

Mr. LIEBELER. Mr. CARRO, I have initialed Exhibit 1 on your deposition for purposes of identification, and I ask you if you would also initial it near my initials so that we won't have any difficulty in identifying it. I am correct in my understanding, am I not, that you prepared this report?

Mr. CARRO. Yes; this is my report and the entries herein, except for one or two that may have been made by Mr. Dunn—and I refer to the entry of 1-5-54, while I was on vacation—those bearing the name John Carro, bearing my name, are my entries, and this is my report.

Mr. LIEBELER. Let the record show that the exhibit that we have marked is a somewhat illegible copy.

Mr. LIEBELER. As you have indicated to me, the original was on yellow paper, which does not reproduce well. I will obtain the original and make it a part of the record. Can you think of anything else, Mr. Carro, about Oswald or your contacts with Oswald that you think would be of help to the Commission?

Mr. CARRO. Well, I think that there has been so much written on it that you have probably a much more comprehensive report, since you have been able to get the actual records of these statements that I made at the time I wrote this. I doubt that I could really say anything at this point, 12 years later or so, that would be of any help to you.

Whatever I might say would just be an independent opinion on my own and I don't think that would be that valid. I think you have the original psychiatric report here, the social agency report, and whatever it is, and they are amply—I don't think that I could add anything independently that would be of help to the Commission.

Mr. LIEBELER. In view of that, Mr. Carro, I don't have any more questions. I want to thank you very much on behalf of the Commission for coming here and for giving the testimony that you have. It is another example of the way the city of New York and the people who are associated with it have cooperated with the work of the Commission. The Commission appreciates it very much. We thank you sincerely.

Mr. CARRO. I appreciate very much your having me over here. I would like to offer whatever help I can, and I hope I have been of some help in making whatever decision you have to make on this matter.

Mr. LIEBELER. You have been very helpful, Mr. Carro.

Mr. CARRO. Thank you.

---

## TESTIMONY OF DR. RENATUS HARTOGS

The testimony of Dr. Renatus Hartogs was taken at 5:20 p.m., on April 16, 1964, at 7 East 86th Street, New York, N.Y., by Mr. Wesley J. Liebeler, assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Renatus Hartogs, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Mr. LIEBELER. My name is Wesley J. Liebeler. I am a member of the legal staff of the President's Commission investigating the assassination of President Kennedy. Staff members have been authorized to take the testimony of witnesses by the Commission pursuant to authority granted to the Commission by Executive Order No. 1130, dated November 29, 1963, and Joint Resolution of Congress No. 137.

The Commission has also adopted certain rules of procedure governing the taking of testimony of witnesses which provide, among other things, that each witness should receive a copy of the Executive order and the joint resolution to which I have just referred, as well as a copy of the rules governing the taking of testimony. The Commission will provide you with copies of these documents.

The rules concerning the taking of testimony provide generally that a witness may have counsel if he wishes. He is entitled to 3 days' notice, which I do not believe you had, but every witness is also entitled to waive that notice. I presume that you will waive the notice since we are here.

Dr. HARTOGS. That's right, sure, yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. We want to inquire of you concerning the contact which the Commission understands you had with Lee Harvey Oswald some time in 1953 or 1954.

Would you state your full name for the record, please.

Dr. HARTOGS. Rénatus Hartogs.

Mr. LIEBELER. What is your address?

Dr. HARTOGS. 7 East 86th.

Mr. LIEBELER. Where were you born and when?

Dr. HARTOGS. In Mainz, M-a-i-n-z, Germany, January 22, 1909.

Mr. LIEBELER. When did you come to the United States, Doctor?

Dr. HARTOGS. On December 4, 1940.

Mr. LIEBELER. You received your education in Germany, is that correct?

Dr. HARTOGS. In Germany, in Belgium. I have a Ph. D. from the University of Frankfurt-am-Main, which is Germany, and I have a medical degree from the University of Brussels Medical School, and then I came to the United States and I studied medicine again to fulfill the requirements of the New York State Education Department, and I have a medical degree from the University of Montreal Medical School. Then I have an M.A. from New York University, and that's it.

Mr. LIEBELER. In what field is that?

Dr. HARTOGS. In clinical psychopathology.

