United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

Interview with Drexel Sprecher
June 18, 1997
RG-50.549.02.0004

PREFACE

The following interview is part of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's collection of oral testimonies. Rights to the interview are held by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

The reader should bear in mind that this is a verbatim transcript of spoken, rather than written prose. This transcript has been neither checked for spelling nor verified for accuracy, and therefore, it is possible that there are errors. As a result, nothing should be quoted or used from this transcript without first checking it against the taped interview.

DREXEL SPRECHER
June 18, 1997

Margaret West: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Jessica and Toby Hill Collection. This is an interview with Drexel Sprecher conducted by Margaret West on June 18th 1997 in Chevy Chase, Maryland. This is a follow up interview to a USHMM videotaped interview conducted with Drexel Sprecher on June the eighth 1990. The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum gratefully acknowledges Jessica and Toby Hill for making this interview possible. This is tape number one, side A. I'd like to ask the first question about the role of Nuremberg and the military tribunal in your life.

Drexel Sprecher: The Nuremberg trial has certainly been the biggest thing in my life, apart from my family perhaps. When I heard Justice Jackson make his first, when I read Justice Jackson's first report to the, to President Truman, I was greatly impressed that he was emphatic in saying that we need to separate out in Germany the really bad criminals from the ordinary Germans. We don't want to have the appearance of collective guilt. But rather individualized guilt proves beyond a reasonable doubt and so forth. That struck me as terribly significant because I knew that then there would be a real penetrating review of what had occurred during the Nazi years, what the leaders did, how the Nazi regime came to power, how it consolidated its power, how it planned for aggressive war, how the wars were conducted and all the barbarous atrocities that occurred.

So I made every effort to get with Jackson whom I did not know. I went back to my old organization, the Office of Strategic Services, OSS, and went to see the general counsel, a fellow by the name of Donovan who was the, no relation at all Wild Bill Donovan, the head of OSS. But Jim Donovan who was the general counsel was immediately impressed by the fact that I had studied a good deal about Nazi Germany, beginning when I was senior in college. And that I had travelled into Germany, both before and after the Nazis came to power. That I had worked with OSS, with some anti-Nazi Germans who had fought in Spain against Franco and who had then come to work as willing agents or you might say spies for the Americans. And I helped train some of those people in Algiers.

So I had enough of a background so that I was immediately hired back into OSS to work on the war crimes trials. That would have been in late June of 1945. I worked on all the OSS studies I could find. It wasn't hard to find them and they were very good about a lot of the things that had happened in Germany under the Nazis that I did not know before. And so I did a lot of work and at night an old friend of mine David Shaw would practice my German a little bit so my German got better. And by the time I got to Paris in July 1945, I was raring to go. At that time, the files of one of the later defendants, Alfred Rosenberg, had been discovered by a German. He had seen Rosenberg and some of his assistants bury these files behind a double wall. And I take it being an anti-Nazi, what he had done was inform an American about this and a Major **Coogan** was flown in to get these document in, with an airplane and to fly them back to Paris. And they had just arrived several days before I got to Paris.in July of 1945. Colonel **Story** who was then the head of the documentation division of the prosecution and who later became the executive trial counsel, the number two man to Justice Jackson called me and said Sprecher, the analysts that we've borrowed from the American embassy here in Paris are bringing me a good deal about atrocities that are shown or spoliation of property and slave labor that occurred in the occupied east. But they haven't brought me anything about aggressive war. And I wish you would find something because I'm flying to London tomorrow to see Justice Jackson and report to him about these files and what we're finding. So I'd like to have something on aggressive war.
So I got myself a drink, had dinner, came back to 7 **Rue de Presbourg** which was the old OSS headquarters in Paris incidentally. And went up to this room where the Rosenberg files were stacked in neat lights orders about three inches or two and a half inches thick and very carefully labeled on the outside as to what they contained, the various kinds of things that Rosenberg had done.
He had been the, kind of the ideological center of the Nazis for a time and then of course he became the rank commissioner for the occupied east, after Nazi Germany invaded the Soviet Union in June of 1941. So I went up there and looked at, gazed at these 50 notebooks or so and I said how can I, with my scant knowledge of German, really find something here that'll be impressive on aggressive war? And I looked and I saw there was one thin notebook half the size of the others and it was labeled **Ataya Norvegan** [ph],.foreign political office Norway. So I said to myself, let's see. The Nazis, the Germans invaded Norway in April or May 1942. Let's take a

look at that notebook. So I looked in there before the invasion of Norway by the Nazis and just afterwards. And there were, was an indication and there was documentation showing that **Vikus Quisling** who later became the head of Norway underneath the Nazis that he and his deputy, a fellow by the name of **Hamelin** had flown down to talk to Rosenberg, had been introduced to Hitler. This is before the invasion. And then of course the invasion took place. And then they put Quisling in as their main deputy in Norway. So I pulled out these documents and the next morning showed them to Colonel Story before he flew to London to see Justice Jackson.
He immediately said give me that notebook. So I gave him the notebook and he took it to Jackson and Jackson in London was very impressed cause this bore on something he was also anxious to have more evidence on aggressive war. So that was my first lead in to impressing Colonel Story and later Justice Jackson.
I had by that time already written a brief on the destruction of the German trade unions and the formation of the German labor front. I had done that back in Washington based on a document which was included as an appendix in a German book which OSS had gotten through Switzerland and it had gotten into the library of OSS. I was visiting with Franz **Neuman**n who was the head of research and analysis at OSS and I told him that I was particularly interested in the destruction of the trade unions. He turned around and he pulled out this book in which the actual order for the destruction of the trade unions led by the storm troops and the SS was included as an appendix. So here was a German document that I got through a German book which was a little unusual. But anyway with that and other studies OSS had, I was able to develop a preliminary brief, one that I think probably the first preliminary brief that was submitted to Jackson. So that was another lucky break and a leg up.
When I got into Germany later in August of 1945 I had already interviewed some German trade union leaders who had fled from Nazi Germany and who were residing in London. And we had – OSS had connections to them. They told me the number of German trade union leaders in the Nuremberg area or in Nuremberg itself whom they thought I should interview. So when I got to Nuremberg in August 1945 I very shortly interviewed them. And they were people who had survived, having been sent to the Dachau concentration camp, and who had been regularly followed after they had been released from Dachau. They had immediately been checked on by the Gestapo every week or two to be sure they weren't leading the opposition and to scare them. So they gave me more detail on how the storm troops came into the offices of the trade unions of

Germany on May second 1933. That's just three, four months after the Nazis had seized power and took over the trade union properties and liquidated the free trade unions and created, under the defendant Robert **Ley**, L-E-Y, the German labor front which was a Nazi company union, you might say. So I incorporated their materials and their affidavits and referred to them in a brief on the destruction of the trade unions. And that brief was later introduced in evidence in the trial. And Colonel Story used it as something of an example of how you could combine the discovery of documents with the interviewing of witnesses. He had other examples of that, but this was one good example.

Q: I have a question about the overall importance of the Nazis taking control of the unions in laying the groundwork for what was later able to happen. How significant was that?

A: The taking over the trade unions and the building of this Nazi company union was very important. In the first place the man who led it was Robert Ley who had the title of **Reich Organizations Leiter** or Reich Organization Leader for the whole Nazi Party. And it was his job to coordinate the various Nazi organizations in ways which would involve the German people more and make them more captives to the propaganda and to these organizations that were set up. The German labor front did do some furnishing of assistance to trade unions, to German workers who were in some kind of temporary trouble and things like that and it circulated a tremendous amount of propaganda among the working people and supervised later the use of the slave laborers who were brought into Germany during the war. So the – I immediately had some background to focus on a brief on Robert Ley cause we knew we were going to have to have briefs and submissions against each of the prospective defendants. Now at that time of course, Ley was in Nuremberg prison and I arranged to have him interviewed by someone from the interrogation division. Then the indictment was served on him on October 15th or something like that, 1945. But then a week he committed suicide. He did not want to face being on trial. He was a very apoplectic kind of fellow anyway. And he was the only one of the defendants who did commit suicide, although in other trials, possible defendants or actual defendants did commit suicide, such as by jumping down from the third or fourth floor down the circular stairs to the concrete floor at the bottom.

Q: How did Ley work? I mean how did he commit suicide? And I wondered also were there tighter measures implemented by guards later?

A: Yes. Ley was in a small cell in the first floor of the Nuremberg prison. And several of the – most of the other defendants, if not all of them, were in different cells on that same floor. And they had at that time several guards for every four or five cells and they would go along and look at the cells. Well there was a corner where there was a toilet, partly hidden from view if you were looking in the peephole that you could use to see into the cell. Ley got back under that, the toilet and tied a towel and some other pieces of clothes around his neck and up higher on a pipe above the toilet and then let his weight down and strangled himself. And along came the guard and saw his legs out there, kind of an odd position. He couldn't see where the body was particularly, so he quickly had the door opened and they found that Ley was dead.
The next morning I was in my office in the Palace of Justice, in a room which overlooked the courtyard where the defendants were often given exercise. And suddenly into my room came Fred **Niebergall** who later became the head of the translation division and he was a translator at that time and a friend of mine. And they came in singing, he and several others came in singing a song, (hums) I didn't know what it was all about. And then they told me, your defendant, your defendant has committed suicide. So that kind of ended my work on that case because there was not too much more to do.

Q: Did you know at that time that you would be working on the **Baldur von Schirach** and the **Fritzche** case?

A: No. That came a little later. Shortly after Ley committed suicide, Colonel Story called me into his office. And he said you know the Soviets are, have brought two possible defendants, probable defendants, Admiral **Raeder** and Hans **Fritzche.** I didn't even know who Hans Fritzche was. It turns out he was the main radio propagandist of the Nazis. He broadcast every week in a program called Hans Fritzche speaks. And he was the head of the radio division of the propaganda minister, ministry under Joseph **Goebbels**. And of all the defendants in the, later in the dock, 20, 21 of them, he had the lowest position of any of them. He was kind of two or three steps beneath a cabinet minister. And really another one or two people including a fellow by the name of Otto

Dietrich who was involved in propaganda activities would have been much better defendants. But anyway Colonel Story called me in and said we don't have hardly anything concerning this man Fritzche, except this confession quote which the Soviets have brought with them and which they have now placed in the document room.

And he said frankly the confession is not the kind of thing which I think we would like to rely on and I, we were wondering if you wouldn't take this over and see if you can't find some more material on Hans Fritzche.

So I then had an assignment to work on a defendant. I went to the British and they had provided some of his speeches that he'd made during the war on the radio, but they were in English. And I said can't we get the original in German. And then introduce those in evidence or parts of them in evidence and so on. Whereupon they did checking and found out that the disks on which they had taken his broadcasts had been reused because of the shortage of disks and so there was no original German available. This was somewhat, somewhat of an unhappy occurrence. So I then started to work up a brief based on these propaganda broadcasts. The main thing that was useful in them was that he kept talking about the Bolshevistic imperialistic Jewish world which was attacking the Nazis and which was causing all the grief for Germany. And this is at the center of his propaganda over and over again.

So while I was working on this, Robert **Kempner** who was the only German born prosecutor. He had become an American just before the war as a refugee from Nazi Germany way back in 1933. And he worked with the American government on intelligence matters and other things and he was partly Jewish. He had been a high officer in the Prussian governmental structure back before the Nazis came to power.

He called me up on the phone one day and he said Fritzche's lawyer, Dr. **Fritz**. Fritz. Fritzche would like to speak to me. So I said send him up. So Dr. Fritz came up to my office and he said we don't really understand why you've indicted Hans Fritzche and we know the Russians have a so called confession that they have from him but we're going to contest that and say it was coerced. And I just wondered what the Americans are going to do. And so I said well I'm not sure what the Americans are going to do. I'll make certain recommendations after I know more about the case.

So he said well I think that Fritzche will be glad to answer any questions you have if they're put through me. And I said well let me think about that. So over a period of time, I submitted quite a

number of questions to Fritzche through his lawyer. And then the answers would come back in Fritzche's hand writing. We would translate them into English and then I assembled these into a proposed affidavit that he might make. And kept showing copies of this proposed affidavit as it grew longer to his counsel of course, Dr. Fritz. So at about this time, Colonel Story was quite impressed that we were getting enough so that we would have at least some kind of an American case to present against Fritzche and he said keep working. Then one day he called me in and he said we've saddled you with the weakest case of all the defendants. We'd like to give you another case. So I said fine.

He said Baldur von Schirach. A lot of work has been done by Major Hartley Murray and I had met Hartley Murray and I knew that he had done tremendously good work in developing the case about the Hitler Youth and about Baldur von Schirach. But somehow Story wanted to reward me with the preparation and the presentation before the tribunal of a more important case than Fritzche. And somehow or other he was willing to sideline Major Murray. I at that time was only a captain and here I'm sidelining a major and I felt rather embarrassed about that frankly. And I was very glad when later on Major Murray was very active in questioning witnesses before the commission of the tribunal concerning the alleged, the criminal organizations, the SS, the SA and so on.

