

**FOR DISCUSSION: THE GERMAN INVASION  
OF HUNGARY IN 1944**

**The Allies, Secret Peace Talks, and the  
German Invasion of Hungary, 1943–1944**

**László Borhi**

On March 19, 1944, Wehrmacht and SS divisions brought an end to the relative peace that had prevailed in Hungary while much of the continent experienced devastating warfare. A report prepared by American intelligence in October 1944, shortly after Regent Miklós Horthy was forced to resign, asserted that, “At the time of the German occupation of Hungary . . . [Hungary had] the largest [number of] and best-treated Jews in Axis Europe . . . The Hungarian Government did not always follow suggestions from Berlin and maintained a higher degree of political independence than other Nazi satellites. The Horthy regime hesitated following the Nazi policy to its ultimate goal of deportation, starvation and extermination.” Prior to the German occupation, “persecuted Jews of neighboring Axis lands looked upon Hungary as a place of refuge.”<sup>1</sup> The Mapai secretariat in Jerusalem made the following note: “German invasion: The process began of turning Hungary from a ‘paradise for Jews’ into a land in which the Final Solution was put into action.” David Ben Gurion was concerned that the “invasion [was] a sign of new calamity.”<sup>2</sup> “Paradise” was relative, of course. Hungary was only a “paradise” in comparison with other parts of German-occupied Europe, where the Jews were murdered on the spot en masse or were deported to German-run death camps. Nevertheless, young Jewish Zionist leader Rafi Benshalom, who arrived in Budapest from Slovakia in January 1944, was shocked: “For me, in Europe of 1944, this seemed like a fantasy . . . Jews seeking entertainment could still visit coffee houses, cinemas and theaters. While in Poland, hundreds of thousands of Europe’s Jews were being annihilated and the whole world lived in fear.”<sup>3</sup>

All this changed after the moderate Kállay cabinet resigned in the wake of occupation, and Horthy appointed a new pro-German administration under Döme Sztójay. Gestapo units arrived with lists of

opposition and anti-German elements, who were arrested in droves. Many of them were sent to concentration camps, including the prime minister. Unintentionally, the Germans helped pave the way for the Communist takeover in Hungary by deporting political figures who could have resisted the Communists. With the active assistance of the new Hungarian administration and the Hungarian gendarmerie, Hitler's men, including Adolf Eichmann and his cohort, deported the majority of the last intact Jewish community in Europe to Auschwitz where most of them were gassed.

When I began researching the Holocaust in Hungary many years ago as an undergraduate, I was interested in the imprint of the secret talks in the Hungarian, international, and mainly British press. I was shocked to find that *The Times* (UK) published verbatim quotes of top-secret Hungarian communications addressed to the British Foreign Office. The secret talks were hardly secret. Later I was interested in finding out why these talks occurred, as, at the time, I thought the argument that the Hungarians had not acted in good faith was unconvincing, on the basis of documentary sources beginning to come to light. Yet I had no inkling that seemingly disparate events—the secret peace initiatives, the Allied strategy to defeat Hitler, the German invasion of Hungary, and, indirectly, the Hungarian Holocaust—would all intersect.

The German invasion of Hungary did not have to happen, or at least not as early as it did, on March 19, 1944. Despite some reluctance to satisfy *all* the Führer's military and economic needs in the early phase of the war, Horthy's Hungary was a reliable ally. The question remains: why was Hungary invaded mere months before the Red Army reached the Hungarian borders and penetrated the Carpathians? Hitler's order to implement Operation Margarethe offered two main reasons for the move: Hungary's impending "treason," and the fact that Hitler would not tolerate having "a million" Jews withheld from Germany's grasp. The meaning of his remarks on the Jews was clear. Hitler had already chastised Horthy for not having dealt with the Jewish Question radically enough when Horthy visited the German leader in Schloss Klessheim in 1943. When Horthy was summoned for another visit with Hitler on March 16, 1944, he and his entourage were berated for their ongoing negotiations with the "Anglo-Saxons." Hitler declared that he did not want a repetition of the Badoglio affair (Italy's 1943 surrender to the Allies), and he insisted that Germany would not tolerate one million Jews in the rear of its armies.<sup>4</sup> What did Hitler mean by "impending treason," a motive that seems to have been extremely important for understanding his decision to invade?