Mr. LIEBELER. And you are——

Dr. HARTOGS. I am a Ph. D. in clinical psychology and an M.D.

Mr. LIEBELER. You are admitted to the practice of medicine in the State of New York, is that correct?

Dr. HARTOGS. In the State of New York.

Mr. LIEBELER. And you have taken the examination for the practice of medicine?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. And you are admitted to practice medicine in the State?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. You are regularly engaged, are you not, in the practice of medicine as a psychiatrist?

Dr. HARTOGS. As a psychiatrist exclusively, yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. How long have you been practicing here in the United States as a psychiatrist?

Dr. HARTOGS. In the States since 1949.

Mr. LIEBELER. Did you practice medicine in Germany?

Dr. HARTOGS. In Belgium.

Mr. LIEBELER. How long did you practice in Belgium?

Dr. HARTOGS. 3 years.

Mr. LIEBELER. Was that as a psychiatrist or in the general practice of medicine?

Dr. HARTOGS. No, psychologist.

Mr. LIEBELER. You are also the chief psychiatrist for the Youth House of New York City, is that correct?

Dr. HARTOGS. That's correct.

Mr. LIEBELER. How long have you held that position?

Dr. HARTOGS. Since 1951.

Mr. LIEBELER. What kind of duties do you perform as the chief psychiatrist at the Youth House? Tell us generally about what they are.

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes, that's right. I examine all the children which have been remanded to Youth House on order of the court for the purpose of psychiatric examination, so not all children who are at Youth House are psychiatrically examined. There is only a specific quantity, number. As these children are psychiatrically examined by me and my staff, I submit my report to the court with recommendations and diagnosis, and it is up to the court to follow the recommendations or not.

I at the same time teach the staff. I give workshops in the psychiatric aspects of social work. I give seminars in which we discuss very interesting

cases which have come up and to which the professional public of New York City is invited.

So, for instance, we gave such a seminar on Oswald. That is the reason why I vaguely remember him.

Mr. LIEBELER. You were also, as you have testified, the chief psychiatrist for the Youth House in 1953.

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. Were your duties in connection with that job pretty much the same in 1953 as they are now?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. How large a staff did you have in 1953, approximately?

Dr. HARTOGS. Approximately I would say 300.

Mr. LIEBELER. A staff?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes, staff, because we have three shifts, you see. We have about two staff members for every child.

Mr. LIEBELER. I see. I thought you testified previously that there were other psychiatrists.

Dr. HARTOGS. Oh, my staff?

Mr. LIEBELER. Yes, on your staff, not at the Youth House, but on your staff.

Dr. HARTOGS. Oh, I thought—on my staff we have three psychiatrists now.

Mr. LIEBELER. About how many did you have in 1953?

Dr. HARTOGS. In 1953 we had two, two or three. It changed continuously. Sometimes we had even four.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you remember the names of the other psychiatrists who were on the staff at the time Oswald was in the Youth House?

Dr. HARTOGS. No, no. They are continuously changing. Sometimes they were just for a few weeks there, but I have remained on the staff continuously.

Mr. LIEBELER. The Youth House is an institution of the city of New York, is that correct, or is it supported by voluntary contributions? Is it a private institution or is it an adjunct of the city of New York?

Dr. HARTOGS. Right now it is part of the probation department of the city of New York, under the jurisdiction of the probation department. Previously it was a private institution with a private board. Then later on the city of New York took over as far as the administration and the payment of the salaries is concerned, but the private board was maintained. So today the private board still exists, but the probation department of the city of New York has the jurisdiction over Youth House.

Mr. LIEBELER. Does the city of New York support it financially?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes, the city of New York pays for it.

Mr. LIEBELER. Was that true, do you know, offhand, in 1953, or was it still a private organization at that time?

Dr. HARTOGS. At that time it was a private organization, yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. You are a citizen of the United States, are you not?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes, since 1945.

Mr. LIEBELER. Would you outline for us in general terms what the procedure is with respect to a boy who is remanded to the Youth House for psychiatric observation. He is ordered by the court to go to the Youth House; he goes to the Youth House.

Dr. HARTOGS. He goes to the Youth House, that's right.

Mr. LIEBELER. What generally happens to him then?

