

Was Germany almost guaranteed to lose World War II after Hitler declared war on the United States?

[Robert Holmén](#), Father was a WWII chemist → [Source](#)

[Updated 13h ago](#) · Upvoted by [Gary Schuster](#), M.S. Aerospace and Aeronautical Engineering & History, University of North Dakota (2017) and [Anthony Ricci](#), 12 years USMC, 10 Navy, 3 Army: ist Gulf War, OIF-06/07

Hitler was like many Europeans.

He didn't understand how big the US really was and how much it could crank out.

There is a story of German spy in the US reporting on a huge locomotive the Americans were building to haul military material across the Rocky Mountains.

Berlin thought he was lying

Making it easy for the US to get in the war by declaring war on it was a major mistake.

EDIT: Many commenters are disappointed that I did not detail the Soviet effort in WWII.

The OP's question was not about the Soviets, however, it was about the US.

The Soviets certainly did most of the fighting and dying in WWII, but attacking the USSR wasn't the guaranteed defeat for the Germans that attacking the US was.

The Germans came very close to over-running the USSR and ending it as an independent country, much as the Soviets eagerly did to Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Poland... when the Soviets were allies of the Germans.

There was never a chance of the US being over-run and defeated in that way.

It was going to be able to fight longer than anyone else could fight it.

It wasn't always clear that the Soviets could hold out.

But the large role of the Soviets in finally ending WWII is an important one that deserves to be noted... especially since they had such a large role in starting it.

Not only that, but Hitler didn't grasp the idea that we were going to build our factories just ONCE.

Then they would crank out whatever we needed for the war for as long as we needed them, never taking a break for months to bulldoze the rubble of the bombed-out plant and build a new one.

And we needed to build exactly ZERO aircraft to defend our own borders and factories.

So, all of our fighters got to go straight to the war front.

And then, after the war, all those factories were going to be converted to pump out everything else the world needed for decades, turning the USA into a major power.

In other words, Nazi Germany had no way to win – too bad they didn't understand that.

My understanding was that the Russians were what broke Hitler far more than any other action.

Hard to resist a country that just went NFG and sent 11 million soldiers to their deaths against Germany.

The Russians owned something like 75% of German casualties.

26 The USA, late to the war impressed with their tanks, troops and enthusiasm, but didn't win the German war by any wild stretch of the imagination.

27 What they did do was help prevent Russia from simply claiming a pretty good chunk of Europe as their own following the German defeat. ¶¶¶

28 There is a substantial argument that the Russians were saved by shipments of arms and other necessary items from the high-producing US factories. ¶¶¶

29 And in December 1941 the Russians had not broken Hitler. ¶¶¶

30 But the OP's question was "Was Germany almost guaranteed to lose World War II after Hitler declared war on the United States?" ¶¶¶

31 My answer is yes, they were definitely not going to win after that. ¶¶¶

32 It was not a request for an assessment of the contribution of every nation in the war. ¶¶¶

33 It's true that the Soviets did most of the fighting and dying to bring down Nazi Germany.

34 It's also true that they wouldn't have been able to do that without enormous quantities of military supplies and humanitarian aid (food, medical supplies, clothing, and such).

35 True, supplies were flowing before the US entered the war, but don't forget that Roosevelt was playing a deep game.

36 The only reason Lend-Lease was started in the first place was because Roosevelt knew the US couldn't sit on the sidelines forever. ¶¶¶

37 The reason Russians did most of the fighting & dying to bring down Germany was because Stalin had entered into a "Non Aggression Pact" with Hitler, in order to invade Poland from the East, shortly after Hitler invaded from the West, making Russia an ally of Germany.

38 In the preceding years, Stalin had murdered thousands and thousands of his own Military, officers & soldiers alike, during multiple and repeated purges, as the result of his paranoia, in conjunction with the Hodolomore and atrocities/ holocausts leveled at his own citizens. ¶¶¶

39 When Hitler invaded Russia, his forces were, consequently, capable of pushing the highly depleted and vastly under-equipped Russian forces back to Moscow.

40 The majority of Russian forces which were wounded and killed suffered their injuries while fighting the German invasion of their country, by armies with whom Stalin had arranged a non-aggression agreement; eventually turning the invasion at Moscow and then pushing German forces West. ¶¶¶

41 So, because of Stalin's agreement with Hitler in the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement, because of which Stalin expected no German aggression and conquest of half of Poland, he expected unimpeded Westward conquest into Poland and status-quo, afterwards.

42 However, Hitler recognized Russia's military weaknesses (in men & equipment) and invaded, violating the agreement Stalin trusted and believed. ¶¶¶

43 Ultimately, the greatest majority of Russian losses were the result of defeating German invasions forces from Russia; from whom Stalin expected only cooperation and accommodation.