In order to understand this, we must go back to an all but forgotten, but all the more fateful, episode of the Second World War: Hungary's (and the other minor Axis states') efforts to break with Hitler, which began in the summer of 1942.<sup>5</sup> By then it was becoming apparent in the capitals of the Axis satellite states that the Germans might lose the war. Hungary was the first state to explore the possibility of a separate arrangement with the Western Allies, and Romania, Finland, and Bulgaria rapidly followed suit. As early as March 1942, Horthy dismissed László Bárdossy, the prime minister who had dragged the country into war with the Soviet Union. The Regent replaced him with Miklós Kállay, a little-known figure in Hungarian politics, and charged him with the recovery of the country's sovereignty. This, of course, was more easily said than done: first, because of the sizable pro-German political forces in the country; second, because of the difficulty of making contact with Allied officials in neutral capitals; third, because of the fear that if the leadership in Berlin discovered the secret dealings, the country could be occupied by the German army; and, finally, because the Allies themselves were not sold on the importance of the peace initiatives emanating from Axis Europe.

Even though Franklin Roosevelt's confidant Adolph Berle saw these initiatives as a chance to break the Germans' southeastern flank and thereby advance the prospect of victory, he found few followers in Allied capitals.<sup>6</sup> Stalin expressed disinterest in the Finnish proposal to conclude a separate peace in January 1943, and Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill accepted the formula of unconditional surrender, which, as they were aware, was inimical to the surrender of Hitler's allies.<sup>7</sup> The chief motivation behind unconditional surrender may have been to reassure Stalin that there would be no deal at the Soviet Union's expense. In addition, Axis efforts may have been seen as a German ploy to split the Allies.

Nevertheless, a steady flow of individuals, diplomats, and various other officials and private personalities travelled to neutral capitals to find contacts among mainly, although not exclusively, Western representatives. The first Hungarian to be taken seriously was Albert Szent-Györgyi, the winner of the 1937 Nobel Prize in Chemistry, who, like a sizeable segment of the Hungarian middle class, had a pro-British outlook. His putatively secret mission did not go unnoticed in Berlin. In fact, the Germans, including Hitler himself, received accurate updates on the secret talks concerning a separate peace a separate peace, including the ones American and Hungarian representatives conducted in Turkey in late 1943 and early 1944.

In fact, the Hungarian peace attempts were initially driven by a desire to avoid a second Trianon, that is, having to return to the pre-1938 borders.<sup>8</sup> At the same time, even well-informed diplomats harbored illusions regarding British and American policies, and were convinced, at least through much of 1943, that Anglo-American troops would occupy the Danubian basin. These were not entirely unfounded: it seemed logical that after their victory in North Africa, the Allied landing would take place in Italy or the Balkans, which would then lead them to Budapest and Vienna. It was also hoped, with no basis whatsoever, that the West would view Hungary as a bastion against Bolshevism and perhaps even a potential participant in a post-war anti-Soviet crusade. National myth played a role here: Hungarians (like Slovaks and Poles) recalled their role as defenders of Christianity against the Ottoman Turks, and now, it seemed, a similar role against godless Bolsheviks awaited them.

