

International Military Tribunal



THE NUREMBERG TRIALS

Complete Tribunal Proceedings
(V. 20)

International Military Tribunal

The Nuremberg Trials: Complete Tribunal Proceedings (V. 20)

**Trial Proceedings from 30th July 1946 to 10th August
1946**

e-artnow, 2022

Contact: info@e-artnow.org

EAN 4066338127198

TABLE OF CONTENT

PREFACE

One-Hundred Ninetieth Day Tuesday, 30 July 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIRST DAY, Wednesday, 31 July 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SECOND DAY, Thursday, 1 August 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-THIRD DAY, Friday, 2 August 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOURTH DAY, Saturday, 3 August 1946

Morning Session

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIFTH DAY, Monday, 5 August 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIXTH DAY, Tuesday, 6 August 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SEVENTH DAY, Wednesday, 7 August 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-EIGHTH DAY, Thursday, 8 August 1946

Morning Session

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-NINTH DAY, Friday, 9 August 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

TWO HUNDRETH DAY, Saturday, 10 August 1946

Morning Session

PREFACE

[Table of Contents](#)

Recognizing the importance of establishing for history an authentic text of the Trial of major German war criminals, the International Military Tribunal directed the publication of the Record of the Trial. The proceedings are published in English, French, Russian, and German, the four languages used throughout the hearings. The documents admitted in evidence are printed only in their original language.

The first volume contains basic, official, pre-trial documents together with the Tribunal's judgment and sentence of the defendants. In subsequent volumes the Trial proceedings are published in full from the preliminary session of 14 November 1945 to the closing session of 1 October 1946. They are followed by an index volume. Documents admitted in evidence conclude the publication.

The proceedings of the International Military Tribunal were recorded in full by stenographic notes, and an electric sound recording of all oral proceedings was maintained.

Reviewing sections have verified in the four languages citations, statistics, and other data, and have eliminated obvious grammatical errors and verbal irrelevancies. Finally, corrected texts have been certified for publication by Colonel Ray for the United States, Mr. Mercer for the United Kingdom, Mr. Fuster for France, and Major Poltorak for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

ONE-HUNDRED NINETIETH DAY

TUESDAY, 30 JULY 1946

[Table of Contents](#)

MORNING SESSION

[Table of Contents](#)

GENERAL R. A. RUDENKO (Chief Prosecutor for the U.S.S.R.):
Gentlemen of the Tribunal. I already indicated in my opening statement that the action of forcibly deporting peaceful civilians -- men, women, and children -- for forced labor into Germany was one of the most important in the chain of foul crimes committed by the German fascist invaders. The decisive role in this sinister crime was enacted by the Defendant Fritz Sauckel. During cross-examination in this courtroom, Defendant Sauckel could not help but admit that during the war about 10 million slave laborers, originating both from occupied territories and from the ranks of the prisoners of war, were utilized in German industries and partly for German agricultural labor.

While admitting the deportation to Germany and the utilization for the war industries of Hitlerite Germany of millions of workers from the occupied territories, Sauckel denied the criminal character of this action, affirming that the recruitment of labor was allegedly carried out on a

voluntary basis. This assertion is not only a lie but a slander against the millions of honest patriots of the Soviet Union, of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, France, and Holland who, devoted to their country, were forcibly sent for labor into Hitlerite Germany.

The attempts of Defendant Sauckel to depict his part of Plenipotentiary General for the Allocation of Labor as consisting merely in the co-ordination and control of other government labor organizations are futile. As the Plenipotentiary General for the Allocation of Labor, Sauckel was invested by Hitler with supreme and all-encompassing powers and was in these activities directly and personally subordinated to Goering. And Sauckel extensively used these full powers in order to deport to Germany labor from the occupied territories.

There is no need to refer to the extensive documentary evidence presented to the Tribunal, which irrefutably establishes the criminal character of the methods of mass deportation into slavery of the population of occupied territories, nor to the role of the Defendant Sauckel in organizing these crimes.

How far these crimes extended is shown in the operation carried out by the German military and civil authorities, coded under the name "Hay Action," which provided for the forced deportation of children from the age of 10 to 14 into slavery, as well as for the deportation of Ukrainian girls destined by Hitler for Germanization.

