

2023. május 5-7.
Miskolci Egyetem

XXVI. TAVASZI SZÉL KONFERENCIA

TANULMÁNYKÖTET

II. kötet



XXVI. Tavaszi Szél Konferencia 2023

Tanulmánykötet

II. kötet

Szerkesztette:

Molnár Dániel - Molnár Dóra

Kiadó:



Minden jog fenntartva.

Budapest

2023

ISBN 978-615-6457-38-7

XXVI. Tavaszi Szél Konferencia 2023

Tanulmánykötet

II. kötet

Lektorálták

Bánkyné Dr. Perjés Beatrix

Benkei-Kovacs Balázs

Dr István Kollai

Dr József Beszédes

Dr. Dobó Zsolt

Dr. Dúró József

Dr. Forisek Péter

Dr. habil Kavecsánszki Máté

Dr. habil Németh Balázs

Dr. habil. Fenyvesi Anna

Dr. habil. Forgó András

Dr. habil. Péter Tusor

Dr. habil. Ujváry Gábor

Dr. Kálai Sándor

dr. Kész Margit

Dr. Konczos Csaba

Dr. Lajos Szalontai

Dr. Magyarics Tamás

Dr. Matuszka Balázs

Dr. Melinda Kalmár

dr. Nagy Ádám

Dr. Pap József

Dr. Péter Bencsik

Dr. Póliska Csaba

Dr. Polyák Petra

Dr. Rainer M. János

Dr. Szabó Beáta

dr. Szilvia Bátyi

dr. Tóth Eszter Zsófia

Dr. Vágvölgyi Sándor

Dr. Valuch Tibor

Dr. Vass Lóránt

Élise Anne Hélène Cantiran Dr.

Jaskóné Dr. Gácsi Mária

Keller Márkus

Mikó Péter

Németh István

Patrik Szeghő

Prof. Dr. Horváth Miklós

Prof. Dr. Kocziszky György

REPORT OF JÓZSEF GRÓSZ, ARCHBISHOP OF KALOCSA AND BÁCS, TO THE APOSTOLIC HOLY SEE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE HUNGARIAN STATE AND THE CHURCH IN 1949

György Sági

ELKH-PPKE-PTE Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group, assistant research fellow; sagi.gyorgy1988@gmail.com

Abstract

József Grósz, Archbishop of Kalocsa and Bács (1943–1961) held the position of President of the Hungarian Catholic Bishops' Bench several times. This report in question was written during his second presidency (1948–1951), on 11th December 1949. The report cannot be found in the archives in Kalocsa, Hungary. During my Vatican research last autumn, I found this Latin document in the Historical Archives of the Papal State Secretariat. Grósz also attached copies of letters in Hungarian to his report. A summary of the report prepared in Italian at the State Secretariat. The list of events described by Archbishop Grósz begins shortly before the arrest of József Cardinal Mindszenty, Prince Primate of Hungary, Archbishop of Esztergom (1945–1974) in December 1948, and summarizes the following year – so it does not yet include the agreement signed by Grósz in the year 1950. From the source, we can find out what information had the Apostolic Holy See and Pope Pius XII (1939–1958) about Hungary at the time. In his writing, Archbishop Grósz comprehensively presents of relations between the state and the Church. He uses examples to illustrate state abuses and the unsuccessful steps of the Bishops' Bench in the interests of Mindszenty, and also writes about the difficulties of the bishops and priests. In my study, I want to give a brief overview of the content of the report of the relationship between the Hungarian state and the Church at the time. I want to talk about the significance of the report in church history.

Keywords: *relationship between state and church, communists, Mindszenty case, church persecution*

1. Introductory Thoughts¹

Archbishop József Grósz of Kalocsa and Bács (1943–1961) served as the President of the Hungarian Catholic Bishops' Bench on multiple occasions. The report in question was issued during his second presidency (1948–1951) and was dated 11th December 1949. It covers a period when the Hungarian state intensified its anti-clerical actions, including the arrest and conviction of József Cardinal Mindszenty, the Archbishop of Esztergom and Prince Primate of Hungary, as well as increasing restrictions on the activities of religious. Based on my research so far, there is no trace of this report being completed in Hungary, in Kalocsa. During my Vatican research last year, I came across this Latin document in the Historical Archive of the Papal Secretariat of State.² Grósz also attached Hungarian-language copies of letters to support the content of his report, primarily copies of his correspondence with the government.³

¹ The study was completed within the framework of the ELKH-PPKE-PTE Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group. The research was realized with the support of the Klebelsberg Kuno scholarship, in the autumn of 2022.

² ASRS AA.EE.SS. (= Segreteria di Stato Sezione per i Rapporti con gli Stati Archivio Storico) Pio XII, Parte II (1949–1958), Serie Ungheria, Posizione 147, ff. 442–448.

³ Ibidem, ff. 438–440, 452–480.

According to the notes found at the Papal Secretariat of State, these Hungarian-language letters, along with the Latin report, were sent to Timothy Bouscaren, the Roman procurator of the Society of Jesus⁴, who then prepared the Italian summary and sent it back to the Papal Secretariat of State.⁵ The comprehensive summary of the events described by Archbishop Grósz begins shortly before Cardinal Mindszenty's arrest in December 1948 and covers the following year, thus excluding the agreement forcibly signed by Grósz with the state (1950).[1] The value of the source is increased by gaining insight into the level of information available to the Apostolic Holy See and Pope Pius XII (1939–1958) about the conditions in Hungary at that time. Archbishop Grósz provides a comprehensive overview of the development of relations between the state and the Church in his writing. He illustrates instances of state abuses and the unsuccessful attempts of the Bishops' Bench to aid Mindszenty. I aim to provide a brief overview of the content and historical significance of the report discussing the relationship between the Hungarian state and the Church during that time.