Dr. HARTOGS. When he is in Youth House he is given a preliminary screening as to what kind of a person he is, through human figure drawings. That is a special test that is given.

Mr. LIEBELER. Who administers that, social workers on the staff?

Dr. HARTOGS. Social workers, and the psychologists, they do that, a preliminary screening, because if we have very disturbed children right away from the beginning we—I see them right away on an emergency basis and send them out because we cannot keep too disturbed children in Youth House. We send them then to a mental hospital. So then this child goes into an intake dormitory where he is dressed, acquainted with the techniques of adjustment in Youth House, the Youth House philosophy. Then he is assigned to one of the dormitories, and then he is sent to school. We have our own school, P.S. 613. We

have our own workshops for the children, recreation department. We have group service. We have our own hospital where the child is checked as to his physical health.

So the child is slowly but surely introduced in all these various departments.

Then the social worker has interviews with this child and with the parents of the child who are invited.

Then the school authorities prepare a report for me so that when I see the child I have in front of me the probation officer's report, the social worker's report on his contact with the child and the parents, I have the report of group service or household, as it is called, I have the report of the medical department, and I have the report of the recreation department, and I have also the report of the psychologist.

And then I see the child and examine the child, and then I incorporate in my report all these, my own findings with the findings of the Youth House staff.

Mr. LIEBELER. Can you tell us approximately in 1953 how much of your time you devoted to the examination of children in Youth House?

Dr. HARTOGS. 30 hours per week.

Mr. LIEBELER. 30 hours a week. And about how many children would you see during the period of time in a week, average week?

Dr. HARTOGS. During that, 10 or 12.

Mr. LIEBELER. So that you would spend somewhere between 2 and 3 hours with each child, is that correct?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. Is that still true?

Dr. HARTOGS. No, I mean not with the child itself. The child is seen for about half an hour to an hour.

Mr. LIEBELER. By you?

Dr. HARTOGS. By me, but then I have also to study the record which takes half an hour, and then it takes about an hour to dictate, so that counts about 2 hours.

Mr. LIEBELER. In your capacity as chief psychiatrist for the Youth House did you have occasion at any time to interview Lee Harvey Oswald?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. Would you tell us when that was and all that you can remember about that interview in your own words.

Dr. HARTOGS. That is tough. I remember that—actually I reconstructed this from what I remembered from the seminar. We gave a seminar on this boy in which we discussed him, because he came to us on a charge of truancy from school, and yet when I examined him, I found him to have definite traits of dangerousness. In other words, this child had a potential for explosive, aggressive, assaultive acting out which was rather unusual to find in a child who was sent to Youth House on such a mild charge as truancy from school.

This is the reason why I remember this particular child, and that is the reason why we discussed him in the seminar.

I found him to be a medium-sized, slender, curlyhaired youngster, pale-faced, who was not very talkative, he was not spontaneous. He had to be prompted. He was polite. He answered in a somewhat monotonous fashion. His sentences were well structured. He was in full contact with reality.

Mr. LIEBELER. He was?

Dr. HARTOGS. He was in full contact with reality. I found his reasoning to be intensely self-centered, his judgment also centering around his own needs, and the way he looked at life and his relationships with people. This was mostly in the foreground. So this is what I remember actually.

Mr. LIEBELER. You say that you have reconstructed your recollection of your interview with Lee Oswald by thinking of the seminar that you gave; is that correct?

Dr. HARTOGS. The seminar; that is right.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you have any independent recollection of the interview with Lee Oswald itself?

Dr. HARTOGS. Only from remembering the seminar, what kind of a boy he was and what I said at that time, I was able to reconstruct the picture of the boy as I just described it; yes. That is how I proceeded.

Mr. LIEBELER. Tell us about the seminar, Doctor. How did it come that you gave this seminar on Oswald, to whom was it given, what was the general subject matter of the seminar?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes; every Monday afternoon, at 1:30 until 3 o'clock, the professional Youth House staff gets together in order to discuss an interesting or unusual child. At that time we selected Oswald because of the reason which I indicated, the discrepancy between the charge and the seriousness of his personality disturbance, and the seminar was opened by the Youth House director; then the social worker talked about the development, background and early history of the child; then the Youth House recreation department and household talked, and then the school department gave a report; then the psychologist reported on his findings, and then I acquainted the people who were present with the findings of the psychiatrist and recommendations which I made to the court.

