

18+ **A BULLET FOR THE PRESIDENT:**

— JOHN F. KENNEDY —

ONE BULLET
CHANGED
HISTORY.

BUT WHOSE
FINGER PULLED
THE TRIGGER?

THE TRUTH WAS
BURIED
ON PURPOSE.

**“I’M JUST
A PATSY.”**

— LEE HARVEY OSWALD

AN INVESTIGATIVE JOURNEY
BEHIND THE LIES, THE SILENCE
AND THE CONSPIRACY.

★
VALERIA V. MILLER



Valeria Miller

**A bullet For The President:
John F. Kennedy**

«Издательские решения»

Miller V. V.

A bullet For The President: John F. Kennedy / V. V. Miller —
«Издательские решения»,

НЕЗАКОННОЕ ПОТРЕБЛЕНИЕ НАРКОТИЧЕСКИХ СРЕДСТВ,
ПСИХОТРОПНЫХ ВЕЩЕСТВ, ИХ АНАЛОГОВ ПРИЧИНЯЕТ ВРЕД
ЗДОРОВЬЮ, ИХ НЕЗАКОННЫЙ ОБОРОТ ЗАПРЕЩЕН И ВЛЕЧЕТ
УСТАНОВЛЕННУЮ ЗАКОНОДАТЕЛЬСТВОМ ОТВЕТСТВЕННОСТЬ. Three
shots. A murdered president. And a mystery that has haunted America for
more than sixty years. This book takes a closer look at the evidence surrounding
the assassination: the mysterious behavior of Jack Ruby, secret MK-ULTRA
program, and the disturbing connections between the death of John F. Kennedy
and his brother, Robert F. Kennedy. Were these events isolated tragedies — or
pieces of a much larger story? Who ordered the killings? Who carried them out?
And why was the truth buried?

© Miller V. V.

© Издательские решения

Содержание

Chapter 1: “The Call from the Club Girl”	6
Chapter 2: “The MK-Ultra Project, Charles Manson, and the ‘Sleeper Agent’”	13
Chapter 3: “The Second Death Live on Air”	24
Chapter 4: “A Pawn in Someone Else’s Game”	28
Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.	35

A bullet For The President: John F. Kennedy

Valeria V. Miller

© Valeria V. Miller, 2026

ISBN 978-5-0071-1718-0

Created with Ridero smart publishing system

Chapter 1: “The Call from the Club Girl”

“Sometimes history begins not with a gunshot, but with a telephone call.” — from the notes of Jim Garrison, New Orleans Archives

Karen Carlin, known as “Little Lin,” a 22-year-old dancer at the Carousel Club in Dallas, was one of dozens of girls who worked for Jack Ruby — the emotional, hot-tempered nightclub owner with close ties to the police, journalists, and the city’s underworld. Ruby ran the club in the spirit of cheap American decadence: red lights, dusty curtains, girls in feathers, whiskey, cigarette smoke, and police officers sitting at neighboring tables. Everyone crossed paths there — from late-night reporters to people it was better not to ask about where they got their money. Karen was one of the youngest. She lived in poverty and sometimes literally had to ask Ruby to lend her money for food and rent. He helped her, but not out of pity — for him, all the girls were part of his little empire, where he felt like the “boss.”

The Morning of November 24, 1963

It was Sunday, just two days after the assassination of John F. Kennedy. America was seething. Karen woke up early. She had no money at all. She remembered that Ruby had promised to lend her \$25 until the following week. She picked up the phone and dialed his number.

“I called Jack around ten. I told him we had no food. He said, ‘Okay, I’ll send the money.’ And that was it.” — from Karen Carlin’s testimony before the Warren Commission, Volume XV.

Everything that happened next seems like an incredible coincidence — or a perfectly scripted scenario.

10:19 a.m. — Karen calls Ruby.

11:17 a.m. — Ruby enters a Western Union office on the corner of Main Street, fills out a receipt, and sends the money to Karen. The clerk, Mary Lou Wilson, later produced the receipt bearing the signature “Jack L. Ruby.”

11:21 a.m. — Ruby leaves the office, turns the corner... and enters the basement of the Dallas Police Department, where, at that very moment, journalists are lining the walls, waiting for Oswald to be transferred. Four minutes after sending the money, on live television, Ruby pulls out a revolver and shoots Oswald in the abdomen.

The shot — 11:21:40 a.m.

The Western Union transfer — 11:17 a.m.

The difference — 4 minutes.

Even within the framework of the official Warren Commission investigation, many lawyers and investigators could not explain how a man could have happened to be in the police basement at precisely the moment Oswald was being transferred. Jim Garrison, the New Orleans district attorney, would later say:

“If Karen had not called, Ruby would not have gone to Western Union. If he had not gone there, he would not have been in that corridor. And Oswald would have lived and, perhaps, talked.”

After Ruby’s arrest, Karen Carlin was called in for questioning. She insisted:

“I just wanted twenty-five dollars. I had no food. I didn’t know what he was going to do.”

Investigators noticed that she had called at exactly the moment when Ruby was already dressed and near the club. He did not tell her that he would go personally — but he went anyway, rather than having an administrator handle the transfer. No one saw him pass security into the police basement, even though the entrance was normally closed.

Garrison and a number of independent journalists, particularly Penn Jones and Harold Weisberg, suggested that Karen’s call might have been a “trigger” — an element of a prearranged plan. She may have been asked to call at a specific time in order to set Ruby in motion along the necessary route — from Western Union to the police station. No direct order was required: it was enough to press one button in the chain.

Karen’s testimony before the Commission was brief and contradictory. Later, it was reported that she had changed her name and left Texas. Some researchers wrote that she lived under police protection; others said that she had been intimidated. She gave no further official interviews after 1964.

But if we assume that Ruby did not act spontaneously, Karen’s telephone call becomes an activation mechanism. Ruby may have received an unspoken signal: “It’s time.” He knew where Oswald would be. He knew how to get into the basement. Besides, no ordinary person takes a loaded revolver with him just to send \$25 to a hungry dancer.

Yet on the morning of November 24, 1963, Jack Ruby left his home carrying a .38-caliber Colt Cobra revolver, and his official explanation to investigators was absurdly simple:

“I always carried a gun with me. It was a habit.”

But District Attorney Jim Garrison and independent investigators pointed out that Ruby was not going to the club or to work, but to a Western Union office, where there was no reason for him to need a weapon. That morning, he appeared composed but nervous — witnesses saw him enter his club several times, listen to the radio, check the newspaper, and then leave. The revolver was fully loaded with “Special” cartridges rather than the ordinary practice ammunition Ruby used for self-defense. This suggested that he already knew he might need a weapon. Garrison, during his investigation in the late 1960s, wrote in his notes:

“The idea that he happened to be there with a gun sounds like a fairy tale for children. He came into a police building where dozens of armed officers were on duty and somehow passed through without being searched. This was no coincidence. It was a script.”

Garrison advanced the hypothesis that Ruby had received an order or a hint to eliminate Oswald so that Oswald would not begin talking. According to one version of the theory, Oswald was preparing to reveal that he had been planted inside an anti-Castro group connected to the CIA and that he

had been used as cover. If he began talking, “the entire operation would collapse.” Therefore, in Garrison’s view, Ruby was the intermediary, while Karen Carlin’s call was the trigger that put him in the right place at the right time, with a weapon in his possession.

Garrison suspected that Karen’s call was not spontaneous but staged. Someone had asked her to call that particular morning, possibly through intermediaries. Ruby understood the call as a coded signal — that “the time had come.” To make everything look ordinary, he really did go to send her the money, so that there would be an official cover story. He knew that Oswald would be transferred at precisely that moment. This information was not secret to journalists and police officers — the people “in the know” knew the transfer schedule. Ruby was one of them: he fed police officers free meals and entered the station without a pass. At that moment, he could go down into the basement without anyone questioning him — everyone considered him “one of the guys.”

At the time of his arrest, he had no holster in his pocket — the weapon had already been drawn. He did not take his dog Sheba with him — the beloved companion of Jack Ruby, whom he normally never left at home — even though he supposedly intended to be gone only briefly. Everyone who knew Ruby said that he was crazy about his dog. He took her with him to restaurants, to the club, even to the dancers’ rehearsals. Neighbors said that Ruby talked to her as if she were a person, fed her only the best meat, and whenever he needed to go somewhere, always took her with him. Journalist Hugh Ainsworth, one of the few people who saw Ruby in his everyday life, wrote:

“He was paranoid and a tough man, but he was touchingly gentle with his dog. It seemed that Sheba was all he had.”

