

mainly a story of the occupier, and the Norwegian perspective is not sufficiently explored, with hardly any Norwegians in the picture. It raises the question of whether the Norwegian authorities played a role in Nazi Germany's building plans and, if so, what kind of role. This would have been an important topic to learn more about and would have provided several other perspectives in addition to a history written from above. Since the conditions of the occupation regime are not presented in Stratigakos's study, the reader has to assume that the German building plans and activities took place largely detached from local realities. But to what extent was this the case? Stratigakos does mention that occupied Norway was characterized by a strong civil resistance movement and a society that widely rejected the National Socialist ideology, a theme she could have explored further in order to reflect various kinds of reality checks that Hitler's builders experienced in a country that was mostly hostile toward the occupier, local collaborators, and National Socialist plans to reshape Norway.

While Stratigakos must generally be praised for her use of a vast number of sources, the selection of source material at times seems somewhat random. In particular, given that she uses very different types of sources with very different levels of usefulness and reliability, it would be helpful to learn more about the criteria she used when choosing her material. Why, for example, offer a chapter on German press accounts of Norway that stem first and foremost from the press-clippings collection of the Reich Commissariat's own propaganda department? In addition, more interconnection between the chapters would have given less of an impression of this being a collection of standalone articles. A clearer distinction between the building projects that eventually became a reality and those that remained at the planning stage, such as Hitler's vision for New Trondheim, would have contributed to a better understanding of which building projects Nazi Germany actually accomplished and which remained only an idea.

Despite these critical objections, Stratigakos offers a detailed and well-written account for a broader audience that is interested in learning more about how the Nazi New Order was intended to be realized through architecture and to reshape "racially equal" Norway.

doi:10.1017/S0008938922000486

Soviet Russians under Nazi Occupation: Fragile Loyalties in World War II

By Johannes Due Enstad. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. Pp. xviii + 255. Cloth \$99.99. ISBN 978-1108421263.

James Casteel

Carleton University

Johannes Due Enstad's well-researched monograph draws on German and Soviet archival sources to analyze the responses of the local populations of Northwest Russia to the German occupation during World War II. Unlike the multiethnic western borderlands of the Soviet Union, this region, consisting of the former Soviet districts of Leningrad and Kalinin, was ethnically homogenous (95% ethnic Russian, with smaller population of Jews, Finns, Latvians, Estonians, and ethnic Germans) and remained under military rule for the duration of the occupation. Enstad's main contribution is to challenge the assumption that the Russian population, unlike non-Russian nationalities, remained loyal to the Soviet state. Enstad argues that the Russians in this region were "virtually primed for cooperation with an invading power seeking to defeat the Bolsheviks and bring about a new regime" (38).

Enstad develops this argument in eight chapters. The first two chapters demonstrate the ways in which Stalinist policies of the collectivization of agriculture and the campaign against “kulaks” (prosperous peasants) disrupted the institutions of rural life and fostered deep-rooted resentments against the Soviet state. After the German invasion, the Soviets evacuated those who had benefitted most from Stalinism (party members, engineers, industrial workers), mobilized young men to serve in the Red Army, and destroyed crops and villages in a scorched-earth strategy. Thus, as the Germans advanced deeper into Soviet territory, the rural population that remained was unlikely to include many who were loyal to the Soviet state.

The German occupation replaced one form of state violence with another that possessed a different underlying logic. Chapter 3 focuses on the murder of populations targeted by the German occupiers: Jews, Roma, the disabled, and Soviet prisoners of war (POWs). Locals witnessed the murder of Jews and Roma by shooting, usually just outside of their hometowns. Anti-Slavic racism also informed German occupation policies—most apparent in the brutal starvation of Soviet POWs and the plans to feed the army at the expense of the local population, which contributed (along with Soviet scorched-earth policies) to famine in the winter of 1941-1942. The treatment of Soviet POWs alienated locals with relatives serving in the Red Army. Nevertheless, Enstad maintains that “Nazi atrocities do not appear to have had a decisive impact on the overall political attitudes of the population at the time” (87).