The Defendant Sauckel has tried to assure the Tribunal that he had complied strictly with the provisions of the Geneva and Hague Conventions concerning the utilization of

labor of prisoners of war. His own instructions, however, fully expose his lies. The Defendant Sauckel had planned beforehand the forced utilization of Soviet war prisoners for the war industry in Germany and never made any distinction between them and civilian labor. The inhuman conditions under which the foreign workers and prisoners of war deported for slavery lived, are testified to by the numerous documents submitted as evidence. The Defendant Sauckel himself was obliged to admit that foreign workers were kept in camps with barbed wire and were obliged to wear special identification badges. The witness Dr. Wilhelm Jöger, summoned to the Tribunal by the defendant's counsel for Sauckel, was obliged to give a picture of the awful conditions under which the enslaved workers at Krupp's works existed. After all this, the deposition of the other witness, Fritz Wieshofer, seems actually ridiculous when, in trying to exonerate Sauckel, he manifestly overdid it by informing the Tribunal that he, himself, allegedly saw foreign workers walking and enjoying themselves in the Prater in Vienna.

The Defendant Sauckel displayed great activity in committing all these crimes. In April 1943 he personally visited the towns of Rovno, Kiev, Dniepropetrovsk, Zaporozhie, Simferopol, Minsk, Riga, and in June of the same year Prague, Kraków, and again Kiev, Zaporozhie, and Melitopol in order to speed up the deportation of labor. And it was as a result of his journey to the Ukraine in 1943 that Sauckel expressed his gratitude for the successful mobilization of labor forces to the Reich Commissioner for the Ukraine, Koch, known for the drastic, cruel measures

which he applied to the fullest extent to the Ukrainian population.

And it is not mere chance that the criminal activities of Sauckel's were so highly appreciated in Hitlerite Germany. On 6 August 1942 the Defendant Goering declared at the conference of the Reich commissioners for the occupied territories:

"I do not wish to praise Gauleiter Sauckel. He does not need it. But what he has done in so short a time in order to gather workers and to have them brought to our enterprises is a unique achievement. I must tell everybody, gentlemen, that if each of you applied but one-tenth of the energy applied by Gauleiter Sauckel, it would be easy indeed to fulfill the tasks imposed upon you..."

In the article published in the Reichsarbeitsblatt for 1944 and dedicated to Sauckel's fiftieth anniversary it was said:

"True to his political task, he pursues his responsible course with unyielding consistency and tenacity, with a fanatical belief. As one of the most faithful adherents of Hitler, he draws his creative and spiritual strength from the Führer's trust in him."

When estimating Sauckel's criminal activity, Your Honors will surely consider the tears shed by the millions of people who languished in German slavery, of the thousands of people tortured in inhuman conditions in the workers' camps-you will consider this and will judge accordingly.

The Defendant Arthur Seyss-Inquart was appointed by Hitler Chief of the Civil Administration in southern Poland at the beginning of September 1939, and since 12 October of

the same year Deputy Governor of Poland. He occupied this post till May 1940.

For 7 months Seyss-Inquart, under the leadership of Frank and jointly with him, had personally conducted a regime of terror in Poland, and he took an active part in elaborating and realizing the plans for the extermination of many thousands of people, for the economic plunder and enslavement of the people of the Polish State.

On 17 November 1939 Seyss-Inquart addressed the chiefs of the administration and departments of the Warsaw Government, mentioning among other things that:

"When the German administration acted in the Government General its guiding principle should be the interests of the German Reich. By means of a severe and unrelenting administration this region should be utilized for German economy; and, in order not to show any undue leniency, one should try to visualize the consequences of Polish penetration into German territory."

Two days later Seyss-Inquart instructed the Lublin Governor, SS Brigadefuehrer Schmidt, on the same question in the following way:

"The resources and the inhabitants of this country should serve Germany, and they may prosper only within these limits. The development of independent political thinking cannot be permitted. Perhaps the Vistula will have an even greater significance for the fate of Germany than the Rhine" (Exhibit USA-706).

From the report on an official journey of Seyss-Inquart we learn that the Governor of Warsaw, Fischer, informed the defendant that all valuables of the Warsaw Bank in gold,

precious metals, and bills of exchange had been transferred to the Reichsbank, while the Polish inhabitants were obliged to leave their deposits in the banks; that the German administration was employing forced labor; that the Lublin Governor Schmidt declared in the presence of Seyss-Inquart: "This territory with its strongly-marked swampy nature could serve as a reservation for the Jews; this measure would possibly lead to a decimation of the Jews."

