours reading a book in the bathroom without his clothes on before letting him out. The Commission was skeptical since Oswald could certainly have prevailed over the weaker and pregnant Marina if he was truly serious about going

out. But that is the point—for Oswald it was not about going out, it never was about shooting at Nixon. It was about provoking Marina to turn him in. Oswald did his best to provoke that in the “Nixon incident” but still Marina did not turn him in, despite her express promise. What more could Oswald do?

Oswald left Dallas for New Orleans three days later on April 24, 1963, soon followed by Marina and their child to join him there. His New Orleans activities are argued to be in direct continuation from his activities in Dallas. In New Orleans he organized a Fair Play for Cuba Committee chapter making use of the alias “A.J. Hidell”—the same fictitious name he had used to mail-order the rifle of the Walker shot. It is argued this was deliberate: if Oswald’s role in the Walker shot had become known, the discovery that the rifle’s owner and the head of the FPCC chapter shared an identical name—were the same person—would have been sensational, linking the pro-Castro FPCC organization directly to a murder attempt on the life of America’s foremost anti-communist. When arrested in New Orleans after a street altercation, Oswald asked to speak to the FBI and told agent Quigley that “Hidell” was his FPCC superior in New Orleans, which may have been in hope that the FBI would correlate the names across the two cities in their records and make the connection. But the FBI either missed that connection or suppressed it. Oswald returned to Dallas in October 1963, and as late as the morning of November 22, the connection of the Walker shot to the New Orleans FPCC name “Hidell” still had not been made.

Post-assassination examination of Oswald’s finances was exhaustive and no large sum of unexplained income was found, establishing that Oswald never was paid for the Walker staged shot. It is reconstructed that a payment from Walker’s people would be expected to have been promised but may have been contingent on Oswald’s public exposure with his communist *persona* as the identification of the would-be assassin of Walker. Yet Oswald’s role in having carried out the alleged assassination attempt on Walker still had not become public by the time of the Kennedy assassination of Nov 22. His death two days after Kennedy’s assassination foreclosed any further possibility.

A German newspaper, *Deutsche Nationalzeitung*, a far-right publication with ties to Walker’s circles, in its edition dated November 29, 1963 but which the FBI determined had gone to press on November 25-26, contained a story identifying Oswald as Walker’s shooter. This predated by more than a week the discovery of the “Walker Note” (the “If I am arrested” note) and Marina’s disclosure on December 3 of Oswald’s confession to her, which was said to have been when the Secret Service and FBI first learned of Oswald’s role in the Walker shot. How could a newspaper in Germany have known of Oswald’s involvement a week earlier, before American law enforcement?

An FBI investigation traced the German story to a telephone interview Walker had given to the German newspaper’s reporter Helmut Muench on the weekend of the

assassination, which the newspaper's editor, Gerhard Frey, then shaped into published form. The German newspaper's story also included a fabricated claim that Oswald had been secretly arrested on the night of the shot by the Dallas police but released on secret orders from Attorney General Robert Kennedy. A story was being planted that Robert Kennedy had intervened to have released the man who months later would kill his brother the president. In this sinister tale, the grieving Robert Kennedy of that weekend was being cast as responsible for his brother's assassination. These details could have originated from either Walker or Surrey. It was a storyline (the claimed secret intervention of Robert Kennedy to have Oswald released on the night of the shot) that aligned with Walker's distaste for the Kennedys, which Walker latched onto, embraced, and retold for the rest of his life. Its publication before Marina's disclosure suggests someone in Walker's circle was the source for the German newspaper, possibly a contact with editor Frey before Frey had his reporter reach out to Walker by phone for the phone interview. For Walker and Surrey, Oswald's role would never have been an actual mystery because they had organized it themselves.

The chapter also examines an 8mm home movie filmed in the summer of 1963 by John T. Martin, a politically active high school student from St. Paul, Minnesota, and at the time a dues-paying member of the Minutemen, a militant right-wing organization supportive of General Walker. During what was described as a family vacation to Texas and Louisiana, Martin filmed a closeup of the bullet hole in General Walker's window sill—of the April 1963 shooting that was officially unsolved and not yet publicly linked to Oswald—before the family traveled next to New Orleans. There, in what is presented as a chance encounter, Martin filmed Lee Harvey Oswald being arrested during a street altercation on Canal Street over his distribution of pro-Castro literature.

