The first step taken by the 17 year old Rudolf Hossen, which resulted in
the death of 3,386,000 Jews, the third Secretary of the German Embassy in Paris,
was not the actual extermination program for organizing the November 1938 pogrom
and for the subsequent introduction of racial legislation depriving Jews of their
property and barring them from the economic life of the country.

The actual reasons are to be sought in the attitudes assumed by the Nazis
toward the Jews and in the general economic situation of Germany. The complete
failure of the Four-Year-Plan, excessive expenditures in connection with the incrase,
and increasing war preparations, economic depression as affected, above all, trade,
and, finally, the necessity (in connection with the war) to take decisive measures
for the creation of a socialist nation, excluding the non-propertied ideology —
there are a number of reasons which induced the Nazis to take the line of
Jewish resistance and led to the idea of taking decisive measures against Jews.

Jewish property played a non-negligible role in national wealth. According to
Hjalmar Schacht, Minister of the Economy, Jewish property was estimated at approximately
7 billion marks, of which 2 billion were already transferred into foreign possession.
by the middle of November, 1938. Agitation, which started with the dawn of the April 1, 1933 boycott, was considerably speeded up by special laws promulgated in 1933, providing for the registration of Jewish property (Mein, I, 1938, p. 414) and penalizing industrial and social activities of Jews in various fields (Mein, X, 1938, p. 457).

Alongside with hyperinflation, anti-Semitic propaganda was gradually assuming form as a means of open assault to acts of violence against Jews. As an illustration, we refer to an article published in the Zeitschrift, which was cited by the Prozessverhandlungen:

"The Jew is a parasite, an enemy of the state. A disease that must be destroyed in the interest of mankind." (Mein, II, p. 2574)

Sir Griffith-Jones, member of the British Commission, while expressing charges against Streicher, rightly remarked:

"...this is an勒aser propaganda for the persecution of the Jews, who is preparing for the extermination of Jews, for the murder of millions. (Mein, II, p. 2574).

Propaganda for the destruction of synagogues began simultaneously. On August 1

1938 a Press Conference was held in Berlin, where a secret communication was made

1) "According to estimates, the net property of approximately 1 million Jews, bénéficiating from the law for the registration of Jewish property, 3 million marks have already been transferred into German ownership. (Speech by Raut, delivered at November 15, 1934, reported by the FA Journal, Nov. 15, 1935). This figure coincides with the claim by Raymond Lott, former government, in his affidavit of August 26, 1935, in which he states, on the basis of information gathered, that the total confiscation from Jews in Germany was between seven and eight billion marks. (Dev, 1738-21; and Hand Spendeur and Heuppler, Vol. IV, pp. 590-609)."
that August 10th was set as the day for the destruction of the local synagogue.

On August 11th, a note appeared describing the demolition:

"The synagogue is being demolished. Julius Streicher himself inaugurates the work by a speech lasting more than an hour and a half. By his order then — up to speak as a product of the demolition — the tremendous leer of David noise off the cupola" (Off., Tr., pp. 1443 and 3007; see also Note 1764-65; 1)."

On November 9th, late in the evening, the death of von Rath became known.

Nearly all the leaders of the Nazi Party were in Munich on that day, where they used to gather after the official yearly celebration (in memory of the unsuccessful 1923 putsch) in the old town hall at the traditional fellowship congregation. Goebbels delivered an address in which he said — referring to Hitler's authority — that it was imperative for the Party to react directly to this assassination. The resolution was to take the form of organised pogroms against Jews. Though officially remaining behind the scenes, the Party was to organise and guide the movement, which was to appear as the expression of "spontaneous indignation" of the German people against the Jews. This resolution was accepted and all the Gauleiters and their deputies telephoned instructions to that effect to their subordinate districts."

---

Footnote: "Excerpts from Gauleiter Deputy, Party Member Karl Rößle and records of the Supreme Court presented by the State Prosecutor under 165. 425-70 and 3003-70, respectively. Federal Attorney, 13th Prosecutor, said: "The Party was in fact used in connection with these issues in and 10 November 1938 anti-Jewish demonstrations" (Off., Tr., p. 1860)."
Independently from this action, Heydrich, as Chief of the Police, sent the
following telegram from Munich on November 15, 1938, at 1:30 a.m., addressed to all
Headquarters and Sections of the State Police and to all Districts and Sub-Districts of
the SS: "Emergency order immediately to the Chief or his deputy!" The title of the
message was: "Heimnakh gegen Jusw. tonight." In this message, Heydrich informed
the local police organs that in connection with the attempt on the life of von Rath
"demonstrations against Jews are to be expected throughout the Reich." Therefore,
he instructed the Chiefs of the State Police or their deputies to arrange a joint
meeting with the political leaders of the Gemeinde and Kommunal to discuss
the organization of the demonstration. In this connection, the following should
be taken into consideration:

"a) Only such measures should be taken which do not involve danger
to German life or property. (For instance, synagogues are to be burned down
only when there is no danger of fire to the surroundings.)