2. The Role of József Grósz in the Hungarian Church in the Second Half of the 1940s

In addition to his excellent economic sense, Archbishop Grósz had a great understanding of diplomacy. All of these were of great benefit during his decades-long service as the prelate. Naturally, he encountered difficulties when he tried to engage in dialogue for the Church, the clergy, and the faithful in a political environment that gradually shifted to the left and eventually turned into a one-party dictatorship in the decade following World War II. After the expulsion of Apostolic Nuncio Angelo Rotta in 1945, Grósz was entrusted with extraordinary authorizations and became the high-ranking clergyman responsible for maintaining contacts within the Hungarian Catholic Church. It is worth noting that not long before that, the traditional head of the Hungarian Church, Archbishop of Esztergom and Prince Primate of the Kingdom of Hungary, Jusztinián Cardinal Serédi, had passed away and returned to his Creator. [2] In this capacity, Grósz conducted numerous negotiations with the state authorities, as well as with foreign diplomats from the Allied Control Commission. Through the mediation of the British Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Alvary Gascoigne, he managed to maintain contact with the Apostolic Holy See. [3] He held the leading position within the bishopric until József Mindszenty assumed office as Archbishop of Esztergom. After the arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty, Grósz came to the forefront again and led the bishopric, as well as the Hungarian Catholic Church, until his own arrest in 1951. He considered it an important task to protect the interests of the Church to the best of his abilities. [4][5] Despite the violent and intimidating pressure from the state, he could only carry out this mission on the basis of saving what could still be saved.

3. Presentation of the Grósz's Report⁶

In the aforementioned context, we need to interpret Archbishop Grósz's report from 1949. It is evident from his words the difficult situation he and the other members of the Bishops' Bench were in. Nevertheless, we can also deduce from the lines that he and his fellow bishops endeavored to go to great lengths to do everything in their power for the sake of those entrusted to them and for the sake of those who suffered harm, such as Cardinal Mindszenty. It is also clear from the Grósz's Report and the more than 20 Hungarian-language documents attached to it that the bishops themselves did everything they could to maintain dialogue with the

⁴ Ibidem, ff. 433, 450.

⁵ Ibidem, ff. 441–449v, 451–451v.

⁶ In the context of the entire chapter, see: ASRS AA.EE.SS. Pio XII, Parte II (1949–1958), Serie Ungheria, Posizione 147, ff. 442–448.

government leaders.⁷ However, the other side did not always appreciate these efforts, most likely due to ideological reasons. The bishops carried out these actions while maintaining the rights that belong to the Church. Despite the fact that the authorities on the state side often disregarded their own laws, especially the ensuring religious freedom.

Now we have come to the point where we can present the content of the mentioned report. Grósz described in it that the bishops last met with Cardinal Mindszenty in Esztergom on 16th December 1948. At that time, the Prince Primate was already under surveillance. The bishops discussed two main issues during this meeting: firstly, the declaration prepared by the cardinal with the involvement of several bishops regarding the settlement of relations between the state and the Church. The approved declaration was published in the „Magyar Kurír”. The bishops reiterated their willingness to negotiate for the purpose of settling the relations between the state and the Church, resolving the disputed issues, but they emphasized that the involvement of the Holy See was indispensable. Secondly, the discussion included the negotiation of an agreement on financial matters between the representatives of the Ministry of Culture⁸ and the Ministry of Finance and the delegates of the cardinal, Archbishop Gyula Czapik of Eger and Vicar General János Drahos of Esztergom, regarding the support to be provided to the Church and the clergy. However, the signing of this agreement took place only on 28th December, two days after Cardinal Mindszenty's arrest.

The cardinal provided a detailed account of his arrest on 26th December and his lengthy ordeal in Grósz's report to the Holy See. On 27th December, at 6:30 pm, János Kádár, the Minister of Interior, invited Archbishop Grósz to meet with him. A State Secretary and a Ministerial Counsellor were present at the meeting. The minister informed to the Archbishop, that the Primate was accused of conspiracy, embezzlement, and currency trafficking. The minister urged Grósz to resign, holding him responsible for not stopping Mindszenty. Grósz refused this request, stating that he would not resign as he was appointed by the Pope, and only the Pope could remove him, and without a valid reason, he – the Pope – would not accept the resignation even if offered. The minister wanted to give him a 24-hour deadline to make a decision, but the Archbishop stated that he did not need that time, as his position was final. [6] Later, he learned that Lajos Shvoy, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Székesfehérvár, József Pétery, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Vác, and Miklós Dudás, the Greek-Catholic Bishop of Hajdúdorog, were also targeted by Kádár for resignation attempts. However, these attempts were in vain. While the Archbishop was in the capital, a search was conducted at his residence in Kalocsa, and the authorities took documents with them. The same happened to the aforementioned three bishops. During the search, the authorities found dollars in Dudás' possession, which were given to him by Mindszenty, causing additional inconvenience for him.

Prime Minister István Dobi invited Archbishop Grósz for a meeting on 31st December regarding the declaration from 16th December mentioned earlier. The government also requested that Grósz or other bishops visit President Árpád Szakasits on 1st January for New Year's greetings. Given the known circumstances, the Archbishop rejected this on behalf of himself and other bishops. Prior to the meeting on 4th January, Grósz invited for a consultation with the members of the Bishops' Bench. In the meantime, the bishops learned and found it reassuring that the behavior of the Hungarian bishops was cautiously evaluated in Western communication. On 4th January, Grósz and his companions were received by Prime Minister Dobi, Ministers of State Mátyás Rákosi and Ferenc Erdey, Minister of Interior Kádár, and

⁷ Cf. ASRS AA.EE.SS. Pio XII, Parte II (1949–1958), Serie Ungheria, Posizione 147, ff. 438–440, 452–480.

⁸ Ministry of Religion and Public Education.

Minister of Culture Gyula Ortutay. The bishops once again affirmed their commitment to the declaration of 16th December, stating their readiness to engage in negotiations for the settlement of the relationship between the state and the Church. However, they emphasized that it was necessary for the Holy See to coordinate the negotiations. The possibility of appointing an apostolic visitor was raised but ultimately there was no progress made in this case.[7] The bishops rejected the accusations brought against them. Rákosi attempted to persuade the bishops to declare that there was religious freedom in Hungary in exchange for two bishops receiving permission to travel to Rome. Pointing out the obvious falsehoods, Grósz and the bishops rejected this offer. They agreed to continue the negotiations on 8th January, but ultimately, they did not take place as a letter from Pope Pius XII arrived on 7th January, which the Archbishop mentioned as a great consolation. In this, the Pope encouraged courageous resilience. Grósz informed Dobi that the negotiations needed to be postponed, and he had to consult with the bishops first. The bishops were called multiple times for negotiations, and they requested a temporary suspension, emphasizing that they were still willing to negotiate but that they needed to consider the perspective of the Pope and the coordination by the Holy See. In his report sent to Rome, Archbishop Grósz attached various copies of letters in Hungarian that he had written to government officials regarding different matters that hindered the continuation of the negotiations. [8]⁹

