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I. INTRODUCTION

As at 11th March, 1957, 18,601 Hungarian refugees had entered Jugoslavia and 173,617 had entered Austria making a grand total of 192,218 to leave Hungary since the revolt began on 23rd October.

2. By 11th March less than 400 of those in Jugoslavia had been resettled. There remain at present in Austria between 53 and 54,000 Hungarian refugees and over 16,000 in Jugoslavia whose emergency relief, care and maintenance cannot be supplied only by the Austrian and Jugoslav Governments.

Since the closing of the Hungarian frontier in February the daily rate of influx into both countries has greatly decreased (in the middle of March about 10 a day into Austria and some 20 to 30 into Jugoslavia). It appears unlikely, however, that all the Hungarian refugees in Austria and Jugoslavia can be resettled elsewhere. A statement published on 12th March, 1957, by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimated that at the end of 1957, there would remain about 20,000 Hungarian refugees in Austria and some 14,000 in Jugoslavia, all in need of accommodation, care and maintenance.

3. The Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) agrees with these estimates; they could of course be modified by an increase of refugees from Hungary into the two neighbouring countries or in the rate of resettlement abroad, especially with regard to Jugoslavia.

4. Despite the considerable financial help given by governments and by private sources, the Austrian and Jugoslav governments up-to-date have carried a disproportionate burden. At the end of January, the Austrian Minister of the Interior estimated that his government had borne 40 per cent of the expenses incurred by the Hungarian refugees in Austria. At the same date the Jugoslav Government had spent the equivalent of £1 million, and since that date almost 5,000 more Hungarians have sought asylum in Jugoslavia.

5. The UNHCR estimates that on the basis of the number of Hungarian refugees in Jugoslavia at the beginning of March, and assuming that the average number would be 15,000 from then to 30th June, 1957, and 14,000 for the rest of the year, the funds still required for their reception, care and maintenance until the end of 1957 would be about £6 million.

6. The same criteria applied to Austria (assuming that there would be 47,000 Hungarian refugees there from March until the end of June and about 25,000 until the end of the year) show that the funds required until the end of 1957 would amount to about £15,250,000.

7. The estimated grand total of funds still required for the care and maintenance of Hungarian refugees in Austria and Jugoslavia for the whole of 1957 is therefore £23,250,000. These funds could be reduced if the League of Red Cross Societies was able to continue the provision of care and maintenance for refugees in both Austria and Jugoslavia until the end of 1957.

(1) The number of refugees who have been repatriated to Hungary and the number who wish to remain in Jugoslavia and Austria is given in Chapter 2.
8. UNHCR statistics show that up to 11th March 1957, 120,2 Hungarian refugees had left, or were about to leave Austria for resettlement abroad, and 374 from Jugoslavia.

9. Of these, 106,400 were being taken by NATO member entries, 53,734 by the two North American members and 52,606 by European members.

10. Many thousands of these refugees in Western Europe wish, however, to emigrate overseas; moreover some NATO European entries have been able to admit them for temporary asylum only. Yet the European countries cannot accept more Hungarian refugees unless several thousands of their present guests are able to emigrate overseas. There is a growing tendency among overseas entries to regard Western Europe as an area of first asylum which, pursued, should alleviate the situation not only in Austria (and actually Jugoslavia) but also in all Western European countries.

AFTER II

Hungarian Refugees in Jugoslavia and Austria

Jugoslavia

UNHCR figures for Hungarian refugees in Jugoslavia at 11th March, 1957, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total arrivals of Hungarians in Jugoslavia</td>
<td>18,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total repatriated:</td>
<td>1,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total resettled in Jugoslavia</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total resettled abroad</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total still in camps</td>
<td>16,415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The influx into Jugoslavia was moderate until the second half of December, when it increased sharply reaching a peak of more than 4,000 during the last week of January. In the middle of March, the daily average was from 20 to 30, about twice the previous entering Austria. This may be attributed to the more favourable terrain of the southern frontier, a part of which lies in wooded and hilly country.

