

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

a social worker in 1953 and 1954, at which time Lee Harvey Oswald and his mother lived here in New York City. Before we go into the details of that, I would like to have you state your full name for the record, if you would.

Mrs. SIEGEL. Evelyn Grace Strickman Siegel.

Mr. LIEBELER. Where do you live?

Mrs. SIEGEL. 1347 River Road, Teaneck.

Mr. LIEBELER. Where were you born?

Mrs. SIEGEL. New York City.

Mr. LIEBELER. And am I correct in understanding that you did work in New York as a social worker?

Mrs. SIEGEL. That's correct.

Mr. LIEBELER. When did you begin working as a social worker?

Mrs. SIEGEL. In March of 1950.

Mr. LIEBELER. How long did you continue in that work?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Im still working as a social worker.

Mr. LIEBELER. In the city?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Yes; on a part-time basis.

Mr. LIEBELER. Would you outline briefly for us your educational background?

Mrs. SIEGEL. A.B., Hunter College; M.S., Columbia University, School of Social Work.

Mr. LIEBELER. And in 1953, at the time that you did have contact with the Oswalds, you had been doing social work for about 3 years; is that correct?

Mrs. SIEGEL. That's correct.

Mr. LIEBELER. For whom did you work as a social worker?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Youth House.

Mr. LIEBELER. Are you still working for Youth House?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No; I'm not.

Mr. LIEBELER. When did you begin working for Youth House and when did you terminate your employment with Youth House?

Mrs. SIEGEL. I began working for them in January of 1952, and I left in August—well, I left Youth House for Girls, which is part of the same institution setup, in August of 1958.

Mr. LIEBELER. Would you describe for us briefly the nature of the Youth House as it existed in 1953?

Mrs. SIEGEL. In what aspect?

Mr. LIEBELER. What kind of institution was it? What kind of people went there? What was done with them there? Will you tell me?

Mrs. SIEGEL. It was a remand center for boys, delinquent boys who had gotten into trouble with the court and were remanded to Youth House for a brief period of diagnostic study. Upon their reappearance in court, so far as I understood it, those children who had been assigned for diagnostic study went back to court accompanied by a report from Youth House, which was given to the judge.

Mr. LIEBELER. What kind of a report was this? What was in it? What did it say?

Mrs. SIEGEL. A full-scale diagnostic study includes a social history taken by the social worker after one or several interviews with the boy and an interview with a parent, as well as an interview with the Youth House psychiatrist; that is, the boy was interviewed by the Youth House psychiatrist. All this material was then typed up and sent to court.

Mr. LIEBELER. Who was the Youth House psychiatrist?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Dr. Rhenatus Hartogs.

Mr. LIEBELER. Did Dr. Hartogs personally interview each boy, or were there other psychiatrists who sometimes interviewed the boys and reported, do you know?

Mrs. SIEGEL. First of all, let me say that not every boy was seen by a psychiatrist or a social worker. Also, the caseload was shared from time to time by other psychiatrists on the staff of Youth House, not by Dr. Hartogs alone.

Mr. LIEBELER. There was a report of the psychiatrist, then, a report of the social worker, and were there any other reports of any other workers, generally speaking, attached to the court report?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Incorporated into the social worker's report was a report from

those workers on the floor where the boy lived, the counselors, so to speak, brief reports as to his behavior and so on.

Mr. LIEBELER. Those would be given to the social workers; is that correct?

Mrs. SIEGEL. That's right.

Mr. LIEBELER. And used as a basis for the social worker's report?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Not as a basis for it but incorporated into it.

Mr. LIEBELER. So as a general proposition, the reports of people from the floor would be before the social worker when she prepared her report and would usually be reflected in the report of the social worker; is that correct?

Mrs. SIEGEL. That's correct.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you have any recollection of any contact during the course of your work as a social worker for Youth House with Lee Harvey Oswald?

