

To go with what I mailed earlier, "indert on Hartogs, Oswald born assassin waiting to assassinate-
Perhaps this can be the beginning of what I've written on this, with what I wrote about
Hartogs to follow at the end of this insertion

If it can be said that anything is rewarding in examining as overt and indedent
a commercialization and exploitation of as great and painful, a national tragedy, the
JFK assassination ^{is} was or the totality of abandonment of all the ethical standards
of writing, certainly checking Posner out qualifies.

With so many departures from fact, reality and truth crammed into so large a text,
checking them all out is a practical impossibility. It would just take interminable
time because ^{Posner's} ~~these~~ dishonesties and departures from all the recognized standards of
non-fiction ~~of~~ writing permeate the book. Yet ~~they~~ they are indispensable in the book he
wrote ~~and achieved both his~~ ^{to get} sought money and international fame from it.

Because Posner himself says that his so-called biography of Oswald is the most
important part of his book and because without his falsified pretense that is basic to
the book, ~~he~~ that from youth on Oswald a was an assassin ~~wait~~ ^{at} writing his moment to
assassinate, I did check some of this fantasy out. In doing that ~~that~~ ^{w/} became obvious
is that my initial impression when I first began reading his book, that it is the most
dishonest of a rather large number of supposed assassination books, is not an exaggeration.

The totality of ~~of~~ his dishonest, its deliberatness, its brazenness and the extent
of his abandonment of all ethics and standards of non-fiction, ethics and standards
that should be ~~adhered~~ ^{adhered} to more regidly on such a subject as this, was a surprise.

Such things as inventing sources, citing sources as saying what they ~~neither~~ ^{neither} said
nor even suggested and quoting ~~or~~ incorrect ~~testimontestimony~~ testimony based on faulty recollection
that was ~~corrected~~ ^{corrected} and withdrawn, under oath, at the very poit he cites ~~as having~~ ^{giving it}
the exact ^{up} opposite meaning of the one sworn to, are not all that commonplace in the many
really bad books supposedly on the assassination.

But without this display of having no active conscience at all, ~~as~~ ^{which} cannot be said
too often given the reception his atrocity received from the major media worldwide,
Posner would have had no book at all.

Without his dishonesties, Posner has nothing. Absolutely nothing to call a book.
His basis of his claim that Oswald was an assassin from childhood is his own ~~circumkery~~ ^{shrinkery}
for which he pretends he has the authority he does not have, not in any part of it.

As we see in checking this out, Posner had a motive in his ^{assaults} contrived ~~assaults~~ on me and my writing and on Sylvia ^{Meagher} Meagher and hers: his falsifications cannot survive comparison with ^{honest} honest, responsible writing. He begins his efforts to destroy our credibility to his readers and to the media at the very beginning with me on the ^(seventh and) ninth page of his first chapter with ^{three outbursts} as I note elsewhere, ^{are} (criticism) that have no validity at ^{In them he} all ~~are~~ represent an entirely different book than I wrote, with an entirely different focus.

Posner wastes no time building a ~~base~~ phony psychiatric ~~base~~ case against Oswald as a born-to-be assassin beginning with his prejudiced account of Oswald's arrest at the Texas Theater. On only the second and third pages of this book he has Oswald "smirking" at the police as they took him from the theater and at the beginning of the first police interrogation of him. It is not true, Posner ~~knew~~ ^{knows} it is not true, and where he cites ~~an~~ alleged source; it was with the expectation that his sources would not be checked in any event. ~~to his sources said no such thing and they did not even hint at it or anything like it. For the one that leads into the amateur shrinkery that is the baseless base of the first part of the book he does not even claim to have any source.~~

fits + chapter
not one of cited what he said they said.
SI/ SI/

When the crowd outside the theater first ~~at~~ ^{saw} Oswald and "surged forward, screaming obscenities" and threatening to kill him, Posner writes that instead of being apprehensive, which one would expect, Oswald "smirked and hollered back, 'I protest this police brutality'." Posner's claimed source is the Commission testimony of Officer Gerald Hill, on page 21 of Volume VII. Neither this nor anything like it is in that testimony.

Posner not only made it up, there are photographs available at the Archives which prove Oswald ~~as~~ ^{was} not "smirking" then.

Posner made up that Oswald also smirked while in the police car being driven to headquarters. He says that in response to Officer C.T. Walker telling him he might find out if "they burn for murder" in Texas, referring to Oswald, "Again, the suspect smirked." His citation to this is Walker's testimony in the same volume, pages 40-42.

