

Stutthof as well as the experience of prisoners towards the end of the war. The chapter focuses on Stutthof survivors, shining a spotlight on their hardships and exposing the conditions of the camp during its final days. The epilogue reflects on the aftermath of the Third Reich's demise and the subsequent evacuation of the camp. It further discusses the narratives of survivors and the potential for reconciliation in the post-war period. The work ends by highlighting the importance of recognizing the role Stutthof played in the history of Nazi camps and the Holocaust.

This work serves as a reminder that while scholarship on the topic has increased in the past two decades, the Holocaust in Poland is a critical component of the study of the "Third Reich". It attributes the gap in the literature to stereotyping, which led to the subsequent neglect of lived experiences and the history of Stutthof. Sch. addresses this issue in the introductory remarks where she highlights the recent decision by the PiS government to penalize people for referring to Nazi camps in the country as "Polish camps" (p. 10). As such, the author's work demonstrates that readers will benefit from these in-depth studies of Poland's role in World War II, as it further facilitates a well-rounded discussion of Holocaust studies. This book helps emphasize Stutthof as a place of not only antisemitism but also anti-Polish violence. Furthermore, the author exposes an increasingly critical aspect of the history of World War II, which is that of propaganda bombardment. Ideas of Germandom, coupled with the constant villainization of the "Jewish Bolshevik," drastically impacted the political climate in Danzig. As the author notes, the Danzigers in the 1930s felt that the Poles wanted to suppress the region economically because of a hatred of Germany. To conclude, the book insightfully exemplifies the consequences that occurred when economic and political turmoil clashed with the weaponization of instability through propaganda.

Toronto

Susan Samardjian

„Euthanasie“-Verbrechen im besetzten Europa. Zur Dimension des nationalsozialistischen Massenmords. Hrsg. von Jörg Osterloh, Jan Erik Schulte und Sybille Steinbacher. (Studien zur Geschichte und Wirkung des Holocaust, Bd. 6.) Wallstein. Göttingen 2022. 391 S. ISBN 978-3-8353-5076-2. (€ 38,—)

"Euthanasia," or the killing of individuals with psychiatric or other disabilities and illnesses, in countries under Nazi occupation is hardly a lacuna of research, yet no comparative or comprehensive studies exist. This collection goes a long way toward remedying the issue, bringing together research by many of the foremost scholars on the various countries and regions. As space limitations here prevent a detailed evaluation of the contents of the entire book, this review will focus on those chapters that cover material for which limited research is available in the English language.

For occupied Poland, Robert Parzer addresses different agents involved in processes that resulted in only 7,000 psychiatric patients surviving the various "euthanasia" actions that were carried out in Poland during the war. Such actions, P. shows, did not always reflect the dichotomy of German killers and Polish victims who became part of Polish collective memory. Certain eugenic ideas, especially concerning the sterilization of individuals considered eugenically inferior, had already gained a foothold in Poland before the German occupation and may help explain the involvement, if not participation, of medical personnel and institutional administrators in various killing actions—especially those whose ethnic background could not, at least initially, easily be classified as either fully Polish or fully German. It was this fluidity in identity, based on German racial and ethnic categorization, P. suggests, that may have pushed these individuals toward taking a role in "euthanasia" actions in opportune times if it advanced their social standing or prevented the loss thereof by assuming a German ethnic identity. This does not change the fact, as P. makes equally clear, that the German occupiers' engagement with Polish psychiatric institutions and their patients was extraordinarily barbaric and destructive. The chapter by Jan

Daniłuk on the Reichsgau Danzig-Westpreußen presents the current state of scholarship, thematizing the beginnings of actions of mass murder of patients at the major psychiatric facilities, particularly the large one at Konradstein (Kocborowo). Transports to and from such facilities, as well as those from smaller institutions and hospitals, are considered, including the transfer of more than 500 patients from Konradstein and affiliated care facilities to the “T4” gas extermination facility Pirna-Sonnenstein and its associated transit facility in Arnsdorf. Particularly valuable in D.’s account are numerous references to recent scholarship by Polish historians. He also addresses “child euthanasia” at Konradstein, with likely more than 500 victims, in a section entitled “Action ‘T4’,” a perspective repeated in the editors’ introductory essay—even though the *Reichsausschussverfahren* was an organizationally separate killing program.

Several chapters thematize historical events in locations to the east of Poland. Dmytro Tytarenko addresses “euthanasia” in German-occupied Ukraine. His account makes abundantly clear just how brutal and destructive this occupation was toward individuals with disabilities and illnesses, particularly children. The reasons for the high mortality rate in this population ranged from direct killing by injection, shooting, and gassing in gas vans to deliberate starvation and the spread of infectious diseases and other conditions brought about by the sheer lack of resources. To provide one example, in Kharkiv in 1942 the mortality rate for newborns was over 50 percent in their first year of life alone. Thousands of patients in psychiatric institutions and hospital psychiatric wards lost their lives, as did residents of homes for disabled people, children’s homes, and individuals believed to be carriers of infectious diseases. The reasons for this, as T. points out, were both ideological (the alleged inferiority of non-Germanic people) and economic-utilitarian (the freeing-up of resources for the occupiers). In a poignant remark in a footnote, he also alludes to the difficulties of carrying out continuing research on this topic as one of the regrettable outcomes of the Russian attack on Ukraine.