But on November 24, 1963, everything changed. That morning, when he supposedly went simply to send Karen Carlin \$25, Ruby left Sheba at home, locked inside without food or water. This was a sharp departure from his usual behavior. His neighbor, Mary Lou Williams, later testified that he always took the dog with him, even when he was going out “for ten minutes.” But that day, he did not take her.

He also left the radio on, the newspaper open, and his keys on the table — like a man who did not expect to return. If the official account is to be believed, Ruby spontaneously went to send money to a dancer, happened to end up at the police station, happened to encounter Oswald, and, in a burst of “patriotism,” pulled the trigger. But then why did he leave the dog when he normally took her even when he went out for cigarettes? Why did he take a loaded weapon without a holster and leave at precisely the time when the “insiders” knew Oswald was being transferred?

Ruby knew he would not return.

In the testimony of his friends and colleagues, contained in the Warren Commission materials, Volume XX, there is a direct quotation:

“He used to say that Sheba was his family. He would never leave her for an hour. Unless... unless he thought it was the end.”

Several months after his arrest, when Ruby was already in prison, he asked for the dog to be brought to him. He desperately wanted to see her, and when he was refused, he cried for a long time — so his prison chaplain, Father Eliot, later recounted.

Jim Garrison saw this as a symbolic but extremely important detail:

“The abandoned dog is not some trivial domestic detail. It is a psychological marker. A man leaving, knowing that he will not return.”

He left the money and keys on the table, which looked like the behavior of a man heading not out on an ordinary errand, but toward something final. When he was arrested after the shooting, he did not resist and said:

“I saved Mrs. Kennedy from a trial.”

But Garrison saw these words as a diversionary statement, intended for the cameras. He wrote:

“He played the role of the patriotic avenger so that no one would ask who had sent him there.”

Garrison and his team found connections between Ruby and the anti-Islamic and anti-Castro networks in the American South. They also found connections to people in organized crime, particularly from Chicago and New Orleans, and to Dallas police officers who “protected” his club. One FBI agent mentioned in Garrison’s materials reportedly said off the record:

“Ruby was a gofer. They had been using him for years. When the time came, they simply told him — ‘It’s time.’”

According to Garrison’s theory, Karen may have been an unwilling participant, a “button.” Her call was the trigger in the chain, creating an alibi and setting Ruby in motion. If she had been called to testify before a jury with the right to cross-examination, her words might have shed light on who was behind the call. But she was not allowed to appear publicly. She gave brief testimony to the Warren Commission, without journalists present, and afterward disappeared from public view. Some reports mentioned that she feared for her life and asked that her name not be mentioned in the media.

In his book *On the Trail of the Assassins*, Garrison wrote:

“Ruby did not kill out of patriotism. He killed because Oswald was going to talk. And the call from the girl at the club became the final line in the script.”

He saw in it a scene of controlled chaos: one call — one trip — four minutes — one shot. And the end of the story.

After the shooting, Ruby began to lose control. In prison, he repeatedly said, “They set all of this up for me,” and before his death from cancer in 1967, he told journalists:

“The truth will never come out. They’ll kill me, just as they killed him.”

Karen’s telephone call became the perfect lure. It provided a reason, a cover, and a precise connection to the timing. To an outside observer, it was simply a random call from a poor young woman. To those who had written the script, it was an activation signal.

Oswald’s death severed the only thread leading to the truth about Kennedy’s assassination. And it all began with a telephone call from a young woman at a cheap strip club.

“Sometimes history begins not with a gunshot, but with a telephone call.” — from the notes of Jim Garrison, New Orleans Archives.

When Jim Garrison began examining the final hours of Lee Harvey Oswald’s life, he discovered that Karen Carlin, whose real name was Karen Bennett, was not simply a dancer, but one of the women at Ruby’s club who were used not only for entertainment, but also for “surveillance” and the transmission of information. In Garrison’s files, there was a theory that the CIA used establishments like the Carousel Club as cover operations — places where prostitutes and dancers could be recruited to observe customers, including police officers, military personnel, and Cuban émigrés. The reports contained the names of women connected to the Cuban underground, while Ruby frequently appeared at parties in the company of people who had direct connections to CIA operations in New Orleans and Miami. Carlin knew quite a lot — which Cubans came into the club, who paid in cash, and what conversations took place about “patriotic missions against Castro.” Garrison reconstructed the events minute by minute.

10:00 a.m. — Carlin calls Ruby and asks for money.

10:15—10:20 — Ruby leaves his house, carrying a weapon, leaving his dog behind.

11:15 — he is already in the police basement.

11:21 — Oswald is shot.

According to Garrison, Carlin’s call was not a request for money, but a coded signal. It was possible that someone among Ruby’s contacts was using Carlin as an instrument to bring him to the right place at the right time.

“If you want to make someone act, you use familiar connections. No one is going to go kill someone on the orders of a stranger. But if the signal comes from someone you are accustomed to helping, you don’t ask questions.” — Garrison.

At first, she said that she had called around 9:00, then around 10:30. At times, she claimed that she “did not remember who had suggested that she call.” In the materials of Garrison’s investigation, he noted that Ruby frequently traveled to New Orleans, where agents and counterintelligence officers working for the CIA on the Cuban front were active at the same time. Oswald was also carrying out his strange “activities” in support of Castro there, although many considered him a double agent. According to Garrison’s theory, Ruby and Oswald may have been links in the same operation, while Carlin was merely an “accidental” channel for transmitting the signal. Garrison later wrote:

“Ruby was not a pimp, but a courier. His club was a communications channel in which women played the role of messengers.”

After Oswald’s murder, several dancers from the Carousel Club disappeared. Beverly Oliver, known as the “Lady in White,” claimed that she had seen Ruby and Oswald together several weeks before Kennedy’s assassination. She insisted that Ruby and Oswald had known each other long before Kennedy’s assassination. She later disappeared and did not reappear until the 1970s, when she openly spoke about it on television. Kathy Brown, the club cashier, was killed in a car accident one month after Ruby’s arrest. Nancy Gamble, one of Karen Carlin’s close friends, moved to Houston and

never gave another interview. To Garrison, all of this looked like a cleanup of witnesses — careful, systematic, and without leaving traces.

In CIA archives declassified in the 1990s, the use of strip clubs and prostitutes to gather information about attitudes within the police and among Cuban émigrés was indeed mentioned. Similar operations were conducted under code names such as “Project Midnight” and “Operation Tick-Tock,” in which women served as “companions” for drunk officers and agents. Garrison believed that the Carousel Club was part of precisely such a structure. Women like Karen Carlin could have passed information through Ruby, who maintained connections with the police, Cuban émigrés, and people from the FBI.

“Ruby was a man who knew everyone who knew something. That is the ideal figure for those who want to control the flow of rumors.” — J. Garrison.

After Kennedy’s assassination, Ruby did not leave, although he could have. He remained at the club, was nervous, made phone calls, drank coffee, and kept asking, “Where is Karen?” Some female witnesses, including bartender Georgia Smith, claimed that Ruby also received a strange telephone call that night, before Oswald’s murder, after which he suddenly became calm. Garrison noted that this call was not recorded in the police reports. He suspected that it involved the transmission of the final signal — not a signal to act, but a signal for the elimination. When Garrison requested a list of all the women who worked at the Carousel Club, it turned out that some of the documents had disappeared. Those that remained looked falsified — the names did not match the tax records. For example, Karen Carlin appeared under the pseudonym “Little Lynn,” but her name had been crossed out on the November 1963 payroll list. This had been done after Ruby’s arrest. For Garrison, this was a key point: someone had altered the club’s records after the fact in order to remove the names of women connected to the events of November 22—24. When Karen was later questioned by representatives of the Warren Commission, she appeared depressed and repeated the same phrase over and over:

“I just called him because I didn’t have any money.”

But Garrison understood — in cases like these, there is no “just.”

After Ruby’s arrest, the Carousel Club was closed. The women were questioned, but most of their testimony did not make it into the commission’s final report. Some materials were classified for decades. When Garrison requested that they be declassified, he was refused. He then uttered the phrase that became a symbol of his investigation:

“They killed not only the president in Dallas. They killed the truth there.”