After the Kennedy assassination when news accounts of Oswald's background became known, Martin said he realized one of the men he filmed might have been Lee Harvey Oswald. Martin called the FBI office in Minneapolis and agents borrowed his film in late December 1963. The FBI returned the film to Martin on January 28, 1964. In a report not published by the Warren Commission, the New Orleans FBI office concluded, "The film obtained by Minneapolis from John Martin was viewed at the New Orleans Office and was found to contain nothing of value to this case." Years later, Martin, who reportedly had renounced his earlier right-wing political activity and become a pacifist, donated the film to the Sixth Floor Museum in Dallas under the condition that he never be contacted again.

Two competing interpretations of the film are considered. The first, represented by Texas researcher Steve Roe, holds that the film is what it appears to be: a routine family vacation movie whose juxtaposition of a closeup of the bullet fired into Walker's house and filming of Oswald's New Orleans arrest in real time is the kind of freak coincidence that occurs in ordinary life. The second interpretation is that someone in Walker's circle

who had knowledge of Oswald's role in the shot, had knowledge of Oswald's planned distribution of pro-Castro literature in New Orleans and wanted it filmed, perhaps in the service of an anticipated forthcoming public linkage between Oswald of FPCC New Orleans and the alleged attempt to assassinate General Walker. Which of these two interpretations is correct is not clear.

## Chapter XVII: De Mohrenschildt's Final Secret

### Summary

George de Mohrenschildt of Dallas was a White Russian émigré with connections to high society, the oil industry, and intelligence agencies. He befriended Oswald and his wife Marina in 1962 following Oswald's return from the Soviet Union and became the most consequential American figure in Oswald's life, a mentor and confidant. The relationship spanned about two-thirds of a year before de Mohrenschildt and his wife Jeanne left Dallas for Haiti in the spring of 1963.

De Mohrenschildt told writer Edward Jay Epstein that he had befriended the Oswalds in mid-1962 not by chance but at the encouragement of J. Walton Moore, head of the CIA's Dallas Domestic Contacts Division. De Mohrenschildt conducted what Epstein characterized as an "unwitting debriefing" of intelligence interest of the newly-returned Oswald from the Soviet Union. In return for his long-time assistance to the CIA, de Mohrenschildt told Epstein as *quid pro quo* he would benefit from U.S. government assistance with overseas business contracts, including a lucrative Haitian government deal finalized in mid-March 1963.

On March 29, 1977, the same day he died by suicide, de Mohrenschildt gave his last interview to Epstein, in which he made a series of revelations. He said he had told the CIA about Oswald's involvement in the Walker shot both before and after it occurred, disclosures that he said had "ruined" him. He corrected an earlier account of how he came to possess his copy of one of the Backyard Photographs of Oswald dressed in black, with Oswald holding his rifle in one hand and Communist newspapers in the other. The photo bore a dedication on the reverse from Oswald to his friend de Mohrenschildt dated April 5, 1963. Another person's hand had added in Russian: "Hunter of Fascists, Ha-Ha-Ha." De Mohrenschildt now told Epstein that Marina had given that photo to him in April 1963, not that he and his wife Jeanne only first discovered it in their possessions after their return from Haiti in 1966 as he had previously claimed. Marina's HSCA testimony corroborated the April 1963 timeline of de Mohrenschildt's correction.

Russian émigré Natasha Voshinin stated in 1992 that de Mohrenschildt had visited her and her husband shortly after the April 1963 shot and told them Oswald had fired the shot, and that she had immediately relayed that to the FBI. Yet no FBI record of such contact survives, and no investigation of Oswald followed.

In a 2003 interview reported by Nancy Wertz Weiford in *The Faux Baron: George de Mohrenschildt* (2013), on November 23, 1963, a visiting University of Texas graduate

student, Alston Boyd, said that in Haiti, on the day after the Kennedy assassination, de Mohrenschildt had told him that Oswald had bragged about taking a shot at General Walker that had missed. That is what Marina also said, that Oswald had bragged to her about taking the shot at Walker that missed. But it only makes sense to brag about missing if the shot was not intended to kill. A missed shot in a true assassination attempt would not be something to brag about.

