

International Military Tribunal



THE NUREMBERG TRIALS

Complete Tribunal Proceedings
(V. 15)

International Military Tribunal

The Nuremberg Trials: Complete Tribunal Proceedings (V. 15)

**Trial Proceedings from 14th of November 1945 to 1st
October 1946**

e-artnow, 2022

Contact: info@e-artnow.org

EAN 4066338127143

TABLE OF CONTENT

PREFACE

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIRST DAY, Wednesday, 29 May 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND DAY, Thursday, 30 May 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-THIRD DAY, Friday, 31 May 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOURTH DAY, Saturday, 1 June 1946

Morning Session

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIFTH DAY, Monday, 3 June 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH DAY, Tuesday, 4 June 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVENTH DAY, Wednesday, 5 June 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHTH DAY, Thursday, 6 June 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINTH DAY, Friday, 7 June 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon Session

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH DAY, Saturday, 8 June 1946

Morning Session

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST DAY, Monday, 10 June 1946

Morning Session

Afternoon 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 AND FORTY- FIRST DAY,

WEDNESDAY, 29 MAY 1946

[Table of Contents](#)

MORNING SESSION

[Table of Contents](#)

THE PRESIDENT (Lord Justice Sir Geoffrey Lawrence): The Tribunal will adjourn this afternoon at 4 o'clock in order to sit in closed session.

MR. THOMAS J. DODD (Executive Trial Counsel for the United States): Mr. President, the day before yesterday the Tribunal asked if we would ascertain whether or not Document Number D-880 had been offered in evidence. It consists of extracts from the testimony of Admiral Raeder, and we have ascertained that it was offered, and it is Exhibit Number GB-483. It was put to a witness by Mr. Elwyn Jones in the course of cross-examination, and it has been offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

MR. DODD: Also, with respect to the Court's inquiry concerning the status of other defendants and their documents, we are able to say this morning that with respect to the Defendant Jodl the documents are now being

translated and mimeographed, and there is no need for any hearing before the Tribunal.

The Seyss-Inquart documents have been heard and are now being translated and mimeographed.

The Von Papen documents are settled; there is no disagreement between the Prosecution and the Defendant Von Papen, and they are in the process of being mimeographed and translated.

With respect to the Defendant Speer, we think there will be no need for any hearing, and I expect that by the end of today they will be sent to the translating and mimeographing departments.

The documents for the Defendant Von Neurath have not yet been submitted by the defendant to the Prosecution.

And with respect to the Defendant Fritzsche, our Russian colleagues will be in a position to advise us more exactly in the course of the day. I expect that I shall be able to advise the Tribunal as to the Defendant Fritzsche before the session ends today.

THE PRESIDENT: Does that conclude all questions of witnesses?

MR. DODD: Yes, I believe—at least, we have no objection to any of the witnesses.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well, then; there need not be any further hearing in open court on the cases of the Defendants Jodl, Seyss-Inquart, Von Papen, and Speer until their actual cases are presented.

MR. DODD: Yes, Sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

DR. ROBERT SERVATIUS (Counsel for the Defendant Sauckel): Mr. President, I have a technical question to bring up. Yesterday the witness Hildebrandt arrived, but again it was the wrong Hildebrandt. This is the third witness who has appeared here in this comedy of errors. It was the wrong one for Mende, the wrong one for Stothfang, and the wrong one for Hildebrandt. But this witness knows where the right ones are.

The witnesses had received information in their camp that they were to appear here and they were then taken to the collecting center for Ministerial Directors in Berlin-Lichterfelde. Perhaps it will still be possible to bring these two witnesses here. Especially the witness Hildebrandt, who can testify about the French matters, would be of importance if we could still get him.

THE PRESIDENT: Was the name given accurately to the General Secretary?

DR. SERVATIUS: The name was given accurately. The other man's name was also Hildebrandt, only not Hubert but Heinrich. He was also a Ministerial Director...

THE PRESIDENT: I do not mean only the surname but all his Christian names.

DR. SERVATIUS: Yes, one name was Heinrich and the other Hubert, and abbreviated it was "H" for both, Dr. H. Hildebrandt, which apparently caused the confusion.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I say the names of all witnesses had better be given in full; really in full, not merely with initials.

DR. SERVATIUS: I had given the name in full. As to the physician, the Witness Dr. Jäger, I received his private

address this morning. He is not under arrest. He was at first a witness for the Prosecution. His private address is in Essen, in the Viehhof Platz, and he is there now.