"b) Business and private apartments of Jews may be destroyed but not
looted. Hence the police is instructed to supervise the execution of this
order and to counsel leaders.

"c) In business streets, particular care is to be taken that non-Jewish
business should be protected from damage.

"d) Foreigners, even Jews, are not to be selected."

Furthermore, it was suggested not to hinder the demonstrators, provided the
instructions for safety measures are complied with. In anticipation of the de-
structions of and setting fire at the synagogues Heydrich ordered the seizure of all
valuable archives of the synagogues. Moreover, the order called attention to the
fact that for the time being only healthy men, not too old, were to be arrested.

"Special care should be taken that the Jews arrested in accordance with these
instructions are not mistreated." The Chief of the Order Police was to instruct
all his subordinate agencies

accordingly dem. The order was issued immediately following
this order, an additional one was sent out in which he explicitly barred any looting
and demanded the arrest of the looters. At the same time he informed his subordinates
that the Reich Ministry of Justice has instructed all Public Prosecutors to put at the
disposal of the State Police the prisons to guard the arrested Jews. Of particular
interest are the last two points of the order which we quote in extenso:

"In addition, the Reich Ministry of Justice asks that in no case
are orders to be issued against persons who may have been arrested
during the action.

Finally, the Reich Ministry of Justice has instructed the Public
Prosecutors not to proceed in any interrogation on matters of the
Jewish actions (Machterpressung).

Simultaneously, Mueller, Chief of Justice, who later on distinguished himself
by his demand in the extermination of Jews, sent an analogous order stating that

1. Actions against the Jews and in particular against their
synagogues will come in a short time in all of Germany. They are not
to be hindered...

2. The seizure of 20 to 30 thousand Jews in the Reich is to be
prepared. Healthy Jews above all are to be seized...

3. If, in the course of the action, Jews are found in possession
of arms or who themselves have manufactured arms or who have
been employed...

3) Ernst v. Pfeffer, preceded by the US Prosecutors, quoted in part in Off. Tr., p. 1549.
4) This order was also submitted by the US Prosecutors, Off. Tr., pp. 1551-52.
5) Mr. v. Pfeffer, submitted by the US Prosecutors, Off. Tr., pp. 1551-52.
As we see, this order differs from that of Heydrich in that his main strategy also are the synagogues and the first victims - wealthy Jews. However, the activities of the Chief of the Police were not limited to the organization of a "massacre" of the Jewish people directed to burning of synagogues and destroying (but not killing) of Jewish property. He also had to take care of the gradual darkening down of the "massacre" indication.

In this connection the following order was broadcast:

"As soon as notice of the ending of the action arrive from the new administration take notice that destroyed items are to be sent up with trains, etc. That the destruction is as little visible as possible. Here ensure directed in certain cases to work under police orders to carry this out. Keep the noise of synagogues, etc. as quiet as possible."

This order was signed "Chief of the regular police" (instead of the now the "Chief of the administrative and addressed to all political authorities."

In addition, the Headquarters of the State Police and the Districts and Sub-Districts of the SD received special instructions from Heydrich on November 10th, in which he ordered the abatement of all protest actions toward the end of the second day:

1. Heydrich himself had written instructions: time, in one written point 3 weeks of the arrest of wealthy Jews similar to Schilling's order: "A country of course of events tonight requires the use of the regulations of the Order as far as possible. As many Jews are to be seized, especially wealthy ones, in all regions as are secured as quickly as possible. However, only healthy male Jews of not too great an age are to be selected. The official position on the streets leads to the expectation that both orders and actions were presented in a concise form and that the very detailed one was just as designated."

2. Bon. 315 No. 10. 26.11.42.
In view of the fact that in the previous order mention was made exclusively of arrests of Jews, it is to be assumed that in the latter order it refers only to the continuation of the arrests of the prison victims — Jews.

