



MIECZYŚŁAW KIETA

Fourth day of the hearing, 27 November 1947

The session commenced at 9.00 a.m., with the composition of the Tribunal the same as previous.

Prosecutor Cyprian: Before the present session begins, I would like to present three motions and request that these be admitted in the afternoon. Namely, [I motion] for the following witnesses: Zdzisław Michalak, Jerzy Pozimski and Władysław Dudek to be heard. The testimony of these witnesses will allow us to determine certain data concerning the activities of the accused Aumeier, Plagge, Breitwieser and Koch.

Defense attorney Rappaport: I do not oppose these motions.

Presiding Judge: The Tribunal has decided to admit the said motions as to evidence.

Defense attorney Rappaport: As regards the accused Dinges, I would request the examination of witness Kazimierz Sondacz, who in any case is to be heard today in the afternoon. At the same time, I request a decision as to the witnesses whom I have requested to be heard in my written motion.

Presiding Judge: The Tribunal's decision concerning the motions of the defense counsel shall be announced later.

Witness: Mieczysław Kieta.

Prosecutor Dr. Szewczyk: The witness has mentioned in his testimony that he was punished, and before that beaten up by Aumeier, this in connection with the fact that one of the prisoners had hid under a bed in the block.

Witness: Yes.

Prosecutor Szewczyk: Was the witness at the time responsible for the fact that the said person hid himself?

Witness: I do not consider myself responsible. The room supervisor was responsible, I was only charged with cleaning the hall, that is preparing it for the admission of new prisoners.

Prosecutor Szewczyk: Did the witness have an opportunity to excuse himself, to explain?

Witness: There was absolutely no possibility of excusing or explaining oneself to any of the SS men. You could only reply thus: *jawohl*, provided you were not interrupted by a blow to the face.

Prosecutor Szewczyk: The witness testified that he was punished by being flogged with a cable. Was this punishment administered in accordance with the regulations, in other words was it approved by the headquarters in Oranienburg?

Witness: This would have been impossible, for the sentence was handed out some five or ten minutes after the incident. My sentence was given summarily by Aumeier, while he was seated at the desk of the *Rapportführer* (report leader].

Prosecutor Szewczyk: The witness mentioned that during his period of incarceration a transport of children from the Zamość region was put to death using lethal injections. Can the witness provide any details about how this was carried out?

Witness: I saw everything through the window of hall 8 in block 20. The window opened onto the courtyard between blocks 20 and 21, that is the infectious diseases and surgical blocks. I was convalescing after a bout of typhus fever, and my bed was near the window. This happened either in the beginning of March, or towards the end of February 1943. A few dozen children aged between 8 and 12 were led into the courtyard. They were brought in by Klehr and another SS man, who stood them against the wall of block 21. The children were at ease, and waited some two hours for their execution. While they were waiting, an SS man took one of the boys and sent him to block 28, where – as I later learned – the child was employed as a runner, and thereby survived. The children had no idea that they were waiting to be killed; they played around and threw snowballs at each other.

At around 1.00 p.m. they were led out through the side exit to block 20, undressed in the laundry next to the *Baderaum* [bathroom], and thereafter taken to the dispensary – where Klehr was waiting – and done away with by means of phenol injections. The only trace of them was a pile of children's clothes and shoes, which our personnel later took to the dressing room. That is all that I know regarding the matter.

Prosecutor Szewczyk: Did any of the accused appear in the vicinity of this group of children? Did the witness see any one of them?

Witness: No, I did not.

Prosecutor: The witness mentioned that in Rajsko, where he worked for some length of time, the Germans performed experiments concerning malaria, and that the negative results of malaria – as the witness himself said – were sent to Majdanek. What are we to understand by this, that “the negative results of malaria were sent to Majdanek”?

Witness: What I meant was that early in the summer of 1940 – this was in the first two months of existence of the Hygiene Institute – the Germans examined patients (and also those healthy prisoners who had previously been referred to the camp hospital due to having malaria) in order to determine whether their blood still contained any malaria bacteria. A positive result, that is one that showed that a prisoner may be a carrier of malaria, led to inclusion in a transport (I cannot specify the number of prisoners) which was sent to Majdanek in the beginning of summer – either towards the end of May or in the beginning of June. I learned this from some of the SS men who went there, and also from camp personnel who had knowledge of these matters. Furthermore, I remember this quite well because one Ołpiński – he was the leading informer of the political department in the camp – turned to me with some question concerning the selection of malaria patients; specifically, he was interested in the fates of these people and the techniques used by the Germans to perform tests. Since at that time I was already working in the Hygiene Institute, he probably assumed that I would be able to provide him with some information. Initially I did not know who Ołpiński was, but I was warned by Dr. Dien and the doctors from block 20, who said that once he had received information – any information – from someone, he would report that person to the political department, following which he or she would be liquidated at block 11.