Walker did testify to the "burn" exchange but he did not use the word "smirk", and he suggested nothing like it ~~and back to~~ and every one of his references to how Oswald looked and behaved are the opposite of smirking.

On the next page Posner writes about the police asking Oswald, on finding he had identifications under ~~that the~~ ^{and} name ~~as~~ as Alek H. Dell, "Which one are you?" Posner ~~the~~ says of Oswald, "A smirk again crossed his face. 'You figure it out,' he said."

This time ~~he~~ ^{Posner} does not even invent a source and once again, ~~at~~ nothing at all

like it happened.

Posner contrived this as a novelist would, leading from it into the allegation that nobody had ever figured Oswald out but he, here, ^(in his book, does that) for the first time would do that.

~~Posner begins as he ends and as he is throughout, not only his contrived shrink's interpretation of Oswald from his selective and angled "biography" of him.~~

But he wasted ^{no} no time poisoning the reader's mind and he ^{does} did that with overt dishonesty, either attributing to his source/claims sources what they did not say or just making it up ^{w/} without a source, ^{This is to condition the reader's mind to believe his phony argument that Oswald is} which is what he did to lead into his develop-
ment of Oswald as the assassin born to be an assassin. He uses the word "smirk" to ~~say~~ say that his born-to-be-assassin Oswald was taking satisfaction from having killed the President.

The first two meanings of "smirk" ^(as a verb) in the Random House ~~at~~ unabridged dictionary are ¹⁾ 1) to smirk in an affected ~~ly~~ offensively familiar way; 2) to express with a smirk: He smirked his lewd delight at the scene. ^(Italics in original) Both convey what Posner wanted ~~to~~ to have believed, the second in particular, as in "He smirked his ^{lewd} delight at having killed the President."

The Oxford American Dictionary gives an apt definition of the word as a noun: "a self-satisfied smile." What as Posner writes could Oswald have been "self-satisfied" about on being arrested other than, ^{born-to-be-} ~~an~~ assassin that Posner makes him, other than because he had killed the President?

Posner ^{all} made this up and ^{then} attributed it to sources who did not say it and got away with it when most of the major media ~~are~~ ^{feel} in love with his seeming confirmation of ^(assassination) of official mythology none of the major media had ever really questioned. It covered them for their failures.

Posner carried his invention, his get-rich-quick fiction, forward with himself in the shrink's role.

What ~~Posner~~ Posner attributes to the psychiatrist ~~Renatur~~ Hartogs, who examined the boy Oswald for the city of New York, is, ~~that~~ "I found him to have definitive traits of ~~angerousness~~. In other words, this child has a potential for explosive, ~~aggre~~ aggressive, ~~unassaulting~~ assaulative acting out which was rather unusual to find in a child...." (page 12)

Posner continues with, "Hartogs' diagnosis was ~~of~~ 'personality pattern disturbance with schizoid features and passive-aggressive tendencies. ...Although Hartogs thought he ' was quite clear' in emphasizing Oswald's potential for violence by 'the diagnosis of passive-aggressive,' he did not explicitly state it since that would have ~~required~~ mandated institutionalization. Instead he recommended that Oswald be placed on probation so long as he was under guidance, preferably by a psychiatrist."

For what he attributes to Hartogs Posner has five source notes, to pages ²¹⁷ 220, ~~221~~ ²¹⁷ and 223 of Hartogs Commission testimony ^(in its Volume VIII) and one to the Commission exhibit that is a photostat of Hartogs' report on his examination of Oswald, Commission Exhibit ~~Hartogs~~ Hartogs Exhibit 1. ⁽²⁰⁴⁸⁹⁾ At the end of what I quote from his page 13 above, he has this footnote ~~refering to~~ critical of Meagher and of me:

Harold Weisberg tells of the tests but does not quote any of Hartogs's conclusions. Sylvia Meagher, in her acclaimed book *Accessories After the Fact*, writes, "There is, then, no basis in any of the available medical or psychiatric histories for allegations that Oswald was psychotic, aberrant, or mentally unsound in any degree." Meagher's conclusion is contradicted not only by Hartogs but also by two Soviet psychiatrists who evaluated Oswald after his failed suicide attempt in Moscow in 1959 (see page 51).

