

HUNGARY AND YUGOSLAVIA BETWEEN 1944 AND 1947

ENIKŐ A. SAJTI

ABSTRACT

The study shows, based on archive sources, Hungarian, Serbian and Croatian literature, how the relations between Hungary and Yugoslavia changed from the autumn of 1944 to the end of 1947. It proceeds from the fact that the descent into war not only made Hungary's revisionist efforts fail, but also put severe strain on the relationship between the two nations. Between 1945 and 1947 Hungary had become a country under military occupation, lost its sovereignty and fell under the authority of the Allied Control Commission (ACC), thus the relationships were not rebuilt between two equal nations. The study presents and analyzes in detail the actions of the Yugoslavian delegation which was ordered to work beside the ACC, the problems that arose between the two governments, among other things, the question of transplanting the German ethnicities in Bácska to Hungarian regions.

The author discusses in detail the anti-Hungarian sanctions carried out by the Yugoslavian Army and the local Slavic population in the Southern Region, examines the confiscation of Hungarian citizens' property in Yugoslavia, addresses the question of land claims in the Baja triangle as well as the population exchange agreement that was established at the 1946 Paris Peace Conference but was never realized. The last part of the study discusses the establishment of diplomatic relations between Hungary and Yugoslavia, and the Treaty of Friendship signed by the two countries upon Tito's 1947 visit to Budapest. The good relationship came to an end in the spring of 1948, due to international political reasons and suddenly reached an all-time low.

Gustav Kálnoky, while serving as the joint Secretary of State of the Austro–Hungarian Empire, made a remark regarding the nature of foreign policy that is still valid today. He wrote: “*the freedom in making foreign policy decisions depends on the strength of internal authority*”.¹

By the end of 1944 Hungary and Yugoslavia were not on equal terms neither in the freedom to make decisions on foreign policy nor in the strength of their internal authority. The post war collapse meant not only that the success of former revisionist attempts would be dissolved, but the revision and the war seriously taxed the relationship with neighboring countries like Yugoslavia, among others.

As we know, the diplomatic relations between Hungary and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia were terminated following Yugoslavia’s military collapse and division in 1941. During the war Hungary maintained its diplomatic relations with the Independent Croatian State through ambassadors. In Serbia, occupied by Germany, there was only a consulate and Serbia had no representative in Budapest. Post-war relations of Yugoslavia and Hungary were rebuilt under radically different internal and international circumstances. The world had changed a great deal by the end of 1944, the power relations had shifted unequivocally in favor of the now internationally recognized Yugoslavia. The defeated Hungary was seated in the defendant’s chair by the great powers. As a consequence of the peace treaty, three million Hungarians found themselves outside their country’s borders again, while Yugoslavia triumphantly took its place on the victors’ side, and reunited the country that had been divided up in 1941. This internationally recognized state reconstruction effectively legitimized the internal power of the new communist elite, the unequivocally Soviet-style (communist) societal configuration.

From 1945 to 1947 Hungary was a country under military occupation regaining its formal sovereignty only after the 1947 Paris Peace Treaty. Before that, just like many of the war’s losing countries, such as Italy, Finland, Romania and Bulgaria, it remained under international control by means of the ACC (Allied Control Commission). The ACC was specified to operate in Hungary in the Armistice Agreement of January 20th, 1945 in Moscow between Hungary and the Soviet Union. The Soviets, the British and the Americans along with Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia were authorized to send missions to Hungary as members of a reparations subcommittee working alongside the ACC. The ACC oversaw the whole of Hungary’s internal affairs and foreign policy, economy, railway system and airspace. Hungary’s Federal Control Commission’s work was terminated on September 15th, 1947, on this day Moscow placed the Hungarian peace treaty in trust, and this meant the Armistice Agreement had expired. It was from this hierarchal, victor–loser situation that Hungarian–Yugoslavian relations were rebuilt after WWII.

The first members of the Yugoslavian delegation arrived in Debrecen on March 10th, 1945 amidst a raging storm; the number of people taking part in the mission soon grew to 10. We can assume that the number continued to grow with time but sources cannot determine the rate of this growth. For the sake of comparison: the Soviet delegation numbered about 800 people, the British about 300 whilst the USA was represented by approximately 120-130 people and the initial 20 member Czechoslovakian delegation grew to 90. Both the occupying Soviet forces and the ACC delegations were supported at the expense of the Hungarian state. The leader of the Yugoslavian delegation was Colonel Obrad Cicmil², among the members was Captain Lazar Brankov, who was later to play an important role in the Rajk trial³. Lieutenant-colonel Jovan Lončar was Cicmil's deputy. Other members included Major Mihaljo Javorski, Captains Pal Kovač and Grujo Spahič and Lieutenants Djordje Milanić and Rajko Popović. The economic experts were Vladimir Gavrilović and Mirko Vukotić. The Yugoslavian mission's tasks included searching for stolen Yugoslavian assets, the question of restoration between the two countries as well as searching for and extraditing war criminals. Due to the lack of official diplomatic relations, the Yugoslavian ACC mission, in addition to their original function ensured the connection between Budapest and Belgrade. Aside from maintaining the relationship between the two communist parties, the Yugoslavian mission played an important role in reinitiating political, cultural relationships between the two countries as well as in the exchange of information due to the lack of other channels of communication. The fact that Hungary had no official representation in Belgrade until 1947 made the relationship fairly one-sided.

Apart from fully supporting the occupying Soviet troops, the Hungarian state was entirely responsible for the whole ACC administration as well as the Czechoslovakian and Yugoslavian missions (living quarters, offices, fuel, food and entertainment allowances, casinos, cars, car repair workshops and sports facilities were all maintained by the state). This was a serious problem for Hungary, which had suffered severe damages during the war and was paying these expenses in addition to reparations.⁴ Neither of the ACC missions exercised moderation. Records show that during one month, the Czechoslovakian delegation ordered 13 thousand (!) bottles of alcoholic beverages and the Yugoslavians ordered 20 Persian rugs in addition to their Baroque style office furniture.⁵ The arrival of the mission to Budapest already posed several problems because the building of the Yugoslavian consulate was damaged during the siege of Budapest.

Apart from reparations, other issues concerning both countries were discussed on May 7th, 1945, just a few weeks after the first meeting. Cicmil, accompanied by Brankov, who spoke excellent Hungarian, called upon Gyöngyösi and they held a discussion lasting over an hour on how to improve the relations between

the two countries as well as the problems they were facing at the time. Gyöngyösi brought up the disorganized and inhumane mass relocation of Hungarians in the Southern Region, to which Cicmil replied, in an effort to “*counterbalance*” the issue that he disapproved of Hungary’s expulsion of five Serbian families living by the border. Cicmil also alluded to the, in his opinion, “*unjustified*” searches conducted in the homes of Serbians along the border as well as the armed conflict that had erupted between Hungarian and Yugoslavian border guards. He also mentioned the question of Yugoslavian territories having been “*robbed of certain assets*”. During the meeting, which, according to the report, was conducted in a “*friendly mood*”, Gyöngyösi tried to answer all of Cicmil’s questions with accurate information. Thus, he referenced the fact that Yugoslavian partisans had smuggled weapons across the border and hid them in villages populated by Yugoslavians as a justification for the home searches conducted in the border regions. He also said that the return of Serbian assets was encumbered by the fact that instead of the Yugoslavian mission an unauthorized delegation had attempted to act in the matter recently in Szeged.⁶

