

1936

## Polish Criminal Statistics: Its Use for a Comparative Study of the Jewish and Non-Jewish Criminality in Poland

Liebmann Hersch

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Liebmann Hersch, Polish Criminal Statistics: Its Use for a Comparative Study of the Jewish and Non-Jewish Criminality in Poland, 27 Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 190 (1936-1937)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

# THE POLISH CRIMINAL STATISTICS

## ITS USE FOR A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH CRIMINALITY IN POLAND

LIEBMANN HERSCH\*

### *Existing Information and Its Use*

1. In 1930 the Central Statistical Office of the Polish Republic published two large quarto volumes dealing with crime among the population of Poland in the years 1924 and 1925.<sup>1</sup> Before that date the Polish Ministry of Justice had published summarized information concerning crime in the ex-Russian part of the country for the years 1921-1922<sup>2</sup> and for crime in the whole of the Republic in 1923.<sup>3</sup> Since the issue of the *Statistique Criminelle*, summarized information has also been published for the years 1926 and 1927<sup>4</sup> and for 1928.<sup>5</sup> The information for 1921 and 1922, besides being incomplete, is compiled on different bases from those of the later years, so that it is quite useless for the present study. The summarized information supplied for the years 1923 and 1926-1928 provide only very general data for a knowledge of the phenomena which we propose to study. The chief document for the comparative study of Jewish and non-Jewish criminality in Poland is the *statistique Criminelle*, with its detailed figures for the years 1924 and 1925.

2. Statistics of crime usually encounter great difficulties, which

---

\* Professor in the University of Geneva.  
<sup>1</sup> STATISTIQUE CRIMINELLE. *Personnes condamnées et acquittées irrévocablement en 1924 et 1925.* Varsovie 1930. We shall henceforth use the term *Statistique Criminelle* to indicate this work.  
<sup>2</sup> *Revue Trimestrielle de Statistique* 1924, fasc. 4.  
<sup>3</sup> Same *Revue* 1927, No. 4 and *Annuaire Statistique de la République Polonaise* 1925-1926.  
<sup>4</sup> *Petit Annuaire Statistique de la Pologne*, 1931 to 1933. It is to be regretted that, doubtless for reasons of economy, a large European country like Poland, with a population of 33 millions and with able statisticians, should have thought it necessary to cease the publication of its Statistical Yearbook from 1931 onwards and should have been satisfied with a small duodecimo volume like the *Small Yearbook*. The 1934 edition of this Yearbook gives general totals for criminality in 1932, including minor breaches of police regulations; these totals, as explicitly stated by the Statistical Office, cannot possibly be compared at all with the information given previously.  
<sup>5</sup> Note especially the last pages (16 to 20) of the Special (No. IV) issue of the *Informations Statistiques* of the Central Statistical Office: *Statistique Judiciaire, Pénitentiaire et Criminelle* (Varsovie 1932).

are well known to statisticians and criminologists. In Poland there are additional special difficulties. One of the chief of these is the fact that the Polish Republic does not yet possess any uniform penal code, each of the three great divisions of the country (belonging formerly to Russia, Austria and Germany respectively) having retained the penal code of the country to which it was previously subject. Hence the very conception of crime varies in the three great divisions of the Republic. Being based on articles of three different codes, the grouping of crimes is clumsy and a comparison of the statistics of crime of the three territories is liable to involve us in serious error. For instance, for the ex-Russian territory, the *Statistique Criminelle* include all offenses punishable by imprisonment or by a severer penalty, while in the ex-Austrian territory they cover those punishable by over three months of ordinary arrest. The lower limit of the crimes included in the statistics is therefore not the same for the three territories of the country; that is to say, there are numerous offenses which, on this basis, are not taken into consideration in the ex-Russian part of the country, although they are in the ex-Austrian territory.