And he was called into the court room to cross examine one of the witnesses later that the defense called. So his name is listed as an assistant trial counsel, along with mine and some 20 other people. Well so I then really converted this brief by Hartley Murray into a presentation before the tribunal. And that was my first presentation to the tribunal, to the international military tribunal and a week later I made my second one against Fritzche. And I was the only American trial counsel who presented two cases to the tribunal. And the funny thing is the reason for that wasn't anything great I did but because of Colonel Story wanted to reward me for working on the worst case in the dock.

Q: What about the timing of these cases? Didn't it happen that they both came up and you had to make your presentation within a short period of time? Did that mean you were working tremendously under time pressure or had you prepared the case against Fritzche earlier?

A: I think most of us worked under time pressure. I went back to work nearly every night, after having gone to the Grand Hotel to eat dinner. And later on when we moved out to **Zambach** [ph], Major Baldwin and I had a house together with one or two other people. We were very pressed for time. But after the case got underway on November 20th and at that time I wasn't certain that I'd be given the case to assign, to present, but I was hoping. And Colonel Story called me in and said your work on Schirach and Fritzche is such that I'm recommending to Justice Jackson that you make the presentations on those cases. Jackson approved and so I did. I worked on a lot of other things as well. We all got copies of so called SEA, Staff Evidence Analysis. And these would tell us something of the nature that the analysts who found this document or who'd reviewed the document thought was in it which might be useful in the case. So if I found such a document, such a staff evidence analysis and I thought it was important for some part of the case, I'd ask to see it and have it if it was – did appear important then I'd have it translated. And Colonel Story came to – we couldn't do all the translations that a lot of the people wanted done and so there had to be some priority. And Colonel Story would rely a great deal on what I thought was relatively more important to be translated, as against other things. So that was an incidental kind of job. I'm certain others did the same thing but I'm just, I'm mentioning that because it is one of the things that did take up time and which was very important. And I'm sure I made mistakes because at times some of the documents I recommended for translation turned out to be inferior to other documents which were found or that I didn't know about at the time. So that was another kind of work that I did.

Q: I want to go back to and I'm sort of backing away and thinking of how it does seem to me that a lot of life experiences all came into play. You know I think of an analogy with Churchill who he said when he finally was chosen as the war leader of Britain, he felt he was walking with destiny. Lots of experiences became relevant to help him to do what his country needed. And similarly there were a lot of things in your background. One thing led to another, led to another but which you had some knowledge of German, you'd been in Germany on visits before. A lot of things fitted you. Your work with the labor board, your knowledge of the unions so that you were the right person for this role when Nuremberg came around. You were eager perhaps to test what you could do but you were well suited also. And did you think of that at the time?

A: Yes, frankly I did. I was quite aware that through my prior history before I joined the organization, I had considerable knowledge of Nazi Germany. And that during the year I studied, I studied abroad, a graduate year at the London School of Economics and I had met some refugees from Hitler at that time already. But being a big blond Nordic, I also had some contacts which led me to go into Germany and live for ten days with a German family in which the husband who did not meet was a member of the storm troops. And this lady who was running this little house of hers as a place to take students from Oxford and from the London School and someone who wanted to stay in Germany, improves their German and learn a little more about Nazi Germany. And of course they figured that she could help influence us to be more sympathetic toward the Nazis. So I went and stayed with her for a week or ten days and she arranged for me and my London roommate, Tom Hitch, to visit the Krupp works and the **Gute Hofening Skita** [ph] and to meet some other Germans, et cetera.
So and then in, at the London School I had met the only Nazi German that I think was there. And I forget his name now. But his father was a Herr Director or a director of the Gute Hofening Skita so while I was visiting during this ten days in the Ruhr or in Dusseldorf and so on I got in contact with him and he took me to visit his father. And he helped give me a pretty good indoctrination from the German point of view. His sister was a very pretty young German girl and she was going to Berlin and I was going to Berlin too. So I arranged to meet up with her in Berlin and she said I have tickets to see **Triumph Des Willens**, Triumph of the Will which was probably the main propaganda film that the Nazis had created. And she suggested that we go and see it together. This again was part of the German attempt to indoctrinate me well. So we did. And that film was a production of a German woman whose name I can't remember right now.

Q: Was that I think it was Leni **Riefenstahl**.

A: You're absolutely right. Leni Riefenstahl. You know more about this than I do and it was a very expensively produced film. The pictures of the Nazis marching, the pictures of the November meetings in Nuremberg, the Nuremberg rallies that they held every year were extremely impressive from the point of view of being well done. While I was in Berlin at that time, which was April, that was April in 1934, 35. 1935. Hermann **Goering** married Emma

Sonneman who was a famous German actress and this was given a lot of publicity and we all went down to **Unter den Linden**, the main avenue running through Berlin and saw these big limousines, open cars. They weren't limousines. They were whatever you call an open car, go from near the what's the big (pause), the big statue, the big memorial and so on, on Unter den Linden. Anyway it went from a certain point there all the way up to the Dom and they were married there and then they came back. And I managed to get down to just behind the storm troopers who were guarding the street, lined up all the way along Unter den Linden. And I turned my camera upside down over my head and hence I got past the storm troopers and took some pictures as they were slowly coming down past me. And I have those in a book here somewhere. And had a lot of copies made and sent to some of my friends.

Q: At that time (pause) States Holocaust Memorial Museum interview with Drexel Sprecher This is tape number one, side B. You know I'm jumping around a little bit here but I was thinking of that visit of yours in 1936.

A: 35.

Q: 35, I'm sorry. Do you remember how you felt about these things seeing that film? I mean was it disturbing to you. It was the time certainly when I think most of Europe was not concerned about what was happening in Germany. But I wonder if you felt that one could discern trends that were disturbing.

A: Well the whole thing was I hated the Nazi regime from the time I was a senior in college, just after Hitler came to power. Several of my professors were very strong anti-Fascists so. One was **Edward Ellsworth Ross** who was the father of American sociology. Another was **Selig Perlman** who was the main professor and historian of American labor history.

Q: Were they both at the University of Chicago?

A: No, University of Wisconsin. In 1933 and so on, 34, beginning. I worked with these professors and I wrote a paper on the structure of National Socialism which was largely a steal

from a book by a professor from the University of Chicago, one of the first books on the Nazi regime. And while I was in, I was writing articles when I was traveling in Germany which were published in a small town newspaper in Wisconsin. My idea, I put my ideas about this into these articles and which got on the front page of this little town or city nearby. And in here you'll find I talked about my visit to the Krupp works and various, this thing about seeing Goering and Hitler in the parade. Of course Hitler led the parade. Goering was in the second car behind Hitler when I saw them on Unter den Linden. And after spending these couple of weeks in Germany, I then went on to Poland. And saw the conditions in Warsaw which I must say were not too good. There was a dictatorship in Poland as well underneath **Pilsudski** at the time. But I had met some Jewish, American Jewish fellow on the way into Poland and they entertained me and were very nice to me and helped me get to know Warsaw very well. That's getting beside the point I guess.

Q: It's of interest to me cause I certainly had the view that in Britain anyway general thinking was supportive of Hitler and was –

A: No, I wouldn't say it was supportive of Hitler. There was a very small group which was active. It was the black shirts underneath a fellow by the name of Sir Oswald **Mosley**, M-O-S-L-E-Y. And very early in my stay in London. It would have been late 1934, I heard there was going to be a Mosley, a Fascist Black Shirt demonstration in Hyde Park. So I went down there and there was a tremendous number of British who were anxious to show their opposition to this parade and to this demonstration. And they outnumbered by far the total number of Black Shirts which had been assembled. And the police had to keep order because a lot of people in this crowd were willing to attack the Black Shirts. So it was very plain to me –

Q: I should change my words and have said that they didn't appreciate the extent of the threat that Germany posed. Is that accurate?

A: Well that's, that's probably true of most Britons. But particularly in the London School of Economics there were, as I've said before, there were students who were refugees from Hitler. There was a professor or two who had gotten out of Germany and who were teaching there. I took a class or did some studying under one of them.

Well anyway, I went to this rally and I met an Englishman there who turned out to be the son of the head of one of the trade unions of Germany and he was there just to see what was going on. And he saw me and he kind of said well here's someone to talk to and so we became friends, went out to dinner. And he took me up to Nottingham to meet his family and took me through the coal mines where his father was the head of the union.

Q: What union was his father with, do you remember?

A: I forget the precise name of it but it was the union which had the jurisdiction over the coal miners who mined coal around Nottingham England. Well when I was going to go on to the continent in April and May, this guy's name was **Heydey**, Fred Heydey. Fred Heydey said to me well my father will be glad to give you some letters of introduction to trade union leaders in the Scandinavian countries. And I said fine. So his father wrote me a general letter of introduction. And the one was to – there were several of them, but one of them was to the head of the trade union movement in Sweden. So when I got to Sweden I went to see this gentleman, I think his name was **Johansen.** And I started to ask him questions and particularly about what was Sweden's role in connection with Nazi Germany. Were they trading freely or and what were the unions doing about talking about and revealing what had happened to the trade unions in Germany, which of course I knew about, et cetera.
And he said well apart from the trade union questions, you're asking political questions and you ought to be taking to the Prime Minister. And I said but I have no letter of introduction to the Prime Minister, whereupon he said well we can take care of that very easily. And so in his longhand he proceeds to write a letter of introduction to the Prime Minister for me to see the Prime Minister, Albin **Hansson**. Funny how these names come back after all these times.

Q: That led to another article in the home town newspaper?

A: In my local newspaper. But anyway the, when I went into the office of the Prime Minister, his main assistant said to me now in English, perfect English cause he studied in Oxford, in England. And he said now the Prime Minister doesn't speak any English and you don't speak any Swedish so I think you should submit your questions in writing. And I'll translate for them and so on.

Whereupon I did that and the Prime Minister wrote out hand written answers to these things which I have hidden somewhere. I don't know where any more, which I thought was quite interesting and it did lead to this article which I published here. But it's amazing how a mere 22 year old student –

Q: Journalistic scoop.

A: Yeah could make a kind of a minor journalistic scoop with the Prime Minister of Sweden just by a chance meeting in Hyde Park because the fascists, English fascists were holding a meeting.

Q: You had mentioned that you were a blond Nordic young man. What was the nationality of origin of your family?

A: My family is of three different origins. The name Sprecher, actually is Sprecher Von **Bernegg**, B-E-R-N-E-G-G is an old Swiss family. And our records on that family go back to the 15th century and in the other room I have a thing they have sent me. I haven't followed up on it much, which is a history showing all the descendants in the various branches of the Sprecher family. And the family as – is fairly well established in Switzerland over years in many fields. And the chief of staff of the Swiss army during World War I was a Sprecher. So whenever I'd go into a hotel in Switzerland why I would be given a certain amount of attention because of something I hadn't even known about. But the name was kind of well-known in Switzerland. I also went out to the canton of **Graubünden**, which is on the east side of Switzerland, the largest canton and there in this little city of **Chur**, I visited family relatives and so on and they made quite a fuss about me. And then I went up skiing in the **Lans** and so on.

Q: What was, in the earlier interview they didn't mention your faith. Is that relevant, your religious faith of your family.

A: Oh, well now my mother whose name is **Malloy**. She was, her father was an Irishman whose father had come over from Ireland and my father had met her when he was going to college and she happened to live nearby and they got to know one another. Now my father's mother and my

mother's mother were both of German extraction. So by extraction, I am one quarter Swiss, one quarter Irish and half German. I don't know what that means except that's kind of American.

Q: Melting pot. So it has no special relevance in any way to, as a student you were involved in issues that made me wonder if you had some particular feeling about the Jews, but that was **COINOSE** I think.

A: When I went off to college. I came from a very conservative family, Republican conservatives in Wisconsin. My father was a banker, lumber man and –

Q: They were comfortably off for you to study at London School of Economics.

A: Yes, I was comfortably off, not rich but comfortably off. And –

Q: Student days and the COINOSE.

A: I had gone off to a small college, North Central College in Naperville, Illinois. And there a student in the seminary of the evangelical church took an interest in me and somehow thought I had a future and he had a great influence on my life. There's a picture of him up there on the wall because he became a famous sculptor in metal. Do you see the picture? He later became a famous sculptor in metal and he was never a great well known pastor, although he always had a church but he created these metal sculptures, some of which he got paid for in a tremendous amount. If you go in the other room, there is a picture of four interlocking flying doves or eagles or something or other which he did and gave to me. And there is also a picture (pause) which has on it shalom. Peace in Jewish which he did and I can show you these after a while because they are I understand very valuable now and very nicely, well done.
Well he had quite an influence in kind of making me a liberal or temporarily a Christian socialist. And I then went to the University of Wisconsin for the next three years and there I was under the influence a good deal of two other pastors, the head of the Baptist Student Union and the pastor of the largest Protestant church, the First Congressional Church. And both of them became friends of mine and I visited in their homes and so on.