Hitler's orders were carried out in a business-like manner. As an illustration we bring here the report of an SS Brigadier to his direct superiors:

"The following order reached us at 9 o'clock on 10 November 1938:

"On the order of the Kommandeur, all the Jewish synagogues within the 50th Brigade are to be blow up or set on fire immediately. "Neighboring homes occupied by Aryans are not to be damaged. The service can be carried out in civilian clothes. Riots and plundering are to be prevented. Report of execution of orders to reach Brigade. Number or office by 10.00."

"I immediately ordered the Standardführer and gave these the exact instructions...""

A report regarding the damage and setting on fire of 26 synagogues was attached to the summaries, as well as detailed reports of five subordinate Standardführers with the description of what was done to the synagogues in their respective districts and the Jews arrested. The report also included an explanation as to the reason of the arrests of Jews. Thus it was reported from Lorsch...

The influential Rabbi Pinker, who is known because of his foreign connections, was taken into protective custody by instruction of the SS..."

Another report stated:

"On the night Jews had to be taken into protective custody for their personal safety by the police..."
It is interesting to note the form in which the subordinate organs were given the
orders. First of all, the categorical tone in which the part relating to synagogues is
worded, is very striking: "To blow up or set on fire indiscriminately." Secondly, the
orders given to members of SS, SD, and other semi-military organizations to appear in
civilian clothing and not in their usual uniform was necessary in order to create the
impression that the population itself, spontaneously aroused by the events, looted
and burned Jewish property. The instructions of local authorities concerning the
destinations were made in such a hurry that they could not even be circulated.
Following this, the pogroms were stopped, however, in a position to report
activities on the successful pogrom against the Jewish population. This report is
interesting by its concise and business-like description of events whereby a very
incomplete number of victims and amount of destroyed property was indicated.

10. "The extent of the destruction of Jewish shops and houses cannot yet be
verified by figures. The figures given in the report are only an estimate of
the number of buildings destroyed. The extent of the damage caused, as far as known to
us, is enormous. Due to the hurry of the reporting, the reports received to date are
entirely limited to general statements such as 'twenty' or 'thirty shops destroyed.'
Therefore the figures given must have been arrived at incompletely.

11. Synagogues were set on fire, and another 76 completely destroyed. In
addition, 21 public halls (Jews' meetings), cemetery chapels and similar
buildings were set on fire and 3 were completely destroyed.

12. 3,000 Jews were arrested, also 7 Aryans and 9 foreigners. The latter were
arrested for their own safety.

13. 36 deaths were reported and those seriously injured were also numbered at 76.
Those killed and injured are Jews. One Jew is still missing. The Jews killed
include one Polish national, and those injured include 8 Poles. (Footnote
300: 30-31, p. 478). At the conference of November 12,
Dönhoff indicated the number of looted Jewish stores at 7,500 - Dec. 1216-8.
Fast Amnesties and Emigration, p. 113.)
The State of Jewish affairs in their turn insisted on sending a report
on their activities to General-Feldmarschall von Bock, entitled: "Junior Against
the Jews in November 1938. Legal Regulations." As usual to comply, they
complied. In the report they disclosed data which the German authority deemed
hostile to control. The report, prepared by the Reich Commissioner for the Re-Union
of Jurists with Germany, states that

"In course of Dr. Goebbels, the Reich Minister for Propaganda,
their report, was that Jewish artists who appeared in Berlin on the evening
of 3 October 1938 were shot by the crowds in the square and in the streets;
under some conditions for this so-called action. Though these facts were
clearly stated, no further evidence could be shown. These facts are
subject to dispute and the report is inadmissible, having been prepared
by a few persons with no further evidence than the report by Dr. Goebbels."

The report furthermore states that "according to the action" schools were closed
so that the youth was able to participate in the demonstrations.

The author of the report was perturbed by the fact that the crowds could
not be kept under control and prevented from looting. In particular it
protested that the political leaders were the only ones who have prevented such
acts in Vienna. While saying that the majority of stolen valuables was taken away
from the Jews and placed in a safe in a bank, the author of the report
summarizes stating that.
From all the official documents it follows exceptionally that the events of
October 9-10, 1938 were not only instigated but also organised and carried out by
the government with the participation of the Party and the semi-military organiza-
tions.

Of particular interest are the demands of evacuation for race of Jews.