Mrs. SIEGEL. After the President's assassination, the name meant nothing to me. As the biographies in the papers started to appear, and it was said that this boy was in Youth House in 1953, I believe it was, I had a vague stirring of memory, and I then said to my husband that somehow I have a mental picture of this youngster. At the time I attributed him not to me but to another worker. I somehow thought that he was assigned to another worker. But I had a picture of what he looked like, and the only reason that I think I remember him is that he was from Texas, and he was distinctive because he had an accent that was different from most of the children I saw, and he wore blue jeans, which most of our kids didn't wear in those days. And that was all I remembered about it. I remembered absolutely nothing about him at all.

Mr. LIEBELER. And your recollection of Lee Oswald is still the same as it was at that time?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Sitting in the corner of my office, a slim, skinny little boy.

Mr. LIEBELER. That is to say, you have not been able to refresh your recollection?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. And improve it at all?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No.

Mr. LIEBELER. Since the——

Mrs. SIEGEL. No. I must have seen between 400 and 450 boys a year in those days. I don't remember.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you remember talking to his mother at all?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No; I do not. I don't even know if I saw her. I am terribly curious to see my report again.

Mr. LIEBELER. How long do you know Dr. Hartogs?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Well, we were associated over a period of from 1952 to 1958—6 years.

Mr. LIEBELER. Have you seen him since that time?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No; we don't see each other socially at all.

Mr. LIEBELER. And you haven't spoken to him?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No; I haven't.

Mr. LIEBELER. About the Oswald case; is that right?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No; I haven't seen him since I left Youth House.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you have any recollection that from time to time the psychiatrist, Dr. Hartogs, would give seminars as a technique to instruct or provide examples to the social workers and perhaps the psychologists and other employees of Youth House?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Well, I don't remember that Dr. Hartogs gave the seminars. We all participated in them, social workers and psychiatrists. I remember them vividly. I was a participant, myself.

Mr. LIEBELER. I didn't mean to characterize Dr. Hartogs' role as being the sole role.

Mrs. SIEGEL. Oh, no.

Mr. LIEBELER. But there were seminars?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Oh, there were seminars. Certainly. I misunderstood you. Yes; there were seminars which took place weekly.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you have any recollection that Lee Oswald was the subject of one of these seminars?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No; I do not.

Mr. LIEBELER. Do you have any recollection of what the reason for Oswald's being remanded to Youth House was?

Mrs. SIEGEL. I only read in the paper that it was truancy.

Mr. LIEBELER. And you have no independent recollection about it otherwise at all?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No; I do not.

Mr. LIEBELER. I show you a photostatic copy of a document entitled "Youth House, Social Worker's Report," which is dated Bronx, May 7, 1953, referring to case No. 26996. This report indicates that the social worker involved was Evelyn Strickman, which would at that time have been you; is that correct?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. And still is?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. I hand you this document, and tell me if that is the report which you prepared in connection with your work with Lee Harvey Oswald. Are you able to state whether or not that is the report you prepared?

Mrs. SIEGEL. This is indubitably mine.

Mr. LIEBELER. These reports were prepared shortly after your contact with the boy, with the mother, or prepared from notes that you made of the interview, were they not?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Oh, yes; they were prepared probably during the time he was still at Youth House.

Mr. LIEBELER. The point being that the report would accurately reflect the interview that you had both with Lee Oswald and with his mother?

Mrs. SIEGEL. As accurately as I could; yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. And it was prepared on or about the time that you conducted the interview, was it not?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Correct, yes; and shortly afterward.

(Document marked "Exhibit 1.")

Mr. LIEBELER. I have marked the photostatic copy of the exhibit as Exhibit 1 to the deposition of Evelyn Strickman Siegel, April 17, 1964, and I have initialed it for purposes of identification. I would ask if you would initial it also so that we can make sure that we are talking about the same thing.

(Witness complies.)