I draw the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that it was exactly at Maidanek near Lublin where the Hitlerite hangmen erected an enormous extermination camp in which they killed about a million and a half human beings.

It is also known that Seyss-Inquart, as Frank's deputy, carried out "special tasks" on his behalf. On 8 December 1939 Seyss-Inquart took part in a conference at which the following subjects were discussed: The appointment of Frank as deputy to the Delegate for the Four Year Plan and the economic exploitation of the Government General for the best interests of the Reich; the arrival of numerous trains with Jews and Poles from the newly-acquired territories, which transportations would continue-according to SS Obergruppenfuehrer Krueer-till the middle of December; the issuing of a supplementary order extending labor duty to the age group 14 to 18. On 21 April 1940 the defendant took part in the conference at which plans for forced deportation of Polish workers to Germany were elaborated. On 16 May 1940 the defendant took part in the elaboration of the "AB Action," which was nothing but a premeditated plan of mass extermination of the Polish intellectuals. In connection with the appointment of Seyss-Inquart as Reich

Commissioner for the Netherlands, Frank and his worthy deputy exchanged farewell speeches:

"I am exceedingly glad"--said Frank--"to assure you that the memory of your work in the Government General will live forever when the future German Reich of peace has been created ...

"I have learned much here"-answered Seyss-Inquart "... and this because of the initiative and firm leadership of the kind I saw in my friend, Dr. Frank....

". . . all my thoughts are connected with the East. In the East we have a National Socialist mission, in the West we have a task."

Seyss-Inquart's task in the West, as well as that of the other Reich ministers and commissioners in all territories occupied by the Germans, is well known: It is the function of hangman and plunderer. My colleagues have given the details about the criminal part played by Seyss-Inquart when annexing Austria and realizing other aggressive plans of the Hitlerite conspiracy. They have clearly shown how Seyss-Inquart applied in the Netherlands the bloody experience gained by him while collaborating with Frank in Poland. For this reason I fully support the charges against Seyss-Inquart as formulated in the Indictment.

- As early as 1932, while still Reich Chancellor of the German Republic, the Defendant Franz von Papen actively contributed to the development of the fascist movement in Germany.

Papen rescinded the decree of his predecessor Bruening prohibiting the activities of the SA. It was he who had overthrown the Braun-Severing Social Democrat

Government in Prussia. These measures greatly strengthened the position of the fascists and contributed to their accession to power. Thus Papen cleared the way for Hitler. Having secured the power for the Nazis, Papen himself assumed the post of Vice Chancellor in Hitler's Cabinet. In this capacity Von Papen participated in the elaboration and the promulgation of a series of legislative acts aimed at the consolidation of German fascism. And later on, for many years, until the collapse of Hitlerite Germany, Von Papen remained true to his fascist friends and participated to the utmost of his abilities in the realization of the criminal conspiracy.

The Defendant Von Papen is attempting now to explain his role in the development of the fascist movement and in Hitler's seizure of power in terms of the political situation of the country which, he says, made Hitler's accession to power unavoidable. The real motives which guided Von Papen were different: They were that he himself was a convinced fascist devoted to Hitler.

Speaking at Essen on 2 November 1933, during the election campaign for the Reichstag, Papen declared:

"Ever since Providence called upon me to become the pioneer of national resurrection and of the rebirth of our homeland, I have tried to support with all my strength the work of the National Socialist movement and its leader; just as I, at the time of taking over the chancellorship, have helped pave the way to power for the young, fighting, patriotic movement, just as I on 30 January was selected by a providential fate to place the hands of our Chancellor and Fuehrer into the hand of our beloved Field Marshal, so do I

today again feel the obligation to say to the German people and all those who have kept confidence in me: The kind Lord has blessed Germany by giving her in times of dire need a leader who will lead her with the unerring instinct of the statesman through distress and weaknesses, through all crises and dangers, into a happy future."

The International Military Tribunal will fully estimate the criminal activities of the Defendant Von Papen, who played a decisive part in the seizure of power by Hitler and in so doing contributed in creating the dark powers of fascism which plunged the world into bloody wars and caused unspeakable misery.

