

Genocide or Genocidal Massacre?: The Case of Hungarian Prisoners in Soviet Custody

Tamás Stark

During the Second World War, and in the early post-war period, approximately 600,000 Hungarian citizens were captured by the victorious Soviet army. About one-third of these prisoners perished in the Soviet camps. In October 1993, a huge marble cross resembling a deformed tortured man was erected in Budapest in memory of the victims, and commemorations have taken place at the site every year since then. The invitation card for these meetings speaks about commemoration of the victims of the “Soviet Holocaust.” Some survivors also use the term “genocide” in referring to the tragic fate of the Hungarians in Soviet camps. Although “genocide studies” is still a nonexistent academic subject in Hungary, some historians have addressed the topic, drawing parallels between the Nazi and the Stalinist forms of evil. The Hungarian gulag expert Miklos Fuzesi writes:

It must be acknowledged that the transport of civilians to the Soviet Union was grounded in the same type of thinking as what led to the deportation and extermination of the Jews, namely the racial argument. The Fascist racial theory predetermined the Jews’...inferiority....Stalinist tyranny...feeding on Eastern despotism and applying the tools of genocide grounded in racial arguments, threw nations into prisons, predictably...leading to their extermination. Adding to the gravity of the situation is that all this was carried out with cynicism, under declaration of friendship and respect among peoples.¹

In contrast to Fuzesi, genocide experts such as Richard Rubenstein, Irving Louis Horowitz, Leo Kuper, and Helen Fein do not even mention the fate of Poles, Slovaks, Romanians, and Hungarians in their classic works. Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn’s edited collection of essays *The History and Sociology of Genocide* was the first work that attempted to present the major case studies of genocides from all regions of the world and from ancient times to the present.² Yet, although the editors devoted a whole chapter to illustrating the genocides committed under Stalin, the Soviets’ deportation of national groups was not mentioned among the case studies. Eric Markusen and David Kopf’s impressive book, *The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing. Genocide and Total War in the 20th Century*, reviews a series of World War II-related genocides, but the au-

thors devoted only two and half pages to Stalin's mass murder of national groups.³

The fate of about 600,000 Hungarian prisoners should not be compared with the Holocaust. Stalin did not want to exterminate the German, Hungarian, Polish, or Romanian nations. Nor were the Soviet camps places of systematic mass killing. Over fifty years later, how can we classify the fate of the Hungarian prisoners during and immediately following the end of World War II?

Definitions and Initial Events

The United Nations convention on genocide declares: "...genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group, as such: a) Killing members of the group; b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part..."⁴

Both the Hungarian armistice agreement and the peace treaty speak of "prisoners of war," referring to the Hungarian citizens captured by Soviet forces. In April 1946, in the Moscow talks between Prime Minister Ferenc Nagy and Stalin, the latter spoke about the continuous repatriation of the "prisoners of war." It was characteristic of Stalin's cynicism that he spoke of the repatriation at a time when the transportation of prisoners from Hungary to the Soviet Union was still taking place. In other words, the official Soviet position was that no civilians—Slovak, Romanian, or Hungarian—were among their captives. Before the Soviet bloc's political change in 1989, Hungarian historians unanimously referred to Hungarian prisoners in Soviet captivity as "POWs." Even today Russian scholars speak about the "tragedy of prisoners of war." If only prisoners of war were in Soviet camps, their fate apparently did not fit the criteria of the genocide convention. But were only POWs in Soviet hands? Who were these "prisoners of war" and how large was their number?

Up until November 1944, about 70,000 prisoners of war were registered by the Department of Losses of the Hungarian Ministry of Defense.⁵ The retreat of Hungarian troops to Germany began in the late autumn of 1944 and lasted until April 1945. Nearly one million Hungarians sought temporary refuge from the Red Army advancing on Germany. They included approximately 580,000 soldiers of the Hungarian Army, who made a last effort to reach the zones in Germany expected to be occupied by the western powers. Defense Ministry records suggest that 300,000 of them succeeded in this effort and were taken prisoner by British, American, and French troops. The rest, about 280,000, were sent east by the Red Army.⁶ Consequently, in the period before November 1944 and after the great retreat, in April and May 1945, the remaining approximately 350,000 Hungarian citizens were captured by the Red Army mainly

outside Hungarian territory. Many of those captured were soldiers, hence "POWs," but it is much more difficult, however, to classify those prisoners who were captured on Hungarian territory after November 1944.