Mr. LIEBELER. Whose suggestion was it that Oswald be used as a subject matter for the seminar?

Dr. HARTOGS. I believe it was mine, because I was the one to select these children.

Mr. LIEBELER. Was there any report of the proceedings of the seminar prepared?

Dr. HARTOGS. No; it is all spontaneous.

Mr. LIEBELER. Just a spontaneous, informal sort of thing?

Dr. HARTOGS. That is right.

Mr. LIEBELER. No one made any memorandum of what occurred at that time?

Dr. HARTOGS. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you have any records relating to the seminar?

Dr. HARTOGS. No; there are never any records, never anything written down; it is purely informal.

Mr. LIEBELER. The only writings that would have been at the seminar would have been the reports that had been previously prepared by you and by the other members of the Youth House staff; is that correct?

Dr. HARTOGS. Right.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you recall what recommendation you made to the court in respect of Oswald?

Dr. HARTOGS. If I can recall correctly, I recommended that this youngster should be committed to an institution.

Mr. LIEBELER. What type of institution, do you recall?

Dr. HARTOGS. No; that I don't recall. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. But you are quite clear in your recollection that you recommended that he be institutionalized immediately because of the personality pattern disturbance; is that correct?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes; that is right. That I remember; yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. How long did Oswald stay at the Youth House, do you know?

Dr. HARTOGS. Not exactly. Not exactly. Anything from 4 to 8 weeks, that is the average stay.

Mr. LIEBELER. The Youth House is a place the basic function of which is observation of children in a controlled environment; would you say?

Dr. HARTOGS. Controlled environment for the purpose of psychiatric observation or for the purpose of detention pending court appearance, or custodial care of the child pending his commitment, I mean his actual transfer to a child-caring or custodial institution such as a training school. These are the three purposes.

Mr. LIEBELER. The Youth House is not the kind of place where a boy would be kept indefinitely after he had been committed, or something like that?

Dr. HARTOGS. No, the average is about 2 to 3 months; I mean 3 months is maximum.

Mr. LIEBELER. Can you recall what kind of institution you recommended that Oswald be committed to?

Dr. HARTOGS. I never make a recommendation as to the name, the specific institution. This is a prerogative of the court.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you make a recommendation as to the type of institution to which you recommend a child?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes; I do that, either a mental hospital or training school or residential treatment center, but I do not recall in this case what I recommended.

Mr. LIEBELER. But you do recall quite clearly that you did recommend, because of this boy's personality pattern, disturbance?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes; that he should not be placed in the community.

Mr. LIEBELER. Or placed on probation?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes; that is right.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you recall being interviewed on this question by the FBI?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you remember approximately when they interviewed you?

Dr. HARTOGS. No; I don't know the date.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you remember that you told them the same thing, that is, that you recommended institutionalizing Oswald as a result of his psychiatric examination which indicated that he was potentially dangerous?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. Would you tell us how you first became aware, after the assassination, that Lee Oswald was a child with whom you had had previous contact?

Dr. HARTOGS. The first time was, I read it in the newspaper, Justice Kelley, you know, Florence Kelley, made a statement to the press that Oswald had been in the Youth House, and she revealed details of the psychiatric report which immediately made me aware of the fact that I was the one to examine the child, because this was my wording.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you remember the wording?

Dr. HARTOGS. For instance, incipient schizophrenia, I think she used; potentially dangerous is something which I use. These are some of the expressions.

Mr. LIEBELER. These expressions are peculiar to your particular type of work?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. And not generally used by others?

Dr. HARTOGS. And by me generally in dealing with children.

Mr. LIEBELER. Did you keep the newspaper clipping by any chance that indicated this?

Dr. HARTOGS. No, no.

Mr. LIEBELER. What did you do after you learned or became aware that Oswald was a child with whom you had had contact?

Dr. HARTOGS. I didn't do anything. I didn't do anything, but the New York Times sent a reporter, and he questioned me on whether I was the one to examine this child, because they read it, and I said that I did not know for sure, but it is possible.

And what happened then? Then very soon the FBI came in here and said, "You are the doctor who examined Oswald." and from then on I know for sure that it was me, because they must have read a report.