When Oswald was arrested after President Kennedy's assassination, de Mohrenschildt knew Oswald better than almost anyone, and he did not believe Oswald had killed Kennedy. Yet in his 1964 testimony before the Warren Commission, de Mohrenschildt did not speak up in Oswald's defense but had gone along with the prevailing winds. De Mohrenschildt came to regard this failing with self-loathing, that he had not stood up and been a man, defended Oswald in the face of the Warren Commission and the world.

In "I am a Patsy!", a manuscript he wrote in the late 1960s and early 1970s intended for publication as a book, de Mohrenschildt made a robust and impassioned rehabilitation of Oswald's character and argument for Oswald's innocence on the Kennedy assassination. De Mohrenschildt described an Oswald very different from the unstable, violence-prone loner depicted in the Warren Report. De Mohrenschildt's Oswald was intelligent, idealistic, cared about racial injustice, and deeply unlikely to have murdered a president he only admired. De Mohrenschildt's central argumentative point was straightforward: if Oswald had shot Kennedy, the Oswald he knew would have said so. The Oswald he knew would not have denied it through twelve hours of interrogation.

The manuscript, however, was not fully candid. De Mohrenschildt claimed in it that he and Jeanne had been unaware of the Backyard Photo in their belongings until after their return from Haiti in 1966. That claim was false. And de Mohrenschildt similarly denied any knowledge of Oswald's involvement in the April 1963 shot at Walker, which has the appearance of being no less false. The manuscript represented an attempt of de Mohrenschildt at atonement in his defense of the dead Oswald, but still concealed the extent of what de Mohrenschildt knew about Oswald's activities.

De Mohrenschildt's psychological unraveling began in mid-1976. Receiving medical injection treatments for severe respiratory illness—likely corticosteroids, which carry known risks of depression and psychotic episodes, especially at higher doses—he began a rapid mental deterioration marked by delusions, paranoia, depression, and reported suicide attempts. Whether this deterioration was accidental and unavoidable or involved medical malpractice or foul play, who knows for sure. In late 1976 his wife Jeanne had him involuntarily committed to the psychiatric unit of Parkland Hospital in Dallas, where he spent seven weeks and received electroshock therapy. During this hospitalization, de Mohrenschildt reportedly made wild statements—including claiming he had been present on the parade route in Dallas during the Kennedy assassination,

when in fact he had been in Haiti—that fall within the pattern of false confessions. A fellow patient, described as a young laborer, later recounted de Mohrenschildt's ravings to a tabloid.

Upon his release from Parkland at the end of December 1976, de Mohrenschildt resumed teaching at Bishop College in Dallas. In March 1977, Dutch journalist and longtime friend Willem Oltmans visited him. In the Bishop College library, de Mohrenschildt now told Oltmans that he felt “responsible” for the assassination, said he had directed Oswald, and asked Oltmans what would happen to him if he admitted as much. For years Oltmans had been influenced by a quack clairvoyant in The Netherlands, Gerard Croiset, who had long pointed Oltmans toward de Mohrenschildt as a Kennedy assassination conspirator. Oltmans believed de Mohrenschildt's statement in the Bishop College library was not simply an expression of moral anguish or allegorical culpability, but a literal operational confession. To Oltmans, de Mohrenschildt was at long last finally admitting the truth that he had masterminded the assassination of President Kennedy.

Not to put too fine a point on it, that was batshit crazy. (De Mohrenschildt was in Haiti at the time.) Oltmans was hearing de Mohrenschildt's words through a pre-formed template, with de Mohrenschildt, weakened by illness, treatment, and psychological trauma, communicating with Oltmans in English, a non-native language for both. There was a secret burden carried by de Mohrenschildt, but it was not that he did the JFK assassination. The nature of de Mohrenschildt's actual secret, as Michael Rinella argued in the excellent critical edition of de Mohrenschildt's Oswald manuscript, *Lee Harvey Oswald as I Knew Him* (2014), had nothing to do with the assassination of President Kennedy, but had to do with the Walker shot seven months earlier. That was correct but Rinella did not go far enough. He could not, for Rinella labored under the mistaken belief that the shot of April 10, 1963 had been an actual attempt to kill General Walker.