3. Accommodation, Care and Maintenance

The refugees are at present billeted in some 36 centres, most of which are not far from the Hungarian border, and in general of the Danube. Others are in hotels on the coast and in hotels in Croatia and Slovenia. This is strictly emergency accommodation and these centres must be vacated by the middle of May to enable their reconversion for the tourist season. This reoccupation, and the over-crowding in many of the centres in northern Jugoslavia, present a serious accommodation problem. The Yugoslav authorities assess the capacity of existing centres at more than 10,000 refugees. If a larger number is to remain, 1957 two or more camps will have to be built at an estimated cost of just over $4 million.
4. The Jugoslav Government bore all initial costs for the refugees, apart from a contribution of $50,000 from the UNHCR to the Jugoslav Red Cross. The League of Red Cross Societies is hoping to be able to undertake care and maintenance for some 10,000 refugees in Jugoslavia until 30th June, 1957. The League may perhaps be able to extend this service to all Hungarian refugees in Jugoslavia. The cost of Red Cross assistance for 10,000 refugees from the middle of March to the end of June is estimated at $633,000. The League will work through the Jugoslav Red Cross.

5. UNHCR

At the request of the Jugoslav Government a provisional office of the High Commissioner was established in Belgrade on 11th February, 1957. No other agencies are working autonomously in Jugoslavia but representatives of the ICEM and of some twelve voluntary organizations are allowed to work under the control of the High Commissioner's representative in Belgrade.

6. Repatriation

1,411 Hungarians have requested repatriation, about 7.5% of the total number in Jugoslavia. Hungarian repatriation missions were working in Jugoslavia in December and in February. The missions only visited centres where refugees had expressed a wish to return to Hungary. One of the High Commissioner's representatives was present at all interviews. Moreover he questioned individually each refugee who asked to be repatriated. Many of the first batch of 100, repatriated in December had come to Jugoslavia in search of a child or relative. The comparatively high figure of the February repatriations may be due to overcrowding in the camps and to the limited possibilities so far available for emigration from Jugoslavia.

7. Resettlement

It is thought that more than 90% of the Hungarian refugees wish to leave Jugoslavia for overseas or other European countries. It is improbable that more than 1,000 can be integrated in Jugoslavia. In the absence of full information on the wishes of the refugees (a census is being made by the Jugoslavs and voluntary agencies are also starting to compile dossiers) an indication of their preferences for particular countries of resettlement may be obtained from the census made for the 937 refugees in the camp at Gerovo on 15th January, 1957:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of refugees registered</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Countries of Overseas resettlement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>525</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European resettlement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Republic of Germany</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>412</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>937</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Requests by the High Commissioner to Governments have resulted in the following answers:

(i) France will admit any Hungarian refugee residing in Jugoslavia who formally expresses the wish to settle permanently in France. About 200 refugees have applied.

(ii) Western Germany is willing to accept for permanent settlement Hungarian refugees of German ethnic origin who have close relatives in Germany willing to sponsor them.

(iii) Italy is offering temporary asylum to 60 Hungarians.

(iv) Switzerland is taking 100 for permanent settlement.

(v) Norway has selected 200 to 260.

(vi) Sweden has selected 400.

9. So far as can be judged by partial censuses, about 80% of the refugees in Jugoslavia belong to the active population, the proportion of women without occupation being about 10%. More than
half of the active population are factory workers, the remainder being almost equally divided between students, civil servants, the liberal professions, farmers and agricultural workers. Among the adults there is an overwhelming majority of males.

10. Summary

The refugees are costing Jugoslavia some £30,000 daily. As noted in the introduction to this report, the UNHCR estimates that about £6 million are still required to meet the costs of the Hungarian refugees who are likely to remain in Jugoslavia during 1957. Although in principle refugees residing in Jugoslavia could be resettled in France, most of them wish to put the ocean behind them.

11. Quite apart from the economic question of cost and accommodation the Hungarian refugees constitute a grave political problem for the Jugoslav government both internally and externally with its Communist neighbours and the Soviet Union. The Jugoslav government, which has done its best in difficult circumstances, has signified that it will continue to grant asylum to refugees and to assist any who wish to establish themselves in Jugoslavia. International assistance, however, is urgently needed to resettle the great majority of the Hungarians who wish to emigrate and to meet the needs of the remainder so long as they are in Jugoslavia.

