

Text of C.I.A. Ellsberg Affidavit

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 25—

Following is the text of an affidavit submitted to the Senate Watergate Committee by a Central Intelligence Agency staff psychiatrist concerning the psychological profile of Daniel Ellsberg.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Bernard Mathis Malloy, being first duly sworn, depose and say:

[1]

I was born on 2 September 1928, was graduated from Lambuth College, Jackhon, Tenn., and Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, Tenn., and have been employed by the Central Intelligence Agency since November, 1958. I have been in the Psychiatric Staff of the Office of Medical Services of the Agency since that time.

[2]

In the summer of 1971 the medical office was approached by the director of security concerning the preparation of a psychiatric study on Daniel Ellsberg, who had been accused of leaking the Pentagon papers. To the best of my recollection, it was my understanding from the Director of Medical Services that the D.C.I. was knowledgeable and had approved the director of security's visit and the request that was being made of the medical office. There was general reservation and concern expressed about such an effort involving as it did potentially controversial and highly speculative efforts. It was felt that such activity, involving as this did an American citizen, might be outside of the agency's purview. It was recognized that such efforts, while desirable in some quarters, could be misunderstood, misinterpreted, and mistakenly considered to have been derived from the doctor-patient therapeutic relationship which was in fact far from the case. An initial effort was prepared by Dr. Jerrold Post under the direction of myself based upon a review of magazine and newspaper articles containing biographical data about Ellsberg, as well as some F.B.I. documents consisting of interview reports by informants about Ellsberg.

[3]

On 12 August 1971, on instructions from the Director of Medical Services the writer met with Mr. David Young, Room 16, Executive Office Building, to discuss the matter of a psychiatric write-up on the case of Daniel Ellsberg. Mr. Young, at the time the appointment was made, had stated that there

9/26/73

EW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2



The New York Times

E. Howard Hunt Jr. considering a question by Senator Sam J. Ervin Jr. during yesterday's committee session.

was more information which he wished to discuss. The meeting lasted for approximately an hour and Mr. Young was joined by a Mr. Linney (probably Liddy), who seemed to be an assistant. Mr. Young stated that the Ellsberg study had the highest priority and had been requested by Mr. Ehrlichman and Dr. Kissinger. Mr. Young also stated that the President had been informed of this study. He stated that it was a multifaceted approach and the psychiatric report would be only one facet. He stated that he understood that the Agency was uneasy about undertaking such a study and assured me that there had been no delineation as to how information derived from the study would be utilized, and if there were any utilization that great care would be given to make it nonattributable to the Agency. Mr. Young was interested in knowing what kind of data would be needed in order to provide further study of the sort done 'on Fidel Castro.' Later on Mr. Howard Hunt joined the group. Mr. Hunt recognized me, being a former Agency employe, and we greeted cordially. Mr. Hunt amplified on Mr. Young's comments and stated that it was his wish to 'try Dr. Ellsberg in public.' Other comments were made by Mr. Hunt or 'Mr. Linney' to the effect that the aim would be to render Dr. Ellsberg ineffective or to make him the object of pity as a broken man. Mr. Hunt stated that he wished to see data of the sort that 'psychiatrists found out about Barry Goldwater in 1964,' and he expressed interest in being able to refer in a knowledgeable way to Dr. Ellsberg's oedipal conflicts or castration fears and other similar points.

[4]

It seemed from Mr. Young and 'Mr. Linney' that there was considerable concern that Dr. Ellsberg had a great deal more sensitive information which it was feared he would from time to time periodically expose. 'Mr. Linney' stated that Dr. Ellsberg thought of himself as 'having the white hat and the President as having the black hat.'

[5]

A discussion was held with the group concerning the dangers of preparing such a study in isolation and without the opportunity for the free give-and-take discussions among experts, as had been the case in our other studies. I was informed that more biographic material was available. I was requested to

give examples of the kind of information needed. I pointed out that insofar as possible, "although possibly not available," data from early life from nurses or close relatives would be useful. I agreed with 'Mr. Linney' that school progress, including testing, would be helpful. In the same way, yearbooks, his years in college and in the military, comments from friends would be helpful. Mr. Hunt also stated that it would be useful for Dr. Ellsberg's first wife to be interviewed and he felt, 'you can easily arrange that under an operational alias.' It was pointed out that the first Mrs. Ellsberg would be cooperative.

[6]

Information was also offered by Mr. Hunt or 'Mr. Linney' to the effect that Dr. Ellsberg had been in analysis although times or location were not known for certain. "Mr. Linney" pointed out that after Dr. Ellsberg gave the Pentagon papers away, he telephoned his analyst stating, "Now I am free."