On December 31st, 1945 György Heltai, Department Councillor of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, handed over the Hungarian government’s memorandum in which Hungary “*acknowledges*” the formation of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the deposition of King Peter II, and the establishment of the Constituent Assembly of Yugoslavia. The meeting lasted almost two hours, during which Heltai inquired primarily about the reason why “*in recent weeks Yugoslavian factors did not deal with us in the friendly spirit in which they had before*”. Cicmil did not deny that they felt that their “*friendly gestures had remained unrequited*”, and then went on to discuss in detail the reasons for their dissatisfaction. Firstly, he mentioned the education issue, stating that there was “*not a single Yugoslavian school established in Hungary*”. Even though, he continued, he had received a promise from the Prime Minister that there will be an inquiry into the matter by a joint committee, this never happened.⁷ They had turned to the Hungarian government several times about the extradition of war criminals, but they only received a reply to their memorandum in the press. He went on to say, certain newspapers had reported that officials in Budapest had already scheduled the ringleaders of the Novi Sad raids to stand trial, instead of extraditing them to Yugoslavia in accordance with the armistice because they had committed their “*shameful business*” here.⁸ Cicmil also reproached Heltai saying they feel that “*Hungarian revisionist propaganda has been resurrected*” in the Hungarian press, so they “*should not be surprised if because of this the Yugoslavian press, out of exasperation, publishes a few acerbic articles*”. However, this does not influence the Yugoslavian government in “*ensuring Hungarians can exercise the fullest range of rights*”, he added

as if to ease tension. Afterward Heltai tried to convince Cicmil that the addressed problems were not due to a change in the Hungarian government's behavior towards Yugoslavia, but can be traced back to a lack of accurate information and the slow-moving function of state bodies. He requested that they accept what he says "*despite any opposing information*", because in contrast with certain press circles, the Hungarian government believes revisionist propaganda to be "*just as unwise as the Yugoslavians do*". Cicmil, after hearing Heltai's arguments, admitted that the reason behind the problems between the two countries were the North Bácska results of the Yugoslavian election, because "*especially in the smallholders' region, 50% of the Hungarian population voted against the government even though they have no cause for complaint against the modern Yugoslavia*".⁹

József Rex, who was from the Vajdaság and spoke Serbian well, became the liaison between the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the ACC's Yugoslavian delegation. He had received his position in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs explicitly due to Soviet pressure. Rex was a member of the Yugoslavian Communist Party, a partisan and then a lieutenant in the Red Army. He later became the secretary of the Hungarian consulate in Belgrade in 1947. He had played an important role in the establishment of the Yugoslav–Hungarian Association, of which he was the first secretary-general.¹⁰

The relationship between the two countries, as we know, was already strained by recent events, primarily by the annexation of the Southern Region to Hungary and the 1942 raids in South Bácska and Novi Sad. The effects of the raids on Hungarians living in Yugoslavia were utterly tragic. The government received an increasing number of reports about the retaliations inflicted on Hungarians in the Southern Region, such as the execution of innocent civilians, expulsion, confiscation of assets and labor camps.

Initial news of atrocities committed by partisans in the Southern Region arrived at the Minorities Department of the government from the disintegrating but still functional Hungarian civil service administration in the Southern Region before the collapse caused by the war, during the Lakatos Administration. The first such report came from the gendarmerie of Muraköz and Iván Nagy, Member of Parliament¹¹ on August 31st, 1944, who forwarded a letter written on August 7th by Rózsi Lajkó of Csáktornya to the ministry. The woman had written an account of the circumstances surrounding their father's death to her brother living in Doroszló. According to the shocking letter on the night of July 23rd, partisans invaded the village, rounded up 68 people, forced them to the edge of the village to a swampy area where they shot the elderly, among them Lajkó's father.¹²

József Grósz, the archbishop of Kalocsa and Bács, brought the expulsions and executions to the attention of János Gyöngyösi, Minister of Foreign Affairs,

in a longer report at the end of April 1945 on behalf of the bishops of the Catholic Church. He urged the government to take effective actions regarding the issue of expulsion. As we can read in his letter: *“The Hungarians of the Southern Region suffered serious tribulations at the end of last year when, as far as I could determine from the credible information available with strict border closure, thousands and tens of thousands of Hungarians have been kidnapped and taken to unknown locations by Yugoslavian partisans. According to some almost unverifiable reports, the number of Hungarians murdered by Yugoslavians can be estimated to be many thousands. [...]”*

*In addition, in the past few days, Yugoslavian authorities have been expelling Hungarians by the thousands from certain regions who moved to the Southern Region after 1941 and are thus not Yugoslavian citizens, as well as those who fled their homes when the Russian army entered but have since returned. I am aware that in accordance with the armistice the Hungarian government is under obligation to transport all non-Yugoslavian citizens from the Southern Region to Hungary but I object and I must urge the Minister of Foreign Affairs to take effective measures against these proceedings, as these expulsions are indeed taking place. [...] They rounded up those who were to be expelled, township by township, without warning, with only the most necessary items of clothing that they were wearing and allowing only 500 P. to take with them in cash on average. The homes of the expelled were sealed and marked by the Yugoslavian authorities, but in many places they also began to carry away equipment immediately.”*¹³

The arbitrary transplantation of the Yugoslavian Germans to Hungary also caused serious problems in the two countries' relationship. In June 1945 some 3000 Germans were placed over the border in Kelebia, accompanied by 400 partisans. Their commander threatened that if the Hungarians do not let them in, then *“they will have them line up along the border and shoot them”*.¹⁴ On January 30th, 1946 the chief constable of Nagykanizsa sent word to the Ministry of Internal Affairs that 16 days ago the Yugoslavians had transported 4000 Germans in crowded train wagons under inhumane conditions to Hungarian territories with the purpose of handing them over to the Austrian authorities, who did not take them. These people were stranded at the border station in Murakeresztúr, *“there are only 1800 people left of the transplantees, of whom many are ill with typhoid and dysentery. If they remain here we are facing a nationwide epidemic.”*¹⁵

According to the official record drawn up on August 2nd, 1945, at the border station outside Nagyszéksós, *“a group of about 150 partisans held patrolmen at gunpoint and placed light machine guns and machine guns on both sides of the bridge. The partisans behind the Swabians chased the group of 157 people over to Hungarian territories. When the Hungarian border guard commander requested them to be taken back as per the ACC's orders, the Serbian commander answered that he will prevent the*

transposal of the Germans even if it means fighting if necessary. He does not take orders from the Russians, because they are nobodies, he only takes orders from Tito and if he must he will beat the Russians back to the Tisza.” For emphasis, he added, *“if there is going to be a lot of talk, they will be at Rösztke within half an hour and within 2 hours at Szeged (at the cost of fighting if necessary) and the Danube–Tisza line will be the new border”*.¹⁶

More and more information was relayed to Hungary about the retaliations against Yugoslavian Hungarians as well. On July 17th, 1947 Cardinal Mindszenty, the Archbishop of Esztergom forwarded to Gyöngyösi János, Minister of Foreign Affairs, the anonymous reports titled *“Hungarian Fate in the Southern Regions”* and *“Shedding a Light of Truth on Circumstances of Hungarians Living in Yugoslavia”* that were personally delivered to him by a delegation from the Southern Region. They referred especially to the executions of Hungarians in Bezdán, the deportation of the Hungarian population in Csurog and Zsablya and the tragic death of the former lord-lieutenant of Szabadka, Andor Reök. *“Dr. Andor Reök was deceived into coming over and a few weeks later he was thrown from a balcony of the bán’s castle in the Southern Region. Dr. József Bogner, newspaper editor, was executed after being subjected to lengthy torture. The parson of Torontáloroszi was beaten to death by Tito’s Gestapo in the basement. The 84 year old abbot of Horgos, István Virág, died of fright on the sight of his execution. Lajos Varga, parson of Moholy, was dragged for kilometers after a cart until he died of exhaustion. Afterward his corpse was mutilated. István Köves, a chaplain from Mozsor, was kidnapped from Hungarian territory and was taken down to Novi Sad.”* They gave accounts of Hungarian people being executed for sabotage in a mine in Vrđnik and they also mentioned an infamous *“slave market”* operating in one of the internment camps in Novi Sad. *“In the camp at 5AM men and women must line up separately. At 5:30AM they step out in front of their employers. They choose from among them and take them away. Some of the employees who come only want women and girls. These employees are usually from one army or another. There are an exceedingly large number of people infected with syphilis. Toward the end of April at 3:30AM a soldier came to the camp into the women’s sleeping quarters and chose a girl for himself saying he »only needed her for 2 hours«. Accordingly, she trudged back half dead at 6AM. [...] They use ordained priests to clean toilets and to tan raw horse, cow and pig skin for months on end. They are not permitted to celebrate mass or to anoint the sick (this would be considered reactionary work). They are not even permitted to go out into the streets.”*¹⁷

