

# DOWNLOAD PDF LAW AND POLITICS IN THE SUBSEQUENT NUREMBERG TRIALS, 1946-1949 JONATHAN FRIEDMAN

## Chapter 1 : Nuremberg Trials bibliography - Wikipedia

*Law and Politics in the Subsequent Nuremberg Trials, â€” Jonathan Friedman 75 The Nuremberg Doctors' Trial and the Limitations of Context â€” Michael R. Marrus.*

The essay suggests that given the specific focus of the author on the genealogy of international criminal law, important legal historical questions are left unexamined. It suggests a research agenda that would focus more specifically on the centrality of the Shoah to National Socialism and argues that the current trend in historical scholarship focusing on war crimes trials as a distinct subject of inquiry could provide a fruitful basis for future socio-legal research into the Nazi state and its legal apparatus. Even supporters of the proceedings admit they were fraught with procedural, substantive and political difficulties. Both sides share a fundamental teleological and legal-genealogical understanding that draws an intellectual line from the IMT to the ICC. The disagreement between the two sides is to be found in the attribution of the appropriate qualifiers to describe the IMT and its successor courts in a battle over the very legitimacy of an emerging international criminal law regime. For one side, the trial of major German war criminals, for all its flaws and imperfections, is the first concrete international embodiment of the civilizational shift towards the international human rights order. For its critics, the trial before the IMT was little more than international politics disguised as law. Like most proponents of the current, evolving system of international criminal law, he recognizes the flaws and lacunae of the IMT proceedings, but he steadfastly maintains that for all the faults of this legal ancestor, the basic heritage of Nuremberg is a positive one. But as the title of his book indicates, Heller does not focus on the trial of the major war criminals before the IMT. The first prosecution that took place before the NMT was the Medical Case, involving 23 defendants involved in atrocities committed in the name of Nazi science. This time the accused came from the Krupp concerns charged because of their role in supporting and benefitting from Nazi aggression, enslavement and racial persecution. As Heller illustrates, this selection and grouping, at a practical level, was a strategic mistake. More details of the charges, the identity of individual accused, the result of the prosecution and where relevant the sentence for each are provided in Appendix A. The rest of the book deals helpfully with the substantive criminal offences and the sentencing issues raised in the various proceedings and with the aftermath of the trials. A final chapter traces the NMT jurisprudence and its impact on recent international criminal law. He has rescued the NMT trials from the relative obscurity in which they have languished for many years. This book brings the subsequent trials out from the shadows of the IMT and for that we should be grateful. Heller also provides us with useful summaries and analyses of often complex historical, legal materials. The effort of synthesizing tens of thousands of pages of trial transcripts, evidential material, autobiographical accounts and judicial decisions deserves our plaudits. That point, highlighted by Heller, is that international criminal law is criminal law. The discussion of the heritage of the NMT proceedings underlines the centrality of issues of criminal liability, and offers important insights about those areas of substantive criminal law that were controversial or left undetermined because of the differences in opinion among the 12 tribunals in the subsequent proceedings. He has made a clear choice about the focus of his research. The synthesizing approach that he has adopted is suited to such a project. Within those confines he has succeeded admirably. The choices made by Heller in discussing the NMT serve as a springboard to interrogate the nature of legal scholarship on the history of Nazi crimes more generally. Nuremberg was chosen as a venue for the proceedings not simply because Allied bombing had left the court building intact, but primarily because Nuremberg was the site of the infamous Nazi rallies, which were seen as the manifestation of the evil grip that Hitler and the Nazis had over a hysterical German public. The rallies were also the occasion for the drafting of the Nuremberg Laws that finally framed the long process of the legalized exclusion of Jewish Germans from the Volksgemeinschaft. Nuremberg was the locus of the Nazi perversion of law. The rule of law and civilization itself would be restored in the very place where the Nazis sought to destroy it. Of the Justice trial, Christiane Wilke has written: The portrayal of Nazi law as non-law was the