(b) Austria

12. UNHCR figures for Hungarian refugees in Austria at 11th March, 1957, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total arrivals</td>
<td>173,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved abroad</td>
<td>119,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatriated from Austria</td>
<td>3,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate total left in Austria</td>
<td>50,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Before the October revolt an average of 66 Hungarians per month escaped into Austria, where there remains a wartime refugee population of about 114,000 (20,000 were in camps in October). After 5th November when the Red Army returned to Budapest, the Hungarian influx increased rapidly. In one week in November over 45,000 refugees entered Austria. In the first half of January about 800 refugees were still arriving, but the rate has decreased since then and in the middle of March it averaged from 10 to 15 a day.

+ 120,122 have been moved from Austria, but 813 of these passed through Austria from other countries on repatriation to Hungary.
14. In order to relieve the congestion at the height of the exodus in November, ICEM and voluntary agencies accepted every available offer of asylum and moved refugees abroad as quickly as possible, generally without proper "screening". This hasty but necessary movement caused frustration among the refugees and some irritation in the host countries. Many refugees found themselves in countries where, on reflection, they did not wish to settle; others believed they would be able to continue to overseas countries. For some time, departure from Austria was slowed down as the refugees feared they would forfeit any chance of resettlement if they left.

15. Accommodation, Care and Maintenance

Lack of large-scale accommodation in Austria is responsible for the variety of arrangements under which care and maintenance are provided for the refugees. Some are in Federal camps, others in provincial camps and centres; almost 10,000 live with private families, while some 8,000 live out of camp but are looked after by voluntary agencies. About 40,000 are now in Red Cross camps; this concentration greatly facilitates the rate of resettlement abroad.

16. The cost to the Austrian authorities varies according to the type of accommodation from £1 to £1.35 a day per head in the government centres and about £0.53 in the Red Cross camps.

17. As noted in the Introduction, the funds still required or the care and maintenance of the Hungarians in Austria for 1957 are estimated to amount to £15.25 million. Moreover, unlike Yugoslavia, many thousands of refugees wish to remain indefinitely in Austria and large additional sums of money will be required for their permanent establishment there.

18. Repatriation

There is a Hungarian repatriation mission in Austria; less than 4,000 Hungarians have requested repatriation, generally people who came over without political reasons. Interviews are now held at the Ministry of the Interior in Vienna in the presence of an official of that Ministry and of a representative of the NHCR. Only refugees who ask to see the Hungarian mission are interviewed.

19. Resettlement

The present rate of movement from Austria appears fairly satisfactory. If it continues ICEM calculates that about 30,000 Hungarians will remain in Austria after June, 1957, always providing there is no further influx from Hungary. The Austrian government as stated that it would be prepared in principle to assist in the integration in Austria of a maximum of 30,000 Hungarian refugees, no either may not wish to leave Austria or for whom there is no chance of resettlement overseas.
20. Summary

The immediate task is to occupy the refugees, both those who are awaiting movement overseas and those who wish to remain in Austria. The great majority is young, active and very tough. Voluntary organizations are doing a lot to give the refugees vocational training but the gap between supply and demand is still enormous.

21. The chief long-term aims for the 30,000 refugees who may remain in Austria are provision of housing and training to enable them to take their place in Austrian life. The prolonged effects of camp life on these energetic people will be disastrous.

22. The Austrian government has been extremely generous. It opened its frontiers to every Hungarian seeking asylum. This was a remarkable effort for a small country with, in addition, a delicate international position. Continued international support will be essential to solve the problem of Hungarian resettlement abroad and to assist Austria to assimilate the many thousands of refugees to whom she has offered permanent homes.

CHAPTER III

Numbers of Hungarian Refugees outside
Austria and Jugoslavia

Statistics published by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees show that at 11th March, 1957, 120,122 Hungarian refugees have left Austria for resettlement abroad. The number of refugees who have left, or who should shortly be leaving Jugoslavia for resettlement is about 974.