If one reads Posner's page 51 one finds a common Posner trick. He does there refer to the two Soviet psychiatrists who examined Oswald when he was in the hospital for ~~the~~ three days after slashing his ~~write~~ wrists, but one does not find a single ~~or~~ word either saying or even suggesting that they said anything at all that "contradicted" a word in what Meagher wrote that he Posner here quotes. My book to which Posner refers was not on Oswald. It was on the Warren Commission, as its title states ~~repetitiously~~. There was no relevance in it for what ^{either} Hartogs did say or ^{for} what Posner says he said, the two not being identical, as we see.

Throughout the book Posner has such notes, pretending to cite what does not exist to support his fabrications.

In a book that would not have been any book at all, a book in which ^{fabrication and} corruption of fact and truth ^{are} is indispensable, a book as ^{and intendedly} thoroughly dishonest as Posner's, the book in which he says his ^{biop} biography of Oswald is the most important part, Posner is flagrantly corrupt and dishonest in his ^{false representation} fabrication of what the shrink Hartogs ^{the exact opposite} actually said about Oswald. ~~This is not~~ This basis of Posner's book is not only what ^{of what Hartogs testified -} Hartogs neither said nor meant, without reasonable question Posner knew it in ^{fabricating} making ~~up~~ what without which, in his own words, he has no book at all!

This also provides an explanation of his indecent, unmanly, utterly dishonest attack on the late Sylvia Meagher who, having died years earlier, could not defend herself and her work.

This also is one of the more significant of the innumerable illustrations of Posner's dishonesty in his endless ~~and~~ bragging that he read all those 26 volumes and had to and did index them. If he had either read or indexed them, if he had, as he said, read the books in his bibliography, then he certainly knew what Meagher wrote about Hartogs and ^{Hartogs actually testified} what he said about Oswald. (Accessories after the Fact, page 244) It is, ^{Hartogs} from his report:

"...no indication of psychiatric changes; superior mental endowment; no retardation despite truancy; ~~no~~ psychotic mental changes. Disturbed youngster who suffers ~~under~~ the ~~xxx~~ impact of really existing emotional isolation and deprivation."

For this she cited Hartogs Exhibit 1, Hartogs actually report. (20HB9)

Citing Hartogs Commission testimony, with his report in his hands, Meagher continued:

"...He conceded that it failed to mention any potential for violence, assaultive ~~state~~ or homicidal potential, or incipient schizophrenia. He conceded also that if ~~he~~ he had found such traits in the boy, he would have said so in his report."

(Accessories after the Fact, page 244)

(8# 221).

Meagher cited Hartogs testimony under question Commission questioning, ~~page 221~~ ^{mistaken testimony}

At that point Hartogs was actually correcting his mistaken testimony, ^{that is the} basis of Posner's ^{falsehood} fabrication about Oswald, ^{being a} born assassin. Of what Posner misused, when read to him by Counsel Wesley Liebeler, ^{testified} Hartogs said "It contradicts my recollection."

Hartogs' testimony is a very big thing to Posner and for his book. Posner's own sources notes (page 509) cite pages 220 and 223. Can it be believed that he did not ~~then~~ even look at page 221? Obviously not and obviously the ~~deliberateness~~ ^{of his dishonesty} is another of Posner's self-characterizations. ^Q And what a ~~picture~~ ^{sub-portrayal} of the ~~man~~ ^{man} it is!

^{and uncaring} How brazen, how unearring, how utterly indifferent to the possibility of getting caught at it!

Can this potentially ruinous dishonesty have been dared without the knowledge that Random House would not ~~have~~ ^{have} any authentic ~~peer-per~~ peer review made?

^Q With both this matter and all of ~~Case~~ ^{Case} ~~has~~ ^{has} ~~been~~ ^{been} ~~opened~~ ^{opened} indicating what such a ~~peer~~ peer review would have shown? ^Q An unprecedented fraud!

Could Posner have dared submit this monumentally dishonest book without the certainty there would be no such review?

Random House was the only possible source of ~~this~~ ^{that} assurance.

Could ^{it} have come other than from the official who shares Posner's dedication with his wife, "risha, "To Bob Loomis, my editor, who nurtured this project from its inception."

^{Robert Dal Dahlen's} Loomis was more than Posner's editor. ~~The~~ ^{From} Publishers Weekly May 3, 1993 story on the coming assassination-~~anniv~~ anniversary books, identifies him as "Random House vice-president and executive editor." ^{From} In what Loomis told Dahlen, he was then thoroughly familiar with the book's contents and the exceptional importance of the foregoing fabrications ~~in~~ ^{the} it: "At heart of it is a biography of Lee ^Harvey Oswald."

Would not this same Loomis have been the official who decided upon and arranged for peer reviews?