The nationwide purges, as we know, were planned and orchestrated by the central military–political circles. OZNA units Yugoslavia-wide received their orders to carry out purges personally from Aleksandar Ranković, Minister of Internal Affairs and OZNA leader. The order was to liquidate the enemies of the people by means

of mass execution: political and class enemies, POWs and civilians, collaborators, Ustashas, Chetniks, Hungarians, Germans, in other words anyone belonging to any nationality or social class, apart from active partisans. The goal of the retaliations against all peoples and nationalities in the last phase of the war was to annihilate possible and assumed enemies, to force political opponents out of power, and to solidify the power of the new, still weak state bodies through intimidation. Regarding this, Serbian literature mentions the “*Forest Psychosis*” of the political elite, meaning that anyone who was not a partisan (i.e. did not go into the forest) was considered an enemy. In 1944, the famous–infamous OZNA Corps, whose 7 divisions and many brigades operated all over Yugoslavia, was established for the explicit goal of liquidating “*the enemies of the people*”. The actions of these Execution brigades were supported by the local Slav population in ethnically mixed territories, such as the Vajdaság, who in many cases took part in the attacks. The executions were initially performed without any formal trial, based only on “*say so*”, in many places according to lists left behind by Hungarian authorities containing the names of Arrow Cross Party members, but anyone who was a member of the Hungarian Renewal Party was automatically considered a war criminal, as well as those who held office during the Hungarian Era – also levente-instructors, clergymen and teachers, in fact anyone who simply enthusiastically welcomed the restoration of the Hungarian Imperium in 1941.¹⁸

News of the atrocities, which went through from the Prime Minister’s Office to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, were met with the response that “*many reports contain false information*” by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and to speak of 40-45 thousand executed and 30 thousand deported was “*completely absurd*”. “*All things considered*”, writes József Rex, the Ministry’s rapporteur, regarding the matter, “*the Hungarians’ situation is not very bright in Yugoslavia but it could be a lot worse*”.¹⁹

My recent research has not changed my previous observations that the Hungarian government did not protest against the executions to the ACC or the Yugoslavian delegation. Sources have been uncovered that attest to the fact that American and British delegates of the ACC, however, knew of the executions, and in many cases requested information about these from the Hungarian government. During these conversations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs officials primarily emphasized that they had no “*official reports*” of the executions even though they had known about them. However, data in connection to these cases, according to their opinion, had been exaggerated to a great extent and was unverifiable. In June 1945, Vladimir Gavrilović, the Yugoslavian delegation’s economic expert, contrary to real facts, had a conversation with the Hungarian government in “*quite a friendly tone*” ensuring that “*there is no persecution against Hungarians in Bácska and never was. Mass expulsion of Hungarians took place in merely two townships, Csurog and Zsabya and only in their own interest, due to the known events in Novi Sad. Hungarians will be grouped into the regions*

abandoned by the Swabians, West Bácska, Hódság, etc. In Óbecse, for example, trials were held by the People's Court which indeed resulted in executions, but only in cases where robbery, murder and complicity in the Novi Sad events were proven." Gavrilović also added: "The Hungarian are very lucky that Tito came to power, otherwise the retroaction and revenge for the Novi Sad events would have been truly terrible. Altogether the Hungarians are doing quite well..."²⁰ Our sources also prove that the Hungarian government made complaints to the Yugoslavian government via the ACC and the Yugoslavian delegation about the inhumane way the expulsions were being carried out, which also effected the so-called "natives", and also about the illegal transplantation of the Germans of Vajdaság to Hungarian territory. On many occasions they requested that the officials expelled in accordance with the armistice at least be given back their movable assets, allowing these to be brought over. The Yugoslavian government cut the matter short with their reply on November 25th, 1945, stating that "the Hungarian officials who came to Yugoslavian territories during the occupation as members of a fascist central administration did not bring anything with them", therefore there is nothing to be given back to them.²¹

On September 10th, 1946 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs addressed the ACC's Yugoslavian delegation in an oral memorandum regarding legal proceedings against the branch- and establishment leaders of Hungarian companies with locations in Yugoslavia accused of collaboration, although, the memorandum did not mention the accused by name. The government, led by Smallholder Party member Ferenc Nagy, raised objection against the confiscation of assets on the grounds of "the armistice being intended to settle the question of the property belonging to Hungarian natural and legal persons on Yugoslavian territory along with the future of their rights and interests, and said Yugoslavian regulation is obstructing these ordinances". The Hungarian government does not question, the memorandum continues, that the leaders of Hungarian owned companies must be held responsible for war crimes, but they consider the regulation that "the assets of Hungarian legal persons will be confiscated due to the possible guilt of the local company leaders" to be far-reaching and unlawful. They also objected to the fact that the vast majority of company leaders were tried without legal representation and declared people who "did everything in their power to ensure that the occupation could use the plants in the companies' possession in as small a degree as possible" war criminals.²²

Yugoslavian propaganda regarding territory claims against Hungary began directly after the reoccupation of Szabadka. On November 5th, 1944 at the Yugoslavian Liberation ceremony in Szabadka, orators pledged allegiance to the Baja Triangle and in a telegram addressed to Tito they stated "the commitment of the Bunjevci of the Baja Triangle to the common homeland". They also expressed their hope that "in contrast with past guilty Yugoslavian governments, Tito and his people will not neglect to annex the Baja Triangle".²³

In Baranya and Vas Counties, in Mohács and Baja, along practically the whole southern border, armed Yugoslavian troops questioned the Hungarian administration's authority. Around Letenye, for example, "*Yugoslavians armed with weapons went door to door to collect signatures*" in the interest of annexing the territory to Yugoslavia. The vice lord-lieutenant of Zala Castle District turned directly to the Minister of Defense for help, because, as he wrote in his letter on May 11th, 1945, a partisan corps of 68 people had been "*vandalizing*" near the oil plants for several days, "*looting daily, they take horses from their carts...*" and they "*bound and kidnapped Hungarian police officers*".²⁴ In Baja, Csikéria, Tompa and Bácsalmás, Russian soldiers detained "*meddlesome*" Yugoslavian gunmen and "*categorically refused Yugoslavians gaining any ground within Trianon country borders*", reads one of the Provisional Government's reports of January, 1945.²⁵

On January 14th, 1945 a Yugoslavian delegation from the Pécs area, whose members were of the ranks of the Antifašistički front Slovena u Mađarskoj (Antifascist Front of Slavs in Hungary), led by, according to Hungarian sources, the Yugoslavian agent and Šokci ethnic writer from Gara, Antun Karagić, called on Josip Broz Tito to request the annexation of the Baja Triangle to Yugoslavia. We also know that the III. Yugoslavian army arriving in Pécs had received the specific order to take over the city's administration, which was, however, prevented by the Red Army.²⁶