44 Had America been invaded by German forces, the US would likely had similar losses, but America never signed an agreement with Germany to invade and split a sovereign nation, and of course, America had the Atlantic Ocean between it and European Theater antagonists. ¶¶¶

45 When you look at the numbers of Russians who died fighting Germany and you look at

Normandy, the Russian losses were far, far higher and that is why Quora followers need to be respectful of THEIR losses. ¶¶¶

46 If I had reason to be in Russia for a while, I might bring flowers to a given site that experienced huge loss of life, as a token of respect, and not try so hard to stick my finger in their eye. ¶¶¶

47 There is a general impression that loss of life indicates contribution to success in defeating Nazism.

48 However, there really is no justification for such a correlation.

49 More modern analyzes argue that without the pressure on German forces in Africa, Italy, and especially the air war over Germany, it is unlikely that the Soviets could have survived. ¶¶¶

50 [Werner Hermann's answer to is the almost-sacred claim that the Allies would have lost the Second World War without the United States overblown?](#) ¶¶¶

51 [Susanna Viljanen's answer to Did Germany have any realistic chance of winning its war against the Soviet Union?](#) ¶¶¶

52 Who's trying to stick a finger in their eye?

53 The people in the Soviet armed forces got the worst of it from everyone – their leaders, the NKVD to the rear, the Nazis.... ¶¶¶

54 Even so – they couldn't have fought at all without supplies. ¶¶¶

55 This !.

56 You've hit the nail on the head exactly. ¶¶¶

57 The amount of suffering and dying done by the Soviet military and the various nations and ethnicities which composed it during WWII is all but unfathomable.

58 I think it's fair to say – if you want to look at it this way – that only the USSR could have "outbled" the Wehrmacht and its allies. ¶¶¶

59 However: there are two large caveats to that statement, and you touch on both of them here.

60 First, the Soviets probably could not have prevailed against the Nazis without the enormous quantities of weapons and, especially, materiel sent by the US and the British Empire.

61 Given the extraordinary measures taken by the Soviets to relocate their major war factories far to the east, could they have held on even without this aid?

62 Maybe, but actually winning in the east without all of the guns, planes, jeeps, trucks, boots, butter, and spam?

63 I doubt it.

64 At best there might have been a negotiated settlement – that's assuming of course that the Germans don't develop nukes during a more drawn-out war and start erasing Russian cities from the map. ¶¶¶

65 Second, and I'm sorry, there's no getting around this, a significant number of the wounds suffered by the USSR were self inflicted.

66 They just were.

67 Or if you like, they were inflicted by the paranoid mass murderer-dictator, Stalin.

68 Not Hitler.

69 Stalin.

70 They should never have had to sacrifice and waste so many soldiers and resources in the first place – but their army was crippled by Stalin’s systematic murder of most of its best officers and anyone else who didn’t immediately poop their pants at the mere mention of his name. ¶¶¶

71 Hitler and his minions added greatly to the carnage and slaughter, for sure.

72 But the Soviets should never have been so vulnerable ... That’s what happens when your country’s leader sends his death squads around to ensure sufficient revolutionary purity by whatever means he deems necessary. ¶¶¶

73 The USA sent hundreds of millions of tons of war material to the USSR. ¶¶¶

74 hundreds ¶¶¶

75 millions ¶¶¶

76 tons ¶¶¶

77 It seems like there are a lot of people obsessed with declaring one true winner of the war.

78 But usually the argument goes something like: ¶¶¶

79 “Country A made indispensable contributions to the war effort.

80 Without them the allies likely would have lost.” ¶¶¶

81 “That’s not true!

82 Country B contributed the most!” ¶¶¶

83 What’s subtle here is that nowhere did the first person claim country A contributed more than B, only that their contribution was critical. ¶¶¶

84 Personally, I think it’s fair to say that without contributions from each major ally - British resolve and base of operations, Russian manpower and space, and American industrial output – there was a very real likelihood of a Nazi victory.

85 Take any one of those factors away and the dynamic of the war completely shifts. ¶¶¶

86 So yeah, your impression may be correct.

87 But I really don’t see how that fact relates to the answer.

88 And that’s not an attack on you especially.

89 The one thing I knew for certain when I read the answer was that someone was going to comment that the Russians did more.

90 If you hadn’t made the comment someone else would have.

91 But it gets a bit old. ¶¶¶

92 The Russian front indeed caused most casualties.

93 However, WWII was very much a mechanized war, where industrial output was a huge factor in winning.

94 Only the defense of Germany against the air bombardment of the US and UK, swallowed up 40% of the total production of Germany.

95 That doesn’t even include the land wars against the western allies! ¶¶¶

96 While the Eastern front was depleting Germany from men, the Western air war was depleting Germany from all its other resources to fight a war. ¶¶¶

97 At Barbarossa, Germany has air superiority over Russia.

- 98 By 1944, the Luftwaffe had all but disappeared from the land battles, as everything was concentrated in a desperate attempt to protect Germany's war production.
- 99 This made the Soviet advance much easier.
- 100 In WWII, in almost all cases, whoever has air superiority won the battles! ¶¶¶
- 101 While it is absurd to say that the USA won WWII by themselves, it is just as ridiculous to claim that the Soviets did it all. ¶¶¶
- 102 There are some who say that on Quora.
- 103 But while it's true that the Russians did the bulk of the fighting and took the most casualties, it isn't true that the US and Britain didn't play crucial roles.
- 104 Stalin himself said that they couldn't have succeeded without American military aid, and the cost of fighting the Americans and British on land and at sea, as well as the impact of the strategic bombings and of course the European invasions, had a significant impact on Hitler's ability to fight in the USSR. ¶¶¶
- 105 Simply put the war could not have been won without the Russians ¶¶¶
- 106 The Russians and Brit's could not have won without the production of the United States. ¶¶¶
- 107 And nobody would have even been in the game if the brits hadn't held out alone for as long as they did and tied the German Air Force and army down in the west.
- 108 This is a very general statement but take any of these dominos out of the equation and your looking at a very different outcome of wwll.