

Rt 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
6/24/79

Mr. Joseph L. Schott
4004 El Campo
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

Dear Mr. Schott,

By way of introduction, I am one who compelled ^{high FBI officials} ~~the~~ to lead the Founding Director into a left turn to save his face - but before your book was out.

For your collection of left-turn stories, if you collect them, here it is.

Director Hoover testified that the reason the assassin did not fire at the President while the motorcade was on Houston Street is because there were trees in the way. In the ~~first~~ ^{second} of my six books on the JFK assassination I quoted Hoover's testimony and printed a Secret Service photograph showing that there was not a single tree on Houston.

What to do when the Director who was always right was proven to be wrong?

As I recall the solution was by or over the signature of Alex Rosen. It consisted of an account of the motorcade route in that area, beginning on Main, saying that there was then a turn into Houston, after which there was this left turn onto Elm, which took the motorcade into a "park." There were many trees in the park. Therefore the Director was correct. Accompanied by nasty cracks about me, albeit more reserved than some I've obtained through more FOIA litigation that I can or want to recall.

As the result of the suit reported in the enclosed Washington Post clipping I have obtained all the FBI's so-called general releases of JFK assassination records, more than 100,000 pages. After reading an appreciable percentage of these and countless other FBI records I believe my use of "sifting and concealing" is too much of an understatement.

One of its more accomplished performances of this nature is the one in ~~xxx~~ which you are reported in the enclosed FD302, the Hosty flap over the Oswald visit/note. It ~~was~~ ^{was} contrived to end with the impossibility of determining who swore falsely and it did end that way. It began with such limited and primitive questioning by Bassett and others that some of those interviewed were interviewed twice more on the same matter, as what others said made it necessary.

All those established as having knowledge were not interviewed and I'd not be surprised if you made a good guess or two.

Like you the late W.C. Sullivan refused to provide an affidavit.

You are quoted as describing what happened as "kind of a fraud against history." To me it is this and is only part of a much larger fraud against more than history. I am doing what I can to reduce this to the minimum possible and to bring to light all that I can. All my records are bequeathed to a university archive.

For more than a year I've been hoping to be able to accept the invitation of a friend to return to Dallas and continue my inquiries. However, my age (66_a) and health (circulatory problems, venous and arterial) plus the amount of time the Bureau and its Department counsel can waste for me in court combine to prevent this for the time being.

Having come to the copy of the FD302 I made to be able to give you when I did get to Dallas again I've decided instead to mail it, even though I do hope to get to Dallas, perhaps by or in the fall.

What you said or what else you said need not be indicated in this record. And I do not pretend to know the antecedents of the leak. Your reference to Director Kelley has some support from the fact that Hosty made a personal appeal to him when he was in KC. So from that Kelley had knowledge prior to the leak.

My own view is that there was no leak before Shanklin's retirement was secure may be significant in the timing.

As a former reporter I'm surprised that the Times-Herald sat on the story for as long as it did. It had to be certain that FBIHQ would not leak it to anyone else.

However, I had indications of something like this years ago. I was never able to get any confirmation. What I received was represented as coming from a former SA who had worked with Hosty. It was not identical with what emerged after the leak.

The amount of time required by these FOIA efforts has effectively prevented my writing. I still hope to be able to write more. One of the matters I hope to address is the possibility of any Oswald/Bureau relationship.

Much else was covered up. Before long you should read some of this in what I have provided Earl Goltz and he is following up on.

If there is any way you can help or contribute to my knowledge or direct my thinking I would appreciate it. I do not ask that you violate any confidences and I assure you that when asked I keep confidences.

From what I have obtained and what I have been told the FBI has a special hatred of me and of my work. I am not what is called a conspiracy theorist. I deal with fact. In what I have received from the FBI it has not been able to flaw my writing. This was so frustrating to it that it actually concocted a scheme to have former SA Lyndal Shaneyfelt file a spurious libel suit against me for the purpose of #stopping" me and my writing. Two different SAs used this expression and determination. In the end they chickened out. When I learned of this, while deposing Shaneyfelt, I gave the AUSA and the FBI Legal Counsel representative a waiver on the statute and sent one in writing to the since-silent Shaneyfelt.

Despite my buy now extensive experience with the FBI's cover-the-ass paper and fabrications for this purpose I was aghast at some of its fabrications about my wife and me and the high-level distribution of it, to the White House and all AGs and DAGs.

An annual religious outing at a farm we owned of September was converted into a celebration of the Russian Revolution, with all dates omitted. When I blundered into Cointelpro in 1969 and reported this to the Department that was transposed into me conspiring with my source, a notorious racist, to besmirch the FBI. Etc.etc. ad nauseam.

I go into this on the chance you may have known or heard of some of the FBI's distribution of such stuff. It has been stonewalling my Privacy Act request for years. Dallas provided virtually nothing. More, when I was able to show that the records I did obtain were false and disclosed Cointelproing me all further compliance was suspended.

The Bureau, which is unable to fault my work in any other way, has been running a large campaign of a personal nature to undermine my credibility. It succeeded with LBJ and with the AGs and DAGs. It is for this reason that, with my increased age and imperfect health, I am anxious to be able to obtain and respond to all its false paper.

I am not anti-FBI. More than 40 years ago, when I was a Senate investigator, the Department borrowed me for a major prosecution of the time, a Harlan County, Ky. case. I lived and worked with the SAs and Department lawyers. Some of the SAs, one in particular, were among the finest people I've ever known. I also am not CIA. I was in OSS. However, I would like very much to see both agencies function better than they have and I think they and the country will be better off if and when this happens^s.