Prosecutor: Could the witness state what role the accused Münch played in the malaria experiments?

Witness: At the time, Münch had not yet arrived at the laboratory. He appeared only in October. Then, in May and June, he was not involved in any work at the laboratory.

Prosecutor: Regarding the accused Münch, the witness stated yesterday that he occupied himself with rheumatism. Does the witness have a medical education?

Witness: No. I am a journalist, I received a liberal education.



Prosecutor: Please tell us what the accused Münch was occupied with as regards the treatment of rheumatism, or experimentation in this field.

Witness: This whole thing came into being only in the summer of 1944. I know that the patients who were sent to block 10 suffered from rheumatism or arthritis.

Presiding Judge: The witness has already said this.

Prosecutor: Yes, but only in the sense that the witness was unable to determine what Münch's activities consisted in, so [may the witness] please specify what Münch actually did as regards rheumatism?

Witness: Münch occupied himself with producing an autovaccine. Individual patients were to receive an autovaccine against rheumatism. Its production took place in the laboratory and in this I had no direct involvement, for at the Hygiene Institute I was in charge of the warehouse for measurement apparatuses, however I did bring in 1 cm ampoules for the autovaccine, which were made from brown glass, to the warehouse. I know that this autogenous vaccine was produced by prisoners under Münch's supervision, whereafter it was sent to the camp and the inmates used it themselves to treat the sick. As I have already stated, referring to conversations with a friend of mine, Przybylski, and another man whose surname I do not recall (he died of tuberculosis), patients complained of these injections, they spoke of them not as a treatment, but experimentation. One cannot be surprised that they said so, for after the various experiments they could not trust anyone. Przybylski worked in very difficult conditions at the blacksmith's, and he was seriously ill with rheumatism.

Prosecutor: I would only like to establish whether Münch administered the injections himself?

Witness: I cannot say exactly, for I did not see this.

Prosecutor: The witness has also mentioned corrosive ulcers, which were particularly widespread amongst the Gypsy children in the camp. Does the witness know anything about healthy people being infected with corrosive ulcers?

Witness: No.



Prosecutor Pęchalski: Yesterday the witness mentioned the execution of a friend of his from Częstochowa who was caught trying to escape. Was he killed on the same day that he was brought back to the camp following his breakout, or perhaps on another day?

Witness: I do not know when he was captured.

Prosecutor: No? Thank you.

Prosecutor: Did Aumeier frequently come to the camp and the roll call square?

Witness: Aumeier frequently assisted at roll call and was usually present at every public execution – unless he was away on official matters. He assisted at each of the larger searches carried out before holidays; these would be conducted over a period of days and targeted every *kommando* that passed through the camp gate. I remember vividly how before Easter in 1943, when 12,000 people were marching around the roll call square with their arms raised, the SS men and block wardens searched through their pockets – and even looked into their underwear – to see if they were not hiding any additional items of clothing, such as sweaters, etc. Aumeier stood on the steps of block 15 and looked on.

Prosecutor: Was Grabner present at these executions?

Witness: I did not see the accused Grabner, and so it is difficult for me to say something with certainty.

Prosecutor: Was Aumeier aware of the prisoners' living conditions, of whether they were hungry or properly dressed, what their living quarters looked like, and that inmates were being killed while working in the *kommandos*?

Witness: It is difficult to provide an answer to all these questions at once. But he must have seen the bodies of those killed. Aumeier, like the other SS men, could not stand entering the prisoners' quarters; he had assistants who performed these chores.

Prosecutor: When the witness was incarcerated at the camp, were the roll calls long?

Witness: When Aumeier was there, they lasted some three – four hours, and we felt the difference when Liebehenschel took over.

Prosecutor: Were the sick required to attend roll call?

Witness: Yes. Specifically those who were in the barracks, for patients in the infirmary did not have to be present.

Prosecutor: Does the witness have any knowledge of the liquidation of the *Effektenkammer* [prisoners' assets warehouse] and the *Bekleidungskammer* [clothing warehouse]?