Mr. LIEBELER. Now, up until the time that the FBI came and said that you were the doctor who interviewed Oswald, did you still have some doubt in your mind as to whether you had actually interviewed the boy?

Dr. HARTOGS. I was not convinced, I was not sure, until I then reconstructed everything in my mind.

Mr. LIEBELER. As you have indicated, by recalling—

Dr. HARTOGS. That is right, then I recalled everything.

Mr. LIEBELER. Did you make any statement to television people in connection with this at all?

Dr. HARTOGS. About Oswald?

Mr. LIEBELER. Yes.

Dr. HARTOGS. No; on the day after President Kennedy died, the television people asked me to make a statement on television in general about why somebody might kill the President. I did not mention any name. I did not refer to any individual. I just made some general psychiatric remarks as to what kind of a person would kill the President.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you recall approximately what you said?

Dr. HARTOGS. That a person who would commit such an act has been very likely a mentally disturbed person, who has a personal grudge against persons in authority, and very likely is a person who in his search to overcome his own

insignificance and helplessness will try to commit an act which will make others frightened, which will shatter the world, which will make other people insecure, as if he wanted to discharge his own insecurity through his own act, something like that in general terms.

Mr. LIEBELER. Was it indicated by you at that time, or was it indicated on the television broadcast that you were the psychiatrist who had examined Lee Oswald?

Dr. HARTOGS. No, no.

Mr. LIEBELER. It was not?

Dr. HARTOGS. No, no. They didn't know. They called me because they call me very often to give some psychiatric explanations of murderers or something like that. They did not know, and I did not know for sure.

Mr. LIEBELER. At that time neither one of you were—

Dr. HARTOGS. And they selected me. I mean it was a fantastic thing.

Mr. LIEBELER. It was purely coincidence?

Dr. HARTOGS. Coincidence that they selected me.

Mr. LIEBELER. So you made no reference at that time to the examination which you had made of Oswald?

Dr. HARTOGS. None at all. I didn't know.

Mr. LIEBELER. Dr. Hartogs, do you have in your possession a copy of the report which you made at the time you examined Oswald?

Dr. HARTOGS. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. Have you had any opportunity to examine a copy of that report since the assassination?

Dr. HARTOGS. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. So the recollection that you have given us as regards your diagnosis and your recommendations is strictly based on your own independent recollection, plus the reconstruction of your interview with Oswald from the seminar that you recall having given?

Dr. HARTOGS. Right.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you remember anything else that particularly impressed you about Oswald? The FBI report indicates that you were greatly impressed by the boy, who was only 13½ years old at the time, because he had extremely cold, steely eyes. Do you remember telling that to the agents?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes, yes; that he was not emotional at all; he was in control of his emotions. He showed a cold, detached outer attitude. He talked about his situation, about himself in a, what should I say, nonparticipating fashion. I mean there was nothing emotional, affective about him, and this impressed me. That was the only thing which I remembered; yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. Now, you recall also that Oswald was a slender and pale-faced boy?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. Can you remember what particular thing it was about Oswald that made you conclude that he had this severe personality disturbance? What led you to this diagnosis?

Dr. HARTOGS. It was his suspiciousness against adults, as far as I recall, his exquisite sensitivity in dealing with others, their opinions on his behalf. That is as far as I recall it.

Mr. LIEBELER. Did you form an opinion as to his intellectual ability, his mental endowment?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes; but that I don't recall for sure. It was at least average at that time.

Mr. LIEBELER. I want to mark "Exhibit 1" on the examination of Dr. Renatus Hartogs, April 16, 1964, in New York, a photostatic copy of a document entitled "Youth House Psychiatrist's Report," indicating a report on case No. 26996; date of admission, April 16, 1953, exactly 11 years ago; date of examination, May 1, 1953, with regard to a boy by the name of Lee Harvey Oswald. I have initialed a copy of this report for identification purposes, Doctor. Would you initial it here next to my initials.

(Witness complies.)

(Photostatic copy of document entitled "Youth House Psychiatrist's Report" marked "Exhibit 1.")

Mr. LIEBELER. Would you read the report and tell us if that is the report that you prepared at that time?

Dr. HARTOGS. That is right, that is it. Interesting.

