CHILDREN REFUGEES OF 1956:

THE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY RESEARCH PROJECT ON HUNGARY (CURPH)

BY TIBOR ZAHONY

CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF THE ARTS

SUPERVISOR: PROFESSOR ANDREA PETŐ

SECOND READER: PROFESSOR MARSHA SIEFERT

BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

2017

STATEMENT OF COPYRIGHT

ABSTRACT

The Columbia University Research Project on Hungary (CURPH) was an interview project that sought to learn about life behind the Iron Curtain by interviewing refugees that had escaped Hungary following the repressed Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Within the broader CURPH, a selection of interviews exclusively with children from seven to seventeen years of age is the primary focus of this thesis. The answers these children provided in the interviews helped in creating an image of life in Hungary before the Revolution. After a background of events in Hungary, the refugee crisis that ensued, an examination of Oral History as a practice, including its limitations in regards to the CURPH, an analysis of the interviews is offered. The CURPH is a lasting testament to the Cold War, the early stages of Oral History as a methodology and most importantly, to the voices of the children that left their homeland.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have enjoyed the past year at CEU and am grateful for the excellent courses that I had the benefit of attending and the stellar instructors that left me with a wealth of new knowledge. I would like to extend particular thanks to my advisor, Andrea Pető, for her enthusiasm, positivity and insights throughout her excellent course and in the process of writing the thesis. My second reader, Marsha Siefert, is owed much gratitude for an entire year worth of courses that I attended. Her worldly outlook and passion for the content she delivered, combined with a Mid-Western practicality that I could relate to, left an indelible mark. András Gerő, sensing the stress I was feeling after relearning how to be a student after seventeen years, helped me put things in perspective. Finally, my mother Agnes Zahony, uncle Dr. Alex Nagy, and all of the other Hungarian children refugees of 1956 need to be recognized as my inspiration for delving into this topic. Finding themselves in new lands as children, they persevered, adapted, and ultimately worked hard for their successes. My admiration for them is immeasurable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AVH - Államvédelmi Hatóság - the state secret police organization in Hungary active in gathering information.

CIA – Central Intelligence Agency

CURPH – Columbia University Research Project on Hungary

HPSSS – Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System

ICEM – Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration

LRCS – League of Red Cross Societies

NGOs – Non-Governmental Organizations

OSA – Open Society Archives

OSS – Office of Strategic Services – the precursor to the CIA, dissolved in 1945

UN – United Nations

UNHCR – United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

US – United States

USSR – Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

INTRODUCTION

For the last seventeen years, I have been a teacher and administrator in schools in the United States (US) and in Europe. On a chance visit to the Open Society Archives (OSA) in Budapest where I first learned of the Columbia University Research Project on Hungary (CURPH), and later in a deeper inspection of the archived documents, I discovered that a selection of interviews within the CURPH had been conducted exclusively with children. As an educator, I was curious to read what these children were asked and to learn how information was gleaned from them to create an image of Communist Hungary[1]. Deciding that this would be an apt and exciting topic for my thesis, I had initially hoped to interview some of the children that had taken part in the CURPH and to gather their thoughts and impressions of the interviews they had given sixty years ago. After spending months trying to contact some of these individuals with little success, and being bound by the restrictions of time, I instead turned my focus to the CURPH materials only. I wanted to know why the CURPH was created, what it set out to accomplish, and why those that created it felt it pertinent to conduct interviews with children.

Since the end of the Second World War, Hungary, as well as other Central and Eastern European countries like Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Romania, had undergone changes in governmental systems. By 1949, all of the countries of the region were Communist[2], and were under the "Soviet sphere", as Winston Churchill called it in his famous "Iron Curtain" speech in Fulton, Missouri in 1946[3]. As relations deteriorated between the

[1] Also formative in my interest in this topic is that my mother and her brothers were children refugees of 1956, being taken from Budapest by my grandparents to start a new life in Canada.
[2] Lewis, Paul G. "Central Europe Since 1945" Longman Publishing, UK. 1994: pp. 49-96
[3] https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/1946-03-05.pdf

Soviet Union and the West, an increasingly inaccessible society in this region of the world developed, with borders being effectively closed and information in the West on what was happening in these countries becoming scarce.

The Hungarian Revolution that began on October 23, 1956 broke this silence. It was a major world event, and one that was covered extensively by western media[4]. While the Revolution was repressed and a Soviet-supported government was restored, a massive refugee crisis developed as hundreds of thousands of Hungarians fled Hungary. Yugoslavia, and to a much greater extent Austria, soon found themselves inundated with a flood of refugees. The largest proportion of them went to Austria, where the UN (United Nations) was asked to intervene and help to relocate the majority of the refugees to other countries. Possible reasons for leaving Hungary included fear of imprisonment for actions during the Revolution, a perceived lack of an adequate life in Hungary, a dislike and distrust of the Communist regime, and, most importantly, the prospect to start a new life in a new country where more personal freedoms were allowed and opportunities were believed to be abundant. With quick organization and much assistance from European and North American countries, and likewise international organizations, refugees were resettled throughout the world in what can be viewed as an efficient and thorough process[5]. Approximately 35,000 of the refugees were given asylum in the US. With public support of accepting refugees at a high level, the US also viewed the refugees as a source of information. The large influx of refugees presented an opportunity to learn about day-to-day life in this central European, Communist country, but also to meet with people that were already living and working in the US and would potentially become American citizens. Although proposal letters exist that state the aims of

[4] Molnár, János "Foreign Correspondents in the 1956 Hungarian Revolution" *The Institute for the History of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution* 2007

[5] Many authors cited later in this paper had this opinion, including Bon Tempo, Loescher, Marrus and Puskás.

the CURPH and its gathering of information, a full report or book that analyzed all of the information gathered was never produced.

While much scholarly literature has been produced concerning the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, little has looked directly at the CURPH and the interviews that were conducted. 356 of these interviews are available at the OSA[6]. Within these interviews that have been digitized and indexed, there are a selection of thirty interviews conducted entirely with children – ranging from seventeen to as low as seven years of age. To my knowledge, no one has yet examined these interviews with children. The leaders of the project hoped to accumulate information about Hungary, yet were also players in the Cold War climate and hoped that the research being undertaken would be a powerful tool in exposing the repression of communist Hungary.

Where a strict format was employed in the interviews carried out with adults, the interviews with children were less rigid in their layout and application. The interviewers still followed the basic guidelines set in place with the adult interviews, but the children interviews were modified and abridged. Like the adult interviews, a cover page accompanied the interview that gave basic information about the interviewee. Once the interviews began however, a more casual atmosphere ensued, whereby the interviews took on a conversational tone. Of course there are differences in the interviews - most notably the length of the transcripts. Children of seventeen are more likely to engage in an interview and have a deeper understanding of events, than, for example, a seven-year-old. Regardless of age, accessibility or understanding, however, the interviewers sought answers to very specific topics that included the Revolution, work and labor, school and family life, which included discipline at home and at school, religious freedom and practices, knowledge of Hungarian historical

[6] Around 600 interviews took place, according to the OSA. See the OSA's "1956 Digital Archive" homepage at: http://w3.osaarchivum.org/digitalarchive/blinken/index.html

figures, impressions of the US, and finally plans for the future. Who were the refugees, what did they want to tell, and what were they requested to describe to the interviewers about life and conditions in this relatively closed society?

In early 1957, a group of academics from the fields of History, Anthropology, Economics and Sociology from Columbia University assembled to undertake an interviewing project with the Hungarian refugees with the goal of gaining a comprehensive understanding of life there. The chairman of the project was Henry L. Roberts, the Director of the Russia Institute and of the Program of East Central Europe at Columbia University.

Born in Denver, Colorado, Roberts had attained two doctoral degrees from Yale University, both of which focused on European history and politics. In the closing moments of the Second World War, he was working for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the precursor to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) - first in North Africa and then in Romania. According to Joseph Rothschild, a student of Roberts's at Columbia and later a professor there that wrote a short biography of Roberts, Roberts's experiences in Romania "confronted him most starkly with the Soviet Union and the beginnings of the cold war" adding that "the OSS experience in general helped to confirm his stance of overall support for American policies in the immediate post-war era". [7] It is through this lens that the CURPH was directed. The challenges of such a large oral history project, most prominently the haste with which it was organized and the immensity of the information that proved difficult to analyze, were ultimately too great. Likewise, while there was a sense of urgency to compile information, the lack of a proper methodology for its analysis was deficient. The interviews with children of the CURPH is a unique source. Roberts understood this dilemma, stating that "this type of source material is exceptionally hard to organize and analyze; indeed. I

[7] Rothschild, Joseph "Henry L. Roberts and the Study of the History and Politics of East Central Europe" *Historians as Nation-Builders: Central and South-East Europe* eds. Deletant, D. and Hanak, H. Macmillan Press London 1988: 207-208

believe that there is a whole methodological field, lying somewhere between history, political science and sociology, that needs development."[8] This "field" was later called oral history. Therefore, this thesis is unique in pointing out the complexities of the undertaking of the CURPH and will hopefully shed light on the children interviews.

Oral history was a practice in its early stages in the 1950s. Today oral history is a well-analyzed, academic discipline with an extensive scholarly output and dialogue that does not necessarily adhere to a structured and strict methodology. What is generally acknowledged in oral history is the importance of the performance of the interview, the shared authority between the interviewer and interviewee, the narrative created, the non-verbal interaction during the interview, and the search for the *meaning* behind the words spoken. The technology available today allows for oral historians to have an audio and visual record of their interview, providing for a greater capability of analysis that incorporates tone of voice, pauses in speech, body movements and reactions, just to name a few. The CURPH, on the other hand, did not incorporate recording devices in the interviews. The interviews followed a formatted English-language questionnaire, and yet the interviews were conducted in Hungarian. Responses of the interviewees then were translated by the interviewer and later transcribed, also by the interviewer. It can be assumed that substantial and significant information was potentially modified or altered in this process.

A variety of topics were covered in the children interviews, but three in particular garnered the most attention, and therefore will be the primary focus of this work. The Revolution, and the children's experiences in it, and opinions and impressions of it, will be analyzed. Work and labor, and how it was viewed by the children, will be examined. Finally, the recollections of the children regarding school and family, and the interaction between the

[8] Supplementary grant application. (Content of the planned book) from the "Curated Collections" of the *1956 Digital Archive* at Open Society Archives, Budapest Hungary: 3

two, will be reviewed. The hundreds of transcribed interviews of the CURPH is its own legacy. The voices of the children – their opinions, feelings, emotions – are proof of that as they are a snapshot of time.

Outside of the interviews themselves, and the analysis I aim to give, it is important to note that there are many limitations in studying the material left by the CURPH. The available source materials are the archived interviews and letters of correspondence between members of the CURPH. The CURPH materials have resided in archives since, first in the Bakhmeteff Archive at Butler Library at Columbia University and since 2006 at the Open Society Archives in Budapest. By focusing on a sampling of these interviews, specifically the interviews with children, my wish is to look at the material that is available, to describe it, and to offer an analysis of it. As a historian, I hope to make use of the empirical data available and to draw conclusions of what children witnessed, remembered, and described to the interviewers.

I have chosen not to make a broad comparative study of the CURPH and earlier works such as "The Polish Peasant in Europe and America" and/or the HPSSS (Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System)[9]. However, both preceded the CURPH and therefore deserve mention.

"The Polish Peasant in Europe and America" was a series of five volumes published up to 1920 - and its title provides for an accurate description of its contents. While the book is a broad sociological study, it did not incorporate interviewing into its data collection, instead focusing on letters, court documents, parish records and newspapers[10]. Also, the

[9] Brandenberger, David "A Background Guide to Working with the HPSSS Online" in *The Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System* © President and Fellows of Harvard College, last reviewed 10 August 2016
[10] Sinatti, Giulia "The Polish Peasant Revisited: Thomas and Znaniecki's Classic in the Light of Contemporary Transnational Migration Theory" Copyright © 2008 by Società editrice il Mulino, Bologna pp. 1-2

Polish subjects of the study were not fleeing their homeland after an armed Revolution, so the comparison to the Hungarians of 1956 would be lacking a key component.

The HPSSS occurred less than a decade before the CURPH, around 1950, and was also a Cold War study. The HPSSS can be viewed as similar to the CURPH as it was an interviewing project with the intent of learning about life behind the Iron Curtain (in this case the Soviet Union), it was headed by academics that created a guide for interviewing, it conducted interviews in one language (in this case Russian), and transcribed the interviews in English, and it also produced a large amount of material that those involved with the project found difficult to analyze[11]. Even some of the same men were involved in both the HPSSS and the CURPH, which will be touched on briefly later. However, in my examination of the HPSSS, I was unable to locate a select group of child-only interviews – making a comparison inadequate in the context of my thesis. Therefore, the CURPH will alone be the subject of this thesis.

The CURPH is a product of oral history, as well as a product of the Cold War. My stated goal is to offer an analysis of this material by looking through the eyes of the children that participated in the CURPH and the meaning that was created by the interviewing process. The four primary limitations in an undertaking of this kind relate to the methodological problems of interviewing refugees, the memory of children and the influences that parents have on that memory, oral history as a practice in the 1950s when the CURPH occurred, and a Cold War climate that carried with it biases and misconceptions.