## DOWNLOAD PDF LAW AND POLITICS IN THE SUBSEQUENT NUREMBERG TRIALS, 1946-1949 JONATHAN FRIEDMAN

basis for important conceptual moves: The disqualification of all Nazi law as non-law also had the effect of depriving Nazi judges and judicial administrators of the immunity that their judicial robes might otherwise have afforded them. The accused were meant to act as the embodiment of the branches of the Nazi state and of the broader nation, which had perverted European civilization and turned the continent into a pit of barbarism. Such choices had inherent strengths and weaknesses. It may have been preferable as Heller argues to have proceeded by criminal offence, *e.* More significantly, it is also an argument that carries with it some of the main intellectual presumptions which have come to characterize many debates about the Nuremberg proceedings, both before the IMT and the NMT, as well as many other international criminal proceedings. Many inter-connected issues of some moment arise in any such discussion and most have been well traversed in the now well-established literature on transitional justice. But what his argument about the failures of strategic thinking that led to the acquittal of some defendants, especially in the industrialist cases, elides, is how or why criminal law is the genre with which to deal with the Nazi state. In summary, international criminal law must by definition proceed on the preconditional assumption that what is being dealt with is criminal behaviour and that formalized criminal trials are the best way to address the issues arising from the conduct of the individual accused. In this very important sense, law operates a taxonomical and hegemonic triage by simply asserting its own jurisdiction. Within that taxonomical structure, obvious and necessary consequences result. Some individuals will fall within the definitions of the various offences. Within a system in which rule of law values are embedded, others will fall outwith the same definitions, because there is inadequate proof, because the prosecution has not met its burden of proof, an affirmative defence has been made out, or there is some other problem with the elements and their definitions. So far so good. This view reveals major flaws at the heart of all legal discussions of the NMT and similar proceedings. First, there is an almost universal assumption which informs such discussions of war crimes cases that someone, most likely the accused, is guilty of committing unspeakable atrocities. The moral or deontological desire for justice often overdetermines the legal quest for a result, in these cases, a conviction. Ironically perhaps, reactions to acquittals in cases of those charged with war crimes or crimes against humanity most often reveal a lack of a deep attachment to rule of law values by those who are either outraged or disappointed by the not guilty verdict. Secondly, there is in such reactions a fundamental confusion concerning the relation between criminal law as a quest for conviction and the symbolic nature of these prosecutions. While Heller is not unaware of the twin function of these trials at Nuremberg, his analysis quickly elides and ignores the symbolic aspect of the prosecutions. There is a significant tendency, by both proponents and opponents of such proceedings, and for supporters of the prosecution and the defence in individual instances, to conflate the legal verdict with the appropriate historical, memorial and deontological lessons to be drawn from the trial. Any legal positivist observer would readily admit that an acquittal does not by definition mean the absence of factual guilt, let alone the lack of moral responsibility. To put the broader case briefly and concretely, an acquittal of a particular defendant accused of participating in the shooting of Ukrainian Jews in a pit outside their village in the Second World War does not mean that such a shooting did not take place, or that there was no Nazi policy of such shootings, or that local Ukrainians did not participate in the killing of their neighbours. It does not even mean that the accused did not shoot Jews. A major weakness in discussions of international criminal law in all such cases is that they too easily confuse the strictly legal with the more broadly normative issues that are always at stake in such prosecutions. With a different emphasis informing our critical analysis, we might conclude that the actual outcome of these trials is or can be less significant than their symbolic or didactic function. The selection of the defendants on the basis of a common semiotic function within the Nazi state can be, and was, constructed as an effective way of offering a collective overview of the implication of various parts of the state and civil society in Nazi Germany in the atrocities of the regime. By focusing on narrow principles and rules of international criminal law, the didactic, memorial and historical significance of the NMT proceedings could be lost or at the very least removed from active, critical consideration. At the same time, a narrow and somewhat distorted and distorting positivistic legalism also means that other broader and