Instead, the shot of April 10, 1963 was staged, and the shot appears to reflect an infiltration of Walker's circle by Oswald which would be expected to have involved government contacts. De Mohrenschildt, the closest person to Oswald and with intelligence contacts, was in an excellent position to have encouraged Oswald to pursue that infiltration.

What Oltmans heard as de Mohrenschildt's confession of responsibility for the assassination of President Kennedy is to be understood in this light. De Mohrenschildt had steered Oswald—the sincere, trusting young man who had so looked up to him—into a covert involvement that de Mohrenschildt could not control or predict, which ended in the horrible denouement of the assassination of the president in November and end of Oswald's life too. De Mohrenschildt was tormented inside. He not only had put Oswald on that path, but had failed to defend Oswald to the Warren Commission.

He had allowed Oswald's memory to be eviscerated before the world. In the cauldron of mental illness and electroshock, this became transmuted into conviction that he bore responsibility.

At the end, de Mohrenschildt seemed to be struggling with a decision to make a fuller disclosure of his still-untold secret, which likely dealt with his knowledge and role in giving encouragement to Oswald in the infiltration of Walker. But he feared ruin and disgrace if he did so. If he admitted he had encouraged Oswald with Walker on the path that led to JFK, he would be blamed for the assassination of JFK. He would not be taking Oswald *out* from the wolves but would be throwing himself *in* with Oswald with the wolves, if he admitted the truth. Oltmans detailed in his notes de Mohrenschildt's fears of how he would look to his daughter and brother and the effect it would have on them if he were to be turned into a spectacle and publicly pilloried. Oltmans mistakenly thought these reactions of de Mohrenschildt were because de Mohrenschildt actually orchestrated the JFK assassination. What Oltmans missed was that de Mohrenschildt's secret involved his knowledge and encouragement of Oswald with *Walker*, not the assassination of JFK.

After an abortive journey with Oltmans to Amsterdam, which he fled unexpectedly after several days, de Mohrenschildt traveled to Florida where his daughter was, and entered into a series of paid interviews with Epstein for *Reader's Digest*. The interviews began on March 28, 1977. On March 29, the second scheduled day with Epstein, having learned an hour earlier from his daughter that he had been found and faced subpoena from the new House Select Committee on Assassinations just beginning to ramp up its investigation, de Mohrenschildt ended his life with a self-inflicted shotgun blast, leaving behind no suicide note or goodbye. Whatever he might have revealed had he lived will never be known. But what de Mohrenschildt did leave was this, from "*I am a Patsy!*":

*"Walking among the poor and dispossessed of Latin America also opened our [George's and Jeanne's] eyes to the realities of human life. Before, like most people living in the United States, we were busy carrying on with business and hustling after success and pushed the existence of poverty and inequality from our minds. Perhaps for this reason I became receptive to some of Lee's ideas, listened to them, discussed them freely, and came to look at him as a friend, almost a son. Possibly I identified him with my lost son, unconsciously, of course, and as far as age is concerned he could have been my son ... I have been in the Social Register, played with the jet-set, knew innumerable rich people, such as the Bouvier family, including both parents and their daughters Jacqueline and Lee when they were young girls. All this foolish activity makes me disgusted with myself today. Now all this is a waste of time, meaningless, but ... to Lee, commiseration for the dejected came naturally ... through his inner nature he felt sympathy for socially marginalized people. He had remained the*

*same since his childhood, which made him such a beautiful and worthwhile person to me ...*

*“Lee without any doubt despised reactionary groups, the white supremacists and all the other so-called ‘hate groups’ and did not hide his feelings ... ‘Segregation in any form, racial, social or economic, is one of the most repulsive facts of American life,’ he told me. ‘I would be willing any time to fight these fascistic segregationists—and to die for my black brothers’ ...*