THE PRESIDENT: I think you had better take up all these details with the General Secretary, and he will give you every assistance.

DR. SERVATIUS: Concerning the case of Sauckel, I should like to make one more remark to the Tribunal.

There are about 150 documents which have been submitted by the Prosecution, and some of them are only remotely connected with Sauckel. No trial brief and no special charges were presented here orally against Sauckel, so that I cannot see in detail to what extent Sauckel is held responsible. The case was dealt with only under the heading of "Slave Labor," and so the ground of the defense is somewhat unsteady.

I do not intend to discuss every one of these 150 documents, but I should like to reserve the right to deal with some of them later if that should appear necessary. I want to point out only the most important ones, and then return to them in the course of the proceedings. At any rate, may I ask you not to construe it as an admission if I do not raise objections against any of these documents now.

THE PRESIDENT: No admission will be inferred from that. Dr. Servatius, I have before me here a document presented by the French Prosecution against the Defendant Sauckel. I suppose what you mean is that that document, that trial brief entitled *Responsabilité Individuelle*, does not refer to each of these 150 documents.

DR. SERVATIUS: There was, first of all, a document book, "Slave Labor," submitted by the American Prosecution, which is not headed "Sauckel" but "Slave Labor"; and I cannot say, therefore, which parts concern Sauckel in particular.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it does say, "...and the special responsibility of the Defendants Sauckel and Speer therefore..." That is the American document book. It does name Sauckel.

DR. SERVATIUS: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: And there is this other trial brief presented by Mr. Mounier on behalf of the French Delegation, which is definitely against Sauckel. But no doubt that does not specify all these 150 documents that you are referring to.

DR. SERVATIUS: Yes.

[The Defendant Sauckel resumed the stand.]

Witness, yesterday near the end of the session we spoke about a manifesto—that memorandum which was intended to impress upon the various offices their duty to carry out your directives and to remove the resistance that existed. Now, you yourself have made statements which are hardly compatible with your directives, it seems. I submit to you Document Number R-124. That concerns a meeting of the Central Planning Board of 1 March 1944. There, with regard to recruitment, you said that, in order to get the workers, one ought to resort to "shanghai," as was the custom in earlier days. You said:

“I have even resorted to the method of training staffs of French men and women agents ... who go out on man hunts and stupefy victims with drink and persuasive arguments in order to get them to Germany.”

Have you found that?

FRITZ SAUCKEL (Defendant): I have found it.

THE PRESIDENT: Whereabouts in 124 is it?

DR. SERVATIUS: That is Document R-124.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it is a very long document.

DR. SERVATIUS: It is in the document itself, Page 1770.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I have got it.

SAUCKEL: That is, as I can see, the report or record of a meeting of the Central Planning Board of the spring of 1944. During that year it had become extremely difficult for me to meet the demands of the various employers of labor represented in the Central Planning Board. At no time did I issue directives or even recommendations to “shanghai.” In this conference I merely used that word as reminiscent of my days as a seaman, in order to defend myself against those who demanded workers of me, and in order to make it clear to the gentlemen how difficult my task had become, particularly in 1944. Actually, a very simple situation is at the root of this. According to German labor laws and according to my own convictions, the “Arbeitsvermittlung” (procurement of labor)—the old word for “Arbeitseinsatz” (allocation of labor)—was a right of the State; and we, myself included, scorned private methods of recruitment. In 1944 Premier Laval, the head of the French government, told me that he was also having great difficulties in carrying out the labor laws where his own workers were concerned.

In view of that, and in agreement with one of my collaborators, Dr. Didier, conferences were held in the German Embassy—the witness Hildebrandt, I believe, is better able to give information about that—with the head of the collaborationist associations, that is to say, associations among the French population which advocated collaboration with Germany. During these conferences at the German Embassy these associations stated that in their opinion official recruitment in France had become very difficult. They said that they would like to take charge of that and would like to provide recruiting agents from their own ranks and also provide people from among their members who would go to Germany voluntarily. Recruitment was not to take place through official agencies but in cafés. In these cafés, of course, certain expenses would be necessary which would have to be met; and the recruiting agents would have to be paid a bonus, or be compensated by a glass of wine or some gin. That way of doing things, naturally, did not appeal to me personally; but I was in such difficulties in view of the demands put to me that I agreed, without intending, of course, that the idea of “shanghai” with its overseas suggestions and so forth should be seriously considered.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did this suggestion come from the Frenchmen, or was it your suggestion?