Evidence suggests that by March 1943, the British discovered that the Hungarian initiative could be exploited to aid the Allied war effort. In a memorandum to the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), which was actively involved in the implementation of US policy in Axis Europe, the Special Operations Executive explained that "His Majesty's Government" no longer feared Hungary's occupation by the Germans, which would be a "positive" outcome because it would increase the burden on the German army. The advantage could be even greater if the turmoil could be timed to coincide with an Allied landing in Europe.<sup>9</sup> Eventually, this position would guide Allied policies regarding the Axis satellites. Allen Dulles, the OSS representative in Switzerland at the forefront of talks to extract the satellites from the war when the time was ripe, was well aware of the Kállay administration's dilemma: if it acted too early, before the Allies were in a position to help, the Germans would invade; but if it acted too late, it would face another devastating peace agreement. The State Department urged caution: a precipitate turn of events in Hungary could lead to "the destruction of those elements," which might be of more use to the "United Nations" when there was hope that a political volte-face could be successfully executed.<sup>10</sup> Negotiations were conducted in this spirit. An experienced Hungarian diplomat, György Barcza, held secret talks with a British intelligence representative in Geneva, Frederick Vanden Heuvel. Vanden Heuvel told him that his government did not expect the Hungarian government to do anything that would lead to German occupation, and in light of the serious consequences, he could not imagine Hungary breaking with the Axis.<sup>11</sup>

Due to these talks, Hungary's image in London changed for the better. The Foreign Office, recognizing that Germany would lose the war, noted that the Hungarians had reduced their contributions to the Axis war effort to a "suicidal" level.<sup>12</sup> Hans Bernard Gisevius, an OSS agent working in the German Foreign Office, reported that Hitler was mad at the Hungarians for trying to deceive him, and hoped to get rid of the prime minister and the "traitors." In September, László Veress concluded a preliminary armistice agreement on behalf of the Hungarian Foreign Ministry with the British consul-general in Istanbul Knatchbull-Hugessen, which, as the British agreed, would not be published until the British invaded Hungary (in which case the Hungarians agreed to surrender). An Anglo-American invasion of the Danubian basin would never materialize, and the British were aware that they could provide no assistance to the Hungarians.<sup>13</sup> During the Quebec meeting of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, it was agreed that the second front would be opened in Normandy, and there would be no operations in the Balkans, nor would the offensive on the Italian peninsula reach Central Europe. As plans to defeat Germany crystallized, the message to would-be Hungarian peace makers began to change. Allen Dulles told Barcza that Hungary had to follow the Italian example and shoulder the consequences. If the Hungarians failed to recognize the consequences of the situation created as a result of Italy's capitulation, it would mean they had renewed their alliance with Germany and would therefore be subject to the same treatment as the Germans. Thus, Hungary had to make the necessary moves to distance itself, "even at the risk of a German invasion."<sup>14</sup>

In the same spirit, the deputy chief of the British staff was interested in the intensification of the crisis created by the Italian defection. A memorandum to Chief of Staff Alan Brooke stated that a Hungarian capitulation would cause great political and military turmoil in Germany, and if Romania followed suit, Germany would face a critical situation that could be resolved only by the occupation of Hungary. If the Germans took the risk of moving troops from other theaters to Hungary, Germany's weakening in other theaters would be to "our advantage." The sooner the Hungarians acted, the better.<sup>15</sup> Apparently the plan was put into effect. In September, the Political Warfare Executive reported that, at present, the Secret Intelligence Service assets in Bern were working to extract Hungary from the war. The aim was "to discredit the Hungarian government in the eyes of the Germans," which would lead to Hungary's occupation by the Germans.<sup>16</sup> Lewis Namier

expressed the Jewish Agency's grave concerns to the Foreign Office regarding this policy. A break with the Germans, he argued, would jeopardize the lives of 800,000 Jews who lived in relative safety in Hungary. Germany would not tolerate Hungary's defection, and would respond to such a move with invasion and the extermination of the last surviving Jewish community in Europe. The only hope for Hungary's Jews, he opined, was that the Hungarians did nothing until it was probable that the Germans would not be able to react.