2. The numbers of Hungarian refugees from Austria admitted by each of the (a) NATO member countries, and (b) other countries, is given below. The contributions and offers of assistance received by UNHCR and ICEM up to 11th March, 1957 are listed under each country. All figures of refugees and contributions are from UNHCR published reports, except when otherwise stated. They do not include the contributions received by voluntary agencies nor, in most cases, the donations of governments to the Red Cross for economic or other aid to Hungarian refugees. Nor was it possible to give figures for the large expenditures incurred by each government in its own country for accommodation and resettlement.

3. NATO Countries

Belgium

There are 3,150 refugees in Belgium. The original figure offered asylum was 3,000.

Canada

The Dominion Government has not set a limit on the number of Hungarian refugees. There are 13,794 in Canada. Canadian
lection missions are operating in Austria and immigration priority being given to Hungarian refugees. The Canadian Government has negotiated special agreements with France and the United Kingdom to admit 3,000 and 5,000 Hungarian refugees from those countries respectively into Canada. Similar agreements with other European countries are under examination and 2,000 Hungarian refugees bound for Canada from Austria are being given asylum in the Netherlands until they can be moved overseas. The Canadian Government has contributed $676,666 to the United Nations Secretary General's and High Commissioner's appeal (UN Appeal) for Hungarian refugees.

Sums have been given to Austria for refugees not in Red Cross camps there, and to the Canadian Red Cross for aid to refugees camps in Western Europe, including those in the Netherlands who are waiting passage to Canada.

Denmark

Denmark offered asylum to 1,000 Hungarians; there are now 105. It has given $50,000 to the UN Appeal and $20,000 in 1956 to ICEM.

ICEM understands that 67% of these refugees desire to emigrate from Denmark as follows:

- 280 to Canada
- 260 to USA
- 184 to other countries

France

The French Government will accept any refugee from Austria, Yugoslavia who expresses a wish to settle permanently in France. The number in France is 8,965. France has contributed $100,000 to the UN Appeal and $54,143 in 1956 to ICEM.

It is thought that about 200 refugees have registered with the French Embassy in Belgrade for permanent resettlement in France.

According to ICEM, 4,500 Hungarian refugees in France wish to emigrate as follows:

- 50 to Australia
- 2,500 to Canada (this has been arranged)
- 1,000 to USA
- 50 other countries

Federal German Republic

The Federal Government has not set a limit to the number it will take. The German authorities have informed NATO that there are 15,000 Hungarian refugees in West Germany.
statistics of UNHCR give 11,564 as at 11th March, 1957. The
Government bears all the expenses of transporting the refugees
from Austria and the German mission in Vienna makes registration
and transport arrangements. Germany contributed £ 20,000 to ICEM
in 1956.

The Federal Government is willing to take permanently
Hungarian refugees from Jugoslavia of German ethnic origin who
have close relatives in Germany willing to sponsor them.

Greece

Greece has not been able to offer asylum to groups of
Hungarian refugees. The government gave the refugees in Austria
30 tons of raisins valued at £ 10,000.

Iceland

In December, 52 Hungarian refugees were brought to
Iceland. The Icelandic Red Cross took care of the refugees and
bore all transportation costs. The Icelandic Government is
willing to consider favourably any application from Hungarian
refugees who might wish to settle in Iceland.

Italy

The Italian Government offered temporary asylum to 4,000
refugees. There are 3,809 Hungarian refugees in Italy. The
government has contributed £ 50,000 to ICEM in 1956 and £ 25,000
for 1957. Italy has also agreed to give temporary asylum to
about 60 refugees from Jugoslavia.

ICEM speaks of an 'unofficial agreement with Australia and
Canada to admit 500 and 1,000 Hungarians from Italy respectively.
A further 693 have registered with ICEM for the USA and about 100
for Latin America.

Luxembourg

The Grand Duchy has offered asylum to 300 Hungarians;
200 are already there. The Government has given £ 5,000 to the
UN Appeal and £ 5,000 to ICEM for 1956.