Grósz's report included information about Bishop Dudás's visit at Andrassy Avenue 60¹⁰, where he learned from Mindszenty that he had written to the Prime Minister and Minister of Justice István Ries, requesting that his case be separated and postponed. Mindszenty asked the bishops to support his application to the minister. The bishops and Grósz were skeptical of the contents of the appeal that was publicly revealed, where Mindszenty admitted to the charges against him. They evaluated the statement as contradictory to Mindszenty's personality. They would have met the Minister of Justice on 1st February at 6 p.m. However, before this, Czapik and Bishop Dudás received information from Rákosi that Mindszenty was asking for the impossible but still expected the bishops to meet with the Minister of Justice as planned. Based on their preliminary discussion, the bishops concluded that it was pointless to support Mindszenty's appeal, as it would be rejected by the state apparatus, and it was clear, it was written under external influence. Consequently, Czapik informed the Ministry of Justice by phone that the bishops would not appear before the minister.

The Grósz's report, after the verdict of the people's court[9][10][11][12][13]¹¹, a report was made about a letter sent by Minister Ortutay, who was in charge of religion and public education, which was clearly written with the purpose of intimidation. In the letter revealed „discoveries” in the Mindszenty case that also raised suspicions about Grósz, Shvoy, Pétery, and Dudás in the eyes of the state. The minister requested separate proceedings against Shvoy and Pétery. The state announced that they would not provide the support as stipulated in the agreement signed on 28th December 1948. The respective Roman Catholic dioceses did not receive it.

The Archbishop of Kalocsa wrote to Rome in his report about an invitation of Mindszenty (14th February 1949), stating that the cardinal would like to speak with him about resolving

⁹ Cf. ASRS AA.EE.SS. Pio XII, Parte II (1949–1958), Serie Ungheria, Posizione 147, ff. 438–440, 452–480.

¹⁰ In his report sent to the Vatican Secretariat of State, apostolic nuncio Giovanni Dellepiane in Vienna, reported that later, on 17th June 1950, Bishop Dudás was the one who visited the cardinal in Vác, too. For information on Mindszenty's health condition, his meetings with his mother, and Mrs. Pehm's appeals, see: ASRS AA.EE.SS. Pio XII, Parte II (1949–1958), Serie Ungheria, Posizione 150, ff. 25–27.

¹¹ The Sárga könyv and Fekete könyv should be interpreted with strong source criticism.

the relationship between the state and the Church. Czapik received a similar letter. Although the letter was not released to the press, it still appeared. Lengthy correspondence took place, but they were not granted permission to meet with the cardinal. Only the cardinal's mother, Mrs. János Pehm, was allowed to visit him on a few occasions. The bishops knew from the widow's account that the cardinal's physical condition had deteriorated significantly.¹²

Archbishop Grósz also reported to the Apostolic See about the Peace Congress held in Budapest on 25th March. He emphasized that he had forbidden every priest from participating in this event organized by the communists. Only the Budapest's pastors who were personally invited by the organizers were exempt from this ban, but they could only attend as private individuals, not as priests of the Archdiocese of Esztergom. In the press, however, it was portrayed as if they were representing the Church. As the President of the Bishops' Bench, Grósz stated in response to the invitation that the Church's teachings and the efforts of the Holy See in matters of war and peace were well-known, and it was unnecessary to emphasize that they preferred peace and supported the avoidance of war. He gave the same response to a similar invitation from the previously unknown Hungarian Intellectual National Committee to Paris.

Grósz also mentioned the parliamentary elections on 15th May 1949, which he described as a comedy.[14][15] The outcome was predictable. Therefore, he saw no point in issuing an election circular urging participation on behalf of the Bishops' Bench. László Rajk, former Minister of Interior, and the arrest of his associates were also mentioned in the report by Archbishop Grósz.[16][17] Grósz's report also addressed the adoption of the Constitution of the Hungarian People's Republic, which provided rights on paper for citizens and also for churches. However, it also included the separation of state and Church.¹³ In addition to the curtailment of church education resulting from nationalization, it also reported on the optionalization of religious education. It described how the state tried to hinder enrollment in religious education for children by setting application deadlines and creating as many obstacles as possible for parents. They were mostly successful in Budapest. However, Grósz was pleased to observe that in villages and working-class districts, people overwhelmingly supported religious education. Understandably, this angered the communists. The bishops' pastoral letters on the subject were perceived as an attack by Rákosi's regime, emphasizing the importance of religious education by the clergy.[18] While the Ministry of Culture approved the religious textbooks, the Ministry of Popular Education did not authorize their distribution. Religious education could only be held in the last school period, but often the catechists found empty classrooms because some school teachers sent the children home. Under the pressure from the state, some parents eventually backed down, but others persisted.[19][20]

In the final section of the report, the archbishop discussed the difficulties faced by religious persons. As part of the nationalization of church schools in 1948, the parts of the monastic/religious buildings previously used for this purpose were separated and repurposed. Soon, the state authorities also targeted the remaining parts of the buildings still used by the

¹² ASRS AA.EE.SS. Pio XII, Parte II (1949–1958), Serie Ungheria, Posizione 150, ff. 25–27.

¹³ Act No. XX of 1949.

https://net.jogtar.hu/getpdf?docid=94900020.TV&targetdate=ffffff4&printTitle=1949.+%C3%A9vi+XX.+t%C3%B6rv%C3%A9ny&referer=http%3A//net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi%3Fdocid%3D00000001.TXT (last accessed: 7th June 2023). For freedom of religion and the separation of state and church, see (in English) § 54. (1) The Hungarian People's Republic guarantees the freedom of conscience of its citizens and the right to freely practice religion. (2) In order to ensure the freedom of conscience, the Hungarian People's Republic separates the church from the state.

monks/nuns. Their argument was that these sections indirectly served educational purposes, so they fell under the law of nationalization. As a result, some religious persons, especially among nuns, who were already being „dispersed”, began to face these circumstances even before the promulgation of the law. However, Grósz did not forget to praise the faithful who supported the religious persons in an exemplary manner based on their experiences. Gradually, nuns serving in hospitals were also expelled from their positions, marking the beginning of the restriction of other areas of interest to the religious persons, following the field of education. [21]

4. Closing Thoughts

The fact that Archbishop Grósz’s report and its appendices reached Rome is definitely a merit, as it provided the Holy See, and specifically Pope Pius XII, with firsthand knowledge of the trials and tribulations of the Hungarian Catholic Church. They obtained authentic information about the events in Hungary and the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty.