Hungary, while still actively contributing to the German war effort—particularly in Ukraine, where the Hungarian army was tasked with carrying out the duties associated with military occupation—stepped up its efforts to find a way out of the war while getting something in return, although the prize was getting increasingly smaller. Hungary's ambassador in Stockholm, Antal Ullein-Reviczky, told R. Taylor Cole, the OSS representative in Sweden, that his government was well aware that Hungary had to do whatever the Allies demanded. This would greatly accelerate events leading to surrender without the term unconditional surrender ever being mentioned in Budapest.<sup>17</sup> Internal correspondence reveals that the terms had yet to be decided, but the Hungarians were left in the dark about this fact. On December 18, the regent's son Miklós Horthy Jr.'s message was delivered to Allen Dulles: to wit, if the Allies expected Hungary to capitulate, he would ensure that it happened.<sup>18</sup>

Facing military complications in Italy, Churchill wrote to Roosevelt calling attention to the potential "landslide" (i.e., defection) of Hungary and Romania and the need to take advantage of it.<sup>19</sup> Sometime in the next few weeks, the decision was made to "detach the satellites." According to a memorandum signed by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) Admiral William Leahy, the strategic objectives of the Allies would be promoted by the defection of Hungary and Romania from the war, even if such a move resulted in the German occupation of these countries.<sup>20</sup> Strategic decisions during the war were made by the president, but in all other matters, the JCS's directives determined policy; in other words, both the OSS and the State Department were subordinated to military policy. Only a day after the Leahy memorandum was signed, William Donovan informed Dulles of the now-official policy. Regarding the ambivalent directions to the Hungarians, he wrote, "for your personal information" the JCS have approved the immediate detachment of Hungary and the other Axis satellites. "Adolf and his boys" were informed, and the JCS directives were to guide Dulles's steps. The purpose of this policy was revealed in a memorandum found

in the W. Averell Harriman papers, according to which an invasion of the satellite states would spread the Germans thin in the western theater of war at the time the second front was opened.<sup>21</sup> A newspaper clipping from the Soviet Army's journal, *Krasnaia Zvezda*, reveals that Moscow was aware of this policy. *Krasnaia Zvezda* argued that German victories over its unfortunate ally only made the German position more difficult, as the diversion of troops to the satellites made their already weak position in the west even weaker. This would make it easier to strike a blow at the Germans from the west.<sup>22</sup>

In the meantime, secret talks between a representative of the Hungarian government and the OSS were taking place in Ankara. These centered on two main issues: the terms of Hungary's capitulation; and a "high-powered" American military mission to be sent to Hungary, headed by a robust, intelligent "American specimen," as Dulles put it.<sup>23</sup>

According to an OSS report, by early 1943, Hungary had renounced all "political and territorial" demands and was willing to furnish the Allies with intelligence related to German troop movements.<sup>24</sup> In return, the Hungarians wanted to be treated as a "liberated" country and receive recognition for the Hungarian contribution to Allied victory. The Hungarians understood that they were going to conclude an armistice agreement, and this was related to the American military mission discussed in the Ankara negotiations. An OSS memorandum stated that the purpose of the talks was to give Hungary an "eleventh-hour" opportunity to distance itself from the Axis by voluntarily cooperating with the Allies—without, however, jeopardizing relations with the Germans. All forms of cooperation excluding military assistance, of course, were to be discussed.<sup>25</sup> In the meantime, the Americans learned that Germany was aware of the secret negotiations conducted with the Hungarians through Fritz Kolbe, a US agent in the German Foreign Ministry.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, the talks continued.