Mr. LIEBELER. Doctor, is your recollection refreshed after looking at the report that you made at that time?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes, yes; that is the diagnosis, "personality pattern disturbance with schizoid features and passive—aggressive tendencies." Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. On page 1, at the very beginning of the report, you wrote at that time, did you not, "This 13-year-old, well-built, well-nourished boy was remanded to Youth House for the first time on charge of truancy."

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. On the last page of the report there is a section entitled "Summary for Probation Officer's Report," is there not?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. And you wrote there, about two or three sentences down, did you not, "We arrive therefore at the recommendation that he should be placed on probation under the condition that he seek help and guidance through contact with a child guidance clinic, where he should be treated preferably by a male psychiatrist who could substitute, to a certain degree at least, for the lack of father figure. At the same time, his mother should be urged to seek psychotherapeutic guidance through contact with a family agency. If this plan does not work out favorably and Lee cannot cooperate in this treatment plan on an outpatient basis, removal from the home and placement could be resorted to at a later date, but it is our definite impression that treatment on probation should be tried out before the stricter and therefore possibly more harmful placement approach is applied to the case of this boy?"

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes. It contradicts my recollection.

Mr. LIEBELER. Yes. As you now read your report—and it is perfectly understandable that it is something that might not be remembered 11 years after the event; I have no recollection of what I was doing 11 years ago.

Dr. HARTOGS. I did not know that I made this ambiguous recommendation.

Mr. LIEBELER. As you read this report and reflect on this report and on the boy, Oswald, as he is revealed through it, do you think that possibly it may have been somebody else that was involved in the seminar or are you convinced that it was Oswald?

Dr. HARTOGS. No; that was Oswald.

Mr. LIEBELER. That was Oswald?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. It would not appear from this report that you found any indication in the character of Lee Oswald at that time that would indicate this possible violent outburst, is there?

Dr. HARTOGS. I didn't mention it in the report, and I wouldn't recall it now.

Mr. LIEBELER. If you would have found it, you would have mentioned it in the report?

Dr. HARTOGS. I would have mentioned it; yes. I just implied it with the diagnosis of passive-aggressive. It means that we are dealing here with a youngster who was hiding behind a seemingly passive, detached facade aggression hostility. I mean this is what I thought was quite clear. I did not say that he had assaultive or homicidal potential.

Mr. LIEBELER. And in fact, as we read through the report, there is no mention of the words "incipient schizophrenic" or "potentially dangerous" in the report.

Dr. HARTOGS. No; I don't know where she has it from, but these are my words. I use it in other reports, but here it is not.

Mr. LIEBELER. "Passive-aggressive tendencies" are fairly common in occurrence, are they not amongst people?

Dr. HARTOGS. No; it is not so common. It is the least common of the three personality traits. It is either a passive-dependent child or an aggressive child, and there is a passive-aggressive child. The passive-aggressive one is the least common.

Mr. LIEBELER. Would you describe for us briefly what the passive-aggressive tendencies are, how do they manifest themselves, what do they indicate?

Dr. HARTOGS. They indicate a passive retiring surface facade, under which the child hides considerable hostility of various degrees.

Mr. LIEBELER. It would indicate to some extent a hiding of hostile tendencies toward others?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes. But usually in a passive-aggressive individual the aggressiveness can be triggered off and provoked in stress situations or if he nourishes his hate and his hostility for considerable length of time so that the passive surface facade all of a sudden explodes, this can happen. I said here that his fantasy life turned around the topics of omnipotence and power. He said also that "I dislike everybody," which is quite interesting, I think, also pertinent.

Mr. LIEBELER. You indicated that his mother was interviewed by the Youth House social worker and is described as such-and-such. That would indicate, would it not, to you that you personally did not see the mother?

Dr. HARTOGS. That is right. I did not see the mother personally, but the information I have from the Youth House social worker's report.

Mr. LIEBELER. You indicated in the second sentence of the summary for the probation officer's report, "No finding of neurological impairment or psychotic mental changes could be made," did you not?

Dr. HARTOGS. That is right.

Mr. LIEBELER. What do you mean when you say that "No finding of psychotic mental changes could be made"?

Dr. HARTOGS. This child was not suffering from delusions and hallucinations.