*“I can still hear his voice: clear, sincere, simple, without affectation ... his frequent outbursts of justifiable anger at the existing situation in this rotten world of ours, his deep concern for the starving and those poorer than himself, his worry and his pity for the racially segregated, and for any masses deprived of their just rights by clever manipulators. Of all the material I have gathered here the one point I would hope to make, more than any other, was that Lee was above all an anti-segregationist, opposed to anyone who chose to discriminate against minorities or anyone underprivileged ...”*

## Chapter XVIII: Oswald as Part of Government Infiltration of Domestic Right-Wing Extremist Activity

### Summary

Chapter XVIII suggests Oswald's involvement with Walker's people may have been part of government undercover activity targeting the far-right extremist network around General Walker. FBI documents showed Walker was the central figure around which secretive right-wing militia activity across the nation was organized, with kill lists of public figures and plans to foment violent civil unrest at the right time. There was strong incentive for the Justice Department under Robert Kennedy to infiltrate and expose and bring Walker down.

An FBI informant from late 1962 said this militia loyal to Walker encouraged one-third of its members to adopt "liberal personas" and infiltrate left-leaning groups for intelligence purposes. This provides a context for how a professed Marxist like Oswald could be accepted by Walker's right-hand man Surrey. Oswald's communist persona could be seen as a credential, not an obstacle, in some of these right-wing contexts.

The chapter notes published suggestions that Oswald's mail-order purchase of the Mannlicher-Carcano rifle under a false name may have been connected to Senator Thomas Dodd's 1963 congressional investigation of mail-order firearms. In his order of the Mannlicher-Carcano, Oswald had proven that a literally non-existent person ("Alek Hidell") could order and receive a lethal firearm, so lax was the existing system, no matter what the rules supposedly were. If Oswald had been apprehended after the Walker shot, the staged nature of the event could have been explained to judges and prosecutors, and Oswald could have testified about Walker's extremist network and vulnerabilities in the system of mail-order gun sales.

Michael Paine—the liberal Unitarian who was the separated husband of Ruth Paine (with whom Marina lived in late 1963) and who had a security clearance at Bell Helicopter—told a PBS/*Frontline* interviewer in 1993 that Oswald "described his activities as spying on them [right-wing groups]." A researcher, Vincent Salandria, reported that Paine told him in 1964 that Oswald would attend right-wing meetings and take careful notes, "apparently reporting on the right wing in Dallas." Paine even bizarrely criticized Oswald in his Warren Commission testimony for frivolously watching a football game on a Sunday afternoon, when he "should" have been attending right-wing political meetings! According to Marina, Oswald told her that Michael Paine knew he had shot at Walker, although Michael Paine denied that when asked by the Warren Commission.

## Chapter XIX: From the Walker Shot to the JFK Assassination

### Summary

Chapter XIX moves from the Walker case to the Kennedy assassination. It opens with a Marina Oswald exchange before the HSCA in which she is asked whether it is consistent that a man who always spoke of liking President Kennedy would have killed him, a question she finds impossible to reconcile.

The chapter follows Oswald's infiltration activities as they continued in New Orleans in the summer of 1963 after the move from Dallas. Oswald made contacts with both pro-Castro organizations (the Fair Play for Cuba Committee) and anti-Castro right-wing Cuban exiles such as Carlos Bringuier of the DRE (Directorio Revolucionario Estudiantil), presenting himself to the anti-Castro side as useful for guerrilla training and intelligence.

Oswald's public persona as a pro-Castro communist is interpreted skeptically as having the appearance of an operational cover, likely part of a U.S. intelligence effort to infiltrate and discredit the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In New Orleans, Oswald established a fictitious one-man chapter of the FPCC in defiance of the organization's national director, Vincent Lee, who had advised him not to open an office until a sufficient local membership could be organized. Oswald fabricated nonexistent members, officers, and an organizational infrastructure—without any authorization from the national organization or even information to the national organization that he had done so—then used that wholly fake chapter as a platform to present himself as a public spokesman for the national FPCC. Oswald sought and obtained media appearances on local radio and television, and damaged the FPCC by publicly associating it with Soviet communism and Oswald's defection.

