TRIAL OF WAR CRIMINALS BEFORE THE NUERNBERG MILITARY TRIBUNALS
VOLUME IV:
"The Einsatzgruppen case"
"The RuSHA case"

Vol. IV, pp.599 to 601

"The RuSHA Case"

MILITARY TRIBUNAL NO. I

CASE 8

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

—against—

ULRICH GREIFELT, RUDOLF CREUTZ, KONRAD MEYER-HETLING, OTTO SCHWARZENBERGER, HERBERT HUEBNER, WERNER LORENZ, HEINZ BRUECKNER, OTTO HOFMANN, RICHARD HILDEBRANDT, FRITZ SCHWALM, MAX SOLLMANN, GRECOR EBNER, GUENTHER TESCH, AND INGE VIERMETZ, *Defendants*

INTRODUCTION

The "RuSHA Case" is officially designated United States of America vs. Ulrich Greifelt, et al (Case 8). "RuSHA" is the German abbreviation of "Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt Race and Settlement Main Office), an SS agency which played a very important role in the case.

The defendants were leading officials of "RuSHA" or of three other offices or agencies of the SS. These four agencies, all branches of the Supreme Command of the SS, were the "Staff Main Office of the Reich Commissioner for the Strengthening of Germanism" (Stabshauptamt des Reichskommissars fuer die Festigung des deutschen Volkstums, abbreviated RKFDV); "Office for Repatriation of Ethnic Germans" (Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle, abbreviated VoMi), a subdivision of the RKFDV; the "Race and Settlement Main Office" (RuSHA); and the "Lebensborn", which was both a private association (Verein) and a department of the Personal Staff of Heinrich Himmler, the Supreme or Reich Leader SS. Lebensborn may be roughly translated "Well of Life". It was founded by the SS before the war to ensure the support of legitimate and illegitimate children of SS men. It was used during the war for the selection for Germanization of "racially valuable children" of foreign nationals.

The defendants were charged with criminal conduct allegedly arising out of their functions as officials of the four agencies mentioned. It was alleged that the crimes charged to the defendants were connected with a systematic program of genocide*. In its judgment the Tribunal hearing the case declared that these SS organizations existed "for one primary purpose in effecting the ideology and program of Hitler, which may be summed up in one phrase—The two-fold objective of weakening and eventually destroying other nations while at the same time strengthening Germany, territorially and biologically, at the expense of conquered nations".

* Since World War II genocide has become the widely used term to describe the systematic persecution and elimination of ethnic or religious groups. After the completion of this trial the General Assembly of the United nations, by resolution of 9 December 1948, adopted a convention entitled "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide".

872486—50—41

The "RuSHA Case" was tried at the Palace of Justice in Nuernberg before Military Tribunal I. The Tribunal convened 121 times, and the trial lasted approximately eight months, as shown by the following schedule:

Indictment	1 July 1947
Indictment served	7 July 1947
Arraignment	10 October 1947
Prosecution opening statement	20 October 1947
Defense opening statement	20 November 1947
Prosecution closing statement	13 February 1948
Defense closing statements	16-17 February 1948
Judgment	10 March 1948
Sentences	10 March 1948
Affirmation of sentences by the Military Governor of the U.S. Zone of Occupation	12 February 1949

The English transcript of the Court proceedings runs to 5,408 mimeographed pages. The prosecution introduced into evidence 904 written exhibits (some of which contained several documents), and the defense 1,148 written exhibits. The Tribunal heard oral testimony of 27 witnesses called by the prosecution and of 70 witnesses, excluding the defendants, called by the defense. Each of the 14 defendants testified in his own behalf, and each was subject to examination on behalf of other defendants. The exhibits offered by both the prosecution and defense contained documents, photographs, affidavits, interrogatories, letters, maps, charts, and other written evidence. The prosecution introduced 93 affidavits; the defense introduced 522 affidavits. The prosecution called 33 defense affiants for cross-examination; the defense called 47 prosecution affiants for cross-examination. The Tribunal was in recess between 10 and 20 November 1947, to give the defense additional time to prepare its case. A further recess was taken from 2 to 13 February 1948, to allow both prosecution and defense time for the preparation of their closing arguments.