After crossing the Hungarian border the Soviet army and its special units, SMERS (Death to the Spies), began a massive campaign for concentration and deportation of Hungarians, regardless of whether they were soldiers or civilians. The number given for those captured on Hungarian soil after November 1944 is based on direct and indirect sources.

The population of Transcarpathia (the eastern part of Hungary during the war years, now belonging to Ukraine) was the first to experience the Soviet practice of mass deportation. In October 1944, following the Soviet occupation, Hungarian and German males eligible for military service (aged between 18 and 50 years) were gathered in a concentration camp located at Szolyva/Szvaljava and then deported to forced labor camps to the Soviet Union. According to the sources of the Soviet Ministry of Interior, by December 17, 1944, 22,000 Hungarians were deported, but according to a local survey carried out between July 1-7, 1945 regarding those eligible for military service, about 30,000 were in "unknown locations."⁷ The documents of the Ministry of the Interior estimates that about 5,000 deportees had already died by that time. During this campaign against the Hungarian and German ethnic groups, Transcarpathia became a part of the Soviet Union in accordance with a June 29, 1945 agreement between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union.

For those who remained in Hungary, one source is a survey by the Hungarian Central Statistical Bureau for the summer of 1945, which lists those Hungarians who were captured on Hungarian territory, excluding Budapest. The Hungarian Central Statistical Bureau records a total of 179,608 citizens who were deported to the Soviet Union.⁸ Since the circulated questionnaires asked for the names of *deportees* and not of POWs, this figure undoubtedly referred only to captured civilians.

The missing figures from Budapest can be estimated from the victory announcement made by the Red Army on February 13, 1945. It says that the Soviet forces took 110,000 prisoners of war in the battle for the Hungarian capital.⁹ If this is taken to mean military prisoners of war, it seems to be an exaggerated figure, designed to magnify the achievements of General Rodion Malinovsky. Earlier, Malinovsky had given the size of the German and Hungarian forces as an excuse to Stalin for the delay in capturing Budapest. The number of German soldiers encircled in Budapest did not exceed 30,000. Thus, at least 80,000 of the 110,000 prisoners would have been Hungarian.¹⁰ Since the number of the encircled Hungarian soldiers was less than 30,000, the vast majority of the "prisoners of war" would have been civilians from Budapest.

Combining these figures and estimates, we can conclude that more than 600,000 Hungarians ended up in Soviet camps. Further, it seems to be reasonable to conclude that, of the 600,000 prisoners, the number of real POWs did

not exceed 360,000. Consequently almost 40 percent of the prisoners were civilians.

Closer examination of the Soviet sources made available to Hungarian researchers since 1991 yields some interesting findings. Neither the Soviet government nor the general staff ever gave an authentic or credible account of how many people were taken prisoner by the Red Army or the security police. Newly available Soviet documents, however, reveal that in the camps, detailed reports were made of the number, nationality, and qualification of the captives. A total of 526,606 personal files on Hungarian captives are preserved in the main hall of the Center for the Maintenance of Historic Documentation in Moscow.¹¹ It has to be mentioned, though, that Soviet statistics were compiled well after the prisoners' arrival in the camps and, consequently, do not contain the number of those deceased who died in the concentration and transit camps or during transit. Taking this point into consideration, the Soviet figure of 526,606 corroborates the estimation of 600,000 discussed above, which is based largely on Hungarian sources.

Soviet documents also reveal that a significant proportion of the prisoners were not soldiers but civilians. I did not find any figure referring to the proportion of civilians and soldiers, but the camp system itself proves the presence of civilians. Although Soviet officials publicly always spoke about POWs, the official name of the camp system where the prisoners were kept, GUPVI, the Main Administration of POWs and *Internees (Glavnoe Upravlenie NKVD SSSR po delam Voennoplennykh i Internirovannykh)* clearly reveals that not only soldiers, but civilians as well, were taken prisoner. GUPVI was under the control of the Soviet Ministry of the Interior, which was principally responsible for foreign prisoners taken during World War II and the early postwar period.¹²