## DOWNLOAD PDF LAW AND POLITICS IN THE SUBSEQUENT NUREMBERG TRIALS, 1946-1949 JONATHAN FRIEDMAN

inter-connected issues arise, which further problematize any study of the NMT process. The overarching frame of our inquiries must resist the temptation to leap from a study of criminal trials of Nazi officials and German industrialists to the conclusion that the correct, best or sole historical template for a study of the Nazi period, and even of the atrocities of the Hitler state, is that of crime, criminal law and criminalization. While this was unquestionably the ideology behind the NMT trials generally, and as Wilke has highlighted, 24 the informing matrix for the Justice trial in particular, other hermeneutics, including one that would offer a mirror image of the Nazi state as deeply imbued with a legalistic and legal self-understanding, must not be neglected. The NMT trials must always be situated in their temporal particularity. Historiography of the Nazi period, in all its constituent parts, has moved on since New archival records have emerged and new and ever evolving interpretive strategies and understandings underpin scholarship exploring the period. Thirdly, we must exercise the same caution in relation to the symbolic and didactic purposes and goals of the NMT proceedings as we do in relation to the first two issues. Simply because the prosecution proceeded on the basis of a certain symbolic grouping of the defendants, this cannot mean that the symbolism or pedagogic lessons on offer from the NMT are in any way correct or accurate, either as a matter of law or history. In other words we must neither accept nor reject the symbolic aspects of the NMT without careful, nuanced and concrete jurisprudential and historical analysis. The idea, presented in the NMT prosecutions, of the Nazi state as a vast criminal conspiracy was in its narrow legal sense and its broader symbolic purchase the result not of an objective and verifiable historical truth. Instead it was the consequence of deliberate strategic and political decisions made by the American prosecuting authorities. Any discussion of the NMT in particular must bear in mind the fact that these were American tribunals, staffed by American judges, for the most part from state courts. Without subtle analyses of the factual record of the trials, the evidence adduced, and the state of historiographic knowledge, the biases, the strengths and personal foibles of those involved, it is not possible to understand the symbolic and didactic functions of the NMT proceedings in any way that brings anything to the relevant debates. If the underpinning ideological and legal understandings of the nature of the Nazi state and its inherent criminality found in the NMT cases were ill-founded, then the substantive legal principles that emerge must, at the very least, be brought into question. This point is further exacerbated by the difficult legal analyses that are themselves required in order to understand the NMT cases. While Heller does an admirable job of carrying out these examinations, he does not take them to their logical or deeper normative conclusions. Two inter-related examples illustrate this difficulty for a future socio-legal interrogation of the NMT. The first question that arises concerns the foundational point of the nature and source of the jurisdiction of the NMT itself. This position may then be countered, as Heller also argues in Chapter 5, by the assertion that while their origins are traced to a sovereign command, the various NMT proceedings relied on norms derived solely from international law as the substantive source of liability of the accused. An important debate, of course, goes to the fundamental issue of whether such norms in fact existed at the time. It is impossible to trace these arguments here. Suffice it to say that only if these norms pre-existed the positivistic imposition of the NMT structures is it possible to trace an arguably legitimate normative family tree from Nuremberg to The Hague. Heller, like most international criminal lawyers with an historical bent, eschews an in-depth study of these issues from a point of view that is presumptively normatively neutral. Because they believe in international criminal law, they believe in the legitimacy of its origins. Even more problematic from the perspective of law and history in the NMT context is the vexed question of the infamous nexus requirement for crimes against humanity. Some followed the traditional IMT position and insisted that such a nexus was required, while others took the wording of Control Council Law No 10 as it was written. At its heart, this is more than a simple question about the wording of the operative definitions of the substantive criminal offences charged and tried before the NMT. It is also something more than a legal question going to the issue of whether acts committed against German citizens, before the war began, would be treated as international crimes. The debates around the nexus issue for crimes against humanity should instead serve as a starting point to highlight the normative confusions and legal historical misunderstandings that continue to plague legal renderings of the