The government, and by no means interested in that Jewish property be looted by
individuals. Its objective was to damage the building occupied by Jewish entre-
preneur, reach the windows, and burn the general appearance. Jews were to be in-
stituted and taught a lesson as the effect that their lives and property in
Germany were not safe and that the only alternative for them was to sell their
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The picture of an organised process was evident from the
very beginning to an all-fencing observer. Daniel A. Rosendor, U.S. Consul
General in Seattle, in his memorandum to the State Department concerning
the events of October 9-10, states the following:

"The plundering of shops, looting of stores and burning of
shops which began in the early hours of November 11, 1938, was halted
subsequently in the last year on 1st spontaneous echo of righteous indignation
throughout Germany, as a result of the country's Jewish center of
clergy, lawyers and others in the German Army of Paris. A glance at
a very high percentage of the German populace in consciousness, a state of
popular indignation that would spontaneously lead to such actions, can
be considered as non-existent. On this occasion, in the newsrooms and
attentive newspapers printed, all of the usual rules observed were ob-
viously broken over that had happened and again over the unpre-
meditated fury of that event that had been or were taking place with
out-violence magnitude throughout the city. The whole semblance of a
fire was organized in such a sinister fashion, as to lead opinion to the
theory that the assassination of it had involved ordered preparations. It has
been ascertained by this office that the plan of spontaneous indignation
was not carried out in leading several hours before news of the death of Third
Secretary von Rath had been broadcast at 10 P.M., November 11, 1938. It is
stated upon authority believed to be reliable that most of the evening was
interpretation at any price. The purpose of this paper was to accelerate the process
of nationalization of Jewish property in favor of the Government. The minutes of
the Emergency Session of November 29, 1935 (which comprised, with additions, 25
typed sheets; p. 21) indicate the manner in which nationalization of Jewish trade and
industry was to be carried out.

First of all, Goring called the attention of those present to this meeting
as of decisive nature; and was convinced of the direct orders of the Führer who
requested that "the Jewish question be now, once and for all, coordinated and
solved one way or another" (Konzentrations and Judentum, Vol. 17, p. 525).

The main problem, in Goring's opinion, was de-nationalization of German economy.
In the name of the Germans, very little can be done in that direction, and little
can be achieved by demonstration. "They don't know the Jew, but we, the
last authority for coordinating the German economy" (p. 528). If a Jewish shop
is destroyed, the insurance company will pay to the Jew for damages, but the
German economy will not benefit by it. The State also derives no benefit if the
profits of nationalization will go to individual Jewish-Germans, irrespective of their
role in the Nazi movement. Therefore, Goring suggested two decisive measures:

11) Thus the Minutes of the Session it reads that the cost of the shattered
windows alone was estimated by representatives of insurance companies at
some 6,000,000 marks (Konzentrations and Judentum, Vol. 17, p. 525).
Jewish property was to be transferred to the state at about 10% of its value, and the Ministry of Finance would sell the property to an agency at the actual price. Thus the profit would go to the state which is in need of revenue. Exceptions should be made only in special cases for those the distinguished themselves in or suffered for the Nazi movement. The same procedure was to apply to industrial undertakings; namely if the owners were a joint stock company, where the majority of shares were held by Jews, they had to deliver their shares which were evaluated at 10-15% of their stock value, and as a compensation they were to receive 5 1/2% long-term state bonds. Jews were to receive an insurance premium for damage resulting from the anti-semitism.

13) Detailed measures were to be prepared by the respective ministries.
   Geising, as Secretary of the Four-Year Plan, sent a secret circular to the highest Nazi authorities, the leaders and heads of branches of the party and the affiliated organizations, district leaders, district governors, state governors, and other high state and party officials, in which he stated, among other things, the following:

   "1. The elimination of Jews from the German economy is to be the task of the state and thus not only the duty of the authorities and agencies especially designated for that.

   11. The taking over of Jewish businesses and other properties from Jewish possessors has to be affected only on a strictly lawful basis according to the directives issued for this purpose. Previous actions which were made since 1 November 1938 contradicting thereby will be cancelled.

   111. Only the Reich is entitled to the benefits from the elimination of the Jews of the German economic life (Nov. 1938-43).

   In addition, Geising sent another secret ordonnance regulating leasing of farms and small businesses, explaining that the measures contained therein were suggested by the Führer directly (Dec. 1938-43)."
Then the representative of insurance companies remarked that if, would be un-

lawful. Goring replied: "What there’ll be a legal order forbidding you to

"take any direct payments from Jews... The money belongs
to the State" (both Compassion and Inhumanity, Vol. IV,
304-309).