SAUCKEL: As I have said already, the suggestion was made by the French leaders of these associations.

DR. SERVATIUS: If you read on a few lines in the document, you will find that mention is made of special

executive powers which you wanted to create for the allocation of labor; it says there:

“Beyond that, I have charged a few capable men with the establishment of a special executive force for the Allocation of Labor. Under the leadership of the Higher SS and Police Leader a number of indigenous units have been trained and armed, and I now have to ask the Ministry of Munitions for weapons for these people.”

How do you explain that?

SAUCKEL: That, also, can be explained clearly only in connection with the events that I have just described. At that time there had been many attacks on German offices and mixed German-French labor offices. The Director of the Department for the Allocation of Labor in the office of the military commander in France, President Dr. Ritter, had been murdered. A number of recruiting offices had been raided and destroyed. For that reason these associations who were in favor of collaboration had suggested, for the protection of their own members, that a sort of bodyguard for the recruiting organization should be set up. Of course I could not do that myself because I had neither the authority nor the machinery for it. In accordance with the orders of the military commander, it had to be done by the Higher SS and Police Leader; that is, under his supervision. This was carried out in conjunction with the French Minister of the Interior at that time, Darnand; so as to be able to stand my ground against the censure of the Central Planning Board, I used an example in this drastic form. As far as I know, these hypothetical suggestions were not put into practice.

DR. SERVATIUS: Who actually carried out the recruitment of the foreign workers?

SAUCKEL: The actual recruitment of foreign workers was the task of the German offices established in the various regions, the offices of the military commanders or similar civilian German institutions.

DR. SERVATIUS: You ordered recruitment to be voluntary. What was the success of that voluntary recruitment?

SAUCKEL: Several million foreign workers came to Germany voluntarily, as voluntary recruitment was the underlying principle.

DR. SERVATIUS: Now, at the meeting of the Central Planning Board—the same meeting which we have just discussed—you made a remark which contradicts that. It is on Page 67 of the German photostat, Page 1827 of the English text. I shall read the sentence to you. Kehrl is speaking. He says, “During that entire period, you brought a large number of Frenchmen to the Reich by voluntary recruitment.”

Then an interruption by Sauckel: “Also by forced recruitment.”

The speaker continues, “Forced recruitment started when voluntary recruitment no longer yielded sufficient numbers.”

Now comes the remark on which I want you to comment. You answered, “Of the 5 million foreign workers who came to Germany, less than 200,000 came voluntarily.”

Please explain that contradiction.

SAUCKEL: I see that this is another interruption which I made. All I wanted to say by it was that Herr Kehrl’s opinion that all workers had come voluntarily was not quite correct.

This proportion, which is put down here by the stenographer or the man writing the records, is quite impossible. How that error occurred, I do not know. I never saw the record; but the witness Timm, or others, can give information on that.

DR. SERVATIUS: I refer now to Exhibit Sauckel-15. That is Directive Number 4, which has been quoted already and which lays down specific regulations with regard to recruiting measures. It has already been submitted as Document Number 3044-PS. Why did you now abandon the principle of voluntary recruitment?

SAUCKEL: In the course of the war our opponents also carried out very considerable and widespread countermeasures. The need for manpower in Germany, on the other hand, had become tremendous. During that period a request was also put to me by French, Belgian, and Dutch circles to bring about a better balance in the economy of these territories and even to introduce what we called a labor draft law, so that the pressure of enemy propaganda would be reduced and the Dutch, Belgians, and French themselves could say that they were not going to Germany voluntarily but that they had to go because of a compulsory labor service and because of laws.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did the proximity of the front have any influence on the fact that people no longer wanted to come voluntarily?

SAUCKEL: Of course I came to feel that; and it is understandable that the chances of victory and defeat caused great agitation among the workers; and the way things looked at the front certainly played an important part.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did purely military considerations also cause the introduction...

THE TRIBUNAL (Mr. Francis Biddle, Member for the United States): Dr. Servatius, will you ask the witness what he means by a labor draft law. Does he mean a law of Germany or a law of the occupied countries?

DR. SERVATIUS: Witness, you heard the question, whether you mean a German law or a law of the administration of the occupied countries?