Land claims regarding the Baja Triangle were on the agenda in Yugoslavian official circles until the Spring of 1946. In February of 1945 Josip Broz Tito, in a letter addressed to Fyodor Ivanovich Tolbukhin, commander of the 3rd Ukrainian Front and veteran of the Serbian and Hungarian battles, on the one part complained of the Hungarian government's "*oppressive politics*" against the Yugoslavians, and on the other, brought to Tolbukhin's attention that he will, at the Yugoslavian Peace Conference, based on "*historical right*", demand the annexation of the Baja Triangle and the Pécs and Arad areas to Yugoslavia. In his letter we can read: "*As much as 50 000 of our countrymen*²⁷, *mainly Serbs and Croats have remained within Hungarian borders since World War I. Most of our compatriots reside in the Baja Triangle in the Pécs and Arad areas but there are many living along the whole of the Hungarian–Yugoslavian border, too. During the peace talks we will demand the annexation of these regions to our country, because we are entitled to them on the basis of historical right. Our residents, throughout history, have always been persecuted by Hungarian feudal lords and German conquerors. They have been violently displaced from these territories, violently Hungarianized. Persecution of our residents has especially escalated during this war, which was accompanied by the solidarity of the Slav peoples. Our brothers have still managed to maintain their national identity though. Hungarian officials, even though the situation has changed radically due to the arrival of the Soviet army, continue to pursue their*

*prior policies against our residents. Searches, holding our brothers captive in camps and arrests are everyday occurrences. I urge you to act quickly so that these residents can be freed and please, prevent the Hungarian authorities from preceding in a similar manner against our residents, and so that our compatriots can freely express their national identity, be free to organize and to proclaim their antifascist views, and organize their own military units and join the People's Liberation Army of Yugoslavia.”*²⁸

Yugoslavia used the border issue to put pressure on Hungary in order to aid the communist party's takeover. The main goal of Yugoslavian foreign policy at this time was, as we know, to ensure the solidification of the new political authority, and to which the means were as close a cooperation with the Soviet Union as possible as well as establishing a Yugoslav-led Balkan-, possibly a Balkan-Eastern European Federation.²⁹ Along the northern border, they wanted to see a communist-led Hungary that would cooperate closely with Yugoslavia.³⁰

Apart from border modification, there were ideas in Yugoslavia on how to deal with the “Hungarian issue”. Some saw the solution in the transfer of the entire Hungarian population or a Yugoslavian–Hungarian population exchange, perhaps combined with a smaller land concession for the benefit of Hungary. Vasa Čubrilović, former assassin, later historian and politician, is credited for the first, whilst the latter was devised by Sreten Vukosavljević, Minister of Resettlement, sociologist and expert on Serbian Village Studies (considered the father of Village Studies in Serbia), from the perspective of resettlement.³¹

The issue of land claims against Hungary was permanently taken off the agenda during Tito's last visit to Moscow on May 28th, 1946. During the talks, Tito urged the Soviets to provide economic assistance and assured Stalin that “*the Yugoslavian government does not intend to allow capital from other powers into its economy*”. Finally, almost marginally, he informed Stalin about the Hungarian–Yugoslavian relations. “*Tito said that the Yugoslavian government had decided not to address Yugoslavian land claims against Hungary (in regards to the Baja Triangle) in the Council of Ministers*”. To which Stalin approvingly remarked: “*If Hungary wishes to have peaceful relations with Yugoslavia, then Yugoslavia must support that endeavor*”, especially, he reminded Tito not without any insinuation, because “*Yugoslavia is primarily having difficulties in their relations with Greece and Italy*”.³²

On August 26th, 1946 Edvard Kardelj, Minister of Foreign Affairs and leader of the Yugoslavian peace delegation, made an unexpected offer of a “*voluntary population exchange of approximately 40 thousand people, within a modest framework*”, to the leader of the Hungarian peace delegation, János Gyöngyösi, in Paris, as well as to sign an agreement on the water supply under Baja. Kardelj first ensured Gyöngyösi that Yugoslavia would make no land claims against Hungary but, as if compensating for this, they should enter into a contract regarding the Baja water supply. Jože Vilfan,

secretary-general of the Yugoslavian peace delegation, let the Hungarians know that if they accept the population exchange proposition, then Yugoslavia will not submit its proposition for the amendment of the Hungarian peace agreement, which would have provided special education and nationality rights to Yugoslavians living in Hungary.

István Kertész, the secretary-general of the Hungarian peace delegation called the offer “*a surprising ultimatum*”, which the Hungarian side should have accepted within 48 hours. A hectic flutter began in Budapest because they did not want to lose the Yugoslavians’ good will at the peace talks, which they were greatly in need of, especially against Czechoslovakia. Ferenc Nagy, Smallholder Party Prime Minister, called the Yugoslavian draft a “*very mild and friendly*” proposal compared to the Czechoslovak–Hungarian population exchange agreement. He called attention to the fact that they should not “*arm the Slovaks*” with a possible refusal. The Council of Ministers essentially accepted the Yugoslavians’ population exchange draft without modification.³³ On September 12th, 1946 Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Kardelj and Gyöngyösi agreed in principal to the population exchange, released a joint bulletin about the agreement and the Yugoslavian delegation withdrew its above mentioned proposal to amend the Hungarian peace agreement. The population exchange agreement was concluded in a unique way, through correspondence, and was quite highly publicized in both countries. The contract comprised 11 sections, which stated that the resettlement was voluntary and pertained to 40 000 people. The contract alludes to the fact that Yugoslavia will have the “*right of recommendation*” regarding the resettlers. These proposals were determined to fall under the jurisdiction of a joint commission. Resettlement propaganda could only be carried out by the Yugoslavian side on Hungarian territory. The Hungarian side, in Yugoslavia, did not have this same right. Resettlers were only allowed to take their movable assets with them, real estate assets left behind would have been mutually credited. The Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs sought to assess resettlement intentions among Yugoslavians living in Hungary. They were surprised to find that there were barely any applicants. The Hungarians of the Vajdaság, however, were “*preparing to leave in droves*”.³⁴ According to Hungarian archival sources, the population exchange was never carried out.³⁵

If we want to answer the legitimate but complicated question of why, out of all its neighbors, did Hungary, despite the afore mentioned problems, form the best relationship with Yugoslavia after the war, furthermore, why Yugoslavia initiated the rapprochement, we must take into consideration the following factors: firstly, among the Hungarian coalition parties, it was primarily the communists who considered it important to build closer ties with Yugoslavia, since they saw in this the outside support of the reinforcement of internal political positions. They considered Yugoslavia’s internal system an example to be followed, going so far as having the

Ministry of Defense's state secretary, in the Spring of 1946, ask the ACC's Yugoslavian delegation to send them the Yugoslavian army's military regulations because "*it would serve as the basis for the Hungarian army's regulations*".³⁶ Between October 10th and 15th, 1947 a police committee led by Police Lieutenant-General Gábor Péter, who was rising to infamy at the helm of the State Security Agency (ÁVH), and Endre Szebenyi, visited Yugoslavia in order to study the local state security institutions.³⁷ These internal military relationships would also be worth exploring in detail.

During the period of the armistice, because it was a country with limited sovereignty, Hungary could not officially initiate diplomatic relations with any country. Other countries did this in its stead, among them Yugoslavia. In the autumn of 1945, the ACC's Yugoslavian delegation had already made a promise to the Smallholder Party Minister of Foreign Affairs, János Gyöngyösi, that if Hungary supports Yugoslavia's claims to Trieste, then the Yugoslavian government will support Hungary not only at the peace talks but even at the peace preparations "*in all questions that do not oppose Yugoslavia's interest*".³⁸ It seemed as though this was not an empty promise on Yugoslavia's part. In the summer of 1945, when Rákosi and Rajk visited Belgrade, they agreed that the Yugoslavian government would moderate Prague in regards to the harsh and inhumane persecution of Hungarians living in Slovakia, which they indeed did in several cases. In 1947 Yugoslavia supported Hungary's admission into the UN.³⁹ Even then, Belgrade was not neutral on whether or not there is a sympathetic country beyond their northern border, one which, in fact, shares the same social configuration, which in return supports Yugoslavia's supranationalist plans for the Balkans.⁴⁰ Yugoslavia's main foreign policy endeavor was to create an external situation that would help solidify the new communist power.