[11] Holmes, Marcia "Deceptive Subjects: Reading the Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System" 11 April 2016 in *Hidden Persuaders* BBC

ORAL HISTORY

The CURPH was an interview project on an immense scale, and after compiling thousands of pages of transcribed interviews, perhaps would be better defined as an oral history project. Oral history provides for the possibility for typically silenced voices to be heard. It offers a forum in which people can express their opinions and recall events from their point of view[12]. It gives researchers and historians a new field of information to analyze and interpret. There are, however, limitations to oral history. The interview itself is an act of performance between the interviewer and interviewee, whereby power is held by the interviewer as he/she directs the course of the interview. Likewise, both the interviewer and interviewee have an agenda – the interviewer seeking answers to specific questions and the interviewee often being careful in what he/she is saying and how he/she is being portrayed through the responses given. These are important considerations to keep in mind in any oral history project, and are perhaps even more relevant when analyzing the interviews with children because the nature of their recollections could be heavily influenced by their parents' opinions, or even by receiving instructions from their parents in how to properly respond to questions.

Oral history as a serious academic field was in its infancy in the 1950s during the time of the CURPH, and proper methodology, concepts, theory and tools for analysis were lacking. It was not until the 1970s that oral history came into its own as a serious academic and scholarly pursuit[13]. During the 1950s, interviewing usually followed a rigid research format, and the CURPH was no exception. According to Thomson, "early interview

[12] Portelli, Alessandro "What Makes Oral History Different" in *The Oral History Reader* Perks, R and Thomson, A. (eds.) London: Routledge 1998 pp. 63-75: 67-68

[13] Thomson, Alistair "Fifty Years On: An International Perspective on Oral History" *Journal of American History* September 1998: 581-582

handbooks sought to legitimize oral history by advocating a 'scientific' model for the research interview. The interviewer should use a consistent and carefully structured questionnaire to facilitate comparative analysis; he or she should control the focus and flow of the interview yet maintain a neutral and objective presence to avoid adversely affecting the stories told".[14] In the context of oral history, the CURPH and its analysis operated in challenging times. As mentioned earlier, Roberts had an understanding of the difficulties associated with a project of this scope. With the advancements made in the field of oral history, and a better understanding in the practices and intricacies of it, it is worth examining some of the important tenets of oral history and applying them to the CURPH.

In contrast with traditional methods of history, where typically a scholar pores over documents and constructs a thematic account, oral history is an interactive event between the interviewer and interviewee. While the interviewer directs the course of the interaction, it is a shared experience which has the "potential to reclaim the history of ordinary people."[15] The CURPH set out to accomplish this task, and did so by giving a voice to the refugees. Following a set questionnaire with detailed guidelines was not necessarily a means to finding out factual information about the events that had occurred in Hungary. Much about that had been covered in the media and was known. As Portelli states, "oral history…tells us less about *events* than about their *meaning*." He goes on to add that "the importance of oral history may not lie in its adherence to fact, but rather its departure from it, as imagination, symbolism, and desire emerge. Therefore, there are no 'false' oral sources."[16] The CURPH is exactly that – a collection of responses about daily life, specific events and societal norms and, most importantly, the *meaning* behind them. This is especially true in the interviews with children.

[14] Thomson 581-582
[15] Sangster, Joan "Telling Our Stories: Feminist debates and the Use of Oral History" in *The Oral History Reader* Eds. Perks, R. and Thomson, A. London: Routledge. pp. 87-110: 92
[16] Portelli, 68

TRANSCRIPTION?

One of the obstacles in looking back over the CURPH is realizing that the interviews were not recorded during the interviewing sessions, but rather notes were taken by the interviewers and then transcribed later that day by the interviewers themselves. Due to the "dominance of the transcription"[17], as Abrams calls it, the reader of the transcripts is unaware of the complexities of the interview and the actions of both the interviewer and the interviewee. Not only that, but the interviews were conducted in Hungarian and transcribed in English. What was omitted, altered, or modified in these processes? As Portelli so aptly stated, "The transcript turns aural objects into visual ones, which inevitably implies changes and interpretation." [18] The transcript then, regardless of what was perhaps absent or excluded, is the primary source which to examine. It lacks the exact voice of the interviewee, the intonation used, and the body language. Comfort in the setting, or the lack thereof, and the interaction between the child and the interviewer, are absent.

MEMORY, AGENDAS AND PERFORMANCE

In oral history, the act of recollecting is of prime significance. While following a structured set of questions, the CURPH nonetheless aimed at the interviewees having space to remember events and experiences. The children were given liberty with which to recollect, and many did so with remarkable detail. By presenting topics to the children (such as the

[17] Abrams, Lynn "Oral History Theory" Routledge New York 2010: 19
[18] Portelli: 64

Revolution, work and school and family), and raising questions related to those topics, the interviewer could help the interviewee in constructing a narrative. Abrams mentions that "through the relationship between the interviewer and respondent, a memory narrative is actively created in the moment, in response to a whole series of external references".[19] How accurate is the memory of a child? According to Fivush, "even quite young children have remarkably good memories for personally experienced events."[20] This is an important recognition, and yet what should not be overlooked is the influence of the children's parents on these memories. What was talked about in the home and the opinions of the parents regarding life in Hungary likely played a distinct role in the children's memories.

The act of the interview is a performance. Both the interviewer and interviewee are, in the moment of the interview, acting on their own agendas. In the case of the CURPH, the interviewers and interviewees were both paid to be there, and were actively purposeful in their roles. Interviewees were paid by the interviewer for their time.[21] In cases of children that were accompanied by parents, the parents received the payment.[22] The parent(s) being present at the interview is also worth examining as it can be assumed that a child would be more easily influenced in his/her responses in the presence of a parent. Only three of the thirty interviews mention that a parent was in the room during the interview. The performance between the interviewer and interviewee is the most significant factor. This performance is not essentially balanced, as the interviewer holds the questions and dictates the direction of the interview. As Jessee said:

[19] Abrams: 23
[20] Fivush, Robyn "Event Memory in Early Childhood" in *The Development of Memory in Childhood* Cowan, N. Ed. Psychology press, Hove, UK 1998: 139
[21] Letter to John Howard by Shuyler Wallace, February 8, 1957 (The Original Grant Application Of CURPH for the Ford Foundation.http://w3.osaarchivum.org/files/holdings/other/blinken/pdf/B_SF_03.pdf
[22] Unfortunately, I have been unable to locate information relating to the exact amount an interviewee was paid. In the proposal letter for the formation of the CURPH and in some of the interviews, there is a brief mention of payments, but no exact amount can be determined.

> "At minimum, the interviewee attempts to convince the interviewer of the accuracy of a particular perspective or version of events, while the interviewer seeks to direct the conversation toward the primary research questions. Thus, while the oral historian's power lies in his or her critical distance and training, for example, many oral historians simultaneously empower their interviewees by encouraging them to take the lead in the conversation".[23]

The CURPH interviewers, while acting in a state of authority, nevertheless allowed for the interviewees to express their opinions and views in a free-flowing and unencumbered manner.

However, the layers of mediation in the CURPH interviewing process have to be recognized. The final product of the interview is the archived transcript we can look at today. The interview taking place in Hungarian, notes being taken, translating notes into English, transcribing those notes into a narrative: these are substantial steps of altering the initial product of the interview. We can never know what was abridged, amended or even converted, but the final transcript that is available is certainly one that went through degrees of transformation.

Therefore, the memories and reminiscences of the children that were interviewed have to be viewed through this prism. Accurate and factual information in the interviews, while present, is not the primary focus. "Historians must search for the story behind the story."[24] It is the *meaning* behind the interviews that is of relevance. Sixty years after the interviews were conducted, it is worthwhile that this *meaning* be examined. "But it is at the point of interpretation that scholars are likely to experience the greatest anxiety."[25] This sentiment is

[23] Jessee, Erin "The Limits of Oral History: Ethics and Methodology Amid highly Politicized Research Settings" in *Oral History Review* 38(2), 2011. pp. 287-307: 293

[24] K'Meyer, Tracy E. and Crothers, Glenn A. "'If I see Some of This in Writing, I'm Going to Shoot You': Reluctant Narrators, Taboo Topics, and the Ethical Dilemmas of the Oral Historian" in *The Oral History Review* 34(1) 2007: pp. 71-93: 91

[25] Abrams, Lynn "Power and Empowerment" in *Oral History Theory*, Routledge, 2010: pp. 153-175: 165

understandable and relatable, and yet the wealth of information left by the CURPH, and its interpretation, is of value.

By analyzing the interviews with children, the possibility for a new perspective on Hungary before and during the Revolution can emerge. No one to this point has carefully undertaken an analysis on these children interviews, and the potential for a new outlook at a specific period of time is therefore available. However, understanding the limitations of such an analysis is imperative. The performance of the interview, the power of the interviewer, the influence of parents: all of these factors are considered in the analysis.

BACKGROUND OF EVENTS AND THE CURPH

This section will give a background to the refugee crisis and the CURPH by examining the Revolution and its aftermath. I aim to show how the refugee crisis that unfolded was managed through the resettlement of refugees, and how primarily Austria and the United States dealt with this crisis. The number of people that left Hungary in a short period of time, and consequently in need of resettlement, necessitated a quick response. The speed with which it was accomplished directly influenced the CURPH and its efficiency. I will examine some of the letters of correspondence between the key players in the CURPH's organization, and their understanding of the importance of the project and their ultimate goals. Finally, I will compare the structure and composition of the adult interviews and the child interviews, in order to situate the child interviews in the thesis.

THE REVOLUTION

The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 was an event that surprised the entire world - including the Soviets and Hungarians. It started in Budapest on October 23rd as an afternoon student march and protest - joined by people from all walks of life - that turned into violent unrest where the massive statue of Stalin in the City Park was torn down, a radio station was stormed, and by nightfall, dead bodies lay in the streets. The Revolution had three basic phases: an armed revolt in which the Hungarian fighters had initial successes against a better-armed opponent, Soviet withdrawal and a few days of relative peace, and finally a second

Soviet invasion with a force of 150,000 that quickly ended the Revolution[26]. In approximately one week of actual fighting, it is estimated that around 2,500 Hungarians, and 720 Soviet soldiers were killed.[27] The loss of life and destruction were significant for such a short-lived event, and yet perhaps the lasting legacy of the Revolution was the refugee crisis that it triggered.

THE REFUGEE CRISIS

The Hungarian refugee crisis of late-1956/early-1957 was immense. Michael Marrus said "there are few comparable outpourings of population anywhere in modern times."[28] Of the 200,000 Hungarian refugees that left Hungary from October 23, 1956 and in the months that followed, the bulk of the refugees, around 180,000, fled to Austria, while close to 20,000 refugees fled south to Yugoslavia.[29] According to Andreas Gémes:

> The refugees included entire families, people of all ages, students, and even orphans. The reasons for their flight ranged from the fear of political repression as a consequence of the revolution to the long-cherished wish to escape the communist regime. More than half of the refugees came from the capital city of Budapest, while the rest hailed almost exclusively from the western regions of Hungary. About 4 percent of the national population fled; the percentage from the city of Sopron was as high as 12 percent. Two-thirds of the refugees were male, with more than half under the age of 25.[30]

[26] This invasion was codenamed "Operation Whirlwind", and occurred on November 4th, 1956, from: Sebestyen, Victor "Twelve Days: The Story of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution" Pantheon Books, NY 2006: 263
[27] Granville, Johanna C. "The First Domino: International Decision Making during the Hungarian Crisis of 1956" Texas A&M University Press, 2004: 97-99
[28] Marrus, Michael "The Unwanted: European Refugees in the Twentieth Century" Oxford University Press 1985; 359
[29] Kovačević, Katarina "The Refugee Problem in Yugoslavia" in *The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and the Soviet Bloc Countries: Reactions and Repercussions* eds. J. Rainer and K. Somlai Budapest, 2007: 111
[30] Gémes, Andreas 2009. "Deconstruction of a Myth? Austria and the Hungarian Refugees of 1956-57" In *Time, Memory and Cultural Change*, ed. S. Dempsey and D. Nichols, Vienna: IWM Junior Fellows' Conferences, Vol. 25.

Absent in the quote above is that children seventeen years and younger are not discussed, making this thesis an important addition to previous scholarship on the topic. Also left out of this analysis are the women that left Hungary, most of whom were also well-educated. "Some [of the women] considered 1956 primarily as an opportunity for leaving the country. The opportunity is very often mixed with a life-saving emergency if they or their husbands had a previous record of anticommunist activity."[31] The reason for young people leaving Hungary was usually because they accompanied their parents. However, some were orphans from the Second World War and used the porous Austrian border as an opportunity to hopefully leave Hungary for some place better.[32] According to a New York Herald Tribune article from August 11, 1957 "almost three-fourths of them were highly skilled professionals".[33]

The situations in Austria and Yugoslavia were vastly different in the numbers of refugees that crossed their respective borders, the treatment of those refugees, and the numbers of refugees that decided to stay there. Austria "was the very first western democracy officially to protest against Soviet actions – well before the major Soviet crackdown that began on 4 November"[34]. A large point of difference between Austria and Yugoslavia was also the involvement of outside help. Very early in the crisis Austria asked for help from the UN. "Vienna formally appealed to the UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) and ICEM (Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration) as early as November 5".[35] With financial backing from the United States, the UN was able to aid the

[31] Pető, Andrea "Memories of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution: Narrating Gender and Migration" in *Immigration/Emigration in Historical Perspective* ed. Isaacs, A. Pisa University Press 2007: 155
[32] Nóvé, Béla "The Orphans of 1956: Hungarian Child Refugees and Their Stories" in *Eurozine* Jan 21 2013
[33] Granville, Johanna "Of Spies, Refugees and Hostile Propaganda: How Austria Dealt with the Hungarian Crisis of 1956" In *History* Vol 91 Issue 301 January 23 2006: 78
[34] Ibid. 64-66.
[35] Kecskés, Gusztáv "Collecting Money at a Global Level: The UN Fundraising Campaign for the 1956 Hungarian Refugees" *Eastern Journal of European Studies* Vol. 5 Issue 2 December 2014: 45

refugees during their life in the camps but also in finding them asylum in a new country.[36] Yugoslavia, in contrast, did not ask the UN for help until mid-December.[37] The reason for this were that the influx of refugees into Yugoslavia were of a much smaller number.