Thanks for any help or suggestions you may have.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 9/3/75

Former Special Agent JOSEPH L. SCHOTT (new retired) was interviewed by Assistant Director HAROLD N. BASSETT and Special Agent in Charge of the Tampa Office FRANCIS M. MULLEN, JR., at the Fort Worth, Texas Resident Agency, located at 402 U. S. Courthouse, Fort Worth, Texas 76102.

At the outset of the interview, MR. SCHOTT was furnished an Interrogation; Advice of Rights form which he read and stated that he understood but that he had no intention of signing. MR. SCHOTT stated that he taught this at the college level and was well aware of his rights. He also informed the interviewing Agents that he was not going to furnish a sworn statement.

MR. SCHOTT furnished his current address as 4004 El Campo, Fort Worth, Texas 76107, telephone 817-738-0601, and his business address as Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast Campus, 828 Harwood Road, Hurst, Texas 76053, telephone 817-281-7860, extension 278, where MR. SCHOTT indicated he was the Department Head of the Law Enforcement Academy.

MR. SCHOTT was told that he was being interviewed in view of information appearing on page 1, of the Dallas Times Herald in its issue of September 1, 1975, which contained results of an interview with MR. SCHOTT apparently by the Associated Press and regarding a previous article which had appeared in the newspaper on Sunday (August 31, 1975) concerning an alleged visit by LEE HARVEY OSWALD to the Dallas FBI Office prior to the assassination of President KENNEDY. The pertinent portion of that article was read to MR. SCHOTT as set forth below.

Interviewed on 9/3/75 at Fort Worth, Texas File # _____
 by Assistant Director HAROLD N. BASSETT and
Special Agent in Charge FRANCIS M. MULLEN/HNB/EMM/nc 9/3/75

"Joseph L. Schott, author of the humerous book about the FBI, 'No Left Turns,' said Sunday that he understood that Oswald, in his note, 'threatened to kill Hosty if Hosty tried to talk to his wife Marina again.'

"Hosty put the letter in his work box -- for incoming mail -- and it was still there on the day of the assassination," Schott said.

"He added that he didn't know what happened to the letter but assumed it was destroyed."

MR. SCHOTT advised that he was not going to identify any individuals who may have furnished him information. MR. SCHOTT was asked if in fact this was an interview by an Associated Press reporter, and he replied in the affirmative. He said that he was contacted telephonically on Sunday, August 31, 1975, and told the reporter that he would have to check. He then claimed that he referred to some notes that he had made and from these notes, he concluded that he received this information from another individual, whose identity he refused to disclose, while in Wichita Falls, Texas, in the early part of 1964, in connection with either a Grand Jury proceeding or a trial.

MR. SCHOTT advised that with regard to these notes, "he had a fire" and when asked what he meant by this, he stated that he had burned these notes that he had referred to.

He was asked if he had any additional information concerning the matter in question other than what had appeared in the newspaper and he said he did not. He claimed that as he understood it, OSWALD came to the office, gave a note to some people, that it contained a threat to kill HOSTY, that HOWE saw the note, who may have given it to HOSTY. HOSTY read it and put it in his workbox where it was at the time of the assassination. He said other than this, he knew nothing about the note except that he never received any information indicating that the note contained any kind of a threat whatsoever with regard to President KENNEDY. He stated that his information was based on what he was told, that he never personally saw the note and had certainly no firsthand knowledge concerning the information set forth above.

During the interview, MR. SCHOTT stated that the fact that this matter has never been brought to light has bothered him since he was in receipt of the information. By way of explanation, he stated that he was an historian of sorts and considered the fact that this matter had never been reported as "kind of a fraud against history".

MR. SCHOTT was asked whether he had discussed this matter with anyone since the above news item of September 1, 1975, and he advised that he appeared on one television news broadcast on Channel 8, Dallas, on Labor Day, September 1, 1975, and then was interviewed on the Criswell Show for thirty minutes on September 2, 1975, also a Channel 8 program. MR. SCHOTT stated that to his knowledge neither he nor his wife had discussed the matter with anyone else.

MR. SCHOTT was asked whether he had any other information relating to the assassination of significance and he stated he did not.

It was pointed out to MR. SCHOTT that his attitude in refusing to furnish any names, particularly as it applied to his source, could possibly change should there be some type of formal hearing concerning the matter such as a Congressional hearing or possibly a Grand Jury proceeding. MR. SCHOTT responded he had no intention of furnishing this information to us and that he had no intention of furnishing this information to any committee which might convene at some future date.

MR. SCHOTT was asked whether he was the source of information resulting in the story which appeared in the August 31, 1975 issue of the Dallas Times Herald. MR. SCHOTT was quite adamant when he stated he was not and if he had been inclined to release this story, he had his own way of doing it and under no circumstances would he ever have used that particular newspaper as a vehicle to release the story. MR. SCHOTT then volunteered that he has an opinion that the source could be the FBI itself and that it was MR. KELLEY's way of releasing to the public this information. He indicated that

the newspaper article stated that the information had been brought to the Bureau's attention on July 7, 1975, and that an inquiry had been conducted. He indicated that he could not conceive taking this long, and that if in fact, an inquiry had been conducted, he was positive that he would have learned of it.