SAUCKEL: That varied. The Reich Government in some of the territories introduced laws which corresponded to the laws that were valid for the German people themselves. Those laws could not be issued by me, but they were issued by the chiefs of the regional administrations or the government of the country concerned on the order of the German Government.

In France these laws were issued by the Laval Government, in agreement with Marshal Pétain; in Belgium, in agreement with the Belgian general secretaries or general directors still in office or with the ministries.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you mean, in the other countries, by the German Government or the German Government's representatives? You have only spoken of...

SAUCKEL: The order to introduce German labor laws in the occupied territories was given by the Führer. They were proclaimed and introduced by the chiefs who had been appointed by the Führer for these territories, for I myself was not in a position to issue any directives, laws, or regulations there.

THE PRESIDENT: Go on.

DR. SERVATIUS: How were these laws carried out?

SAUCKEL: The laws were published in the official publications and legal gazettes, as well as being made known through the press and by posters in those territories.

DR. SERVATIUS: I mean the practical execution. How were the people brought to Germany?

SAUCKEL: They were summoned to the local labor office, which was mostly administered by local authorities. Cases had to be examined individually, according to my directives, which have been submitted here as documents. Cases of hardship to the family, or other such cases, were given special consideration. Then, in the normal manner—as was done in Germany also—the individual workers or conscripted persons were brought to Germany.

DR. SERVATIUS: Were you present—did you ever witness this procedure?

SAUCKEL: I observed this procedure personally in a number of cities in Russia, France, and Belgium; and I made sure that it was carried out in accordance with orders.

DR. SERVATIUS: If compulsion was necessary, what coercive measures were taken?

SAUCKEL: At first, such compulsory measures were taken as are justified and necessary in every normal civil administration.

DR. SERVATIUS: And if they were not sufficient?

SAUCKEL: Then proceedings were proposed.

DR. SERVATIUS: These were legal measures, were they?

SAUCKEL: According to my conviction, they were legal measures.

DR. SERVATIUS: You have stated repeatedly in documents, which are available here, that a certain amount of pressure was to be used. What did you mean by that?

SAUCKEL: I consider that every administrative measure taken on the basis of laws or duties imposed by the state, on one's own nation, or in any other way, constitutes some form of stress, duty, pressure.

DR. SERVATIUS: Were not measures used which brought about some sort of collective pressure?

SAUCKEL: I rejected every kind of collective pressure. The refusal to employ collective pressure is also evident from decrees issued by other German offices in the Reich.

DR. SERVATIUS: Is it not true that in the East the villages were called upon to provide a certain number of people?

SAUCKEL: In the East, of course, administrative procedure was rendered difficult on account of the great distances. In the lower grades, as far as I know, native mayors were in office in every case. It is possible that a mayor was requested to select a number of workers from his village or town for work in Germany.

DR. SERVATIUS: Is that the same as that form of collective pressure, where, if nobody came, the entire village was to be punished?

SAUCKEL: Measures of that kind I rejected entirely in my field of activity, because I could not and would not bring to the German economy workers who had been taken to Germany in such a manner that they would hate their life and their work in Germany from the very outset.

DR. SERVATIUS: What police facilities were at your disposal?

SAUCKEL: I had no police facilities at my disposal.

DR. SERVATIUS: Who exercised the police pressure?

SAUCKEL: Police pressure in the occupied territories could be exerted on order or application of the respective chief of the territory, or of the Higher SS and Police Leader, if authorized.

DR. SERVATIUS: Then it was not within your competence to exert direct pressure?

SAUCKEL: No.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did you exert indirect pressure by your directives, by cutting off food supplies, or similar measures?

SAUCKEL: After the fall of Stalingrad and the proclamation of the state of total war, Reich Minister Dr. Goebbels in Berlin interfered considerably in all these problems. He ordered that in cases of persistent refusal or signs of resistance compulsion was to be used by means of refusing additional food rations, or even by withdrawal of ration cards. I personally rejected measures of that kind energetically, because I knew very well that in the western territories the so-called food ration card played a subordinate role and that supplies were provided for the resistance movement and its members on such a large scale that such measures would have been quite ineffective. I did not order or suggest them.

DR. SERVATIUS: At the meeting of the Central Planning Board on 1 March 1944 you also stated that, if the French executive agencies were unable to get results, then one might have to put a prefect up against a wall. Do you still consider this to be legally justified pressure?