This remark applies, of course, to minor offenses only, but then minor offenses are especially numerous. We need give only one illustration of this point; in the *Statistique Criminelle* we find for Lemberg Department alone (in ex-Austrian territory) a total number of "slight physical injuries" double that of all the "offenses against health and the body" given for the whole of the ex-Russian territory (ten departments comprising 57 per cent of the total population of the Republic). It is very obvious that a very large number of the slight physical injuries which are reckoned as such by the *Statistique Criminelle* under the Austrian method of computation are not so reckoned under the Russian method.

Seeing that certain particularly numerous offenses are included in some parts of the country and excluded in others, it is impossible to give any single figure as the general total of the offenses committed in the Republic. For the same reason it would be an error to work out relative figures based on a general total obtained by simply adding the totals for the offenses committed in the three parts of the country; and it is impossible to compute the ratios of the various crimes in percentages of the total number. We cannot compare the absolute figures obtained for one of the three parts of the country with those of the two others. Nor can we compare the three parts of the country according to the relative importance of

the various offenses (still less in respect of the total number of offenses in the territory under consideration), or the general rate of criminality (relative to the population figure) of the three large territories of the Polish Republic. According to existing statistics, and so long as the country possesses three different penal codes, each of the three territories must be considered separately. This of course applies equally to Jewish criminality and to that of the whole of the population.

3. As far as may be, the *Statistique Criminelle* has endeavored to assimilate the grouping of the crimes of the three territories. Apart from the "detailed" classification of crimes—under 137 headings according to the Russian Code (for the Central and Eastern Departments which formerly formed Russian Poland), 139 headings according to the German Code (Western Departments), and 111 headings according to the Austrian Code (Southern Departments, formerly Austrian Poland and otherwise known as Galicia) the *Statistique Criminelle* has also established a common "abridged" classification, i. e., three great categories of crime, subdivided into 75 headings and applicable to all three territories. This last classification alone is combined in the *Statistique Criminelle* with the grouping of offenses according to the religion of the persons condemned. This "abridged" classification, therefore, is the one upon which we must rely for the present study. We shall call it henceforth "the classification of the *Statistique Criminelle*."

Certain points in the "abridged" classification of offenses adopted by the *Statistique Criminelle* are open to criticism. But, taken as a whole, it is sufficiently detailed to allow, when necessary, of the regrouping of certain offenses. But we must not forget that when we find the same names used for the various headings of this classification, they do not always stand for the same thing if the territories in question come under different codes; hence, it is sometimes quite impossible to compare figures coming under the same headings when these refer to the three different Polish territories.

In the *Statistique Criminelle* each of the 75 headings is combined in various ways with the department, the size of the locality in which the offense has taken place, the sex, age and state of family of the criminal, his *religion, and ethnical nationality*, his degree of education, the number of his past offenses (recidivism), his sobriety or drunkenness at the moment of committing the offense, the month of the year, the penalty imposed and the number of accused persons acquitted. The *Statistique Criminelle* makes, therefore, a very

valuable contribution to the study of Polish criminality and to criminology in general.

It contains, moreover, information which is unique of its kind for the study of delinquency among the *Jews*. For it should be borne in mind that the Polish Republic contains in round figures *three millions* of Jews (2,845,364 according to the census of 1921, 3,028,000 according to that of 1931). It provides, and for the first time, comparatively detailed statistics of Jewish criminality on so large a scale; and these form part of the official statistics. Who knows how long we shall have to wait before we again get such statistics in this sphere?

