ers who persevered in manufacturing munitions demonstrated "enormous heroism" (332–33).

Alexis Peri has mined a treasure trove of 100 unpublished and twenty published diaries to illumine the inner thoughts of Leningrad's emaciated *blokadniki*, in particular as they waited in food lines or ate in canteens. Her findings are deeply disturbing. The diarists almost uniformly emphasized social enmity, not camaraderie. Leningraders sized up each other in crowded settings and heaped scorn in their journals on food workers, local party officials, and anyone else nearby who appeared to have some food advantage that they lacked. Peri's most important discovery is that a significant disparity exists between diaries and memory-based accounts of the blockade. The latter contain examples of social animosity but also include many instances of altruism and cooperation, which are rarely found in the diaries. Peri's forthcoming book promises to make major contributions to our understanding of the popular mood of besieged Leningraders as well as the function and utility of the diary as a primary source.

Rebecca Manley's contribution focuses on the term "nutritional dystrophy" (*distrofiia alimentarnaia)*, which was introduced in Leningrad in December 1941. She argues that "the term represented not an obfuscation of . . . 'starvation,' but rather a new understanding of that condition" (208) because, although she acknowledges that starvation remained a sensitive political subject, it drew attention to the source of the people's affliction. She traces how the new term spread quickly (and even acquired a popular pejorative meaning as in "moral dystrophy") and became the heading under which medical experts could classify starvation victims and treat them.

Brandon Schechter illustrates in great detail how the Red Army was supplied with food from soup to kasha to vodka, although he leaves discussion of Lend-Lease food to Filtzer. Soldiers generally received rations that were larger and of better quality than those of civilians; however, like civilians, soldiers depended on local food supplies and in rear areas often worked as farmers. For civilians and military personnel, the size of the ration was pegged to their importance to the war effort, and food supply in both sectors was plagued by widespread theft.

Hunger and War broadens our horizons on a crucial dimension of the Soviet-German War. Indiana University Press has done an admirable job in producing the book, which will prove valuable to researchers and as assigned reading for students.

Richard Bidlack
Washington and Lee University

Stalingrad: The City that Defeated the Third Reich. By Jochen Hellbeck. Trans. Christopher Tauchen and Dominic Bonfiglio. New York: Public Affairs, 2015. viii, 500 pp. Notes. Index. Illustratians. Photographs. Maps. $29.99, hard bound.

Compared to twenty-five years ago, today's historian of the Great Patriotic War has access to a large volume of rich personal testimony of the experiences of Soviet soldiers—from the many candid memoirs and diaries published from the late 1980s onwards in Russia, to the vast library of personal testimonies collected by Russian historians such as Artem Drabkin. A growing body of this material has been translated into English. Jochen Hellbeck's *Stalingrad: The City that Defeated the Third Reich* adds to this bank of testimony. In this work, Hellbeck has edited and collated personal testimonies collected by a Soviet historical commission working in Stalingrad towards the end of the fighting there in early 1943 and in its immediate aftermath. Ten

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.75.4.1045 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interviews are provided verbatim—the remaining material edited. This material is at times surprisingly candid and very much captured in the heat of the moment—apparently far too candid for publication at the time. Undoubtedly, the material presented by Hellbeck provides what seems in the light of the wider pool of material available, to be meaningful and certainly far from an outlandish insight into at least some of the attitudes and motivations of a group of Soviet soldiers and officers at the time.

The testimony focuses in particular on two units—308th Rifle Division and 38th Motorized Rifle Brigade—troops of the latter singled out, it seems, for having captured German Field Marshal von Paulus and other senior German commanders at the end of the siege. Those interviewed by the commission may have been candid about many issues and even critical of superiors even if not by name, but the limits of their candor have to be appreciated. The interviewees do not for example—understandably—criticize the Stalinist system. Hellbeck also provides some German testimony on the fighting—also collected by the Soviet commission concerned and often drawn from intelligence materials. That there are limitations to the testimony provided is hardly surprising, but bearing those limitations in mind I was nonetheless very pleased to receive this work for review in time to incorporate some of the Soviet testimony into a piece of my own work.

Valuable as the material presented by Hellbeck is, his suggestion on page 6 that "this book allows English readers for the first time to imagine Red Army soldiers and other defenders of the city as thinking and feeling individuals" is somewhat disingenuous to the work of many other historians, particularly academic military historians such as Roger Reese, whose works are hidden away in the endnotes. Hellbeck's straw man characterization of our existing understanding of soldiers during the battle in the main body of the text focuses on cinema and a handful of other works such as Catherine Merridale's *Ivan's War* and Anthony Beevor's popular *Stalingrad* that are deemed to portray Soviet personnel as more often than not fighting under a Stalinist yoke. Hellbeck, in apparent contrast, situates his work as part of a recent body of literature focusing on the "people's war," and addressing such concerns as "how frontline soldiers began to understand themselves as actors in the Soviet regime" (19).

Given that this work only provides a glimpse of the material collated by the Soviet commission concerned—much of it heavily edited—it is important to understand the selection provided in light not only of Hellbeck's introductory comments but also of the selectivity of the Soviet commission in choosing interviewees and their undoubtedly guarded and often less than candid responses. The material selected frequently gives "actors" and "actresses" in the Stalingrad battle considerable agency in their participation in fighting the enemy and challenges crude ideas such as that Soviet citizens fought primarily thanks to a repressive apparatus. Much of the testimony that we have, however, is not consistent with that presented here, where testimony is not distorted by time in the same way it often is, but certainly by the circumstances in which it was provided. That the voices here undoubtedly existed and may at times have been candid does not mean that we should go as far as Michael Geyer in his blurb on the book in suggesting that the testimony provided "recasts our understanding of the 'Russian way' of waging war." What this book does do is add a rich new vein to the accumulated testimony available in English on the Soviet soldier at war.

Alexander Hill
University of Calgary

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.75.4.1045 Published online by Cambridge University Press