Statistics on the repatriated prisoners also indicate the high proportion of civilians among those who were captured by the Soviet forces. Precise figures are available on the composition of the repatriated prisoners in the period between May and October 1947. During that period, when Soviets released almost exclusively former soldiers, 100,288 persons returned to the Hungarian reception camp located outside Debrecen, a city in the eastern part of the country. This group included 7,171 officers, 9,984 NCOs, 72,751 rank and file soldiers, 817 Jewish former forced laborers, 124 members of the Hungarian Youth Organization, 5,829 civilian men, 3,596 civilian women, and 16 infants who were born in Soviet camps.¹³

What these statistics do not tell us is that a significant percentage of the real prisoners of war were captured independently of the military operations. Winston Churchill termed the prisoner of war thus: "He is a man who tries to kill you and fails, and then asks you not to kill him."¹⁴ The majority of Hungarian POWs were not that kind of men. In September, when the Soviets reached Hungary, the Hungarian army was in a state of disintegration. In the period between September 1944 and February 1945, almost half of the soldiers of the

formerly one million strong army deserted and escaped to territories which were already under Soviet control. In spring 1945, four armed divisions with about 65,000 soldiers opened the front line and joined the Red Army. Other units simply surrendered themselves because of leaflets dropped from airplanes that read that the Soviets promised freedom to soldiers who stopped fighting. But no matter how they finished the war—active soldiers, deserters, and those who joined the Soviet forces voluntarily—all suffered the same fate. All these groups were registered and consequently treated as POWs.

The deportation of Hungarians parallels the series of mass deportations carried out by the Soviet forces before and during the Second World War. The first mass deportation took place in 1937. At that time, some 190,000 Koreans were forced out of Khabarovsk district and resettled in Kazakhstan.¹⁵ According to Soviet sources, the Soviet authorities, in a series of actions, interned some 391,000 Polish civilians from eastern Poland between February 1940 and June 1941.¹⁶ This number does not include military victims who were interned and murdered *en masse* in Katyn. From August 1941 to June 1942, 1,209,000 ethnic Germans were deported from the Crimea and the Volga region. The Chechens, Karachai, Kalmyks, Ingush, Balkars, Crimean Tatars, and Meskethians were all victims of collective punishment. Between November 1943 and December 1944, some 900,000 people, virtually every representative of these ethnic groups, were deported to Kazakhstan and to Siberia.¹⁷ These operations were carried out secretly and with great brutality. There are reports of a 50 percent death rate among the Karachai and Balkars during their winter deportations. This deportation of the eight nationalities was clearly a punitive measure. Karachai, Kalmyks, Chechen, Ingush, Balkars, and Crimean Tatars were charged with collaboration with the German occupation forces, while the deportation of Volga Germans and Meskethians can be termed as “preventive.” (Both groups were considered potential enemies.) Since the deportations took place with the intent to destroy whole national groups, these are clear cases of genocide.

The second wave of mass deportations started in late 1944, after the occupation of the Baltic states and Eastern Poland. By the end of 1946, 100,000 Lithuanians, 60,000 Latvians, and 50,000 Estonians had been deported to various Gulag camps.¹⁸ Simultaneously with the deportations of Poles, Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, members of Central European ethnic groups such as Slovaks, Hungarians, and Romanians were also deported in the framework of the great punitive campaign.

The significant difference between the above cases is that while in the first wave of deportations, entire ethnic groups were transferred, the deportations which later took place in the Baltic states and in Eastern Europe were partial. Apart from this essential difference, one basic parallel remains: in each case, people were judged collectively, and the determining factor for deportation was that victim groups were related to the enemy.

The deportation of about 100,000 Poles, mainly from eastern Poland, also belongs to the series of mass deportations. But this deportation can be termed "preventive" rather than punitive. The former soldiers of the anti-Communist Home Army and Poles in the territories annexed by the Soviet Union were arrested and deported to remote parts of the Soviet Union because they were considered a potential threat to Soviet rule. The deportation of Poles from eastern Poland, a territory the Soviet Union annexed, was a form of ethnic cleansing.

