

OFFICE OF SPECIAL SERVICES  
Research and Analytical Branch

Supplemental

- E. S. A. 1152 -- Robert Higgins as a War Criminal
- and
- E. S. A. 1152 II -- Technical Staff Organisations  
Involved in the Commission of  
War Crimes --  
Criminal Responsibilities of  
Connections with the John Pritch

Washington  
2 July 1945

Additional Note on the Purge of 30 June 1934

Additional information on the events of 30 June is now available in two manuscripts by Dr. Gisevius, entitled respectively The Frenzy of the Masses and The Thirtieth of June. At the time of the purge, the author was an official in the Reich Ministry of the Interior closely associated with Daluege, then Chief of the Prussian Police and Chief of the Police Department of the Reich Minister of the Interior. In that capacity he claims to have been a direct witness of certain events of the purge in Berlin, and seems to have been in a fairly good position to secure reliable second-hand accounts of those episodes in Berlin and elsewhere which did not fall under his immediate observation. His account serves in general to confirm that presented, on the basis of other sources, in R & A 3113.1. In the light of the material now available the following additions and corrections should be made, however, to the list of "Individuals Bearing Responsibility for the Purge as a Whole" given in Appendix B (pp. 15-21) of that report.

1. Daluege, Kurt. According to Gisevius, who claims at this time to have been in close personal contact with Daluege, the latter had no part in or prior knowledge of the purge, and even went for a time in fear of his own life. Although Daluege was Chief of Prussian Police, full police powers for the duration of the crisis were assumed over his head by Goering and Himmler, who left him entirely uninformed as to the course of events. If this is true, Daluege's

only responsibility in connection with the purge would consist in his willingness to lend subsequent public support, and to profit by the opportunity to assume new powers (e.g. temporary leadership of the Berlin SA.) (See The Thirtieth of June pp. 23-4 and 56)

2. Goering, Hermann. Gisevius presents additional second-hand evidence to indicate that Goering was the prime mover in the killing of Gregor Strasser. (See The Frenzy of the Masses, p. 98). He also presents direct, but probably superfluous, evidence of Goering's personal participation in the "Committee of Execution" which directed the killing of SA leaders (and perhaps others, though direct evidence here is lacking) in Berlin. (The Thirtieth of June, p. 33)

3. Heydrich, Reinhard. Gisevius presents direct evidence of Heydrich's personal participation in the "Committee of Execution" which directed the killing of SA leaders (and perhaps others, though direct evidence is lacking) in Berlin (The Thirtieth of June, p. 33) Heydrich should therefore be added to the list of those bearing particular responsibility for the Berlin phase of the purge.

4. Korner, Willi. Same as Heydrich.

Gisevius also presents in some detail the case of Paul Schulz, an associate of Gregor Strasser, who was left for dead by the police after having been shot "while attempting to flee." Schulz survived and ultimately escaped to Zurich, Switzerland (The Thirtieth of June, pp. 34-9.) He might prove a valuable witness. Gisevius himself should also be seriously considered as a witness, since his evidence is more

direct than that of Otto Strasser or of anyone else who has written any general account of the events of 30 June.

On the basis of evidence newly made available, the following addition should also be made to Appendix A: "Cases Which Might be Used to Establish Criminal Responsibility in Connection with the Purge."

#### The Case of Willi Schmid

Probable Facts. At 7:30 P.M. on 30 June 1934 four armed men in SS uniforms appeared at the residence of Dr. Willi Schmid, music critic for the Muenchener Neuste Nachrichten, at 3 Schackstrasse, Munich. They took Dr. Schmid away in an automobile. On July 3 inquiries at the Gestapo headquarters elicited the information that he had been shot "by accident" at Dachau. His body was delivered to the family by members of the Gestapo, who gave strict orders that the coffin should not be opened. On 7 July 1934 a Gestapo official, Regierungsrat Brunner, visited the widow to express his sorrow for the "regrettable accident." On 31 July 1934 Rudolf Hess came on a similar mission, and on 24 September he sent the widow a letter stating that Schmid was not in "any way" connected with the Roehm revolt, or otherwise at fault. A pension was paid to the family, at first by the Party, later by the Ministry of the Interior.

Probable Motive. Although it was never officially admitted, it is generally believed that Dr. Schmid was mistakenly killed in place of the SA leader Willi Schmidt. This other Schmidt was also killed in the course of the purge.

The Problem of Proof. The facts as set forth above are supported by the sworn deposition of an eye-witness, Dr. Schmid's widow, and by certain other documents, photostats of which are appended hereto. Because of the circumstances of this particular case, it might be

SECRET

possible for the defense to claim that the death of Dr. Schmid was not murder, but simply an unfortunate accident. The fact that so gross an error could have been committed is in itself evidence, however, of criminal carelessness on the part of those who carried out the purge. By disregarding the normal requirements of judicial process in their liquidation of SA leaders, the Gestapo and the Nazi Party unnecessarily jeopardized the personal security not only of SA leaders but also of ordinary citizens. In the case of Dr. Schmid the resulting criminal responsibility can be assigned with unusual clarity.