Then Goring learned that some of the 7,000 destroyed Jewish stores had goods

on consignment from Jews firm and that the insurance companies would have to pay

for these goods directly to the Jews who sustained the loss, he remarked usually:

"I wish you had killed 7,000 Jews, and not destroyed their values," to which

the Chief of the Police apologetically replied: "There were 55 killed."

This meeting, which recited a gathering of gangsters after a successful raid

rather than a meeting of Ministries, at which — among others — members of the

Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Justice attended, dealt with the fate of the

destroyed Jewish values. When the question as to the looted jewelry of

Euryale (one of the most important Columbia jewellers) arose, Goring demanded evidently

the discussion stated authoritatively:

"As far as the Jews may be returned again by the police, they belong to the State."

14 During the examination at the trials Goring explained that his remark

was "an utterance of spontaneous excitement" to the Justice Jackson and

"expressed only sincerely, wasn’t it?" Goring then explained further:

"It was not meant seriously and I understood it was a spontaneous and

momentary excitement about the proceedings, about the destruction of

valuables and the difficulties which had arisen for me. Of course, if every

one of us after having done the course of twenty-five years in intimate circles

put into balance, I admit those utterances assume another nature (P. 241, p.

509).

From this interesting statement only one conclusion may be drawn.

In their intimate circles Nazis were used to talk about Jews only in terms

referring the possibility of their annihilation.
Then the representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs called attention to the fact that even the killed Jews there was a Polish citizen and that in this connection the Polish Government might make representations, Coerring answered sharply:

"What every living Polish Jew has a legal position here and we have to stand up for them. This ought to come..." Police are doing something against them (we) in the Polish Bund... but the claim if the Bund has left Poland, he should be treated like a Pole. He should not be treated like a foreigner."


After this incident which occurred detached from the original subject, the minutes again turned to the problem of the economic destruction of the Jews. Pfeffer, who during the trial tried to appear as a friend of the Jews, submitted his plan of elimination of Jews from trade and industry, which met with the full approval of all those attending the meeting.

15) Pfeffer: "I have proposed a law elaborating that, effective 1 January 1929, Jews shall be prohibited to operate retail stores and wholesale establishments as well as independent artisan shops. They shall be further prohibited from keeping employees or offer any ready products on the market. Wherever a Jewish shop is operated, the police shall shut it down. From 1 January 1929, no Jew can no longer be employed as an employee as stipulated in the law for the organization of National Labor from 20 January 1914. If a Jew holds a leading position in an establishment without being the owner, his contract may be declared void within 6 months by the enterprise. With the expiration of the contract all claims of the employee, including all claims on maintenance, become obviated. This is always very disagreeable and a great danger. A Jew cannot be a member of a corporation; Jewish share of corporations shall have to be retired by 31 December 1929. A special authorization is unnecessary. The competent Ministries of the Reich are being authorized to issue the provisions necessary for the execution of this law."

Coerring: "I believe that we can agree with this law."

(Anonymous)
Among these measures is to be noted, in the first place, a fine of one million
reparations imposed on the Jewish population. While suggesting the imposition of the
fine, Goering said that it would be a punishment and warning. "That "I& work,
"The Jews won't consent another murder." And then again, with his usual arrogance
and attempt to be witty, while closing the meeting, he said:
"I'd like to say again that I would not like to be
a Jew in Germany." 16) "

After studying the entire material referring to the organization of the
program, the cynical lie whereby Goering wanted to conceal his violent action
against the physically and morally raised Jew becomes quite obvious.

On November 23rd, the government tore off the last vestige of "lawfulness"
by its measures. The latter enabled the ruthlessattro to assume that everything
was permitted as far as Jews were concerned. In this connection it is of interest that
the statement made by Ratzel, chief collaborator of Streicher, who had
been called before the Party court for uncontrolled diatribe in the course
of organization:

"...All of us were of the opinion that we had faced an absolutely
new state of affairs on these questions. But the great sudden
attack of the Jews, carried out in the night and morning of the 10th
November, all our principles and legal, as this subject had been
made before.