A punitive campaign by ethnic cleansing took place simultaneously in Transcarpathia, where the Hungarian ethnic group was considered a destabilizing factor in the newly incorporated territory. Transcarpathia had been an integral part of Hungary before 1919. In the interwar years this territory belonged to Czechoslovakia, but after the collapse of the Czechoslovak Republic, the Hungarian army re-occupied it. The territory was then officially incorporated by the Soviet Union in May 1945. Statements of Soviet top leaders prove the punitive character of the deportations that took place there and in the present day territory of Hungary; in a letter written on June 7, 1943, to A.J.C. Kerr, the British ambassador in Moscow, Vyacheslav Molotov said that "the responsibility for helping the Germans lay with the people of Hungary, not just their government." On December 14, 1943, he told Eduard Benes, the Czechoslovak President in exile, that "The Hungarians must be punished."¹⁹

That attitude may help to explain how captives ranged from 13 to 80 years old and how women came to be taken prisoner merely because they happened to pass Soviet troops on the road. Particular energy was put into rounding up those of German ethnic origin or with German surnames. Historian György Zielbauer estimates that over 44,000 Hungarian citizens of German ethnicity were taken prisoner.²⁰ But the captives also included French and Polish nationals who had earlier found refuge in Hungary, and even White Russians who had come to Hungary in the 1920s.

Besides the factor of collective responsibility, economic considerations also played a decisive role in the deportations. Having lost twenty million lives in the war, the Soviet Union was certainly desperately short of labor, and forced labor from abroad could help to relieve the situation. The mass utilization of prisoners boosted the Soviet national economy after 1945. Stefan Karner and Barbara Marx have estimated that the total value of the prisoners' work between 1943 and 1949 was approximately 50 billion rubles.²¹

In the GUPVI archipelago there were more than 4 million prisoners of war and civilian internees. Of this number—according to GUPVI documents—more than 2.3 million were Germans, along with approximately 530,000 Hungarians and 187,000 Romanians. The remaining half million prisoners represented about twenty-five other nationalities.²² Since Hungarians were among the most populous groups of prisoners, they were employed in every important industrial project in the Soviet Union.

How to Classify Soviet Captives

Having presented the main facts of the deportations, we now return to the problem of classification of the Hungarian prisoners' fate. In order for mass killing to fall within the jurisdiction of the Genocide Convention, it must not only be directed against one of the designated types of groups, but there must also be evidence of "intent" to destroy that group in whole or in part. On this point, the fate of the Hungarian prisoners does not meet the criteria of the convention. One cannot use the term "genocide" to describe collective punishment through forced labor. Contrary to the fate of Volga Germans, Karachai, Kalmyks, Chechen, Ingush, Balkars, Crimean Tatars, and Meskethians, the Soviet government had no program to destroy in whole or in part the Hungarian nation. Although the key element necessary to establish the crime of genocide—"intent"—is missing, the classification of the fate of the Hungarian prisoners is still a complex problem.

Although the intent of the Soviet government was to exploit the prisoners, not to destroy them, in practice these notions had the same result. Mass death was a general phenomenon in the GUPVI archipelago.

In the GUPVI's statistical survey of February 1, 1947, in the section of losses, the figure for those who died is given as 47,966.²³ This figure, however, can be considered as only partly accurate. From reports by repatriated ex-captives, we know that deaths were often unregistered, especially during the war. The number of those who died in or en route to concentration and transit camps are not included in GUPVI data either. How many people remained there until they died? The answer can be given only indirectly. One must establish how many of the 600,000 returned home. Unfortunately, there are no exact figures, since up to July 1946, when the Ministry of Public Welfare took over POW affairs, there was not, and could not be, a comprehensive record of prisoners of war in Hungary. Before July 1946, the Soviet-dominated Allied Control Commission did not consent to the foundation of a POW department within the anti-Communist-controlled Ministry of Defense. The POW department was instead finally established in the Communist-controlled Ministry of Public Welfare in July 1946. Thus, the press and official documents published widely differing estimates regarding the number of those who had come home earlier from the Soviet camps. If we accept as correct the highest of the contradictory figures given by the two competent departments, the Ministry of Public Welfare and the Ministry of National Defense, 150,000 people at most had regained their freedom by the summer of 1946.²⁴ Authentic data is, however, available for the number of prisoners who came from the east between July 1946 and November 1948. Precise records from the Debrecen reception camp contain the names of 200,915 persons. Including those released during the 1950s, the number of the repatriated prisoners can be estimated at a maximum of 400,000. Thus at least 200,000 of the 600,000 never returned.

