

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HAROLD WEISBERG,

Plaintiff

-v-

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
et al.,

Defendants

Civil Action No. 75-226

DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S
MOTIONS TO STRIKE, TO COMPEL ANSWERS
TO INTERROGATORIES, FOR PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTS, AND RESPONSE TO MOTION TO
POSTPONE CALENDAR CALL AND STAY ALL
FURTHER PROCEEDINGS

On February 19, 1975, plaintiff filed this suit under the Freedom of Information Act, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 552, seeking disclosure of the spectrographic analyses and other tests made by the F.B.I. for the Warren Commission in connection with the investigation into the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, as well as any tests made by the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with said investigation.

On March 14, 1975, plaintiff and his attorney met with representatives of the F.B.I. for the purpose of specifically identifying the scope of plaintiff's request. ^{*/} Defendants attach

*/ Plaintiff's attorney was advised by correspondence prior to filing of this action that the Atomic Energy Commission (now Energy Research and Development Administration) provided technical assistance to the F.B.I. at AEC's Oak Ridge National Laboratory (now Holifield National Laboratory) in performing paraffin casts taken from Lee Harvey Oswald and neutron activation analyses of bullet fragments. Plaintiff's attorney was further advised that neither AEC nor its laboratory at Oak Ridge prepared any report on the results of these analyses, and was referred to the F.B.I. for any further information. (plaintiff's Exhibit E to the complaint; attachment to plaintiff interrogatories to ERDA).

hereto the affidavit of Special F.B.I. Agent John W. Kilty, assigned to the F.B.I.'s laboratory in a supervisory capacity, who was present at that meeting. (Government Ex. 1) As established by Special Agent Kilty's affidavit, Mr. Weisberg requested certain specific categories of information which were subsequently given to him on March 31, 1975. Thereafter, when plaintiff's attorney advised the F.B.I.'s Freedom of Information Act unit that plaintiff had also intended his request to include certain other data, the F.B.I. also provided this information to plaintiff on April 15, 1975. Mr. Kilty's affidavit, sworn on May 13, 1975, concludes that F.B.I. files do not to the best of his knowledge contain other information responsive to plaintiff's request.

Defendants also attach hereto the affidavit of Bertram H. Schur, Associate General Counsel of the United States Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA), formerly the AEC, which establishes that the AEC did provide technical assistance to the F.B.I. at AEC's Oak Ridge National Laboratory (now Holifield National Laboratory) in performing analyses of paraffin casts taken from Lee Harvey Oswald and neutron activation analyses of bullet fragments, that neither AEC nor its laboratory prepared any report on the results of these analyses, and that no other tests were performed by or for the AEC on behalf of the Warren Commission (Government Exhibit 2).

At calendar call held in this matter on May 21, 1975, counsel for defendants provided plaintiff with a copy of Special F.B.I. Agent Kilty's affidavit and indicated an expectation that an affidavit indicating ERDA's compliance with plaintiff's request would be forthcoming shortly, and that these affidavits would be used to support a brief motion to dismiss on grounds of mootness since all information requested of which defendants are aware would have been provided to plaintiff. At that time, plaintiff's

counsel indicated dissatisfaction with the Kilty affidavit and contested the fact that all information had been provided. The Court also suggested that a reasonable way to proceed would be for plaintiff to specify what documents he contended had not been given and to thereby resolve the matter amicably.

Subsequent to the calendar call, counsel for defendants was served with plaintiff's motion to strike the Kilty affidavit on grounds, inter alia, of bad faith, and other discovery-related motions calculated to probe behind defendants' assertions of good faith compliance with plaintiff's Freedom of Information Act request. Plaintiff alleges in his motion to strike and attached affidavit that the Kilty affidavit is deliberately deceptive, not based upon personal knowledge, and should have been made by Special Agent Robert A. Frazier who plaintiff believes is still an active agent with the F.B.I. Laboratory. Defendants respectfully inform counsel and the Court, however, that Special Agent Robert A. Frazier retired from the F.B.I. on April 11, 1975 after thirty-three years, ten months and three days service, and that supervisory Special Agent Kilty is the most knowledgeable active service Special Agent to give this testimony on behalf of the F.B.I.

In the motion to strike (pp. 2-3), plaintiff also alleges the existence of certain documents which he claims have not been provided by the F.B.I. In a sense, plaintiff could make such claims ad infinitum since he is perhaps more familiar with events surrounding the investigation of President Kennedy's assassination than anyone now employed by the F.B.I. However, in a final attempt to comply in good faith with plaintiff's request, a still

act which will make others
make other people insecure,
ugh his own act, something

, or was it indicated on the
st who had examined Lee

alled 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

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

at particularly impressed
on were greatly impressed
because he had extremely
ngents?

all; he was in control of
ude. He talked about his
onparticipating fashion. I
him, and this impressed

s a slender and pale-faced

hing it was about Oswald
mality disturbance? What

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

s intellectual ability, his

It was at least average

amination of Dr. Renuis
py of a document entitled
rt on case No. 26006; date
te of examination, May 1,
Oswald. I have initialed
for. 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?