And the Baptist student minister encouraged me as a quote Nordic unquote to work with some Catholics and some Jews to form an organization which would be dedicated to tolerance among the students. At that time there was considerable anti-Jewish prejudice, even at Wisconsin, although Wisconsin probably had more Jews attending it than almost any other college outside of New York City. So I got together with some of these students. We didn't allow anyone into this group we formed which was called COINOSE. It's from the Greek word meaning in common. About a half a dozen of us formed this group and we wouldn't allow anyone in unless they had done something on the campus that was worthwhile in the way of student activities and if you didn't have a B average. So we were kind of an elite group. We did that purposely in order to get attention. And we would meet every two weeks or so rather conspicuously in the student union and sit at one or two tables together and talk. And we also brought some speakers to speak to the students in various forums that were arranged.

I also became the head of the conference on war which at that time drew strangely enough three different types of speakers. We wanted to be representative. We had pacifists mainly who were Christian preachers. We had the heads of two military academies who came to speak. We had people from the ROTC, the Reserve Officer Training Corps. And we had professors. And they talked about the world situation and about the possible threat of war in Europe again. Even though this was 1934. Hitler had been talking about **lebensraum** and so on. So I was pretty well schooled as an anti-Nazi while I was at the University of Wisconsin. And I did this paper during my senior year on the structure of National Socialism.

So by the time I got to London and to Germany, I was not without some background.

Q: The anti-Jewish sentiments, was that typical of the United States or was it Midwestern.

A: I can't really speak with great knowledge about the entire United States. But this was visible at the University of Wisconsin in several ways. Number one I was, I had joined one of the larger and better known fraternities, Phi Gamma Delta, which Fred Maytag, the son of the Maytag wash machine people were present, and a number of other people whose fathers were millionaires.

There wasn't a Jew in that fraternity. There were no fraternities that had Jews in them except the Jewish fraternities. So there was this bias. And I, because of having helped form COINOSE, I

was asked to visit in Jewish fraternities a time or two or three or four. But I couldn't bring a Jew into the Phi Gamma Delta. It would have caused too much of a opposition by my fraternity brothers.

Now let's get real concrete about how this was carried out and the extreme and what we did about it.

A fellow by the name of Max **Knecht,** which translates as Max servant, Max Knecht was the heavyweight boxing champion of the Big Ten set of universities. And he was a member of the Xi Phi fraternity which had a nice pier running out from its house beside the huge lake **Mendota** along whose shores the university has its main building or many of its buildings. And some Jewish students had come walking along and walked out on this pier which had been constructed by the Xi Phi's. Max Knecht and a couple of his fraternity brothers went out there and threw those Jews into the water. And it got around so a fellow by the name of Willard W. Blazer and I went to see the dean, Dean Goodnight. And we said we're terribly ashamed that any students would do a thing like this. And we are proposing that Bill Blazer or I should say he was the head of the Student Union, that Bill Blazer and I call on Max Knecht and tell him if there's any repeat of anything like this, he would be confronted by a number of other people who were six feet tall and that we'll make a hell of a protest. That we think it's utterly un-American and thoroughly barbaric and so on, the way you behaved and so on.

So Bill Blazer and I went down and asked to see Knecht and just told him this. And he was damn near threatening us and so on. And we said we aren't frightened of you and you don't dare do a damn thing to us because we have told the dean that we're going to visit you. And we just want you to know we don't want anything else like that happen on the University of Wisconsin campus again and he stormed and turned around and went back into his fraternity house.

So that was kind of the background. There was a lot of anti-Jewish prejudice among a lot of the students. On the other hand, one of the reasons they were coming to Wisconsin is because on the whole it was relatively more open and tolerant than the campuses of many universities.

Q: If we go back now to Europe later on, I'm interested that already in our discussion we have talked about several factors that were brought up in a lecture I went to last week. This lecturer was speaking about the problems of international tribunals today. The tribunal in Yugoslavia or in Rwanda and speaking about the conditions that had to be in place before systematic mass

violence take place. One thing is the gaining of political power by an elite. The gaining of political power which had happened under the Nazis, the concentration of power and the role of the propaganda in inciting the people and of course your Fritzche had been doing that. He may have been doing what he was told, but nevertheless I guess that was why you saw he fit into the category as a war criminal. It's interesting and I'd like you to comment on the extent to which you have observed later tribunals and think of them in contrast or comparison with what was done at Nuremberg.

A: During 1995 and 96 I attended several conferences in Boston and New York and a couple of other places usually entitled the legacy of Nuremberg. And a number of us who were prosecutors would speak at these reunions along with other professors and so on who were knowledgeable about the Nazis and about Nuremberg. And one of the, at two of these conferences an Australian by the name of Graeme **Blewitt**, B-L-E-W-I-T-T was present. Blewitt is the deputy chief prosecutor of the Yugoslav war crimes tribunal. He and I and my wife Virginia quickly became friendly. And we stayed in the same hotel a couple of times and we had a lot of dinners and breakfasts together. And so on.

He got to know that I was working on this book and we talked about some of it and so I gave him a number of chapters of my proposed book, particularly those dealing with the procedures of the trial, the defense counsel, the introduction I had done to the whole defense case which is the longest part of my book actually because I think it's been the most neglected dealing with what the defense really had to say in how the trial worked in detail as far as the defendants were concerned.

So I have letters back and forth with Blewitt and he says among other things that he circulated the materials I sent him to other members of the prosecution. The last letter I had from Blewitt stated that they had convicted one Yugoslav war criminal who had gotten into Germany and they were able to grab hold of him and have him brought to the Hague for trial. But that it was almost impossible for them to go after others who they had, against whom they'd like to bring trials because the leaders of the countries involved in Bosnia and Serbia and so on don't want to surrender any of these people for trial. So even where they have clear cut cases and have submitted those to the governments of these countries, they are not interested in surrendering

these persons who committed massive atrocities to the Yugoslav tribunal which is headquartered in the Hague.

This leads to another very big problem of course. And that is that there is no permanent regular international criminal court. If there were this would give that court and its staff more standing among a lot of countries. And its authority would be greatly increased. Any country that refused to surrender upon request, people for trial would be attacked in the newspapers and in the, by the media and by a lot of leaders.

As it is, the whole thing is just considered buried among the confused state of international relations that exists with sovereign nations having their unimpeded rights, associated loosely in the United Nations, defying the United Nations constantly without penalty. It's just a sad situation.

Q: Nuremberg seems even more remarkable perhaps for having happened and being a step forward.

A: Yes and of course the difference is that we were victors and committed to the trials long before Justice Jackson even became the chief prosecutor for the United States. In 1942 President Roosevelt began to make statements about the horrors that the Nazis were committing and that the leaders would be punished. Even in 1940, in August of 1941 which is before we became involved in war, which was later that year.

Roosevelt met with Churchill in **Argentia** just in Newfoundland just off Canada and they had this what was called the Atlantic Conference, the two of them. And it was quite a thing in that they came out with a declaration stating that after the Nazi dictatorship had been replaced by a democratic government and after the governments and after free governments had been reestablished on the continent of Europe, then we look forward to an era of great peace and prosperity and so on.

So here was a real condemnation of the Nazis appearing, getting a lot of attention even before America became involved in the war. I don't think it mentioned anything specifically about the persecution of Jews or Gypsies or any special group. It just talked about the tyranny that had to be removed. And here we are supposedly a neutral nation and it was the kind of thing which pleased me very much and indeed to see Roosevelt doing that.

Q: Of course you mentioned that Nuremberg happened because the victors wanted it, but many said and I think the defendants saying this is no justice. This is just the victors seeking vengeance.

A: Yes that was a, not only the Nazi leaders saying that. But some political leaders in this country took the position during the war that we should keep our hands completely off, that there was no such thing as an international law that we should be a part of in the sense of enforcing it by holding trials. And one was Senator Taft of Ohio who was an isolationist. So there was opposition to the idea of having international trials here in America. I don't know how extensive it was. It was not the kind of thing that bothered Roosevelt very much.

Q: What were ways in which the trial differed from anything that had happened before or from the normal course of a trial?

A: Well there had never been any international trials previously. At the end of World War I, there was a trial or two which was conducted by individual nations, including one by the Germans themselves. Somebody had done something like some of our officers did in Vietnam. I mean they misbehaved and they got tried. The antecedents of international law concerning war crimes goes way back to some formalization in the Hague Convention of 1899 and then the Geneva Conventions which had to do with the treatment of prisoners of war, things you couldn't do to prisoners of war and so on. Things you couldn't do when you were occupying a country during war. But there was very little that had anything to do with aggressive war until 1928. In that year our Secretary of State under President Hoover, a Secretary Kellogg became active with **Briand** the prime minister of France, the president of France. I forget his exact title. And the two of them led a lot of other leaders from a number of nations in what later got to be called the Pact of Paris or the Kellogg Briand pact. That was called a treaty or the pact to outlaw war. And it just declared that in modern circumstances war is an improper way to settle international or national disputes between one country and another but it made no provision as to how people who did conduct war or leading to aggressive war, led the country that was invading another

country. It made no reference as to how they might be tried or that there was no structure, no court established.

So after a number of pronouncements had been made at Yalta, the Nazis were going to be punished and again no structure established, our war department, particularly under Secretary of War Stimson, became very active in figuring out what might be done about this.

Now the interesting thing is that Stimson's great interest in this field of trying to work out some kind of an international trial came about partly because of his response to another cabinet officer, Hans **Morgenthau** who was an American Jew or a Jewish American who had proposed after meeting with Hitler, meeting with Roosevelt that there be an executive punishment of some of the top Nazi leaders, without mentioning who or how would they be cut off and all that but just seize some of them and kill them after the war.

This so upset Stimson that he immediately put to work inside the war department some of his trusted associates and they did some work in developing proposals that would lead to investigations of these Nazis and to setting up some kind of a tribunal and they actually proposed in great detail which I could show you here, what would be done in a memorandum which was then initialed by the secretary of State, the Secretary of War, who was Stimson. If I said Secretary of State before, I was wrong. He was the Secretary of War. **Stettinius** was the Secretary of State and Frances Biddle was the Attorney General. Those three people in January of 1945 signed a memorandum called the trial of war criminals. And this became kind of the Bible for later discussions and it was Justice Jackson saw that copies of that were sent to the preliminary conference on the formation of the United Nations in May of 1945.

And copies were circulated among the foreign ministers of several countries – Britain, France, and so on. And then Truman appointed Jackson to be the US Chief of Counsel for war crimes in May of 1945.

Jackson went over to Britain and Britain immediately changed its mind and moved away from this idea of executive punishment to being willing to join the Americans and the French and the Soviets and whoever else in having a war crimes trial and Britain thereafter became very active in helping promote that.

And Sir David Maxwell **Fyfe** who was the Attorney General of Great Britain under the conservatives, under Churchill as Prime Minister, he offered to host a conference in London concerning this matter. And so there was the London conference which held negotiations over a

period of two months or so in the summer of 1945 which led to the so called London Agreement on August eighth, 1945. That agreement provided for the establishment of the international military tribunal.

Q: Why did Britain come round to this point of view, do you think?

A: I think that Churchill whoever had these notions and who'd ever had kind of pushed this as the statement of position which had been made as the statement of position by the British government. I think and he saw what Jackson was doing and began to think about it. He completely reversed course and put the British solidly behind the idea of having a war crimes trial. The details of why he or the British government changed its mind I don't know. But Churchill was shortly thereafter the war defeated in an election. I don't mean he was personally

Margaret West: This is a continuation of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum interview with Drexel Sprecher. This is tape number 2, side A. You were talking about the ways in which Nuremberg created new law or moved international law forward, ways in which it differs from prior trials.

Drexel Sprecher: Well there have been no prior war crimes trials on an international basis. So this was entirely new and the four main representatives negotiating in London to set up this tribunal and to provide for an international trial were wholly new ground and I mean it took them a couple of months to work out the details, to overcome some of the obstacles. There were some considerable disagreements among them along the way and all of this is fairly well reflected in this book called International Conference. (pause)
Some of the background materials made during the war including statements by Roosevelt and the three secretaries' memorandum that I mentioned in January 1945 and then the transcript that was made of the conference's meetings over two months in London, where representatives of the British, the French, the Soviets and the Americans negotiated the London agreement.

Q: Who is the book by?

A: Well this is a documentary book. It's done by the -- Justice Jackson had it assembled, but it's published by the Department of State in February 1949 and it's published by the Superintendent of Documents. Way back it cost only a dollar 75. Today you can't get a copy of this for $50 because there's very few copies around.

Q: What about those, I just wondered what in hindsight you see as the great advantages of an international tribunal of this kind? I know that other criticisms were that law was being made after the acts had been committed. But it must have a great moral value to hold a tribunal of this kind.