In August of 1945, a few months after the liberation of Belgrade, the Yugoslav-Hungarian Association, led by writer, Lajos Zilahy, who at the time was the leader of the Hungarian-Soviet Friendship Society, commissioned by the Hungarian-Yugoslavian Association's preparation delegation, visited the Yugoslavian capital. Their goal was multi-directional: they tried to establish contacts among the representatives of the arts and cultural world, they wanted to ascertain the attitude toward the Hungarian-Yugoslavian Association in official circles, and to view the building of the former Hungarian consulate on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The report from their travel reads: "*The building of the Hungarian consulate (in Krunska ulica) is, unfortunately, in an unusable condition. The top floor has burned down, in the right wing of the ground floor there are 3, on the left there are 4 rooms in »usable« condition. So, there is severe fire damage in these as well, the roof in the hall has caved in with fallen beams and rubble. At the moment some kind of Fire Guard headquarters occupies three rooms. Renovating the building, if at all possible, would cost millions, but due to today's lack of material, this is almost impossible.*"⁴¹

The issue of establishing diplomatic relationships was already addressed in autumn of 1945, the deterrence of which was explained by the purposely dark portrayal of the Yugoslavian minorities' educational and cultural situation in Hungary, as well as the "very bureaucratic" Hungarian stance regarding the extradition of war criminals.⁴² In Paris, on September 25th, 1946, Stanoje Simić, Yugoslavian Minister of Foreign Affairs, during the peace talks, addressed the Hungarian government in a memorandum, in which he communicated that due to the agreement in principal regarding the water supply and the population exchange they are "willing to establish diplomatic relations with Hungary". The Hungarian government turned to the ACC immediately in order to obtain the consent necessary for establishing these contacts. On October 4th, Ivan Ivanovich Levushkin, ACC chief of staff, who held the rank of major, informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that the ACC "had no objection" to the restoration of diplomatic relations between the two countries.⁴³ In the middle of October 1946, so before the Hungarian peace agreement was signed, technical and political preparations began around the implementation of the Hungarian consulate in Belgrade.

Chosen to be the first post war ambassador, returning from emigration in Moscow, was Zoltán Szántó⁴⁴, a communist belonging to Rákosi's inner circle who was thus a welcomed guest in Belgrade.

The ambassador and his colleagues began their work in Belgrade under very difficult circumstances. The building of the former Hungarian consulate, as mentioned before, suffered a severe bomb strike during the war.

Because of this, at first, they had to reside in hotel rooms that "cost a fortune" but had been deteriorated by the war. Not having any automobiles, the ambassador and his colleagues had to travel on foot. It was obvious that Szántó did not handle easily these quite uncomfortable circumstances. In his reports to Budapest, he often raised complaints and requested that their circumstances be improved. As he wrote in one of his reports in April of 1947, "I had to conduct a series of introductory visits while traveling on foot in the sopping wet streets of Belgrade. I often felt ashamed to arrive in the study of an ambassador or minister with muddy shoes. Sometimes they took pity on me and sent me home by car. It has also happened that, due to bad weather, I had to cancel appointments at the last minute only to have them send a car for me." He then added emphatically, "It is not a good thing if an ambassador's work circumstances incite pity from his colleagues. No less embarrassing is receiving visitors in my cramped, dirty hotel room, where the slush seeps through the cracks in the roof making fantastic frescoes. (...) This afternoon there will be a reception in Avala but first, I have to make phone calls to find out which ambassador will be kind enough to give me a ride."⁴⁵ On other occasions he used even harsher words. "I find it very awkward to always be dealing with such financial matters. It is possible

that our government cannot provide the funds necessary for the consulate's maintenance. If this is truly the case, then we must reorganize our diplomatic representation in Belgrade, the ambassador must be called back, and the most necessary tasks should be carried out by a caretaker and one or two subordinates."⁴⁶ he writes. At this time Szántó obviously had no idea yet that he would soon be called back but not because of the consulate building's truly desolate state but due to the severe 1948 political crisis around Yugoslavia and the dramatic escalation of Hungarian–Yugoslavian relations.⁴⁷

On February 4th, 1947, a few days before the signing of the Paris Peace Treaties, Ambassador Zoltán Szántó handed over his letter of credence to Ivan Ribar, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.⁴⁸ Translating Hungarian foreign policy's most important message to Belgrade, he structured his speech around the dichotomy of victorious superiority and guilt. He spoke of Yugoslavia's "*rebirth under the heroic liberating war lead by Marshal Tito*" and clearly dissociated from "*the guilty politics of a system foreign to the Hungarian people*". He emphasized, "*the rebirth of Hungary and the fight against the fascist reaction*" made possible a new basis of the relationship between the two countries.

In 1947, the relations between the two countries became more cordial than ever before, crowned by Josip Broz Tito's visit to Hungary, amid shining formalities, in December 1947. Tito's visit was preceded by Lajos Dinnyés' trip to Belgrade in October 1947, which was not only noteworthy because of the secured cultural agreement, but because this was the first time a Hungarian Prime Minister set foot in Belgrade.

Tito's visit unequivocally signified that this was not a meeting between the leaders of two equal countries at Keleti Railway Station. Prime Minister Dinnyés was basically apologizing to Yugoslavia for the past when in his welcome speech he said: Hungary "*is guilty of a series of serious crimes against the freedom-loving peoples of Yugoslavia*". On the one hand, because "*Hungary kept minorities under relentless oppression*"; on the other, because in World War I they attacked the Yugoslavians; and finally, because they were responsible for the ensuing "*bloodbath*" in the Vajdaság after Horthy treasonously attacked Yugoslavia. After this, the Prime Minister expressed gratitude "*for the full range of human and civil rights Marshal Tito provides the Hungarians of the Vajdaság. The Yugoslavian government's wise Leninist–Stalinist national policy results in completely equal rights for our brothers in the Vajdaság.*"⁴⁹

Tito, when signing a mutual agreement of friendship and assistance on December 8th in the parliament, answered, reflecting on this that: "*Everyone who professes the principles of a true people's democracy, who holds the position that ethnic issues must be solved in the correct, Stalinist way, is our friend, be they Hungarian, Czech, Polish or anyone else, it does not matter.*"⁵⁰

József Rex, secretary of the Hungarian consulate in Belgrade, who accompanied the Marshal's train all the way from Belgrade, wrote a rather unflattering episode regarding Tito's trip to Budapest in his memoir: "*Ambassador Szántó and myself were on Tito's private train. It does not give me pleasure to spoil anything but Tito fed ham to his German shepherd, Tiger, with a gold knife and fork from a Rosenthal plate. Barely a week before, I was at the construction site of the Youth Railway in the Bosnian mountains, where the enthusiastic young people were made to work in snow and ice receiving only half a kilo of cornbread and two bowls of soup to eat per day.*"⁵¹

The treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance was signed in the parliament on December 8th, in the Council of Ministers' hall by Prime Ministers Lajos Dinnyés and Josip Broz Tito. The treaty was to be valid for 20 years starting January 20th, 1948.⁵² Unlike the Yugoslavian–Albanian and the Yugoslavian–Bulgarian friendship agreements, the contract did not specify any closer economic, financial or military integration but did not exclude these possibilities. As it says in the agreement in regards to this: "*The Contracting Parties agree that with the aim of solidifying close cooperation between the two countries, they will join forces in the interest of their countries and people in the name of a tried and long-term friendship*". It is no coincidence that the Hungarian Communist Party's newspaper, *Szabad Nép* (Free People) hailed the Yugoslavian delegation as the New Great Power. The article welcomed the integration of the region's seven "*democracies*" (Yugoslavia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania and Albania) as the establishment of a "*unified front*".⁵³ So, the 1947 Treaty of Friendship still envisioned a regional integration, which though counted on support from the Soviet Union, did not wish for it to assume an exclusive role as leader. However, a few months later, at the time of the Yugoslavian and Bulgarian delegations' visit to Moscow, Stalin made it clear that he laid claim to the direct leadership of the region and did not wish to share it with anyone, not even the Yugoslavs.