The members of the Tribunal and prosecution and defense counsel are listed on the ensuing pages. Prosecution counsel were assisted in preparing the case by Walter Rapp (Chief of the Evidence Division), Herbert Meyer, Fred Rodell, and Larry Wolff, interrogators, and Margit Braid, M.L. Dezborowska, Stanley Donath George Grant, Olga Lang, Dorit Margen, Stephen Mayer, Eduard Rolling, Frank Young, and Hedy Wachenheimer, research and documentary analysts.

———————

Selection and arrangement of the "RuSHA Case" material published herein was accomplished principally by Arnost Horlik- Hochwald and Olga Lang, working under the general supervision of Drexel A. Sprecher, Deputy Chief Counsel and Director of Publications, Office U.S. Chief of Counsel for War Crimes. Catherine W. Bedford, Henry Buxbaum, Emilie Evand, Paul H. Gantt, Enid M. Standring, and Dr. Wolfgang Theobald assisted in selecting, compiling, editing, and indexing the numerous papers.

John H. E. Fried, Special Legal Consultant to the Tribunals, reviewed and approved the selection and arrangements of the materials as the designated representative of the Nuernberg Military Tribunals.

Final compilation and editing of the manuscript for printing was administered by the War Crimes Division, Office of the Judge Advocate General, under the direct supervision of Richard A. Olbeter, Chief, Special Projects Branch, with Alma Soller as editor, Amelia Rivers as assistant editor and John W. Mosenthal as research analyst.

(...)

IX. OPINION AND JUDGMENT (Vol. V, pp.88 to 89)

(...)

The indictment in this case is framed in three counts. The first and second counts charge the commission of crimes against humanity and war crimes, respectively. Count one alleges, in substance, that between September 1939 and April 1945, all of the defendants—

> "were principals in, accessories to, ordered, abetted, took a consenting part in, were connected with plans and enterprises involving, and were members of organizations or groups connected with atrocities and offenses, including but not limited to murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, imprisonment, torture, persecutions on political, racial, and religious grounds, and other inhumane and criminal acts against civilian populations, including German civilians and nationals of other countries, and against prisoners of war."

Count one further alleges that these—

> "Acts, conduct, plans and enterprises * * * were carried out as part of a systematic program of genocide, aimed at the destruction of foreign nations and ethnic groups, in part by elimination and suppression of national characteristics. The object of this program was to strengthen the German nation and the so-called 'Aryan' race at the expense of such other nations and groups by imposing Nazi and German characteristics upon individuals selected therefrom * * * and by the extermination of 'undesirable' racial elements. This program was carried out in part by—
>
> (a) Kidnaping children.
> (b) Abortions.
> (c) Taking away infants of Eastern workers.
> (d) Punishment for sexual intercourse with Germans.
> (e) Preventing marriages and hampering reproduction of enemy nationals.
> (f) Evacuating enemy populations from their native lands by force.
> (g) Forced Germanization of enemy nationals.
> (1) Slave labor.
> (h) Plunder.
> (i) Persecution of Jews."

Count two, which charges the defendants with war crimes, alleges that all the defendants between September 1939 and April 1945—

(...)

KIDNAPING OF ALIEN CHILDREN (Vol. V, pp.102 to 108)

(...)

ABORTIONS ON EASTERN WORKERS (Vol. V, pp.109 to 112)

The policy of abortions on Eastern workers began in 1943, and had its basis in a decree issued by Himmler in March 1943, which provided:

> "* * * that in those cases where pregnancy is caused by sexual intercourse between a member of the SS or the police and a non-German woman residing in the occupied Eastern territories, an interruption of pregnancy is to be carried out positively by the competent physician of the SS or the police, unless that woman is of good stock, which is to be ascertained in advance in every case.
>
> "The Russian physicians or the Russian Medical Association, which must not be informed of this order, are to be told in individual cases that the pregnancy is being interrupted for reasons of social distress. It must be explained in such a way that no conclusions to the existence of a definite order may be drawn."

Following the Himmler decree on abortions, Dr. Kaltenbrunner [chief of RSHA], from the office of the RKFDV, issued detailed instructions on the subject of abortions, stating:

> "In cooperation with the offices concerned, the Reich Health Leader has decreed in his Order No. 4/43, dated 11 March 1943, that in the case of Eastern female workers, pregnancy may be interrupted if the pregnant woman so desires * * *.
>
> "The consent for abortion of Eastern female workers on the part of the offices of the Reich Commissioner for the Strengthening of Germanism is valid herewith as retroactively granted in the cases in which the father was a man of foreign race (not Germanic). In these cases, the office for expert opinion will,

therefore, not obtain the consent of the Higher SS and Police Leader as Deputy of the Reich Commissioner for the Strengthening of Germanism, but may order the abortion on its own authority.