But two days before the shots rang out in Dallas, one woman claimed that she had overheard a conversation about the impending assassination of the president. To Jim Garrison and many researchers of the Kennedy case, she became a symbol of the fact that the truth had been nearby, but was deliberately ignored. Rose Cheramie (real name — Melba Christine Youngblood) was born in 1929. Her life was difficult and dramatic: drug addiction, prostitution, and constant problems with the law. She lived on the edge of society and crime. Despite this, her voice became one of the first warning notes in the case of Kennedy’s assassination.

Cheramie claimed that two days before the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, two men gave her a ride. During the trip, she overheard their conversation, in which they discussed a plan to assassinate the president. They named details, the date, and even the place where everything was supposed to happen. According to Cheramie, she tried to warn the police and the public, but her words were ignored. She claimed that after accidentally overhearing dangerous information, one of the men threatened her and literally threw her out onto the side of the road.

Garrison wrote in his materials that Rose Cheramie's story was not ignored by accident. According to his version, it was part of a system: remove a witness who could shed light on the conspiracy. Her reputation as a prostitute and drug addict became a convenient pretext for discrediting her testimony. The police did not take her seriously, and the case disappeared into the bureaucratic system. Despite the fact that her words were not included in the official reports of the Warren Commission, Jim Garrison incorporated her testimony into his investigation, considering it one of the most important links in the chain of the conspiracy.

“Rose Cheramie heard what we were not supposed to hear. That night, she was thrown not only out of the car, but out of history.” — Jim Garrison.

Chapter 2: “The MK-Ultra Project, Charles Manson, and the ‘Sleeper Agent’”

“The CIA broke people the way a locksmith breaks a lock — without mercy, without compassion, for the sake of pure power.” — Journalist Seymour Hersh, on the secret MK-Ultra experiments.

In the middle of the twentieth century, the CIA launched one of the darkest programs in the history of intelligence — MK-Ultra. It had no equal in its inhumanity: dozens, even hundreds of people became test subjects without knowing that experiments were being conducted on them, and in most cases, they had given no consent. The goal of the program was simple and terrifying — to find ways to achieve complete control over the human mind.

Documents declassified in the 1970s revealed that MK-Ultra included a wide range of methods. The program involved the use of psychoactive substances (LSD, mescaline, psilocybin), hypnosis, sensory deprivation, psychological manipulation, and other experiments on the borderline between science and torture. The goal was to create “sleeper agents.”

MK-Ultra was practiced on prisoners, mentally ill people, soldiers, homeless people, students, and ordinary civilians. LSD and other psychedelics were slipped into drinks or food, even to CIA employees. Experiments were conducted at universities, clinics, and prisons. CIA documents, partially declassified in 1977 following a U.S. Senate investigation, confirm that hundreds of people became victims of these methods.

The CIA’s goal was to test mind-control techniques for possible use in espionage, interrogations, and psychological warfare. But in practice, the project went beyond the boundaries of morality and law, turning ordinary people into research subjects, often with tragic consequences.

The CIA organized brothels in San Francisco and New York, where prostitutes secretly administered LSD to test subjects through drinks or food. Their behavior was recorded on hidden cameras. Many experienced extremely severe psychotic reactions.

During the 1950s and 1960s, LSD and other psychoactive substances were tested at several U.S. military bases. Soldiers often did not know that they were participating in an experiment. After the tests, cases of serious psychological disorders were recorded. Many soldiers died by suicide. The details of these cases remain classified, but they are mentioned in CIA documents and in the records of Senate hearings on MK-Ultra.

There are accounts that people disappeared during secret experiments: employees involved in the tests, civilians invited under the guise of ordinary medical research, prisoners, patients in psychiatric hospitals, and homeless people. Officially, their fate was never established. According to some researchers, many of them may have been eliminated in order to preserve the secrecy of the program.

Among the many victims of this program, the name of Frank Olson occupies a special place. His death became a symbol of how far the intelligence services were willing to go in their experiments.

Frank Olson was a microbiologist working for the CIA as part of secret research programs. His field included biological weapons and the study of the effects of psychoactive substances on humans. Olson held a high-level security clearance and was involved in projects that even most CIA employees knew nothing about. His work included the study of methods of behavior control, which eventually brought him into contact with the MK-Ultra program.

In November 1953, Olson was invited to a CIA “corporate retreat” at one of the agency’s country facilities. During the gathering, LSD was secretly administered to him, as well as to other participants. Documents indicate that the purpose was to observe the participants’ reactions under natural conditions.

For Olson, the experience was a shock. He experienced a sudden alteration in perception, a loss of control, and growing anxiety. Afterward, his mental state began to deteriorate rapidly. He suffered from deep depression, paranoia, and the feeling that he was being watched.

Several days after the incident, Olson arrived in New York. He was staying at the Statler Hotel. On the morning of November 28, 1953, Olson fell from a thirteenth-floor window and died.

The official version was suicide. But later, evidence emerged that raised doubts about that conclusion. Friends and colleagues claimed that Olson had never shown suicidal tendencies, while his family stated that he had been depressed but not desperate.

In 1975, a CIA commission acknowledged that Olson had participated in MK-Ultra experiments and that the administration of LSD may have had a negative effect on his mental state. Documents indicate that the CIA deliberately altered details surrounding his death and conducted an internal investigation.

Many believe that Olson may have been killed to prevent the disclosure of secrets surrounding the MK-Ultra program. Olson’s case became one of the most notorious episodes in the history of MK-Ultra. It illustrates the terrifying logic of the program: the human being is not a subject, but an object. The experiment is more important than life, and consciousness becomes a field for manipulation.

Olson became a victim not only of the experiment itself, but also of a system that regarded him as expendable.

Before the MK-Ultra project, there was already a project known as Bluebird. Bluebird was the code name for a CIA program launched in the early 1950s (officially in 1950) with the purpose of studying methods of influencing the human mind.

The goal was the same — to develop technologies capable of controlling human behavior, obtaining confessions and information from subjects without their knowledge, and turning a person into a “sleeper agent” or a controlled operative.

The project was also classified, and it became known only in the 1970s, after leaks and investigations. Bluebird included a wide range of practices, many of which later became the foundation of MK-Ultra.

The goal was to create the “perfect agent” — a person who could carry out orders without conscious awareness and against their own will.

In the mid-1950s, Project Bluebird was transformed into Artichoke — a program with a broader range of research and a more aggressive approach. Artichoke became more aggressive and included studies of the effects of psychoactive substances on military personnel.

Experiments were conducted involving interrogations, “brainwashing,” and the creation of “zombies.” Bluebird/Artichoke demonstrate that the CIA’s experiments in mind control existed long before MK-Ultra.

In the context of the assassination of Kennedy, MK-Ultra raises extremely dangerous questions: could intelligence agencies have created an “assassin agent”? Could Jack Ruby have been “programmed” to carry out a specific action? And could Karen Carlin’s phone call have served as a trigger activating a hidden instruction?

When we talk about the killing of Lee Harvey Oswald, Jack Ruby always stands apart. His act — killing the president’s alleged assassin live on television — remains a mystery to this day.

He was a man with a criminal past, but his actions seemed too spontaneous, too artificially provoked, to be explained simply as an impulse.

Jack Ruby was a man immersed in the world of underground entertainment, familiar with both the criminal underworld and the police. He knew how to handle a weapon and was decisive, yet his action inside the police station looked like a step taken “without preparation.”

Officially, his motive was described as revenge for the president, but many researchers believe that the motive may have been artificially implanted.

The MK-Ultra program, as we already know, included methods involving hypnosis and psychoactive substances. One of its objectives was the creation of “ sleeper agents ” — people who would act according to a pre-programmed instruction activated by a specific signal.

Ruby could have been such an agent.

This would explain his unusual determination and the absence of any logical preparation for the killing of Oswald. Supporters of conspiracy theories suggest that Karen’s phone call may have been a trigger for Ruby — a stimulus activating a planted instruction.

Under MK-Ultra conditions, this was possible.

The program’s documents contain descriptions of cases in which a particular word, phrase, or signal led to a person carrying out actions that they would not normally have been willing to perform.

Ruby was arrested and found guilty of killing Oswald. But questions remain: why did his actions appear so abrupt and illogical?

If we accept the MK-Ultra theory, the answer is simple: he did not control his behavior. He was a “zombie” with a planted instruction, and Karen Carlin’s phone call may have been the very key that activated it.