SAUCKEL: That is a similarly drastic remark of mine in the Central Planning Board which was never actually followed by an official order and not even by any prompting on my part. It was simply that I had been informed that in several departments in France the prefects or responsible chiefs supported the resistance movement wholeheartedly. Railroad tracks had been blown up; bridges had been blown up; and that remark was a verbal reaction on my part. I believe, however, I was then only thinking of a legal measure, because there did, in fact, exist a French law which made sabotage an offense punishable by death.

DR. SERVATIUS: May I refer to the document in this connection?

THE PRESIDENT: Is it in Document Number R-124?

DR. SERVATIUS: It is on Page 1776, where it says that on the basis of the law it would then be necessary to put a mayor up against a wall.

[*Turning to the defendant.*] Do you know what laws existed in France compelling co-operation from the French authorities, or whether there were such laws?

SAUCKEL: Yes, such laws existed.

DR. SERVATIUS: A number of reports, which were submitted here, concerning the application of measures of compulsion, mentioned abuses and outrageous conditions allegedly caused by recruitment measures. What can you say about that in general?

SAUCKEL: I did not quite understand your question.

DR. SERVATIUS: Concerning the use of compulsion, a number of reports were brought up here, and you have heard them; reports setting forth measures which must

surely be generally condemned. You heard of the burning down of villages and the shooting of men. What can you say to that in general?

SAUCKEL: All these measures are clearly in contradiction to the directives and instructions which I issued and which have been submitted here in large numbers, and to these I must refer. These are methods against which, when I heard as much as hints of them, I took very severe measures.

DR. SERVATIUS: And who bears the immediate responsibility for such incidents?

SAUCKEL: The responsibility for such incidents rests with the local authorities which did these things.

DR. SERVATIUS: Were there any other offices besides the local authorities which dealt with recruitment of labor?

SAUCKEL: That is exactly what I was fighting for from the very beginning—to eliminate and combat the intricate maze of offices which, without restraint or control, recruited workers by compulsion. That was part of my job.

DR. SERVATIUS: What kind of offices were they? Local offices?

SAUCKEL: They were offices of all kinds. I myself heard about most of them only here.

DR. SERVATIUS: What was the situation with regard to the Todt Organization?

SAUCKEL: The Todt Organization for a long time recruited and used manpower independently in all territories.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did the labor service have anything to do with that?

SAUCKEL: Do you mean the labor service of Reichsarbeitsführer Hierl?

DR. SERVATIUS: Yes.

SAUCKEL: That I cannot say; that was a German military organization for training for manual work.

DR. SERVATIUS: Were workers taken for the Armed Forces?

SAUCKEL: Workers were employed for local urgent work, of course, by army groups, by construction and fortification battalions, and so on, which I neither knew about nor was in a position to control. Road building...

DR. SERVATIUS: How about the Reichsbahn?

SAUCKEL: The Reichsbahn repaired its tracks itself and recruited or hired the workers for its requirements whenever it needed them.

DR. SERVATIUS: These offices were not under your supervision?

SAUCKEL: No.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did they carry out your instructions or were they required to carry them out?

SAUCKEL: They were not obliged to carry them out; and for that very reason I sent out, and in a very emphatic form, that manifesto which was mentioned yesterday. As, however, I myself had no supervision over the executive authorities, I had to leave it to the various offices to take these instructions into consideration.

DR. SERVATIUS: Was the number of workers recruited in the various territories in that manner very large?

SAUCKEL: There were certainly very large numbers of them.

DR. SERVATIUS: There were also Reich offices which dealt with the question of manpower. What about the

deportations carried out by Himmler? Did you have any connection with those?

SAUCKEL: With reference to the question of these deportations, I can only say that I did not have the least thing to do with them. I never agreed—I never could have agreed, in view of my own outlook, my development, and my life—I could not have agreed to the use of prisoners or convicts for work in that manner. That was absolutely foreign to my nature. I also have the firm conviction that, on account of my forcible statements and measures, I was intentionally kept uninformed about the whole matter, because it was quite contrary to my own views on work and on workers. I said very often—and it can be seen in documents here—that I wanted to win the co-operation of the foreign workers for Germany and for the German way of life, and I did not want to alienate them.

DR. SERVATIUS: These then were the various offices which, apart from you, had to do with recruitment of workers?