"Obtaining the consent of the Higher SS and Police Leader as Deputy of the Reich Commissioner for the strengthening of Germanism is, according to this, necessary only in the cases in which it is maintained or is probable that the father was a German or a member of an ethnically related (Germanic) race.

"The Higher SS and Police Leader will then be informed of those cases. * * *"

The decree then provided for the taking of personal histories and racial examinations by the RuS Leader, and further provided:

"* * * If it is found by this racial examination that a racially valuable result is to be expected, then the consent for abortion is to be denied. If on the basis of the racial examination the offspring is expected not to be racially valuable, the consent for abortion is to be granted.

"The racial examination is to be carried out rapidly. Further directives concerning the carrying out of the racial examination and the treatment of the cases in which the consent for abortion is to be denied are issued by the Reich Leader SS and Chief of the German Police, or by the RuS Main Office SS."

It appears from the evidence that basic decrees and memorandums on the question of abortion were principally issued by offices and defendants other than those here involved, with the exception of RuSHA. That RuSHA participated in the abortion program is clearly shown. The role played by RuSHA was principally in conducting racial examinations of the pregnant worker as well as the suspected father to determine whether a racially inferior or satisfactory child might be expected; and upon the basis of this examination it was determined whether an abortion should or could be performed--orders being to the effect that no abortion could be performed where a child of good racial characteristics might be expected, and that an abortion should be performed where such a child was improbable. Upon these racial examinations depended also the future treatment of a child in those cases where a pregnancy interruption was not practicable because pregnancy was in too far an advanced stage at the time of the examination. In the event the racial examiner determined that a racially inferior offspring was to be expected, the child was assigned to a "foreign children's home", which meant that it would be reared under adverse conditions without the benefit of the normal necessities of life and culture, while in the event the racial examiner found that a racially suitable child might be expected, such a decision meant that the child would be subjected to Germanism through adoption by foster parents.

That a child evaluated as of good racial characteristics would be wrested from its mother and subjected to Germanization is clearly shown in a letter from Himmler's office to RuSHA in which it is stated:

"The reception into the care of the NSV or of Lebensborn of the child of good racial stock will necessitate in most cases its separation from the mother who remains at her working place. Particularly for this reason the reception into that care of the child of good racial stock is only possible with the mother's consent. She has to be made to consent to it through interpretations by the caretaking office which set forth the advantages but not the ends of this procedure. * * *"

While it may be noticed that this letter states that such a child can be taken from its mother only by her consent, the letter proceeds to state that the mother "has to be made to consent." Of course, through no stretch of the imagination can the forced agreement of a slave laborer in the Reich, working under the conditions to which these laborers were subjected, be termed a "consent".

The role of RuSHA in the abortion program was principally carried out, so far as basic directives are concerned, by the defendants Hofmann and Hildebrandt. On 13 August 1943, Hildebrandt wrote concerning abortions:

"I should like to emphasize especially that the necessity for the racial examination, which take place upon the suggestion of the SS Race and Settlement Main Office, also applies here.

"The directives for the RuS field leaders' decision in the racial examination are the same as the ones laid down by me through the ordinance of 13 August 1943 to be applied in decisions about applications for pregnancy interruption for Eastern female workers.

"All files of cases in which the RuS field leader refuses the pregnancy interruption are to be submitted to the Race and Settlement Main Office together with photographs and addresses of their relatives, so that they may be examined in the light of inclusion into the re-Germanization program."

And 10 days later, Hildebrandt, in a memorandum marked "Secret", stated:

"Enclosed find the Order of the Reich Leader SS and Chief of the German Police of 27 July 1943 which has been issued in agreement with the Race and Resettlement Main Office for your compliance.

"The carrying out and the decision on the treatment of the pregnant women, as well as of the expected children, is the responsibility of the SS Leader for Racial and Resettlement matters. The regulations issued

by me, in regard to the decisions on applications for interruption of pregnancy, also correspondingly apply to the decisions of the SS Leaders for Racial and Resettlement matters. * * *

"Naturally the opinion of the SS Leader for Racial and Resettlement matters is the decisive one in the judgment. * * *

"Though I have already done so in the regulations on the decisions on the interruption of pregnancies, I want to point out once more the grave responsibility which has been assigned to the SS Leaders for Racial and Resettlement matters by this new order, i.e., to especially further all valuable racial strains for the strengthening of our people, and to accomplish a complete elimination of everything racially inferior."