The repatriation or resettlement of refugees was a priority for both countries as the economic and social aspects of the crisis were critical; and can be looked on as a successful operation in the course of the refugee crisis. Virtually all of the Hungarians that fled to Yugoslavia were either repatriated or resettled. The newly-installed Hungarian government was quickly asking for refugees to be returned by early November of 1956, but the request mostly fell on deaf ears. Especially sensitive was the issue of the unaccompanied minors amongst the refugees. Many young people had fled Hungary on their own, without parents or relatives. The Hungarian government wanted anyone under the age of eighteen returned immediately. Both Austria[38] and Yugoslavia[39] repatriated back to Hungary all unaccompanied minors under the age of fourteen, but allowed children between the ages of fourteen and eighteen to make their own decisions on whether to be resettled or not. "The final report on Hungarian refugees, composed at the Belgrade UNHCR office, states that Yugoslavia accepted 634 persons."[40] This is in stark contrast to Austria, where very few of the refugees were repatriated, but a large amount, around 11,000, chose to stay.[41] Resettlement was preferred to repatriation, as repatriation back to Hungary entailed returning to a country where at a minimum, uncertainty awaited, and in most cases, a sense of fear was prevalent. "The fear of reprisal appears to be vindicated as a motive by the fact that at least

[36] Granville, Johanna C. "The First Domino: International Decision Making during the Hungarian Crisis of 1956" Texas A&M University Press, 2004: 196-197
[37] Kovačević: 114 and Kecskés 44
[38] Gémes, Andreas "Austria and the 1956 Hungarian Revolution: Between Solidarity and Neutrality" Pisa University Press, 2008: 82
[39] Kovačević: 119-123
[40] Kovačević: 127
[41] Gémes, Andreas "Austria and the 1956 Hungarian Revolution: Between Solidarity and Neutrality" Pisa University Press, 2008: 82

22,000 people were convicted by Hungarian courts after the repression of the Revolution".[42] Repatriation was a sensitive issue between the countries willing to accept refugees and Hungary. Auguste Lindt, High Commissioner for the UNHCR used "painstaking diplomacy…to gain the cooperation of both the Western asylum and resettlement countries and the Hungarian authorities in embarking on what became the first successful repatriation program to an East European communist state. More than 13,000 persons returned to Hungary during the first year; and by the end of the crisis, approximately 18,000 – or ten percent of those resettled abroad – had gone home."[43]

AUSTRIA: TRANSIT COUNTRY

The Austrian state, which initially pledged to grant asylum to all Hungarian refugees,[44] soon found itself overwhelmed with the mass migration and unable to cope. Austria was in a difficult position. It lacked economic wealth, was still dealing with refugees from World War II, and had only recently gained its independence.[45] As mentioned earlier, the Austrian state asked for assistance early in the crisis. Oskar Helmer, the Austrian Interior Minister, lobbied groups abroad and in Austria to coordinate the effort of handling the refugee crisis. "A committee was immediately set up comprised of Helmer and his staff, UNHCR, ICEM and the League of Red Cross Societies (LRCS), as well as a number of local and international

[42] Niessen, James P. "Hungarian Refugees of 1956: From the Border to Austria, Camp Kilmer, and Elsewhere" *Hungarian Cultural Studies* Volume 9 2016: 124
[43] Loescher, Gil "Beyond Charity: International Cooperation and the Global Refugee Crisis" Oxford University Press 1993: 70
[44] Gémes, Andreas 2009. "Deconstruction of a Myth? Austria and the Hungarian Refugees of 1956-57" In *Time, Memory and Cultural Change*, ed. S. Dempsey and D. Nichols, Vienna: IWM Junior Fellows' Conferences, Vol. 25. 8
[45] The Austrian State Treaty was signed on May 15th, 1955, establishing the modern state of Austria.

NGOs."[46] They set about in organizing the resettlement of refugees. According to Colville, "It was the first modern relief effort, and, after an understandably chaotic start, it proceeded remarkably smoothly. In the eyes of the donors, and virtually all the historians, the three coordinating agencies and many of the NGOs that worked with them put up an exceptional effort."[47] The resettlement efforts not only involved the abovementioned, but many countries offered asylum, the US in the form of "parolee" status, which will be discussed in the next section. "The success in resettling so many refugees so quickly was also attributable in part to the personal qualifications of the Hungarians and to the favorable economic conditions that prevailed in their new home countries. In many ways, Hungarians were a model immigrant group. A large percentage of them were young, skilled and educated, and they entered labor markets at a time when employment rates were low."[48] The largest numbers of refugees were sent to the US, Canada and the UK, respectively.

AMERICAN RESETTLEMENT

There was motivation for the Hungarian refugees to be resettled, especially by the United States, which is where the largest number of Hungarians went, "approximately 35,000"[49]. According to Granville, the acceptance of refugees to the US helped Austria with its burden, deterred the Soviets from a possible invasion of Austria in pursuit of the fighters, provided an enormous amount of intelligence about the USSR, and helped the reputation of

[46] Colville, Rupert "A Matter of the Heart: How the Hungarian Crisis Changed the World of Refugees" in *Refugees* UNHCR 2006 Number 144 Issue 3; 7
[47] Ibid. 8
[48] Loescher, Gil: 70
[49] The number of 35,000 refugees is the most common in my sources, though Pastor and Loescher give the figure of 38,000. Coriden, Guy E. "Report on Hungarian Refugees" Central Intelligence Agency, Winter of 1958, approved for release 1994 https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol2no1/html/v02i1a07p_0001.htm

the US on a global scale.[50] The US was the preferred destination for the majority of the refugees,[51] and American officials were eager, in the Cold War climate of the time, to counter the recent Soviet repression of the Hungarian Revolution with a humanitarian effort. As Guy Coriden wrote, America's acceptance of refugees would allow for the US "to take full advantage of the propaganda opportunity against the Soviet Bloc."[52] While the acceptance of refugees was viewed as advantageous from an official American perspective, the massive amount of refugees that were in need of resettlement proved to be problematic.

Following the guidelines of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953[53], President Eisenhower granted five thousand visas to Hungarian refugees in early November of 1956, but by the end of the month had pledged to accept 21,500. Acting without the approval of Congress because of the desire to quickly resettle the refugees, the remaining refugees "would be admitted as 'parolees' under section 212 (d) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act".[54] This creative approach by Eisenhower allowed for a large number of Hungarians to come to the US, although "parolee" status was not necessarily ideal. "Because the 'parolee' was admitted without a visa, he/she had no official immigration status and could not become a permanent resident or citizen. Eisenhower promised to introduce legislation to 'regularize' or 'normalize' the immigration status of the parolees, essentially saying that any Hungarian refugee who wanted to stay in the United States would be allowed to do so."[55] Hungarian refugees in Austria went through a series of protocols before boarding a plane to the US. They

[50] Granville, Johanna C. "The First Domino: International Decision Making during the Hungarian Crisis of 1956" Texas A&M University Press, 2004: 197-199
[51] Niessen, James P. "Hungarian Refugees of 1956: From the Border to Austria, Camp Kilmer, and Elsewhere" *Hungarian Cultural Studies* Volume 9 2016: 126
[52] Coriden, Guy E. "Report on Hungarian Refugees" Central Intelligence Agency, Winter of 1958, approved for release,1994:https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol2no1/html/v02i1a07p_0001.htm
[53] The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 expired in 1952, hence the creation of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.
[54] Markowitz, Arthur A. "Humanitarianism versus Restrictionism: The United States and the Hungarian Refugees" *The International Migration Review* Vol. 7 No. 1 Spring 1973: 47-48
[55] Bon Tempo, Carl J. "Americans at the Gate: The United States and Refugees During the Cold War" Princeton University Press 2008; 70-71

first met with the ICEM to make travel arrangements, were interviewed by one of the relief agencies working with the US government, had a physical examination, and then were interviewed by a consular official.[56] If all procedures were satisfactorily completed, the refugee could travel to the US.

The resettlement of the Hungarian refugees, nicknamed "Operation Safe Haven" or "Operation Mercy"[57], now proceeded. Eisenhower then created the President's Committee For Hungarian Refugee Relief and "appointed a New York lawyer Tracy S. Voorhees, a talented bureaucrat"[58] to head it. Voorhees set about his new role with efficiency, even hiring two public relations firms to acquire the support of the American public in assisting the refugees. These PR firms employed all forms of media, including magazines, newspapers and television[59]. By all accounts, Voorhees did a remarkable job, and coordinated many people and agencies in the resettlement of refugees. The majority of the refugees arrived at Camp Kilmer, New Jersey, and, after already having completed the procedures in Europe mentioned above, were processed in roughly an hour. Proceedings at the camp were so efficient that it did not remain open long. Having opened to refugees in late November of 1956, it was closed by May of 1957. "On May 6, 1957, the last refugee left the center for a new home in the United States, and the largest single immigration to the United States in such a brief period had been completed."[60] What had not been completed was American interest in the refugees.

[56] Ibid. 68
[57] Markowitz: 48
[58] Puskás, Julianna "Ties That Bind, Ties That Divide: 100 Years of Hungarian Experience in the United States" Holmes and Meier, New York 2000: 275
[59] The two public relations firms were The Advertising Council and Communications Counselors, Incorporated in Bon Tempo: 77
[60] Puskás: 276

When resettlement had ended, thousands of refugees "found haven in the United States."[61] Of this group, approximately one-third were under the age of nineteen.[62] Close to forty thousand people entering the US from a country in Eastern Europe in the late 1950s provided for an opportunity of study. "The refugees could provide the West with information about life behind the Iron Curtain."[63] This is echoed in Guy Coriden's report for the CIA, the first sentence being: "The Hungarian Revolution of October 1956 provided an unprecedented opportunity for the collection of intelligence on a Soviet Bloc country."[64] The CURPH set out in this collection of information.

CURPH AND ITS ORGANIZATION

In the wake of the Hungarian Revolution and refugee crisis, the CURPH was organized quickly by a group of scholars to attain information about life in Hungary under a communist government. An "Interview Guide" was created, in which a structured interview was presented to the interviewees. Interviews would take place in both Europe and the US. Professor Henry L. Roberts[65], the Director of the Russian Institute and of the Program on East Central Europe at Columbia University, was the chairman and driving force behind the CURPH. Roberts had served in the OSS and the experience had a profound impact on him. According to Joseph Rothschild, "Both the nature of his work with that body [the OSS], and

[61] Pastor, Peter "The American Reception and Settlement of Hungarian Refugees in 1956-1957" *Hungarian Cultural Studies.* e-Journal of the American Hungarian Educators Association, Volume 9 2016: 1
[62] Puskás: 273 Table 5c shows that 10, 453 of the refugees were under the age of nineteen, and 6, 073 were under the age of fourteen. Why "19" was used as a benchmark number is not clear.
[63] Zieck, Marjoleine. The 1956 Hungarian Refugee Emergency, An Early and Instructive Case of Resettlement. Amsterdam Law Forum, [S.l.], v. 5, n. 2, p. 45-63, June 2013. ISSN 1876-8156. Available at: <http://amsterdamlawforum.org/article/view/314>.
[64] Coriden: 1
[65] An interesting side note for me personally, Roberts was born in Denver, Colorado, also my birthplace.

the colleagues with whom he worked in it, appear to have been intellectually formative."[66] Roberts spent the majority of his career working with issues in East Central Europe and the region's relationship with the USSR. The Project Director was Alexander Dallin, Professor of International Relations at Columbia and himself an immigrant to the US. Dallin, who had previous experience in working with a large-scale interview project as a member of the HPSSS, was to head up operations in Europe. These two chief organizers of the CURPH soon realized the scope and breadth of the task, and were overwhelmed by the volume of material.