In the Polish *Statistique Criminelle* Jews even appear under two different headings; once under the heading of *religion* and a second time under the heading of ethnical (or cultural) *nationality*.<sup>6</sup> The numbers are not the same in both cases; the criminals of the Jewish *religion* are far more numerous than those who declare themselves to be of Jewish nationality, for a considerable number of Jews say that they belong to a non-Jewish ethnical nationality, especially the Polish ethnical nationality. At the time of the general census of the population in 1921, one-fourth of the Jews (25.8 per cent) stated that they were of non-Jewish nationality. The proportion of Jewish criminals claiming to belong to another nationality is even higher, i. e., more than one-third (39 per cent in 1924). It is quite likely that many Jewish accused persons say they belong to the Polish cultural nationality in the hope of thus winning more sympathy from their judges, who are almost always Polish and hardly ever Jews. In any case, it seems clear that for the study of the Jewish population of Poland religion is a much more solid statistical criterion than nationality. We believe, moreover, that the real criminality of the Polish Jews would be reduced considerably by reckoning amongst them only those criminals who declare themselves to be of Jewish *nationality*. Henceforth, therefore, we shall consider as Jewish criminals all criminals of the

<sup>6</sup> Ethnical (or cultural) nationality must not be confused either with political nationality, that is to say, the State of which the person in question is a national, or with the "race" in Hitler's sense of the term, which is primarily based on ancestry and origin. "Nationality" in Polish statistics, as in those of many other countries, is an idea which is associated with national culture. As a rule the chief external sign of such nationality is language, although it is sometimes inadequate. A "nationality" consists of all those who have been born and brought up in a specific national culture or spiritually assimilated with it. A Jew with Polish mother-tongue who recognizes the Polish culture as his national culture is regarded as Polish in nationality; another Jew speaking the Yiddish (or Hebrew) language and regarding Jewish culture as his national culture is classed as Jewish in nationality.

Jewish religion, whether they declare their nationality to be Jewish, Polish, Ruthenian, German or any other.

In the *Statistique Criminelle*, the information as to the religion (and nationality) of the persons condemned, and hence also that referring to the Jews is supplied by *departments* (*woiewodies*) and is conjoined with that stating the *nature* of the offense (classified under 75 headings) and the *sex* of the criminal. Our data concerning Jewish criminality deal therefore only with these three points. We get no information dealing with Jews in respect of age, state of family, degree of education of the delinquent, his past offenses, the respective criminality of the urban and rural populations or in respect of any of the other points covered by the *Statistique Criminelle*. Nor do we even hear anything of the criminal's occupation; it is not at all taken into consideration by the *Statistique Criminelle*; unfortunately, for it would have been very interesting in connection with our study, since the occupational structure of the Jewish population is fundamentally different from that of the rest of the population of Poland. But, as already remarked, this does not prevent the information we do get from it from being a valuable and interesting addition to our knowledge in this sphere.

4. The Jewish population is distributed very unequally throughout the three divisions of the Polish Republic. According to the census of 1921, there were over two million (2,065,000) Jews in the ex-Russian territory, nearly three-quarters of a million (744,000) in the ex-Austrian part and less than 23,000 in the ex-Prussian provinces. In other words, of every 100 Polish Jews, 73 (or nearly three-quarters) are to be found in the ex-Russian provinces, 26 (or over one-quarter) inhabit ex-Austrian territory and barely 1 (0.8, to be precise) live in the ex-Prussian part.

This being so, we need not trouble to analyze the information relating to the ex-Prussian territory. We are the more justified in reaching this decision because, as so few Jews inhabit this region, the number of Jewish criminals is very much smaller still. If, therefore, we come to consider the different kinds of crime, we get figures which dwindle away to vanishing point, and pass outside the bounds of statistics altogether. We will therefore examine Jewish criminality in the *former Russian and Austrian territories*, which contain 99.2 per cent of the Polish Jews, or nearly the whole of Polish Jewry.