16) This assertion is fully repeated in the preamble to the decree:
"The hostile attitude of Jews toward the German people and culture,
which does not even shudder from committing everyday murder, makes
a decisive defense and a harsh punishment necessary." (Verfassungs-1, 1933,
p. 1999)
Therefore, though Weering's order spoke of organization of commercial and industrial enterprises only, Heis, with the tacit connivance of the Party, began himself the organization of real estate in his district. In his deposition Heis gives the following explanation to it:

"I considered it unthinkable that after the Jews had had their property searched they should continue to be able to own houses and land" (Bundesarchiv und Archiv, Vol. IV, p. 382).

But the Jews were ruined not only by organization but also by the merciless bribery of the German authorities who on the one hand took the Jews by their threat, and on the other were emptying their pockets. In this connection, particularly distinguished himself Count Heldorf, Chief of Police in Berlin, who issued a number of orders concerning persecution of Jews. Also Raymond M. Saint, former U.S. Consul, in his testimony under oath stated that Count Heldorf, after the November pogroms, demanded 250,000 marks as a bribe from a well-known banker (whose name is indicated) for the issuance of a passport to an American. From another important manufacturer (whose name is also indicated) Heldorf demanded 500,000 marks for a passport, and the customs officials took 750,000 marks for letting his son into the country. Among the names of German authorities to whom the acquired real estate through organization, Saint also listed Rosenberg and was Speth. The entire administration, beginning with the local first

Hitler’s ambitions, centred itself at the expense of the Jews. And when
Nazis wanted to take some measures against such a situation, it was done rather
not for the purpose that the big shots and not the small fry got the lucrative posts.

Despite the arbitrary acts and ruthlessness in regard to Jews in 1933, the Nazi
Government still intended, from time to time, to bear the semblance of legality,
certainly not so much in the interest of the Jews as for the maintenance of public
order. The killing of 30 Jews at that time could not pass unnoticed and some measures
had to be taken. The police made some arrests, but then it was decided to turn over
the entire matter to the Supreme Party Court. The Court established, first of all,
that the defendants acted according to Party instructions, carrying out the orders of
the Party, and in some cases even as ordered that they went beyond the limits of the
orders. Of the 16 arrested, three charged with robbing Jews (in one case it
referred to a 12-year-old girl) were excluded from the Party and SA, and left in
protective custody. One defendant, charged with the murder of a marital couple,
received a warning and was sentenced to three years, deprivation of ability to hold
office because of psychiatric disorder. A disciplinary violation.

Bill of the Reich Supreme Court in order. Another defendant, charged with

10) At the same time, the Party Court applied to the Führer for the

abridgment of the proceedings underfoot. During the examination at the

scene, Fleming said he did not see anything unusual in it, since it was the

presumption of the Führer (off. tr., p. 6182),
the shooting of a sixteen-year old boy, received the same punishment. In regard
to the other defendants excepted to killings, proceedings were either suspended or
minor punishments inflicted.

While exonerating the defendants, the Supreme Court pointed out that

"...as was repeatedly expressed by the colonists, it is not
one of our men's affair to follow their way into the woods by
night dressed in civilian clothes in order personally to do away
with the legal political foe by his wife's side or together with
his wife."

By exonerating the defendants, the Court thus shifted the responsibility to those
who gave the orders.

The verdict was sent to Georgia and in a special communication, informed
that he had taken note of it with thanks.

Consequently, a letter from the Governor admitted not only the justice of the
sentence but also the accuracy of the facts concerning the organization of the
pogrom, which are indicated in the sentence.

The question still unanswered remains whether the pogrom pursued also of
economic nature only — destruction ofJerry and enrichment of the State at the
expense of the Jews — or whether the atrocities, cruelties, killings committed
in those days pursued other objectives as well. The learned writer Raphael Hess,
19) Document 5725-Fb.
20) Document 5725-Fb. When during the examination ofCooper, Justice Thaddeus read from the
judgment of the Court, "when all the newspapers burned down in one night,
it must have been organized in some way and only have been organized by the
Jews," and askedaasa whether this was actually said in the judgment,Cooper answered: "That is correct" (Off., Fr., p. 438).
The intention of the region was educational. The purpose was to educate mankind to humanity by means of proving that God has made mankind to live in unity. Communalism is the only teaching of mankind.

Unfortunately, the subsequent events have shown that the prophetic words uttered in 1939 became reality. In the 1930s region we can both the realization of the immediate objectives and the first stage of the final solution of the Jewish question.

2) Dr. Farago, "Jewish-Theo-Jewish Foundations," cit Szymon von Santoshaw, 
  "The 3rd, 1939."