“Ruby is a question that has no answer. But the question itself is very dangerous,” prosecutor Jim Garrison wrote.

He killed Lee Harvey Oswald live on television, but the motivation behind his action remains a mystery to this day. Many researchers describe his behavior as strange, inconsistent, and contradictory.

And in this context, the possibility that Ruby may have been the subject of a psychological experiment takes on a frightening meaning.

After killing Oswald, Ruby indeed behaved as though he were in a state of emotional and psychological shock. Witnesses noted a sudden burst of aggression followed by tearfulness. Paranoia and anxiety. Deep depression.

Ruby asked to see his dog while in his cell, and when he was refused, he burst into tears. It seemed to him to be more important than anything else in the world.

This is strange for a man who had deliberately committed a murder live on television, knowing that there would be no way back. Ruby had taken an enormous risk and carried out a spontaneous act that instantly cost him everything.

Such behavior corresponds to descriptions of people who had undergone psychoactive conditioning.

If Ruby really had been the subject of such an experiment, his action could have been the result of an external instruction — as if his consciousness had been “switched” to carry out an assignment.

After his arrest, Ruby changed. He ceased to be the confident, tough man he had once been. His behavior became anxious and uncertain. His incoherent statements, tears, paranoia, and aggression toward those around him all pointed to a man who suddenly realized that he had lost control over his own life.

But if we take the capabilities of MK-Ultra into account, this may not necessarily have been an awakening.

It could have been the “deactivation” of the implanted instruction.

The trigger that had led him to the killing had been activated, and afterward he found himself in a state of deep psychological crisis.

There are indirect indications that Ruby may have been under the influence of psychoactive substances: the strange suddenness of his actions, emotional instability, the absence of clear preparation, and the lack of an obvious motive.

Within the framework of MK-Ultra, such effects were described repeatedly. The victim receives an assignment, carries it out, and afterward experiences a profound crisis, a loss of meaning, and depression.

This completely corresponds to what was observed in Ruby.

If we assume that Ruby really was the subject of a mind-control program, then Karen's call may have become the trigger that activated the hidden instruction — causing the emotional state necessary to carry out the assignment and “launching” him toward the killing of Oswald.

This would explain why Ruby's actions were so sudden and appeared spontaneous.

And if Karen Carlin's call really was the trigger, then the killing of Oswald ceases to be merely an act of personal revenge or a random impulse.

It becomes a carefully planned operation involving the CIA.

Roger Smith — an employee of the California Department of Adult Probation and Parole and a graduate of psychology at UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles). From 1965 to 1970, he supervised a number of programs for the “rehabilitation” of prisoners, funded through the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) and private foundations linked to the CIA. According to internal UCLA records, Smith was appointed supervisor of a research project formally known as the “Behavioral Adaptation Studies.” In practice, these projects involved monitoring people who had been released from prison and analyzing their behavior in new social environments. The documents contain references indicating that Smith received instructions from a group that included representatives of UCLA, the U.S. Department of Defense, and, apparently, the CIA. These instructions concerned the selection of “subjects” for observation, data-collection methodology, and reporting forms that were never published. In 1967, Roger Smith became Charles Manson's parole officer after his release from Terminal Island Prison.

Manson was known as a criminal with a long record. Before 1967, he had been held in California prisons for various offenses: theft, fraud, and unlawful entry. Under standard practice, the California parole system generally required strict supervision and documentation of the behavior of released prisoners. But something unusual happened with Manson: despite repeated violations of the conditions of his release and numerous offenses, he was repeatedly allowed to remain free, suggesting some form of protective supervision.

According to the archives of the Department of Adult Probation and Parole, decisions to extend his freedom were made with the participation of Roger Smith, who submitted written recommendations — and those recommendations were always approved.

In his book *CHAOS: Charles Manson, the CIA, and the Secret History of the Sixties* (2019), Tom O'Neill puts forward and documents a serious hypothesis about the connection between Manson, his “Family,” and the MK-Ultra program — through specific doctors, institutions, and documents. Tom O'Neill does not directly claim that Manson was an official participant in the MK-Ultra program, but he presents a chain of facts and individuals suggesting that Manson was under the observation of psychiatrists and drug specialists connected to the project. Women from his “Family” participated in experiments involving psychoactive substances, particularly LSD, sometimes under medical supervision.

O'Neill provides numerous pieces of evidence that at the Haight-Ashbury Free Medical Clinic in San Francisco, founded by Dr. David Smith, studies were conducted on the effects of LSD and other psychedelics on “vulnerable groups” — hippies, homeless people, and girls dependent on

Manson. Doctors at the clinic had connections with scientists who had previously worked within MK-Ultra or related subprojects studying mind control.

Manson frequently brought his girls there, where doctors supposedly “helped” them — and afterward their behavior became increasingly unstable. O’Neill cites eyewitness testimony, including that of former members of the “Family,” that Manson controlled the doses, forcing the girls to take more than he did himself. He used recruitment, suggestion, and depersonalization techniques resembling psychiatric experiments. He created an environment in which participants lost their sense of time, reality, and free will — a structure characteristic of MK-Ultra experiments.

O’Neill cites actual FBI, CIA, and prison-system reports showing that Manson was under the observation of psychiatrists connected to research institutions appearing in MK-Ultra documents, while his releases from prison often occurred on the orders of “higher authorities,” despite numerous violations.

Tom O’Neill writes in CHAOS:

“Manson became an exception to the rules. He didn’t simply get out of prison — he got out under the control of people who were clearly interested in him not as a criminal, but as an object of observation.”

“I found official notes indicating that someone was protecting him — or studying him.”

Testimony collected by journalists in the late 1970s suggests that Roger Smith saw Manson as a subject of particular interest: an opportunity to observe the development of “group dynamics” and submission to a leader. Documents declassified in 1977 indicate that the clinic was also a center of observation where the reactions of subjects to psychoactive substances were recorded. Internal clinic records contain references to “observing changes in behavior under altered states of consciousness and collecting data on social integration.”

Roger Smith organized systematic visits by Manson and his girls — Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel, Leslie Van Houten, and Mary Brunner — to the clinic. Medical records documented physiological data such as pulse, blood pressure, and emotional state, as well as information concerning the use of psychoactive substances and descriptions of behavior within the social group.

According to witnesses, these visits were not accidental. They were part of a systematic process of observing and documenting how psychoactive substances and isolation could create a state of submission to a leader.

From Tom O’Neill’s CHAOS: Charles Manson, the CIA, and the Secret History of the Sixties (2019):

“Dr. David Smith founded the Haight-Ashbury Free Medical Clinic in 1967. It was one of the first places in San Francisco where addicts and street kids could get treatment without being arrested. But what was less known is that Smith and his colleagues were conducting behavioral studies funded by the NIMH and linked to earlier MK-Ultra projects on LSD.”

He further states that NIMH funding was a CIA cover, with the institute allegedly being used as a channel for financing experiments on civilians.

“Manson brought his girls to the clinic frequently. They thought they were getting help; in reality, they were being watched, dosed, and recorded. Manson, according to several witnesses, rarely took LSD himself. He’d pretend to swallow, then observe his followers tripping.”

Tom also cites the testimony of Sandy Good and Diane Lake — they said that Manson “loved to control the trip.”

“He’d control every variable: the lighting, the music, the dosage, and the language. Then he’d guide their experiences, programming them, breaking them down. It was textbook MK-Ultra conditioning.”

Tom O’Neill also describes Professor J. West, known as “Jolly” West — a psychiatrist who genuinely participated in the MK-Ultra program and met with Manson shortly after the Tate murders. Strangely, after the assassination of Lee Harvey Oswald, Jack Ruby, already in prison, also demanded that Louis Jolyon West be the person to treat and observe him.

Louis Jolyon West (Louis Jolyon West, 1924—1999) was a figure who was both distinguished and highly controversial. He was a psychiatrist, a professor at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), and a consultant to the U.S. Air Force, CIA, and FBI. But his name became associated not only with science, but also with some of the darkest experiments of the Cold War — the MK-Ultra program, mind control, and coercive psychiatric practices.

He was born in Chicago in 1924, the son of Russian immigrants. He received his medical education at the University of Minnesota. He served in the U.S. Air Force, where he worked in the field of “military trauma psychiatry.” After the war, he participated in several projects funded by the CIA and the U.S. Department of Defense.

He participated in MK-Ultra Subproject 43, as documented in CIA records. He also worked at the UCLA Neuropsychiatric Institute, where research was conducted into “social control through drugs.” He later became director of the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.