Witness: In January 1943, when I was being driven on a cart for delousing in a 30-degree frost, we passed by a cart from block 11, which was going in the opposite direction; it was carrying bodies and blood was dripping down its sides. These coffins had a lot to do with the people from block 24. At the time, the Germans were carrying out a partial liquidation of the *Effektenkammer* and the *Bekleidungskammer*. Palitzsch himself shot a few people, in order to get rid of those standing in the frost.

Prosecutor: Did Aumeier and Grabner take part in this? Did the witness see them?

Witness: No, I did not.

Defense attorney Druszkowski: When did the witness come into contact with Münch?

Witness: This was in 1943, and I accompanied him until 25 October 1944.

Defense attorney: The witness mentioned that his friend, Przybylski, ran a high fever. Was this caused by the injection given him by Münch?

Witness: This I do not know.

Defense attorney Kossek: I would ask the witness to tell us what the bunker was, and when it was used.

Witness: There were three types of bunkers at block 11: [the first two were] the standing bunker and the closed bunker; the latter had a cubic capacity of 6 meters and a single tiny opening. People would be locked up for various offenses. The third was the black hole, which had no light; it was in the corner, on the left side of block 11.

In 1942 and in the beginning of 1943, a great many of my friends ended up in the bunker. I myself spent four days there, all because during work I had eaten some scraps from a bowl left by one of the female *kommandos*. You could be placed in the bunker for possessing



matches, a cigarette lighter (even if had no wick), for holding your hands in your pockets when walking along a pathway in the camp, and for numerous other “crimes”.

Defense attorney: In what exactly did the cruelty of the bunker punishment consist?

Witness: After spending 12 hours in the standing bunker, you had to go to work. It was no more than 80 cm by 80 cm, and three or four inmates would be locked up simultaneously. To get into the black hole, you had to crawl – and the SS men helped you with their boots. This bunker had a pipe through which some light fell inside. In winter, it was not unusual for this orifice to be covered with snow, or fallen leaves. Those who were to be released from the black hole knew that the last stage would be the “wall of death”. I also remember that block 11 was fitted with central heating. And how does this location of ultimate SS comfort appear today? I was kept in block 11 for one month. The temperature there was terrible, right up to plus 40 degrees, while outside there would be a frost of minus 30 degrees.

Defense attorney Kossek: Was the witness present in the camp when Prime Minister Cyrankiewicz was incarcerated there?

Witness: Yes.

Defense attorney: Does the witness remember Prime Minister Cyrankiewicz being locked up in the bunker, and did the accused Liebehenschel facilitate his release therefrom?

Witness: Prime Minister Cyrankiewicz was indeed locked up in the bunker, but I know nothing about the accused Liebehenschel contributing to his release.

Defense attorney: Did the witness notice that during Liebehenschel’s tenure the conditions of prisoners improved? That they were no longer beaten, that the “wall of death” was abolished, and that the food improved.

Witness: I witnessed the demolition of the “wall of death” while I was in block 11. I also saw the destruction of the *Stehenbunkers* [standing punishment bunkers], the doors of which were thrown out into the courtyard of block 11. Prisoners said at the time that things were improving, that we would no longer be beaten. Nevertheless, *Sondergerichts* [special courts] continued to function, and truckloads of prisoners or civilians from Silesia drove up regularly, directly to the gas chambers. The gassings took place in Birkenau. The conditions in Auschwitz



itself were somewhat better then. We explained this by the fact that the Reich was in a dire state and required a considerable amount of labor, and so Liebehenschel was added as [a smoothing] oil to make the camp machine work, to strengthen the German potential.

Defense attorney: Did Liebehenschel shorten the roll calls?

Witness: Yes, he shortened them, and he even abolished the morning roll call.

Defense attorney: Can the witness confirm that Liebehenschel removed all of the criminals who acted as *kapos* and replaced them with political prisoners, in particular with Austrians?

Witness: This statement is somewhat imprecise. For a good many criminals, the so-called “green triangles” [thieves, fraudsters and forgers], remained in the camp. To an extent, they were replaced by the “red triangles”, i.e. the politicals. But one cannot generalize by stating that Liebehenschel swapped the criminals for Communists.

Defense attorney: Was there a difference as regards the treatment of prisoners when Höß and Liebehenschel were in charge? What was their approach to prisoners?