TIMELINE OF THE CURPH

To better understand how the CURPH functioned, an examination of some of the correspondences and related materials is necessary. On February 8, 1957, a proposal letter was sent from Schulyer Wallace, Director of the School of International Affairs at Columbia University, to John Howard of the Ford Foundation[67] requesting grant funds to undertake the CURPH. The letter gives a detailed account of the aims of the CURPH. In the opening paragraph, Wallace maintains that "the recent…flight...of…Hungarians provides a potential source of information about Hungary, the Soviet orbit, and the international Communist movement equaling and perhaps exceeding in importance the other major sources which have been available to Western scholars in the last twelve years."[68] He goes on to add: "the

[66] Rothschild, Joseph "Henry L. Roberts and the Study of the History and Politics of East Central Europe" *Historians as Nation-Builders: Central and South-East Europe* eds. Deletant, D. and Hanak, H. Macmillan Press London 1988: 207

[67] The Ford Foundation was founded in 1936 with the goal of providing resources for "scientific, educational and charitable purposes, all for the public welfare". <https://www.fordfoundation.org/about-us/our-origins/>

[68] Letter to John Howard by Schuyler Wallace, February 8, 1957 (The Original Grant Application Of CURPH for the Ford Foundation) from the "Curated Collections" of the *1956 Digital Archive* at Open Society Archives, Budapest Hungary: 1

information which may be gained from the Hungarian refugees is of such importance that we should not take the chance of failing to *exploit* it."[69] The proposal letter contains a sense of urgency and importance. Wallace describes that the CURPH will be a large project where the gathering of information will be used to develop an understanding of Hungary and the recent events there. He also claims that the findings will be of interest to the Department of State, while twice reiterating that the CURPH "will engage in no covert activities whatsoever".[70] He gives a timeline for the CURPH to occur in a roughly two-year period[71], whereby interviewees will be paid for their time and interviewers will interview subjects and will take, and later transcribe, their own notes. From the transcriptions, the goal was to create a book with the CURPH's findings. Further details of the letter included the staff to be used and the proposed budget for the CURPH, which the Ford Foundation approved. While Roberts and Dallin were the leaders of the CURPH, it is interesting to note who was chosen to be part of the Executive Committee. Understanding that the information to be gathered from the refugees was not to be only of a historical nature, professors from various departments were brought on to the project to offer insights from their respective fields. Conrad Arensberg from the Department of Anthropology, Alexander Erlich from the Department of Economics, Paul Zinner, a professor of Government, and, most notably Paul Lazarsfeld, a professor of Sociology, were all members of the Executive Committee[72]. Lazarsfeld has been called "one of the most influential sociologists of the twentieth century."[73] Interviewing commenced in

[69] Ibid. :2 Italics added
[70] Ibid. 6 and 8
[71] In Wallace's letter, there is a section on "Phasing", which maps the timeline for interviewing between March-September of 1957
[72] Ibid. 14
[73] Logemann, Jan "Paul Lazarsfeld (1901-1976): Sociologist and Expert in Media and Market Research" from *Transatlantic Perspectives* 6 May 2011

the spring of 1957 and continued through September, with Dallin heading operations in Europe and Andre Varchaver[74] overseeing interviewing in the US.

Alexander Dallin wrote a letter to Henry Roberts on October 1, 1957, where he discussed the progress of the CURPH. He briefly discusses the success of the CURPH's first phase of operations, namely the completion of interviews. Throughout the letter, he mentions the speed of the CURPH and the challenges that a hastily-created project generates, and yet he looks forward to the next phase of the CURPH, where an "analysis of materials" can ensue.[75] By the spring of 1958, Roberts, in a letter to Wallace, relates that he believes that the CURPH has enough material to proceed with generating a report[76], and adds that "Beyond this, it is obviously desirable to organize the interview materials into some sort of permanent archive available to scholars in the future."[77] By the early days of 1959 Roberts asked the Ford Foundation for additional grant money, but was already realizing the immensity of the undertaking and the limitations the CURPH faced.

In his final report on the CURPH to the Ford Foundation, on January 8, 1962, Roberts discusses the successes of the CURPH, including works by scholars that referenced the material and pending doctoral dissertations. Most poignant, and in greater length and detail, are his reflections on what he viewed as unsuccessful. He talks about the speed with which the CURPH was put together, the stress for the people involved with it, and admits that "we had far better luck in gathering the material than in digesting, interpreting, and presenting

[74] Varchaver was a graduate of Columbia's School of International Affairs and the Russian Institute, and went on to have an almost 30-year career with the UN. (from US Department of State Archive: Andre Varchaver, information released online from Jan. 20 2001- Jan. 20 2009: https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/io/unesco/members/63109.htm#)

[75] Alexander Dallin's memorandum on the progress of CURPH, October 1, 1957 from the "Curated Collections" of the *1956 Digital Archive* at Open Society Archives, Budapest Hungary: 10

[76] As mentioned above, this text was never produced.

[77] Correspondance [sic] on the project, related records: April 23, 1958 letter from Henry L. Roberts to Schuyler Wallace from the "Curated Collections" of the *1956 Digital Archive* at Open Society Archives, Budapest Hungary: 2

it."[78] However, he retains a positive outlook towards the CURPH and offers an effective conclusion:

> "To conclude, I should like to make one defense of the whole project that may not be so apparent today. When the Project was first considered, immediately following the Soviet suppression of the revolt, it looked for a time as though the iron curtain were going to close again as in the darkest days of Stalin. Our initial proposal had an urgent sense that unless these refugees were interviewed for what they knew, we might remain seriously ignorant about the shape of things in Eastern Europe. Fortunately, a degree of relaxation returned. Eastern Europe is relatively accessible, and hence the reasons for the project are not as urgent as they appeared in mid-winter of 1956-57. I cannot regret that our fears in this were not born out."[79]

The disappointment is palpable in Robert's final letter on the CURPH, but the material has retained its value and validity, as is proof in the material it provided in creating this thesis.

COMPOSITION OF THE INTERVIEW AND THE CHILD INTERVIEW

The organization of the adult interviews was based on the "Interview Guide"[80], a structured and precise guideline for conducting the interviews. Interviewees were paid by the CURPH for the interview[81]. The adult interviews began with a statement that instructed the interviewees as to the purpose, procedures, and justifications of the CURPH.[82] Once the adult interviews started, they covered six basic topics, and were sub-headed as follows: Section R: The Revolt and its Antecedents; Section C: Communications and Propaganda; Section G: Government, Party, Politics; Section W: Work Experience and Economic Conditions; Section

[78] Letter to Cleon O. Swayze by Henry Roberts, January 8, 1962. The final report to the Ford Foundation from the "Curated Collections" of the *1956 Digital Archive* at Open Society Archives, Budapest Hungary: 4
[79] Ibid: 5
80 "CURPH "A" Interview Guide and Face Sheet Questions for "A" and "B" Interviews", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-1; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
81 While it is mentioned that interviewees will be paid for their time, I have been unable to locate an exact sum that they were given.
82 See Appendix A

I: Political Opinions and Ideology; Section S: Social Status, Education and Family; and Section X: Conclusion and Other. The interviewer was instructed to follow the sequence of questions exactly, and yet to keep the setting informal. "The main emphasis was that the respondents should feel liberated to express their views and opinion as properly as possible, and certainly avoid the impression that any kind of interrogation was taking place."[83] According to Mink, the average completed transcript[84] was around 50-70 pages in length.[85]

The interviews with children conducted with children vary greatly from this[86]. By contrast, most of the interviews with children took place over a two-hour time span. While the interviews conducted with the seventeen-year-olds averaged around 59 pages in length, the interviews with children under seventeen averaged only fourteen pages. The child interviews also had six sections, and were as follows: The School Situation, Family, Rewards and Punishments, the Revolution, Future Plans, and the Special Section, which was generally a section asking the children about famous people in the world and in Hungary, followed by a request for the children to compare their lives in the United States, whether positive or negative, to their previous experiences in Hungary.

Perhaps the greatest difference between the adult interviews and those conducted with children lies in the "Character Description". The "Character Description" only occurs in the child interviews, and is typically a small section of the transcript that precedes each interview. It is here that the interviewers give a personal report of the interviewee. Included in the "Character Description" is a physical description by the interviewer of the interviewee, an

83 Mink, András "Columbia University Research Project Hungary: 1956 Hungarian Refugee Interviews at OSA Archivum, Budapest": http://w3.osaarchivum.org/digitalarchive/blinken/curph.pdf: 2006: 7

84 I use the word "transcript" here as cited in Mink, yet because the interviews were conducted in Hungarian, with notes then translated into English, perhaps "summary of interview" is a better term to be used.

85 Ibid: 2

86 The Interview Guide for children was abridged specifically for the Child Interview, as referenced by the interviewer in the: "CURPH Interview CH8-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee; Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-125; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. However, I was unable to locate the Child Interview Guide.

account of the interviewee's family and background - which includes a label of what class the child is perceived by the interviewer to be from, a report on where the interviewee is from, and usually a depiction of where the family is living in the US[87] and what occupations the parents have. Most interestingly, the interviewers inject their own, personal opinions on the interviewee and on the interview itself. The interviewers in the child interviews comprised of all women, and one man. The interviewers write about what was successful during the interview, if the child was cooperative and engaged, and if they had any difficulties with the child. Whereas the body of the interviews is a relatively free-flowing account by the interviewee, the "Character Description" is a judgmental and critical interjection by the interviewers.

The final section of the child interview was labeled the "Special Section", wherein the interviewer aimed to test the knowledge of the child by asking about famous people in Hungarian history, for example King Matthias, Lajos Kossuth, and István Széchenyi, as well as asking about the greatest Hungarians living during the time of the interviews. Following this, the interviewer sometimes asked for the child to list the three most important people living in the world at the time of the interview. Finally, the child was briefly queried about his/her impression of life in the US. Most of the children were able to describe famous Hungarian historical figures, and their answers for the greatest living Hungarian were strikingly similar, with the majority of the interviewees listing either Imre Nagy or Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty as the greatest living Hungarian.[88] Answers for the most important people living in the world at the time of the interviews, when asked, were also uniform, with the most

[87] I have created a Table, Appendix B, which contains pertinent information from all thirty of the child interviews.

[88] Imre Nagy was a prominent communist Hungarian politician, twice the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Hungary, and was executed in 1958. Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty was the leader of the Hungarian Catholic Church from 1945-1973. He was imprisoned in 1949, released from prison during the Revolution and lived for fifteen years under protection in the US Embassy in Budapest until 1971. He died in Vienna in 1975.

common answer being Dwight Eisenhower. Many of the young children under nine could not list three people. Impressions of the US was given little attention in the interviews, usually with children positively talking about bigger cars and the abundance of food, while disliking the dirtiness of New York City.

AVAILABLE INTERVIEWS

The Open Society Archives of Budapest is the current (in 2017) location of the CURPH interviews. The transcripts have been digitized and are available online. 356 interviews are online. Of the 356 interviews, 175 were conducted in the United States, and 181 were conducted in European countries, including Germany, Austria, the UK, France and Switzerland. All of the interviews with children between the ages of seven and seventeen in the Open Society Archives, except one, were conducted in New York City between May 9 and September 30, 1957. These are all one-on-one interviews. The exception to this is one group interview, conducted in Adelboden, Switzerland in August of 1957. It was conducted with a group of forty-five children in a children's home and it is a document that lacks clarity and direction. With so many children assembled in one room with a single interviewer, it is difficult to tell who is speaking and what questions are being asked and answered. There is no order or theme to the interview, and therefore it has not been included in this thesis[89].

The quick resettlement of a large number of refugees proved to be challenging, and yet it was accomplished. The correspondence examined previously between members of the CURPH proves that they believed that not only would the refugees provide a wealth of

[89] "CURPH Interview 620A with 1956 Hungarian Refugees: Group interview of 45 children who had crossed the border without their parents. 36 male, 6 female", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-354; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

information about a region they wanted to better understand, but also that they had to act quickly in their project because they believed the information to be gathered to be relevant in the current time period and also because the Hungarian refugees were mobile in their adopted land. Having witnessed the closure of Hungarian society after the Second World War, they assumed the region would again be inaccessible. Therefore, the haste with which they carried out the CURPH was full of shortcomings. The correspondence reveals a frustration with the end results of the project, where a large amount of information was gathered but was ultimately never organized into a coherent, scholarly body of work. I will now examine the three sections of the child interviews that were the most extensive in length and detail. In order, these sections are the children's views of the Revolution, work and labor, and school and family, which provide the most detailed information, allowing for an adequate analysis.

CHILDREN'S VIEWS ON THE REVOLUTION

The Revolution and the interviewee's involvement in it was an important part of the CURPH interview, and was the first section to be conducted in the adult interviews. The interviewer was instructed in the "Interview Guide" to gather information, stating that the "Project [CURPH] is interested both in the respondent's experience in the Revolt of 1956 and in his *image* of it."[90] I believe that the children's recollections of the Revolution were heavily influenced by those around them, most notably their parents and family members. Mindful of the fact that the interviewer would possibly want to hear first-hand accounts of bravery and rebellion, the children would likely be inclined, on their own or under the instructions from their parents, to depict an involvement in the Revolution through an emotionally-laden portrayal.

In the interviews with children, the Revolution is not the first section in the order of the interview, rather, it is one of the last sections to be covered. This can be attributed to the fact that young children were typically not involved in actual armed combat, so their *impressions* of the Revolution are of more interest to the interviewer. The Revolution was not only a Budapest-based event, with demonstrations and fighting taking place in provincial cities, as well. While the armed-combat lacked the intensity of the scenes in Budapest, violence was likewise a common theme in these locales[91]. It should be noted that one-third of the interviewees came from places outside of the capital, and a few of these were involved in the events in their cities; notably Debrecen, Pécs and Győr. The interviewer is more

[90] "CURPH "A" Interview Guide and Face Sheet Questions for "A" and "B" Interviews", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-1; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. *Italics added.

[91] Similar to Budapest, demonstrations were organized by students and workers councils in Győr, Szeged, Pécs, Miskolc and Salgótarján, according to Lomax.
Lomax, Bill "Hungary 1956" St. Martin's Press, New York 1976: 78-103

concerned in *why* the interviewee thinks that the Revolution occurred. For those children living in Budapest or in other cities where protests occurred, the interviewer asks if and how they were specifically involved in events.

