

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Notes on 25 Nov 52 meeting with SCHAAK on UJ DREADFUL

1. Members on German side now having knowledge of the case are: SCHNEIDER, MERKER, LOEBNE, KUEHNE, KLAUSNER, HERDAHL, SCHAAK. SCHAAK intends to bring one more person in, probably ROEMER, as a witness and co-interrogator.
2. The sole background on the case available to SCHAAK is an Lebenslauf which SCHAAK required of UJDREADFUL when the latter got his present job. This item is dated 29 November 1950, and by SCHAAK's statement is somewhat less detailed than the handwritten Lebenslauf obtained for the Carriage test.
3. SCHAAK presumes that BOSSELT, who recruited UJ DREADFUL, knows quite a bit more about UJD, but BOSSELT is no longer a member of the organization, and SCHAAK does not want to make any contact with him or bring him into the matter. The org. did not obtain written material on UJD from BOSSELT.
4. SCHAAK states that after discussion with 25, Dr. SCHNEIDER decided that the proper course of action would be to take the matter up via SCHAAK directly with UJD, and that no prior further investigation is either possible or feasible. SCHAAK clearly does not intend to investigate further.
5. SCHAAK read his list of questions for the interrogation. The questions covered the period of from UJD's arrest by the Soviets until his employment by the organization. They were reasonably detailed. They began as though UJD was to be questioned about Carriage and his reaction to it. They soon dropped this line and adopted the position that certain embarrassing questions had arisen as a result of UJD's test and that the matter had to be cleared up in a straightforward and honorable manner between SCHAAK as former superior and UJD.
6. SCHAAK ~~STRT~~ stated, accurately, that his questions (as such) were quite objective, but he hastened to add several times that he does not believe that UJD is guilty as indicated. As proof he has only to add his associations with UJD, the fact that UJD in no way ever gave any cause for suspicion, and his long experience as a judge of men which indicates that UJD is not guilty. At the same time SCHAAK admits that he has never been very close to UJD. Nevertheless he believes he is the man to interrogate UJD and he will approach him as his former superior on the basis of mutual confidence and request clarification on an honor basis. (My only question is: Assuming UJD were guilty, could this approach be expected to yield results? This is after all the test of any line of action we undertake.)
7. SCHAAK states that the interrogation must take place in one day, and that therefore no complicating arrangements are necessary. Need for one day treatment is in order that one person can handle the matter and the problem of lack of continuity cannot arise. SCHAAK does not appear to face the possibility that this matter could get very sticky and require long interrogation. Only conclusion I can draw from this is that they have not the faintest expectation that guilt will be indicated. The only intention is to make a gesture at clarification of the matter.
8. SCHAAK was unwilling to talk of arrangements for re-Carriage, indicating that a second Carriage would have to await his recommendations based upon interrogation, and upon Dr. SCHNEIDER's approval of a second Carriage.

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE/METHOD/EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

9. SCHAAK will let us know the date of the interrogation. (Indicating to me that it is at least not clear in his mind that their entire course of action is to be coordinated with us.)
10. SCHAAK agreed, reluctantly, to give us a copy of their Lebenslauf, dated 1950. He will also let us read the interrogation questions, or read them to us. However, he declined giving us a copy on the basis that the matter is being hand written in order to avoid use of a secretary.

25.40 SI