Long before the Nazis came to power the architect Albert Speer was a personal friend of the draftsman Hitler and remained so until the end. Not only common professional interests, but political interests also brought them together. Speer began his career in 1932 with the reconstruction of the Brown House, the headquarters of the NSDA-P in Berlin, and in 10 years' time he was at the head of all military construction and war production in fascist Germany. Starting with the construction of the buildings of the Reichsparteitag, Speer ended by setting up the Atlantic Wall.

Speer held an important post in the Government and military machinery of Hitler's Germany and played a direct and active part in planning and realizing the criminal conspiracy.

What is Speer's line of defense at the Trial? Speer presents his case in the following way: He was pressed by Hitler to take on the post of Minister; he was an intimate friend of Hitler's, but he knew nothing about his plans. He

had been a member of the Nazi Party for 14 years, but he was far from politics and he'd never even read Mein Kampf. It is true that upon being given the lie Speer confessed that he had lied during his preliminary interrogation. Speer lied when he denied that he had ever belonged to the SA and then to the SS. The Tribunal possesses the original file of the SS man Albert Speer, who belonged to the personal staff of the Reichsfuehrer SS Himmler.

Speer also held a rather high rank in the Nazi Party. In the Party Chancellery he was a delegate for all technical questions; he headed the Main Office for Engineering of the Party; he directed the union of German National Socialist technicians; he was deputy for the staff of Hess, and a leader of one of the major German Labor Front organizations.

After all this can Speer's declaration that he was a specialist indifferent to politics be given credence? In reality, as a close collaborator of Hitler, Hess, Ley, and Goering, he directed German engineering not only as Reich Minister, but also as a fascist political leader.

Upon succeeding to Todt, Speer, as he expressed himself in his speech before the Gauleiter, devoted himself completely to war tasks. By means of the pitiless exploitation of the population in the occupied territories and of the prisoners of war of the Allied countries, at the expense of the health and lives of hundreds of thousands of people, Speer increased the production of armament and ammunition for the German Army.

By plundering the raw materials and other resources of the occupied territories, Speer, by all possible means,

increased the war potential of Hitler's Germany. His powers grew with every month of the war. By Hitler's decree of 2 September 1943 Speer became plenipotentiary and the responsible man for the supply of raw materials, for the direction and production of war industry. He was even commissioned to regulate the turnover of commodities, and by Hitler's decree of 24 August 1944 Speer was practically made dictator of all German offices, in Germany as well as in the occupied territories, whose activity was in any way connected with the strengthening of the German war potential.

And when the fascist fliers bombed peaceful towns and villages, thereby killing women, old men, and children, when the German artillery bombarded Leningrad, when the Hitlerite pirates sank hospital ships, when English towns were bombed by the V-weapon -- all this came as a result of Speer's activity. Under his leadership the production of gas and of other weapons of chemical warfare had been greatly increased. The defendant himself, when interrogated by Justice Jackson at the Trial, confessed that three factories were producing gas and that they were working at full speed till November 1944.

Speer not only knew of methods used by Sauckel for deporting the population from the occupied territories for slave labor, but he himself took part, together with Sauckel, in conferences with Hitler and of the Central Planning Board where decisions were taken to deport millions of people to Germany from the occupied territories.

Speer kept up a close contact with Himmler; he received from Himmler prisoners for work in war factories; branches

of concentration camps were organized in many factories subordinated to Speer. In recognition of Himmler's services, Speer supplied the SS with experienced specialists and with supplementary war equipment.

Speer has spoken quite a bit here about his having sharply criticized Hitler's close circle, that he had allegedly had very serious differences with Hitler and that, in his letters to Hitler, he had written about the futility of continuing the war. When the representative of the Soviet Prosecution asked Speer which of the persons close to Hitler he had criticized and in what connection, the defendant answered, "I shall not tell you."

It is quite evident that Speer not only did not want to, but that in fact he could not tell, for the simple reason that he had never criticized anyone who was close to Hitler and could not do so as he was a convinced Nazi himself and belonged to this close circle. As to the so-called serious differences, they began, as Speer admitted, when it became clear to him that Germany had lost the war. Speer's letters to Hitler are dated March 1945. At that time Speer could without great risk depict Germany's hopeless condition. It was apparent to everyone and was no longer a subject of discussion. And it was not by accident that after these letters Speer still remained Hitler's favorite. It was precisely Speer whom Hitler appointed on 30 March 1945 to direct measures for the total destruction of the industrial enterprises by obliging all Party, State, and military offices to render him all possible help.