The Loomis who said this of the book while "reluctant to reveal much of the book's contents" only "because it's too early" while also telling Dahlen that the book "confronts" others who have written in the field" and that he "expects the book to arouse controversy"?

The fact that there would be controversy, that as he knew the book condemns those

who then would have every interest in defending themselves, did not suggest to the Random House vice president and executive editor that his publishing house's reputation did not require protection from an unimaginable disaster if this fraud of a book were to be exposed as soon as it appeared?

Which would have happened if the media had met its responsibilities?

With this apotheosis of dishonesty, this perfection in corruption - all those Posner says Posner "smirked" his "satisfaction" from having killed the President said no such thing and did not even suggest it and the truth about Hartogs is that he ~~swore~~ swore under oath to the exact ~~opposite~~ opposite of what Posner quotes as his professional opinion - can anyone who disagrees with him have indicted and condemned ~~the~~ Posner more convincingly, more thoroughly than he himself does in this complete fabrication of what he himself, supported by Loomis, says in the most important part of his ~~book?~~ ^{book?}

What Loomis says it "the heart of it"?

Without which Posner and Random House would have had no book at all?

And their enormous benefit from it?

asked by 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?"

Hartogs responded, "I didn't mention it in the report." Liebeler then as then asked, "If you had found it, ^{you} would have mentioned it in the report?" Hartogs response was,

"I would have mentioned it; yes." (20H221)

This is not a simple error. We are none of us immune to that. This is the basis of the most important part of his book, as Posner himself stated, and the deliberate-ness of his ^{open, astounding} incredible dishonesty cannot be exaggerated.

Under oath and in ^{the way} that volume Posner claims to have studied and ~~included in his~~ ^{ed and at the same time in it} indeed, Hartogs swore to the exact opposite of what Posner says!

He ^{Hartogs} actually testified that what Posner quotes, without reference to his correction of it, was not true and he did correct it only four pages later.

~~Can this be done so brazenly, unconscionably dishonestly, and exaggerated~~

~~Can anyone who disagrees with Posner have written a more thoroughgoing allegation that he is corrupt and dishonest; that he ~~deliberately~~ falsified what he himself says is most important in his book, and that he did it knowingly, not by error, because without this ^{deliberate misrepresentation} corruption of what he knew was true he had no book at all?~~

Does this not also illustrate why he had to condemn those who wrote in disagreement with the official mythology he set out to ^{and did} commercialize and exploit because without ^{his about what he wrote?} his false pretenses about us those ^{of} reading his book might compare it with what we wrote?

Because ^{Meagher} ~~we~~ utterly disprove his concoction and he knew that before he began to write his rewriting of our so painful history for his dirty pieces of silver, ^{those} that dirty pieces ^{of monetary reward} that made money for him and for Random House and ~~made~~ Posner a world figure?

Does this, too, not explain why Random House ^{avoided} ~~avoided~~ the traditional ^{peer} review review with controversial non-fiction?

Did it not have reason to believe that anyone who had made a series ^{one} study of the assassination and its investigations might ^{perceive} ~~recall~~ this ^{shockingly} astounding open dishonesty from Meagher's book? But, as we see throughout, Posner and ^Random House were up to that!

For money! Dirty money!

For money" ! For dirty money!

The Random House certainty that the major media would be without question is obvious. This in itself says much about the major media when what Random House had to have assumed is considered.

It depended upon acceptance and support from the major media. And that it got.

But just suppose that before vesting its reputation in its support of and encouragement to this incredibly bad book any component had done any checking, of even what most obviously called for checking?

In any checking, is not his ^{Posner's} careful omission of where in her book Meagher said what Posner says she wrote a red flag, waving to be heeded?

And when she ^{Posner's own authority,} quotes Hartogs, as saying the exact opposite of what is so basic in Posner's book, does that not really demand checking? Especially when all that had to be done was what I did, go to the testimony she cites, 8H221?

If for all the money and prestige it invested in the first ancillary rights, supposed U.S. News had exercised the very minimum in self-protections and being sure it got its money's worth? Or saw to it that its trust was not imposed upon?

Or that any one of the TV nets all of which treated Posner as the one and only oracle had? Public broadcasting included.

Especially CNN, when Posner was disputed and contradicted to his face and for all practical purposes called a thief to his face?

Or that after Nosenko threw mud in Posner's face on ABC it had had any question at all?