For researchers, finding these details in the Vatican in this form confirms that despite the diplomatic rupture between the Apostolic See and Hungary in 1945, the connection between the Hungarian Church and Rome, although not free from obstacles, successfully persisted with the possibility of maintaining contact. This report by Grósz may have contributed to shaping the Holy See’s policy toward Hungary and determining its response, seeking to take steps in the future.[22][23]

From this perspective, one must consider the steps of the Holy See in the long term, not just during the pontificate of Pope XII. It is worth noting that the Pope excommunicated those involved in the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty, but despite this, even in the last years of his pontificate, he did not completely reject his obvious anti-communist stance or the possibility of dialogue between the Holy See and the communist states, in this case, with the Hungarian leadership, in order to alleviate the constrained situation of the Church.[24] It should not be forgotten that in the 1950s, severe attacks continued to be directed against the Church in Hungary. It did not take long after the report for the operating permits of the religious orders to be revoked. Priests and individuals with religious affiliations were subjected to consecutive show trials, and even József Grósz himself was imprisoned in 1951, despite having signed an agreement with the state, without the permission of the Holy See, to salvage what could be saved.[25][26] In the following decades, there were some changes in the relationship between the state and the Church, following the suppression of the revolution and the war of independence of 1956, although the persecution of the Church did not cease even then. In the second half of the 1950s, priests were also murdered, yet (e.g. Chaplain János Brenner of Rábakethely, at the end of 1957[27]¹⁴). Strong state control prevailed until the regime change in 1989, as evidenced by the functioning of the State Office for Church Affairs[28][29]. Despite the Kádár regime’s attempts to present a more acceptable image compared to Rákosi, its true nature remained unchanged.

Document

Necessarium duxi relationem praestare de vita et actionibus nostris.

¹⁴ In 2018 the young martyr priest was beatified by Cardinal Prefect Angelo Amato of Congregation for the Causes of Saints in Szombathely with the consent of Pope Francis.

Ultimo die 16. Decemberis 1948 fuimus coadunati apud Eminentissimum Dominum Cardinalem Mindszenty. Vocavit nos in suam residentiam Strigoniensem, quia libertas ejus tunc jam limitata erat. Custodes enim detecti observabant domum et imprimis cussus ex ea exeuntes, ne forsitan E. D.¹⁵ clam civitatem aeppalem relinqueret. Quaestiones, quae in hoc conventu tractabantur, erant praeprimis duae: a. approbatio et publicatio alicujus declarationis ab ipso E. D. et quibusdam episcopis praeparatae circa pacificam collaborationem inter ecclesiam et statum et b. approbatio conventionis, quam delegati E. D., archiepiscopus nempe Agriensis¹⁶ et vicarius gen. Strigoniensis¹⁷ cum delegatis ministrorum Cultus et finciarum inierunt circa subsidia materialia ecclesiae, resp. clero praestanda. Textum declarationis sub 1 ad jungo – sacerdos quidam potest illum, prout etiam sequentes in linguam italicam vertere –. Exprimit promptitudinem nostram ad pacificam collaborationem et refutat accusationem iteratam, nos nolle tractare de quaestionibus inter ecclesiam et statum pendentibus, una tamen defigit, coordinationem rerum exigere interventionem S. Sedis. Hanc declarationem publicavimus per Agentiam „Magyar Kurír”. – Conventionem circa subsidia materialia in conventu approbatam delegati E. D. subscripserunt die 28. Decembris 1948.

Die 26. Decembris vespere E. D. detentus est. Die sequenti meridie apparuit cursor ministri negotiorum internorum¹⁸ cum litteris, quibus minister me in casu Mindszenty ad horam 18 et dimidiam ad se vocavit. Minister in praesentia secretarii status et unius consilarii ministresialis me recepit. Exponens breviter, Dominum Mindszenty detentum esse ob tria delicta, nempe conjurationem, infidelitatem et speculationem valutariam, persecutus est, de his etiam me respondere debere, quia qua membrum Episcopatus et aeppus senior Dominum M.¹⁹ non admonui et delicta non impedivi, et ad finem ad resignationem me provocati. Respondi breviter: Episcopus catholicus in praesenti rerum statu sponte non relinquit officium suum; ceterum resignatio mea nihil valeret; me enim Romanus Pontifex constituit archiepiscopum, ergo tantum Ipse me a munere sublevare potest, Ipse vero non sublevabit me sine argumentis gravibus et talibus non possum fulcire petitionem meam. Nogatia D. Cardinalis me mine gravant, quia haec omnino ignoravi. In conventibus nostris non agimus de talibus rebus. – Denique voluit mihi dare spatium 24 horarum ad rem melius considerandam. Respondi ei, me non indigere tali spatio, sententiam meam esse definitivam. – Die sequenti, nempe 28. Decembris rescivi, episcopus Shvoy²⁰, Dudás²¹ et Pétery²² pariter provocatos esse ab eodem ministro ad resignationem et cum eodem effectu. Evidenter tacticam apud protestantes cum effectu applicatam voluerunt applicare etiam in ecclesia catholica: per resignationem spontaneam liberari voluerunt a quibusdam episcopis, ut ceteri facilius starent beneplacito dominorum potestatis.

Domum reversus die 30. Decembris accepi schedulam anonymam, qua significatum est mihi, contra aeppum Colocensem nullum documentum esse in manibus custodum publicorum. Revera me ad hodiernum usque diem non excusserunt, nec postquam die 8. Januarii 1949 cubacula mea, me absente, perscrutabantur et scripta diversa abstulerunt. Tres supranominati episcopi mense adhuc Januario excussi sunt, Shvoy et Pétery in Budapest, Dudás in sua residentia. Apud episcopum Dudás invenerunt valutam americanam paulo prius ab E.D. Cardinali ipsi traditam.

¹⁵ Eminentissimum Dominum, that is to say József Cardinal Mindszenty.

¹⁶ Archbishop Gyula Czapik of Eger.

¹⁷ Archdiocesan Vicar General János Drahos of Esztergom.

¹⁸ János Kádár, Minister of Interior.

¹⁹ József Mindszenty.