## DOWNLOAD PDF LAW AND POLITICS IN THE SUBSEQUENT NUREMBERG TRIALS, 1946-1949 JONATHAN FRIEDMAN

Shoah today. It is now trite to point out that the proceedings of the IMT virtually ignored those events that have become known as the Holocaust. The prosecutorial focus on the Nazi state as one aimed at aggressive expansionism meant that the centrality of the destruction of European Jewry to the Nazi project was left fundamentally unexplored. Thus the NMT cases missed a crucial historical point. The Nazi state was not a criminal conspiracy to wage aggressive war on its neighbours. It killed Jews because Jews posed the most serious biological threat to the survival of the German Volk. Because the NMT prosecution philosophy, with its emphasis on an overarching semiotics of the Hitler state, failed to grasp the centrality of the Jewish Question and its exterminatory logic within the Nazi worldview, its legal principles could never incorporate that understanding. Instead the point is more basic. Charges relating to crimes against humanity, with or without a nexus to another substantive offence, were always situated in NMT proceedings within a set of overarching positions about the Nazi state apparatus that placed the Holocaust at the margin. If Heller eschews any detailed discussion of the Holocaust, he does so as the natural consequence of the failures of his core subject matter, the trials before the NMT. This is obviously in keeping with the emphasis in the book itself on the overall doctrinal and genealogical legacy of the NMT. However, at the broader normative level of why we should care about the prosecution of Nazi war criminals, the positioning of the NMT proceedings as legal phenomena will inevitably miss the more basic deontological concerns which should inform any such legal historical inquiries. Law and History in the Context of the Shoah Holocaust historian Michael Marrus has proposed a six-part taxonomy in relation to the study of legal proceedings regarding the Holocaust—international trials such as the IMT; zonal trials held by each of the four occupying powers in Germany in the aftermath of the defeat of the Nazi state; successor trials under restored national governments following the liberation of Europe; Holocaust-related trials of Jews charged with collaboration; 36 third-party trials conducted by countries not directly affected by Nazi atrocities such as Canada and Australia and finally Holocaust denial litigation.

# DOWNLOAD PDF LAW AND POLITICS IN THE SUBSEQUENT NUREMBERG TRIALS, 1946-1949 JONATHAN FRIEDMAN

## Chapter 2 : The Nuremberg Symposium – International March of the Living

*Law and Politics in the Subsequent Nuremberg Trials, (Jonathan Friedman) The Nuremberg Doctors' Trial and the Limitations of Context (Michael R. Marrus) "The Scars of Ravensbrück": Medical Experiments and British War Crimes Policy, (Ulf Schmidt).*

Bryce discussed her prior experience performing humanitarian aid work in Sudan and South Sudan and Ms. Umunyana shared her account of surviving the Rwanda genocide when she was four years old. The Symposium evolved from a combination of two previous programs put on by each of the two co-sponsors. See below for more info on the Symposium. The historic legal symposium took place on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the Nuremberg Race Laws and the 70th anniversary of the Nuremberg Trials. This is what the struggle for human rights and human dignity – and anti-racism and anti-hate – is all about. The Nuremberg Laws represent the most extreme distortion of law-- misusing the forms of justice to produce grave injustice. The Nuremberg Trials represent a triumph of Justice over injustice. Rights come from a recognition of wrongs. The Nuremberg laws represent the wrongs, and the Nuremberg trials reflect the rights that grew of the acknowledgment of those terrible wrongs. These laws were enacted along with a host of other discriminatory, anti-Semitic measures. The defendants were former Nazi German leaders who were involved in waging of aggressive war, committing war crimes, and committing crimes against humanity. Although many culpable persons were never brought to justice at Nuremberg or elsewhere, the Nuremberg Trials adjudicated many of the most culpable and developed the evidence that allows history to understand the scope of Nazi crimes, including the Holocaust. In , a United Nations committee codified Nuremberg Principles that are, alongside the records and precedents of the Nuremberg trial judgments themselves, important components of international law today. The gathering discussed the following themes: The Double Entendre of Nuremberg: The History of the Nuremberg Trials 3. The Holocaust, Genocide, and Human Rights: The Aftermath of the Holocaust in Europe 5. What Have We Learned? Poland and Holocaust Legacy:

## DOWNLOAD PDF LAW AND POLITICS IN THE SUBSEQUENT NUREMBERG TRIALS, 1946-1949 JONATHAN FRIEDMAN

### Chapter 3 : Nuremberg Laws | Revolv

2 Jonathan Friedman "Law and Politics in the Subsequent Nuremberg Trials, " in Patricia Heberer and Juergen Matthaeus (eds) *Atrocities on Trial: Historical Perspectives on the Politics of Prosecuting War Crimes* (University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, ).