SAUCKEL: May I make a short statement in that respect? I heard the word “deportation” a few times in Germany and I always rejected the idea very emphatically because I knew nothing about such operations. According to the use of the word in the German language I understand “deportation” to mean the sending away of prisoners and of people who have committed some punishable act against the State. I never carried out deportations because of my own views on the ethics of work. On the contrary, I gave the workers recruited through my office—and that was the point on which I finally obtained Hitler’s consent at the beginning of

my job, and it was not an easy matter—I gave all foreign workers legal contracts, whether they came voluntarily or through German labor conscription. They should and must receive the same treatment, the same pay, and the same food as the German workers. That is why I rejected the idea of deportation in my methods and my program. I can testify here with a clear conscience that I had nothing at all to do with those deportations, the terrible extent of which I learned only here.

DR. SERVATIUS: You have pointed out repeatedly that this labor had to be brought to Germany under all circumstances, that one had to proceed ruthlessly, that it was an absolute necessity to get the workers. Does that not show that you agreed with such measures?

SAUCKEL: I should like to point out the following distinction:

My directives and instructions can be clearly seen in numerous documents. I could issue only these because I had no executive power and no machinery of my own. All these directives, from the very beginning, prescribe legally correct and just treatment. It is true, however, that I used the words “under all circumstances” when communicating with German offices—the Führer himself had impressed these words on me—and I used the word “ruthlessly,” not with respect to the treatment of workers but with respect to the many arguments, disputes, arbitrary acts, and individual desires which the German offices, with which I had to contend fiercely, had among themselves and against me. For the most part they did not understand the importance of the allocation of labor as an economic measure in time of

war. The military authorities, the army commanders, very often told me, for instance, that it was nonsense to bring these people to Germany. There was the Vlassov Army under the Russian general of that name, and the military authorities wanted these Russian workers to join the Vlassov Army. I opposed that. I did not consider it right, nor did I consider it sufficiently reliable. These were the things against which I had to proceed ruthlessly in my dealings with the German administration in those territories.

DR. SERVATIUS: Were there other circumstances, too, which led to the transportation of people to Germany?

SAUCKEL: Yes, there were other circumstances which, however, were not connected directly but indirectly with the allocation of labor, and they often took me by surprise; for example, the evacuation of military zones, which frequently had to be carried through at a moment's notice or after only a very short time of preparation. And when such an evacuation had been carried out it was the task of the local labor offices to put the evacuated population to work in areas in the rear or to bring to Germany such workers as could be used there.

This sort of labor allocation entailed, of course, considerable difficulties for me. There were families and children among the evacuated people; and they, naturally, had also to be provided with shelter. It was often the very natural wish of the Russian fathers and mothers to take their children with them. That happened, not because I wanted it, but because it was unavoidable.

DR. SERVATIUS: And did you always use this labor, or only occasionally?

SAUCKEL: To a large extent those people were used by the local authorities in those territories and put into agriculture, industry, railroads, bridge building, and so on.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did you have anything to do with resettlement?

SAUCKEL: I never had anything to do with resettlement. By a decree of the Führer that task was expressly delegated to the Reichsführer SS.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did Rosenberg not report to you about bad conditions which existed in his sphere?

SAUCKEL: Yes. I had about four conversations with Rosenberg, at his request; and he told me about the bad conditions. There was no doubt on my part that such conditions were to be utterly condemned.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did he speak about Koch?

SAUCKEL: The Reichskommissariat Ukraine was mainly involved. There were considerable differences between the Reich Minister for the Occupied Eastern Territories, Rosenberg, and Reich Commissioner Koch.

DR. SERVATIUS: Were you in a position to take measures against Koch?

SAUCKEL: Koch was not subordinate to me either directly or indirectly. I could not give him any instructions in such matters. I let him know from the outset that I could not possibly agree with such methods as I had heard about, to some extent through Rosenberg, although I could not prove them.

Koch was of the opinion—and he explained that in his letters to Rosenberg—that in his territory he was the sole authority. He also pointed that out to me.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did Rosenberg not think the cause for these conditions was that your demands were too high?

SAUCKEL: I also spoke to Herr Rosenberg about that. I personally was of the opinion that, if the demands could be divided up and orderly recruitment and conscription could take place, it was quite possible to fill the quotas. After all I had orders and instructions from the Führer and the Central Planning Board.