A: Well two different aspects of what you are raising. Number one the four powers as occupying powers of Germany did have the power of occupying powers and they created a tribunal to deal with the leaders of the vanquished Nazi nation. Now there was no exact precedent for this but the idea that someone out to do something about crime is a pretty old idea. And that's what was pursued at the London conference.
The trial itself was great, was terribly important in ways that are mostly forgotten today. And that is that it revealed details concerning how the Nazis built up their power and how they prepared for war, how they planned each individual case. The number of documents that we found and the number of documents the Nazis had made was amazing. There was a general order put out toward the end to destroy documents and many were. But an awful lot of them were not.
And let me give you some examples.
The Rosenberg files were at least 50 notebooks of materials concerning what he had done and he had been in various top positions in the Nazi regime. The defendant Hans Frank maintained a very detailed diary. Why he didn't burn it is a wonder and he actually talks about this and how he was torn. He claims that toward the end he got reconverted to Catholicism and he decided that he wanted to contribute his extensive diaries. Now these are not just hand written notes that he made. They are dictated materials which include the minutes of all kinds of conferences which he held with leaders of the general government, the German government in Poland in which he

refers. He makes such statements as if there are only a few hundred thousand Jews left in Poland today, I haven't completely done my job yet. Well number one, in the first place, he wasn't basically in charge of liquidating the Jews. He was certainly supporting it and all that. But the SS was largely responsible for rounding up the Jews and so forth. So he was partly bragging beyond his competence in this. And this, even diaries don't reveal all the truth by any means as you know.

But they gave lots of leads and they did talk about a lot of the detailed conferences which were held concerning the exploitation of Polish property as well as the use of foreign laborers to run factories, the shipping of production materials from Polish factories into Germany to sustain the war effort there. The taking of – his diaries as far as I know don't mention the persecution and murder of the Gypsies. They may have it in passing at one point or another. I don't even recall. The persecution and murder of the Gypsies is mentioned in a number of the SS documents which we put into evidence at Nuremberg.

But as a part of the case on the persecution of the Jews, there was no separate case made, no separate submission made concerned the persecution and murder of the Gypsies. One of the great faults of the Nuremberg trials.

Q: What is the impact of that?. You had said in the earlier interview it was a great mistake. And I think that **Höss** when he testified was never asked specifically about the Gypsies.

A: Who?

Q: Rudolph.

A: Hess.

Q: Not Hess but Höss.

A: No, that's right. Rudolph Höss the commandant of Auschwitz was a witness in the first trial. Nobody asked him any questions about the Gypsies, but if you want his account of what happened to the Gypsies you can read his book called Commandant of Auschwitz which I have a

copy here. And which Höss, Rudolph Höss talks about the murder of some of the Gypsies. It isn't a full account by any means.

Q: Your feeling is that it was this, because there was no specific presentation the documentation was lost.

A: No the documentation was there. It wasn't – nobody was assigned to look for it, you might say. There was nobody in charge of developing a case concerning Gypsies. If they got mentioned along with a document that talked about the shipping of Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals to concentration camps, it was thoroughly incidental. Nobody made much point of it. There was not separate case on the persecution of homosexuals. There was something of a separate case on the persecution of Jehovah's Witnesses who later in the war were all killed off because they wouldn't salute. They wouldn't enter the army and so they were killed as quote traitors to the Nazis.

Q: How is it that the case was made. You know how is it that there was a presentation and somebody specifically looked into the Jehovah's Witnesses and didn't for instance of the Gypsies.

A: I don't know. At the time, I saw the documents coming through and saw that Gypsies were mentioned, that Jehovah's Witnesses were mentioned but I think there was just no basis for motivation particularly on the part of the establishment, of the leaders. I don't think Justice Jackson was intentionally overlooking the Gypsies but the thing that was being talked about was the murder of six million Jews. That a half million Gypsies were also murdered was just a footnote. It was not paid attention to and it's a shame. It's a damn shame.

Q: Has there been an impact of the different groups like the Gypsies not being looked into? Or it was just a historically –

A: The Gypsies were – had almost no organization in, during the war or after the war, apart from their little groups on their own. There's some Gypsies who did write a few accounts of one thing

or another but it got no attention anywhere and they were not a group who had professors in universities or who had leaders in governments. And I mean I can remember coming out of the Midwest, the only thing I knew about Gypsies was that they moved around in caravans and that they did some iron work or some metal work occasionally for people. And that they played banjoes and sang. You know I mean I had no notion of their background, history or how they got here or what. No one paid any attention to it. Now they have become much more organized. In the Holocaust Museum has, after, way back they had some struggles to get the Gypsies on to the Council but there's now William Anthony **Duna**, D-U-N-A who is a member of the Council of the Holocaust Museum. He's a professor in the University of St. Olaf, it was a university in Minneapolis. I can't think of exact name for sure. St. Thomas. The University of St. Thomas. Another professor is Ian Hancock who is an advisor to the Holocaust Museum. He is a professor down at the University of Texas. He has written a number of articles, some of which have been published by the Holocaust Museum. And the Holocaust Museum has put out a very good small pamphlet summarizing the history of the treatment of the Gypsies. This wasn't done until a year or two ago. So there's now a growing amount of literature.

Q: You mentioned the documentation earlier. And I think it is you who have spoken of it being almost a national trait that the Germans were document makers and it was remarkable how little was destroyed, how much was written down that was later incriminating and then how much was kept. Is it true that just as the German characteristic to be obedient, not question authority that it was equally strong?

A: Well I don't know, I don't know whether the Germans either before Hitler or after Hitler kept more documents and what the Americans do or the British do. But they kept an awful lot of them. And one of the differences is that a tremendous amount of their material was marked **geheim**, secret, highly secret and so on. Or for eyes only and then destroy. It was, an awful lot of those documents were not destroyed. People kept them, filed them and we found them. So really the -- to me the most important thing about the trial, beyond any doubt, is the revelations that it brought about. These are not mentioned now, but at the time, these documents were filtered back into the universities of this country, Britain. There is a special center of documentation maintained in London. I forget the name of it now which has collected practically

every document there is about Nazi Germany. And of course there are Holocaust and the centers of German documentation in Harvard University, Yale and other, other places. There is a tremendous documentation on this around.

And quite a number of students are interested as, as was shown to me by the attendance at some of these conferences we had in 1945 and 46. Last Sunday I spoke for an hour to the Church of, St. John's Episcopal Church down near the White House, just across from the Hay Adams Hotel there.

And about a hundred people stayed after church in order to hear a talk on the Nuremberg trial. And I gave that talk and I talked for about half an hour and they kept me busy up until the full hour, a little over an hour, asking questions and so on.

This is not uncommon. Many of the other surviving prosecutors and interpreters, translators are asked to do different things before public audiences. A number of people who were involved in the trials have written about the trials. Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, his book up there, has quite a bit on Nuremberg. He became Lord Chancellor of England later on. Judge Biddle and his book in Brief Authority has written about it. And of course Telford Taylor has written a number of books. And these are spread around a good deal. Also books by Joe **Persico** and by **Conot**, C-O-N-O-T. So we feel rather good about the availability of materials on the trial. I think most of us don't feel very good about the legacy of Nuremberg in the sense that we are only now talking about forming a permanent international court.

And there is a committee, it's called the permanent committee for an international court of the United Nations, which is now working toward a draft of what would be a new charter for an international permanent international tribunal.

Q: If you like, I suppose in law, one is always reaching out for justice and it seems to me it is a superb step forward. Always there are compromises. Even in the number of people you are able to bring cases against. Wasn't that determined by the number of seats in the dock?

A: No, not by the number of seats in the dock. We held 12 more cases after the first Nuremberg trial. We had 12 more trials in Nuremberg. The British had one or two trials of top people. The French, one or two. They tried the leaders of the **Röchling** industrial firm for example and I helped a Frenchman by the name of Charles **Gertohoffer**, G-E-R-T-H-O-F-F-E-R prepare that

case because I had been head of the subsequent proceedings division toward the end of the first trial. And later the deputy to General Taylor, the successor to Justice Jackson as the US Chief of Counsel. And so I helped these other countries who didn't have the same number of staff. The British had very few people working on this. They were too busy getting themselves reconstituted, having fought so hard during the war and made such tremendous sacrifices. The French were very disorganized after the war. The main leaders had been in the underground or had been in the background during the time when the Nazis had occupied France. And influenced the Petain government and had a subservient arrangement over France.

Q: You were I think the longest serving American prosecutor. Is that right because you were there for the subsequent trials. Indeed they were your suggestion. Is that so?

A: They were what?

Q: Did you not suggest to Jackson subsequent trials after the first trials?

A: Yes. But that wasn't the first time he had thought of that. I wrote him a memo shortly after the first trial began in which I said there are some of us who are planning to stay on for any trials and I think you should, might you might know this. And I mentioned a dozen people. I think I was maybe the only attorney that was on that list. But I had some interpreters, translators and investigators about ten of them or so. Without telling me in advance, Jackson appointed me director of the subsequent proceedings division. I got this notice I was as surprised as anybody. So I immediately started to collect staff which was no longer needed on the first trial or some people who came over who were to be interpreters and it turned out that their language skill was not sufficient for them to be interpreters but they could be translators which is quite a different thing. And I gathered these people together and built up the subsequent proceedings division. I knew that I would never be made the head of it. I was a captain and my background wasn't of such an impressive nature that I would be any more than maybe a division chief.
Justice Jackson some six months later, five months later perhaps, chose General Telford Taylor, now a professor at Columbia or has been a professor at Columbia for 50 years. Chose him as his successor. And Taylor then immediately made me the head of first the economics division, the

IG **Farben** trial team. Head of the publications division. And toward the end, his one deputy and chief counsel as the main deputy in Nuremberg after the, all the trials were over except for the ministries case. And I made the, spoke the last words to a tribunal for the prosecution in Nuremberg in the ministries case and there was a rebuttal argument in the ministries case. It was sometimes late in 1948 or early 49. I forget the date.

And meanwhile I had been collecting staff, over half of whom were Germans to work in collecting materials for the green volumes. The 15 official volumes on the 12 later trials. They are in the other room. And selections from the main highlights, all of each of the 12 trials. The indictment, the opening statements, both the prosecution and the defense, closing statements, some of the main evidence and the judgment of the tribunals. This we worked on and what should be chosen as the evidence in some of the argumentation was determined by a mixed group working under me which included a lot of Germans and some of the best ideas came from these Germans who had of course been cleared as being satisfactory, whether giving a Nazi salute way back when there was compulsion in Germany. I don't think we asked but we knew that they were dedicated to exposing what happened under the Nazis and they contributed a very great deal.

One of them, Karl Hoffman had been the counsel to one of the defendants in the IG Farben case where I was the chief of the prosecution team. And Hoffman represented the defendant Ambrose in that case and maybe another defendant. I forget. But he and I became quite friendly in a professional sense. And I think at one point or another I probably snuck him in to have lunch along with prosecutors and interpreters and all that. No one would pay much attention after the two years. The security was, anyone was, no one was going to ask any questions.

I made him a part of the publications divisions and he worked and helped supervise some Germans in collecting the materials that he thought would bring out the best part of the defense case in a brief way that could be put in this book, in these volumes. He did very good work on that and I can remember him having tears in his eyes when we were saying goodbye in 1949 when I left Nuremberg. And we brought all the files back to the Pentagon that we were working on and finished the editing of the volumes there.

He later became the main counsel for trade unions of all things, in Nuremberg which is his native city. Maybe that part of his, our natural friendship probably grew out of the fact that we both had this interest in labor. I'm not sure.

Q: Of course his working with you would have materially benefited him. Isn't it true that the Germans had such poor, they were shell shocked and rations were poor and so on? Would not all your staff have been attracted also by American rations and so on?

A: I think that was certainly a factor with many of them. In the case of Dr. Hoffman, he was somehow recruited to be – to represent the defendant. I imagine they had heard of him as an able counsel and asked him to serve. And then of course they were given a monetary pay by the war crimes set up by the Americans. They were given a ration. They always used to laugh and say look you're giving us second grade cigarettes rather than Camels and Lucky Strikes and they were getting – that's a kind of discrimination that's kind of laughable. I don't think they cared too much. At least they got fairly good cigarettes.
And they were given, if they came from out of the city or out of Nuremberg, they were given billets and office space and so on. I must have had 50 people altogether in the publications division, beginning in late 48 and 49 and a lot of the Germans who had worked assisting on other parts of the cases or moving documents or running mimeograph did we call it at that time. I think the copies and so on, putting them together, making the document books, helping in the restaurants to serve us meals and all that.
They were, the Germans that we had working for us were very glad to be working for us. And it was partly because I think a lot of them found the work more interesting than anything that was available then. And although German industry and commerce were slowly recovering, I think a lot of them liked the experience of working with the Americans.

Q: Nuremberg had been a very heavily bombed city so there was extensive damage there.