That is the true picture of the Defendant Speer and the real part played by him in the crimes committed by the

Hitler clique.

Constantin von Neurath's part in the consolidation of the Nazi conspirators' power and in the preparation and realization of aggressive plans is a remarkable one.

Over a period of many years, whenever traces had to be covered up, when acts of aggression were to be veiled by diplomatic manipulations, Neurath, fascist diplomat and SS general, came to the help of the Hitlerites, bringing them his long experience of world affairs.

May I remind you of the high official appraisal of Neurath's activity which appeared in all the newspapers of fascist Germany on 2 February 1943:

"Germany's leaving the Geneva Disarmament Conference on 14 October 1933, the return of the Saar territory, and the denunciation of the Locarno Treaty will rank among the most outstanding political events since the inauguration of the Nazi regime. In these Baron von Neurath played a decisive part and his name will always be connected with them."

In his capacity of Reich Protector of Bohemia and Moravia Neurath represented to the Nazi conspirators those "firm and reliable hands" of which General Friderici wrote in his memorandum, which were to transform the Czechoslovak Republic into an "indissoluble part of Germany." In order to attain that object Neurath established the notorious "New Order," the nature of which is now known to all.

Neurath attempted to assert here that all the atrocities were committed by the Police and Gestapo, upon Himmler's direct order, and that he knew nothing of them. It is quite

comprehensible that Neurath should say so, but one can hardly agree with him.

Interrogated on 7 March 1946, Karl Frank testified that Neurath received regularly the reports of the Chief of Security Police, as well as those of Frank himself, regarding the "most important events in the Protectorate" pertaining to the Security Police. He stated also that it was possible for Neurath to issue directives to the Reich Security Police, and that he did indeed do so; while, as far as the SD was concerned, his powers were still greater, depending in no way upon the consent of the Reich Security Main Office.

I wish also to recall to your memory Paragraphs 11, 13, and 14 of the decree, issued on 1 September 1939 by the Reich Defense Council, which proves that the Reichsfuehrer SS and Chief of the German Police carried out administrative measures in Bohemia and Moravia with the knowledge of the Reich Protector, and that the German Security Police agencies in the Protectorate were obliged to inform the Reich Protector as well as the offices subordinated to him and to keep them aware of all major events.

If I add that on 5 May 1939 the Defendant Neurath appointed an SD Leader and Plenipotentiary of the Security Police to the post of his political reporter; if we recall the testimony read to the court of Richard Bienert, the former Czech Minister President under Neurath, in which it says that the Gestapo carried out arrests on orders of the Reich Protector, we can hardly have any doubt but that Neurath gave his sanction to the mass arrests, summary executions, and other inhuman acts committed by the Gestapo and Police in Czechoslovakia.

I will pass on to the events of 17 November 1939 when nine students were shot without trial, while over a thousand were thrown into concentration camps and all the Czech high schools and universities were closed for 3 years.

Neurath said that he heard of these acts of terror post factum. But we have submitted to the Tribunal a public announcement of the shooting and arrests of the students which bears Neurath's signature. Neurath then seeks another loophole. He declares that Frank signed this announcement in his -- Neurath's -- name, and to be more convincing he even adds that later he heard from an official that Frank often misused his name in documents. Are Neurath's statements to be credited? One has only to analyze briefly the actual facts in order to answer this question in the negative. Neurath says that Frank misused his name. What did Neurath do in answer to this? Did he demand Frank's resignation or his punishment for forgery? No. Did he, perhaps, report this forgery officially to somebody? No. On the contrary, he continued to collaborate with Frank as before. Neurath says that he heard of Frank's misuses from an official. Who is that official? What is his name? Why was no application made to call him to the witness stand or at least to secure his written testimony? This is simply because nobody spoke to Neurath of Frank having forged his signature on the documents, and nobody could have done so, for there was no forgery. On the contrary, the Tribunal has evidence which confirms the fact that the announcement of 17 November 1939 was signed by Neurath and that the terroristic measures mentioned therein were actually sanctioned by him. I am speaking of

two statements of Karl Frank who directly participated in these bloody events.