Witness: I remember a few instances when Liebehenschel, immediately after or even before roll call, would walk into block 15 or 17 without any bodyguards and greet the prisoners with the words *Gut Morgen*. I do not know whether he added *meine Herren*. Such behavior made headlines around the camp. However, people viewed these efforts – aimed at introducing greater leniency – with considerable distrust. They suspected that the “new policy” hid a threat of some sort. It is interesting to note that inmates who were familiar with the intricacies of camp life did not trust the new approach. Only simple people saw this as a colossal change and accepted it at face value.

Defense attorney Minasowicz: Does the witness know what Aumeier’s role in the camp was?

Witness: He was the first *Lagerführer* [camp leader].

Defense attorney: Was this during Höß’s tenure?

Witness: Yes.

Defense attorney: Who appeared more frequently at the camp: Aumeier or Höß?



Witness: Aumeier without a doubt, since administering the camp was his job.

Defense attorney: Did the witness see the accused at any of the selections? And – if yes – then at what types of selections, for there were a few different kinds.

Witness: I was referring only to one selection, which took place on 27 (or possibly 28) August 1942 after evening roll call in the roll call square, immediately in front of the kitchens. At the time, columns of laborers were marched before Aumeier and the *Rapportführers* [report leaders], and then arranged in the roll call square in fives. When ordered, the inmates lifted their trouser legs to show whether their legs were swollen. This was the basis for dividing the prisoners into two groups. When darkness fell, floodlights were switched on and the procedure was continued. In the light of one of these, held by a *Rapportführer*, I saw Aumeier's face.

Defense attorney: Was he present there the whole time?

Witness: I do not know, for my block was located further away and I only saw him while passing by with my *kommando*. The selection did not reach my block, because they had obviously gathered the required number of prisoners for extermination.

Defense attorney: Was it known what purpose these people were chosen for?

Witness: No, but I am aware that they were transported to Birkenau already on the same evening. Within three days my mother received a telegram informing her that my father had died. While checking in the files I found that my father had died in the evening, at 8.50 p.m., however no cause of death was given. Numerous of my friends received similar messages.

Defense attorney: Does the witness know who ordered these selections?

Witness: I have no idea.

Defense attorney Minasowicz: The witness said that the order to punish the witness with a whipping came from Aumeier?

Witness: Yes.

Defense attorney: Does the witness remember the wording of this order?

Witness: I do not, for I had been dazed by a strong blow to my face.



Defense attorney: But the witness figured out in the circumstances that the order had been issued by Aumeier?

Witness: Aumeier must have been the instigator of this punishment, since he kicked and beat me and the others. He was also present at the location where the punishment was enforced.

Defense attorney: The witness stated that he saw how the accused Aumeier personally shot a prisoner who was begging for his life. In what circumstances did this occur? Maybe the witness could have been mistaken in his observations, or perhaps due to his personal experiences these observations became more subjective, especially in light of the reputation that Aumeier had amongst the prisoners?

Witness: I saw the shooting momentarily, I heard a single shot, and I remember this man crying as he crawled before Aumeier. I must say in complete honesty that the sight terrified me so much that I walked away from the window. I was removed from the block a few days later.

Defense attorney: Did the witness observe the scene through a window?

Witness: No, there were these basket-like structures made from boards, with cracks between them. These gaps allowed one to view the area immediately in front of the wall.

Defense attorney: And so the witness saw only a small fragment of the area?

Witness: Yes.

Defense attorney: What were the lighting conditions?

Witness: It was a bright, sunny day.

Defense attorney: Did any of the victims try to break free?

Witness: Yes.

Defense attorney: Was the prisoner whom Aumeier shot at standing or lying down?

Witness: He was lying down.

Defense attorney: How many times did Aumeier fire?



Witness: I heard only one shot.

Defense attorney: The witness arrived in August 1942?

Witness: Yes.

Defense attorney: Did the witness not observe, on the basis of a comparison or information provided by other prisoners, that the conditions were even slightly better than they had been before the witness' arrival? Does the witness know where the so-called Bunawerke were located?

Witness: Yes.

Defense attorney: How far away were they?

Witness: Some 8 – 10 km distant.

Defense attorney: Did the prisoners who worked there have to go there from the camp on foot?

Witness: I had many friends who worked [there], and I know that they walked to the station, where they were put on a train, and they also returned by train. Sometimes, they had to wait a few hours for the train. They would then return to the camp at 11.00 p.m. or 0.00 a.m., and so they had only three – four hours of sleep, because we were woken up at 3.00 or 4.00 a.m.

Defense attorney: Does the witness know that barracks and a camp were erected there at that time?

Witness: They were erected there, but at a later date.

Defense attorney: In any case during the witness' period of incarceration?