A: They old city of Nuremberg had in it, I don't believe one building which hadn't been touched by bombs or hadn't been affected by bombs. There was one church which was remarkably undisturbed and one old synagogue which hadn't been torn down. It had been used for something else, obviously after the Nazis, after Crystal Night in 1938.

Q: Did that bombing, this is almost a side question. But did it seem to you justifiable the extent of the bombing of cities like Dresden and –

A: Well the justification is that the Nazis started bombing first. They bombed London as much as they could. Trying to and other also the industrial areas. Coventry which was a great center of the airplane industry of Britain. And the British focused even before we got into the war a great deal on retaliating in two ways or in responding in two ways. One building up a military ground force which would be able to repel an invasion. And they worked like mad on that. But the other, the main thing, that had a great injury, caused great injury to Germany was the building up of the Royal Air Force. They really concentrated on building up those machines and repairing those that were injured, that got out of whack and so on. And beginning by 1942 and certainly after the Americans got into the war we had aerial superiority over the continent of Europe. Not over the whole continent but over the western part of it at any rate.

And the bombings which occurred in all the larger cities of western Germany and to some extent in Berlin, Dresden certainly which is in eastern Germany, these really blasted those cities apart. I forget how many people were killed in Dresden but that was kind of a surprise attack to the Germans. I don't think they expected that and they hadn't moved people around or prepared for that very much.

And I think a couple hundred thousand people were killed there. And why the Germans were able to even to maintain and carry on the war is very, is amazing after all these bombings. And it was because of the complete control that the Nazis had as a dictatorship, over the press and over the police and people had no real freedom to show their willingness to let's get the hell out of this war. My relatives are being killed. I don't have a place to sleep. I have to live out in the country. They had no way of making this effective until the -- til near the end.

The attempt on Hitler's life which was made on July 20th 1944 was the result of a resistance movement by mainly some military men but also a few officials who were anti-Nazi or who became anti-Nazi at one point or another. And not only risked their lives but thousands of them, thousands of Germans were killed after the attempt on Hitler's life. And I never forget, when I visited Berlin afterwards, years after, 20 years after the war, there is this monument near the, where the Reichstag building was and I can't think of what that monument is I want to talk about on Unter den Linden.

The amount of the bombing was just incredible and the -- even in the parks there were craters near Berlin because the bombing couldn't be too focused. It was done from a very high altitude. And they often missed the center of the city or the factories they were attempting to focus on. And of course the people were, would get warning that there was going to be an air raid normally and they'd go underground or something like that to save their life. But an awful of them were killed notwithstanding by these raids. And the Germans were very glad to have the war over with, even if they were losers.

Q: What was it like to be in Nuremberg at the time of the trial? And I am particularly interested. I have been delving in different books and I can't remember the words but a comment by Rebecca West who wrote some articles about it. She spoke, she said something that suggested how isolated people were. This group who were there for the most part without your families. You were not supposed to fraternize with the local population.

A: Which we did.

Q: Well I think it would be inevitable but I wondered what did it feel like to be, and was it a very strange yet dramatic experience?

A: Well I'm not exactly typical in this respect. When I made the presentation to the tribunal on Schirach, I immediately within a day or two, a fellow who was an interpreter Wolf Frank who had been a German. His father had been one of the owners of the automobile outfit in Germany. It's a very common one. I can't think of it. It was centered in Nuremberg. And Wolf Frank came in to me and said by any chance do you have a remote cousin by the name of Nina. So I said yes, she's a Swiss. He says she is no longer a Swiss. She is living out at the edge of town and she married Count **Farber-Castell**, the maker of the pencils. And all the equipment. I've got some of them here. You know the slides and so on. And I said well that's interesting. I visited them in Switzerland before the war when I was traveling and they treated me very well. He said well the Faber-Castells would like to have you visit them and I'll go out there with you. So we got a car and went out there. And they naturally played up to me --

Q: This is a continuation of United States Holocaust Memorial Museum interview with Drexel Sprecher. This is tape number two, side B.

A: Faber-Castell had, was a Count and he had been a lieutenant colonel in the German army and I think he'd been on the fringe of some of those in the German army which were opposed to Hitler. But he had never been arrested. On the other hand the Germans had, the Nazis had taken away the factory from his supervision and placed in charge some Nazi deputies and so on, so that, for the balance of the war. His record was such that he had been reestablished immediately after the occupation, very soon after the occupation. And was allowed to go back and to start his factory up again. Pencils were needed and so forth. And by the time I met them, they were doing very well. Their living space in Nuremberg was an old semi-castle which was the center for the press corps that was visiting the trials, reporting on the trials. The media people lived there, most of them. They had a huge number of buildings, got rooms in it and some places where they could entertain themselves, have their bars and so forth. I went out, I came to go out there every other week or so on the weekends, to the Faber-Castells to what was called their **yakt** house, their hunting lodge which is where they lived and they had this big spread. Hundreds of acres of forest land, some of which had been used to make paper products of one kind or another and some of which was used for the pencil business et cetera.

This pencil business had been going on for generations. I have a whole book here on the **blitshtift**, the pencil business in Nuremberg. I went out there and I would meet some of their friends and occasionally Wolf Frank, well they kept a couple of witnesses out there for us too, for the prosecution, some of them who were not such that we wanted them in jail or held in a detention house. And some who didn't want to go into the witness house where a lot of Germans were kept as possible witnesses when they came to Nuremberg and given good meals and a place to stay.

Some of them wanted to have something more private. One of them was Rudolph **Diels** who was former head of the Gestapo underneath Goering but he had had his trouble with Goering and had become attached somewhat to some of the resistance, at least he was suspected of this and he damn near had been a part of those Germans liquidated after the attempt on Hitler's life. Well he stayed out there with the Faber-Castells for a while until they thought that he better find another

place which he did. But he testified for the prosecution in Nuremberg, gave us a lot of information. How did I get on this?

Q: Wouldn't that have been an amazing privilege for him to stay at this hunting lodge rather than being in a Nuremberg cell? How did that –

A: Well he wouldn't, just the cell, he wouldn't have been placed in a cell because he was known to be, become an honest anti-Nazi so he was not going to be arrested or anything.

Q: Oh I know we got onto this because of that odd official like isolation, not fraternizing.

A: Let me carry on one thing. Rudolph Diels, no it was not Diels, I'm sorry. Remind me to talk about Hitler's interpreter when you're ready. Go ahead you had another question.

Q: We talked about the not, I don't know what the rules were about not –

A: Fraternizing.

Q: Fraternizing and there's the story of somebody who I think was dating a Russian interpreter and was told that she may well be a sort of intelligence plant. And I think that was proven to be the case. I just wondered what life was like in this situation.

A: Well the Grand Hotel was the place where people went at night and more than anywhere else, at least the Americans and the British. When they wanted to be away from their digs, from the places they were staying. The French established what was called the French Club on the west side, outside of Nuremberg in **Dombach**, right next to Dombach. And this became a very popular place for everybody because the French managed to get and create the best damn food, much better food than we got in the Grand Hotel and so on and brought in wine and all that. So it was a great place to go to have dinner in the evening and to stay around. After the French, after the first trial and the French left, they left behind people who helped keep that thing going. Americans sponsoring it. And we held many parties there, one of which I sponsored for the new

coming people that were coming in after I was director of the subsequent proceedings division. And we brought in German entertainers to help keep the thing going and so on.
I know that one thing I wanted to say to you and that is that one -- the principle interpreter for **Von Ribbentrop** the foreign minister and often for Hitler, too, when he was having conversations with Mussolini or with some other leaders of other countries, they used a guy by the name of Otto **Schmitt** and this fellow just was one of these guys who could speak all kinds of languages without any problems. And here he was someone who'd been present doing a number of the many interviews that Hitler had when he was planning aggressive war and so on.
And as a matter of fact he's quoted in the judgement of the tribunal later on because he was a witness in the first trial. Now because he had been that close to the top, even as an interpreter, some American authorities, not in, not us Nurembergers, not us war crimes people, but somebody else figured he was a subject for automatic arrest. So despite the fact that he'd been friendly as a witness to us and all, they threw him in jail.
So he wrote me a letter which I have somewhere still, if – it might be in the Harvard collection where I've put most of my early notes. He wrote me a note saying I don't want to ask any favors of you but I'm being held here and I don't think they understand so I got him yanked out of there. I put him in my car and he went on down to a place he had where he could stay a hundred miles south in Bavaria somewhere so the authorities couldn't jump at him again like that.
And he was a witness in a couple of the later trials there as well.

Q: I was thinking as you said that, that I have questions right away though that he was simply translating so you view that as neutral. And then I'm thinking of other people **Streicher.** I mean totally different but it almost seemed that he -- I've answered my own question. It seemed to me --

A: Streicher was an entirely different man in terms of authority. It was the **Gauleiter** of Franconia which is where the capital city, which was Nuremberg, incidentally. He was the publisher of **Der Sturmer**, the Stormer and a number of other publications which were stupidly anti-Semitic. And he got these, the publication subsidized. At one time I think there were several hundred thousand copies put around. And they very, they were very much encouraged the persecution of the Jews. And at one point, the reason he was convicted and sentenced to death.

He talked about the disappearance of the Jews and a report that had come out of it, some Jewish groups in Switzerland which reported that the Jews were disappearing as they were going to these and he published the news in Der Sturmer. That's no goddamn Jewish lie which proves that he knew they were being killed, at least enough to satisfy the court so he was not convicted.

Q: That was the end of somebody's court statement. I've forgotten which lawyer it was but using that statement very effectively in cross examination. Is that right?

A: Yes, I forget. It might have been Elwyn Jones. It was one of the Births prosecutors. No, it wasn't Elwyn Jones but it was a British prosecutor. I can tell you who if you want to know.

Q: Going back to – HJ **Fillmore**.

A: Yeah, Colonel HJ Fillmore. He was the one that I think cross examined. I'm almost positive. It was a British --

Q: On the rules on fraternization, why would they be in place?

A: Well this, these rules on fraternization were issued by the army in order to supposedly to keep American GIs from having friendships with German girls. That was the main reason I think. Maybe they didn't want them to become too friendly with the population, local population in general as an occupying force. But the rule was completely not enforced. As far as I know, I know of no case GIs, the soldiers went out with German girls openly. They took them to the clubs which were -- openly. Their officers didn't discipline them as far as I ever heard. I went out with German girls. I didn't bring a German girl into the Grand Hotel. I thought it was a cause, caused bad feelings by some people. But I had German girlfriends. And I went out with Faber-Castells. I dealt with Schmitt. Got ready for the new world.

Q: I'm really very fascinated to know about both about the, your two cases, but also about all the defendants and you'd have been in a position to know a lot through observing them in court, the whole 20 or so defendants. And the story is really a riveting personal story of the character

Goering still seeming to call the shots, even as a Nuremberg prisoner. Some characters influencing others. The camaraderie between them, the way they dressed, the comparing of notes on what position to take. **Speer's** fascinating I think seemingly brilliant plan of how to present himself. The impact some would have on the judges I think in that environment. Showing remorse.

A: Several of them of course did. Goering, although he had actually gotten into disfavor with Hitler at the end because of a misunderstanding as Goering put it. Goering wanted to get out of Berlin and even have Hitler get down into the Bavarian Alps and hide away. And Hitler of course stayed and Goering went down there, why he actually ordered, he figured that he was being disobedient. So here is a number two man to Hitler who was actually under threat of his life for a week or so toward the end. It's hard to believe.

I might tell you one story which most people have found interesting. The people last Sunday at the St. John's Church did. I only had one quote brief conversation with Goering. I watched him being interrogated by Colonel **Amon** who was the head of the interrogation division or Colonel **Burkhart** or somebody or other from the interrogation division. But we in the documentation area were not allowed to do any – we could suggest questions but we couldn't do any questioning ourselves, which is kind of stupid cause we knew more about it than they did.

I was in court one day and either Justice Jackson or his son had asked me right at the beginning of the trial to help entertain Senator Claude Pepper from Florida. Pepper later became a congressman, but at that time he was a newly elected Senator. He hadn't been in office for more than a year or two. And he was coming over there, right at the beginning of the trial, just before the trial began and when they were testing out the simultaneous interpretation, he was there watching that. He was terribly interested and obviously wanted this to be a big part of his background and that that would help him contribute in the Senate in the Foreign Relations committee to the future handling of Germany et cetera.