²⁰ Bishop Lajos Shvoy of Székesfehérvár.

²¹ Greek-Catholic Bishop Miklós Dudás of Hajdúdorog.

²² Bishop József Pétery of Vác.

Die 31. Decembris accepi litteras ministri primi Staphani Dobi²³, quibus me ad diem 4. Januarii ad se invitavit in causa declarationis Episcopatus de die 16. Decembris. Eodem die in ephemeridibus legi, etiam ceteros ordinarios invitatos fuisse. Ad meridiem ejusdem diei telephonice me vocavit vicarius Domini Cardinalis Budapestiensis et communicavit mecum petitionem ministri Cultus, ut aut ego aut alius episcopus compareret die 1. Januarii apud praesidem Reipublicae salutationis causa. Respondi: Nec ego comparebo, nec alius episcopus ibit; rationes patent, nec expositione indigent.

Convacovi Ordinarios, ut de nostra agendi ratione tractaremus, antequam praesidem ministerii adiremus. Interium e publicationibus radiophonicis accidentalibus intellexi, Sedem Apostolicam dedisse aliquod responsum ad aliquam notam gubernii Hungarici. Stationem Vaticanam ita turbarunt, ut nec petitionem gubernii, nec responsum Sedis Apostolicae clare et praecise eruere potuissemus. Attamen communicationes occidentales cautos nos reddiderunt.

Die 4. Jan. 1949 receperunt nos praeses ministerii Stephanus Dobi, duo ministri status Mathias Rákosi²⁴ et Franciscus Erdey²⁵, minister negotiorum internorum Joannes Kádár, minister Cultus Julius Ortutay et secretarius status [Geysa] Losonczy²⁶. Post salutationem ex parte praesidis ministerii factam perlegi declarationem nostram sub 2 adjacentem, cujus summa est: Libenter ad notitiam sumimus gubernii intentionem ad ordinandam relationem inter ecclesiam et statum. Nos denuo promptos declaramus ad pacificam collaborationem, attamen iteramus, quod jam in nostra declaratione de die 16. Decembris diximus, nempe coordinationem rerum exigere interventionem, Sanctae Sedis; petat igitur ministerium Hungaricum Visitatorem Apostolicum aut reddat possibile, ut quidam episcopus Romam proficisci et proposita gubernii officiis S. Sedis substernere possit. In secunda parte declarationis refutavimus iteratas accusationes contra ecclesiam et episcopatum factas. – Post haec vocem sumpsit Rákosi; ceteri ministri nonnisi ipso perpittente hinc-inde aliquid dixerunt per reliquas duas circiter horas. Sic minister negotiorum internorum Kádár per longum et latum exposuit infelicissimam epistolam Mons. Mihalovics²⁷ ad E.D.C.²⁸, quae etiam in famosum librum flavum assumpta est. De nota gubernii et responso S. Apostolicae ne verbum dixit Rákosi. Quoad visitatorem Apostolicum dixit, gubernium non posse visitatorem petere, promptum autem esse, ut uno vel etiam duobus episcopis iter Romanum possibile reddat, postquam res cum episcopatu pertractatae fuerint. Rákosi omnino inducere nos voluit, ut in declaratione nostra ediceremus, in Hungaria liberum esse exercitium religionis; hoc rejecimus dicendo, nos non posse affirmare, quod evidenter inverum est et cujus contrarium centum et pluribus factis probare possumus. Secundam partem declarationis in forma positiva petiit cum agnitione Reipublica et damnatione legitimismi omniumquae actionum, quae mutationem violentam formae regiminis intendunt. Hac damnatione evidenter abuti volebant contra E.D.C. Demus ad continuationem colloquiorum /:nunquam utebamur voce „tractatio”:/ invitaverunt nos pro die 8. Januarii. Ad hoc tamen non est perventum, quia die 7. Januarii accepimus litteras Suae Sanctitatis, quae immensum nobis contulerunt solatium et robur. Statim certiores reddidi primum ministrum Dobi, colloquia differenda esse. Item feci e sessionibus episcoporum diebus 10. et 17. Januarii habitis, quamvis ad colloquia continuanda iterum vocati essemus. Ultima vice adjunximus litteris nostris etiam diversas quaerelas, quae continuationem colloquiorum impediunt /:Cf. adjuncta sub N. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 et ad 9/.²⁹

²³ Prime Minister István Dobi.

²⁴ State Minister Mátyás Rákosi.

²⁵ State Minister Ferenc Erdey.

²⁶ State Secretary Géza Losonczy.

²⁷ Zsigmond Mihalovics.

²⁸ Eminentissimum Dominum Cardinalem, that is to say Cardinal Mindszenty.

²⁹ ASRS AA.EE.SS. Pio XII, Parte II (1949–1958), Serie Ungheria, Posizione 147, ff. 454–461.

Die 31. Jan. 1949 telephonice Budapestinum me vocavit episcopus Dudás in causa E.D.C. simulque rogavit, ut vocarem etiam ceteros episcopos, quod et feci. Post adventum meum rescivi sequantia:

Die 30. Januarii post meridiem comparuit officialis quidam politiae cum curru automobili in Nyíregyháza et tradidit eppo Dudás petitionem E.D.C., se velle apud eum confiteri. Eppus Dudás cum eodem curru statim profectus est Budapestinum, ubi post horam 20-am adveniens ductus est in carcerem Andrásy-út 60.³⁰ E.D. apparens in habitu eppali cum cuce pectorali, annulo, pileolo, cingulo peregit suam confessionem et postea in praesentia duorum officialium politiae et de eorum licentia per decem circiter minuta cum eppo confessario locutus est. Aperuit ei, se scripsisse praesidi ministerii et ministro iustitiae et petiisse, ut sua causa separaretur ab ista ceterorum accusatorum et processus suus differatur, et rogare episcopos, ut hanc suam petitionem coram ministris comparentes fulciant. – Recursus ad ministrum iustitiae directus in processu publicatus est; continet confessionem delictorum ipsi imputatorum, damnationem actionum suarum et promissiones de futura gestione. – Ante meum et episcoporum adventum Aeppus Agriensis, de re edoctus ab eppo Dudás, convenit cum praeside ministerii de visitatione nostra apud ipsum ad horam 18-am die 1. Februarii; colloquio ipsorum adfuit Rákosi, qui aeppum Agriensem pro suo modo edocuit, dominum M. petere rem impossibile; hoc non obstante episcopi venire possunt. Episcopi die 1. Februarii adunati post longam diputationem convenerunt in eo; quod non possunt fulcire recursum, quem gubernium rejiciet et qui evidenter sub quodam influxu scriptus est; continet enim confessiones et promissiones characteri et actionibus E.D. omnino contrarias; aeppus Agriensis igitur telephonice et breviter raddat certiolem praesidem ministerii, quod episcopi ad horam praefixam non comparebunt. Aeppus Agriensis et eppus Dudás adhaerebant suae opinioni, hoc personaliter fieri debere, et cum eppo Csanádensi et vicario gen. Stigoniensi se praesentabant praesidi ministerii, qui eos praesente Rákosi recipiebat; consequentia fuit communicatio absurda in ephemeridibus publicata, eppos Hungariae nolle se occupare cum causa D.M., sed relinquere rem „prudenti iudicio gubernii”.