Witness: Yes.

Defense attorney: Does the witness know on whose initiative these barracks were erected?

Witness: This I do not know. I know only that the *Lagerführer* there was one Schwarz.



Defense attorney: Does the witness know whether any bathing facilities were set up on the grounds of the camp at the time?

Witness: In the parent camp, there were four bathing points (*Effektenwannen*) with disinfection tubs, into which entire transports were herded together for disinfection (and the water was not changed between transports); these were located at block 20, block 28, and between blocks 1 and 2 (the *Baderaum*).

Defense attorney: Did the prisoners use these facilities?

Witness: Yes, but they tried to avoid such baths whenever possible, particularly in autumn and winter, for they had to run naked from the *Baderaum* and wait until the previous block had finished bathing.

I bathed there only once, and thereafter paid a portion of bread to be able to wash in somewhat different conditions.

Defense attorney: Does the witness know whether those who performed the hardest work received additional rations?

Witness: Those who had the difficult jobs were given two bread portions – sometimes sausage – twice a week.

Defense attorney: Does the witness know who helped secure these additional rations?

Witness: No.

Defense attorney: Was it possible to buy anything in the canteen?

Witness: In the canteen you could purchase a pencil, a notebook, a hair restorer (for we all had our heads shaved), rotten cabbage that was unsuitable for the SS canteen, and rotten snails, which the SS men did not eat. And since the majority of prisoners did not eat snails either, the cooks at our canteen used them to make a soup that was sold to inmates for 50 groszy per portion.

Defense attorney: The accused would like to make a statement shortly.

Presiding Judge: Of course.



Defense attorney Kruk: The witness testified that he encountered Müller in the camp and that his face etched itself on his memory. Can the witness describe how he behaved in his contacts with prisoners?

Witness: I remember him best from the first days, when he was my *Blockführer* [block leader], regularly bringing the block to order with punches and kicks, and hitting us with a small board. He was assisted in his efforts by the block orderly, who was a criminal. Thereafter I did not see him for a long time, seeing as I did not take part in the roll calls; we at the sick block had separate roll calls. I encountered him a few more times only in the summer of 1944, when he was taking roll call, but I do not remember any instances of prisoner maltreatment occurring during that period. My testimony concerning the beating of prisoners referred only to the first week, when he was my *Blockführer*.

The accused Aumeier: I would request the witness to inform me when he arrived at the camp?

Witness: On 17 August 1942.

The accused: I would now like to ask when and why I punished the witness with a flogging?

Witness: I have already explained this to the Esteemed Tribunal, and thus the accused must have heard what I said.

The accused: As regards the first part of the witness' statement, I did not understand exactly, for the lady who was interpreting in the booth could not keep up and thus did not provide me with the full text of the witness' statement.

Presiding Judge: I therefore ask the witness to briefly repeat the part that the accused did not hear.

Witness: Esteemed Tribunal! If I may, I would request that it be read out to the accused from the minutes.

Presiding Judge: I would however ask the witness to repeat his statement.

Witness: I was punished by the accused with a flogging because during roll call in hall 5 of block 10, when the prisoner count for our block did not tally, they found a sick man who had hidden himself there so as not to go to roll call.



The accused: Further, I would like to ask how the witness defines the term “selection”?

Witness: In exactly the same way as the accused.

Presiding Judge: The accused may proceed with his questions.

The accused: Is the witness aware that for me at least, the term “selection” refers to searching, to all types of searching – not only for the purpose of destruction.

Witness: This was such a search exactly, and its ultimate objective was confirmed by what happened to the people who were taken from Auschwitz to Birkenau.

The accused: There were searches carried out in order to move people to Birkenau, or to supplement outbound transports. I would like to inquire whether these searches – called “selections” – were attended by a doctor?

Witness: This I do not know, for I did not have the honor of meeting all the SS men from camp headquarters.

The accused: When was I supposed to have used the expression “we do not want your death, only your labor”? Under what circumstances did I say this?

Witness: This was a speech made after a roll call, and you were standing on the steps of block 5 or 6. This was in the first days of September. A *dolmetscher* did the interpreting – the sailor who later escaped from the camp.

The accused: Did the witness ever see me in the infirmary?

Witness: Luckily not.

The accused: From which point in block 10 could the witness have seen me shooting the prisoner?

Witness: I am extremely sorry that at this very moment I cannot precisely show the accused my location at the actual spot, but a description would be too long. There were four windows in the hall.