Edit There were, I suppose, three possible courses: Which was it to be? Was it possible to let such atrocities go unpunished? It will be remembered that after the first world war alleged criminals were handed over to be tried by Germany, and what a farce that was! The majority got off and such sentences as were inflicted were derisory and were soon remitted. Defendants in the dock. At the beginning of , the Polish government-in-exile asked the British and French governments to condemn the German invasion of their country. The British initially declined to do so; however, in April , a joint British-French-Polish declaration was issued. On 1 November , the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States published their "Declaration on German Atrocities in Occupied Europe" , which gave a "full warning" that, when the Nazis were defeated, the Allies would "pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth The above declaration is without prejudice to the case of the major war criminals whose offences have no particular geographical location and who will be punished by a joint decision of the Government of the Allies. British Prime Minister Winston Churchill had then advocated a policy of summary execution in some circumstances, with the use of an Act of Attainder to circumvent legal obstacles, being dissuaded from this only by talks with US and Soviet leaders later in the war. US President Franklin D. Roosevelt , joked that perhaps 49, would do. Churchill was vigorously opposed to executions "for political purposes. The plan advocated the forced de-industrialisation of Germany and the summary execution of so-called "arch-criminals", i. Later, details were leaked to the public, generating widespread protest. The demise of the Morgenthau Plan created the need for an alternative method of dealing with the Nazi leadership. Stimson and the War Department. Truman , gave strong approval for a judicial process. After a series of negotiations between Britain, the US, Soviet Union and France, details of the trial were worked out. The trials were to commence on 20 November , in the Bavarian city of Nuremberg. At the meetings in Tehran , Yalta and Potsdam , the three major wartime powers, the United Kingdom, United States, and the Soviet Union, agreed on the format of punishment for those responsible for war crimes during World War II. France was also awarded a place on the tribunal. The legal basis for the trial was established by the London Charter , which was agreed upon by the four so-called Great Powers on 8 August , [15] and which restricted the trial to "punishment of the major war criminals of the European Axis countries". Some German war crimes defendants were tried at Nuremberg, and 1, others were tried under the traditional channels of military justice. The legal basis for the jurisdiction of the court was that defined by the Instrument of Surrender of Germany. Political authority for Germany had been transferred to the Allied Control Council which, having sovereign power over Germany, could choose to punish violations of international law and the laws of war. Because the court was limited to violations of the laws of war, it did not have jurisdiction over crimes that took place before the outbreak of war on 1 September Location Edit Leipzig and Luxembourg were briefly considered as the location for the trial. Nuremberg was considered the ceremonial birthplace of the Nazi Party. As a compromise with the Soviets, it was agreed that while the location of the trial would be Nuremberg, Berlin would be the official home of the Tribunal authorities. Participants Each of the four countries provided one judge and an alternate, as well as a prosecutor.

# DOWNLOAD PDF LAW AND POLITICS IN THE SUBSEQUENT NUREMBERG TRIALS, 1946-1949 JONATHAN FRIEDMAN

## Chapter 4 : Holdings : Atrocities on trial : | York University Libraries

Friedman, Jonathan (). "Law and Politics in the Subsequent Nuremberg Trials, ". In Patricia Heberer & Jürgen Matthäus. *Atrocities on Trial*.