The Allied offensive to get the Hungarians to finally act decisively and break with the Nazis intensified. On December 11, 1943, immediately after the Tehran Conference of the Big Three ended, US Secretary of State Cordell Hull issued a warning to the German satellites that because of their "reckless" participation in the war, they would share the consequences of Germany's defeat. On March 16, 1944, the day Horthy received Hitler's "invitation" for a visit, Hull declared that in order to preserve their independence and territorial integrity, the satellites had to break with Hitler. The longer they procrastinated, the more serious the consequences would be.<sup>27</sup> Frances Deak, who claimed to be

negotiating on behalf of the “US High Command,” told the Hungarian envoy in Lisbon Andor Wodianer that unconditional surrender was a flexible formula, but if the Hungarians acted too late, his “American friends would not be in a position to help.”<sup>28</sup> On the one hand, in Ankara, the Hungarians were told that Washington expected the Hungarians to accept unconditional surrender, otherwise the talks would be broken off and “hostilities” would begin.<sup>29</sup> On the other hand, the Hungarians made it known that immediate surrender would allow pro-Nazi elements in the country to seize power, but at the same time, they reiterated that US troops would meet no resistance and asked for an American officer to personally bring the terms of surrender to Budapest.<sup>30</sup>

The OSS’s Operation Sparrow flew into Hungary on March 16, 1944, the day the regent of Hungary attended a meeting with Hitler where he was told that Hungary would be occupied due to its impending treason. Ferenc Szombathelyi, the head of Hungarian intelligence, claimed that Florimond Duke, who headed the US military mission, handed him the American terms of surrender. Duke, however, asserted that his mission had no political purpose and was supposed to negotiate Hungary’s contribution to the Allied war effort. Which account is correct has yet to be determined.<sup>31</sup> But be that as it may, the German invasion of March 19, 1944 may have been triggered, at least in part, by the Führer’s conviction that he was about to lose a crucial ally.<sup>32</sup> In this sense, the Allied ploy to spread the Germans thin succeeded—for a while. They expected the Germans to send ten to fifteen divisions, and they eventually sent ten. When Lipót Baranyai, the former president of the Hungarian National Bank, who had also acted as a vehicle for peace feelers, reminded Allen Dulles of the potential consequences of a German occupation, he allegedly replied, “We are up to our elbows in blood, a few hundred thousand lives here or there will not matter.”<sup>33</sup>

D-Day was perhaps the most important single operation in the drive to win the war. Had it failed, the consequences would have been unfathomable. Difficult moral choices had to be made. Lewis Namier’s dark prediction came true. Already on March 13, 1944, Goebbels noted in his diary the Führer’s statement that after the invasion, he would go after the Hungarian Jews. The country’s darkest political forces were propelled into power, and the elderly and inept regent gave them a free hand to deport Hungary’s Jewish population in collaboration with the SS and Gestapo elements that came on the heels of the Wehrmacht to finish off the Holocaust. The Gestapo also unintentionally helped Stalin by arresting and partially deporting many political elements that could

have stood in the way of the country's Sovietization, which was already in full swing a little over a year after the March 19 invasion. The fate of the Jews caused few headaches in the capital cities of the Allies.

Some of Prime Minister Kállay's contemporaries placed the blame for the failure of Hungary's defection policy on his alleged weakness, irresolution, and timidity. Diplomat György Barcza, for instance, bitterly noted in his memoirs that Kállay wanted to delay as long as possible but failed to realize that he could run out of time. This wound up being both a personal and national tragedy.<sup>34</sup> But Barcza thought very differently about Kállay's strategy during the secret talks in 1943. In May 1943, he wrote that those who wanted Hungary to make the move to break with Hitler immediately "have no idea of the consequences of such a move." The Germans would invade, and they would arrest and perhaps execute the democratic opposition and would kill tens, perhaps even hundreds of thousands of Jews.<sup>35</sup> He was mistaken on one point. The Germans actually needed the collaboration of Hungarian Nazis, who could hardly wait for the demise of the "liberal" old regime under Miklós Kállay, the man they accused of protecting the Jews. We now know that the premier negotiated in good faith, and was eventually ready to accept unconditional surrender. For the Allies, the secret peace talks were important only so long as they encouraged the Germans to invade Hungary and thereby spread them thin in the western theater of war. As noted in a paper prepared by the OSS in the wake of the tragedy of the Hungarian Jews, "the fate of these millions of Jews [in German-occupied Europe] had elicited slight notice from the world, which was more interested in the larger issues of the war."<sup>36</sup>