These activities occurred at a precise time when the FBI, CIA, and Army Intelligence were all known to have been conducting operations to penetrate, discredit, and dismantle the FPCC. Former intelligence figures interviewed by author Anthony Summers stated that Oswald was known to have been connected with intelligence operations in New Orleans. The chapter draws parallels between Oswald's behavior and that of other operatives of the period: Jerry Milton Brooks, who infiltrated communist organizations on behalf of right-wing New Orleans investigator Guy Banister, and then the right-wing Minutemen on behalf of the government which came out later in court; John Glenn, who joined the FPCC, traveled to Cuba, and gave congressional testimony that damaged the FPCC; and the scheme of New Orleans anticommunist Ed Butler, who

debated Oswald on a radio program and testified before Congress about training “conflict managers”—individuals who would impersonate communists in order to infiltrate and destroy communist organizations, raising the question whether Oswald was one such Butler had in mind.

Particularly striking is Oswald’s written correspondence. While publicly denying in the radio debate that the FPCC had any connection to communism, Oswald (who never attended an American communist meeting or had an American communist friend in his life) wrote to the entire governing Central Committee of the Communist Party USA, addressing its leaders familiarly as “comrades,” claiming openly to them to have secretly used his FPCC chapter “to foster communist ideals,” and soliciting their written advice—which, had it been provided, would have created a paper trail linking the CPUSA’s leadership to FPCC activities. A similar entrapment strategy may have been underway by Oswald with the Socialist Workers Party.

This activity raises the question: what was Oswald’s true political orientation underneath the personas? From his private writings apart from the letters, and from those who knew him most closely—including Soviet-period friend Ernst Titovets, fellow Marine friend Nelson Delgado, and Dallas mentor George de Mohrenschildt—that question is answerable. From 1959 to 1963 Oswald’s true political orientation remained consistent and clear and may be identified as anti-authoritarian socialist shaped by the writings of George Orwell. Delgado recalled Oswald reading and discussing *Animal Farm* while in the Marines. Oswald’s private writings criticized the Communist Party USA as an apologist for Soviet authoritarianism and never said anything good about them. Oswald’s writings advocated a loose confederation of democratically self-governing local communities and worker-owned enterprises. He supported Kennedy on civil rights and desegregation, anticolonialism and moves toward ending the Cold War. Oswald’s writings contain no advocacy of political violence.

Canadian political scientist Gary O’Brien in *Oswald’s Politics* (2010) wrote of political scientists’ criticisms on methodological grounds of the kind of psychology-pathology interpretation dominant in the Warren Report’s discussions of Oswald. Ernst Titovets, one of Oswald’s long-term best friends when Oswald was in Minsk, then a medical student who became a doctor, in a 2010 book, *Oswald: Russian Episode*, rejected the Warren Commission’s psychological portrait of Oswald as a disturbed, alienated loner, written from input of doctors who had never met Oswald. Citing his professional credentials including coursework in psychiatry and speaking from personal knowledge, Titovets stated he recognized in Oswald none of the pathologies described in the Warren Report. The irony is the reason the Warren Commission went to poorly-supported psychology-pathology interpretations was because the Commission lacked a motive explanation on rational grounds for why Oswald would kill Kennedy. So the fallback: he

had psychological problems. Titovets, speaking as a medical professional with knowledge of the subject, said what the Warren Report said in those areas was not true.

A repeated claim of Michael Paine in his later years that Oswald had told him “change only comes through violence” is shown to be factually untrue, a case of manufactured memory. The claim is contradicted in Paine’s own 1964 Warren Commission testimony, in which Paine repeatedly stated Oswald never said any such thing, that Paine only thought that was what Oswald meant without saying so, but Paine is shown mistaken on that claim too. A parallel case of manufactured memory is seen in the case of German émigré Volkmar Schmidt who in a November 1963 post-assassination FBI interview described Oswald of a February 1963 dinner party discussion as having been “objective,” “articulate,” and not critical of Kennedy, but which by the time of a 1993 filmed interview had been transformed into a portrayal of Oswald of that encounter as having been obsessed with hatred of Kennedy, a description with no corroboration from either the earlier FBI interview or from any person who knew Oswald.