Post sententiam tribunalis popularis accepi litteras a ministro Cultus sub N. 10 acclusas.³¹ Minister communicat cum Episcopatu, processum Mindszentynianum protulisse momentam quae quatuor episcopos – in specie eppos Shvoy et Pétery – de delictis suspectos reddunt, et interrogat, an episcopatus contra suspectos examen instituerit /: alii duo sunt: Aeppus Colocensis et eppus Dudás:/. Ex his tres, nempe Aeppus Colocensis, eppi Shvoy et Pétery una cum cancellariis et Capitulis inde a mense Februario non accipiunt subsidia in conventionem de die 28. Dec. 1948 assignata. Eppus Jauriensis jam a die 15. Nov. 1948 nihil accipit ob denegatam sepulturam ecclesiasticam alicujus communistae, qui in bigamia vivens repente mortuus est; parochus ipse ob hanc rem jam inde ab anno internatus est.

Aliquot diebus post, die 14. Febr. 1949 accepi litteras E.D.C. manu propriam scriptas sub N. 11 acclusas, quibus me invitat ad pertractanda negotia Ecclesiam et statum concernentia.³² Litteras has cum consensu et sub influxu potestatis scriptas esse patet; post hebdomada in ephemeridibus publicatae sunt, quin a me quisquam eas accepisset. Similes litteras accepit etiam aeppus Agriensis.

Convocavi Ordinarios ad diem 18. Februarii. E. conventu nostro rescripsimus ministro Cultus, collegium episcoporum non esse competens in causis episcoporum ideoque non posse examen instituere /:12:/.³³ A ministro iustitiae petivimus licentiam ad E.D.C. visitandum, statim e conventu per telephonium, deinde per litteras sub N. 13 adjacentes.³⁴ Rescripsit die

³⁰ State Security Authority (Államvédelmi Hatóság), the infamous headquarters of the ÁVH.

³¹ ASRS AA.EE.SS. Pio XII, Parte II (1949–1958), Serie Ungheria, Posizione 147, f. 462.

³² Ibidem, f. 463.

³³ Ibidem, f. 464.

³⁴ Ibidem, ff. 465–468.

10. Martii, licentiam talem quidem nonnisi cognatis dari posse, se tamen petitionem episcoporum benevole examinare velle, si substernantur quaestiones concretae cum D.M. tractandae. Minister optime quidem novit, quid E.D.C. nobiscum agere vellet, sed hoc pertinent ad eorum tacticam. Hucadusque praeter matrem neminem admiserunt ad E.D.C. Mater primis temporibus tertio quoque mense, nunc sex hebdomadibus elapsis filium visitare potest. Ultima vice ad finem mensis Septembris admissa fuit; sequenti termino, nempe circa medium Novembrem, non potuit filium videre, nec eruere, ubi D.C. detineatur. A matre scimus, conditionem corporalem D.C. pejorem redditam esse.

Inde a die 9. Martii usque ad diem 10. Aprilis ob debilitatem cordis decubui in nosocomio Filiarum S. Francisci in Budapest. Durante mea in nosocomio commoratione die 25. Martii celebrata est in Budapest „conferentia pacis”, ad quam per vicarios Strigoniensem et Budapestinensem iterum atque iterum invitabant etiam ecclesiam /:cf. 14:/.³⁵ Vetavi omnem interventionem nomine ecclesiae in hoc conventiculo a communistis organiato, vicarius tamen Strigoniensis permisit, ut quidam parochi Budapestinenses a vicario Budapestinensi designandi et nominatim invitati compareant, cum explicita declaratione, hos sacerdotes non repraesentare ecclesiam, nec Archidioecesim Strigoniensem, sed ad maximum seipsos. Nin obstante hac declaratione ephemerides parochos comparentes uti repraesentantes acclesiae catholicae registrarunt; quod praevideri potuit.

Item in nosocomio accepi litteras cujusdam Societatis, cujus eousque ne nomen quidem audivimus /:Magyar Értelmiség Nemzeti Bizottsága – Commissio Nationalis Intelligentiae Hungaricae:/, quae ad Congressum pacis Parisiis celebrandum nos invitavit. Respondimus e conventu episcoporum de die 6. Aprilis, doctrinam ecclesiae circa bellum et pacem tam evidentem laboresque Summi Pontificis pro pace inter nationes tam notos esse, ut ex parte episcopatus nihil dicenda sit, in Congressu vero Parisiensi utpote internationali episcopatum Hungariae non esse competentem ad Ecclesiam repraesentandam /:15:/.³⁶ Simile responsum dedimus etiam ad invitationem ad Congressum Budapestinensem /:16:/.³⁷ Responsa nostra non publicaverunt.

Post foundationem Frontis Popularis ad hujus instantiam gubernium edixit novas electiones ad diem 15. Maii. Praesidium centrale iterum atque iterum petiit ab episcopis, ut instructionem similem illae, quam ante electiones anno 1947 habitas dederat, fidelibus darent. Publicavimus instuctionem, resp. declarationem sub N. 17 adjacentem e rationibus sequentibus: 1. electio est pura comoedia; resultatum a priori definitum est, quidquid facturi sint electores; 2. propter hanc comoediam non licet exponere fideles nostros cruciatibus, qui certe sequentur, si notabilis pars electorum abstineat a votatione.³⁸ Resulationem fideles nostri et intellexerunt et probaverunt, exceptis iis nonnullis, qui alios ad publicum certamen adhortantur et in casu periculi seipsos salvant. Comoedia electoralis e publicationibus occidentalibus satis nota est. Electores a potestate dependentes sub vexillis corpolariter debebant se sistere ad urnas et aperte vota dare. Coram localibus electionum scholares, pueri et puellae, alique ex parte communista cantabant et saltabant. Horis pomeridianis requirebant illos, qui nondum comparebant ad urnas, et diversis vexationis minisque adduxerunt ad votationem. His non obstantibus non pauci contra Frontem Popularem dederunt vota, sed functionarii invenerunt modum ad suffragiam corrigenda.