What is this *image* that the children then had of the Revolution, and more importantly, is this image their own or is it constructed with the intent of satisfying what they think the interviewer wants to hear? Of the thirty interviews examined, all of the children except one eight-year-old girl[92] - who had no idea that the Revolution had occurred - had opinions as to why the Revolution took place. With the average age of the interviewee around eleven years old, it should be assumed that the opinions that they had were heavily influenced by their parents or other adults in their lives. Generally, the children spoke of the Revolution as a rebellion against Soviet oppression, often indicating an inaccurate understanding of historical reality[93]. Twenty of the children had no active involvement at all in the Revolution, nor in any activities connected to the Revolution. These interviewees generally were not allowed by their parents to leave the home. They spent their time listening to the radio and getting updates from parents and neighbors. Those children that lived in Budapest, even if not permitted to leave the home, often heard gunfire and witnessed the movement of people from their windows. There is a mood of tension and fear in these recollections as most of the children recount the sounds of gunfire or of the running to a cellar for protection.

Of the thirty interviews, ten have particular interest, as the interviewees were actively involved in aspects of the Revolution and had distinct images of what they witnessed. Three of the interviewees in this sample were seventeen years old, and all three were employed and

[92] "CURPH Interview CH13-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 8 Years Old, Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-104; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

[93] One of the children claimed that the burial of Stalin caused the Revolution. "CURPH Interview CH16-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 9 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-107; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

working during the time of the Revolution. The remaining seven interviews are worthy of analysis as they contain eyewitness accounts of the events both in Budapest and in the provincial cities. Interestingly, the images of the Revolution and its aftermath vary greatly in the interviewees. There is hope and excitement in many of the responses, especially with the younger children, but there is also sadness and negativity in the recollections at the Revolution and its results. Whether described positively or negatively, the children's narrated descriptions of the Revolution reveal an emotional involvement.

PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS OF THE REVOULTION AND THE IMAGES CONSTRUCTED

A ten-year-old boy from the city of Pécs, and living close to the university where students had organized, witnessed events from his home. He recalled that "the university students fought against the Communists" and that fighting occurred in the mountains around the city before "Russian tanks" entered the city to restore order.[94] His parents decided to escape Hungary with the family after these events. The boy stated that "everyone was happy… [and] then the Russians came back [and] everyone became terribly sad."[95]

A girl of seventeen, working as weaver in factory in Győr, offers a different viewpoint from that of the boy from Pécs. She initially took part in demonstrations, including one in front of the local prison, but after witnessing the shooting of a young girl, she "lost hope" and

[94] "CURPH Interview CH12-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 10 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-103; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[95] Ibid.

decided to escape the country.[96] Later on in the interview, her answers changed to highlight the positivity of the Revolution. She viewed the Revolution as "useful", adding that "the Hungarian people gained great respect by having shown the courage to fight the great Russian nation."[97] Her true sentiment appears in her initial comments.

Another seventeen-year-old, an orphan and living and working at Debrecen during the Revolution, also changed his answer. Leaving work at his job as a waiter to take part in the demonstrations, the boy witnessed the large gatherings of people and of shots being fired into the crowds. After several days he was interrogated by the headmaster of the orphanage as to his involvement in the demonstrations. With threats from the headmaster of police interest in his activities, the boy decided to escape in the middle of the night for the West. The interviewer notes:

> Respondent thinks that nothing good came out of the Hungarian revolution for the Hungarian people; only oppression, torture and intimidation. 'The rule of terror returned to Hungary' respondent says. Then he changes his mind and says: 'Perhaps one good thing came out of the revolution; namely, we demonstrated to the world how the Hungarian people craved freedom. Now they know it is not the fault of the Hungarian people that they are in the Soviet orbit'.[98]

This is a telling admission and an illustration of the uncertainty in the responses being given in the interviews, revealing unsettled narratives that had been constructed.

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE REVOULTION FROM BUDAPEST

[96] "CURPH Interview 156 with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 17 Years Old, Female, Weaver", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-172; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[97] Ibid.
[98] "CURPH Interview 61-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 17 Years Old, Male, Waiter", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-59; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

The two largest demonstrations during the Revolution were at the Parliament and at the statue of Stalin at the City Park[99]. Both of these events were seminal moments during the Revolution, and both were recounted in the interviews with children. While these two locations saw the largest crowds gather, they were not the main centers of combat. Fighting first started when shots were fired at the Budapest Radio[100], and erupted in various parts of the city, most intensely around the Corvin movie theater. Of the children interviewees from Budapest, many were in attendance or even participated at these sites.

A seventeen-year-old barber from Budapest recounted his surprise that demonstrations were taking place. After arriving at Parliament and witnessing the large crowd, he hitched a ride on a truck bound for the statue of Stalin at the City Park. Arriving home close to 11:00 PM, he was not allowed by his father to leave the home again during the remaining days of the events. He left Budapest alone on November 19th and on November 22nd crossed into Austria. While being "very much elated at the revolution", he poignantly stated that "I do not know whether Hungary has gained anything through the revolution, but it is certain that she has lost much."[101] Another child that ended up leaving Hungary without his parents, fifteen years of age[102], observed the initial melee at the radio station before joining friends at the Corvin. While not directly involved in any fighting, he aided the fighters by bringing weapons and ammunition to them in various apartment buildings. While enthusiastic in his recollections, the boy repeatedly adds that he was "scared" during the Revolution. When fighting had subsided, he was questioned by a local party official and decided it would

[99] "Városliget" in Hungarian, literally meaning "City Park". This is the main park in Budapest at the end of Andrássy Avenue.
[100] Sebestyen, Victor "Twelve Days: The Story of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution" Pantheon Books, NY 2006: pg. 122
[101] "CURPH Interview 66-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 17 Years Old, Male, Barber", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-64; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[102] This was the first interview conducted by the CURPH with a child and the interviewer notes that "there was no questionnaire to go by. Therefore, the interview may appear a little haphazard."

be best to leave his family and Hungary[103]. By leaving without his parents, at fifteen, indicates a dysfunctional family dynamic and also, by admitting fear, the boy is possibly perceiving that he is aiding in his status as a "refugee". Both of these children left Hungary after the Revolution. Regardless of their activities in the events, there is a pervasive feeling of fear in the potential for repercussions or punishments from authorities. Ultimately, they narrated their stories that they decided to leave their homes on their own because of this.

Three of the younger interviewees from this sample group, boys aged ten, eleven and twelve, recounted events as well from both the Stalin statue and the Parliament. Where a sense of fear or danger is evident in the recollections of the older children, these younger boys are more in amazement in what they have witnessed. Two of these boys would sneak away from home to roam the streets and see what was happening, while one was taken by his parents to view the tearing down of the statue of Stalin. There is a lack of understanding of the violence and severity of the events, but instead an admiration for those that were fighting and a curiosity in the transformation of their surroundings. While the accuracy of their claims can be questioned, the impressions with which they were left with and which were related to the interviewer helped in placing them within the Revolution. Said the eleven-year-old boy: "This made the biggest impression on me – how courageous the people were."[104]

One of the more interesting observations in this sample group is by a fifteen-year-old girl that lived and attended school near the Parliament in the Fifth District. While the interviewer described her as "serious-minded and studious", the girl explained that "her friends and I were just terrible happy and elated that finally we could shout loudly what we

[103] "CURPH Interview CH1-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 15 Years Old, Male, Apprentice school boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-111; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[104] "CURPH Interview CH18-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 11 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-109; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

wanted and speak loudly and curse the Russians loudly."[105] Leaving the Parliament for the Stalin statue, it appears that interviewer labeled her in an inaccurate fashion. The girl, with a self-knowledge of irony, points out that "it was quite amazing to meet my teacher who taught us Constitution and Law[106], in the crowd at the statue."[107] She is not in awe or wonderment at the events, but takes part in them earnestly and passionately.

The final interview worth noting from this sample selection is from an eleven-year-old boy, also from the Fifth District. This is the only child interview where the child claims to have killed a Russian soldier. This claim cannot be verified, but the telling of the tale is nonetheless relevant. The boy talked about his older brother being an active fighter during the Revolution. Could it be that he heard stories from his brother (or others) and took them as his own? It seems likely. The boy described throwing a Molotov cocktail at a tank, then waiting for the soldier to emerge from the burning tank before shooting him. At several points in the interview, the boy grits his teeth in anger when describing "Communists and the Russians".[108] When asked about his feelings or potential fears, he goes on to state that "if you have a weapon in your hands, then you are never afraid."[109] These are bold statements for a child of his age, and are absent of regret, remorse or even consequences. In all likelihood he is retelling tales of his older brother's experiences, or of things he witnessed or heard about. The emotions he reveals, specifically his anger towards the Russians, could indicate the influence that his parents and family had on his memory of events.

[105] "CURPH Interview CH8-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee; Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-125; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[106] This is likely an error in the translation by the interviewer, as this was not a typical class that was taught. Perhaps this should have been "Civics", or "Állampolgári Ismeretek" in Hungarian.
[107] Ibid.
[108] "CURPH Interview CH23-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 11 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-115; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[109] Ibid.

This section of the interviews proves that the children revealed emotional opinions concerning the Revolution. Their responses stress both an optimism for the initial stages of the Revolution and a bleakness in the realization that the Revolution had been repressed. Their personal experiences during the Revolution, whether as eye witnesses or as listeners to the stories told by others, indicates a strong influence from parents and other family members. When recollecting during the interview process, and being aware of the interviewers' interest in the Revolution, the children attempt to emphasize a personal knowledge of the events and to stress an anti-Russian sentiment.

WORK, LABOR AND CLASS

In this segment I will analyze the section devoted to work within the interviews. I will examine how children viewed work within their family, as well show how the interview questionnaire promoted an importance of the occupations of the fathers of the children and relegated the role of women within the sphere of work and labor. I will show that the interviewer's voice and opinions are often injected into the interview transcript in this section, specifically in regards to the prominence placed on certain occupations; as well as in their labeling of the children based on their parents' work, their neighborhoods in which they lived and the perceived class to which they belonged. This indicates a level of stereotyping on the part of the interviewer.

The fourth section of the interviews, section "W", titled "Work Experience and Economic Conditions", is where the interview focuses on work and labor. There are instructions laid out for the interviewer, whereby a comprehensive picture of the interviewee's occupation and of the working conditions in Hungary are the ultimate aims of the interview. Interestingly, a differentiation is made where "students, housewives and others who were never employed will not be able to answer some of the questions in this section." There were around 85-90 questions created that revolved around work and the subject being interviewed, and his/her experience with work. The questions were scripted, with room for optional questions, and were related to previous jobs held by the interviewee, job skills, work satisfaction, relationships with coworkers, mobility within a field of work, pay and spending habits, complaints with work and opinions on the state of the Hungarian economy.[110] For the

[110] *Open Society Archives* Digital Repository : CURPH "A" Interview Guide and Face Sheet Questions for "A" and "B" Interviews: pp. 31-37

children that were interviewed, the questions related to work were amended due to age and experience.

Less specific questions were asked of the children, and yet there is still an interest on the part of the interviewer to form a framework with which to place the child. Similar topics that are covered in the adult interviews take place in the interviews with children. With generally no formal work experience, the children were queried about "work-related" issues involving themselves and their families. Because most typically the children had never been formally employed, the section on work is substituted by a "Family Background' section. It is in this section that questions of work regarding the parents and other family members is discussed. The interviewer in this section is noticeably present, often interjecting a class label onto the child and the child's family.

THE INTERVIEWER'S "CHARACTER DESCRIPTION"

As briefly looked at earlier in the thesis, after each interview was completed and then transcribed, the interviewer wrote up a brief summary of the interviewee, titled "Character Description", which then headed the interview. The "Character Description" of each interview aims to set the stage for the interview with background information, yet the opinions of the interviewer are laid out, revealing a bias on the part of the interviewer in regards to class and work. Distinctions are made between interviewees and their backgrounds which likely had influenced the interaction that took place within the interview. Preferential treatment is often given to those children that come from educated and/or middle class backgrounds. Several examples illustrate this point. An eleven-year-old boy's "Character Description" reveals that "His peasant-worker background cannot be traced on him. He is

more like a middle class boy, neatly dressed and intelligent looking. He is not stupid, on the contrary, but undeveloped."[111] An eight-year-old girl is described as "not a bright child [and] has to repeat the third grade this Fall, which is unusual in Hungarian kids as they adjust very quickly and get on with their studies here well." She is also described as being from a "typical Hungarian proletarian background". The interviewer makes special mention that the girl "lived in Budapest all her life in the VIII District (this is a working-class district of the city)".[112] In contrast, a boy of the same age is depicted as being "the only son of a former career officer" and being "bright, alert, serious and intelligent." The interviewer likewise goes into great detail describing some drawings completed by the boy: "Within a jiffy he made a couple of minutely drawn rocket propelled cars and planes, quite correct technically, and also a Cow-Boy(sic), in Durer style anatomically correct and showing great style." The interviewer points out that the boy and his "family lived at the Óbuda district"[113], unnecessarily entering the interview to prove awareness of locales and a familiarity with Budapest. Another example relates to two fifteen-year-olds that were interviewed. The interviewer states that "This boy is a member of the proletariat. He lived under extremely bad conditions during the Communist regime and he received the average education for his social class".[114] Once again, a differentiation is made by the interviewer. She describes a fifteen-year-old girl as having "a good middle-class background" and being from "the fifth district of the capital which is the district where most well-to-do merchants, tradespeople and

[111] "CURPH Interview CH18-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 11 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-109; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[112] "CURPH Interview CH13-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 8 Years Old, Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-104; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[113] "CURPH Interview CH20-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 8 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-112; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[114] "CURPH Interview CH1-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 15 Years Old, Male, Apprentice school boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-111; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

business men lived."[115] By injecting personal opinions and labels, the interviewer is establishing a framework with which the interviewee can be defined, interpreted and valued.