The desired result of this systematic program of abortions was (*a*) to keep the Eastern laborers available as slave labor; and (*b*) to hamper and reduce the reproduction of the population of the Eastern nations.

Since one of the main defenses to this specific charge is the contention that abortions were performed in all cases only on a voluntary basis, by the express consent of the women involved, we quote another document which clearly refutes this contention:

"It is known that racially inferior offspring of Eastern workers and Poles is to be avoided if at all possible. Although pregnancy interruptions ought to be carried out on a voluntary basis only, pressure is to be applied in each of these cases. * * *"

TAKING AWAY INFANTS OF EASTERN WORKERS (Vol. V, pp.112 ff.)

Closely linked to the program of abortions was that of stealing children born to Eastern workers. Notwithstanding the abortion program, it often happened that a case of pregnancy was not discovered until it was too late to perform an abortion or the child was born before pregnancy was actually discovered. Therefore, the Nazis conceived it to be necessary to deal with this situation. They solved it by simply, in many cases, stealing the child and sending the mother back to labor for the Reich.

The procedure of taking away infants of Eastern workers is clearly outlined in a decree issued by Kaltenbrunner on 27 July 1943. This decree, among other things, provided:

"Relative to the question of the treatment of pregnant foreign women and the children born in the Reich by foreign working women, I give the following directives in accordance with the respective central offices which, on their part, will give corresponding instructions to their subordinate offices:

'After giving birth the foreign working women have to resume work as soon as possible according to the instructions of the Plenipotentiary for the assignment of labor. * * *'

"The children born by the foreign working women may in no case be attended by German institutions, be taken into German children's homes, or else be reared and educated together with German children. Therefore, special infant-attendance institutions of the simplest kind—so-called 'foreigners' children's nursing homes—have been erected within the billets where these children of foreigners are attended to by female members of the respective nationality. Foreign population is emphasized by the human sacrifices in the war. It is therefore important that the children of foreigners who, partly, are of a similar race and bearers of German blood and may therefore be considered as valuable are not assigned to the 'foreigners' children's nursing home according to figure 3 (not reproduced), but, if possible, they are to be saved for the German nationality and to be educated as German children.

"For this reason an examination of the racial characteristics of the father and mother has to be carried out in cases where the father of a foreigner's child is of German or of kindred race (Germanic). * * *"

The decree then provides for racial examinations by RuSHA, and further states:

"In cases where on the basis of the racial examination and of the expert opinion as to the health stock both of the father and the pregnant woman racially good descendants can be expected, the children, in order to assure their education as German children, will be put in the care of the National Socialist Public Welfare Association (NSV) which will place them in special children's homes for foreigners' children of good racial stock or in private families. Should the examination prove negative then the children will be treated according to figure 3 (not reproduced).

"The Higher SS and Police Leader is to submit as quickly as possible—

"To the Youth Offices the result of the racial examination, respectively the decision on all cases reported by them. In cases of a positive result of the racial examination the summons has to be added to bring about the appointment of a guardian at the appropriate time.

"In cases of a positive result of the racial examination, to the competent Gau office of the NSV moreover the summons to have the child of the foreign woman adopted at the appropriate time under the care of the NSV for children of good racial stock. * * *

"The reception into the care of the NSV or of Lebensborn of the child of good racial stock will necessitate in most cases its separation from the mother who remains at her working place. Particularly for this reason the reception into that care of the child of good racial stock is only possible with the mother's consent. She

has to be made to consent to it through interpretations by the caretaking office which is set forth the advantages but not the ends of this procedure. * * *"

A copy of this decree went to RuSHA.
(...)

PERSECUTION AND EXTERMINATION OF THE JEWS (Vol. V, p.152)
(...)

WAR CRIMES AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY (Vol. V, pp.152 to 154)
Judged by any standard of proof, the record in this case clearly establishes crimes against humanity and war crimes, substantially as alleged in the indictment under counts one and two.

The acts and conduct, as set forth in this judgment, and as substantially charged in the indictment, constitute crimes against humanity as defined in Article II (c) of the Control Council Law No. 10, and are violative of international conventions, and particularly of Articles 23, 45, 46, 47, 52, 55, and 56 of the Hague Regulations (1907), and are violative of the general principles of criminal law as derived from the criminal laws of all civilized nations and of the internal penal laws of the countries in which such crimes were committed.