One of the most important events in the history of Hungarian–Yugoslavian relations after 1945 is the reparation agreement between the two countries, which was signed on May 11th, 1946.⁵⁴ I only wish to reference Hungary's obligation to pay Yugoslavia reparation (7 million dollars) to say that the payments began in order. Following Yugoslavia's, the Soviet Union's and Czechoslovakia's gesture, the original 6 years allotted for delivering the reparation was prolonged to 8 years at Budapest's request on August 8th, 1946. Later, also citing Moscow's example, the Hungarian government requested the remainder of the reparation to be decreased by 50%. This request was, however, denied by the Yugoslavians based on the Information Office's June 27th, 1948 decision and due to the deterioration of the relationship between the two countries.⁵⁵ All Hungarian assets in Yugoslavia were nationalized, or more accurately, the previous nationalization of the assets of Hungarian citizens

and legal persons in Yugoslavia was completed. According to a statement by the Hungarian Ministry of Finances, apart from the 5% interest due for late payment specified in the reparation agreement, Hungary had paid 29.8% of the entire reparation sum by August 25th of 1948, when it was discontinued, so Hungary remained 49.2 million dollars in debt to Yugoslavia.

By 1947 economic relations were regulated by a two-sided trade agreement of 2 million dollars for both countries in that year. Yugoslavia primarily transported raw material (iron ore, copper, lead, zinc, mercury, acetic acid, etc.) and Hungary paid in machinery, locomotives, medicine, etc. On May 11th, 1947 a 15 year, 32 million dollar aluminum agreement was signed, which was followed on June 24th by a 5 year, 120 million dollar mutual trade agreement.⁵⁶

Following the international “*show trial*” against Yugoslavia, that is, due to the Soviet–Yugoslav conflict, Hungary went from good neighbor to adversary again.⁵⁷ The Rajk Trial saw the Hungarian–Yugoslavian Treaty of Friendship seated at the defendant’s chair, because, according to the prosecution, the treason occurred while Tito was going home to Belgrade. On September 30th, 1949 the Hungarian government terminated the contract. They justified the termination of the contract saying that “*Yugoslavia had already started planning to overthrow the Hungarian People’s Republic during the time the friendship and mutual assistance agreements were signed, and to this end, members of the Yugoslavian government were holding secret discussions with police-spy, provocateur and imperialist agent, László Rajk. (...) The Yugoslavian government has behaved in a hostile manner toward Hungary for years, instead of friendship and alliance they did everything in their power to overthrow the People’s Republic, aided Hungary’s internal and external enemies and dragged the Hungarian–Yugoslavian treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance agreement through the mud. Hence, from this day forth, the government of the Hungarian People’s Republic feels exempt from any obligations named in said contract.*”⁵⁸ On October 7th, 1949 Yugoslavia acknowledged in a memorandum that the responsibility for this rests “*solely*” on the Hungarian government.⁵⁹ Although they did not follow through with complete termination of diplomatic relations, Hungary, which was now unequivocally under Soviet protectorate, also terminated its economic agreements one by one. The aluminum industry agreement of May 11th, 1947, for example, was done away with on June 15th, 1949, the five year economic treaty of July 24th, 1947 aborted three days later, but practically all economic agreements suffered the same fate. The cultural and other restitutional issues determined in the peace treaty also came to a standstill.⁶⁰ On August 25th, 1948 Hungary discontinued its reparation payments to Yugoslavia, which had been secured by international agreements. From 1949 only 15 technical agreements remained in place between

the two countries. Such contracts as the 1926 agreement regarding the maintenance of ironwork bridges connecting the two states' railway lines, the 1928 agreement regulating guardianship, but we can also mention the 1947 air traffic agreement and the 1948 water-agreement. From 1949 the Rajk Trial, the severe, armed border conflicts, the fierce propaganda war, the relocation of the Yugoslav population along the border and other issues veritably criminalized the relationship between the two countries.

This was the low point from which Hungarian–Yugoslavian relations had to be rebuilt following the death of Stalin.

NOTES

- ¹ István Diószegi: *Az Osztrák–Magyar Monarchia külpolitikája 1867–1918*. Budapest, 2001. p. 9.
- ² Obrad Cicmil (1904, or 1915–?) teacher, communist politician who took part in the Tito-led resistance movement; he was then the leader of the ACC's Yugoslavian delegation in Hungary. He later acted as consul and ambassador to Bulgaria, the United Kingdom, Pakistan and Canada.
- ³ Lazar Brankov (1912–2011), for more information on his work in Hungary see: Péter Vukman: *Tito legszívósabb ügynöke. Lazar Brankov Magyarországon (1945–1956)*. In: Nándor Bárdi – Ágnes Tóth (ed.): *Egyén és közösség. Tanulmányok*. Zenta, 2012. pp. 291–313.; And also: *Egy jugoszláv diplomata Magyarországon (1945–1949): Lazar Brankov*. Századok, 2014. No. 4. (Henceforth: Vukman, 2014) pp. 959–981.
- ⁴ Margit Földesi deals in detail with the topic of the ACC's actions in Hungary: *A szabadság megszállása. A megszállók szabadsága: a hadizsákmányról, a jóvátételről, a Szövetséges Ellenőrző Bizottságról Magyarországon*. Budapest, 2002 (Henceforth: Földesi, 2002); István Feitl (ed.): *A magyarországi Szövetséges Ellenőrző Bizottság jegyzőkönyvei 1945–1947*. Budapest, 2003.
- ⁵ Földesi, 2002. pp. 85–94.; Vukman, 2014. pp. 962–963. The records show that there were two cases resulting in death in connection with the ACC's Yugoslavian delegation's activities in Hungary. On October 24th, 1945 the delegation's car was attacked by armed robbers near a Russian barrack in Kispeszt, the Hungarian driver was killed. The other happened on February 18th, 1947 on the road between Kecskemét and Kiskunfélegyháza when an automobile carrying the ACC's documents to Belgrade encountered a truck that did not want to pull off the road. The Yugoslavian soldier, an employee of the mission, who was sitting beside the driver "first fired a shot into the air and then fired a round into the car killing the driver". Since both of them were "serving in a foreign, occupying army" the Hungarian courts could not hold them responsible. Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára (The National Archives of Hungary) (MNL OL) KÜM XIX-J-1-k-Jugoszlávia. 30/e -32 700. pol/1945.; 101 604/10. a-1947. Box No. 50.
- ⁶ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-n-Gyöngyösi János-szn.-1945. Box No. 23.
- ⁷ At the beginning of 1946 the Minister of Religion and Education led an inquiry by a joint committee into the language use in the townships populated by Yugoslavians and the Yugoslavian complaints regarding "Yugoslavian native language education" and administration. In 1947 several administrative steps were taken toward native language education. MNL OL Vallás és Közoktatási Minisztérium (VKM) Külföldi kulturális kapcsolatok osztálya 1945–1949. XIX-J-1-e-154-2-31766-1946. Box No. 51.; MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-k-Jugoszlávia-16/b-63981-1947. Box No. 22. For a comprehensive look at the regulation of education of ethnicities in Hungary, see: Gizella Föglein: *Etnikum és educatio. A magyarországi nemzetiségek és az alsó fokú oktatásuk állami szabályozása, 1945–1985*. Budapest, 2005.
- ⁸ On extraditing war criminals to Yugoslavia and holding them responsible there, see Gergely Galántha: *Háborús bűnösök kiadatasi eljárásai Magyarország és Jugoszlávia között 1944–1948*. Bácsország Vajdasági honismereti szemle, Vol. 39. (2006) No. 4. pp. 14–23. The committee for determining war crimes already sent its trustee, Triva Militar, to Budapest on January 17th, 1945. His task was to research archives on the matter. In the spring of 1945 the OZNA special internal affairs unit arrested several people in Hungary who were