In Chapters 5 and 6, Enstad explains why by turning to German practices which the locals supported. The most successful policy in Northwest Russia was the *de facto* and later official abolition of collective farms that addressed a key grievance against the Soviet state. Because German requisitions were not as harsh as those of the Soviets, many farmers considered themselves to be better off than they had been under Soviet rule. German officials encouraged the activities of the Pskov Orthodox mission, a network of priests who led a religious revival, held pro-German sermons, and fostered an anti-Bolshevik Russian nationalism. These policies helped build support for the Germans, though other policies such as the recruitment of forced laborers had the opposite effect. Chapters 7 and 8 delve deeper into the motivations that explain locals’ responses. Enstad considers the concepts “collaboration” and “resistance” to be politically loaded. Rather, he prefers to analyze “how people *related to power*” (163) focusing in particular on two essential groups of local participants in the occupation: village elders and auxiliary police forces. Enstad shows how these local actors could enforce German orders while at the same time using their positions of authority to further their own interests. Enstad argues that locals demonstrated a “calculated pragmatism” in which they were “inclined to heed the stronger power” (226). He employs this concept to explain why there was little support for the Soviet partisan movement in the region until late 1943. Once it became apparent that the Germans would lose the war, locals rapidly turned against the occupiers in anticipation of the return of Soviet power.

Enstad’s main contribution addresses debates in Soviet historiography—by demonstrating that Stalinism had failed to instill political loyalty among the peasant population, Enstad challenges arguments that Soviet officials were successful at merging Russian and Soviet patriotism in the 1930s. This focus, however, obscures other issues. Despite the fact that the occupied population was predominantly female (by a ratio of 2:1), gender is largely absent from the analysis. There is no mention of the German army engaging in sexual violence. The question of why Soviet violence provoked such a strong response from locals, whereas German violence apparently did not, is not satisfactorily answered. Enstad suggests that targeted violence against Jews, Roma, and Soviet POWs had little impact on local attitudes: “The atrocities remained unknown, or a matter of hearsay, to most people” (223). This seems debatable, given his estimate that witnesses of these killings “numbered in the tens of thousands” (83). Also, there is surprisingly little discussion of local participation in these killing actions. It is mentioned early on but is absent from the later chapter on local auxiliaries. The attitudes of collaborationist Orthodox priests on German violence also deserves attention. Their silence on the murder of Jews and Roma stands in sharp contrast to their willingness to disobey German orders to collect food and clothing for Soviet POWs.

These criticisms should not detract from the value of this important study that will be of interest to historians of everyday life and of World War II. The text is well-written and suitable for advanced undergraduate or graduate courses in German and Soviet history. Enstad makes a strong case for local acquiescence under German rule that complicates myths surrounding the Great Patriotic War. Although some will quibble with aspects of his interpretation, the evidence he garners provides deep insights into the ways that locals navigated a perilous path from Stalinist to Nazi rule and back again.

doi:10.1017/S000893892200036X

Hitler's Fatal Miscalculation: Why Germany Declared War on the United States

By Klaus H. Schmider. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2021. Pp. xxvii + 595. Cloth \$39.99. ISBN 978-1108834919.

Sylvia Taschka

Wayne State University

The influential twentieth-century German journalist and historian Sebastian Haffner once referred to Adolf Hitler's declaration of war against the United States on December 11, 1941, as the "most mysterious" decision Hitler made during World War II (*Von Bismarck zu Hitler* [1987], 293). Haffner was not the only scholar perplexed by this decision, as Klaus Schmider illustrates in his illuminating new study about this fateful step. To this day, generations of historians and pundits have expressed their bewilderment about the move that would ultimately doom Germany's entire war effort.

They have offered plenty of explanations, of course, for why Hitler acted as he did. These explanations include the idea that he was driven by a kind of suicidal impulse devoid of any rationality; the claim that, because of his skewed worldview, he gravely underestimated American military power; as well as the assertion that it was a strategic decision based on the realization that American resources and especially the U.S. Navy could only be kept in check if they were forced to divide the power of their military between Japan and Germany. Schmider's work rejects all these explanations. Instead, he offers a novel one, arguing that Hitler's decision-making process was largely "driven by a rational weighing of pros and cons" (9) in the early weeks of December 1941 and was "determined solely by military estimates, rather than ideological paradigms" (549).

Dismissing the role ideology played in one of Hitler's most momentous decisions is a bold move. But Schmider backs up his argument with a plethora of evidence. He starts off by demonstrating that the popular notion that Hitler simply underestimated the United States because of his racist and antisemitic views does not hold—a point recently made by an increasing number of scholars, especially since the publication of Adam Tooze's *Wages of Destruction* (2006) which emphasizes the German dictator's keen cognizance of America's overwhelming industrial might and the danger this potentially posed for Germany. Schmider then addresses the question of Hitler's physical and mental health at the time he declared war on the United States, demonstrating that he was not yet aware of his serious health issues. This made it highly unlikely that any fears he was personally running out of time played a role in his decision to take on the American giant.