Netherlands

Holland has offered to take 3,000 Hungarians of which
2,958 are already there. In addition, the Government is giving
temporary asylum to 2,000 Hungarian refugees who are to be taken
to Canada.

The Netherlands donated £ 15,000 to ICEM for 1956 and
25,000 for 1957. The Dutch National Committee for Relief to
Hungary gave £ 19,231 to the UNHCR Representative in Vienna to be
used for emergency relief.
Norway

The government has not specified a limit. At the moment there are just over 1,000 Hungarian refugees in Norway. The government is to spend £139,997 on the care of Hungarian refugees in Norway. It is to take a number of tubercular refugees and also other handicapped or specially difficult cases. Norway has contributed £41,999 to the UN Appeal and £27,999 to ICRC for 1956 and £21,000 for 1957.

Norway is taking 200 to 260 refugees from Jugoslavia.

Portugal

The Portuguese Government offered temporary asylum to 4,000 to 7,000 children, possibly with some mothers.

During November 1956, the Portuguese authorities flew 13½ tons of food to Vienna; private sources contributed over £10,000 to the Austrian Red Cross.

Turkey

The government offered to take 500 Hungarians; 443 are now there. The Istanbul newspaper Millet raised £12,500 for use through the UNHCR.

United Kingdom

The government last autumn set no limit to the number of Hungarians it allowed to enter Great Britain. There are now 19,299 Hungarian refugees in the United Kingdom. Refugees are still being brought in under the arrangement by which the United Kingdom undertook to accept 5,000 from Austria to replace those which the Canadian Government are to take from Britain. The British government feels unable to give an assurance that more Hungarians will be admitted after the 5,000 for Canada have been replaced. Moreover, a considerable number of the refugees in the United Kingdom wish to move to other overseas countries, and if these countries can accept them the British Government would be prepared to consider taking an equivalent number from Austria.

The British Government has contributed £42,005 to the UN Appeal, £112,014 to ICRC in 1957, and is also paying for the transport to the United Kingdom of 4,500 Hungarians from Austria, which ICRC was unable to finance.

The government is spending some £230,000 on the resettlement of refugees in Great Britain.

In addition, Britain has given the UNHCR £575,931 from private sources for the care of Hungarian refugees. These contributions were raised by the Lord Mayor's Fund, the United Nations Association, and several other bodies.

United States

The United States offered asylum to 30,000 Hungarian refugees; this quota will be filled by the end of March 1957. Approximately 6,200 of these are being admitted for permanent residence under the Refugee Resettlement Act; the balance is
being admitted temporarily pending legislation to authorise their permanent admission.

The Administration has contributed $5 million to the UN Appeal and $368,374 to ICEM in 1956.

During 1957, the United States will pay $75 per head for a maximum number of 35,450 refugees transported overseas by ICEM, and an additional $125 per head to cover further resettlement costs for up to 20,450 of these refugees, to be designated by the United States Escapees Programme.

4. Other Countries

(1) Europe:

Ireland

The Irish Republic offered to take 1,000 Hungarians; 541 have arrived.

Spain

The government offered to take an unspecified number of mothers and children and to give temporary asylum to an undetermined number of refugees in transit to Latin America. Spain contributed $10,000 to ICEM for 1957.

Sweden

The Swedish Government offered to receive about 5,000 Hungarians, including 60 tubercular refugees. 4,151 Hungarians have arrived. The government contributed $96,630 to the UN Appeal.

Sweden has selected 400 Hungarian refugees from Jugoslavia.

Switzerland

The Federal Government agreed to receive 10,000 Hungarians; the number now in Switzerland is a little higher. Switzerland is willing to give all of them permanent residence but ICEM believes that about 3,000 wish to emigrate as follows:

1,500 to Australia
400 to Canada
1,200 to the USA

Switzerland has donated $18,692 to the UN Appeal, $18,692 to ICEM for 1956 and $23,364 for 1957.

Switzerland has offered to admit 100 Hungarians for permanent settlement from Jugoslavia.