- pronounced war criminals and transported them to Yugoslavia without the permission of Hungarian authorities. For example, Leó Deák, who was the lord-lieutenant of Bács-Bodrog castle-district from 1941–1944. Aware of his innocence, he voluntarily presented himself at the Soviet military headquarters only to be handed over to the Yugoslavians. For the trials of the ringleaders in the 1942 raids, which were held in the Southern Region in November of 1945 and the verdicts of these trials, see the newly available records. Aleksandar Kasaš (red.): *Stenografski zapisnici sa suđenja glavnoodgovornima za raciju u Južnoj Bačkoj 1942. godine*. Novi Sad, 2008
- ⁹ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-a-IV-107-66/Bé-1946. Box No. 55.
- ¹⁰ József Rex (1920–2004) was arrested in 1949 in connection with the Rajk trial; he was first given a life sentence, which was later reduced to 15 years. Released in 1955, he emigrated to the United States. Enikő A. Sajti: *Egy kommunista káder a külügyben, 1945–1948, Rex József*. Forrás, Vol. 39. (2009) pp. 7–8., pp. 89–109.; József Rex: *A Magyar–Jugoszláv Társaság története. (1946 október–1949 vége)*. Edited, introduction and footnotes written by: Enikő A. Sajti. Forrás, Vol. 41. (2011) No. 2. (Henceforth: Rex, 2011) pp. 29–56.
- ¹¹ Iván Nagy (1904–?), lawyer, right-wing Hungarian minority politician. In the second half of the 1930s he sought out contact with the Croatian opposition. He was one of the founders of the Hungarian Christian right-wing newspaper, *Nép* (The People). From 1941 to 1944 he was a Member of Parliament, in 1945 he was declared a war criminal but he could not be convicted because he had emigrated abroad.
- ¹² MNL OL K-28. ME Kisebbségi osztály (Department of Minorities). 1944R-25 965.
- ¹³ Kalocsai Főegyházmegeyi Levéltár (=KFL) (Archdiocesan Archives of Kalocsa) I.1.a. Generalia de Archidioecesis, 1945. 476.
- ¹⁴ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-k-Jugoszlávia-17/d-31.390 -1945. Box No. 22.
- ¹⁵ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-k-Jugoszlávia-16/d-225/pol.-1946. Box No. 22.
- ¹⁶ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-k-Jug.-16/f-32.338/pol.-1945. Box No. 22. For information on the great powers' policies in Austria and Germany regarding the Yugoslavian Germans, see: Vladimir Geiger: *HEIMKEHR. Povratak slavonskih Nijemaca nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata iz izbjeglišta/prognaništva u zavičaj i njihova sudbina*. Scrinia slavonica, 2003. br. 3. pp. 521–547.
- ¹⁷ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-a-IV-109-1981/Bé.-1946. Box No. 55.
- ¹⁸ We are referencing only a few important works from the abundant literature available on the retaliations: Kosta Nikolić: "Kužne jedinke se odstranjaju" *Rana faza rađanja komunizma u Srbiji 1944–1945*. Istorija, Vol. 20. (2004) No. 2. pp. 47–62.; Srđan Cvetković: *Broj i struktura optuženih domaćih ratnih zločinaca i kolaboracionista prema fondu Državne komisije i njena instrumentalizacija*. Arhiv, časopis Arhiva Srbije i Crne Gore, 2004. No. 2. pp. 81–95.; And also: *Uloga OZN-e u likvidaciji "narodnih neprijatelja" 1944–1945. Šta kriju arhivi OZN-e o revolucionarnom teroru 1944/1945*. Arhiv, časopis Arhiva Srbije i Crne Gore, 2006. No. 1–2. pp. 127–136.; And also: *Između srpa i čekića – represija u Srbiji od 1944 do 1953*. Beograd, 2006; And also: *U ime naroda*. Beograd, 2014; Momčilo Mitrović: *Srpska nacionalna čast pred zakonom 1945*. Beograd, 2007; Priredili Zdravko Dizdar – Vladimir Geiger – Milan Poić – Mate Rupić (ed.): *Partizanska i komunistička represija i zločini u Hrvatskoj 1944–1946. Dokumenti. Knjiga 1–2*. 2005–2006; Mate Rupić – Vladimir Geiger: *Partizanska i komunistička represija u Hrvatskoj 1944–1946. Dalmacija. Dokumenti. Knjiga 1–2.*, Zagreb, 2011; Vladimir Gajger: *Josip Broz Tito i ratni zločini. Bleiburg. Folksdojčeri*. Zagreb, 2013; Aleksandar Kasaš: *Mađari u Vojvodini*. Novi Sad, 1996. (Henceforth: Kasaš, 1996) pp. 156–184.; Žarko S. Jovanović: *Nova vlast u Srbiji. 1941–1945*. Beograd, 1993; Slobodan Maričić: *Susedi, dželati, žrtve. Folksdojčeri u Jugoslaviji*. Beograd, 1995; Zoran Janjetović: *Between Hitler and Tito. The Disappearance of the Vojvodina Germans*. Beograd, 2000; And also: *Neslovenske nacionalne manjine u Vojvodini krajem Drugog svetskog rata*. In: Hans Georg Fleck – Igor Graovac (red.): *Dijalog povjesničara – istoričara*. Zagreb, 2001. (Henceforth: Janjetović, 2001) pp. 389–401. Enikő A. Sajti analyzes the Hungarian language literature on the retaliations. Enikő A. Sajti: *A magyarok elleni partizán megtorlások a Délvidéken, a történetírás eredményei és kérdőjelei*. http://adattar.vmmi.org/fejezetek/1339/04_a_magyarok_elleni_partizan_megtolas_a_delvideken.pdf. (Last downloaded: 2015. 05. 27.) The article contains a detailed Hungarian language bibliography.
- ¹⁹ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-k-Jugoszlávia-16/b-1874/1946. Box No. 22.
- ²⁰ Ibid.
- ²¹ Regarding protest against expulsions, see: Enikő A. Sajti: *Impériumváltások, revízió, kisebbség. Magyarok a Délvidéken 1918–1947*. Budapest, 2004. pp. 341–348.