The accused: Please tell me which hall was it? To the left or to the right of the entrance?



Witness: To the right.

The accused: Yesterday the interpreter said to the left.

Witness: This is an error, the windows on the left opened onto block 9, and those on the right onto block 11.

The accused: Was this the first room or the last?

Witness: The last.

Presiding Judge: Does the accused have any further questions?

The accused: Yes. Yesterday the witness declared that he saw me during an execution by hanging. And so – when and where did it take place?

Witness: The accused must know of a number of instances, for there were quite a few such executions. This execution took place behind the fence of the women's camp, between 1 and 10 September.

The accused: Where was this?

Witness: Auschwitz I (*Stammlager*).

The accused: Or in the roll call square?

Witness: The accused knows that all public executions took place in the roll call square.

The accused: This is not true. The witness stated that one of the accused knocked out his gold tooth to purchase bread. Where could he have bought it?

Witness: Certainly not in the canteen. But there were people there who had whole baskets of bread at their disposal.

The accused: How does the witness know that this Jew was shot dead?

Presiding Judge: The witness did not say so.

The accused: Purportedly the witness did. Did the witness see how before the shooting – which I was supposed to have carried out – the prisoners left block 11?



Witness: They were led out of block 11 towards the wall.

The accused: Did the witness see the prisoners being tied with barbed wire?

Witness: The accused would want me to have seen too much. But what I saw was more than enough.

The accused: I ask whether the prisoners were tied with barbed wire?

Witness: I did not see this, and I did not say so.

The accused: I am not purporting that the witness said so, but I am asking whether the witness saw a prisoner so bound?

Witness: I could not have seen such details.

The accused: Does the witness know that I was supposed to earmark inmates for medical experiments?

Witness: No.

The accused: How can the witness explain the fact that he was hit in the face?

Witness: I spoke about this yesterday. Since the accused could not reach up to my face, he kicked me in the stomach. At the time I weighed some 52 – 53 kg.

The accused: The witness declared that the roll call lasted three – four hours. Does the witness know why the roll call lasted longer than usual?

Presiding Judge: The question is overruled.

The accused: Was the witness aware of the fact that I had to meet the deadline for marching off to work?

Witness: I was not interested in such matters.

The accused: Is the witness aware that the sick were numbered off at roll call?

Witness: This was only in the hospital, while the sick from the barrack, such as I, who were ill with typhus fever, had to appear in the roll call square.



The accused: I have finished.

Defense attorney Rappaport: Esteemed Tribunal, the accused turn to Your Honor with a request that you ask the witnesses to speak slower, for the interpreters cannot keep up and the accused hear only fragments.

Presiding Judge: Of course.

(The accused Münch stands up and requests permission to submit testimony concerning the malaria research.)

Presiding Judge: Permission is granted.

The accused Münch: Although the witness declared that in 1943 I could not have been present during the malaria research, I would like to make a statement regarding the matter. Malaria was – this I declare – a most dangerous disease, as the witness himself has stated, for the sick were segregated. In the main, such selections were based on documents of the Hygiene Institute. In 1943, more than four reports concerning malaria received a negative assessment. The results of the tests that were made available were in the main positive. In 1941, the number of malaria cases had been the same. Some 350 tests were sent in, of which only 16 were positive. In 1944, as the head of the bacteriological unit of the Institute, I supervised these experiments and tests, and it would have been impossible for the difference in results not to have been noticed by the camp doctors.

I remember one instance, when Dr. Mengele came up with 10 samples of blood, which he himself had taken, to my laboratory. He wanted to be present during the analysis in order to see the results of the tests for himself. After receiving these 10 samples, I handed them over to inmate Włodarski, all the while continuing my discussion with Dr. Mengele concerning the malaria tests. In the meantime Włodarski dyed the blood and prepared it for analysis. When we carried out the tests, it transpired that only two out of these 10 samples were positive, and thus Dr Mengele saw for himself that the malaria samples that he had personally taken were not positive, i.e. only two were. As proof of my statement I would like to submit the files of the Hygiene Institute, wherein all 400 cases of malaria have been described in detail.

Presiding Judge: Is there anything more that the witness would like to say?



Witness Kieta: This work was conducted in the *Schreibstube Bakteriologische* [office of the bacteriological unit], but I did not work there, and so I have no knowledge of this.

Presiding Judge: Does anyone else have questions for the witness?

Prosecutors: No.

Defense attorneys: No.

Presiding Judge: The witness may step down. I order a recess of 10 minutes.