Justice Jackson asked me to see that he was taken into the courtroom whenever he wanted to go and sit at the prosecution table, et cetera. So during the first week of trial, I brought him into the courtroom where there were these five tables of – four tables of prosecutors and one where the assistants to the judges could sit. And I sat him down at the American prosecution table. And we talked and the court went on. And I was looking over at the dock and I saw Goering scribbling

and he broke his pencil and he took it and threw it down in the dock. And was, kind of grimaced. So I took a pencil that I had and I went up to the guard beside Goering and I says, give it to Goering. Goering saw this going on. I turned around and came back and sat down beside Pepper. Then came a recess. And the defendants got up, stood up and were going to be taken to the bathroom and so on and the rest of us were milling about between these tables and the dock and so on. And I had my back to the dock. And Senator Pepper kept looking around and he said I think Goering wants to see you. He's going like this. So I turned around and he was. So the guard beside Goering at the corner of the dock, you can see it right on over there. There's Goering and there's the back of a guard. At the bottom on the left there. You can see Goering is the one whose face you see and the helmet is the guard that's right beside him. I went over to a guard standing there and he said Goering wants to talk to you. So Goering bowed to me and he said **Danke Felmous**, Danke Felmous. Thank you very much. Thank you very much and I said **Bitte schön**, Bitte schön which means you're very welcome, you're very welcome. That's the only conversation I ever had with Goering. I turned around and Claude Pepper said to me, are you allowed to do that. I says hell I never even thought of it. I said I don't think we are.

Q: One of the things I wanted to ask you about is more on Goering and his suicide at the end of the trial or before the execution. And also what you thought of him, what you observed of him as a man.

A: I observed serval interrogations of Goering before the trial. But I don't remember much about it. He was always quite lucid. His testimony at the trial was the longest testimony of any witness to trial. I think he was on the witness stand for seven days or so. The tribunal hardly interrupted him during the whole time because I think President Lawrence wanted to show that we were giving the defendants a chance to say just about anything they wanted to say and that didn't prove to be true actually when they went too far or were repetitive or later on. but with respect to Goering the tribunal allowed him that long period of time to talk.
I don't have any special feelings about what kind of a man he was, apart from having read the documents in which he was involved. He was utterly ruthless. He was convinced that Germany had been greatly wronged by the Treaty of Versailles. He certainly had been a war time hero in the First World War as a flyer. He was the kind of man who was perfectly willing to risk his life

obviously for what he believed in. Hitler made him his first designated successor because he trusted him. I don't know what more you want me to say.

Q: Can you comment on I think intelligence tests that were done by the psychologist, Gilbert.

A: Gilbert. I can only say what's in his book. That is that the intelligence test giving Goering and all the other defendants placed Goering and **Hjalmar Schacht** at the very top. It was an extremely high grade. I would say way in the upper one percent. He's clearly a very highly intelligent man.

Q: I was thinking also of those bizarre details given about his drug taking and I think when he turned himself in to the Americans they said that his toenails and fingernails were painted red and there was –

A: I don't know anything about that.

Q: And that doesn't seem to – I mean he certainly looks in – well you observed him at the trial. It almost seems that that was a sort of bizarre phase perhaps, under the influence of drugs.

A: I know nothing about that.

Q: I also I read statements that he was suspected of being homosexual cause he had a lot of male toiletries.

A: I know nothing about that.

Q: The other aspect was his lack of remorse. So many of the defendants seem to have been rethinking things in a profound way during their Nuremberg imprisonment.

A: Well Goering was clearly – had more influence than anybody else among the defendants. However there was of course a group which grew up, a minority group which was rather strongly

opposed to him. And was led by Albert Speer, the defendant Albert Speer. Fritzche was a part of it. Schacht of course disliked Goering intensely. I didn't get in on those kinds of things I have to rely as you do I guess on Dr. Gilbert who had these conversations with the defendants during the course of the trial as their psychologist. The Protestant chaplain, **Gerecke**, G-E-R-E-C-K-E wrote an article I think for the Saturday Evening Post in which he talked about his interactions with some of the defendants. That's about it.

Q: I'd also like to have you tell more about Baldur Von Schirach. You didn't go into any depth earlier. And I'd just like to hear more about his background and your case against him.

A: Well Schirach was of course the head of the Hitler Youth. And very early Hitler had picked him out as a student leader and brought him down to the party headquarters in Munich where he got considerable indoctrination. When he was very young, he was a very young man and he was indicted because he was the Hitler Youth leader and had indoctrinated much of the youth of Germany with the Nazi ideas. And we said that this was part of a conspiracy to make aggressive war because he built up military mood you might say in these younger men and also some of the things that were written, some of the pamphlets that were circulated were anti-Semitic and contained some very prejudiced type of material.

The main thing that he was involved in actually though was as Gauleiter Vienna where he had a conversation with Hitler and someone else about hastening the process of getting the Jews out of Vienna and he made a speech to a group of European youth leaders which was published in the **Folke Shebir Backter** [ph] and which was a very foolish thing from his point of view because I think more than anything it earned him, it caused him to get a sentence of 20 years. He concluded that speech more or less with these words. If I have sent thousands upon thousands of Jews into the ghettoes of the east, I consider it a contribution to humanity. And it was that quotation that I finished my summation to the tribunal. And I think the tribunal mentions it in his judgment. The strange thing is, is that at a certain point, he started to lose favor with Hitler. And this is partly because of Goebbels not liking the competition of a Von Schirach as someone who is well known to Hitler and all that.

But anyway Henrietta Von Schirach his wife and he, saw some Jews being pushed around in one of the occupied countries. I think it was Holland. I'm not sure. They were being rounded up and

put on a train. And they came down to **Berchtesgaden** to visit Hitler and Henrietta had been quite upset by this and so she mentions it to Hitler and there's some confirmation by von Schirach himself that this was a kind of dirty bunch of actions. And Hitler became extremely agitated and made some kind of a comment. And after that Schirach was not in good graces. And I think during the last two years of the war never saw Hitler. But Hitler did keep him on as Gauleiter of Vienna but he placed around him other people who had quite a bit of influence and power. He could kind of stop the influence of Schirach if they wanted to.

Q: Were they his original ideas, these sort of way of indoctrinating boys. I think they joined the Hitler Youth at quite young ages.

A: Yes, almost required for all the Aryan young men.

Q: It seems quite fascinating the way in which the views that the Nazis wanted would be inculcated in these young boys. They'd be taken away from their home environment and so on. Do you have any thoughts about that, how effectively they were indoctrinated and how dangerous that was?

A: Well the indoctrination of the German youth was a high point in the whole Nazi creed and that was one of the first stages through which they were marched as they went along toward becoming members of the army or the SA or in some cases the SS. Hitler wanted to – and Goebbels wanted to have control of the German mind and the German spirit and so naturally they directed a lot of attention to the Hitler Youth. They dressed them up in their uniforms and had all kinds of rallies and at the party rallies of – in Nuremberg and so on they would have marching demonstrations with them in their uniforms so they're given a lot of attention.

Q: Was there family opposition to their sons going off and joining the Hitler **Jugend.**

A: I don't have any knowledge about that. I imagine that some people didn't like it and that some people were glad about it. I don't know. I don't have that much.

Q: The 20 year sentence von Schirach got, was that a disappointment to you or –

A: I didn't think much of it at the time. I just didn't think much of it at the time. I was glad he was found guilty. I, my main feeling was that on the whole having him in the case had helped expose a lot more about the Nazi regime. And that was that. But I didn't necessarily feel one way or the other about the length of the sentence. I don't have any feelings about that.

Q: Did you with any of the, I mean observing the sentence of the defendants have any particular thoughts. You had succeeded with your cases. I don't know how involved you felt in observing other defendants and their verdicts.

A: I don't get the question.

Q: I wondered if you remember or if you had strong views about the sentences imposed on the defendants.

A: I don't think that any of us, particularly thought about whether there were too many death sentences or too few. I think the prosecution had been generally indicating that they favored heavy sentences for all of the defendants but when the judgement came down we were so glad to see its coverage of the history, the exposition, the exposing that it made of what had happened and that there were findings of guilt for very specific things with respect to the defendants.
I think there was some feeling that the three defendants who were found not guilty should have been found guilty but there was very little talk about that at the time, at the time of the judgement. I think that overall we were just thought we had pretty much accomplished our mission. So actually though I thought Fritzche was at a lower level than Julius Streicher in many ways. But on the other hand he had more influence with larger numbers of Germans in terms of creating anti-Semitism. And encouraging hatred of the Germans. And I was also convinced that when he was on an assignment to the Soviet Union he did get to know about the **Einzatsgruppen** but we could never prove that beyond a reasonable doubt. And so the tribunal didn't give us, well the tribunal didn't really have a good basis for making a finding on that.

Q: The one person who in my reading seems to have been most skillful in manipulating his position if you like, was Speer, Albert Speer. Did you follow his case closely and –

A: Relatively closely and after the trial I had one of my deputies, John **Sharmatz,** interview him in connection with the industrialists, the cases against some of the leading industrialists of IG Farben, Krupp and **Flik**. And he just took the position that he did not want to be a part of incriminating anybody that he would discuss facts about general developments, but he wouldn't go into anything about particular people.
This is after the trial now, when he was either awaiting going up to Spandau where they were imprisoned or after he was in Spandau. I forget which. I think all of us rather credited Speer with his general statement that there is a collective responsibility by people at the top of a dictatorship for all the acts of the dictatorship, even if they were not personally involved in all of them. And of course that has been one of the main things that people have pointed to with respect to the whole Speer case. And from the very beginning of the trial he was willing to take some responsibility. And he was the main leader of the anti-Goering group among the defendants. I don't know anything about the details of that except what I have read from other sources. From Speer himself and from Gilbert, Dr. Gilbert's book.

Q: How much of the time would you actually be in the courtroom? Would you be observing there or would you just go in when you were presenting your cases?

A: Well obviously I had to be there when I was presenting my cases. But apart from that, I would go when there were specially important things in which I was interested. And obviously at the time of the reading of the judgement I was there throughout and during the sentencing of each of the judges I was there. During the main part of the trial, I was very busy working up evidence and getting ready for the later trials, preparing for the later trials. So I would not be in the courtroom but maybe a half hour each day going in to see how things were going. I would rely on what was going on in the courtroom. I would rely upon daily summaries which were made and circulated among the prosecution as to what was going on. And also we had a general idea of course in advance as to what was going to happen on a particular day and if I was specially interested I'd go in.

But I relied a good deal on reading the transcript or the summary, daily summaries rather than sitting in the courtroom hour by hour which was pretty slow, tedious work.

Q: I wondered if you have any particular memories about what it was like to observe the defendants. We see photos and so on. You were there. Whether it really seemed like they were an ordinary group of men or whether there was something about their demeanor or aspect that sheds light on what happened.

A: As far as looks were concerned, the defendants were a very diverse looking lot. I would look at the dock and now and then catch the eye of a particular defendant and then normally either he or I would avert our eye

Margaret West: This is a continuation of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum interview with Drexel Sprecher. This is tape number 3, side A. Hess in the dock.

Drexel Sprecher: I think probably more than any other defendant I, my eyes would catch the eyes of the defendant Hess more often. But as soon as that would happen he normally would avert his eyes and look somewhere else again. I have no other feelings about having gazed at the individual defendants and not – it got to be a pretty customary thing when every day you walk past the dock and sit down and look at 21 men sitting there. And then you just got to accept it as a part of the daily business, the daily routine. I have no special recall of behavior of defendants in the dock, apart from such things as the unusual behavior of Goering that day when he had thrown his pencil in the dock and I went up there and handed him a pencil. But that was, there was nothing else similar to that.

Q: Also to what extent was the trial the sort of headline story in Germany and in the United States?

A: Well the trial at first of course received a tremendous amount of publicity in this country. There was, there were certainly I think nearly a hundred or more correspondents there from different countries around the world. My parents now and then sent me clippings from some of the Midwestern papers like the Chicago Tribune as to what was going on. I just didn't pay too much attention to it. You see and I didn't have access to the American newspapers. We basically relied on the Paris Herald Tribune for, apart from the Stars and Stripes the army newspaper, for getting our news. I didn't pay too much attention to the details of it. I wasn't in a position to.

Q: Tell me about the IG Farben case.

A: Well the IG Farben case was to me the most interesting of the three cases against leading German industrialists. They were the largest concern, industrial concern in Germany. And they were in the chemical field as well as several other fields. And the head of the **Aufsigzrat [**ph**]**, the supervisory board of IG Farben, Carl **Krauch** was also – was chosen by the defendant Goering to head up a special unit which in the Four Year Plan, which had to do with focusing industry on war production and things like that.

Q: The Four Year Plan was the Nazi –

A: The Four Year Plan was basically the basic economic plan of the Nazis for rearming Germany and making it more self-sufficient less dependent on imports, building up the armament industry and Krauch played a very major role in that. The concern was very much involved in slave labor in that large numbers of foreign laborers were imported to work in Farben plants. It was very much involved with respect to Auschwitz where they built a plant right near the concentration camp and used concentration camp labor. And one of the defendants in the IG Farben case, **Dürrfeld** was the head of that plant next to Auschwitz and so he was a logical defendant to include.
I interrogated before the trial Von **Schnitzler** who was the head of the **Aufmanischaushuss** [ph], the commercial committee of the **Forshtine**, of the managing board of the IG Farben case. And he was quite outgoing. Why yes, of course, what could we do except support them and I was, did that and I'm sorry about it and so on. This was not a position that was taken by most of

defense and Schnitzler declined to testify because the court ruled that the affidavits and the interrogations we had of him from before the trial, could not be introduced against other defendants than him. It's a very peculiar ruling actually unless he took the stand and could be cross examined about them. He refused to take the stand and so a lot of these admissions that he had made were according to the court's ruling valid only as to him. I forget the sentence he got but it wasn't, it was a very small sentence. By the time that sentence came down the tribunals in Nuremberg had become very accustomed to giving relatively small sentences for most of the defendants, except the SS defendants.