Or much later, ^{had which} CBS-TV had accepted him and what he said so uncritically? ^{still, NBC-TV had checked before proceeding with its Posner-glorifying mini-series?} Or, later, if any one of these major-media components had behaved naturally, done the minimum

of checking, Posner and Random House would have been ruined.

But they did not, not a single one of them, in any part of the major media.

And ^{as} it is startlingly obvious, Random House was certain it would get away with its coldly calculated ~~and~~ unprecedented and very prog profitable fraud.

Of such is the ~~kindom~~ kingdom in post-JFK assassination The United States of America!

extra space

Important as he is to Posner's book, his ^lwalth and fame from it, what struck me as odd when I first read ~~the~~ his first chapter is ^{to} the beivity of his use of ^{that} shrink ^{gives} his absolute indispensibility to Posner's ticket to fame and fortune. Long as the book is, this is the only mention of Hartogs, in this ~~part~~ part of Posner's first chapter. He appears and disappears at the same time and in the same place. ^HHe is never mentioned again.

Quite separate from what Posner did with Hartogs, this scant reference to him with all the basic importance he has in Posner's book raises questions about him.

What is ^{the}Hartogs' story? What kind of man, what kind of psychaitrist is he?

I think that what is in the draft can follow this.

y who does not go to go to the park, fish, [Oswald] was a boy home, not do any- ant to play with any- a few classes Oswald d been disruptive. trickman, his case- a damn" about him. s almost as if there's h which they cannot n intact."⁶⁰ After the to the staff psychia- al psychology and an years later when he rtogs gave seminars sed interesting and One week, he chose Hartogs considered o us on a charge of d him, I found him to aer words, this child assaultive acting out who was sent to the cy from school." Har- ality" but "intensely -year-old "showed a out his situation" in d it "difficult to pene- boy hides."⁶³ He per- shyness, feelings of reasons for his with- Oswald told him his rtogs noticed he had nd the topics of om- gry with his mother ing brought food for

supper, and confessed he occasionally hit her. He also told the psychiatrist, "I don't want a friend and I don't like to talk to people." When asked if he preferred the company of boys or girls, he responded, "I dislike everybody."

Hartogs's diagnosis was "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 selfinvolved and conflicted mother."⁶⁵ Although Hartogs thought he "was quite clear" in emphasizing Oswald's potential for violence by "the diagnosis of passive-aggressive," he did not explicitly state it since that would have mandated institutionalization. Instead, he recommended that Oswald be placed on probation so long as he was under guidance, preferably from a psychiatrist.*

The New York Domestic Relations Court considered Hartogs's diagnosis serious enough that it assigned a probation officer to Oswald and tried for the next nine months to find appropriate treatment for the disturbed youngster. Meanwhile, Lee was at his ninth school, P.S. 44. On several occasions, Marguerite refused to bring him to court, claiming he had returned and adapted well to school. Instead, his grades were low, sometimes failing, and comments from his teachers noted he was "quick-tempered," "constantly losing control," and "getting into battles with others."⁶⁶ Oswald refused to do his homework or salute the

*Many of the critics ignore Hartogs's testimony. He is not even listed in books written by Mark Lane, Josiah Thompson, Jim Garrison, John Davis, Robert J. Groden and Harrison Livingstone, Robert Blakey, Henry Hurt, David Scheim, or David Lifton. Among the few who mention the tests, Jim Marrs disingenuously says: "The results were essentially inconclusive. They showed him to be a bright and inquisitive young man who was somewhat tense, withdrawn, and hesitant to talk about himself or his feelings."

Harold Weisberg tells of the tests but does not quote any of Hartogs's conclusions. Sylvia Meagher, in her acclaimed book *Accessories After the Fact*, writes, "There is, then, no basis in any of the available medical or psychiatric histories for allegations that Oswald was psychotic, aberrant, or mentally unsound in any degree." Meagher's conclusion is contradicted not only by Hartogs but also by two Soviet psychiatrists who evaluated Oswald after his failed suicide attempt in Moscow in 1959 (see page 51). *How many*

years later?

It is easy to overlook the availability of *qualified* psychiatric findings on Oswald. In addition to the New York City Youth House report on Oswald at age thirteen, the following facts should be given due weight: (1) The Marine Corps medical records on Oswald for 1956-1959 (*Donabedian Exhibit No. 1*) consistently show no sign of emotional problems, mental abnormality, or psychosis. (2) Oswald was the subject of psychiatric evaluation in the Soviet Union after his effort to avoid deportation by feigning an attempt at suicide. Soviet records (*CE 985*) show that he was found to be "not dangerous to other people . . . clear mind . . . no sign of psychotic phenomena . . . no psychotic symptoms."

