

38,02

Interrogation of KALTENBRUNNER, Ernst
By Lt. Col. S. W. Brookhart
Time 10 November 1945, PM

Kaltenbrunner denied that document 2519-PS (handwritten radio message regarding measures taken against Jews and Concentration Camp inmates) was among his papers when he was captured and reiterated a story about papers of three prisoners having been put into one envelope which was marked 'Kaltenbrunner'. He said that this form of message might have been prepared by his Adjutant Schoidler on the basis of conversations between Kaltenbrunner and the Commanding Officer at Theresienstadt, although it was not a correct interpretation of such conversations. Kaltenbrunner said that he had no knowledge as to whether his defense counsel had seen this or other documents, and refused to be questioned further on this document until he had discussed the matter with his defense counsel.

A photostatic copy of document 498-PS, Hitler's Order of 18 October 1942, on action against Kommandos, was shown to the witness who stated he did not know the order itself but identified the signature. Witness explained that he had nothing to do with treatment of PWs and insisted that his letter, document 535-PS, dated 23 January 1945, addressed to the senior military command which mentions treatment of PWs, could not have originated from him. He admitted that the signature resembles his own but insisted he had never seen, written, or signed the letter. He said that according to the letter heading and notation in the upper left hand corner, it must have originated in Amt IV and that possibly a rubber stamp had been used for signing the letter (the original exhibit appears to be signed). He further stated that he was never in written contact with any command of the Armed Forces.

Kaltenbrunner further denied any knowledge of documents listed under 540-PS, consisting of the draft of a letter dated 3 January 1945, a signed letter of the same date similar to the draft, and a letter dated 8 February 1945, all pertaining to treatment of prisoners according to orders from Kaltenbrunner. Witness again denied that he had all the functions of the Chief of the RSHA, but said he was only in charge of Intelligence. He also denied responsibility for Amt IV, Amt V and Amt VI Mil, but used reports on foreign policies from Amt VI. The accuracy of this statement was questioned by the interrogator. As further proof of the witness's lack of veracity he was confronted with the statement by other witnesses who had accompanied him to Mauthausen Concentration Camp (which he has denied) and that still another witness had seen him there at the gas chamber during a gassing operation. Kaltenbrunner said that such statements were untrue.

He also denied having known General Westhoff or knowing anything concerning the turning over of Allied fliers to the secret police and the

(Interrogation of KALTENBRUNNER, Ernst - - - 10 November 1945, PM, cont'd)

execution of some such fliers at concentration camps. He denied knowledge of there having been over 600 American PWs in concentration camps at the end of the war. He again denied knowledge of any meeting between himself and Warlimont in June 1944 as shown by minutes prepared by Warlimont, and said he would prove at the trials that it was known that Warlimont did not always speak the truth.

When again pressed for an explanation as to the letter dated 23 January 1945 (supra), and subsequent correspondence relating thereto, Kaltenbrunner raised a general objection to a further questioning "to aid in the case of the prosecution" when no questions and statements were being directed which would be in aid of his defense. He furthermore stated that he felt he was in the hands of the prosecutor and not in the hands of an objective investigating judge.

Kaltenbrunner stated that this was not meant as a criticism since he did not know the procedures applicable to the present trials, but he had only seen his defense counsel once and would not see him again until Monday 12 November 1945. His counsel was a German selected for him and the Swiss counsel he requested and who had accepted, had not yet arrived. He acknowledged that all of his testimony to the present time had been given voluntarily and under no compulsion and that he had received fair treatment. He said he would decide whether to submit to further questioning after he had conferred with his defense counsel.