Q: You had been chief counsel in that case?

A: I was head of the IG Farben trial team. The chief counsel of course was General Taylor himself as the chief prosecutor. And he had a deputy chief counsel, Josiah **Dubois** who has written a book called the Devil's Chemists about that IG Farben case. And Joe Dubois worked with Taylor on the indictment, the opening statements, and things like that. I handled almost all the court work. I was the main lawyer in the courtroom and I questioned most of the defendants. Dubois did very little of that kind of thing.

Q: Where would that case fit in the history of the era? I mean was that the principle case against the industrialists?

A: Yes.

Q: And the impact of the findings. I just wondered with historical perspective what you think.

A: Well I think the, each of the industrialists' cases brought home to a lot of people, including certainly the Germans that their industry and I think most of them knew this, that their industry had been placed under directives and quite willingly accepted a situation where economically they gained power and there was hardly any unemployment in Germany and the concerns were doing very well. I never thought of any intimate conspiracy between these leaders and the top leaders of the Nazi regime. What conspiracy charges there were, were made were dismissed by

the tribunal on the ground of we had to prove beyond a reasonable doubt in the Farben case there was any planned conspiracy. Our argument was that it was accessorial, namely that they had supported and joined even though they hadn't been in on the detailed planning of military operations, they knew roughly, speaking that the regime was aggressive and that they cooperated with the regime after it invaded other countries. They gladly took over a number of concerns in the occupied countries and either incorporated them into the IG Farben or made collaborative arrangements with them so that German armament industry benefited. They were, a number of the defendants were convicted of the slave labor charges and spoliation charges. None of them were convicted of aggressive war.

Q: What were the other cases that you worked on after IG Farben?

A: Well having been there longer than any of the other counsel and having been the supervisor of the largest number of people underneath in any one or two divisions, a tremendous amount of material flowed through my hands and I made suggestions about how some of that might be used. I made suggestions to some of the counsel as to what cases they might want to work on.
I, in the last six months of the trial, I was left in charge and I made the -- spoke the last words to an American tribunal. I think I mentioned to you yesterday in the ministries case. It was the rebuttal argument after the defense had made their arguments.
I,+ really the Krupp case and the Flik case were based on documents which had been collected underneath, in my economics division. I was head of the economics division before it was split off into these three trial groups, you might say. So I contributed to all three of those cases. And that's about it.

Q: What was happening in Germany in these years prior to your leaving? You left in 1951.

A: 49.

Q: You left in 1949. What changes were taking place in Germany?

A: Well Germany was slowly recovering economically. A tremendous amount of work was

being done to clear up the debris which had been caused by the bombings and so forth. More people were being employed again and the ordinary kinds of work. Transportation system was working quite well. You saw people on the street. They began to look a little better dressed than they had at the end of the war. You could go into German cafes and see Germans drinking beer or eating food in a quite normal way. The changes represented partly the disengagement of our military forces, being pulled back, made less obvious in the occupation. There was much less attention being given to the war crimes trials in the national press. There still was a lot of attention given to them in the German press.

Q: Do you know what that, what kind of coverage there was in the German press? Would they suggest that these were the trials sort of unduly vindictive or would they be factual coverage without any viewpoint of that kind?

A: I think on the whole the press felt some constraints because it, it was the allies were occupying Germany and obviously the, at the early part of the, in the early years just after the war, the press was supervised in the sense that most of the older persons who'd been journalists or top journalists in control of the press were removed and not an influence. And, in one case that I recall, the one of the German newspapers severely criticized one of the defendants in the Nuremberg trials. And the tribunal took that press to task because it had kind of threatened that this defense counsel would be penalized for his work. I forget the exact case. I may remember it. If I do I'll recall it to you later.
Germany was beginning to move toward becoming a sovereign state again and so there was more freedom of the press. I had some influence on how the Germans were interacting about the trial in one case. General Gill who was administrative deputy to Justice Jackson, the chief prosecutor, arranged so that the only people who could attend the, in the visitors part of the trial, were those who had passes from somebody or other else. And he passed out a certain number of tickets you might say to a number of division heads and so on. And there were almost none left for Germans. So I talked to Robert Kempner who was the only German born prosecutor in the trial. He's written several books since, as you know. And he was very upset about it as well. So I wrote a letter to Justice Jackson in which I complained about this policy. And I said that I didn't think enough Germans that wanted to attend could do so underneath General Gill's policy.

Jackson referred the memo to General Gill. General Gill called me in and said he was going to tap my hand slightly for having written that memo. And that I didn't understand all the problems that were involved and security and all that. And I said all the defendants, all the Germans who were Kempner and I wanted to get in there were probably anti-Nazi in the first place and that's why they wanted to, partly wanted to attend the trial. And we weren't able to get all of them in. They changed the regulation so that we were able to get in, on our recommendation, any Germans that we wanted to. And what happened was that the former trade union leaders who had survived would tell their friends, you want to have a ticket to the trial. And they'd say yes and we'd get it for them. The same way with Kempner had a lot of people who a lot of Germans who he wanted to allow to come into the trial. And they were allowed in.

Q: Did you have something of a reputation as an outspoken person? Six foot three, no I wondered, you mentioned the slight scolding. Were there other occasions when that happened?

A: Scold, you mean the scolding from General Gill. No I don't recall any off hand. It was generally known that I was going to stay for the later trials and that I was accumulating staff that was no longer needed on the first trial. And wanted to go to the later trials, they'd come and be, they'd be attached to my subsequent proceedings division and I suppose I'm a fairly outspoken person in meetings and so on but I don't think that had any special role. Most of us prosecutors were fairly articulate.

Q: Your background knowledge and your length of time there, did you feel that that gave you a greater depth of understanding of the issues?

A: Well obviously the fact that I had traveled in Germany both before and after the Nazi regime and that I had had contacts in London with the refugees from Germany that I had worked in OSS with anti-Nazi Germans who had fought in Spain. That I trained agents who were going to jump into Germany. All of this gave me a considerable amount of knowledge and the capacity to react to the documents. Most of the American lawyers did not speak any German or very little. And that meant they were dependent greatly upon written reports that research analysts made and when they did get documents they were largely translations, whereas I was able to work, to some

extent with the original documents, although I mainly worked with staff evidence analyses which the research analysts had made. I did have a little more preparation you might say for doing the work than what a lot of the prosecutors or attorneys did have.

Q: I wondered if you or indeed the trial proceedings as a whole was handicapped by many staff members going there for a limited period of time and then returning to the United States, whereas you were there for a longer period of time?

A: Well I suppose that if you're immersed in the history of the Nuremberg regime for a longer period of time you become more adept and a little more reactive to the documentation. And you have ideas about interrogating witnesses and so on, that others that are there for a shorter time may not have. But mainly the people that were assigned to particular things during the first part of the case. At least half of them left during the defense case in the first trial. So the trial, the number of attorneys that had worked on the trial shrank toward the end. And those of us who were around the prosecution table at the end were and where the prosecutor sat, behind the prosecution table there were, there was room for most of us. Whereas at the beginning of the trial we were in the balcony, some of us. There weren't, there was a contraction in the staff there. Now there was then an increase in the staff again as they got ready for the later trials. And people were normally assigned to a particular kind of case and with a half a dozen exceptions, when most cases were over they would return to the United States. A few of them didn't. Some of them stayed throughout. Bob Kempner stayed throughout. Alexander Harney stayed throughout and a few others.

Q: I wonder what your feelings were when the time came for you to leave Germany. I would think that it would be such an immense transition. What are your thoughts about that, about that period of transition when you were leaving and going on to your next job in the United States? Were you sad to be leaving Germany?

A: No, I wasn't sad to be leaving Germany. I was still going to be working on the trials for some time because I was editor in chief of the publications of, the official publications of the last twelve trials. And I came back and worked on that in the Pentagon, in the office of the judge

advocate general for nearly two more years along with a limited staff who assisted me there in this final editing work.

Q: That would have been 1949 to 1951.

A: 51 yes.

Q: And then you worked with the, was it the salary stabilization board?

A: Yes.

Q: Was that an easy transition to the work with the stabilization board? Was it linked in any way with your Nuremberg experience?

A: Not at all. I somehow -- I met a woman, I knew a woman from the old labor board. I think it was her name was Helen Humphrey. I'm not certain any more. And she was working with the wage stabilization board or some thing or other like that, and suggested I come over and meet the general counsel of the salary stabilization board and I did. And he hired me as his deputy, his first deputy. So that was that.

Q: What bearing did your Nuremberg experience have on that work?

A: None whatsoever.

Q: I just was thinking of this immense drama that you had lived through and if it would have a huge impact.

A: Coming back in 1949 to the States was something of a shock because among other things, of course, the world was going on over here. There was almost no attention to the war crimes trials. And I recall having made a speech to a group of officers, military officers which were assembled in the Pentagon and it was amazing to me how little they knew about anything, about the war

crimes trials. And I was for many years not too happy about the amount of attention that was given to what we had, the history we had developed about the Nazi regime. So that was kind of a shock, but it had nothing to do with the work I engaged in after I finished the editing of the official volumes.

Q: What work did you do next? I know that you moved on from the Salary Stabilization Board.

A: General Telford Taylor had been asked to be administrator of the Small Defense Plants Administration which had been established, I don't know I think about 1951 or something like that. And since I had worked under him in Nuremberg and administered a number of people he had thought I could do a pretty good job of administration in the Small Defense Plants administration. There was no connection between Nuremberg and the work of the Small Defense Plants Administration except that Taylor had been my boss during the last three years in Nuremberg and now was my boss for another six months or so. And I had under me the usual organization management sections, the personnel section, the finance section and I became kind of an administrator. And I arranged the conferences where we took the top leaders of the different divisions in Washington to six difference conferences around the country where they could talk to the local employees of the SDPA, the Small Defense Plants Administration, about their problems and about what the policy was and where we were going et cetera.
So that's that.

Q: Were you at this time continuing to follow what was happening in Germany? Were you taking an active interest or did you tend to put it behind you?

A: Well sort of in between. What was going on in Germany was not of central concern. I didn't have access to much detail about what was occurring. I received the publication of the city of Nuremberg which, copies of which you'll find there on the floor. It's a beautiful magazine and they sent me this every time it was published. I didn't subscribe to it but they felt I had been around Nuremberg long enough so I ought to get their magazine. Apart from that I read the Washington Post and nothing more. I had no contacts with our allied forces or with intelligence agencies that had anything to do with what was going on over there. I was a real civilian.

Q: Also would your Nuremberg experiences be in your mind as in the decades that passed when different things would be happening in the United States. I can think of the McCarthy era, of your involvement in politics and so on. Would this be sort of an ever present part of your mental thinking, remembering and thinking about what had happened in Germany?

A: You cannot have gone through the experience of trying a large number of the German leaders in the Nazi regime without its having a tremendous impact upon your whole life. I mean the revelations of what could happen to a modern country were astounding. And it had, it has, it left a lot of earmarks on my life, yes.

Q: You were involved in the Democratic party, would that also be related to Nuremberg? I even think of, I'm assuming that even in bringing up your children there would be things you'd share with them that would sort of inform their thinking, sharing your knowledge and insights.

A: I suppose my children realize that Nuremberg was the most important thing that happened in my life and that I showed that in different ways. But I didn't sit down with them and explain it in any great details that had happened. They have attended conferences where I have spoken since Nuremberg, especially in the last several years. I don't have anything else on that.

Q: Are they involved in politics?

A: Yes, two of them are. My daughter Karen has done advance work for President Clinton's campaigns and my son has worked in California with some Democrats. But my getting into the Democratic party had nothing, to the leadership of the Democratic party and becoming deputy chairman for organization, had nothing to do with Nuremberg.

Q: Tell me about your role in the Democratic party.

A: Paul Butler was chosen as the chairman of the Democratic National Committee in about 1955 I believe. And I had had some experience running a small business concern, the Potomac

Construction Company and I had some connections to people who were interested in small business. And I went to, down to the National Committee and somehow got an interview with Paul Butler, the chairman. And he hired me in 1956 to head the small business division of the Democratic National Committee. That division was composed of me and my secretary. But we did have an advisory committee on small business which included Senator Sparkman, the head of the small business committee of the Senate and Congressman Wright Patman, the head of the small business committee of the House of Representatives. And we called this advisory committee into the national headquarters and we published some statements of position through the democratic digest. We made some releases and at the 1956 convention we made some kind of reports, I don't remember exactly what about small businesses. And we encouraged a strong plank in the Democratic party platform about supporting small business more.