WORK OF PARENTS

In twenty-six of the thirty child interviews, the work and occupations of the parents is queried. All of the interviewees' fathers worked. The exceptions were two fathers that were killed in the Second World War, one father that was in prison, and the seventeen-year-old boy who was an orphan and did not know his father.[116] The majority of these fathers were employed in some field of manual labor, the most common occupations being driver, factory worker, mechanic, craftsman, tailor and waiter. Two exceptions to this, an attorney and an engineer, were the only two fathers in the interview sample that worked at jobs not defined as "working class". Three of the fathers were career officers in their earlier careers, but had become factory workers.

Twenty of the mothers of the interviewees had formal jobs, with the most common livelihood being typist or office worker, factory worker, waitress, bartender and saleswoman. The other six mothers stayed at home with the children as housewives.

HOUSEWORK

[115] "CURPH Interview CH8-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee; Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-125; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[116] See Table in Appendix B

The question of housework and all the members of the family that participated in it comes up in each interview, albeit with very few (if any) follow-up questions. This lack of detailed information about the functions and operations connected to the household provide for a gap in the interviews. While much emphasis is placed on employment outside the home, and especially as it relates to the fathers or grandfathers of the interviewees, the details of life in the home would have provided for a more thorough portrait of Hungarian family life for those that organized the interviews. This "cooperation within the household", or "internal" relation of labor, is only touched upon briefly.[117] In all of the interviews examined, the household work was carried out by women. One might assume that it was the mother of the interviewee that was the primary worker in the house, but it being Hungary in the 1950s – economically depressed – most of the household work was carried out by grandmothers. Most of the mothers were also working at this time, leaving the household tasks to their mothers or their mothers-in-law. Not acknowledged in this representation of women is the "double-burden"[118] that most of them existed under, wherein they were employed outside of the home and still expected to cook and maintain the household.

This separation of work from housework is a reminder of the gendered implications of labor as well as the lack of recognition for housework's relevance or importance. Komlosy states that "men were defined as breadwinners, hence working; while women were declared to be mothers and housewives, performing labor which was no longer considered to be work but rather a function of their sex."[119] The interviews show that while housework is acknowledged as a topic, its significance doesn't measure up to formal work. Except for the first interview with a child, where no script existed, the rest of the interviews begin the work

[117] Lucassen, Jan "Outlines of a History of Labor" in *International Institute of Social History* 2013 5-46: 7
[118] Hochschild, Arlie and Anne Machung. 1990. *The Second Shift*. Avon Books: New York
[119] Komlosy, Andrea "Work and Labor Relations" from *Capitalism: Reemergence of a Historical Concept* eds. Kocka, Jurgen and van der Linden, Marcel: Bloomsbury, London 2016:33-69: 42

section with the question "What did your father do?" Women, including not only the mothers of the children but often the grandmothers, are left out of the discussion in regards to work.

WORK OF OLDER CHILDREN

Four of the thirty interviews with children were conducted with older children, three of whom that were already working at the time of the Revolution. These four interviews, even though conducted with children, used the adult questionnaire, and do not contain a "Character Description", but rather a "Personal Inventory". In the "Personal Inventory", the interviewer's opinions are not given in regards to class, such as they are in the "Character Descriptions" in the interviews with younger children. The details of work and working conditions are more acute than in the interviews with the younger children. The three children that were working were a weaver in a factory, a waiter and a barber, respectively. All three worked six days a week and at least eight hours a day in jobs not considered middle or upper class occupations.

The weaver, a seventeen-year-old girl, gives a comprehensive account of her working life. She freely discusses the positives and negatives of the day-to-day routine of her work at the factory. While she reiterates twice that she enjoyed her work, she nonetheless mentions that she would have rather been a hairdresser and wouldn't wish for her own children to work in a factory like her. She worked alongside 200 other girls and women in the factory. She goes on to mention that "the workshop where I worked was quite an unhealthy place" and

states that "I felt that I was exploited" because she was hurried by her superiors and had her pay deducted if she was late[120].

The waiter, also seventeen years of age, is mostly positive in his recollections of his job at the restaurant. He got along well with everyone in the restaurant and enjoyed his time there. While working eight-hour shifts, he felt that the people there "treated him decently", and had only one complaint of a "manager [that] took advantage of him" by requesting extra work at times with no extra pay.[121] The barber seems to have had the most intense work schedule, estimating that he "worked about 58 hours a week"[122]. He goes on to discuss that his shifts were constantly rotating, which didn't allow him enough sleep. Like the weaver, he would have chosen a different profession. "I did not like my trade and was planning to change it for something else. Originally, I wanted to become a garage mechanic."[123]

There is a working class element to the older children interviewees. All three were manual laborers and the possibility of returning to school in a higher education setting in Hungary was not discussed. When asked about their future plans in the US, two of the interviewees wanted to return to school and continue their education, while the barber, at the time of the interview, was yet unable to find work because he was under eighteen years of age.

[120] "CURPH Interview 156 with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 17 Years Old, Female, Weaver", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-172; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[121] "CURPH Interview 61-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 17 Years Old, Male, Waiter", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-59; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[122] "CURPH Interview 66-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 17 Years Old, Male, Barber", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-64; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[123] Ibid

WISHES OF THE CHILDREN

All of the interviews with children, at some point during the line of questioning, asked the children what they wanted to be when they grew up. Nearly half of the children (45%) stated that they wanted to be a doctor or an engineer. Of this group, 83% were boys. None of the girls wanted to be an engineer and only two of the girls expressed their interest in becoming a doctor. Answers to "What do you want to be when your grow up?" included hairdresser, gardener, dancer, dress designer, stewardess, pilot, mechanic, day care teacher, athlete, typist, miner, cleaner, singer and cowboy(!).[124] Gender undoubtedly plays a role in these responses and the wishes the children had for their future careers, reinforcing stereotypical norms of the time period.

The portrait of work given by this sampling of interviews from the CURPH is useful in forming an opinion of working conditions in Hungary prior to the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Yet the interviews show a bias that only reinforces preconceived norms in the region. How questions are ordered, where importance is placed on those questions, and the interviewer's summaries of the interviews help to only fortify stereotypes of not only the time-period, but also the region in general. Speaking specifically about Eastern and Central Europe, Pittaway states that "Both official myths of the 'working class' and hegemonic working-class cultures privileged specific worker identities – mostly the skilled, urban, male elite – and marginalized others: women, rural commuters, and the young."[125] The lack of attention and detail paid to housework and all that it necessitates is sadly absent. Too much

[124] The seven-year-old boy that wished to be a cowboy described his decision. The interviewer noted that "The answer of the child reflects the influence of television on young children." From "CURPH Interview CH10-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 7 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-101; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

[125] Pittaway, Mark "Introduction: Workers and Socialist States in Postwar Central and Eastern Europe" in *International Labor and Working-Class History* No. 68, Fall 2005 pp. 1-8: 5

prominence is given to the fathers' work while relegating the mothers' and grandmothers'. The children are the focus of the interviews, and yet it is the voice of the interviewer that can at times seem most dominant in creating an image of the children and their families. "What do you want to be when you grow up?" is a question that was asked of all of the children in the interviews. With this, the interview attempted to project a possible future for the interviewees. It would be fascinating to find out what career paths (if any) each of the children embarked upon in adulthood. As I attempted to locate some of the children that were interviewed and was unsuccessful in my efforts, it will remain a point of curiosity for me.

SCHOOL AND FAMILY

In this section, I will examine how the children described their lives in school and at home. I aim to show that the children, being aware of being interviewed in the United States, distinctively tailored their replies to match what they perceived to be the interviewer's desired responses. I will analyze what topics were taught in school, and how teachers were looked at by their students. I will cover discipline, both at home and at school, as well as the flow of information between the school and the home, with the children being the conduit between the two. Finally I will analyze the importance placed on religious instruction, and what the interviewers hoped to achieve by discussing the Pioneer Movement in Hungary, a communist youth organization.

The final scripted section of the adult interviews was Section "S", identified as "Social Status, Education, Family and Religion". After covering the Revolution and a variety of other topics mentioned earlier, this section was given less importance than earlier sections on the Revolution and economic and political matters. The primary aim of this section was to discover "personal information of a sociological sort"[126] about the interviewee. It wanted to "determine the respondent's image of the society around him".[127] In the interviews with children, this was the first section to be covered – and the most thorough in terms of topics covered. The child interviews began with "The School Situation", followed by "Family" and then "Rewards and Punishments", which was an examination of how children were disciplined at both school and home. The interviews were attempting to learn about schooling

[126] "CURPH "A" Interview Guide and Face Sheet Questions for "A" and "B" Interviews", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-1; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[127] Ibid.

in Hungary and how the child related to, and made sense of, experiences at school to those of home, and vice-versa.

TEACHERS

The interviews begin with asking about instruction in the classroom. The children are asked about what subjects they took and what they liked during their daily school routine. Subjects that were covered in school were typical for any school – mathematics, reading and writing, history, art and gymnastics. Children were asked about their favorite and least favorite subjects in school. Most of the children under the age of twelve preferred art classes and gymnastics. The older children tended to enjoy reading and history classes. Of the thirty interviews, eighteen of the children, from the very youngest interviewees of seven years old to the oldest of seventeen, discussed Russian language classes or Russian[128] topics being covered in classes. The prevailing sentiment in these responses is that the children found the Russian language, which was a required class anywhere from three-to-five hours a week, difficult to learn. More poignantly, many of the children talked about how Russia was covered in all other subjects, including in geography, history, and most prominently in reading classes.

According to the responses by the children, Russian geography was given much attention. An eleven-year-old girl stated: "In geography, for instance, almost everything was about Russia. We learned about the Russian cities, rivers, economy, farming, [and] the plants which grow in Russia. We learned the same thing about Hungary, but it was about one third

[128] While it was the "Soviet Union" in 1957, I use the term "Russian" because that is how it is most commonly presented in the interviews.

of the material in our book which was about Hungary, and two thirds about Russia."[129] History classes likewise comprised of Russian topics, including "the heroism of the Russian soldiers, how they fought against the Germans and how they sacrificed their lives for victory."[130] In the Reading classes, Russian fairy tales, poetry and literature were featured. In both the older and younger children, there is a disregard for the value of this knowledge, and a prevalent cynicism. A girl of fifteen said "All of us tried to learn as little as we could. We had to learn, by heart, Russian propaganda stories."[131] Referring to Russian stories as "propaganda" indicates a willingness on the interviewee's part to project herself as resistive to these stories that were taught. A nine-year-old boy echoed these sentiments: "We had to learn once a poem on a Russian soldier, how we have to be grateful to him and whenever we pass his grave to honor him, because he has died in saving our country. You know, of course, this is just plain nonsense."[132] All of the children offer an opinion that indicates a dislike and resistance of things Russian. These opinions are likely what the children thought that the interviewer wanted to hear, and instruction from the parents as to how to answer questions of this sort seems likely.

Questions then proceed into asking about the teachers directly. Two primary questions were posed to the interviewee, namely if the teacher was fair and if the child thought that the teacher was a Communist. Remarkably, of the thirty interviews, twenty-five of the children believed that the teacher's treatment of the students was fair and balanced. Only five

[129] "CURPH Interview CH15-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 11 Years Old, Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-106; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[130] "CURPH Interview CH18-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 11 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-109; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[131] "CURPH Interview CH8-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee; Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-125; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[132] "CURPH Interview CH14-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-105; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

of the children believed their teachers to be unfair. Three of the students observed that those students that brought small gifts to the teachers, for example flowers or fruit, were treated better than the rest of the class. Two of the five believed that certain students were treated better because of political orientation. One child stated that "they [the teachers] were always much nicer with the Communist kids, and they even praised them when they didn't know their lessons very well"[133] while another student claimed "the boys who belonged to the Pioneer Movement were always treated preferentially, and usually got better marks".[134] Whether these claims are based on fact is unimportant. It is rather their *image* of their teachers, and of the school system in general, which is interesting because they have a knowledge of political ideology that they believed was a motivating factor in the education that they received.

All children were asked if they thought any of their teachers were a Communist. The majority of the interviewees denied this or were unsure. This shows a loyalty to their teachers, and surprisingly shows an unwillingness to be an informant. Only seven of the interviewees made this judgement, basing their assertions on observations. In these interviews, most of the students believed that the Director of their school was a Communist, and any teacher that spoke Russian or showed admiration for Russia or the Soviet Union was presumed to be a Communist. This could have been a narrative strategy on the children's part to project an opinion that they would think the interviewer would want to hear. An eleven-year-old girl

[133] "CURPH Interview CH23-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 11 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-115; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[134] "CURPH Interview CH1-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 15 Years Old, Male, Apprentice school boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-111; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

stated "It wasn't difficult to see who was a Communist and who wasn't. The Communist teacher didn't believe in God. They always talked about Stalin or Rákosi instead."[135]

REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS

This section focuses on rewards and punishment at school, as well as punishment in the home. Rewards at school were typically described by the interviewees as receiving good marks on assignments and reports home. Occasionally an interviewee was given candy by the teacher, or at the end of the year they were sometimes given a book. Punishments at school are discussed in more depth. While corporal punishment was banned in Hungarian schools in 1993,[136] in the 1950s it was still used as a disciplinary practice.