About 20 percent of the prisoners died in transport. In terms of mortality, the highest numbers occurred in transit camps in Romanian territory, where tens of thousands of prisoners suffered from dysentery. The situation was not much better in the camps located in the Soviet Union. Apart from exceptional cases, the Russian guards did not deliberately kill the inmates. That job was done by the prevailing sanitary and nutritional conditions. On the basis of Soviet documents and eyewitness accounts, I must state that mass death was neither "accidental" nor just a "side effect" in the camps, but an integral part of the forced labor regimen, and clearly understood as such by the Soviet officials.

Conclusions

From a purely academic point of view, the deaths of the hundreds of thousands of prisoners, both former soldiers and internees, from forced labor is still not a sufficient reason to classify this case as "genocide." Some scholars, however, have proposed the concept of "genocidal massacre" to characterize acts of mass death that do not conform strictly to the criteria of the Genocide Convention, but have some features that do fit it. Leo Kuper and Helen Fein suggested that this term is applicable to cases of mass killing in which the scale is relatively small and the intent of the perpetrators is not to murder all members of the group but only a portion of them.²⁵ In the case of the Hungarian prisoners, the number of victims was high and, although they were not murdered systematically, the camp administration did factor in the deaths of large numbers when planning work projects. So we can say that the administrators gave at least tacit consent to the inhuman living conditions. I therefore regard the fate of Hungarian prisoners as "genocidal," even if it does not constitute genocide per se, because the Soviets targeted a large group of Hungarian non-combatants; because the group was targeted as a punishment for the nation's alliance with Germany during World War II, although such punishment is against the international accords; and because the camp administrators gave at least tacit consent to the inhumane living situation in the camps which led to the eventual death of one-third of the group. In my view, the adjective "genocidal" also illustrates the fate of Latvian, Estonian, Lithuanian, Slovak and Romanian inmates.

From the evidence I presented earlier, we can thus classify the civilian and military status of the Hungarians taken prisoner by the Soviets:

- (1) More than 40 percent of the 600,000 Hungarians prisoners were civilians;
- (2) The handling and fate of the Hungarian POWs as forced labor for an unspecified period of time was not in accord with the Geneva Convention on POWs;²⁶ and
- (3) The hardships of years of forced labor killed approximately one third of the Hungarian prisoners.

The fate of the Hungarian prisoners does not meet the criteria for an act of genocide as defined by the UN Genocide Convention. However, we cannot deny the similarities of their fate and the fate of other victim groups of World War II, such as the Soviet and Polish prisoners in German forced labor camps. Consequently, their story, as well as the story of Slovak and Romanian prisoners in Soviet custody, must have a place in the international literature on the phenomenon of genocide and genocidal massacres. Such visibility has had pragmatic consequences beyond the intellectual quest for historical completeness and accuracy: a new Hungarian law introduced after 1989 has already recognized the sufferings of former POWs and internees. Consequently, those former prisoners who did return from the camps have been able to receive financial compensation.

Notes

1. Miklos Fuzesi, *Modern rabszolgasag* (Modern Slavery) (Pecs: Formativ KFT, 1990), 48.
2. Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990)
3. Eric Markusen and David Kopf, *The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing. Genocide and Total War in the 20th Century* (Westview Press, 1995).
4. Chalk and Jonassohn, 44.
5. Archives of Military History Budapest, HM 1945 eln. 29055 Report to the Allied Control Commission, Budapest, June 21, 1945.
6. Archives of Military History Budapest, HM box 2, A/l. 94/4766.
7. Report of the Camp Administration of the Fourth Ukrainian Army, January 7, 1945. Report cited in György Dupka and Alekszej Korszun, *A "Malenykij Robot" a dokumentumokban* (Documents on the "Malenkij Robot") (Ungvar-Budapest: Intermix Kiado, 1997), 80-81. See also *Emlékkönyv a sztalinizmus kárpátaljai áldozatairól* (Memorial Book on the Victims of Stalinism in Transcarpathia) (Ungvar-Budapest: Intermix Kiado, 1993), 286. See also: Károly Kocsis and Eszter Kocsis-Hodosi, *Ethnic Geography of the Hungarian Minorities in the Carpathian Basin* (Budapest: Geographical Research Institute Research Centre for Earth Sciences and Minority Studies Programme of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1998), 90-91.
8. "Tájékoztató gyorsfelvetel a községek és városok közterdeku viszonyairól" (An Informative Quick Survey of the Public Relations of Villages and Towns), *Magyar Statisztikai Szemle* 1-6 (1946): 12-13.
9. Dimitrii F. Ustinov, *A második világhaboru tortenete* (The History of World War II), Hungarian edition, vol. 10 (Budapest: Zrinyi Kiado, 1981), 216-217.
10. Archives of Military History Budapest, Papers in preparation for the peace treaty, Box 2, A/l. 94/4766.
11. Gosudarstvennaia archivnaia sluzhba Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Centr khranenia, istorikodokumentalnykh kollektzii (State Archives of the Russian Federation, Center for preservation of historical collection), Moscow, MVD, fond: 1/n opis: 01e delo: 81. See also V. P. Galicki, "Vengerskie voennoplennie v SSSR" (Hungarian POWs in the Soviet Union), *Voenna Istoricheskii Zhurnal* (Review of Military History) 10 (1991): 45.
12. Stefan Karner, "GUPVI: the Soviet main administration for prisoners of war and internees during World War II," *Bulletin du Comité international d'histoire de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale, 1945* (Montreal: Consequences and Sequels of the Second World War, 1995), 178.
13. Archives of Military History Budapest, "Papers in preparation for the peace treaty," Box 2, A/l. 94/4766.
14. Churchill made this statement in the debate on Korea in the House of Commons on July 1, 1952. Cited by George Barany in "Jewish Prisoners of War in the Soviet Union During