[7]

"Mr. Linney" and Mr. Young, with Mr. Hunt's assent, pointed out that the Ellsberg study was of the highest priority, even over the SALT negotiations. It was agreed that the further biographic information regarding Dr. Ellsberg would be sent to us and Mr. Hunt agreed to manage this. Mr. Hunt would also make arrangements whereby periodic conferences would be held as necessary. Mr. Hunt did, however, offer that he did not wish to come to the agency if he could avoid it.

[8]

At this point Mr. Hunt made some comments in the presence of the group based on his previous acquaintance—remained behind and made some further comments expressing a desire that his presence and participation in the meeting not be mentioned at the agency. After arriving back at the agency I informed Mr. Hunt by telephone that it was not feasible for me to avoid reporting Mr. Hunt's presence at the meeting. Mr. Hunt expressed great regret that this was necessary, stating that he had adequate contact with General Cushman and was on good terms with the director. He was reluctant in agreeing to my statement that it was necessary to inform the director of medical services. Mr. Hunt wished to know if this could be treated as confidential medical information, but could not tell the writer in what way. I discussed the entire situation

—the dangers and the reservations and the gravity of the situation with the deputy chief, psychiatric staff, the director and deputy director of medical services.

[9]

On 13 August, 1971, additional information was received from the White House. To the best of my knowledge this was from Howard Hunt and consisted of poorly Xeroxed classified F.B.I. reports and Department of State documents. This material proved additional data and on 20 August 1971 the director of medical services and the writer met with the Deputy Director for Support concerning the White House request in the Ellsberg case and the continuing pressure and desire for a psychiatric study. The problems associated with developing the study and our continuing reservations were discussed in detail. In view of Mr. Hunt's enthusiasm, concerns existed about the checks and balances to actions based on a study if one were to be undertaken. To the best of my recall the Deputy Director for Support was in agreement with us. While the additional information furnished further suggested that Ellsberg was under emotional pressure it was not possible to arrive at any firm conclusions or comprehensive understanding of the man's personality. The additional information indicated that:

a. He had revealed quasi-secret information while still in the service when he was applying for a Ph.D. fellowship.

b. He had volunteered for the Vietnamese service for the State Department in 1965 while under the stress of obtaining a divorce from his first wife.

c. He had sought psychoanalytic treatment between the fall of 1968 and 1970 with a psychoanalyst (who was determined to be professionally qualified and reputable) in California.

d. He may have been involved in learning information about a South Vietnamese in 1970 while he was actually in psychoanalytic treatment.

To the best of my recollection it was agreed that the implications of the above data would be orally discussed by me with Mr. Hunt, Mr. Liddy and Mr. Young. It was also agreed that there would be the greatest reluctance to undertake any interview of the former Mrs. Ellsberg, and it was hoped that after this a written document would not be necessary.

[10]

The Deputy Director for Support considered advising the D.C.I., but it was decided that I would first visit Mr. Young and inform him that the additional material basically provided no further understanding. It was hoped that this would put an end to the situation but if further material was forwarded the matter would have to be dealt with at that time.

[11]

The Deputy Director For Support stated that after the meeting with Mr Young, the D.C.I. would be brought up to date.

[12]

Following the meeting on Friday 20 August, and in accord with the discussions on that date, a call was placed on Monday, 23 August, to Mr. David Young at the White House. Mr. Young was informed that we had received the material which had been forwarded and that we had considered it, and would be available to discuss the data further. Mr. Young stated that he would have Mr. Hunt call me. He stated that Mr. Hunt's office was elsewhere in the building and he did not have his number immediately available. As of 27 August 1971 Mr. Hunt had not called me.

[13]

On 30 September 1971, there is a yellow memorandum of a telephone call to me from David Young at the White House with the message that Mr. Hunt suggested meeting Wednesday 27 October at 11:00 A.M. On 12 October 1971 I received some more data from Mr. Hunt at the White House.

On 27 October 1971 I met with Mr. Hunt and with Mr. Liddy and with Mr. Young at the Executive Office Building. The essence of the observations noted above in the 20 August 1971 discussions were orally presented. I was told to prepare the material in writing. On 3 November 1971 Mr. Liddy sent me further information on Ellsberg. On 1 November 1971 Mr. Young at the White House telephoned me requesting the report the following day and he was informed that the requested report was at that time in the hands of my supervisors for their evaluation. On 12 November 1971 the material was delivered by me to the White House and to Mr. Liddy, Mr. Young and Mr. Hunt. These men were interested in obtaining information which could be used to defame or manipulate Ellsberg. While it was never expressed, it was my impression that the material and information provided were not of direct interest or usefulness, to Hunt, Liddy or Young.

(signed) Bernard Matthias Malloy M.D. subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of May 1973 (signed) Virginia C. Long, Notary Public.