5. The *ratio* of criminality must be reckoned for the population which is responsible in the eyes of the law, that is to say, for

the two territories under consideration, for those of the population who are over ten years old. But we have not been able to ascertain the number of the Jewish population according to age separately for each territory. We have therefore worked out the ratio of criminality in respect of the *total* of each population, whether Jewish or non-Jewish, of each of the territories under consideration. By doing this we slightly *augment* the ratio of Jewish criminality in comparison with that of the non-Jewish population, for the population aged ten and over ten, which should have been taken as the denominator of our ratio, is larger for the Jewish population of the whole Republic than for the non-Jewish (80 per cent among the Jews and 78.4 per cent among the rest of the population). But the resulting inaccuracy is trifling (an average of nearly 2 per cent) and can have no significant effect on the result of the comparison which we have in hand between Jewish and non-Jewish criminality—for if these differed by about 2 per cent, we should nevertheless consider them practically equal. Once only (Table V) do we give a table relating to the general ratio of criminality computed by the Central Statistical Office of the Polish Republic on the basis of the *estimated* figures of the population of each religion responsible in the eyes of the law. Of course, the picture presented by this table in respect of the levels of Jewish and non-Jewish criminality *compared* differs hardly at all from that given by ratios computed for the whole of the population.

Then again, we ought to have computed the criminality of the years 1924-1925 in respect of the estimated population on the 31 December, 1924. But we preferred to use the *census* population of September 30, 1921, seeing that the estimate for the end of 1924 could only be approximate and furthermore, that the number of the population constituting the denominator of the ratio of the criminality, the difference between the estimated figures and those furnished by the census could not in most cases affect even the decimal fractions of our ratios of criminality reckoned per 10,000 inhabitants. This being so, we decided in favor of the census figures, since these did not call for any supplementary calculations.

6. We saw at the beginning (Section 1) that although we have summarized information on criminality in Poland for several years, the full details given by the *Statistique Criminelle* only cover the two years 1924 and 1925. We may add, however, that the general criminality of these two years does not greatly differ from the average of the period 1923-1928, for which period we have comparable

figures. The numbers of persons condemned during this period were as follows:

TABLE I  
Annual Number of Persons Condemned in the ex-Russian and ex-Austrian Territories of the Polish Republic from 1923 to 1928:  
Total Number and Number of Jews

	—Ex-Russian Territory—			—Ex-Austrian Territory—		
	Total	Jews	Jewish Percentage of Total	Total	Jews	Jewish Percentage of Total
1923	50,398	4,150	8.2	57,614	3,169	5.5
1924	55,266	4,255	7.7	96,841	4,296	4.4
1925	48,727	3,464	7.1	106,795	4,535	4.2
1926	52,853	3,776	7.1	103,022	5,103	4.7
1927	60,067	4,060	6.8	112,542	5,728	5.1
1928	56,474	3,953	7.0	101,532	4,884	4.8
1923-28	53,964	3,943	7.3	97,224	4,617	4.7
1924-25	51,997	3,860	7.4	101,818	4,416	4.3

This table shows that, either taken by itself, or compared with that of the total population, both in the ex-Russian territory and in the ex-Austrian territory, the Jewish criminality of 1924-25 coincides, broadly speaking, with that of the period 1923-1928. This correspondence is especially striking in the case of the ex-Russian territory, where three-quarters of the Polish Jews are congregated; in this territory the average annual number of Jews condemned is 3,860 for the years 1924-25 and 3,943 for the total period 1923-28; the percentage of Jews among the condemned is 7.4 for 1924-25 and 7.3 for 1923-28.

Hence it may be presumed that the fuller details furnished by the *Statistique Criminelle* for the years 1924-25 do not differ to any greater degree from the normal criminal of the period under review.

But of course every time the information published enables us to take into consideration the whole period 1923-28, we shall use the whole of this information.

7. It remains true, however, that in respect of the distribution of the total number of offenses among the various genera and species, the fact of our only possessing two years' observations is undoubtedly a disadvantage. This applies primarily to offenses which only occur in very small numbers and are consequently very dependent on accidental circumstances.

To minimize this disadvantage, we shall put together several headings which cover only small numbers of delinquents and stand for the same kind of delinquency. We shall however retain the

headings of the *Statistique Criminelle*, even if they cover very few condemned persons, when the crimes in question are very serious, well defined and clearly distinguished from other criminal acts, and when, owing to their serious nature, they would appear to be more independent of purely accidental circumstances.