Though relatively recent, neither the Marine Corps medical records nor the Soviet psychiatric evaluation support the facile finding that Oswald was "irrational"—all too frequently the response to objections that Oswald's actions were inconsistent with guilt. Nor does the Youth House report really justify the inference that he was unbalanced or deranged. Irresponsible statements purporting to be based on the Youth House report were published and given great prominence in the period immediately after the assassination. They created an exaggerated or erroneous impression, as the Report acknowledges. (*WR 379*) The Youth House psychiatric report (*Hartogs Exhibit 1*) actually found

no indication of psychotic changes; superior mental endowment; no retardation despite truancy; no psychotic mental changes. Disturbed youngster who suffers under the impact of really existing emotional isolation and deprivation.

Dr. Rhenus Hartogs, chief psychiatrist of Youth House, wrote that report on April 16, 1953 and did not see it again for eleven years. He testified on April 16, 1964 that the thirteen-year-old Oswald had "definite traits of dangerousness . . . a potential for explosive, aggressive, assaultive acting out. . . ." (*8H 217*)¹ Hartogs was then asked to review his 1953 report. He conceded that it failed to mention any potential violence, assaultive or homicidal potential, or incipient schizophrenia. He conceded also that if he had found such traits in the boy, he would have said so in his report. He did not agree, however, with Liebler's logical suggestion that his categorical comments before re-reading his report might have been based on mistaken identity, and that he had no personal recollection of Oswald at all. (*8H 221*)

Not a very professional performance.

There is, then, no basis in any of the available medical or psychiatric histories for allegations that Oswald was psychotic, aberrant, or mentally unsound in any degree. His life history is consistent with the conclusion that he was a rational and stable personality (which is not to say that he was appealing, admirable, or untroubled). He was capable of marriage and fatherhood, with responsibility and devotion, particularly to his two children. He was conscientious in his punctuality and work, completed military service satisfactorily, paid his bills and repaid his debts promptly, and managed his practical affairs capably.

¹ Hartogs apparently described Oswald in similar blood-curdling but mistaken terms in an FBI interview on an unspecified date. The FBI report on that interview was mentioned during Hartogs' testimony but is not included among the Exhibits.

Motive and Mind

Since there has been no one who never heard of Oswald, the judgments of those who know him and (b) capacity for violence.

His wife, star witness, was a sound, smart and capable, rational person.

Most members of the Youth House, those who were not fond of Sam Ballen, for example, were friendly toward the President; it was not warm feelings for him. Oswald was not George De Mohrenschildt. When he heard of Oswald's actions, he did not believe Oswald was the circumstantial evidence.

George Bouhe was not "crazy," a mental case. But Oswald was capable of such violence. He never questioned Oswald's violence. (*10H 29*)

Anna Meller was "convinced" she could not believe that he had never regarded Oswald as a threat when he was arrested. (*8H 217*)

Michael Paine (*2H 39*) and Michael Schildt (*9H 255*) testified and had praised him. Lillie, the President and admired his actions. He affirmed that Oswald had spoiled Oswald was not capable of such an act; no motive for such an act; Oswald resented authority or violence.

None of Oswald's fellows were or homicidal. Lieutenant F. I. though he found it unusual (*8H 299*) Kerry Thornley was a ward violence; on the contrary.

Adrian Alba, who knew Oswald, didn't impress me as being of assassinating the President (*10H 227*) Tommy Barga of the Company, said that he had no sign of temper or violence. A mental counselor, had found Oswald with Oswald. (*10H 128*)

FBI Agent Quigley, was

act which will make others
make other people insecure,
ough his own act, something
e, or was it indicated on the
st who had examined Lee

called me because they call
of murderers or something
sure.

a fantastic thing.

ie to the examination which

session a copy of the report

amine a copy of that report

en us as regards your diag-
on your own independent
ew with Oswald from the

at particularly impressed
ou were gently impressed
because he had extremely
agents?

it all; he was in control of
tude. He talked about his
mparticipating fashion. I
him, and this impressed

is a slender and pale-faced

thing it was about Oswald
nality disturbance? What

ills, as far as I recall, his
alons on his behalf. That

s intellectual ability, his

It was at least average

amination of Dr. Renatus
opy of a document entitled
ort on case No. 26906; date
te of examination, May 1,
Oswald. I have initialed
tor. Would you initial it

use Psychiatrist's Report"

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?

221