During his interrogation on 26 November 1945 Karl Frank testified:

"This document, dated 17 November 1939, was signed by Von Neurath, who did not protest either against the shooting of the nine students or against the deportation of numerous students to the concentration camps."

I quote Karl Frank's second testimony on this matter, dated 7 March 1946:

"By signing the official announcement which informed the public of the shooting of the students Reich Protector Von Neurath sanctioned this action. I informed Von Neurath in detail of the course of the investigation and he signed the announcement. Had he not agreed and had he demanded a modification of the penalty, or its mitigation-and he had a right to do so -- I would have been obliged to accede to his opinion."

In August 1939, in connection with the "extraordinary situation" by which he proclaimed Bohemia and Moravia to be an integral part of the Greater German Reich, Neurath issued a so-called warning. Therein he stipulated that "not only individual perpetrators but the entire Czech population would be responsible for all acts of sabotage" (Document USSR-495). Thereby he established the principle of collective responsibility and introduced the hostage system. The events of 17 November 1939, considered in the light of this directive of Neurath, supply more irrefutable proof against the defendant.

Starting from 1 September 1939 some 8,000 Czechs were arrested as hostages in Bohem-Aa and Moravia. The majority were sent to concentration camps; many were executed or died of hunger and torture. On this subject you have heard, Your Honors, the testimonies of Bienert, Krejci, and Havelka. There is no doubt that these terror acts against the Czech intellectuals were carried out in conformity with Neurath's warning.

I need not relate in detail all the events which took place at Lidice and later in the village of Lestraki as they are already well known. Were not the German invaders acting in accordance with Neurath's warning? Did they not conform to his principle that the entire Czech population, and not the individual persons, must bear the responsibility?

It was Neurath who initiated mass terror against the Czechoslovak population in August 1939. He has on his hands the blood of many thousands of women and men, children and old people, murdered and tortured to death. And I see no difference between Baron von Neurath and the other ringleaders of the criminal fascist regime.

The Defendant Hans Fritzsche's part in the conspiracy, the War Crimes, and the Crimes against Humanity is certainly greater than it might appear at first glance.

The criminal activity of Fritzsche, Goebbels' closest assistant, carried out systematically day after day, constitutes a very important link in the Common Plan or Conspiracy and contributed effectively to the creation of the conditions under which the numerous crimes of the Hitlerites were conceived and nurtured.

All the attempts made by the defendant himself and his counsel to minimize his importance and the part he played in the perpetration of these crimes have clearly failed.

In Mein Kampf Hitler describes the very special part attributed to mendacious propaganda in Nazi Germany. He wrote:

"The problem of the revival of German might is not how we will make weapons but how we will create the spirit which will make our people capable of bearing weapons. If this spirit pervades the people, the will power shall discover thousands of ways and each of them will lead to weapons."

I am quoting from Pages 365 and 366 of Mein Kampf, sixty-fourth edition, 1933.

Neither is it by chance that the following slogans were proclaimed at the Congress of the Nazi Party in 1936 at Nuremberg:

"Propaganda helped us to come to power; propaganda helps us to keep power; propaganda will help us to conquer the world."

Owing to his position, the Defendant Fritzsche was certainly one of the most outstanding propagandists and also one of the best-informed persons in Nazi Germany. He enjoyed Goebbels' particular confidence.

As we know, from 1938 till 1942 Fritzsche, was head of one of the key departments of the Propaganda Ministry, that of the German Press. And from 1942 until the defeat of Hitler's Germany he was head of the German radio communication service.

Having grown up as a journalist of the reactionary press of Hugenberg, Fritzsche, who was a member of the Nazi

Party since 1933, in his capacity of Government spokesman played an important part in the dissemination of fascist propaganda throughout Germany and in the political and moral disintegration of the German people. This was testified to in detail by witnesses such as former Field Marshal of the German Army Ferdinand Sch"rner and former Vice Admiral Hans Voss. The Defendant Fritzsche's broadcasts, intercepted by the BBC, and submitted to the Tribunal as Document 3064-PS and Exhibit USSR-496, fully confirm these charges of the Prosecution.