We shall also put together certain headings of the *Statistique Criminelle*, even when the number of delinquents concerned is not very small, in cases where the crimes are so closely associated that chance circumstances or the state of mind of the judge may cause the verdict to swing sometimes towards one article of the Code (corresponding to one of the headings in question) and sometimes towards another (corresponding to a heading near by); here again, in order to lessen as far as possible the disadvantages of the comparatively short period under observation, we shall put together the headings in question.

Lastly, we shall put together headings of the *Statistique Criminelle* in still another case, namely, when the kinds of crime specified are in some sort complementary and when, owing to social differences between the populations compared, one of the kinds under consideration can hardly have been committed by a non-Jew and another can hardly have been committed by a Jew. This will be conspicuously the case for corruption and venality. In Poland, where Jews are politically in a subordinate position and rarely have access to public functions, it will be evident *a priori* that only an infinitesimal number of Jews can be condemned for venality, but that a considerable number may be found guilty of corruption; under such historical conditions, it would be absurd to compare the number of cases of venality per 10,000 inhabitants for Jews and non-Jews; and the same would be true of cases of corruption. In the one case (the non-Jews) the delinquent may *sell* his conscience; in the other (the Jew), he can only *buy* another's conscience. Hence, instead of comparing the respective frequencies of buying or selling one's conscience, it has seemed to us much more logical to compare the two from the point of view of *traffic* in conscience (buying and selling together).

8. Is it, speaking generally, possible to compare statistics relating to the criminality of Jews with those relating to the rest of the population in the same Polish territories?

From the juridical point of view, that is, from the point of view of the legal standards applied to the two parts of the population, comparison is perfectly possible, since in each territory the same

legal code prevails for both populations. In this respect we do not meet with any of the many and great difficulties which occur when we endeavor to compare the criminality of different countries. But the case is otherwise from the social point of view, owing to the different characters of the populations to which the legal standards are applied. Important reservations are essential here. The customs and social structure of the Jewish population differ greatly from those of the rest of the population of the Republic. Let us touch on some of the circumstances which impose limits on the degree to which the statistics we propose to examine are comparable.

First of all, there is the fact that in Poland, especially in the ex-Russian part, the *judges* are almost always non-Jews. The effect of this in the long run will in all probability be to *augment* the number of condemnations of Jews as compared with those of non-Jews. We need not presuppose any anti-semitic prejudice on the part of the judges, although it is not quite impossible that such exists in some cases. But it suffices that the judge in one case belongs to the same national environment as the accused and that in the other his environment is completely alien. This mere fact makes it probable that the non-Jewish judge will *understand* the non-Jewish prisoner better and will therefore be likely to acquit him oftener than when he is a Jew. The influence of this factor will be increased by the fact that all judicial proceedings are carried on in the Polish language, while Yiddish is the mother-tongue of nine-tenths of Polish Jews. The Jewish prisoner, especially if he belongs to the lower social strata, does not understand his judge very well, nor does the judge possess an adequate understanding of the "Polish" of the accused Jew. This, it seems to us, is a factor which must in the long run tend to increase the number of the Jews condemned.

It is impossible to estimate to what degree the national barrier which in Poland separates the accused Jew from his judge tends to increase the number of Jewish condemnations. We have little doubt that this factor comes into play, especially in cases of minor importance, and perhaps also when the offenses are of a political nature. We do not believe, however, that it has any appreciable influence in the case of grave offenses against the common law.

On the other hand, we must take account of the fact that many lawsuits *between Jews themselves* are settled in Poland by rabbinical arbitration and do not come into court, and therefore do not

appear in statistics of crime. Of course, such lawsuits usually appertain to the sphere of the civil law. But not seldom penal matters also are brought before the rabbi (fraudulent practices, embezzlement, offenses against honor, etc.). Hence the statistics show figures *lower* than the real ones for certain kinds of offenses committed by Jews.

