

## Historians interpretations

### **1: Professor William Rubinstein, '1944: Should we bomb Auschwitz?' BBC, 2019:**

'One has to understand that the allies were fighting a world war. The fate of the surviving Jews of Europe depended not on the bombing of Auschwitz but upon the liberation of Nazi occupied Europe and destroying the Nazi regime.'

### **2: Professor Michael Berenbaum, '1944: Should we bomb Auschwitz?' BBC, 2019:**

'Auschwitz should have elicited the most outrageous response whilst it was happening. That it did not was a moral failure of the West. Moral protest in the wake of genocide(mass murder) is much better than nothing. Much, much better than nothing.'

### **3: Professor Peter Hayes, *Why? Explaining the Holocaust* (2017) p. 294-295:**

' In the end bombing the camp might not have saved many lives. By the time those planes appeared, about 90% of Auschwitz's victims were already dead. The SS transferred more than half of the population of the camp complex- to camps further inside Germany between July 1944 and the end of the year. But planners did not know all this at the time, so the question remains why did the allies not try? Trying was just not important enough; other needs or goals always took precedence.'