Though Oswald’s socialism was real, the chapter challenges the common assumption that Oswald was necessarily pro-Castro in the summer of 1963. The widely-held notion that Oswald was always pro-Castro is contradicted by Priscilla McMillan in *Marina and Lee* (1977), in which Oswald is confirmed to have been disillusioned with Castro by early October 1963 (“Lee’s disenchantment with Castro and Cuba was complete”). It is argued McMillan was correct on the disillusionment but wrong on the date and why. It is argued McMillan’s date may apply to when it became open for Oswald after need for pretense was over, but that disillusionment with Castro had actually occurred earlier than McMillan had it.

By 1963, the Kennedys were secretly backing a coalition of a small number of favored selected anti-Castro Cuban exile groups, one of which was JURE (Junta Revolucionaria Cubana) led by Manuel Ray, in preparation for a regime change in Cuba to be coordinated with an internal coup planned for either late 1963 or early 1964. JURE, which had significant support among Cubans and a respected leader, was different from the other anti-Castro exile groups in that JURE’s platform preserved the socialist economic program of the Cuban Revolution while rejecting the dictatorship and Soviet alignment of Castro. JURE, socialist and critical of Castro on anti-dictator grounds, understood itself as the Cuban Revolution without Castro, or as JURE’s right-wing exile opponents disparagingly paraphrased it, “Castroism without Castro.” According to a CIA document, a senior figure in JURE’s leadership, Cisneros, told an informant that the JURE leadership believed President Kennedy privately favored Ray and JURE to emerge as the leader of a post-Castro Cuba among the coalition. JURE’s opponents among the anti-Castro Cuban exile groups also believed that. It is suggested that this was not only the belief of the JURE leadership and JURE’s opponents, but there is reason to believe it was true: that the Kennedys’ vision for a post-Castro Cuba was a

JURE Cuba. There are also signs that although JURE leader Manuel Ray was in good graces with the Kennedys, he was not so with the CIA with whom he was at odds and wished to maintain some distance, and the feeling was mutual.

It is argued the significance of JURE with respect to Oswald may have been underestimated in the history of scholarship. For JURE's socialist platform was so like the socialism of Oswald's own views that it would be natural and indeed practically predicted that when Oswald encountered JURE he would turn from Castro to JURE on anti-dictator grounds, just as so many Cubans who had supported the Revolution but now backed JURE.

In this light a disillusionment of Oswald with Castro dating earlier than McMillan had it may render comprehensible Oswald's FPCC-destructive activity if Oswald understood himself to be working in the interests of a Kennedys-backed post-Castro JURE Cuba. Oswald's desire by the end of the summer of 1963 to relocate to Cuba may make sense if he anticipated a role in a post-Castro Kennedys-backed JURE Cuba rather than Castro's Cuba.

When the House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA) directly asked Marina, "Do you believe he was on the pro-Castro or the anti-Castro side in New Orleans?", Marina answered cryptically: "At the time, you mentioned just right now, I always thought that he was a pro-Cuban, not anti- [or] pro-Castro." Even a comment of Oswald, according to Marina, that he might in twenty years become "prime minister"—mocked by Marina—could reflect a belief by Oswald (exaggerated in the telling by Marina) of prospects for advancement in a post-Castro JURE Cuba.

The much-debated late-September 1963 visit to Silvia Odio of Dallas by two Latins driving Oswald from New Orleans to Houston for his bus trip from there to Mexico City, may support an interpretation of Oswald as pro-JURE. Silvia Odio was an unusually prominent JURE insider figure, close to both Ray and Cisneros. The two men with Oswald claimed to Silvia Odio that they were JURE and were friends of and had confidential information from her father, then imprisoned by Castro on the Isle of Pines in Cuba. Silvia Odio did not believe the men and wrote her father asking about them. Her father wrote back he did not know the men and not to trust them. Nor was Manuel Ray or anyone else in JURE able to identify those men. Therefore they were not JURE as they claimed, but Oswald may not have known that.

The analysis establishes that the correct date of the visit was the evening of Wednesday, September 25, 1963, drawing on overlooked evidence for the Wednesday weekday date in Silvia's father's responding letter, which is the only date that works with Oswald's trip to Mexico City. It is suggested the visit to Silvia Odio—Dallas not being en route in a direct drive from New Orleans to Houston but representing a considerable detour by Oswald's drivers—could have been intended to prove to Oswald the JURE credentials of

his escorts assisting him in getting to Mexico City where Oswald intended to attempt to gain entry to Cuba.