Here again it is impossible to determine the extent of the difference. But again the inexactitude only affects minor offenses of definite kinds. In any case, we get an element of inaccuracy which runs counter to the one referred to at the beginning of this section, so that the two factors largely rule each other out.

9. The difference in the social structure of the two elements of the population of Poland gives rise to a whole series of problems in respect of the possibility of comparison between the criminal statistics relating respectively to the Jewish and non-Jewish populations.

It will undoubtedly be of some interest to compare the actual criminality of the two populations, even although they live in very different social conditions. The quantitative and qualitative divergences in their criminality will be the resultant of the total number of factors, internal and external, which are at work upon these populations. But for that very reason we must be very careful not to attribute this difference in criminality solely to internal factors peculiar to each of them, and still more careful not to think they are due only to differences in the nature, that is to say, the "race" of these populations. We should, however, get a clearer idea of the criminality characteristic of each of them if we could observe them in social conditions which, if not equal, are at least similar.

Chief among the social conditions exercising considerable influence on the level and nature of the criminality of a population are undoubtedly the distribution of that population over town or country, their occupational structure, their social conditions (in the narrower sense of the term, largely corresponding to the economic situation of the respective elements) and their political and legal situation within the State. We have no practical way of gauging the effect on the criminality of the Jews of their political situation. The Polish *Statistics of Crime* does not record the occupation or social position of the persons condemned, so that we are ignorant of the effect of these two factors on the numbers of Jewish and non-Jewish delinquents. It does, however, state the size of the localities where the crimes were committed, thus giving us a very interesting

insight into the action of town and country on criminality in Poland. Unfortunately, the statistics dealing with the religion of criminals do not record the place where the crime was committed. We do not therefore learn the number of condemnations among the populations of the various religions in localities of *the same size*; nor can we eliminate the action of the different distribution of Jews and non-Jews between towns and rural districts.

Now, on the one hand, in Poland, as elsewhere, town and country have very different rates of criminality: on the other, Jews and non-Jews are very differently distributed over towns and rural districts.

10. On this last point we need only say that, according to the 1921 census, 76 per cent of the Jews and only 19 per cent of the non-Jews inhabited towns. In other words, *while four-fifths of the non-Jewish population is rural in Poland, three-fourths of the Jewish population of that country is urban.*

But urban criminality is *much higher* than rural. This fact does not come out strongly enough for Galicia (ex-Austrian part) where the enormous number of "slight physical injuries" (very widespread in the country) recorded in the *Statistique Criminelle* undoubtedly distort the general picture of the criminality of the district.<sup>7</sup> But this phenomenon is extremely striking in the ex-Russian territory which, as we have seen, contains three-quarters of the Polish Jews. The facts may be stated as follows:

TABLE II  
*Persons Condemned in ex-Russian Territory in 1924-25 According to  
Size of Locality Where the Offense Was Committed<sup>8</sup>*

Localities	Persons Condemned	Population	Condemned per Year per 10,000 Inhabitants
With population under 5000	63,360	11,680,866	27
With population over 5000	39,829	3,697,996	54

We thus see that in ex-Russian Poland the town has *twice as much criminality as the country* taking 5000 inhabitants as the line of division between town and country.

But is not this greater criminality of the towns the effect of the large proportion of Jews congregated in them?

<sup>7</sup> Of 203,636 persons condemned in this district during the years 1924-25 there were 61,097 (30 per cent) condemned for slight physical injuries; and of 60,427 persons condemned for this kind of offense committed in known localities, 53,233 (88 per cent) came from localities with less than 5,000 inhabitants.

<sup>8</sup> Exclusive of 804 cases in which the place of offense is unknown.