Then I left for a time and went down to the Hill to work for the House small business committee under Congressman Wright Patman. And after a time when that work came to its end and they were reducing the staff, so I came back to the Democratic National Committee in 1957 and Paul Butler and I had a discussion. He told me that they were thinking of forming a new wing of the Democratic party which would be concerned entirely with organizational matters, strengthening the party's organization from precinct level, county level or city level, county level, state level, all the way up. And that somehow we had to get these party activists more involved on a regular basis.

And he asked me if I would like to undertake that job and I said yes, provided I didn't have to travel too much because I had been overseas and all that. I was wanting to stay home more. So he sent me out to Michigan to see Neil Stabler who later became a congressman from Michigan and he was head of the advisory committee on political organization to the Democratic National Committee. And I stayed out there for two days and met with all the main political leaders in Michigan and Stabler, and they kind of grilled me about this and that. And I came up with the positive rating and I was in the room with Neil Stabler when he called Paul Butler, by telephone, and he said Paul you've not got a, we've now approved your new deputy chairman for political organization. And then he smiled and that was it. For the next three years I did work for the Democratic National Committee and again I organized a lot of regional meetings where we brought in, particularly some behavioral scientists, professors and so on. So we got more of an intellectual mix at the top levels and a lot of conferences were arranged where people who were

interested in organizational development, most of whom would be liberal Democrats, were able to interact with party leaders at the state and it kind of helped change the complexion of influence within the party so that the more intellectuals became involved and helped conduct a lot of conferences out in the states and things like that.

Q: And that has a lasting impact I assume.

A: Anything you do in politics has some inheritance. That's, I don't measure what its impact has been.

Q: Have you remained politically active since that time?

A: No, I've maintained some friendships and I've made minor contributions to the various committees, to the House, the Senate and the Democratic committee. But after 1960 I became involved in training and consulting work with state organizations, various federal agencies in order to develop managers who had a broader aspect, a broader conception of their task and causing them to think about their intercommunications with one another and the fact that in groups always grew up and what were their effects and how to have them be more positive than negative et cetera, et cetera.
I later held, was a part of leadership conferences with National Security Agency, with the Labor Department, with a number of the federal agencies and we formed an organization called Leadership Resources and a behavioral scientist by the name of Gordon, Professor Gordon **Lippett** was the head of that and he brought in some other professors and we --

Q: This is a continuation of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum interview with Drexel Sprecher. This is tape number three, side B. Tell me more about the –

A: Leadership Resources became a very active training and consulting organization. In connection with the riots, the civil rights riots in 1968 and so on, we were called in to, by the International Association Chiefs of Police in the Department of Justice to lead a number of

conferences of police chiefs all over the country. And I was, probably handled more of that than anybody else did and we published with some of the police chief leaders some monographs which were widely circulated among the police which are entitled quote The Police Leader Looks at Unrest within the department, changing nature of police organization and motivation. Communications problems. And the whole, kind of the whole management course you might say for adults. Adult training. Why I got into this is largely because I had a certain amount of training in psychology over the years. And I became very interested in this because of the help which a lot of these behavioral scientists had given to the Democratic National Committee during the time I was deputy chairman. Many of them like Professor Lippett and Professor Warren Schmitt gave their time, provided we paid their expenses to come to these conferences and they would put on conferences which was very much liked by the people we asked or the people who attended which would be the state leaders of the Democratic party and some of the larger cities.

Then we did similar, Leadership Resources did similar conference work building up management with a large number of federal agencies. We didn't have too much competition at that time and I got to know the training directors of a number of the agencies. We also did, worked for Westinghouse Company. We held a number of leadership conferences with their supervisors. And as a matter of fact, after several years of industry came to be as much a part of our work as with the federal agencies' work. So the organization had quite an influence.

Q: You tell me what was happening in the United States then. Certainly the country was prospering and it would be a booming time economically. And I wondered if it was also a time when there was a lot of new thinking in terms of economics, management.

A: I really don't have anything to say on that.

Q: It does seem to me that your prior experiences which kind of inform your thinking deeply, but that's a personal thought. Do you feel that –

A: I can't hear you.

Q: It does seem to me that your Nuremberg experiences would be sort of informing and molding your thinking, your insights in all these matters.

A: Nuremberg had a tremendous influence on my life. Yes it obviously if you study the psychology of the leaders of a dictatorship and how they behaved, it causes you to be interested in international law, in justice, in peace, collective security, leading issues of the day. And as a consequence I have been asked to speak at a large number of conferences on the legacy of Nuremberg and these conferences involve universities, as well as the churches. The last one was last Sunday was St. John's Church downtown when 60 of the Episcopalians came in to be converted to something about the history of the trial.

The Holocaust Museum and a group of professors at -- I think, they're out of Boston. I don't know what university it is any more, put on a conference concerning the Nuremberg code and medical experiments. The first trial after the main trial, the international trial, which concerned the medical experiments that were conducted on concentration camp inmates mainly. And this was a very famous case which has had its influence and the so called Nuremberg code. It's ten basic principles that physicians are expected to follow before they conduct any experiments on human beings. They have to one, have their consent. They have to tell them expressly what the nature of the experiment is, what the dangers are. There has to be a public need for work in that area and so on. They have ten different points.

This led to a conference at the Holocaust Museum where there must have been a hundred doctors all together and two of us from Nuremberg spoke. I, on the general background of the trials and how medical experiments came to be considered. And another prosecutor took it from there to the actual case, the medical case where he was one of the prosecutors. I was not. And that was that.

Q: Was that case dealing with a whole range of medical experiments? I'm aware of some of them, sort of aviation experiments.

A: High altitude experiments. Well the range of medical experiments was quite broad. A doctor **Ivy**, I-V-Y, who later became I think head of the American Medical Association, testified at Nuremberg as an expert witness concerning medical ethics and things like that. And the

experiments covered a wide range. They lowered the temperature of human beings til they damn near died and the theory being that they were testing what happened to them, to an airplane pilot if he fell into cold water for a long time and how he might be resuscitated. Among other things they resuscitated and warmed up these bodies in the most unimaginable way. By placing two women, concentration camp inmates beside this half frozen man. Utterly incredible scenarios. There were sulfanilamide experiments. There were high altitude experiments where they took away the oxygen, the normal air as if you were, if you were flying in the air at 40,000 feet in different levels. And what influence did this have on people? Of course they gasped and some of them died from these experiments. And they kept meticulous records of that kind of thing. They did bone marrow transplants on unconsenting people. I remember a woman who'd had her leg cut very badly in order to take, do some bone marrow work some kind. And we brought her into the courtroom and she showed that big scar on the back of her leg and was available for cross examination.

Gypsies were sent for some of the experiments to a, sent from one concentration camp to another. A lot of the experimentation was done at the Dachau concentration camp. A Czech doctor by the name of **Blaha,** B-L-A-H-A was confined by the Nazis and sent to Dachau. They used his medical talents there. He had to perform autopsies and a lot of other things. He refused to do some of it but he did other parts of it because he thought he could be more helpful than hurtful. He was one of the witnesses in the first trial about these medical experiments.

Q: And he worked on some enormous number of cases.

A: I think a half a dozen types of different experiments. I don't know if that's enormous or not.

Q: I thought there were hundreds of cases.

A: Well there may have been hundreds of individuals but the types of cases were six to ten or something like that. I don't remember.

Q: In recent years you've attended Nuremberg reunions. Have you been the main force behind getting together the participants?

A: Well I have certainly been a, a force. I wouldn't say I was the major force. I have been chair of the three reunions that we've had. And I've had a committee of ten to 15 other people who were either Nuremberg prosecutors or translators or the spouses of people who were active at Nuremberg as the members of this committee. And then we put these reunions on. Normally they were two days in length. We'd have leading speakers there as well as small groups talking about different things. Senator Christopher Dodd was one of the leading speakers at the last reunion. And Dr. Latimer, one of the physicians to the defendants at Nuremberg, came and showed a number of slides about pictures that he'd taken of pictures of the defendants and so on.

Q: One author spoke of Nuremberg as having been a young man's game so that most of the participants were still in good health and I imagine it must be really wonderful to be with old colleagues again.

A: Yes.

Q: To what extent are you busy discussing international tribunals now, what the UN is doing and decisions relating to the Congo or Cambodia or Yugoslavia?

A: Well day by day I merely read the newspapers like you do, I assume. But in these conferences questions will come up about Zaire or the Congo and what do I think about the Yugoslav tribunal and what are some of the problems. And since I did make an acquaintance with Graeme Blewitt, the deputy chief prosecutor of the, at the Yugoslav tribunal, I have had some information, exchanged some letters with him, given him materials concerning the working with the defense or how the defense worked at the Nuremberg trials and things like that.
Of course I'm interested. I'm very sorry there isn't an international, a permanent international criminal court so that a regular professional staff which is broadly accepted internationally could be at work considering these things, rather than having to pick up a hit and miss type staff as you go along.

In Rwanda there have been some problems with respect to the recruitment and behavior of some of the people that have been on that staff. This would be avoided if there was a more professionally organized, permanently organized group.

Q: If that were to happen, do you think that would move us forward? That would be the one change that you'd like to see made.

A: That isn't just the one change I would make. The developing of some limitations upon what people can do when they claim to be a sovereign state which means there is no restrictions on my state. This is a whole area of a great concern. And the aggressive nature of you might say an awful lot of countries about maintaining their independence which often means behavior which is not in line with what a majority of nations would want or what is thought to be a just course of events.
The development of collective security is an extremely difficult task and the development of an international permanent court would be one part of improving collective security and insuring more justice throughout the world. It won't be a cure all, so long as human groups exist and aren't fully educated or better educated let's say. That's another thing.

Q: Tell me more about your family and marriage.

A: During the last year I was in Nuremberg Virginia Sprecher came over there and the Secretary General of the tribunal, Dr. Howard Russell and his wife had known Virginia's family and so on. He said why don't you come into Nuremberg? We'll get you in as if you were going to come, to become secretary. So they gave her some phony papers. She was on the tour with some Wellesley girls. She's Wellesley College she graduated. And so she came into Nuremberg. And the only time during those four years I was there that I had flown back to the states was just before I met her there in Nuremberg in 48. I came into my desk loaded with all the things that had accumulated during the two weeks I had been gone to the states and there was a big note says come to see pretty American girl. So I went out to this dinner at the Russells and I met Virginia. And of course she went on, back to the states, and I didn't come back for about six months but meanwhile we started to correspond. And she had been engaged to a young doctor

and she broke that up and when I came back to the states why I started to court her and we were married within six months I guess. And then we've had three children, two years apart. We were active out in the Potomac area in the Democratic affairs. The children have all done some interesting things but that's that.

Q: Let me go back in time to something else that occurred to me. In Nuremberg because that city had been a site of the Nazi rallies and so on, did you feel through your knowledge of the local people, and I assume you'd get to know some of the Germans there well. How had that affected their lives both the fact that they'd been witnesses if you like to the glorious days of the Nazis and then also the crushing defeat and the horrors of, that came with the war and devastation.

A: I don't think that we talked about it too much and I had German domestics taking care of the house that was assigned to me and so on. But these were servant women, servant girls who were very nice and we just never talked much about it. They obviously had gone through some minor clearance or they wouldn't have been given positions, allowed to work for us. But outside of that I never had much to do with them.

Some of the defense counsel I knew. Very regretful that Germany had to go through this and they would normally take the position that it wasn't easy to be independent and you must face up to the fact that when you live in a coercive authoritarian society where there's all kinds of penalties as well as all that, it's not easy to have a free mind. And a number of them would say we're glad that you are having a trial and because it is exposing things.

Often there was a lot of avoidance of talking about the Nazi regime and what had happened before. When I was out at the Faber-Castells at their hunting lodge, there was very little talk about the Nazi period, except that they all would generally like to say that we didn't have too much to do with it. We were kind of forced to be a part of things and so forth.

And as I think I said to you, Count Faber-Castell had been a colonel in the German army and he was sufficiently suspect so that as being against Hitler at the end at any rate, in the last several years so that he had no problems being de-Nazified or classified as a non-dangerous German who could run his own factory and have influence again as an employer.

Q: Was there resentment? I was thinking of imagining that if there would be German girls may be dating Americans who would be based there, that the families might be very much opposed to their I don't mean particularly women, but parents might carry this resentment because the Americans were there as victors. But I don't know. I'd be interested in your view.

A: I don't know. I mean I never, never heard anything about parents being unhappy because their daughters were going with the Americans. I just never heard anything about that. I don't think they would be. I think they were glad because they got some candy bars from their daughters and some cigarettes that they could use on the black market or whatever. I don't think there was any, very many people that attempted to limit their daughters going out with American soldiers but I'm not an expert on that. I don't know.

Q: This concludes the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum interview with Drexel Sprecher.

(end)