The acts and conduct set forth in this judgment, and as substantially alleged in the indictment, also constitute war crimes, as defined in Article II (b) of Control Council Law No. 10, and are violative of international conventions, and particularly of Articles 23, 45, 46, 47, 52, 55, and 56 of the Hague Regulations (1907), and are violative of the general principles of criminal law as derived from the criminal laws of all civilized nations and of the internal penal laws of the countries in which such crimes were committed.

During the course of the trial defenses common to all defendants have been urged.

It has been insisted repeatedly by the defendants that numerous activities were not within their sphere of competency but on the contrary some other person or some other organization was charged with the performance of these various tasks. We have given careful consideration to these assertions, and in instances we have determined that certain assertions of this nature were creditable; and in such instances the defendant has not been held responsible for those activities. However, a complete and irrefutable answer to many of these assertions is found in the words of the defendants themselves in many orders, directives, and memoranda issued under their own signature while the barbarous Germanization program was in full swing. We can give no credence to such defenses when the words of a defendant absolutely refute the contentions now urged. It is no defense for a defendant to insist, for instance, that he never evacuated populations when orders exist, signed by him, in which he directed that the evacuation should take place. While in such a case the defendant might not have actually carried out the physical evacuation in the sense that he did not personally evacuate the population, he nevertheless is responsible for the action, and his participation by instigating the action is more pronounced than that of those who actually performed the deed.

Another defense urged is that, in performing certain functions, the defendants were acting under superior orders. By Control Council Law No. 10 it is expressly provided that superior orders shall not free a defendant from responsibility for crime but this fact may be considered in mitigation of punishment. We have, in passing judgment on all the defendants, given due consideration to this defense as it might affect the punishment of the individual defendants. It is our view in this respect that justice demands a fair consideration of the fact that each and all defendants occupied a subordinate position, being answerable to Himmler, and several of the defendants were even subordinate to other defendants at bar.

Still another defense often asserted is to the effect that if certain events happened, or certain orders or memoranda were issued, the defendant knew nothing of these transactions. Such a defense is of no avail when it appears, as it does in many instances, that the defendant urging such a defense actually issued an order or memorandum, or actually received it, or otherwise had full knowledge, at the time, of the commission of various acts.

It has been urged and argued at length that certain territories, such as the Incorporated Eastern Territories of Poland and parts of Luxembourg, Alsace, and Lorraine, were incorporated into the Reich and thereby became a part of Germany during the war. Hence, it is urged, the laws and customs of war are inapplicable to these territories.

Any purported annexation of territories of a foreign nation, occurring during the time of war and while opposing armies were still in the field, we hold to be invalid and ineffective. Such territory never became a part of the Reich but merely remained under German military control by virtue of belligerent occupancy. Moreover, if it could be said that the attempted incorporation of territories into the Reich had a legal basis, it would avail the

defendants nothing, for actions similar to those occurring in the areas attempted to be annexed also occurred in areas which Germany never professed to have incorporated into the Reich.

COUNT THREE (Vol. V, p.154)
Count three of the indictment charges all defendants, except the defendant Viermetz, with membership in a criminal organization, namely, the SS. This charge will be dealt with in passing upon the guilt or innocence of the individual defendants.

———————

We shall now consider and determine the individual responsibility of the defendants.
(...)

OTTO HOFMANN (Vol. V, pp.160 ff.)
Otto Hofmann, as chief of RuSHA from 1940 to 1943, actively participated in the measures adopted and carried out in the furtherance of the Germanization program, as has heretofore been set forth in detail in this judgment. The evidence establishes beyond any reasonable doubt Hofmann's guilt and criminal responsibility for the following criminal activities pursued in the furtherance of the Germanization program: the kidnaping of alien children; forcible abortions on Eastern workers; taking away infants of Eastern workers; the illegal and unjust punishment of foreign nationals for sexual intercourse with Germans; hampering the reproduction of enemy nationals; the forced evacuation and resettlement of foreign populations; the forced Germanization of enemy nationals; and the utilization of enemy nationals as slave labor.

The evidence is insufficient to prove this defendant's guilt with regard to the plunder of public and private property.

The defendant Hofmann is found guilty upon counts one and two of the indictment.