Later on, when we have compared the criminality of the Jews with others, we shall find that this is not so. For the moment, we can obtain an idea of the influence of the town on the general rate of criminality, independently of the number of Jewish delinquents, from the following table which refers to the non-Jewish population only:<sup>9</sup>

TABLE III

*Criminality and Percentage of Urban Inhabitants Among the Non-Jewish Population of the Centre, East and South of Poland, According to Departments (Woiewodies)*

	Non-Jews Condemned in 1924-25		
	Absolute Figures	Per Year and per 10,000 Inhabitants	Urban Inhabitants % Non-Jewish
<b>EX-RUSSIAN TERRITORY</b>			
<i>Centre</i>			
City of Warsaw <sup>10</sup>	10,195	81	100
Dept. of Lodz	16,886	44	30
Dept. of Bialystok	9,381	42	15
Dept. of Kielce	15,790	35	17
Dept. of Lublin	12,338	34	10
Dept. of Warsaw	12,760	33	16
<i>East</i>			
Dept. of Vilna	5,309	30	11
Dept. of Polesia	4,126	27	9
Dept. of Volhynia	6,753	27	7
Dept. of Novogrodek	2,732	18	7
<b>EX-AUSTRIAN TERRITORY</b>			
<i>South<sup>11</sup></i>			
Dept. of Cracow	{ 58,918 (43,576)	{ 160 (118)	19
Dept. of Lemberg	{ 65,070 (45,763)	{ 135 (95)	
Dept. of Stanislawow	{ 33,462 (22,688)	{ 140 (95)	13
Dept. of Tarnopol	{ 33,390 (22,366)	{ 128 (86)	

We thus see that in each of the districts considered, in the Centre (inhabited by Poles), the Eastern borders (chiefly inhabited by Lithuanians and White Russians) and the South (inhabited by Poles and Ruthenians) the general ratio of criminality of the non-

<sup>9</sup> In this table, the Statistics class as an urban population the inhabitants of localities which have urban by-laws.

<sup>10</sup> The City of Warsaw constitutes a special administrative unit, separate from the *department* of Warsaw.

<sup>11</sup> The figures in brackets give the number of condemned persons, without counting "slight physical injuries."

Jewish population is higher for departments in which there is a higher percentage of urban inhabitants, and lower where the contrary is the case.

The *City* of Warsaw and the *department* surrounding it are especially instructive in this respect: in the department of Warsaw, the non-Jewish population includes only 16 per cent of urban inhabitants, while the City of Warsaw is of course entirely urban. We find that the ratio of criminality per 10,000 inhabitants is 81 in the City and only 35 in the department; or, in other words, in the City of Warsaw it is 130 per cent higher than in the surrounding department (2.31 times higher in the City than in the department).

In comparing the total ratio of the criminality of the Jewish population with that of the non-Jewish population (without distinction between town and country), that is to say, in comparing thus the criminality of a population which is three-quarters urban with that of a population which is four-fifths rural, we are obviously increasing considerably Jewish criminality as compared with non-Jewish: we are laying upon Israel the "sins" of the city and are crediting the others with the "virtues" due to the country.

11. As already stated (Section 9), it is also interesting to compare the Jewish population as it is (including its large concentration in towns) with the non-Jewish population as it is (including its preponderance of dwellers in the country). But it would at least be equally interesting to compare the criminality of Jews and of others in the same conditions, whether urban or rural. Hence the criminal statistics of the City of Warsaw are of unique value to our inquiry. As we have already stated, the *Statistique Criminelle* gives information as to the criminality of the various religious groups by departments; as the City of Warsaw constitutes a special department, we thus have information concerning the criminality of Jews and non-Jews for a place in which both belong wholly to the urban population, so that the disturbing factor of the difference of structure in town and country is no longer present. We may add that in the City of Warsaw alone there are, according to the census of 1921, over 300,000 Jews (310,334); a larger number than is to be found in many European countries.

After having studied the criminality of the whole of the Jewish population as compared with that of the rest of the population of the same territories, we will devote special attention to the criminal statistics of the City of Warsaw.