The Council of Europe donated $2,900.12 to the UN Appeal fund and the Holy See $2,000 to ICEM for 1957.
(2) Australasia

Australia

The Federal Government offered to take 10,000 Hungarians from Austria, of whom 3,426 have left. The quota of 10,000 will be available until the end of June, 1957. Australia has contributed £4,671 to the UN Appeal, £134,409 to ICEM for 1956 and about £200,000 for 1957. In addition, Australia has donated £4,671 to the Austrian Government and a further sum of £22,336 will be used in Australia to provide personal equipment for newly arrived Hungarian refugees.

New Zealand

The Government has offered asylum to 1,000 Hungarian refugees and 617 have gone. New Zealand has contributed £14,000 to the UN appeal, £14,000 to ICEM for 1956 and £70,000 for 1957. In addition, the government will pay £140 toward the transport of each Hungarian.

(3) Latin America

Argentina

The Government has offered asylum to 2,000 Hungarians. It gave £10,000 to ICEM for 1956.

Bolivia

Bolivia has offered resettlement to 500 families, preferably agricultural and skilled workers.

Brazil

The Federal Government offered asylum to 10,000 Hungarians, and 354 have left. In 1956, Brazil made available 30,000 to the High Commissioner requesting that it be divided equally between ICEM and his Office. It donated £10,000 to ICEM for 1957.

Chile

Chile has offered resettlement for 1,000 Hungarians; 155 have left. The selection is to be made by the Chilean Embassy in Rome; with emphasis on farm workers. Chile has donated £10,000 to ICEM for 1957.

Colombia

The Government has offered to take up to 10,000 Hungarians, and 72 have gone. 1,000 refugees could be admitted immediately. Colombia would need financial assistance from international organizations for their transportation and reception.
Venezuela

Venezuela offered to take 1,500 Hungarians; 62 have gone there. The government donated $10,000 to ICEM in 1956.

Other Latin America countries which have offered to take small numbers of refugees, or have made contributions in money or kind, are Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay.

(4) Africa

Rhodesia and Nyasaland

The government has offered asylum to 30 orphans under five. The children are to be admitted under the auspices of the Child Protection Society. More children might be accepted later. The Government has donated $10,000 to the UN Appeal and $10,000 to ICEM for 1956.

Union of South Africa

South Africa offered asylum to 1,770 Hungarians; 1,097 have gone there. The government contributed in 1956 $28,003 to ICEM and $14,002 for payment at $56 a head for 250 unsponsored refugees to be resettled in the Union.

Tunisia has offered temporary asylum to 100 refugees and has given contributions, as have Ethiopia, Liberia and Morocco.

(5) Asia

Israel will take any number of Hungarian Jewish refugees; 1,644 have left. Israel, Cambodia, the Chinese Republic and Pakistan have made contributions in money or kind.

CHAPTER IV

International Action

(a) United Nations

On 9th November, 1956, the General Assembly adopted resolution A/RES/398 requesting the Secretary General to call upon the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to consult with other appropriate international agencies and interested governments to arrange emergency assistance to Hungarian refugees and urged Member States to make contributions for this purpose.

2. In a second resolution (A/RES/409) adopted by the General Assembly on 21st November, 1956, the Secretary General and the High Commissioner were requested to make an appeal to governments and non-governmental organizations. They were also authorised to make subsequent appeals based on plans and estimates by the UNHCR, with the concurrence of the UN Refugees Emergency Fund Executive (UNREF). Governments and voluntary organizations were
requested under A/RES/409 to "co-ordinate their aid programmes in consultation with the Office of the High Commissioner".

3. On 30th November, 1956, a joint appeal for $10 million was made for the refugees in Austria and governments were urged to make further offers for acceptance of Hungarian refugees in their territories. By 1st March, 1957, $6,926,767, including contributions in kind, had been donated through the United Nations as well as a sum of $415,615 made available directly to the Austrian Government. As stated in Chapter III, these sums do not include the considerable contributions made to ICEM for refugee transport, or the donations received by national and international voluntary agencies for the Hungarian refugees.