At first glance, this appeared to be a typical academic career. But his actual activities increasingly raised questions.

West appears in documents as one of the researchers involved in the MK-Ultra program — a CIA project investigating mind control through drugs, hypnosis, isolation, and electroshock. He supervised experiments involving LSD, conducted interrogations involving psychoactive substances, and participated in what were known as behavior modification studies.

In some declassified CIA materials, “Jolly West” is mentioned as a consultant conducting experiments on both humans and animals. His laboratory in Lexington, Kentucky, conducted experiments on drug-addicted prisoners, often without their full informed consent.

One of the darkest episodes occurred in 1962, when West administered 297 milligrams of LSD to an elephant named Tusko — approximately 3,000 times a human dose. The animal began convulsing and died several hours later. Officially, the experiment was an attempt to study psychosis in animals. In practice, it looked like a brutal demonstration of the effects of psychedelics.

In the 1970s, West proposed creating a center in Los Angeles dedicated to the study and prevention of violence, which critics argued effectively amounted to a laboratory for behavioral control. He wanted to use brain implants, medication, and psychiatric methods to “correct aggressive people.” The public called it an “Orwellian project,” while senators accused him of intending to turn the university into an instrument of surveillance and repression.

West also consulted on the Patty Hearst case, involving the SLA terrorist who had allegedly been “reprogrammed.” In all these cases, his involvement was accompanied by allegations of psychiatric manipulation rather than treatment.

Tom cites documents from the Bureau of Prisons and the Federal Probation Service indicating that Manson received “unusual leniency” — something that fits the image of a “test subject.”

“If you overlay Manson’s world with the map of MK-Ultra activities, you’ll see the same names, the same labs, the same psychiatrists. It’s not a conspiracy theory — it’s a convergence.”

Was Manson Recruited?

Possibly. Manson received unusually lenient treatment from probation authorities and the police. He was repeatedly released despite obvious violations. He maintained close contact with people and institutions connected to CIA research — Smith, West, and the NIMH. He also used psychological control techniques resembling those developed in mind-control projects.

Summer 1967. Charles Manson was increasingly gathering a group of young women around him — his future “Family.” According to Tom O’Neill’s investigation, Roger Smith already saw this as a “social phenomenon” — a unique opportunity for observation. Supervision reports allegedly mention that one of the objectives was “monitoring the formation of a cult and studying the mechanisms of suggestion within a closed group.” Documents from the Haight-Ashbury clinic reportedly record:

“Patients display signs of persistent dependence on the leader, particularly after courses of psychedelic use. Further observation under conditions of social isolation is required.”

Autumn 1968. Manson and his “Family” withdrew almost completely to Spahn Ranch. The ranch became a closed environment where outside control was minimal. For observers, this was an ideal “field laboratory”: the group lived under the complete authority of its leader, cut off from outside information, while contact with the outside world took place through intermediaries. Internal records from Haight-Ashbury allegedly state:

“An environment has been created in which the transition from individual will to collective dependence can be observed. Continued observation is required.”

The Mass Murders of August 8—9, 1969

The prosecution, led by Vincent Bugliosi, argued at trial that Manson was not present at the murder scenes but had issued a “spiritual directive” — “Helter Skelter” — and that the murders were his own idea, intended to provoke a race war. Bugliosi argued that the girls and men of the “Family” had been “zombified” by Manson and killed on his orders.

According to this version, there were no outside sponsors; everything was initiated by Manson and his “Family.” But the “Helter Skelter” motive appears contrived, and Manson himself did not speak about it for a long time; the explanation emerged only later. Soon afterward, some police records disappeared or were classified.

Only one thing is particularly striking: Charles Manson and those around him were under observation by the FBI, the sheriff’s department, narcotics authorities, and even psychiatrists, yet no one stopped them — as though a “protective shadow” prevented intervention.

The murders themselves looked more like a drug-related or criminal dispute — one of the men killed at the Tate residence had connections to the drug trade and acted as an intermediary — than a “ritual for Helter Skelter.” Perhaps Charles Manson was merely an instrument: his “Family” could have been a convenient tool for eliminating someone, after which all of the Family’s actions could simply be blamed on a “psychopathic cult leader.”

The fact that they were not immediately arrested despite apparent evidence, and that the investigation proceeded in such a strange manner, is still used as an argument that Manson and his “Family” may have been someone’s instrument.

There are no documents proving an official order or a connection to the CIA. There is only a chain of coincidences, “protection,” and an environment in which structures connected to MK-Ultra were operating. After the murders, society turned sharply against the entire counterculture and the hippie subculture associated with it. This coincided with the interests of the FBI and CIA, which at the time were conducting COINTELPRO operations against radicals, anti-war movements, and activists.

O’Neill writes:

“When you pull the thread of Helter Skelter, it unravels into something much darker — not madness, but manipulation.”

After his arrest, Jack Ruby demanded only one thing: that Dr. West treat him. This was strange. How did a Dallas nightclub operator know a university psychiatrist from California? Yet in March 1964, West did indeed arrive at the Dallas jail. He was allowed to meet with Ruby alone, and an hour after the session Ruby began shouting that “everything around him was melting,” that “the air was alive,” and that he could “feel people coming from the television.”

Later, he claimed that “everyone around him was Jewish” and that “his brain was under control.” According to the investigation by the Frank Church Committee, West administered a “psychotropic injection, allegedly LSD or a derivative,” to Ruby in order to “assess his condition and suggestibility.” In effect, this meant continuing MK-Ultra experiments on a key witness in the assassination of the president.

West stated that Ruby suffered from “acute paranoia,” but other doctors did not confirm this. Later researchers claimed that West influenced Ruby through medication or hypnosis in order to invalidate his testimony.

After the incident involving Ruby, Dr. West left the military and became head of the Department of Psychiatry at UCLA. On the surface, it was an impeccable career. But, as we already

know, several years later the same Dr. West appeared in San Francisco — at the Haight-Ashbury psychiatric center, at the very epicenter of the countercultural revolution.

There, he ran a laboratory studying LSD, where young people, former prisoners, and street girls strangely seemed to appear with unusual frequency — including girls from Charles Manson's "Family."

A coincidence? Hardly.

When the U.S. Congress began investigating the MK-Ultra program in 1977, the name Louis Jolyon West appeared in fourteen different files. He denied everything, stating:

"I always acted solely for the sake of science and humanity."

But the archives allegedly contained letters in which he thanked the CIA for "supporting research into the social consequences of psychoactive substance use."

Manson died in prison. Ruby died in his cell, complaining that his "brain was burning." Both were different branches of the same program. Both were products of Dr. West. And when people today speak of Manson, Jack Ruby, LSD, and the CIA, it sounds like a conspiracy theory. But once the dates, documents, and names are placed side by side, it becomes clear: this was not madness, but systematic work.

MK-Ultra did not create monsters — it tested obedience. Dr. West demonstrated that a human being could be turned into a tool. And Manson and Ruby were merely two names on the long list of those who became evidence for this hypothesis.

"Do not fear the monsters created by the government. Fear those who call it an experiment," — from an interview with a former CIA agent, 1978.

In private notes discovered after his death, West wrote more openly. One document, dated 1968 and allegedly held in the UCLA archives under the code LW-23b, states:

"A man is not free if the right feeling can be induced in him by pressing a button or giving him an injection. But that is precisely what makes him controllable, and that is remarkable. Democracy is impossible without control."

These were not simply the words of a scientist — they were the credo of an architect of MK-Ultra. He believed that the chaos of the 1960s, the protests, drugs, and hippie culture could all be used as weapons. His task was to turn a social movement into a controllable experiment.

There was another detail. After the Manson murders, West advised the Los Angeles Police Department. He allegedly advised them not to describe Manson as a "product of experiments" in order to "avoid panic and distrust of science." During the same period, he became a regular guest at film studios, where he was invited to consult on screenplays involving hypnosis, murder, and mass hysteria.

On one occasion, he told an MGM producer:

“People love stories about possession because they do not know how real it is.”

He was invited onto talk shows, where he discussed the “danger of cults.” The irony was that he himself had helped create them.

In 1974, West allegedly sent the Department of Defense a document entitled “Psychiatry as an Instrument of National Security.” It contained a disturbing conclusion:

“The masses need emotional stimulants in order to obey. Television, drugs, fear, and cults are effective tools. We stand on the threshold of a new era — the psychological management of civilization.”