COUNT THREE
The Tribunal finds that the defendant Hofmann was a member of a criminal organization, that is, the SS, under the conditions defined and specified by the judgment of the International Military Tribunal, and he is, therefore, guilty under count three of the indictment.

RICHARD HILDEBRANDT
Richard Hildebrandt was Higher SS and Police Leader at Danzig-West Prussia from October 1939 to February 1943, and simultaneously he was leader of the Administration District Danzig-West Prussia of the Allgemeine SS and deputy of the RKFDV. From 20 April 1943 to the end of the war, he was chief of RuSHA. From 1939 to 1945, while serving in these capacities, he was deeply implicated in many measures put into force in the furtherance of the Germanization program, as has heretofore been set forth in detail in this judgment. By an abundance of evidence, it has been established beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant Hildebrandt actively participated in and is criminally responsible for the following criminal activities: the kidnaping of alien children; forcible abortions on Eastern workers; taking away infants of Eastern workers; the illegal and unjust punishment of foreign nationals for sexual intercourse with Germans; hampering the reproduction of enemy nationals; the forced evacuation and resettlement of populations; the forced Germanization of enemy nationals; and the utilization of the enemy nationals as slave labor.

Hildebrandt, as the sole defendant, is charged with special responsibility for and participation in the extermination of thousands of German nationals pursuant to the so-called "Euthanasia program." It is not contended that this program, insofar as Hildebrandt might have been connected with it, was extended to foreign nationals. It is urged by the prosecution, however, that notwithstanding this fact, the extermination of German nationals under such a program constitutes a crime against humanity; and in support of this argument the prosecution cites the judgment of the International Military Tribunal as well as the judgment in the case of the United States of America vs. Brandt, Case No. 1. Neither decision substantiated the contention of the prosecution. For instance, in holding defendants guilty in the Brandt judgment, the Tribunal expressly pointed out that the defendants, in participating in this program, were responsible for exterminating foreign nationals. The Tribunal expressly stated:

> "Whether or not a state may validly enact legislation which imposes euthanasia upon certain classes of its citizens is likewise a question which does not enter into the issues. Assuming that it may do so, the Family of Nations is not obliged to give recognition to such legislation when it manifestly gives legality to plain murder and torture of defenseless and powerless human beings of other nations.

"The evidence is conclusive that persons were included in the program who were non-German nationals. The dereliction of the defendant Brandt contributed to their extermination. That is enough to require this Tribunal to find that he is criminally responsible in the program."

It is our view that euthanasia, when carried out under state legislation against citizens of the state only, does not constitute a crime against humanity. Accordingly the defendant Hildebrandt is found not to be criminally responsible with regard to this specification of the indictment.

The evidence is insufficient to implicate this defendant on the specification regarding the plunder of public and private property.

The defendant Hildebrandt is found guilty upon counts one and two of the indictment.

COUNT THREE

The Tribunal finds that the defendant Hildebrandt was a member of a criminal organization, that is, the SS under the conditions defined and specified by the judgment of the International Military Tribunal, and he is, therefore, guilty under count three of the indictment.

(...)

This March 10, 1948

[signed] LEE B. WYATT
Presiding Judge
DANIEL T. O'CONNELL
Judge
JOHNSON T. CRAWFORD
Judge

SENTENCES (Vol. V, pp.165 to 167)

(...)

OTTO HOFMANN, Military Tribunal I has found and adjudged you guilty of war crimes, crimes against humanity and membership in an organization declared criminal by the judgment of the International Military Tribunal, as charged under the indictment heretofore filed against you.

For your said crimes on which you have been and now stand convicted, Military Tribunal I sentences you, Otto Hofmann, to twenty-five years of imprisonment.

RICHARD HILDEBRANDT, Military Tribunal I has found and adjudged you guilty of war crimes, crimes against humanity and membership in an organization declared criminal by the judgment of the International Military Tribunal, as charged under the indictment heretofore filed against you.

For your said crimes on which you have been and now stand convicted, Military Tribunal I sentences you, Richard Hildebrandt, to twenty-five years of imprisonment.

(...)

This the 10th day of March, 1948.

[Signed] LEE B. WYATT
Presiding Judge, Tribunal No. I.
DANIEL T. O'CONNELL
Judge, Tribunal No. I
(Handwritten] Concurring specially.
JOHNSON T. CRAWFORD
Judge, Tribunal No. I