## NOTES

1. "The Jews of Hungary," October 19, 1944. R&A 2027. National Archives and Records Administration, Record Group 226, Entry 191, Box 1.
2. Tuvia Friling, *Arrows in the Dark: David Ben Gurion, the Yishuv Leadership, and Rescue Attempts during the Holocaust* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003), 2:4.
3. Cited in Zoltán Vági, László Csósz, and Gábor Kádár, *The Holocaust in Hungary: Evolution of Genocide*. (Lanham, MD: Alta Mira Press in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, 2013), xlvii.

4. Allen Dulles, the OSS resident in Bern, received firsthand information about the Hitler-Horthy meeting from his Hungarian contact, the diplomat György Bakách-Bessenyei. "To the Secretary of State," March 22, 1944. National Archives and Records Administration, Record Group 226, Entry 190c, Dulles Files, Hungary, Box 6.
5. To the best of my knowledge the only British monograph that deals with the Hungarian peace efforts during World War II is Elisabeth Barker, *British Policy in South-East Europe in World War II* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1976).
6. "Memorandum," December 17, 1942. National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) Record Group (RG) 226, Entry 210, Box 593.
7. A couple of days before the German invasion of Hungary, British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden asserted that unconditional surrender delayed rather than encouraged the break with Hitler. Eden's Telegram, March 17, 1944. NARA RG 59, General Records of the Department of State, Central Files 1940-1944, Box 2960.
8. In the Peace Treaty of Trianon, concluded in 1920, Hungary lost roughly two-thirds of her territory. The focal point of Hungarian interwar foreign policy was to recover all, or at least the ethnically predominantly Hungarian parts, of the detached lands.
9. NARA RG 226, OSS "Withdraw Records" Entry A1-210, SOE Branch Files 1943 Hungary, Box 286, WN 12125-12127. "SOE Policies in Hungary." March 24, 1943.
10. NARA RG 59, General Records of the Department of State, Decimal Files 1940-1944, Box 2955. "Memorandum by the Department of State to the British Government." April 28, 1943.
11. The Macartney Papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford, Box 4. Barcza's telegram to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. May 23, 1943.
12. Memorandum by F. K. Roberts, Head of the Foreign Office Central Department, June 5, 1943, in *Magyar-brit titkos tárgyalások 1943-ban* [Hungarian-British secret negotiations in 1943], ed. Gyula Juhász (Budapest: Kossuth, 1978), Document 31/a, 154.
13. Telegram from the deputy chief of staff to the chief of staff, August 23, 1943. In Juhász, *Magyar-brit titkos tárgyalások*, Document 47, 219.
14. Barcza's report to the Foreign Minister, August 5, 1943. The Macartney Papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford, Box 5.
15. Telegram from the deputy chief of staff to the chief of staff, August 23, 1943.
16. Memorandum by the Political Warfare Executive, undated [September 1943]. NARA RG 226, Entry 192, Box 88.