Societas tali modo electa et post detentionem ministri Rajk ejusque sociorum purgata approbavit Constitutionem Reipublicae Popularis, quae inter alia decrevit separationem Ecclesiae et Status. Jura civium assecurata sunt in Constitutione, sed haec non sunt serio

³⁵ Ibidem, f. 469.

³⁶ Ibidem, ff. 470–471.

³⁷ Ibidem, ff. 472–473.

³⁸ Ibidem, ff. 474–475.

sumenda. Vocabularium enim communistarum valde differt ad illo ceterorum hominum. De facto nulla existit libertas praeter illam partis communisticae ad omnia.

Constitutio craevit Consilium Praesidentiale Reipublicae Popularis cum potestate legislativa, quod deinde die 5. Septembris institutionem religiosam in scholis facultativam declaravit cum additamento, quod parentes, qui institutionem religiosam prolium suarum volunt, id in scholis indicare debeant /:18:/. Ordinatio ministri Cultus praefixit teminum 15. Septembris /:18:/.³⁹ E conventu nostro die 8. Septembris celebrato dedimus litteras pastorales, quae die 11. Septembris in omnibus ecclesiis et in omnibus functionibus sacris lectae sunt /:19:/.⁴⁰ Ad terminum praefixum parentes, imprimis in pagis et circulis operariorum, fere ad 100% pro institutione religiosa prolium institerunt. Resultatum hoc inopinatum furore implevit potentes ita, ut Mathias Rákosi in suo discursu die 30. Septembris litteras episcoporum belicasas declararet et ecclesiam de terrore accusaret /:20:/.⁴¹ Directores scholarum – certe ad ordinationem secretam partis – praesertim in Budapest aliisque civitatibus impedire studebant institutionem religiosam ita, ut e.g. in Budapest die 27. Septembris nullibi institutio religiosa incipi potuisset. Ideo 29. Septembris nomine episcoporum alias litteras circulares breves dedi, quibus ex una parte laudavi fidem parentum, ex altera parte urgebam, ut gubernium voluntati tam evidenti populi satisfaceret institutionemque religiosam juventutis scholaris possibilem redderet /:21:/.⁴² Hae circulares legendae erant die 2. vel 9. Octobris. Potestas civilis cum omni forma pressionis et minarum impedire conabatur, ut hae circulares – utpote antidemocraticae – legerentur, tamen fere in omnibus ecclesiis lectae sunt. Et die 3. Octobris etiam in Budapest incepta est institutio religiosa. Certe adsunt difficultates diversae. Religio uti disciplina extraordinaria in orario post disciplinas ordinarias tenet locum, ergo horis tantum meridianis tradi potest, quando alumni jam fatigati sunt; non raro accidit, quod catechetae scholam derelictam inveniunt, quia magistri alumnos domum miserunt aut ad aliquam excursionem /:Kino, museum etc.:/ duxerunt; in scholis, ubi discipulorum pars ante meridiem et altera post meridiem docetur, non manet pro religiosa institutione nec tempus nec locus; libros ministerium Cultus quidem approbavit, sed ministerium educationis popularis non dat indultum propagationis; parentes et alumni praesertim Collegiorum popularium minis et terroribus omnis generis retinentur ab institutione religiosa. Sunt quidem, qui defecerunt, sed maxima ex parte et parentes et alumni fideles remanserunt. Tota tendentia vergit eo, ut institutionem religiosam e scholis expellant. Nominatio catechetarum pertinet ad Ordinarios, sed eorum acceptadirectoribus. Nominati saepe saepius rejiciuntur absque ulla causa vel e causis vere ridiculis et etiam catechetae jam approbati amoventur ad simplicem accusationem „reactionis”. Protestatio contra amotionem nihil valet, ad summum exponit amotum periculo detentionis.

Perdurat et de die in diem crescit vexatio religiosarum. Post laicisationem scholarum catholicarum commissiones statutuales separabant partes aedificiorum, quae scholis inserviebant, ab illis, quibus religiosae utebantur. Post quietem aliquot mensium incipiebant requisitiones novarum partium aedificiorum, absque ulla quidem necessitate, sed tantum vexationis causa. Titulus est: Etiam hae partes inserviebant mediate finibus scholaribus, ergo subjacent legi laicisationis. Et si non possunt religiosae vexari ratione scholae, occupantur aedificia ad alios fines, non raro per actio-juria reparanda adire possint. Sorores a S. Cruce expulsae sunt e domo principali in Zsámbék, aliis imminet sors eadem. In pluribus domibus sorores ita compressae sunt, ut vix respirare possint; ex parte jam in actuali dispersione vivunt et occupantur a Communitatibus catholicis in diversis operibus /:cantores, sacristae, cura infirmorum et pauperum:/. Fideles caritate vere exemplari adjuvant eas.

³⁹ Ibidem, f. 476.

⁴⁰ Ibidem, ff. 477–478v.

⁴¹ Ibidem, f. 479.

⁴² Ibidem, f. 480.

Expulsae sunt sorores e plurimis nosocomiis cum ingenti damno infirmorum, quorum etiam cura spiritualis de die in diem difficilior reddit. Curati enim magis magisque impediuntur in visitatione eorum.

Adjungo quaedam acta, quae pro seipsis loquuntur.

Colocae /:Kalocsa in Hungaria:/, die 11. Dec. 1949.

+ *Josephus Grősz*
archiepiscopus Colocensis

An expression of thanks

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to Péter Tusor, the leader of the Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group, my doctoral supervisor, for supporting my research and providing valuable insights, as well as undertaking the proofreading of this manuscript. I would also like to extend my thanks to Katalin Nagy, the resident of the Fraknói Research Group at the Vatican Archives, as well as to the staff members of the Historical Archives of the Papal Secretariat of State.

