

Police chief Daluege and the Fraudster Statistics

In his 1996 biography Goebbels. Mastermind of the Third Reich, Mr Irving wrote at pages 46–47 this passage (about the Weimar Republic and Berlin's then police chief Weiss):

“Dr Goebbels would shun no libel to blacken his name. Instinctively carrying on an ancient tradition of name-calling, he seized on his nickname of ‘Isidor’ and commissioned a scurrilous Nazi marching song about him.²⁹ He would highlight every malfeasance of the criminal demimonde and identify it as Jewish. In the Weimar republic, he was unfortunately not always wrong. In 1930 Jews would be convicted in forty-two of 210 known narcotics smuggling cases; in 1932 sixty-nine of the 272 known international narcotics dealers were Jewish. Jews were arrested in over sixty percent of the cases of running illegal gambling dens; 193 of the 411 pickpockets arrested in 1932 were Jews. In 1932 no fewer than thirty-one thousand cases of fraud, mainly insurance swindles, would be committed by Jews.³⁰

“Statistical comparisons are of course usually odious, but it was against this background that Goebbels now started his campaign.”

The Goebbels endnotes (on pages 547-548) read as follows:

²⁹ ‘Der mächtigste Mann in Gross-Berlin /Das ist der Isidor Weiss. / Doch Joseph Goebbels, der “Oberbandit”, / der macht ihm die Hölle schon heiss,’ etc. Bering, 20; Bering shows that the Berlin communist Otto Steinicke (later a Nazi and editor on Goebbels’ *Angriff*) had first dubbed Weiss ‘Isidor’ in *Rote Fahne* No.152, as early as Jul 5, 1923; and see May 16, 1924.

³⁰ Interpol figures, in Deutsche Nachrichten-Büro (DNB), Jul 20, 1935; and see K Daluege, ‘Judenfrage als Grundsatz,’ in *Angriff*, Aug 3, 1935 (Hauptamt Ordnungspolizei files, BA: R.19/406); on the criminal demimonde of 1920s Berlin see Paul Weiglin, *Unverwüstliches Berlin. Bilderbuch der Reichshauptstadt sekt 1919* (Zürich, 1955) and Walther Kiaulehn, *Berlin: Schicksal einer Weltstadt* (Munich, 1958).

Prof Evans seized on this passage as further evidence of Mr Irving's distortions and manipulations (see his Expert Report, page 694, para. 5.4 (b) *Jewish Criminality in Berlin*).

Although Mr Irving is explicitly giving statistics for the entire Weimar republic, Evans (page 695, para.14) stated untruthfully that Mr Irving was attributing the criminality figures to Berlin alone.

In his prejudicial and irrelevant para. 7 – about Daluege's unbecoming later career, all of which is properly reported by Mr Irving in the biography – Evans describes Daluege, whose paper on the Jewish crime statistics, from the German federal archives collection of Daluege papers, was used by Mr Irving as his primary source, as making the statement in his capacity “a *Generalleutnant der Landespolizei*.” The opening two lines (see facsimile on next page) make plain however that Daluege was speaking as “*Befehlshaber der deutschen Polizei*” (commander in chief of all German police forces), and thus clearly in a position to know what he was talking about. Evans also finds it repugnant and blameworthy that the National Socialists appointed a fellow-Nazi to that post.

It is however the deliberate omissions and distortions in Prof. Evans's report which show what this neutral expert witness is up to. Thus, in para. 9 Evans merely states,

“Daluege went on to present figures detailing the alleged participation of Jews in criminal activities in Germany which proved the danger of Jewry for the German people .

But this obliquely worded sentence masks precisely the statistics which Mr. Irving quotes in Goebbels, which was why Evans was careful not to provide it to the Court, to enable it compare the original source with the precise figures cited by Mr Irving. Daluege stated (quoted in full to enable the Court now to assess the full flavour):

“Now that professional criminals can be considered as having been smashed by the National Socialist methods, we have begun directing our attention to the public danger of the professional fraudster, a circle of anti-social elements which functions more beneath the surface but causes at least the same harm to the

economy as the former. I'm not thinking here of the big rackets, which are no longer possible in today's Germany. I'm thinking of the countless 'minor cases' in which a refined fraudster exploits the gullibility of his more simple-minded countrymen to rob them of their last farthing and drive them to despair. I'm thinking above all also of the unclean business practices in business life, with which the professional fraudsters inflict multi-million-mark damages on the economy and, sad to say, very often slither through the loopholes of the criminal law in doing so. Among them I count the so-called hit-and-run deals, junkbonds, loansharking, insurance rackets, and the like.

“Even if we have succeeded in forcing down the number of fraud [*Betrug*] cases, from 31,000 in 1933 to 18,000 in 1934, the damage done still comes to over 112.5 million Reichsmarks. Here we were able upon closer investigation to establish that a considerable portion, if not the largest part, of these fraudulent manipulations was still being effected by Jews. [...]”