For the Baltics, Björn Felder supplies a brief overview of actions that led to mass death among psychiatric and sick patients. Whereas in Estonia and Lithuania, no large killing actions against institutionalized populations took place, in Latvia, they did, in the form of executions and poisoning via injections. Jewish patients in state facilities were killed by security police in all three Baltic countries in the process of ghettoizing the Jewish population. The occupation, in fact, allowed Baltic physicians, under conditions of widespread acceptance of eugenic ideas, to carry out risky and unethical somatic treatments on their patients. In a particularly insightful chapter, Irina Rebrova and Alexander Friedman present the current state of research on the murder of children in Shumiachi in the region of Smolensk and in Jeisk in the region of Krasnodar. As part of a larger killing operation in Shumiachi, members of the Einsatzgruppe B murdered 16 children, who were deemed mentally ill and contagious. In fact, they were intellectually disabled, and on that basis, they had not been included in the general evacuations of children by Soviet authorities from that region. Importantly, the authors thematize the post-World War prosecutions of perpetrators, including Walter Döring, who was prosecuted for his involvement in this crime and other crimes as well. Döring ended up serving less than one year in prison after his conviction in a West German court and was released on probation. The East German and Soviet sides, on the other hand, were mainly interested in instrumentalizing Döring’s lenient treatment in the West for their narrative of memory politics and, consistent with a long tradition, did not mention that the children had been murdered because of their intellectual disabilities. For Jeisk, the authors find a similar pattern: they describe a brutal “evacuation” by German Security Police via a gas van, which involved the murder of 214 children whose disabilities were not mentioned on the Soviet side when their fate was addressed in the context of depicting fascist crimes. However, the authors’ association of the crimes at Jeisk with “children’s euthanasia” is wrong, as the *Reichsausschuss* had nothing to do with it. It bears emphasizing, as the authors do, that it was generally Jewish

children with disabilities who were targeted first for ideological reasons. Few of them likely survived the Nazi occupation.

Such connections to the Holocaust are also made by Christina Winkler in her chapter on occupied areas in the Soviet Union in general. Against the backdrop of Soviet medicine's rejection of eugenics—the concept of “negative eugenics” that W. appears to ascribe to it actually emerged in the discourse of American eugenics—it stands to reason that the involvement of Soviet military and police personnel in “euthanasia” murders was very limited and if anything, was not based on ideologic but rather pragmatic considerations. This, indeed, is the picture that emerges, in contrast to the ideologically driven radicalization of the occupiers' killing methods, including starvation, injection of poison, shootings, and gas vans, which W. discusses for Crimean Simferopol, the municipality of Orel, and the region around Rostov.

In one of several chapters addressing conditions in the west and southwest of Poland, Isabelle von Bueltingsloewen outlines her earlier path-breaking studies on “l'extermination douce” in Vichy France. She recounts the developments that led to the argument that the Vichy Regime had participated in the starvation of 45,000 psychiatric patients in its territory, or at least failed to alleviate conditions that led to such excessive mortality. None of this was true. The ultimate explanation, she points out, is a social one: local or regional organizations that supported marginalized groups such as prisons did not extend their efforts to them, nor did national organizations, while family members had often lost contact with their institutionalized relatives long before the 1940s. While she does not use the term, B.'s account is reminiscent of what is captured in Orlando Patterson's concept of “social death.” The account is one of the few in this book that also relates historical developments to national memory politics and its changes over time. In the Netherlands, as Cecile a an de St e g g e shows, the rate of excess mortality was higher than in France, but it derived from the same issue: societal indifference toward the welfare of individuals with psychiatric disabilities, particularly under extenuating conditions of war and occupation. More so than in France, or differently than there in some regards, some Dutch medical personnel were sympathetic to fascism. Maria F i e b r a n d t adds to such nuanced accounts of societal marginalization by looking at ill and disabled patients in facilities in South Tyrol. They received preference in a resettlement program to fulfill German authorities' promises to their Italian counterparts to meet ethnic German resettlement quotas. Many of them were predestined for murder in the “T4” program but were saved by the fact that they had retained connections to family members and relatives and through their status of statelessness. The lack of family connections proved fatal for ten resettled children, who ended up in Kaufbeuren's Special Children's Ward. All became victims of “children's euthanasia.”