4. In view of the number of refugees still in Austria and Jugoslavia the United Nations Secretary General and the High Commissioner made a further appeal on 11th March, 1957, for a sum of $23,153,425 to finance the operation of care and maintenance of Hungarian refugees in both Jugoslavia and Austria until the end of 1957.

5. The second joint appeal expresses the hope that interested governments will continue to take part in the international effort "by providing appropriate assistance, so that the problem of Hungarian refugees can be solved this year".

6. UNHCR

The High Commissioner's Office was assigned by the General Assembly the three tasks of co-ordinating assistance to refugees from Hungary, of making appeals, with the UN Secretary General, for assistance to these refugees, and of developing a comprehensive assessment of their needs with the concurrence of the UNREF Executive Committee.

7. The mandate of the High Commissioner's Office, as well as the special task entrusted to the High Commissioner by the General Assembly under resolution A/RES/398 and A/RES/409 cover the Hungarian refugees who seek asylum in both Austria and Jugoslavia. (The High Commissioner's statement to his Executive Committee on the "Eligibility of Hungarian refugees" is given at Annex I). These refugees, therefore, qualify for the 1951 Geneva Convention concerning the Status of Refugees.

(b) Other Organizations

8. Working closely with the UNHCR are the Inter-governmental Committee for European Migration, the League of Red Cross Societies and over sixty voluntary organizations.

9. ICEM is engaged in large-scale transport of Hungarian refugees from Austria to overseas and European countries. It is also registering these refugees in many European countries in order to find out their preferences for resettlement. The organization requires additional funds for moving Hungarians within Europe and for administrative purposes.
10. The International Red Cross has divided its activities, the International Committee Working in Hungary and the League of Red Cross Societies concerning itself with Hungarian refugees in Austria. The League, with financial assistance from the UNHCR, has assumed responsibility progressively for the basic care of some 40,000 Hungarians in camps in Austria. This work is carried out under an agreement between the League, UNHCR and the Austrian government. It hopes to be able to do the same for the majority of the refugees in Jugoslavia.

11. The League is served by voluntary helpers from the national Red Cross Societies, many of whom have responsibilities in their own countries which limit the time they can give to refugee work abroad. The League therefore has made it clear that it must consider 30th June, 1957, as the terminal date for its operation as an emergency organization.

12. Many voluntary organizations are doing invaluable work in the camps in Austria; they also assist in resettlement planning for refugees in both countries of first asylum and final settlement.

Council of Europe

In December, 1956, the Committee of Ministers allocated to the Austrian Government the sum of 100 million French francs out of the Council's budget.

On 26th January, 1957, the Ministers' Deputies invited Member Governments to examine the possibility of complying with the wishes expressed in the Assembly's recommendation 114 of 8th January to give further support to the measures taken by UNHCR and ICEM for the Hungarian refugees.

CHAPTER V

Conclusion

The Hungarian refugees, as far as can be ascertained, consist of a high proportion of male industrial workers between the ages of 16 and 40, with a spearhead of students and intellectuals, educated according to Marxist ideas, and a leavening of members of the former middle classes whose outlook is closer to that of the West. The majority has come to maturity during the twelve years of "peoples democracy" and has little idea of how a Western democrat State functions. Many of them expected the West to be an Eldorado and were discouraged when they found it to be such a workaday place.

2. The refugees are still under the spell of their fight for freedom; they see themselves as paladins in the struggle against Soviet communism.

3. Few of the refugees know a foreign language and few foreigners know Hungarian. This is one of the biggest immediate obstacles in regard to integration.

4. On the whole, however, host countries are finding it relatively easy to absorb refugees into their industries and economy generally. In the United Kingdom, for example, the Under-Secretary at the Home Office said early in March that about 6,000 Hungarians were already in employment and paying their own way. She added: "In view of the language difficulty that is a fine record".
5. It appears then that countries encounter less difficulty in absorbing the Hungarians than with previous large groups of refugees. The chief factors delaying a solution of the problem are (i) insufficient offers for resettlement and (ii) insufficient funds to move the refugees from countries of first asylum.