Defendants in the dock The following is a bibliography of works devoted to the Nuremberg Trials. The Nuremberg Trials were a series of military tribunals , held by the victorious Allied forces of World War II , most notable for the prosecution of prominent members of the political, military, and economic leadership of the defeated Nazi Germany. The trials were held in the city of Nuremberg , Bavaria , Germany , in 1946, at the Palace of Justice. The first and best known of these trials was the Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal IMT , which tried 24 of the most important captured leaders of Nazi Germany, though several key architects of the war such as Adolf Hitler , Heinrich Himmler , and Joseph Goebbels had committed suicide before the trials began. Nazi War Criminals in America: Section of International and Comparative Law Section. The Infamous of Nuremberg. German Views of the War Trials. Southern Methodist University Press, Final Judgment; the Story of Nuremberg. The Search for Nazis in America. The University of North Carolina Press, The Crime and Punishment of I. Bower, Tom []. Blind Eye to Murder: War Crimes Trial Program in Germany, Nuremberg; the facts, the law and the consequences. The Man and His Crime. War Criminals and Punishment. McBride and Company, The Trial of the Germans. The Attorney-General of the Government of Israel v. Adolf, the Son of Adolf Karl Eichmann. The Trial of Adolf Eichmann: Record of Proceedings in the District Court of Jerusalem. Josef Schwammberger and the Nazi Past. We Shall Never Forget: An Album of Photographs, Articles and Documents. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, The Nuremberg Trial and Aggressive War. The Case of Adolf Eichmann. The Camelot Press, Chief Judge Walter B. Gregor, Neil, Haunted City: Nuremberg and the Nazi Past, New Haven: Yale University Press, United States National Archives, The House on Garibaldi Street. Heller, Kevin Jon Focal Point Publications, The case against the Nazi War criminals. Opening statement for the United States of America. Trial of war criminals. Report of to the President. Agreement establishing an International military tribunal. Zachodnia Agencja Prasowa, University of North Carolina Press. A bibliography of war crimes trials. Santa Barbara, California; Oxford, England: Eichmann in My Hands. The Nuremberg War Crimes Trial, 1945-1946 Peron and the Nazi War Criminals. Latin American Program ; no. Nazi War Criminals in Canada. Five Men at Nuremberg. Mitscherlich, Alexander and Fred Mielke. A Study in Public International Law: Nuremberg war crimes trials: Otto Ohlendorf et al. Compiled by John Mendelsohn. The Nuremberg Trial and International Law. George Ginsburgs and V. Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression. The Capture of Adolf Eichmann. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, The Capture and Trial of Adolf Eichmann. No Time Limit for these Crimes! The Brandt, Pohl, and Ohlendorf Cases. Report of Robert H. Penguin Books, , c Prosecuting Nazi War Criminals. Russell, Edward Frederick Langley. The Scourge of the Swastika. Prosecuting Nazi War Criminals in America. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, State University of New York Press, The Road to Nuremberg. The American Road to Nuremberg: The Documentary Record, Hoover Institution Press, The Anatomy of the Nuremberg Trials: The Trial of Ivan the Terrible. Doenitz at Nuremberg, a Reappraisal: War Crimes and the Military Professional. Troper, Harold Martin and Morton Weinfeld. Tusa, Ann and John Tusa. War crimes, war criminals, and war crime trials. An annotated bibliography and source book. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law. Nuernberg War Crimes Trials: Records of Case Records of the United States Nuernberg war crimes trials interrogations, Harvard University Press, Bantam Books , Nazi War Criminals in the United States: A Train of Powder. The Murderers Among Us. The Nuremberg Trials in International Law.

# DOWNLOAD PDF LAW AND POLITICS IN THE SUBSEQUENT NUREMBERG TRIALS, 1946-1949 JONATHAN FRIEDMAN

## Chapter 5 : Hitler's Generals on Trial - Wikipedia

*Jonathan Friedman. West Chester University of PA, History, Faculty Member in the Twelve Subsequent Nuremberg Trials, , " in Atrocities on Trial: The.*