For the Reichsgau Sudetenland, Hagen Markwardt analyzes “euthanasia” actions in care facilities, specifically those in Wiesengrund (Dobřany), the largest facility there, but also Sternberg (Šternberg) and Troppau (Opava). After it was assigned to Germany, the Sudetenland experienced chaotic conditions, which included declining capacities for care in those facilities and a lack of medical personnel. One of the immediate consequences was that eugenic sterilizations were implemented to a much lesser degree than expected. However, the “T4” action began swiftly with the mailing of more than 6,000 reporting forms to the main care facilities and around 30 smaller ones in early 1940. Subsequently, numerous transports departed to the “T4” gassing center Pirna-Sonnenstein and possibly also to Hartheim. Over 1,000 people fell victim to the operation, including Jewish and non-Jewish patients in the same transports, as well as a small number who were stateless or of Czech nationality. After the “T4” action had ended, Wiesengrund was turned into a large “dying institution” (Sterbeanstalt) to which patients from other regions were sent. It also housed a Special Children's Ward, which remains a lacuna in research. According to M., in August 1941 the number of deaths among minors under 14 years of age began to increase. By the end of 1943, a total of 150 had lost their lives. It appears likely that after

April 1944, when the director, Dr. Karl Hever, was replaced by a physician who did not want to become personally involved, the ward was discontinued. Michal Šimůnek and Michel Novák address the conditions in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. German patients of care facilities were concentrated in the facility Kosmanos and were destined to become victims of "T4," which was prevented only by the discontinuation of the operation in August 1941, whereas Jewish patients were sent to two facilities from where they were deported to Terezín and the death camps. Kosmanos recorded an increased mortality rate of close to 1,700 patients between 1939 and 1945, which the authors attribute to adverse conditions such as a lack of food as well as direct killings as part of "decentralized euthanasia." For the Special Children's Ward at Wiesengrund, they located the ward in a section of the existing children's home and found a rise in mortality as early as August 1940. Here, as many as 150 minors died in 1941 and 1942 alone.

In other chapters, Paul Weindling provides a comprehensive overview of "euthanasia" actions across the entire region. Harald Jenner presents the current state of research on "euthanasia" for the care facility Meseritz-Obrawalde, and Florian Schwanninger for the "Ostmark." An introductory chapter by the editors, Walter Pehle on the career of "euthanasia" researcher Paul Klee and Gerrit Hohendorf on Germany, round out the book.

The compilation of essays in this volume is one of the best available. One could have wished for abstracts of the chapters in English and a chapter providing a comparative analysis of the judicial prosecution of perpetrators, but these are minor points.

Burlington, VT

Lutz Kaelber

Yecheil Weizman: Unsettled Heritage. Living Next to Poland's Material Jewish Traces after the Holocaust. Cornell University Press. Ithaca – London 2022. XIV, 289 S., Ill. ISBN 978-1-5017-6174-4. (\$ 45,-)

Yecheil Weizman hat eine zeitgeschichtlich-ethnografische Studie über den Umgang mit der materiellen Hinterlassenschaft der jüdischen Bevölkerung Polens vorgelegt. Der Titel lässt sich im Deutschen nicht leicht wiedergeben, geht es doch um ein Erbe, das noch ungeklärt, gewissermaßen in der Schwebe ist – und zugleich Beunruhigung hervorruft.

W. befasst sich vor allem mit der Entwicklung in kleinen Provinzstädten, also den ehemaligen jüdisch geprägten Shtetln im Jiddischland Ostmitteleuropas (S. 4). Sein Interesse gilt der Fragestellung, welche „Interaktion“ (S. 16) in Bezug auf die nach dem nationalsozialistischen Judenmord verbliebenen Synagogen und jüdischen Friedhöfe seitens der dort lebenden und später dort aufgewachsenen Polen erkennbar ist. Vor 1939 gab es in Polen etwa 10 000 Synagogen und 2 000–2 500 Friedhöfe, davon entfielen 60 Prozent auf das Gebiet, das nach dem Krieg zu Polen gehörte (S. 26).

Um herauszuarbeiten, wie in den Augen der polnischen Bevölkerung das Erbe der früheren Nachbarn betrachtet wurde, nutzt W. eine vielgestaltige Quellenbasis. Sie reicht vom Schriftverkehr aus der Lokalverwaltung über Niederschriften, Berichte in Staats- und Ortsarchiven „across Poland“ (S. 12) hin zu Reiseberichten, Zeitungsmeldungen, Veröffentlichungen mit lokalem Bezug und jüdischen Erinnerungsbüchern; darüber hinaus fließen Interviews und eigene ethnografische Feldforschungen mit ein.

In seiner Einleitung geht W. von einem prägenden Erlebnis aus, das er beim Besuch des verwilderten Friedhofs in Kolbuszowa hatte. Ein Ortsansässiger mittleren Alters habe ihm den Weg dorthin gezeigt und, nachdem sie dort angekommen waren, eine 1942 oder 1943 von den deutschen Besatzern verübte Massenerschießung zu schildern gewusst. Dem stellt W. Erkenntnisse der neuesten Forschung gegenüber, welche die polnische Bevölkerung nicht mehr nur als „Zuschauer“ ansieht, sondern in vielen Fällen als Mitbeteiligte oder gar Mittäter beim nationalsozialistischen Mordprogramm.

Die Untersuchung ist in zehn Kapitel gegliedert. Im ersten – betitelt mit dem Bibelzitat „Everything Was a Void“ – gibt W. einen Überblick über die aufgrund der NS-Herrschaft