- World War II," in *Jahrbucher fur Geschichte Osteuropas* 31 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1983), 162.
15. Michael Gelb, "An Early Soviet Deportation: Far Eastern Koreans," *The Russian Review* 54 (July 1995): 389-412.
 16. Nicholas Werth, "Ein Staat Gegen Sein Volk," in *Das Schwarz Buch des Kommunismus* (Munich: Piper Verlag GmbH, 1998), 230.
 17. M. Guboglo and N. Kusnetsov, "Deportatsii narodov SSSR, 1930-je-1950-je godu," a compilation of documents, Moscow, 1992. See also N. Bugai, L. Berija, and J. Stalinu, "Soglasno vashemu ukazaniu" (Moscow, 1994), 27-55.
 18. United Nations Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labour, United Nations International Labour Office (Geneva, 1953), 450.
 19. Peter Gosztonyi, *Magyarország a második világháborúban* (Hungary in World War II) (Munich, 1984), 65-66.
 20. Gyorgy Zielbauer, "Magyar polgari lakosok deportalasa es hadifogsaga 1945-1948" (The Deportation and Captivity of Hungarian Civilians, 1945-1948), *Tortenelemi Szemle* 3-4 (1989): 289.
 21. Stefan Karner and Barbara Marx, "World War II prisoners of war in the Soviet Union economy," in *Bulletin du Comité international d'histoire de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale, 1945* (Montreal: Consequences and Sequels of the Second World War, 1995), 196.
 22. The NKVD branch dealing with POWs and internees (GUPVI-NKVD) mentioned 526,604 Hungarian prisoners in their reports. This number does not include those who died in transport or in transit camps. Gosudarstvennaia archivnaia sluzhba Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Centrkhranenia, istorikodokumentalnykh kolleksi (State Archives of the Russian Federation, Center for preservation of historical collection), Moscow, MVD, fond: 1/n opis: 01e delo: 81.
 23. Gosudarstvennaia archivnaia sluzhba Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Centr khranenia, istorikodokumentalnykh kolleksi (State Archives of the Russian Federation, Center for preservation of historical collection), Moscow, MVD, fond: 1/n opis: 12e delo: 20.
 24. Archives of Military History Budapest, Papers in preparation for the peace treaty. Box 2, A/ I. 94/4766
 25. Leo Kuper, *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 60. See also Helen Fein, "Genocide: A Sociological Perspective," *Current Sociology* 38 (1990): 18-19. Eric Markusen and David Kopf also give a summary of the concept of genocidal massacre in their book *The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing*, 62-64.
 26. The Soviet Union did not sign the Geneva Convention of 1929 on POWs. It did, however, recognize the Hague Convention of 1907 on the Rules of War, and the Soviet government officially declared on July 1, 1941, that it felt itself "bound by the spirit of the Geneva Convention on POWs." Erich Maschke, *Die deutschen Kriegsgefangenen des Zweiten Weltkriegs. Eine Zusammenfassung* (Munich, 1974), 236.