Mr. LIEBELER. I show you another report, which upon examination you will note contains much of the same material as is set forth in the Exhibit No. 1, and ask you if you recognize the sheaf of photostatic copies which I have just shown you and if you can tell me what they are.

Mrs. SIEGEL. This is my report. Just a minute. This is what I dictated into the record before I pulled from it the essential material which should go into the report to the court.

Mr. LIEBELER. So that the photostatic document that I have just shown you was prepared before Exhibit No. 1, and closer in time to your actual contact with the boy and with the mother?

Mrs. SIEGEL. This is correct.

Mr. LIEBELER. The one you have in your hand?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Right.

Mr. LIEBELER. And from the document you hold in your hand you prepared Exhibit No. 1, which is the formal report which was submitted to the court along with the report of Dr. Hartogs and perhaps of other personnel; is that correct?

Mrs. SIEGEL. This is correct.

Mr. LIEBELER. We will mark the document to which we have just been referring, which is captioned "Oswald, Lee Harvey—Charge: Truancy," and has "Youth House" written at the top of it, and which consists of 7 pages, the last of which has the typewritten name "Evelyn Strickman" and the date 4-30-53, and bears your initials—does it not?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Those are the initials of Marion Cohen, who was casework supervisor at Youth House at that time. That shows she read it.

Mr. LIEBELER. She read it also?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. And we will mark the document Exhibit No. 2.

(Document marked "Exhibit 2.")

Mrs. SIEGEL. Wait a minute. Let me just correct that. Marion would have written her own initials. That isn't my handwriting. I never made an "E" like that. I don't know who did that.

Mr. LIEBELER. You have no question, however, that this is the report prepared by you?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No; I have absolutely no question. This is my dictation into the record. I know—that was Sadie Skolnick. That was the undersupervisor at the time. That is who that S.S. is.

Mr. LIEBELER. I have initialed Exhibit 2. So that we are sure we are talking about the same exhibit, would you initial it also, please?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Sure. [Witness complies.]

Mr. LIEBELER. Exhibit 1 consists of six pages; is that correct?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. LIEBELER. After reviewing the report which you prepared in connection with Lee Oswald back in 1953, is your recollection refreshed so that you could add anything other than that which is already set forth in the written report which you prepared at that time?

Mrs. SIEGEL. No; I can't add a thing to that.

Mr. LIEBELER. Would you say after reviewing the report that you prepared at that time that this boy gave any indication to you back in 1953, that is, as indicated in your report, that he had any violent tendencies or tendencies in this direction, in the direction of violence?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Well, I can only say from what I wrote in that report that apparently this was a youngster who was teetering on the edge of serious emotional illness. Now, whether that included violence I am not prepared to say.

Mr. LIEBELER. You couldn't say that one way or the other from the material set forth in your report; is that correct?

Mrs. SIEGEL. Yes; I would say that is correct.

Mr. LIEBELER. Can you think of anything else that you would like to add to the record after reviewing these reports that you think might be helpful to the Commission in its work?

Mrs. SIEGEL. I am sorry, there is nothing I can add.

Mr. LIEBELER. I have no more questions. I want to thank you very much on behalf of the Commission.

Mrs. SIEGEL. Not at all. It is a real tragedy.

Mr. LIEBELER. Thank you very much, Mrs. Siegel.

Mrs. SIEGEL. Yes; not at all. Thank you. Goodbye.

TESTIMONY OF NELSON DELGADO

The testimony of Nelson Delgado was taken on April 16, 1964, at the U.S. Courthouse, Foley Square, New York, N.Y., by Mr. Wesley J. Liebeler, assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Nelson Delgado, 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. 11130, dated November 29, 1963, and Joint Resolution of Congress No. 137.

Under the Commission's rules for the taking of testimony, each witness is to be provided with a copy of the Executive order and of the joint resolution, and a copy of the rules that the Commission has adopted governing the taking of testimony from witnesses.

The Commission will provide you copies of those documents. I cannot do it