In the interviews with children, all of the children, except one boy of twelve that stated "we were never physically punished at school",[137] had at one time or another received physical punishment at school. According to the children, punishment at school was administered for reasons such as misbehavior in class, being late, not completing homework, breaking something at school, quarreling with other students, or disrespect. The most common disciplinary measures were making the child stand or kneel in the corner, or being kept after school in the classroom and being forced to write. However, many of the

[135] "CURPH Interview CH15-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 11 Years Old, Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-106; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

[136] Corporal punishment is unlawful in schools under article 10(2) of the Public Education Act 1993, which states: "The personality, human dignity and rights of children and students shall be respected, and protection has to be provided against physical and spiritual violence. Children and students may not be subject to physical admonishment, torture, cruel and humiliating punishment or treatment." http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/progress/country-reports/hungary.html

[137] "CURPH Interview CH25-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 12 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-117; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

interviewees described getting slapped in the face or back of the head, getting rapped on the knuckles, or having their hair pulled by the teacher. The most extreme recollection is that of a ten-year-old boy, who recounted "when we broke the window with a football once, I had to stand for an hour with my hands lifted above my head. It was very unpleasant."[138] Overall, the children were not critical of this physical punishment, and viewed it as commonplace. It is likewise true of physical punishment administered in the home. Only two of the interviewees reported that they were not subjected to corporal punishment at home. The rest of the children reported physical punishment at home for misbehavior, disrespect, or a bad report from school. Both parents dispensed punishment, usually in the form of a slap to the face or a spanking.

TRUTH AT HOME AND AT SCHOOL

In twenty-six of the interviews, there were two questions devoted to what the children discussed at home regarding their school day, and also if they spoke at school about what went on in their homes. This section of the interview was examining the children's honesty and the dynamics of family openness. Only four of the interviewees did not speak about their school day to their parents, and three of these children explained that their parents were working late and that they did not have the opportunity to share in the day's events. One child described that she did not share everything, and even admitted to forging an unsatisfactory

[138] "CURPH Interview CH24-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 10 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-116; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

report card in lieu of a parent signature.[139] However, the majority of the interviewees spoke openly about their day at school when they arrived home.

Talking about what went on in the home while at school was an entirely different matter. A majority of the interviewees that were asked about discussing family matters at school – twenty-four of the twenty-six – answered that they did not converse openly at school about what had ensued at home. These family dialogues appeared to be free-flowing and unencumbered, as one might expect in a home, with only one of the interviewees relating that his parents did not speak about serious issues in front of him.[140] Most tellingly, eleven of these children, close to half of the interviewees, were warned by parents to not talk about family discourses at school. While most of these warnings were related to keeping the private life of the family protected, the most extreme of these talked about the possibility of dire consequences for the family, including imprisonment. "They [the parents] made us [the children] realize if we tell others what we are talking about at home, the AVH will come and arrest dad."[141] This revelation, included with the proclivity in many of the interviewees for keeping family matters secret, exposes a distrust for the authorities and an awareness for, and fear of, consequences. It also promoted a dual-reality for the children, where life at home and life at school were separated, and behaviors in the two different places modified.

[139] "CURPH Interview CH17-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 9 Years Old, Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-108; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[140] "CURPH Interview CH25-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 12 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-117; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[141] "CURPH Interview CH5-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 12 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-122; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
The AVH (Államvédelmi Hatóság) was the state secret police organization and were active in gathering information.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

This is one of the more peculiar sub-sections in the child interview. Much time is dedicated to asking about religious teaching. Because religious instruction did not occur in American public schools, why would this topic even be broached? It could be due to the fact that religion in 1950s America was a substantial part of the cultural fabric of the country. "On a typical Sunday morning in the period from 1955-58, almost half of all Americans were attending church – the highest percentage in U.S. history. During the 1950s, nationwide church membership grew at a faster rate than the population, from 57 percent of the U.S. population in 1950 to 63.3 percent in 1960."[142] Religion, and the freedom to practice it, was looked at as an essential element of 1950s America. The interviews wanted to know about religion and religious instruction in Hungary, and the freedoms with which it could be carried out. There is not a focus on *what* was learned, but only an interest in *if* religious instruction was allowed to transpire. Of the thirty interviewees, twenty-five were Roman Catholics, and five were Protestants, which is not an accurate representation of the religious makeup of Hungary at the time, where around two-thirds of Hungarians identified as Roman Catholic[143]. All but three of the interviews covered the topic of religious instruction. Only five of the interviewees did not attend religion classes or had no formal religious instruction. The majority of children said that they attended religion classes did so in private, either with local priests, nuns, pastors, or teachers.

Religious instruction was often offered at schools after regular school hours, but only three of the interviewees participated in these classes. According to the children's responses, those that attended religious instruction at school were made to register – and that the

[142] Tucker, Carol "The 1950s – Powerful Years for Religion" in University of Southern California News 16 June 1997
[143] From "Population Census, 2011" Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO), Table 1.1.7.1

"registration always took place in [the] presence of a communist official."[144] This registration, and subsequent attendance at instruction, brought about consequences, most notably according to the interviewees, lowered grades in other school courses. One fifteen-year-old boy recounted that "my parents thought it wiser not to have me attend religious instruction at school."[145] Understandably, most parents did not register their children for religious instruction at school, preferring instead to send their children to church or to have the instruction take place secretly, in the privacy of a home. Nevertheless, even in those cases where a formal registration process had not occurred, anxiety and stress were associated with religious instruction. An eleven-year-old girl specified: "At school, we had to hide the fact that we went to the Sunday school. If they[146] learned about it, are marks were made worse."[147] What can be determined is that religion was an important identifier for the children interviewees, and that religious instruction came with a degree of trepidation for those that took part. Interestingly, the topic of religious involvement, especially at the school, would have provided the interviewees with a forum for creating a narrative that showed their resistance to the system in which they lived.

PIONEER MOVEMENT

[144] "CURPH Interview CH7-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 10 Years Old, Male, School boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-124; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[145] "CURPH Interview CH1-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 15 Years Old, Male, Apprentice school boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-111; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.
[146] School officials
[147] "CURPH Interview CH15-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 11 Years Old, Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-106; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

Particular interest is given in the interviews towards the Pioneer Movement. The Pioneer Movement was a communist youth organization with formal ceremonies and protocols. The Pioneer Movement followed twelve key principles, including loyalty to the Hungarian People's Republic.[148] Membership was compulsory at the age of seven. It is unclear as to how the CURPH viewed the Pioneer Movement, though it can be assumed that they thought of it as an organization with the goal of indoctrinating the children with Communist ideology.

Of the thirty interviewees in our sample, fifteen children said that they were members of the Pioneers. Ten were not members, and five were never asked about their membership during their prospective interviews. The ten children that were not members were generally too young to join the movement, as they were younger than seven years of age when leaving Hungary. The rest of the older interviewees were Pioneers, except a boy of fifteen. When he was prodded by the interviewer as to why he was not a member he stated "I was supposed to join and to attend the initiation ceremonies, but I had no clean clothes. Mother washed my slacks and shirt and they didn't dry in time. So, by the time I got there, the ceremony had started and I was not admitted. So it was really quite by chance that I was not a member."[149] What is unsaid in this response, but obvious, is that this boy lacked clean clothes because he only had one appropriate outfit. It is not a declaration of resistance to the Pioneer Movement, but an admission of poverty.

The young Pioneers were required to join meetings, had uniforms with red scarves, and attended summer camps. A nine-year-old girl stated: "In the Pioneer Movement we also

[148] From "Budapest Retro: Communist Youth" http://budapestretro.weebly.com/communist-organisations.html and also "The Pioneers and the Children's Railway" http://disappearingbudapest.blogspot.hu/2008/11/pioneers-and-childrens-railway.html

[149] "CURPH Interview CH1-M with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 15 Years Old, Male, Apprentice school boy", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-111; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

had celebrations and meetings. Every Friday we had to stay at school from three to seven in the afternoon. We had to learn different things – to march like soldiers, to salute, and then we got an emblem."[150] The children that were members had mixed feelings of the movement, though none of the interviewees claim that any political agenda occurred within these meetings. Not surprisingly, some of the children viewed the regular meetings as boring and unnecessary, and did not like attending. However, the majority of the children looked back on their time in the Pioneers with fondness. They enjoyed the activities, especially the summer camps, and also spending time with friends.

The children, when discussing their lives at school and at home, were shown to be aware of responding to questions in a way that might elicit approval or acceptance from the interviewers. While topics covered at school are reviewed, particular attention on the part of the interviewees is given to Russian topics, and the interviewees' disapproval of them. Again, this is reflective of the children's understanding of anti-Soviet sentiment in Cold War America, or at least of their parents' understanding of it, and the possible instruction they received from their parents on how to respond. A surprising discovery in the interviews was an unwillingness on the children's part to openly denounce their teachers by claiming them to be a "Communist". Perhaps the interviewers were hoping to prove that a level of indoctrination had occurred within the schools of Hungary, and yet the children did not verify this. Also noteworthy was the section on religious instruction, especially in the context of a 1950s American climate where religion was paramount. Attending religious services and instruction could be viewed as acts of defiance against the regime. Instead, most religious instruction was carried out in secrecy. Finally, I had assumed that the interviews would

[150] "CURPH Interview CH17-F with a 1956 Hungarian Refugee: 9 Years Old, Female, School girl", 1957. HU OSA 414-0-2-108; Donald and Vera Blinken Collection on Hungarian Refugees of 1956: Transcripts of Refugee Interviews; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest.

reveal that an attempt at communist indoctrination within the Pioneer Movement was the norm, and yet the children looked at the Pioneer Movement with relative affection and positivity.

CONCLUSION

The large amount of Hungarian refugees being resettled in the US after the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 provided an opportunity to learn about life behind the Iron Curtain. In a Cold War climate of distrust, misunderstanding and curiosity, this mass influx of people were able to impart first-hand knowledge of the society which they had left. The speed of the resettlement of the refugees was attributable to several factors. First, the newly-independent state of Austria was unable to cope with such a large number of people. Second, Dwight Eisenhower, President of the US, acted without Congressional involvement and admitted thousands of Hungarians as "parolees". This gesture helped to bolster the US's reputation on the world's political stage as a bastion of freedom and a counterpoint to the perceived oppressive nature of East and Central European communist regimes. Finally, after witnessing the closing off of a large part of the European continent after the Second World War, and wary of a return to such a restrictive geo-political climate, the quick resettlement of refugees was viewed as a necessity.

The CURPH sought to utilize these resettled refugees to create an image of life behind the Iron Curtain. By conducting in-depth interviews from a structured questionnaire that covered not only personal experiences but also political and societal norms, work, religion, school and the family, the aim was to develop a portrait of Hungary and then to create an analysis of the material that would be useful in the Cold War climate of the time. Henry L. Roberts, Chairman of the CURPH, understood the immensity of the project, and also its limitations. Employing the expertise of scholars from a variety of fields such as Anthropology, Sociology, Government and History, the hopes for a scholarly assessment of

the materials were never realized. What was left to posterity is an interview project of 356 transcripts in archival form.

The child interviews which had not been analyzed, to my knowledge, in the sixty years since they had been created, were the primary focus of this thesis. In my reading of these materials and my analysis, I came to comprehend and appreciate some of the same limitations that Roberts recognized, specifically the overwhelming amount of information and the difficulty with which to organize it. The portrait of Hungary that the CURPH set out to create, and in a broader sense life behind the Iron Curtain, proved to be a monumental task for those involved in the project. Throughout this process of research and analysis, and understanding the immensity of material, I too felt overwhelmed at times. Also challenging for me was the lack of information about several important factors, including a detailed pre-history of the CURPH, the motivations for the CURPH to interview children, how the original interviews were amended expressly for the child interviews, and finally my unrealized hopes of finding people that had been involved in the project and would have been willing to describe what they had experienced.

After attaining a better grasp of oral history during the course of the year, I believe that an examination of the CURPH, even with its shortcomings, was a worthwhile and fruitful endeavor. My goal, much like Roberts and the others of the CURPH, was to create an image of Hungary in the years leading up to the Revolution of 1956. By reading through the many transcripts of the interviews, and coming to understand the complexities of this topic, namely the methodological problems in interviewing, the limitations of oral history, the children's memories and the layers of mediation, as well as the dynamics of the Cold War climate, I feel this image came into focus.

The three primary sections of the children interviews that were looked at for the purposes of this thesis – the Revolution, Work and Labor, and School and Family – offered a

perspective of life in Hungary before the 23rd of October, 1956. While it is my contention that the children were influenced by their parents in their responses and in their recollections, they nonetheless offered new insights into this time period. The dynamics between the interviewer and interviewee, the agendas that they have, the performance of the interview in which they both engage, all factor in to the final product of the interview transcript. Yet for me, regardless of the interviewer's presence and imprint on the interviews, it is the voices of the children, albeit mediated through the interviewer, which emerge.

While a sense of regret can be felt in the correspondence of Roberts that a thorough analysis of the transcribed interviews was never realized, perhaps the interviews themselves *are* the accomplishment. The legacy of the CURPH is that it has bestowed upon historians a snapshot of a region, a country, a people and a time period. The information gathered in the interviews played no important role in the Cold War itself, and yet the interviews are a representation of the time period in which they were created and a useful source of original material for anyone that decides to examine this time period. Most importantly for me, the CURPH allowed for the voices of the children to be heard. These voices have given me a greater understanding of Hungary and the Revolution, and left me with a feeling of profound gratitude that the CURPH created and left these documents for future generations.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:Introductory Statement of the CURPH interview *

As you maybe already know, this research project has been established for the purpose of learning about Hungary. What we are interested in is what has happened since the Second World War. How people reacted to what has happened. What it was that they liked and what they disliked, and why they did certain things.