Mr. LIEBELER. Would you couple that with the concept of neurological impairment which indicated no brain damage or anything of that sort which would cause hallucinations or disturbance of the personality?

Dr. HARTOGS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you remember the circumstances of Oswald's home environment here in New York at the time he came?

Dr. HARTOGS. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. You have no recollection of that. If I were to tell you now that this boy came to New York with his mother, his father having died before he was born, to live with one of his older brothers, and that they lived with the brother here in Manhattan on 92d Street for a short time, after which friction developed, and they then moved to the Bronx, the mother worked all day, to support the child, in a department store here in New York or in Brooklyn, and the boy apparently found difficulty in his relations with others at school because he dressed differently, being from Texas, they lived apparently on the Grand Concourse, which has been described to us at that time as being a generally middle-class Jewish neighborhood, in which the boys did not dress in levis or quite so casually as Oswald did; that he was given some difficulty because of the fact that he did not speak the way the people did in New York, he spoke with a southern Texas accent and did not understand the patois of the city; assuming that those things were true, would that be a partial explanation, do you think, of the way that he reacted to you during the interview as reflected in your report?

Dr. HARTOGS. No; I would not say. This was not the personality disturbance which was the result of the situation of changes or conditioning; this was more deeper going. A personality pattern disturbance is a disturbance which has been existing since early childhood and has continued to exist through the individual's life. It is not the result of recent conditioning.

Mr. LIEBELER. After reading your report, are you able to form an opinion or did you form an opinion at that time of what might have caused this particular personality pattern disturbance in this boy?

Dr. HARTOGS. I mentioned it, I think, in the report, the lack of a father figure, the lack of a real family life, neglect by self-involved mother. Yes; I think these are the three factors.

Mr. LIEBELER. After reviewing the report, do you have any other remarks that you think would be helpful to us in trying to understand what motivated this boy, assuming that he was the assassin of the President?

Dr. HARTOGS. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. That you haven't already talked about?

Dr. HARTOGS. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. I will ask the reporter to set forth the text of the report at the end of the deposition. I want to thank you very much for giving us the time that you have, and on behalf of the Commission we want to tell you that we appreciate it very much. Thanks very much, Doctor.

Dr. HARTOGS. Okay.

"This 13 year old, well-built, well-nourished boy was remanded to Youth House for the first time on charge of truancy from school and of being beyond the control of his mother as far as school attendance is concerned. This is his first contact with the law.

"He is—tense, withdrawn and evasive boy who dislikes intensely talking about himself and his feelings. He likes *the* give the impression that he doesn't care about others and rather likes to keep himself so that he is not bothered and does not have to make the effort of communicating. It was difficult to penetrate the emotional wall behind which this boy hides—and he provided us with sufficient clues, permitting us to see intense anxiety, shyness, feelings of *awkwardness* and insecurity as the main reasons for his withdrawal tendencies and solitary habits. Lee told us: 'I don't want a friend and I don't like to talk to people.' He describes himself as stubborn and according to his own saying likes to say 'no.' Strongly resistive and negativistic features were thus noticed—but psychotic mental content was denied and no indication of psychotic mental changes was arrived at.

"Lee is a youngster with superior mental endowment functioning presently on the bright normal range of mental efficiency. His abstract thinking capacity and his vocabulary are well developed. No retardation in school subjects could be found in spite of his truancy from school. Lee limits his interests to reading magazines and looking at the television all day long. He dislikes to play with others or to face the learning situation in school. On the other hand he claims that he is 'very poor' in all school subjects and would need remedial help. The discrepancy between the claims and his actual attainment level show the low degree of self-evaluation and self-esteem at which this boy has arrived presently, mainly due to feelings of general inadequacy and emotional discouragement.