Bibliography

- [1.] Balogh, Margit: „Nem meggyőződésből, hanem kénytelenségből...”. Vázlat a katolikus egyház és az állam 1950. évi megállapodásának értelmezéséhez. In: Episcopus, Archiabbas Benedictinus, Historicus Ecclesiae. Edited by Somorjai, Ádám OSB–Zombori, István. Budapest 2016, pp. 485–509.
- [2.] Sági, György: A Kalocsa–Bácsi Főegyházmegye helyzete és Grősz József érsek tevékenysége 1944–1946 (PPKE BTK, bachelor’s thesis, thesis supervisor: Tusor, Péter). Pilicsaba 2011, pp. 42–44.
- [3.] Sági, György: Grősz József kalocsa–bácsi érsek megbeszélései Alvary Gascoigne budapesti angol követtel 1945-ben. In: Magyarország és a római Szentszék III. Exquisitae lucubrationes Cornelio Szovák amicabiliter dicatae (Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae I/21). Edited by Tusor, Péter–Kanász, Viktor. Budapest–Rome 2022, pp. 341–358.
- [4.] Sági, György: Grősz József kalocsa–bácsi érsek kapcsolatának alakulása a magyar állammal 1943 és 1961 között. Honismeret 49 (2021) 5, pp. 82–87.
- [5.] Sági, György: Grősz József, a válságkezelő és egyensúlykereső főpap. Újkor.hu 19th May 2021 <https://ujkor.hu/content/grosz-jozsef-valsagkezelo-es-egyensulykereso-fopap> (last accessed: 8th June 2023).
- [6.] Lakatos, Andor: A kalocsai érsekség 100 esztendeje (1909–2009). Kalocsa–Pozsony 2009, p. 58.
- [7.] Rétfalvi, Balázs: Czapik Gyula 1948-as római útja és az apostoli vizitáció ügye. Egyháztörténeti Szemle 12 (2011) 2, pp. 3–38.
- [8.] Lakatos, Andor: A kalocsai érsekség 100 esztendeje (1909 – 2009). Kalocsa–Pozsony 2009, p. 58.
- [9.] Kahler, Frigyes: A főcsapás iránya Esztergom. Mindszenty bíboros pere. Budapest 1998.
- [10.] Mészáros, István: „Állok Istenért, egyházért, hazáért”. Írások Mindszenty bíborosról. Budapest 2000.
- [11.] Izsák, Lajos: Pártok és politikusok Magyarországon 1944–1994. Budapest 2010, pp. 201–215.
- [12.] Sárga könyv: A Mindszenty-bűnügy okmányai. Budapest 1949.

- [13.] Fekete könyv: Mindszenty József a népbíróság előtt. Budapest 1949.
- [14.] Bölönyi, József–Hubai, László: Magyarország kormányai 1848–2004. Budapest 2004, pp. 138–139.
- [15.] Izsák, Lajos: Pártok és politikusok Magyarországon 1944–1994. Budapest 2010, pp. 309–315.
- [16.] Hajdu, Tibor: A Rajk-per háttere és fázisai. Társadalmi Szemle 47 (1992) 11, pp. 17–36.
- [17.] Rajk László és társai a népbíróság előtt. 40 év távlatából... Similar edition of the so-called „Kék könyv”; int. Zinner, Tibor. Budapest 1989.
- [18.] Szántó, Konrád OFM: A magyar katolikus egyház története 1945–1991. Miskolc 1992, pp. 18–19.
- [19.] Szántó, Konrád OFM: A magyar katolikus egyház története 1945–1991. Miskolc 1992, pp. 18–19.
- [20.] Bozsóky, Pál Gerő OFM–Lukács, László SchP: Az elnyomatásból a szabadságba. Budapest 2005, pp. 35–36.
- [21.] Hűség és megújulás. A szerzetesi élet Magyarországon 1950–2000. Edited by Fejérdy, András. Budapest 2021.
- [22.] Casaroli, Agostino: A türelem vértanúsága. A Szentszék és a kommunista államok, 1963–1989. Translated by Szerdahelyi, Csongor. Budapest 2001.
- [23.] Szabó, Ferenc SJ: A Vatikán keleti politikája közelről. Az Ostpolitik színe és visszája. Budapest 2015.
- [24.] Magyarország és a Szentszék diplomáciai kapcsolatai, 1920–2015. Edited by Fejérdy, András. Budapest–Rome 2015.
- [25.] Sági, György: Grósz József érsek 1990-es rehabilitációja és emlékezete. In: Arma: Tanulmányok a Colloquium Officiale III konferencia előadásaiból. Edited by Kiss, Alpár. Budapest 2018, pp. 267–268.
- [26.] Sági, György: Grósz József kalocsa–bácsi érsek megbeszélései Alvary Gascoigne budapesti angol követével 1945-ben. In: Magyarország és a római Szentszék III. Exquisitae lucubrationes Cornelio Szovák amicabilem dicatae (Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae I/21). Edited by Tusor, Péter–Kanász, Viktor. Budapest–Rome, pp. 351–352.
- [27.] Halálra ítélve. Papi sorsok ’56 után. Edited by Bellavics, István–Földváryné Kiss, Réka. Budapest 2018, pp. 62–73.
- [28.] Köpeczi Bócz, Edit: Az Állami Egyházügyi Hivatal tevékenysége. Budapest 2004.
- [29.] Szabó, Csaba–Soós, Viktor Attila: „Világosság”: az Állami Egyházügyi Hivatal és a hírszerzés tevékenysége a katolikus egyház ellen. Budapest 2006.

Lecturer: Dr. habil. Péter Tusor DSc, Research team leader, (ELKH-PPKE-PTE) Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group, university docent (PPKE BTK)

Támogatóink:



KULTURÁLIS ÉS INNOVÁCIÓS
MINISZTERIUM



KÜLGAZDASÁGI ÉS
KÜLÜGYMINISZTERIUM

Együttműködő partnerünk:



A pályázat a Miniszterelnökség megbízásából az Emberi Erőforrás Támogatáskezelő által meghirdetett Nemzeti Tehetség Program NTP-TK-M-22-0005 kódszámú pályázati támogatásból valósult meg.

XXVI. TAVASZI SZÉL KONFERENCIA

2023. MÁJUS 5-7.
MISKOLCI EGYETEM



MISKOLCI
EGYETEM
UNIVERSITY OF MISKOLC