A followup phone call Silvia Odio received from one of the two men, attributing to Oswald talk of assassinating Kennedy, is interpreted as sinister—an attempt to entrap and implicate both Oswald and JURE if Silvia Odio had answered differently than she did. Drawing from research of Larry Hancock and David Boylan in the added chapters 24 and 25 of the 2026 paperback edition of the 2025 hardbound *The Oswald Puzzle*, it is suggested the two men with Oswald at Silvia Odio's door in Dallas actually were from right-wing anti-Castro Cuban exile sources in New Orleans and Florida opposed to JURE and Kennedy's favor toward JURE. The reconstruction would be that Oswald did not realize that, but had been deceived by those men into believing they were JURE helping him get into Cuba. Understood in this light, the incident can be read as supportive of a reconstruction of Oswald as pro-JURE and anti-Castro, despite a pro-Castro public face necessary for Oswald to present to the Cuban consulate in Mexico City in order to attempt to gain entry.

The chapter closes with examination of the Warren Commission's treatment of the question of intelligence agency relationships with Oswald, long suspected but denied by every agency asked. In an executive session, one of the seven Commission members, former CIA director Allen Dulles, explained to his fellow Commissioners that a U.S. intelligence agency head could not and should not be expected to tell the truth if asked whether it had a relationship with Oswald, if it were true. The moral thing for a head of an agency to do if asked, said Dulles, would be to deny it under oath as Dulles said he would if he were still head of the CIA and asked (if it was true that his agency had been involved with Oswald). Dulles set forth a secret doctrine to his fellow Commissioners in which only the President personally, and no one else, had the right to a truthful answer from the head of an intelligence agency on that question. Dulles further told his fellow Commissioners it was not possible for the Commission to ever learn the true answer to that question; therefore Dulles recommended the Commission make no attempt to find out since the attempt would only be a waste of time. Dulles' recommendation was the Commission not investigate (attempt to find out if Oswald had an intelligence relationship) but rather simply obtain statements of denial from the various agency heads, publish them and be done with it. Dulles emphasized explicitly to his fellow Commissioners in the executive session that although they should publish the statements, they personally should be under no illusions that it was possible to know or discover the actual truth of that matter one way or the other.

But in its published final Report, the Warren Commission concluded publicly in the strongest of terms, as a statement of finding of definite fact, that Oswald had never at any time been involved with a U.S. agency in an informant or undercover role. The Commission stated:

“Close scrutiny of the records of the Federal agencies involved and the testimony of the responsible officials of the U.S. government establish that there was absolutely no type of informant or undercover relationship between an agency of the U.S. Government and Lee Harvey Oswald at any time.”

All seven Commission members including Dulles signed their names to that, thereby declaring with certainty publicly to the U.S. President, the American people, the world, and to history something Dulles had explicitly and openly told the other six in executive session they could not possibly know.

It was like Plato’s Nocturnal Council and “noble lies” in which privately the Nocturnal Council knew certain myths were not true, but the myths were considered beneficial to a well-functioning social order for the public to believe.

The present study has justified the following conclusions concerning the shot fired into the home of General Walker on the night of April 10, 1963:

- It is beyond reasonable doubt that Walker’s people were involved.
- It is beyond reasonable doubt that Walker knew.
- It is beyond reasonable doubt the shot was staged.

And therefore,

- It is beyond reasonable doubt that Oswald did not attempt to kill General Walker, no matter what he told Marina, and Oswald is exonerated in history from that charge.

The analysis has not disputed Oswald’s involvement and presence the night of the shot. The analysis has not disputed any physical evidence involved in the case. The analysis has identified the two men Kirk Coleman saw, thereby solving the case.

The removal of the Walker shot as an actual assassination attempt from Oswald’s résumé eliminates the principal claim supporting the Warren Commission’s portrait of Oswald as a violent extremist capable of killing the President.

To the extent that the erroneous interpretation of the Walker shot entered into the finding of Oswald’s guilt on JFK, the JFK case should be rechecked to determine whether the finding of Oswald’s guilt carries the same degree of confidence with that item removed from consideration.