The report allegedly reached a congressional committee only twenty years later, after his death. None of its points was ever refuted.

The world remembered Manson as a murderer and Ruby as a fanatic. But behind each of them stood a man who regarded the human mind simply as a laboratory.

Dr. West did not pull the trigger, write manifestos, or stand at the altars of cults. He created the conditions.

“Once you learn how to break the will of one person, you can control millions. You only need to find the right trigger,” — Louis Jolyon West, unpublished lecture for the FBI, 1971.

And if the archives are to be believed, those triggers had long since been found.

The same psychiatrist was connected to the principal figures in two of America’s greatest tragedies — the assassination of Kennedy and the murders at the Tate residence. In both cases, what appeared on the surface was madness, but behind it was control and psychological conditioning.

West was not merely a doctor. He was an operator within a system that tested how far human behavior could be controlled. And Ruby and Manson’s girls were merely different stages of one and the same experiment.

Chapter 3: “The Second Death Live on Air”

“I was part of a show I knew nothing about... I was supposed to get rid of him, and I did.”
— Jack Ruby.

After the killing of Lee Harvey Oswald, Jack Ruby was sentenced to death and soon found himself in the Dallas County Jail. There, he began behaving strangely: complaining that he was being followed, saying that “all of this is part of a larger conspiracy,” and that he had simply been used. In conversations with his attorneys, Ruby repeatedly said:

“I was part of a show I knew nothing about... It was as if I had been told that I was supposed to get rid of him, and I did.”

In an interview with *Esquire* magazine, he would make a cryptic statement:

“The world will never know the truth about what happened to our president. And my lips will be sealed forever.”

Soon, they would indeed be sealed forever. But for now, Ruby continued to hint that “people at the top” were behind the killing — intelligence agencies, officials, perhaps the Mafia. He continued repeating to journalists and visitors:

“If I told everything, no one would believe me. And I would have been gone long ago. I was supposed to get rid of Oswald. But I didn’t know the whole game. I simply didn’t know...”

His behavior became increasingly strange, marked by emotional outbursts, frequent flashes of anger and tears, and unexplained episodes of panic. He demanded meetings with journalists, only to suddenly refuse to speak with them. He began inventing versions of events, mixing truth with fantasy, sometimes insisting that “someone was watching him through the walls.” He became confused in his statements and wept.

His attorneys wrote in their reports:

“Ruby is clearly under psychological pressure. It is as though he knows something dangerous but is afraid that his words will become fatal to him.”

Ruby repeatedly begged to be transferred from Dallas to Washington, claiming that only there would he be able to tell Congress “the whole truth” and feel safe.

From the transcript of the Warren Commission, June 7, 1964:

“I would like you to take me to Washington, because there I will be able to tell everything. I cannot do it here. Nothing I say here makes any sense. My life is in danger. If you take me away, I will tell the truth.”

“You don’t understand anything here. I am in Dallas, and they can do whatever they want to me. If you don’t take me away, you will never know the whole truth.”

“Our people will never know the real truth about what happened to our president. My life no longer matters. But if you take me away, you will save not only me, but our country.”

Ruby insists that he is under threat in Dallas, repeatedly saying that “everything is under control here” and that either he will be killed or he will not be allowed to speak. He insists that only in Washington will he have the opportunity to expose the conspiracy. He hints that other people were behind Kennedy’s assassination and that both Oswald and his own shooting were part of a larger operation. But he is refused. The Warren Commission and the authorities do not take his statements seriously. His claims are dismissed as paranoia or manipulation. Besides, transferring him to Washington would have looked like an admission that his statements about a “conspiracy” carried weight. The formal explanation was:

“You are already being held in custody in Texas, you were sentenced there by a court, and there is no legal basis for transferring you.”

In the end, Ruby remains in Dallas. In 1966, he is suddenly diagnosed with aggressive lung cancer, which quickly metastasizes to the brain. Doctors note that the disease has progressed with “abnormal speed.” Alongside the illness, Ruby begins frequently complaining of headaches and memory loss, although he had not experienced such symptoms before his imprisonment. Journalists and attorneys notice that he sometimes appears “not himself.” Many reporters believe that Ruby’s behavior is explained by fear. Some journalists claim that Ruby receives letters, visitors, and hints that force him to behave cautiously or theatrically. Outside observers call him “a symbol of the entire game behind the scenes.” On January 3, 1967, Ruby dies in the prison hospital without ever revealing the information he supposedly possessed.

But his strange death was not the only one.

Journalists and reporters visited Ruby in prison. They were interested in him, took notes, and asked questions. One of them was Dorothy Kilgallen — a well-known New York journalist, society columnist, and television personality. She had connections in political and entertainment circles and knew how to obtain information that others could not reach. After the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Kilgallen almost immediately took a public position of skepticism. In her column, she wrote:

“I do not believe that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone. And I do not believe that the American public is being told the whole truth.”

This was not merely rhetoric. Unlike most journalists, who simply rewrote press releases, Kilgallen began working independently with sources. She attended the Warren Commission hearings, documented contradictions, and made notes that she did not publish. But the key event was her interview with Jack Ruby — the man who had shot Oswald live on television.

Dorothy Kilgallen was the only journalist who was permitted a private conversation with Ruby in the Dallas County Jail. Not FBI agents. Not members of the Warren Commission. Her.

After the meeting, she wrote:

“Jack Ruby is not insane. He is frightened. And he knows that his life means nothing.”

In private conversations — according to friends — Kilgallen spoke even more bluntly:

“Ruby told me what he did not dare tell the Commission. Oswald was eliminated. I know who killed our president.”

She claimed that Ruby spoke of protectors, hinted at pressure, and referred to the involvement of people whose names could not be spoken aloud. After the interview, Kilgallen openly stated that the Warren Commission was lying or concealing key facts. From that moment on, she became inconvenient.

In 1964—1965, the tone of the American media changed sharply. Anyone who questioned the “lone Oswald” theory was portrayed as hysterical, a conspiracy theorist, or mentally unstable. In the press, Kilgallen began to be described as “emotional,” “exhausted,” and “a woman with problems.” It was a classic method of discrediting a witness.

Meanwhile, she was preparing a book about the Kennedy assassination. Her editors knew about it. Her close associates knew about it. She reportedly said:

“When everything is published, the country will be shocked.”

But that book would never be published.

On November 8, 1965, Dorothy Kilgallen was found dead in her Manhattan apartment. The official version: an accidental overdose of alcohol and barbiturates.

Kilgallen was found in a bed in which she never slept. According to her family and those close to her, Dorothy always slept in another room. But on the night of her death, she was found carefully laid out, with no signs of a struggle.

She was fully dressed, wearing daytime clothes, which contradicted the theory of an “accidental overdose before going to sleep.”

Reading glasses were found on Dorothy, which, according to her relatives and colleagues, she never wore. Kilgallen used contact lenses and had no habit of keeping glasses beside her bed. This fact was documented, but never explained in the official reports.

Beside the body lay a book that Kilgallen had neither been reading nor kept by her bed. The book was completely outside the scope of her interests, and those close to her insisted that Dorothy had neither started reading it nor planned to. The book looked like a prop — an object intended to create the illusion of an “ordinary evening before bed.”

One of the most disturbing details: Kilgallen was wearing a wig.

In everyday life, she never went to bed wearing a wig. Moreover, those close to her stated that at home, outside public appearances, she hardly ever wore one at all.

A wig on the head of a dead woman is not a domestic detail.

It is a sign of staging.

Medications that had not been prescribed to her were found near the body. According to her treating physicians, she did not take that type of barbiturate.

The amount of alcohol listed in the report did not correspond to the state of intoxication in which witnesses had seen her the day before her death.

No complete forensic autopsy was conducted. Toxicological testing was limited. Some samples were lost.

And most importantly: Kilgallen's notebook containing her notes on the Kennedy case and her interview with Ruby disappeared.

Family members and colleagues stated that her notebooks had always been kept close to her. According to witnesses, outsiders had entered the apartment and the arrangement of belongings had been disturbed; some papers were missing.

This happened before the materials were officially documented.

What disappeared was precisely what had value not personally, but politically.

Kilgallen's death was officially ruled an accidental overdose of alcohol and barbiturates.

But the main contradictions remained unanswered.

Other witnesses died or were silenced.

A coincidence?

I don't think so.