"Lee is the product of a broken home—as his father died before he was born. Two older brothers are presently in the United States Army—while the mother supports herself and Lee as an insurance broker. This occupation makes it impossible for her to provide adequate supervision of Lee and to make him attend school regularly. Lee is intensely dissatisfied with his present way of living, but feels that the only way in which he can avoid feeling too unhappy is to deny to himself competition with other children or expressing his needs and wants. Lee claims that he can get very angry at his mother and occasionally has hit her, particularly when she returns home without having bought food for supper. On such occasions she leaves it to Lee to prepare some food with what he can find in the kitchen. He feels that his mother rejects him and really has never cared very much for him. He expressed the similar feeling with regard to his brothers who live pretty much on their own without showing any brotherly interest in him. Lee has vivid fantasy life, turning around the topics of omnipotence and power, through which he tries to compensate for his present shortcomings and frustrations. He did not enjoy being *together* with other children and when we asked him whether he prefers the company of boys to *the one of girls*—he answered—'I dislike everybody.' His occupational goal is to join the Army. His mother was interviewed by the Youth House social worker and is described by her as a 'defensive, rigid, self-involved and intellectually alert' woman who finds it exceedingly difficult to understand Lee's personality and his withdrawing behavior. She does not understand that Lee's withdrawal is a form of violent but silent protest against his neglect by her—and represents his reaction to a complete absence of any real family life. She seemed to be interested enough in the welfare of this boy to be willing to seek guidance and help as regards her own difficulties and her management of Lee.

"Neurological examination remained essentially negative with the exception of slightly impaired hearing in the left ear, resulting from a mastoidectomy in

1946. History of convulsions and accidental injuries to the skull was denied. Family history is negative for mental disease.

*"Summary for Probation Officer's Report:*

"This 13-year-old, well-built boy, has superior mental resources and functions only slightly below his capacity level in spite of chronic truancy from school—which brought him into Youth House. No finding of neurological impairment or psychotic mental changes could be made. Lee has to be diagnosed as 'personality pattern disturbance with schizoid features and passive—aggressive tendencies.' Lee has to be seen as an emotionally, quite disturbed youngster who suffers under the impact of really existing emotional isolation and deprivation: lack of affection, absence of family life and rejection by a self-involved and conflicted mother. Although Lee denies that he is in need of any *other* form of help other than 'remedial' one, we gained the definite impression that Lee can be reached through contact with an understanding and very patient psychotherapist and if he could be drawn at the same time into group psychotherapy. We arrive therefore at the recommendation that he should be placed on probation under the condition that he seek help and guidance through contact with a child guidance clinic, where he should be treated preferably by a male psychiatrist who could substitute, to a certain degree at least, for the lack of father figure. At the same time, his mother should be urged to seek psychotherapeutic guidance through contact with a family agency. If this plan does not work out favorably and Lee cannot cooperate in this treatment plan on an out-patient basis, removal from the home and placement could be resorted to at a later date, but it is our definite impression that treatment on probation should be tried out before the stricter and therefore possibly more harmful placement approach is applied to the case of this boy. The Big Brother movement could be undoubtedly of tremendous value in this case and Lee should be urged to join the organized group activities of his community, such as provided by the PAL or YMCA of his neighborhood."

---

### TESTIMONY OF EVELYN GRACE STRICKMAN SIEGEL

The testimony of Evelyn Grace Strickman Siegel was taken at 2:39 p.m., on April 17, 1964, at the U.S. Courthouse, Foley Square, New York, N.Y., by Mr. Wesley J. Liebeler, assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Evelyn Grace Strickman Siegel, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Mr. LIEBELER. Mrs. Siegel, my name is Wesley J. Liebeler. I am a member of the legal staff of the President's Commission investigating the assassination of President Kennedy. Staff members have been authorized to take the testimony of witnesses by the Commission pursuant to authority granted to the Commission by Executive Order No. 11130, dated November 29, 1963, and Joint Resolution of Congress No. 137.

Pursuant to the authority so granted to it, the Commission has promulgated certain rules governing the taking of testimony from witnesses, which provide, among other things, that each witness is entitled to 3 days' notice before he or she is required to give testimony. I know you didn't get 3 days' notice of this, but each witness also has the power to waive that notice, and I assume that you will be willing to waive that notice, and go ahead with the testimony since you are here. Is that correct?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Yes. That's correct.

Mr. LIEBELER. We want to advise you also that the rules provide that if you wish to have a copy of your transcript, you may have it at your own expense, at such time as the Commission releases the transcripts, releases the testimony, and that you are entitled to counsel if you wish. You don't have counsel here, and I assume that you do not wish it.

Mrs. SIEGEL. No. I do not wish it. Will I be advised when the transcripts are released?

Mr. LIEBELER. Yes. The Commission understands that you were working as