DR. SERVATIUS: Did you ever talk about the methods which should be used?

SAUCKEL: The methods that should be used were not only frequently discussed between us, but I published them in many very clear directives. I even went so far as to issue and distribute my manifesto over the head of this higher authority to the subordinate offices so that they could be guided by it.

I have to point out emphatically, however, that these were incidents which occurred for the most part before my directives came into effect and before my appointment.

DR. SERVATIUS: I want to refer you to Document Number 018-PS. That is in the "Slave Labor Brief," Page 10.

THE PRESIDENT: That is not Page 10. It is Number 10.

DR. SERVATIUS: It is Exhibit Number USA-186. In the English "Slave Labor" Book it is Document 10. It is a letter of 21 December 1942.

[The document was handed to the defendant.]

If you go through that document, you will see that Rosenberg complains about the methods used by your

agents and collaborators. What are these offices for which you are being made responsible here?

SAUCKEL: There is an error in this letter on the part of Herr Rosenberg, because it was not I who had offices there but the Reich Commissioner.

DR. SERVATIUS: In other words you are saying that he addressed himself to the wrong person?

SAUCKEL: Yes.

DR. SERVATIUS: Then will you lay that document aside.

SAUCKEL: Rosenberg writes on Page 2, "I empowered the Reich Commissioner for the Ukraine..."

DR. SERVATIUS: You assume, therefore, that the writer of this letter did not himself know exactly who the authorities in his territory were?

SAUCKEL: Yes, that was quite possible, because I myself had only been in office a short time.

DR. SERVATIUS: What did you do as a result of the complaint which Rosenberg made? Did you do anything at all?

SAUCKEL: After receiving Rosenberg's letter I had a discussion with him immediately. As it was shortly before Christmas, 21 December 1942, I called by telegram an official meeting at Weimar for 6 January, to which representatives of the respective offices in the East were invited. I also invited Reich Minister Rosenberg to that meeting. And at that conference these officials were again told clearly and unmistakably, that it was their duty to use correct and legal methods.

DR. SERVATIUS: In that connection I would like to refer to Document Number Sauckel-82. It is in the Sauckel

Document Book Number 3, Page 207. I submit the handbook itself, which contains a number of documents for judicial notice.

I quote one sentence from the speech on the principles of recruiting which Sauckel made there before 800 people who were employed in the Allocation of Labor program.

THE PRESIDENT: Did you say 800?

DR. SERVATIUS: Page 206.

THE PRESIDENT: It is 8,000 in my copy. Isn't it 8,000?

DR. SERVATIUS: The third book, Page 206, Document Number 82.

THE PRESIDENT: I am looking at Document Number 82. I thought you said 800 men were employed. I am looking at the beginning of Document 82.

DR. SERVATIUS: It begins on Page 204. He spoke before 800 people, not 8,000. It should be 800. That is a mistake in the translation of the document.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well.

DR. SERVATIUS: The following is stated here:

“Principles of our recruiting:

“1) Where the voluntary method fails (and experience shows that it fails everywhere) compulsory service takes its place....”—I skip a few sentences.

“It is bitter to tear people from their homes, from their children. But we did not want the war. The German child who loses its father at the front, the German wife who mourns her husband killed in battle, suffer far more. Let us disclaim every false sentiment now.”

THE PRESIDENT: You have left out some of the document, have you not?

DR. SERVATIUS: I did not quite understand.

THE PRESIDENT: You have left out some of the document.

DR. SERVATIUS: Yes, I omitted some sentences and I said so. But I can read all of it.

THE PRESIDENT: I only mean on Page 206. I didn't mean the whole document. On Page 206 you have just skipped two sentences.

DR. SERVATIUS: I have four sentences there. I will read them again:

"Where the voluntary method fails, compulsory service takes its place."

Then I omitted two sentences, which I shall now read:

"This is the iron law for the Allocation of Labor for 1943. In a few weeks from now there must no longer be any occupied territory in which compulsory service for Germany is not the most natural thing in the world."

THE PRESIDENT: Didn't you also leave out the words "experience shows that it fails everywhere"?

DR. SERVATIUS: I read that the first time; I wanted to save time.

"We are going to discard the last remnants of our soft talk about humanitarian ideals. Every additional gun which we procure brings us a minute closer to victory. It is bitter to tear people from their homes, from their children. But we did not want the war. The German child who loses its father