Here, the facts form a line — and that line leads to a conclusion America still is not ready to acknowledge:

The truth about the assassination of the president was dangerous not only to the state — but deadly to those who came too close to it.

Dorothy Kilgallen came too close.

And she paid for it with her life.

For decades, the authorities in New York have refused to reconsider Dorothy Kilgallen's case, despite repeated requests from journalists, researchers, and her family.

To this day, the official position of the New York authorities remains:

“The case is closed.”

Chapter 4: “A Pawn in Someone Else’s Game”

“I’m just a patsy.” — Lee Harvey Oswald.

Lee Harvey Oswald was born on October 18, 1939, in New Orleans, into a family where chaos had prevailed from the very beginning. His father died two months before his son was born, while his mother, Marguerite, was a harsh and cold woman, unable to provide either love or stability. A single mother after her husband’s death, she had little emotional connection with her children. According to neighbors’ recollections:

“She never hugged her children or praised them. It seemed that, to her, they were more of an obligation than a source of joy.” — witness, archival interviews

The children were raised strictly, with an emphasis on discipline and obedience. For Lee, a sensitive and withdrawn child, this was experienced as emotional coldness. Marguerite constantly changed residences and jobs in an effort to provide for the family, but at the same time demanded independence from Lee and his brothers from an early age. Psychologists who analyzed her parenting style noted:

“Her style was authoritarian and emotionally distant. She controlled her son’s behavior but emotionally withdrew from him.” — Dr. Hartogs, 1953

From an early age, Lee felt “alone,” and he experienced his mother’s demands as pressure, which intensified his withdrawal. Biographers and psychologists believe that his mother’s coldness and strictness contributed to Lee’s sense of alienation, his inability to trust people, and his desire to act independently. This trait would later play a key role in his life. As a teenager, he would turn toward radical ideas and seek his own ways of resolving his conflicts with the world.

“Marguerite was an emotionally detached woman. Her children grew up in the shadow of discipline and a lack of warmth.” — R. Sikorski, *Oswald’s Tale*

In Oswald’s school records: “Withdrawn, prone to fantasies, displays aggression at the slightest conflict.”

Age 12. He was referred for psychiatric evaluation at Youth House in New York after neighbors complained about threats involving a knife. The conclusion sounded like a warning of the catastrophe to come:

“Emotionally immature, prone to isolation and retreat into his own world. Possible latent psychopathy.”

Age 13. He was sent to a home for troubled adolescents in New York. Psychologist Dr. Hartogs prepared a report in which he noted:

“A 13-year-old boy with good intellectual abilities, but with chronic truancy, which led to his placement in the home for troubled adolescents. Mild neurological abnormalities and psychosis were identified. Diagnosis: personality disorder with schizoid traits and passive-aggressive tendencies.” — National Archives

Dr. Hartogs strongly recommended that Oswald receive treatment at a child guidance clinic and that his mother receive psychotherapy. But this never happened. Lee frequently avoided contact with classmates and teachers. His teachers described him as withdrawn and uninterested in social interaction.

“He did not want to have friends and did not like talking to people.” — National Archives

“Mother and son shared a similar view of the world; both felt like victims, isolated and surrounded by people and government institutions that did not understand their special place in the world.” — History News Network

Age 15. Oswald began to take an interest in socialism. In his diary, he wrote:

“I was looking for the key to my surroundings, and then I discovered socialist literature.”

While serving in the U.S. Marine Corps, his fellow Marines recalled his unusual fascination with Marxism and his cold detachment. One fellow Marine would later say:

“He was always alone. He read Marx’s Manifesto and remained silent. When he fired during training, it felt as though he wasn’t shooting at a target, but at something inside himself.”

Age 19. After leaving the U.S. Marine Corps in September 1959, Lee Harvey Oswald decided to leave the country. He traveled to Europe and then to the Soviet Union, where he intended to remain permanently.

On October 16, 1959, Oswald arrived in Moscow. He immediately submitted an application for Soviet citizenship. In interviews with Soviet officials, he stated that he was a communist and wished to live in the Soviet Union.

But on October 21, 1959, Oswald was informed that his application for citizenship had been rejected. In response, he attempted suicide by cutting his wrist. Soviet authorities placed him in a hospital, where he underwent psychiatric evaluation.

After treatment, Oswald went to Minsk, where he found work as a mechanic at the Horizont factory, which manufactured televisions and radio equipment. He was provided with an apartment and a monthly financial allowance.

In his diary, he writes: “The Soviet system is better than America. Here, people value work and equality. I want to be part of this world, not a world that rejected me.”

“Oswald was given a job and provided with an apartment, despite the fact that he was not officially a citizen. This was standard practice for foreigners who wanted to integrate.” — from the KGB archives. Minsk, 1960.

“He was under observation and, of course, an ideal subject for testing loyalty. But there is no evidence of recruitment.” — James Wilson, Oswald’s biographer.

1961, March. Nineteen-year-old Lee Harvey Oswald meets Marina Prusakova, a pharmacy student from Leningrad, at a dance in Minsk. Six weeks later, on April 30, 1961, they get married. Their marriage is registered at the home of her uncle, who worked in Soviet counterintelligence. And that is an interesting fact.

In an interview with Radio Liberty, Inessa Yahel, a family acquaintance, recalled: “Oswald always spoke very positively about Kennedy” (Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty).

This suggests that during the period of their acquaintance and early marriage, Oswald did not express any negative opinions about the U.S. president. In one of his letters to his parents in 1961, Oswald writes:

“I live here, but I don’t feel like I belong, I don’t feel that I am at home. People are friendly, but my life is controlled from all sides. Sometimes I feel like I am simply a toy in the hands of this system.” — Lee Harvey Oswald, letter to his parents, Minsk, November 1961.

In a letter to friends, he describes his family and work: “Marina is a good girl, she takes care of me, but we live under constant surveillance. The work at the factory is boring, although stable. I think about the future, about where I should go next.” — Lee Harvey Oswald, Minsk, December 1961.

In June 1962, after lengthy bureaucratic procedures, Oswald and Marina left the Soviet Union with their daughter and arrived in the United States, where their lives continued under the close attention of the press and the authorities.

In January 1963, Oswald writes to a friend: “Returning to America is a strange feeling. On the one hand, freedom; on the other, the feeling that everyone knows who I am and watches my every step.” — Lee Harvey Oswald, letter to a friend, 1963.

He also mentions his life with Marina: “Marina and our daughter are my family, but I feel like a stranger everywhere. It seems that my life was scripted, like a film in which I don’t know what my role is.” — Lee Harvey Oswald, personal notes, 1963.

In his diary, he writes: “I am alone. A stranger everywhere. No one understands what I feel. Even my thoughts seem foreign to me. My life is too small, too insignificant. I have to do something to be heard.”

The United States. When Oswald returned to America with his wife in 1962, instead of being subjected to harsh interrogation, he received a relatively mild reception. He was hardly pursued by either the FBI or the CIA, even though the very fact of a “defector returning” should have triggered a serious investigation. Moreover, he was left free, although people had been imprisoned for much lesser offenses. This could have been connected to the possibility that he was simultaneously “under the wing” of both systems — the KGB in the USSR and U.S. intelligence agencies after his return. The question is who ultimately used him as a pawn, and who “burned” him to eliminate the traces. In the USSR, he was surrounded by the niece of an intelligence officer; in the United States, there was an unusually mild reaction from the intelligence services. Coincidence? The dry lines of declassified archives sometimes speak louder than any theory. Here is how the CIA formulated its position in the 1960s. CIA, service memorandum:

“Lee Harvey Oswald was not connected with the CIA as an agent or in any other capacity.”

A formal denial. But the very existence of a separate 201 file suggests otherwise — he was the subject of close attention.

FBI, final conclusion after 25,000 interviews: “Oswald acted alone.”

A phrase that sounds more like a verdict than the result of an investigation.

Soviet report from Minsk: “Oswald works at a factory, married to Marina Prusakova.”

A dry registration, but it is precisely this marriage that connects him with people close to the KGB. Both systems — Soviet and American — kept Oswald within their field of attention. But the question remains: was he a pawn or an agent? In this game, Oswald may have been an object of interest to both intelligence services at the same time. But who ultimately used him last? And who turned off the lights when the game came to an end?

September 1963. Oswald travels to Mexico, where he visits the Cuban consulate. He attempts to obtain a visa to travel to Cuba, but encounters bureaucratic obstacles.