General Daluege mentioned on this occasion that the international war on narcotics smuggling was a matter of concern to the League of Nations, and called for the closest cooperation of all nations. “We have established,” he continued, “that in 1931 of 272 international drug dealers, 69, *i.e.* 25 percent, were Jews; in 1932 the ratio was 294 to 73, also twenty-five percent; in 1933 the ratio of Jews involved in international narcotics cases rose to 30 percent, and in the years 1934 and 1935 it declined again a bit. In 1934, 24 percent of all international drug dealers were Jews, in 1935 they were 13 percent.

“What is of particular interest in this connection are the figures on domestic narcotics crimes, and it is to be observed that in relation to the overall German population figures Jews form a startlingly high proportion of narcotics dealers. In 1930, 42 Jews were involved in 210 domestic narcotics cases, *i.e.* 24 percent; in 1931 9 percent; in 1932, 12 percent; in 1933, 14 percent; in 1934, 17 percent, and in 1935, 11 percent. If one contrasts the Jewish

In the Court of Appeal

for pickpocket gangs. Before the tough National Socialist measures against professional criminals came into effect the art of dipping lay, if I may put it like this, almost exclusively in Jewish hands. In 1932, 193 Jews were arrested in 411 pickpocketing cases, *i.e.* 74 [*sic. the typescript draft correctly has '47'*] percent.”

First, it is to be noted that the various figures cited by Daluege fluctuate just as “real” statistics do, and Daluege cites them all, even those that appear inconvenient to his argument.

Second, Prof. Evans in his Expert Report went to great and devious lengths to suggest that Mr Irving had invented the figures and quotations.

The discrepancy between 47 percent and 75 percent referred to by Evans in para.(b)3 of his report is simply explained: the correct percentage (47%) is given in the typescript draft speech in Daluege’s files (German federal archives, R.19./406), the evident typo (74%) is given in the 1935 printed version (*see the facsimile on previous page*); Evans has not spotted this. Mr Irving used the correct figure in his book.

The reference to Interpol as the source is in other papers in the file, to which Mr Irving no longer has access; there would have been no reason for him to invent the phrase. In Court, Evans untruthfully tried to suggest that Interpol did not exist in 1935.

Mr Irving made no attempt in Goebbels to conceal the source of his figures, which was the official German (Evans: “Nazi”) news agency report on Daluege’s speech, and the general’s own draft for that speech. While Evans is perhaps right to point out that Mr Irving clumsily condensed the Daluege sentence in writing “In 1932, no fewer than thirty-one thousand cases of fraud, mainly insurance swindles, would be committed by Jews,” Daluege still clearly stated that of the 31,000 (1933) and 18,000 (1934) fraud cases recorded in the Weimar Republic “we were able upon closer investigation to establish that a considerable portion, if not the largest part, of these fraudulent manipulations was still being effected by Jews,” *i.e.* in 1934 as in 1933.

It is hard therefore to see what point Evans thinks he has scored

other than a mistaken year (1932 instead of 1933). Evans is accusing Mr Irving however of using false statistics, not mistaking the year. He concludes by triumphing,

“It would have been easy for Irving to have verified his account against other sources. Thus the official German Criminal Statistics for the year 1932 recorded a total of 74 persons convicted of insurance fraud (paragraph 265 of the German Criminal Code) *in the whole of Germany* — a far cry from Irving’s figure *of over 15,500* cases of insurance fraud committed in 1932 by *Berlin* Jews alone.”

This argument (based on a statistical table, buried in one of twelve ring binders supplied to Mr Irving on December 22, 1999) and put to him at the last minute under cross-examination by Mr Rampton, is demonstrably deceitful.



The table of the Reich Statistical Office (*Criminal Statistics for 1932*) which Evans relied on (*see facsimile below: the first column lists actual “convictions”*) in fact confirms that in 1932 there were 50,126 convictions for *Betrug* (fraud); 7,376 convictions for repeat fraud; 74 (as Evans stated) for insurance swindles; and 10,600 convictions for serious document-forgery; so

77a	Personenhehlerei: § 258	391	22
77b	Sachhehlerei: § 259	110 484	428
78	Gewerbe- od. gewohnheitsmäßige Hehlerei: § 260	142	—
79	Hehlerei im wiederholten Rückfall: § 261	139	—
80a	Betrug: § 263	50 126	581
80b	Betrug im wiederholten Rückfall: § 264	7 376	1
80c	Betrügerisches Beschaffen geringwertiger Gegenstände aus Not: § 264a	312	3
81	Versicherungsbetrug: § 265	74	—
82	Untreue: § 266	4 243	13
83a	Einfache Urkundenfälschung: § 267	1 431	48
83b	Schwere Urkundenfälschung: § 268	10 600	257
83c	Hochverrat, simple falsche Staatspapiere: § 269	518	33

Daluege’s figures for 1933 and 1934 do not seem to have been inflated at all, and the trend of Mr Irving’s figures appears to have been an under-estimate, if anything.

The gratuitous interpolation, with emphasis, by Prof. Evans of the phrase “committed . . . by *Berlin* Jews alone” is disgraceful.

Further comment on this instance of his manipulation of documents and selective quoting of statistics seems superfluous.