17. Memorandum by William Donovan to the Department of State, October 23, 1943. NARA RG 218, JCS, Geographical Files 42-45, Box 191.
18. Memorandum by Jackson to Dulles, Horthy Jr.'s letter to Dulles, December 18, 1943. Papers of Allen Dulles, Seely Mudd Library, Princeton.
19. Churchill's letter to Roosevelt, October 7, 1943, in *Churchill and Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence*, ed. Warren F. Kimball (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), 2:498-99.
20. Memorandum by the Chairman of the JCS William Leahy, November 2, 1943, cited in Memorandum by Cordell Hull to William Leahy, March 16, 1944. NARA RG 218, JCS Geographical Files 42-45, Box 191.
21. Undated memorandum [December 1943], "Overall Deception Policy for War with Germany." Papers of Averell Harriman, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Box 171. The historian Patrick K. O'Donnell argues that "Even the failed Sparrow Mission to Hungary drew German divisions from the front, degrading their operational effectiveness for the Normandy invasion." Patrick K. O'Donnell, *Operatives, Spies, and Saboteurs: The Unknown Story of the Men and Women of WWII's OSS* (New York: Free Press, 2004), 312.
22. Telegram by Harriman, "Article by Gavrillov, 'The Occupation of Hungary by Hitler,'" April 6, 1944. Harriman papers, Box 537.
23. NARA RG 226, Entry 190, Box 593. Hungarian Special Plan, undated [1943].
24. "Hungarian Scheme," undated [January 1944]. NARA RG 226, Entry 210, Box 447.
25. Report on Draft Agreement, December 23, 1943. NARA RG 226, Entry 211, Box 226.
26. Telegram from Bern, January 2, 1944. NARA RG 226, Entry 211, Box 5.
27. Consideration of Draft Statement for Satellites, Memorandum from Hull to the Chiefs of Staff, March 16, 1944. NARA RG 218, JCS Geographical Files 42-45, Box 191.
28. Francis Deak is cited in Antal Czettler, *A mi kis élethalál kérdéseink. A magyar külpolitika a hadba lépéstől a német megszállásig* [Our little life-and-death questions: Hungarian foreign policy from entry into the war to the German occupation] (Budapest: Magvető, 2000), 439.
29. Answer to Hungarian Interim Reply, February 1944. NARA RG 226, Entry 226, Box 447.
30. "Situation in Hungary," February 14, 1944. NARA RG 226, Entry 211, Box 447.
31. According to Douglas Waller, Béla Király asked Duke for the American peace proposal. Duke told him that they had none other than the regular

- terms of unconditional surrender. Hungarian intelligence chief Ujszászi told the Americans that he had arranged a meeting with two cabinet members, who would lay out the government's offer to switch sides. Douglas Waller, *Wild Bill Donovan: The Spymaster who Created the OSS and Modern American Espionage* (New York, Free Press, 2011), 196–97.
32. Terry Crowdy notes that, as conceived in the Bodyguard Plan, deceptions in the Middle East, the Mediterranean, the Adriatic, and Italy played a key role in supporting the Neptune landings by deterring the Germans from moving reserves to Normandy. Crowdy adds that “they also had an important part in paving the way for the Anvil landings in southern France. The part of Bodyguard covering the eastern Mediterranean was codenamed Zeppelin . . . One of the outcomes of Zeppelin was the German occupation of their supposed ally, Hungary. It was clear that the Germans had taken in the long running order of battle deception.” Terry Crowdy, *Deceiving Hitler: Double Cross and Deception in World War II* (New York: Osprey, 2008), 281–83.
  33. Aladár Szegedy-Maszák, *Az ember ősszel visszanéz . . . Egy volt magyar diplomata emlékiratából* [One recalls in fall . . . From the memoirs of a former diplomat] (Budapest: Európa-História, 1996), 1:330.
  34. Károly Urbán and István Vida, eds., “Részlet Barcza György Diplomataemlékeim című emlékiratának második kötetéből” [Excerpt from the second volume of György Barcza's memoir entitled *My memories as a diplomat*] *Századok* 121, nos. 2–3 (1987), 397–98.
  35. Memorandum by Barcza, May 21, 1943. Macartney Collection, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Box 5.
  36. NARA RG 226, Entry 191, Box 1, Research and Analysis 227, October 10, 1944. The historian John S. Conway has written that “British and Allied policy on the European Jewish Question was often deliberately blind to the unfolding catastrophe.” John S. Conway, “The Holocaust in Hungary: Recent Controversies and Reconsiderations,” in *The Tragedy of Hungarian Jewry: Essays, Documents, Depositions*, ed. Randolph H. Brahm (New York: Social Science Monographs and Institute for Holocaust Studies of the City University of New York, 1986), 4.