German propaganda in general, and the Defendant Fritzsche in particular, made full use of provocative methods, lies, and slanderous statements, and this was especially the case when Nazi Germany's acts of aggression had to be justified. For did not Hitler himself write in Mein Kampf, Page 302:

"With the help of a propaganda skillfully and continually applied even heaven can be represented as hell to the people and on the contrary, the most miserable life can be represented as heaven."

Fritzsche turned out to be the best man to carry out this dirty work.

In his affidavits, submitted to the Tribunal and dated 7 January 1946, Fritzsche gave a detailed description of the provocative methods applied on such a vast scale by German propaganda and by him personally in connection with the acts of aggression against Austria, the Sudetenland, Bohemia and Moravia, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

On 9 April and 2 May 1940 Fritzsche broadcast mendacious explanations of the reasons which led to the

occupation of Norway by Germany. He declared, "Nobody was wounded, not one house was destroyed, life and work continued unhindered as before." Meanwhile, the official report presented by the Norwegian Government states:

"The German attack against Norway on 9 April 1940 brought war to Norway for the first time in 126 years. For 2 months war was fought throughout the country, causing destruction. Over 40,000 houses were damaged or destroyed, and about 2,000 civilians were killed."

German propaganda and Fritzsche personally spread insolent lies in connection with the sinking of the British passenger steamer Athenia. But German propaganda was particularly active on the occasion of Hitler Germany's treacherous attack upon the Soviet Union.

The Defendant Fritzsche has attempted to assert that he first heard of the attack upon the Soviet Union when he was called on 22 June 1941 at 5 o'clock in the morning to a press conference held by Foreign Minister Von Ribbentrop. As far as the aggressive purposes of this attack were concerned, he allegedly had learned of them only through his personal observations, in 1942. However, these statements are refuted by such documentary evidence as the report of Defendant Rosenberg. This document establishes the fact that a long time before the attack upon the U.S.S.R., Fritzsche knew of the appropriate measures which were being taken and that in his capacity of representative of the Propaganda Ministry he participated in the elaboration of propaganda measures for the East by the Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories.

In answer to the questions put to him by the Soviet Prosecution during his cross-examination Fritzsche stated that he would not have gone with Hitler had he had knowledge of the Hitler Government's criminal orders, of which he heard for the first time here in court. And here again, Fritzsche told the International Military Tribunal an untruth. Thus he was compelled to admit that he had knowledge of the criminal Hitler orders regarding the extermination of Jews and the shooting of Soviet commissars as early as 1942. And yet he continued thereafter to remain at his post and to spread mendacious propaganda. In his broadcasts on 16 June and 1 July 1944, Fritzsche ballyhooed the new weapons being used, doing his best to, incite the Army and the people to further senseless resistance.

And even on the eve of the collapse of Nazi Germany, on 7 April 1945, Fritzsche broadcast an appeal to the German people to continue their resistance to the Allied armies and to join in the Werewolf movement.

Thus, the Defendant Fritzsche remained true to the last to the criminal Hitlerite regime. He gave his entire self to the task of realizing the fascist conspiracy and of perpetrating all the crimes which were planned and carried out in order to put that conspiracy into effect. As an active participant in all the Hitlerite crimes, he must bear the fullest responsibility for them.

Your Honors, all the defendants have passed before you—men without honor or conscience; men who hurled the world into an abyss of misery and suffering and brought enormous calamities upon their own people; political

adventurers who stopped at no evil deed in order to achieve their criminal designs; brummagem demagogues who concealed their predatory plans behind a veil of mendacious ideas; hangmen who murdered millions of innocent people—these men formed a gang of conspirators, seized power and transformed the German State machinery into an instrument for their crimes.

Now, the hour of reckoning has come. For the past 9 months, we have been observing the former rulers of fascist Germany. In the dock before this Court they have suddenly become meek and humble. Some of them even actually condemned Hitler. But they do not blame Hitler for waging a war or for the exterminating of peoples and plundering of states; the only thing they; cannot forgive him is defeat. Together with Hitler, they were ready to exterminate millions of human beings, to enslave civilized mankind in order to achieve their criminal aim of world domination.

But history decided otherwise. Victory did not follow upon the steps of crime. Victory came to the freedom-loving nations. Truth triumphed and we are proud to say that justice meted out by the International Military Tribunal will be the justice of the righteous cause of peace-loving nations.