6. The refugees in Jugoslavia are a special problem. The Jugoslav government is being urged by Russia to send the refugees back to Hungary and this political factor, apart from the crucial lack of accommodation and the impossibility of integrating refugees in Jugoslavia, makes it particularly urgent to begin moving large numbers of them without further delay.

7. The vast majority of refugees in Austria and Jugoslavia is determined to immigrate overseas. Moreover, it would appear that almost half of those in Western European countries wish also to go overseas. It may be realistic, therefore, to regard the whole of Western Europe as an area of first asylum.

8. The implications for NATO and recommendations

The Hungarians have sought freedom in the West; most of them are in member countries of NATO. Their treatment by us is a test of our principles and it will be closely watched by the peoples of Eastern Europe.

9. The emotional impulse which prevailed during the first weeks of the exodus is almost spent. The free countries - and first of all those of the Atlantic Pact - must make a further conscious and determined effort to share the burden equitably so as to solve the problem in 1957.

10. It is recommended therefore that, in accordance with United Nations resolutions regarding Hungarian refugees and the appeals made by the United Nations Secretary General and the High Commissioner, the Council invite NATO member governments to:

(i) provide increased opportunities for emigration from Jugoslavia and Austria and absorb costs of such emigration to their countries;

(ii) consider Hungarian refugees in other European countries, no less eligible for resettlement overseas;

(iii) continue to co-operate with existing initiatives with a view to resettling the Hungarian refugees in the countries of their choice by the end of 1957;

(iv) respond generously to appeals of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and of the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration for funds which will permit the resettlement of Hungarian refugees.
ELIGIBILITY OF HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

Statement Communicated by the High Commissioner to his Executive Committee.

1. Refugees from Hungary who meet the terms of Article 6B of the Statute of the Office are within my mandate.

2. Article 6B provides:

Any other person who is outside the country of his nationality or if he has no nationality, the country of his former habitual residence, because he has or had well-founded fear of persecution by reason of his race, religion, nationality or political opinion and is unable or, because of such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of the government of the country of his nationality, or, if he has no nationality, to return to the country of his former habitual residence.

3. It will be noted that this paragraph of the Statute contains no reference to any date limit such as that which is contained in paragraph 6A of the Statute which states:

A.(ii) Any person who as a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951 and owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear or for reasons other than personal convenience, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence, is unable or, owing to such fear or for reasons other than personal convenience, is unwilling to return to it.

and Article IA (2) of the United Nations Convention on the Status of Refugees of 28 July 1951 which states:

A. For the purposes of the present convention, the term "refugee" shall apply to any person who:

(2) As a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951 and owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.
"4. As regards the date of 1 January 1951, attention is
drawn to page 39 of the Report of 17 February 1950 of the Ad Hoc
Committee on Statelessness and Related Problems (E/1618), where
it is stated:

'The expression 'as a result of events in Europe' is
intended to apply to happenings of major importance involving
territorial or profound political changes, as well as sys-
tematic programmes of persecution in this period which are
after-effects of earlier changes.

The second date, 1 January 1951, excludes events which
happen after that date but does not exclude persons who may
become refugees at a later date as a result of events before
then, or as a result of after-effects which occurred at a
later date.'

In my opinion it is reasonable to relate the departure of the
refugees from Hungary not merely to the events which took place in
Hungary in November 1956, but also to fundamental political changes
which took place as a result of the last war. It would follow,
therefore, that the refugees from Hungary who meet the other
requirements of the Convention should be considered to be within
its scope notwithstanding the fact that their flight took place
after 1 January 1951.

"5. This interpretation has been adopted by the Austrian
authorities who are prepared to consider the Hungarian refugees
in Austria to be within the scope of the Convention and to issue
them with a normal eligibility certificate to this effect as soon
as it is technically possible, unless eligibility examinations show
that any individual applicant should not be entitled to the bene-
fits of the Convention. The attitude which has been taken by
the Austrian authorities on this question has been followed in
most countries where refugees of Hungarian origin coming through
Austria have been given asylum."