This research, which is exclusively of a scientific character, is being conducted by Columbia University, one of the leading American universities. Owing to its scientific character, it does not propose either to justify or to refute any given thesis. It is independent from any political group or organization. It is not a government enterprise, not an émigré activity. Nor does secret military information fall within the sphere of interest.

What we want is above all the truth. Most of us here tried to follow the events in Hungary, as a result we know certain facts or at least we believe we know them. Therefore I am convinced that you will have many interesting things to tell us. It goes without saying that you can talk of anything with us with the greatest frankness. In order to be able to judge things correctly, first we have to know the facts, regardless of whether they are pleasant or unpleasant.

As you know, we do not care whether or not we know the names of the people we talk with. We do this partly for your sake, that is to dispel your possible worries in this respect, and partly in order to have not even a shadow of suspicion fall on ourselves. Also you are entirely free to refuse to answer any question to which you do not wish to reply for any reason. Please feel free to tell me if you wish to take a break of if you have any other observation to make.

I hope you won't mind if I take notes as we talk. This is necessary in order retain exactly what I hear and thus have the full benefit of your experience for our work. Before we get started, if you have any questions you want to ask, I shall try to answer them to the best of my ability.

***The Introductory Statement is from the "Interview Guide" and can be found at:**

http://w3.osaarchivum.org/files/holdings/other/blinken/pdf/B_SF_04.pdf

APPENDIX B:

Table of Interviewees

AGE	SEX	WHERE CHILD IS FROM	WHERE CHILD IS LIVING AT TIME OF INTERVIEW	RELIGION (RC=Roman Catholic)	WORK OF FATHER	WORK OF MOTHER	PIONEER MOVEMENT YES/NO	CLASS INTERVIEWER PLACED THEM	WISHES FOR FUTURE
7	M	Balatonfüred	Connecticut	RC	Dock worker	N/A	NO	Working Class	Cowboy
9	F	Sopron	Connecticut	RC	Engineer	Typist	YES	Middle Class	Dress Designer
10	M	Pécs	Connecticut	RC	Tailor	Movie theater employee	YES	Middle Class	Pilot
8	F	Budapest	New Jersey	Protestant	Iron Worker	Sold newspapers	NO	Working Class	Stewardess
9	M	Székesfehérvár	NYC	RC	Tinsmith	Seamstress	NO	Working Class	N/A
11	F	Budapest	New Jersey	Protestant	Furniture repair	Helped father	YES	Middle Class	Teacher/Nurse
9	M	Budapest	NYC	RC	Stove-setter	Saleswoman	NO	Working Class	Sportsman
9	F	Budapest	NYC	RC	Wallet-maker	Factory worker	YES	Working Class	Typist
11	M	Budapest	NYC	RC	Barber	Coffee shop	YES	Working Class	Doctor
8	M	Tatabánya	New Jersey	Protestant	Miner	Worked at mine	NO	Working Class	Miner
15	M	Budapest	NYC	RC	Toy-maker	Toy-maker	NO	Working Class	Mechanic
8	M	Budapest	NYC	Protestant	Textile factory	Typist	NO	Middle Class	Engineer

8	F	Budapest	NYC	RC	Driver	Office worker	NO	Working Class	Singer
7	F	Pápa	NYC	RC	Stoker in a factory	Textile Mill	NO	Working Class	Cleaning Lady
11	M	Budapest	NYC	RC	Tailor	N/A	YES	Middle Class	Doctor
10	M	Budapest	NYC	RC	Driver	Factory-worker	YES	Working Class	Doctor
12	M	Esztergom	NYC	RC	Waiter	Bartender	YES	Working Class	Doctor
11	M	Szombathely	NYC	RC	Leather factory	N/A	YES	Working Class	Architect
10	F	Budapest	NYC	Protestant	Prison	Worker	NO	Working Class	Gardener
12	F	Budapest	N/A	RC	Deceased	Dancer	YES	N/A	Dancer
12	F	Budapest	Connecticut	RC	Technician	Office worker	YES	Middle Class	Designer
12	M	Budapest	Buffalo, NY	RC	Lawyer	Typist	YES	Middle Class	Engineer/Doctor
12	M	Paks	Connecticut	RC	Laborer	N/A	YES	Middle Class	Engineer
10	M	Budapest	New Jersey	RC	Driver	Bus Conductor	YES	Working Class	Engineer
15	F	Budapest	New Jersey	RC	Deceased	Journalist	YES	Middle Class	Doctor
8	M	Budapest	New Jersey	RC	Engineer	Textile Factory	NO	N/A	Soldier/Engineer
17	F	Győr	NYC	RC	Farmer	N/A	YES	Working Class	Hairdresser
17	M	Debrecen	NYC	RC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
17	M	Budapest	NYC	RC	Driver	Cleaning Woman	N/A	Working Class	Barber
16	M	Budapest	New Jersey	RC	Lawyer	Deceased	N/A	Middle Class	Engineer

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Lynn "Oral History Theory" Routledge New York 2010

Abrams, Lynn "Power and Empowerment" in Oral History Theory, Routledge, 2010: pp. 153-175

Bon Tempo, Carl J. "Americans at the Gate: The United States and Refugees During the Cold War" Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ 2008

Brandenberger, David "A Background Guide to Working with the HPSSS Online" in The Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System © President and Fellows of Harvard College, last reviewed 10 August 2016

"Budapest Retro: Communist Youth" http://budapestretro.weebly.com/communist-organisations.html and also "The Pioneers and the Children's Railway" http://disappearingbudapest.blogspot.hu/2008/11/pioneers-and-childrens-railway.html

Bursten, Martin A. "Escape from Fear" Syracuse University Press, NY: 1958

https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/1946-03-05.pdf

Colville, Rupert "A Matter of the Heart: How the Hungarian Crisis Changed the World of Refugees" in Refugees UNHCR 2006 Number 144 Issue 3

Conrad, Robert "I Never Met a Hungarian Who Didn't Want to Learn – Memories of the Traiskirchen Refugee Camp of 1956" in Hungarian Review Vol. IV, No. 6 28 November 2013

Coriden. Guy E. "Report on Hungarian Refugees" Studies Archives Indexes Vol. 2, Issue 1 Central Intelligence Agency 8 May 2007

Fivush, Robyn "Young Children's Event Recall: Are Memories Constructed through Discourse?" in Consciousness and Cognition Vol. 3 Issue 3-4: September 1994

Gémes, Andreas "Austria and the 1956 Hungarian Revolution: Between Solidarity and Neutrality" Pisa University Press, 2008: 82

Gémes, Andreas "Deconstruction of a Myth? Austria and the Hungarian Refugees of 1956-57" 2009

Granville, Johanna "The First Domino: International Decision Making during the Hungarian Crisis of 1956" Texas A&M University Press, 2004

Granville, Johanna "Of Spies, Refugees and hostile Propaganda: How Austria Dealt with the Hungarian Crisis of 1956" in History Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Vol. 91 Issue 301 January 23 2006: 62-90

"Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System" found at Harvard College Library © President and Fellows of Harvard College, last reviewed 6 Jan. 2012 http://hcl.harvard.edu/collections/hpsss/index.html

Hochschild, Arlie and Anne Machung. 1990. The Second Shift. Avon Books: New York

Holmes, Marcia "Deceptive Subjects: Reading the Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System" 11 April 2016 in Hidden Persuaders BBC

Jessee, Erin "The Limits of Oral History: Ethics and Methodology Amid highly Politicized Research Settings" in Oral History Review 38(2), 2011. pp. 287-307

K'Meyer, Tracy E. and Crothers, Glenn A. "'If I see Some of This in Writing, I'm Going to Shoot You': Reluctant Narrators, Taboo Topics, and the Ethical Dilemmas of the Oral Historian" in The Oral History Review 34(1) 2007: pp. 71-93

Kecskés, Gusztáv "Collecting Money at a Global Level: The UN Fundraising Campaign for the 1956 Hungarian Refugees" Eastern Journal of European Studies Vol. 5 Issue 2 December 2014: 45

Komlosy, Andrea "Work and Labor Relations" from Capitalism: Reemergence of a Historical Concept eds. Kocka, Jurgen and van der Linden, Marcel: Bloomsbury, London 2016:33-69

Kőrösi, Zsuzsanna and Molnár, Adrienne "Carrying a Secret in My Heart: Children of the Victims of the Reprisal after the Hungarian Revolution in 1956, An Oral History" Central European University Press: Budapest 2003

Kovačević, Katarina "The Refugee problem in Yugoslavia" in The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and the Soviet Bloc Countries: Reactions and Repercussions eds. J. Rainer and K. Somlai Budapest, 2007

Lewis, Paul G. "Central Europe Since 1945" Longman Publishing, UK. 1994: pp. 49-96

Loescher, Gil "Beyond Charity: International Cooperation and the Global Refugee Crisis" Oxford University Press: Oxford 1993

Logemann, Jan "Paul Lazarsfeld (1901-1976): Sociologist and Expert in Media and Market Research" from Transatlantic Perspectives 6 May 2011

Lomax, Bill "Hungary 1956" St. Martin's Press, New York 1976: 78-103

Lucassen, Jan "Outlines of a History of Labor" in International Institute of Social History 2013 5-46

Markowitz, Arthur A. "Humanitarianism versus Restrictionism: The United States and the Hungarian Refugees" The International Migration Review Vol. 7 No. 1 Spring 1973

Marrus, Michael R. "The Unwanted: European Refugees in the Twentieth Century" Oxford University Press: Oxford 1985

Mink, András "Columbia University Research Project Hungary: 1956 Hungarian Refugee Interviews at OSA Archivum, Budapest": http://w3.osaarchivum.org/digitalarchive/blinken/curph.pdf: 2006

Molnár, János "Foreign Correspondents in the 1956 Hungarian Revolution" The Institute for the History of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution 2007

Niessen, James P. "Hungarian Refugees of 1956: From the Border to Austria, Camp Kilmer and Elsewhere" Hungarian Cultural Studies. E-Journal of the American Hungarian Educators Association, Vol. 9 2016

Nóvé, Béla "The Orphans of 1956: Hungarian Child Refugees and Their Stories" in *Eurozine* 21 January 2013

Open Society Archives Digital Repository CURPH Interviews with 1956 Hungarian Refugees from: http://www.osaarchivum.org/hu/digital-repository/osa:ea9bfcca-2dd5-4da8-b6a4-74871c5373f4

Pastor, Peter. "The American Reception and Settlement of Hungarian Refugees in 1956-1957" Hungarian Cultural Studies. E-Journal of the American Hungarian Educators Association, Vol. 9 2016

Pető, Andrea "Memories of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution: Narrating Gender and Migration" Pisa University Press, 2007: 153-163

Pittaway, Mark "Introduction: Workers and Socialist States in Postwar Central and Eastern Europe" in International Labor and Working-Class History No. 68, Fall 2005 pp. 1-8

Portelli, Alessandro "What Makes Oral History Different" in The Oral History Reader Perks, R and Thomson, A. (eds.) London: Routledge 1998 pp. 63-75

Puskás, Julianna "Ties That Bind, Ties That Divide: 100 Years of Hungarian Experience in the United States" Holmes and Meier: New York 2000

"Resettling Hungarian Refugees: A Report on the Resettlement Activities of the International Rescue Committee, Inc. in the United States 1957-1959" International Rescue Committee: May 1960 from Open Society Archives: http://www.refugees1956.org/start

Rév, István "The Unnoticed Continuity: The Prehistory of the Hungarian Refugee Interview Project" http://w3.osaarchivum.org/digitalarchive/blinken/index.html#desc2

Rothschild, Joseph "Henry L. Roberts and the Study of the History and Politics of East Central Europe" Historians as Nation-Builders: Central and South-East Europe eds. Deletant, D. and Hanak, H. Macmillan Press London 1988

Sangster, Joan "Telling Our Stories: Feminist debates and the Use of Oral History" in The Oral History Reader Eds. Perks, R. and Thomson, A. London: Routledge. pp. 87-110

Sebestyen, Victor "Twelve Days: The Story of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution" Pantheon Books, NY 2006

Sinatti, Giulia "The Polish Peasant Revisited: Thomas and Znaniecki's Classic in the Light of Contemporary Transnational Migration Theory" Copyright © 2008 by Società editrice il Mulino, Bologna pp. 1-2

Thomas, William I. and Znaniecki, Florian "The Polish Peasant in Europe and America" Edited and Abridged by Zaretsky, E. University of Illinois Press, Urbana: 1984

Thomson, Alistair "Fifty Years On: An International Perspective on Oral History" Journal of American History September 1998

Tucker, Carol "The 1950s – Powerful Years for Religion" in University of Southern California News 16 June 1997

US Department of State Archive: Andre Varchaver, information released online from Jan.202001-Jan.202009:https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/io/unesco/members/63109.htm#)

Zieck, Marjoleine "The 1956 Hungarian Refugee Emergency, an Early and Instructive Case of Resettlement" Amsterdam Law Forum: 25 March 2013

"1956: The Hungarian Revolution and War for Independence", eds. L. Congdon, B. Király, K. Nagy Columbia University Press, NY, 2006