The Defense spoke about humanity. We know that the concepts of civilization and humanity, democracy and humanity, peace and humanity are inseparable. But we, the champions of civilization, democracy, and peace we positively reject that form of humanity which is considerate to the murderers and indifferent to their victims. Counsel for Kaltenbrunner also spoke here of love for mankind. In

connection with Kaltenbrunner's name and actions all mention of love for mankind sounds blasphemy.

Your Lordship, Your Honors, my statement concludes the case for the Prosecution. Speaking here on behalf of the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, I consider all the charges against the defendants as fully proven. And in the name of the sincere love of mankind which inspires the peoples who made the supreme memory of the millions of innocent human beings slaughtered by a gang of murders who are now before the court of civilized mankind, in the name of the happiness and the peaceful labor of future generations, I appeal to the Tribunal to sentence all the defendants without exception to the supreme penalty-death. Such a verdict will be greeted with satisfaction by all progressive mankind.

THE PRESIDENT (Lord Justice Sir Geoffrey Lawrence): Now we will deal with the applications for witnesses and documents by counsel for the SA.

MAJOR J. HARCOURT BARRINGTON (Junior Counsel for the United Kingdom): May it please the Tribunal, there were initially seven witnesses applied for for the SA: four for the General SA; two for the Stahlhelm, and one for the SA Reiterkorps (Riding Corps). Since then there has been an eighth application for a witness for the Stahlhelm, who, I understand, is to be a substitution for the other two for the Stahlhelm. That would reduce the total number of witnesses applied for for the SA to six. All those originally applied for have already been heard by the Commission, but the one recently applied for, by the name of Gruss, has not yet been heard by the Commission; and if the Tribunal approve of

that witness, it would involve his being heard by the Commission now.

I apprehend that the Tribunal will have the recommendation of the Commission before them when they are deciding this. In the circumstances, the Prosecution only desire to say that they have no objection to these applications.

THE PRESIDENT: That means no objection to any of them?

MAJOR BARRINGTON: No objection to any of them, on the understanding, My Lord, that Grass is applied for in substitution for the other two Stahlhelm witnesses, Waldenfels and Hauffe.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Dr. Böhm?

HERR GEORG BÖHM (Counsel for SA): I have applied for the witnesses Juettner, Bock, Kldhn, Schdfer, Van den Borch, and primarily Waldenfels and Hauffe to be heard as witnesses for the SA.

The witness Hauffe has been applied for because it has not been possible to bring one witness, who had been allowed, to Nuremberg; that was the witness Gruss. Concerning the witness Grass, I should like to apply for him to be questioned before the Commission so that he can also be heard before the Tribunal. Grass could be called only a few days ago, although my application to hear him had already been made in the month of May, and a search had to be made for him for 2 months. He is an important witness for the Stahlhelm in the SA, and because of his position of Treasurer in the Stahlhelm he knows about conditions throughout Germany, particularly for the period after 1935.

But as I can make the application for the witness. to be heard here only after he has been before the Commission, I beg that it be granted that this witness be heard by the Commission. I will not, however, give up the witness Waldenfels, on that account, so that the situation will be that for the SA not six but seven witnesses are to be heard, as had been provided for originally.

THE, PRESIDENT: Well, what would be the names?

HERR BÖHM: Juettner, Bock, Klähn, Schdfer, Van den Borch, Waldenfels, and Grass.

But I should like to ask, Mr. President, since I do not as yet know the extent of the testimony of the witness Grass, to be permitted to choose between the two witnesses Grass and Hauffe. That is, after the witness Grass has been heard by the Commission, I should like to be permitted to decide whether, besides the witness Waldenfels, I shall want to apply for the witness Hauffe or the witness Grass for questioning.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that all you wish to say, Dr. Böhm?

HERR BÖHM: In connection with the witnesses, yes, Mr. President, but I should like to speak in connection with the document book for the SA, if I may be permitted.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Barrington, do you wish to say anything more about the application which Dr. Böhm now has, which is for seven, and not for six?

MAJOR BARRINGTON: Well, the Prosecution are of the opinion that one witness for the Stahlhelin would be enough, but Your Lordship will, of course, have the Commission's recommendation on that. They will have been heard. On the question of the choice between Gruss and Hauffe after