- ²² Ibid and MNL OL PM XIX-L-1-k - 293 981/IV.b./1948. Box No. 33.
- ²³ Ibid.
- ²⁴ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-k-16/b.-30.013/pol.-1945. Box No. 22.
- ²⁵ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-n-Gyöngyösi János - 1945. Box No. 23.
- ²⁶ Branko Petranović: *Istrorija Jugoslavije 1918–1988. Treća knjiga. Socijalistička Jugoslavija 1949–1988*. Beograd, bez. god. Izd. (Henceforth: Petranović, bez. god. Izd.) pp. 173–174.
- ²⁷ The number of Yugoslavians at this time really barely exceeded 30 thousand. The number of Croatians was 20 400 (0.2%), the Serbians numbered 5200 people (0.1%) and the Slovenians numbered 4500 (0.1%).
- ²⁸ Petranović, bez. god. Izd. p. 174.
- ²⁹ For Balkan Federation Branko Petranović: *Balkanska federacija 1943–1948*. Beograd, 1991.; György Gyarmati: *Vámunió, föderáció – új nagyhatalom? Korunk*, February, 2006. <http://www.korunk.org/?q=node/8&ev=2006&honap=2&cikk=8099>. (Last downloaded: 2015. 03. 06.); Árpád Hornyák: *Délszláv rendezési tervek és területi követelések a második világháborúban és a párizsi békekonferencián. Századok*, 2007. No.1. pp. 57–86. This study was also published in the author's collection of essays entitled: *Találkozások és ütközések. Fejezetek a 20. századi magyar–szerb kapcsolatok történetéből*. Pécs, 2010. pp. 162–190.
- ³⁰ Zoltán Ripp: *Példaképből ellenség. A magyar kommunisták viszonya Jugoszláviához 1947–1948*. In: Éva Standeisky – Gyula Kozák – Gábor Pataki – János M. Rainer (ed.): *A fordulat évei 1947–1949*. Budapest, 1998. pp. 45–62.
- ³¹ Vasa Čubrilović: *A kisebbségi kérdés az új Jugoszláviában*. Híd, 1996. No. 12. pp. 1043–1060. The document was published by Imre Bori. The draft was first published by the *Dnevni telegraf* in the edition of September 18th and 25th, 1996. The plan of Vukosavljević is presented in: Petranović, bez. god. Izd. pp. 176–177. and Janjetović, 2001. pp. 397–398. In this question see also: Aleksandar Kasaš: *Mađari u Vojvodini 1941–1946*. Novi Sad, 1996. p. 194.; Enikő A. Sajti: *Mađari u Vojvodini 1918–1947*. Novi Sad, 2010. (Henceforth: Sajti, Madari...) pp. 269–271.
- ³² Géza Mezei (ed.): *Európa kettészakítása és a kétpólusú nemzetközi rend születése (1945–1949)*. Budapest, 2001. pp. 175–178.
- ³³ MNL OL Council of Ministers' Records. XIX-A-83-a-133. Record of August 28th, 1946. The Czechoslovakian–Hungarian population exchange agreement of February 27th, 1946 envisaged an equal number of Czechoslovakian Hungarians displaced to Hungary to the Hungarian Slovaks displaced to Czechoslovakia. However, based on the contract, Czechoslovakia could not free itself of the Hungarians, who were collectively declared guilty; it urged the displacement of a further 200000 Hungarians and continued their deportations to Moravia and the Czech Republic.
- ³⁴ MNL OL XIX-A-1-n-“Z”-3187-1946. Box No. 6.
- ³⁵ For more information on the population exchange agreement, see: Sajti, Madari... pp. 272–273.
- ³⁶ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-k-16/f.-1012/pol.-1946. Box No. 22. They, however, did not receive the regulations on grounds that they are still in the process of being drawn up.
- ³⁷ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-4/a.-Belgrád TÜK 85/biz. -1947.
- ³⁸ MNL OL KÜM J-1-n-Gyöngyösi János-1947-Box No. 25. Gyöngyösi's speech in parliament during the Foreign Affairs Department's budget debate on March 20th, 1947.
- ³⁹ MNL OL KÜM J-1-Z-Cipher Telegrams 1949–1964. Belgrade. Incoming. Zoltán Szántó's telegrams from March 19th and September 29th, 1947.
- ⁴⁰ On Yugoslavia's plans for a Balkan-Federation, see note No. 29.
- ⁴¹ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-n-Gyöngyösi János-sz.n.-1945. Box No. 23.
- ⁴² MNL OL KÜM J-1-k-16/c-32. 728/pol.-1945. Box No. 22.
- ⁴³ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-k-1/a.-27845/pol.-1946.; 2591/pol.-1946.; 2681/pol.-1946. Box No. 1. Marshal Voroshilov remained the president of the ACC in Hungary for the duration. In February of 1946 he left the country and was substituted by vice president Lieutenant General Sviridonov.
- ⁴⁴ Zoltán Szántó (1893–1977) Social Democrat and later Communist politician and diplomat. In 1919, he emigrated

to Vienna, later returned to Hungary and emigrated again to the Soviet Union. He was the ambassador to Belgrade, Tirana and Paris between 1947 and 1949. In 1956 he was interned in Romania along with the Imre Nagy group. There were no legal proceedings against him upon his return to Hungary.

⁴⁵ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-4-a-Belgrád-40-1947. Box No. 1.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Szántó was called home by Minister of Foreign Affairs, László Rajk on January 27th, 1948. Rajk informed him that "his stay would be a long one" MNL OL XIX-J-1-Z-Cipher telegram January 27th.

⁴⁸ Zoltán Szántó's February 4th, 1947 telegram. Hungary established diplomatic contact with 15 countries during the armistice period.

⁴⁹ MNL OL XIX-J-1-j-4/b-4764/pol.-1947. Box No. 6.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 532/pol.-1947. Box No. 6.

⁵¹ Rex, 2011. p. 48.

⁵² For the text of the Friendship Treaty (No. IV. Act of 1948) see: <http://www.1000ev.hu/index.php?a=3¶m=8286>

⁵³ Miklós Gimes: *Új nagyhatalom! Szabad Nép*, 1947. december 7. See also in this question: György Gyarmati: *Vámunió, föderáció – új nagyhatalom? Duna menti kisállamok különbéke-víziói a második világháború után*. In: *A demokrácia reménye*. Magyarország, 1945. Évkönyv XIII. Budapest, 2005. pp. 42–44.

⁵⁴ For the original reparation agreement of 70 million dollars over the course of 6 years see: *A magyar jóvátétel és ami mögötte van... 1945–1949. Válogatott dokumentumok*. Budapest, 1998. Selected, introduction and notes written by: Sándor Balogh – Margit Földesi. pp. 94–99.

⁵⁵ For details regarding the question, see: Enikő A. Sajti: *A magyar vagyoniok kisajátítása Jugoszláviában 1945 után*. In: Enikő A. Sajti – József Juhász – Tibor Molnár: *A titói rendszer megszilárdulása a Tisza mentén (1945–1955)*. Konsolidacija titovog režima na Potisju (1945–1955). Jenő Hajnal (ed.). Zenta – Szeged, Senta – Segedin, 2013. pp. 133–159.

⁵⁶ MNL OL XIX-J-1-j TÜK Jugoszlávia Box No. 27. Notes on the Yugoslavian reparation. July 29th, 1955. For more on the history of the reparations payed to Yugoslavia, see: János Honvári: *Az 1956. május 29-ei magyar–jugoszláv pénzügyi és gazdasági egyezmény*. ArchivNET, Vol. 10. (2010) No. 2. http://www.archivnet.hu/pp_hir_nyomatat.php?hir_=35. (Last downloaded: 2015. 03. 04.)

⁵⁷ For new information on the issue, see: *Moszkvától Londonig. Nagy-Britannia és Jugoszlávia a szovjet–jugoszláv konfliktus idején, 1948–1953*. Szeged, 2011; Zoltán Ripp: *Magyarország és Jugoszlávia politikai viszályának évtizede 1948–1958*. In: Enikő A. Sajti. (ed.): *Magyarország és a Balkán a XX. században*. Szeged, 2011. pp. 121–136.

⁵⁸ MNL OL XIX J-1-n-1945-89. Rajk László - 10411. Box No. 60. The 1947 cultural agreement was not terminated formally by either side but it was never applied either.

⁵⁹ MNL OL J-1-n-1945-1989- Rajk László-001926-1963.X.1.Box No. 60.

⁶¹ MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-k-Jugoszlávia-25/c-szn.-1949. Box No. 43. MNL OL XIX-J-1-k-Jugoszlávia-23/d-367/biz.-1948., 120 341/1948. Box No. 35. MNL OL VKM XIX-J-1-e-177 Item No. 3., 256 509/1948. Box No. 139. In accordance with the armistice and later the peace agreement, from 1945 on, Hungary was continually returning those assets that were illegally taken to Hungary by civilians or military troops from – to use the terminology of the time – the occupied southern territories. This restitutorial work was discontinued in 1948. The Yugoslav Cultural Restitution List contained 5000 objects, and also listed a substantial amount of archival material. Talks began again in September of 1956 and were discontinued again due to the revolution in October. Talks were renewed on October 12th, 1957 and the agreement was signed on June 3rd, 1958. The archival and other papers determined in the agreement, along with microfilms, were only handed over two years later. MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-j- Jugoszlávia-23/g- szn.-1958. Box No. 39. and 002 017/6/1960. Box No. 27. The quantity of Hungarian assets taken from Yugoslavian territory by Germans and Arrow Cross Party members was much smaller (equipment from the Pécs firefighters' barracks, 45 tons of electric motors, 50 tons of crude oil, 130 tons of grains, ambulances, etc.). The return of these assets was absorbed by other restitution issues. MNL OL KÜM XIX-J-1-k-Jugoszlávia-23/g-35/KHJ-1947. Box No. 39.