The two laws were the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour, which forbade marriages and extramarital intercourse between Jews and Germans and the employment of German females under 45 in Jewish households; and the Reich Citizenship Law, which declared that only those of German or related blood were eligible to be Reich citizens; the remainder were classed as state subjects, without citizenship rights. A supplementary decree outlining the definition of who was Jewish was passed on 14 November, and the Reich Citizenship Law officially came into force on that date. The laws were expanded on 26 November to include Romani people – known at the time as "Gypsies" – and Black people. This supplementary decree defined Romanis as "enemies of the race-based state", the same category as Jews. Out of foreign policy concerns, prosecutions under the two laws did not commence until after the Summer Olympics, held in Berlin. Books considered un-German, including those by Jewish authors, were destroyed in a nationwide book burning on 10 May. Jewish citizens were harassed and subjected to violent attacks. They were actively suppressed, stripped of their citizenship and civil rights, and eventually completely removed from German society. The Nuremberg Laws had a crippling economic and social impact on the Jewish community. Persons convicted of violating the marriage laws were imprisoned, and subsequent to 8 March upon completing their sentences were re-arrested by the Gestapo and sent to Nazi concentration camps. Non-Jews gradually stopped socialising with Jews or shopping in Jewish-owned stores, many of which closed due to lack of customers. As Jews were no longer permitted to work in the civil service or government-regulated professions such as medicine and education, many middle class business owners and professionals were forced to take menial employment. Emigration was problematic, as Jews were required to remit up to 90 per cent of their wealth as a tax upon leaving the country. By it was almost impossible for potential Jewish emigrants to find a country willing to take them. Mass deportation schemes such as the Madagascar Plan proved to be impossible for the Nazis to carry out, and starting in mid-1941, the German government started mass exterminations of the Jews of Europe. In it he outlined his belief in Jewish Bolshevism, a conspiracy theory that posited the existence of an international Jewish conspiracy for world domination in which the Jews were the mortal enemy of the German people. Throughout his life Hitler never wavered in his world view as expounded in *Mein Kampf*. Discrimination against Jews intensified after the NSDAP seized power; following a month-long series of attacks by members of the *Sturmabteilung SA*; paramilitary wing of the NSDAP on Jewish businesses, synagogues, and members of the legal profession, on 1 April Hitler declared a national boycott of Jewish businesses. Citizens were harassed and subjected to violent attacks. According to Zindel, the "Gypsy problem" could not be dealt with by forced resettlement or imprisonment within Germany. He recommended identification and registration of all Roma, followed by sterilisation and deportation. In 1935, public health authorities were ordered to register all Roma and Roma Mischlinge. The draft law also called for a ban on marriage for persons with hereditary illnesses. Hitler argued against violent methods because of the damage being done to the economy, and insisted the matter must be settled through legislation. The two men arrived on 14 September. Hitler chose the most lenient version, but left vague the definition of who was a Jew. The Reich Citizenship Law declared that only those of German or related blood were eligible to be Reich citizens; the remainder were classed as state subjects, without citizenship rights. Article 1 Marriages between Jews and citizens of German or related blood are forbidden. Marriages nevertheless concluded are invalid, even if concluded abroad to circumvent this law. Annulment proceedings can be initiated only by the state prosecutor. They are, on the other hand, permitted to display the Jewish colours. The exercise of this right is protected by the state. Any person violating the provisions under Articles 3 or 4 will be punished with prison with hard labour for up to one year and a fine, or with one or the

## DOWNLOAD PDF LAW AND POLITICS IN THE SUBSEQUENT NUREMBERG TRIALS, 1946-1949 JONATHAN FRIEDMAN

other of these penalties. Article 1 A subject of the state is a person who enjoys the protection of the German Reich and who in consequence has specific obligations toward it. The status of subject of the state is acquired in accordance with the provisions of the Reich and the Reich Citizenship Law. Reich citizenship is acquired through the granting of a Reich citizenship certificate. The Reich citizen is the sole bearer of full political rights in accordance with the law.

### Chapter 6 : Nuremberg Trials | Military Wiki | FANDOM powered by Wikia

*Allied Courts and German Crimes in the Context of Nuremberg* / *Law and Politics in the Subsequent Nuremberg Trials*, / Jonathan Friedman-- *The Nuremberg Doctors' Trial and the Limitations of Context* / Michael R. Marrus-- "The Scars of Ravensbruck": *Medical Experiments and British War Crimes Policy*, / Ulf Schmidt-- *The*.

### Chapter 7 : Jonathan Friedman | West Chester University of PA - blog.quintoapp.com

See, for example, Michael Marrus, "The Nuremberg Doctors' Trial and the Limitations of Context," and Jonathan Friedman, "Law and Politics in the Subsequent Nuremberg Trials, , in Heberer and MatthÄus, *Atrocities on Trial*;

### Chapter 8 : 1, results in SearchWorks catalog

*The Secondary Nuremberg Tribunals were war crime trials that took place in the American Jonathan Friedman, Law and Politics in the Subsequent Nuremberg Trials.*

### Chapter 9 : Read eBooks online | World Heritage Encyclopedia | Nuremberg Laws

*Law and Politics in the Subsequent Nuremberg Trials*, 75 *The Nuremberg Doctors' Trial and the Limitations of Context*