“Oswald visited the Cuban consulate in Mexico City on September 27, 1963, and again on September 28” — from a CIA report.

At the consulate, Oswald states that he intends to travel to Cuba and then to the Soviet Union. However, Cuban diplomats tell him that he needs permission from the Soviet authorities in order to do so.

“Oswald stated that his ultimate destination was the Soviet Union and that he wanted to travel through Cuba” — from a CIA report.

Despite his attempts, Oswald is unable to obtain a visa to travel to Cuba. This frustrates him, and he returns to the United States without achieving his goal.

“Oswald was unable to obtain a visa to travel to Cuba and returned to the United States” — from a CIA report.

Some researchers have suggested that Oswald may have maintained connections with the Cuban regime. However, the evidence for this theory remains disputed and insufficient.

“Some researchers have suggested that Oswald may have maintained connections with the Cuban regime” — from an article in The Washington Post.

“Oswald’s motives for traveling to Cuba remain unclear” — from an article in The Washington Post.

San Francisco — “US Radar.” Oswald briefly works for a company associated with electronics and radio equipment manufacturing. However, his stay there is short-lived: instability and a lack of career prospects force him to look for other options.

“He returned to America with a dream, but found himself a man without a stable job, without friends, with ideas that few people understood” — researcher Robert Edwards.

Then Dallas — the Texas School Book Depository. In 1963, Oswald gets a job at the textbook warehouse, where he sorts and packs books. Colleagues note his withdrawn and secretive nature:

“He was quiet, withdrawn, almost invisible among his colleagues. No one could have imagined that this modest warehouse worker would end up at the center of the tragedy of an entire nation” — historian Michael O’Brien.

“Oswald seemed like an ordinary worker, but he always kept to himself, did not make friends, and hardly spoke” — a witness from the Texas School Book Depository.

“He did his work exactly as required, without showing initiative. But at the same time, he gave the impression that he was thinking deeply and secretly” — journalist John Marlow, Washington Post.

Lee Harvey Oswald’s life in the United States is severely constrained by circumstances that do not correspond in any way to his inner needs and ideals. His low-paying jobs, social isolation, and constant instability create a psychological gap between who he is on the inside and who he is forced to be in reality.

Immediately after the assassination of President Kennedy, the name Lee Harvey Oswald becomes synonymous with the crime. Newspapers scream about his “lone attack,” and the police quickly announce that the shooter has been found. But the deeper you delve into the details, the more clearly a disturbing picture emerges: Oswald was too weak, too nervous, and too unprepared to carry out such a precise and bloody act. One of the first doubts came from eyewitnesses. Witnesses in the Dallas area claimed that they saw “another man” getting into a car with a rifle. Mr. Hughes, a tenant in a neighboring house, made notes for the police:

“I saw him clearly. He raised the rifle and carefully put it into the car. Oswald? No. Not in his build, not in his walk. Too tall, too confident... Oswald didn’t look or move like that.”

Another witness, Oswald’s neighbor, Mr. Carter, recalled:

“Lee was never careful with weapons. Once he spilled cartridges right on the table, trembling with nerves. He could not have prepared a rifle for the assassination of the president. I tried to help him; he was almost crying from confusion.”

Colleagues and friends describe Oswald as a person who was easily influenced and directed:

“He was like a puppet on strings. He always followed the instructions of those above him, never showed initiative... If someone used him, he wouldn’t even have understood what he was doing,” one of his colleagues said.

Even security service personnel who later gave interviews to journalists admitted to having doubts:

“We knew that Oswald was nervous and impractical. He could not have organized the assassination on his own. Someone used him as cover, as a scapegoat.”

There is a theory that Oswald was part of a group, but that his role was not to fire the shots, but rather to create a convenient image of the shooter for the public. This “ideal victim” was lonely, withdrawn, and easily agitated — a man whose mistakes and nervousness made him easy to control. One of the diaries of Dallas journalists contains a strange note:

“It doesn’t matter who fired. Oswald is the perfect victim. Nervous, lonely, easily directed. Everything can be pinned on him, and no one will ask uncomfortable questions.”

The question of the rifle from which the heart of the American nation — John F. Kennedy — was killed remains one of the most controversial issues in the history of the investigation. The Mannlicher-Carcano M91/38 became a symbol of the Warren Commission’s version, while at the same time giving rise to dozens of critical analyses and conspiracy theories. The key question is: could Oswald, a man with average shooting skills, have fired three accurate shots alone within 5.6 seconds from this rifle, under the conditions of the noisy, chaotic movement of the motorcade in Dallas? To answer this question, it is necessary to delve into the technical and historical aspects of the rifle, as well as to assess Oswald’s actual level of training.

So, the Carcano rifle was developed in Italy at the end of the 19th century. The M91/38 model was a short, lightweight version of the standard M91, using 6.5×52 mm ammunition. It was adopted by the Italian army in 1891 and remained in use until the Second World War. The characteristic features of the M91/38 model were: length — approximately 102 cm, weight — 4.3 kg, a six-round magazine, and a four-power optical sight. For a shooter without serious training, this rifle was not considered a high-precision weapon — its accuracy decreased significantly at distances of more than 100 meters. Oswald acquired the rifle through a mail-order purchase under the name “Alek Hidell.” The package included an inexpensive optical sight whose quality of manufacture was poor. The low stability of the sight caused the mount to shift after each shot, requiring readjustment. Accurate shooting, especially with this rifle, required regular practice and good positional stability. At distances exceeding 200 meters, the Carcano rifle lost a significant degree of accuracy. In the Kennedy case, the distance to the target was approximately 72 meters, which was technically within the rifle’s capabilities. But the important question remains: was Oswald able to aim the sight correctly, taking into account the movement of the limousine and his own lack of experience? Mannlicher-Carcano is a bolt-action rifle that requires effort and time to reload. According to the official version, Oswald fired three shots in 5.6 seconds. This means that he had to fire, reload the rifle, aim accurately, and fire the next shot — repeating the process three times. Numerous experiments conducted as part of independent investigations showed that for an untrained shooter, accomplishing this was impossible without significant practice. Even experienced shooters with good skills noted that three such shots required at least 8—10 seconds. This adds further doubt to the version that Oswald acted alone. Lee Harvey Oswald had experience serving in the U.S. Marine Corps, where he received firearms training, but his results were not outstanding. In one of the tests, he demonstrated an average level of accuracy and did not receive a high qualification. In addition, doctors and experts who analyzed his physical condition pointed to unstable health and less-than-exceptional physical fitness. Experts agree that although the weapon was technically capable of firing at a distance of 72 meters, the combination of factors — the sight, reloading, shooting conditions, and Oswald’s skills — makes the official version extremely questionable.

Dr. Philip Marshall, a weapons expert, wrote: “The Warren Commission’s version of three shots in 5.6 seconds with a Mannlicher-Carcano requires a very high degree of shooter training, which Oswald, judging by his records, did not possess.”

After Kennedy's assassination, numerous independent shooters attempted to reproduce the shots from the Mannlicher-Carcano M91/38 under conditions approximating those on the day of the assassination. These experiments were conducted by various organizations, including research groups and investigative journalists. In 1978, as part of the House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA), a test was conducted: experienced shooters attempted to fire three shots in 5.6 seconds from a position similar to Oswald's alleged shooting position in Dallas. The results were ambiguous: only a few experienced shooters were able to complete the task, and even then — with prior preparation and training. In most cases, the shooting time exceeded 7 seconds, which contradicts the official version. This gave supporters of alternative theories grounds to claim that there may have been several shooters.

Detail from the HSCA report: "The experiments showed that firing three accurate shots within the specified time was extremely difficult, even for trained shooters."

A key argument in the discussion is an audio recording made by a police officer at the time of the assassination. Analysis of the sound waves showed that the number of shots may have exceeded the official three. Dr. Donald Cahill, an acoustics specialist, stated:

"Analysis of the sound signals indicates the presence of at least four shots, which calls into question the lone-shooter theory."

Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.

Текст предоставлен ООО «Литрес».

Прочитайте эту книгу целиком, [купив полную легальную версию](#) на Литрес.

Безопасно оплатить книгу можно банковской картой Visa, MasterCard, Maestro, со счета мобильного телефона, с платежного терминала, в салоне МТС или Связной, через PayPal, WebMoney, Яндекс.Деньги, QIWI Кошелек, бонусными картами или другим удобным Вам способом.