

ETHNICALLY BASED ENROLLMENT PATTERNS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CLUJ/KOLOZSVÁR, 1900–1944

ZOLTÁN PÁLFY

Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj
Romania*

This paper is an assessment of Hungarian and Romanian degree-holder contingents of the Cluj/Kolozsvár university in times of spectacular political change and relative social stagnation. This university has invariably been localized within a higher educational market mostly limited to the needs of the ethnically mixed population of Transylvania, needs that were seldom, if ever, reflected in equitable ethnic enrollment ratios. Local ethnic competition in and through the academe was always conditioned by external centers of political gravitation. The integrative role of the university altered each time the centre changed, and each time it was exerted not so much along socio-economic but along ethno-political lines. The late imperial educational commonwealth before World War I was largely dominated by the Magyar element. The subsequent nation-state framework reversed the situation to the advantage of Romanians in the inter-war period. This was followed by yet another turn-over between 1940 and 1944. All the while the university was less an agent of modernization than a fortress of survival in a continuous struggle for national dominance. Ethnic dominance tended to prevail over reform and social advancement, and repeated failures in the latter were ascribed to the presence of the rival ethnic other in the competition.

Keywords: academic market, enrollment pattern, university, nationalism, ethno-confessional cluster, academically-based elite, ethnic cleavage, majority, minority, ethnic revolution, social reform, sociology of education, history of higher learning, Cluj, Sibiu, Transylvania, Romania, Hungary

Introductory Remarks

Owing to its uniquely mixed ethnic surroundings, the national and confessional composition of the Kolozsvár/Cluj university was symptomatic for the underlying social inequalities as well as the advantages from which members of the ruling elite (and those culturally or socially associated with them) could benefit (Karády 1989). This local segment of the educational ‘commonwealth’ of the

* Str. Gen. Traian Moşoiu 71, 00-40-264-431505; E-mail: palfyz@yahoo.com

Monarchy proved to be limited in scope and highly selective as regards the various ethnic minorities.

Apart from the underlying strife for modernization manifesting itself during the decades at the turn of the century, the University was conceived of as a markedly Hungarian institution, presenting the local ethnic minorities with the chance of upward social mobility by and large via a change in cultural and national loyalty in favor of the Magyar element. Meager as it was, this perspective seems to have been nevertheless rejected by many Romanians since in their view integration in the above-mentioned sense would have meant 'disintegration' on the level of the ethnic society.

With the dissolution of the imperial bondage (that is, of the multinational Monarchy in 1918), the new political paradigms of successor states (each of which thought of itself as a nation-state) reshaped the self-identifying goals of Transylvanian¹ ethnic groups, both majorities and minorities, new and old alike. Among the problematic areas of heavily state-engineered political and socio-economic integration, cultural nationalization figures as both means and purpose.

A distinguishing feature of the post-imperial academic market was closure along nation-state borders, a stubborn market-protection from any eventual alien intrusion. Meanwhile, instability and repeated turnovers tended to hinder substantial qualitative expansion. This lack was compensated for by quantitative expansion on national grounds. The repeated instances of (ethnically framed) 'numerus clausus' and academic market closures/restriction along nation-state borders are illustrative in this sense, too. All the while, scholarly allegiances and career-expectations were hampered by exclusionary ethno-political drives. Irrespective of who dominated whom, the underlying assumptions were that ethnic domination can work as a substitute for reform and social advancement, and that repeated failures in these was due to the presence of the rival in the competition. Shifts occurring in the political realm induced a peculiar conservatism in the academic field in the sense that competition aimed at the conservation of the expectations concerning and the social functions of higher learning, not to speak of its inner structure. Implicitly or explicitly, the two dominant groups that periodically changed places aimed to monopolize positions in or attainable through the educational market.

The period surveyed is one of expansion and diversification of European higher learning in general, swelling student contingents in the less modern courses of study, and ethno-national friction in East-Central Europe, where expansion occurred without a significant diversification of study paths. In the latter case the competition tended to be inter-ethnic and the academic market was closely tied to the state-managed sector of labor-market.

The rapid growth in the nationalized academic sector was a sheer quantitative one, veiling an acute crisis in the modernization process of education (and not only this). Generally, for the first four decades of the 20th century, career-choices

were not strategic in the sense that they blindly followed the ephemeral tides of conjuncture. Unemployment became a constant challenge, pushing student masses towards (Rightist) political radicalization. Yet these phenomena were, in a most peculiar way, cause and effect at the same time. While the official standpoint was for ‘rationalization’, over-production served for ‘filling the blanks’ in the ranks of an educated middle class largely employed in state-bureaucracy either in the immediate future (in the case of Greater Romania) or in an envisaged future (in the case of Trianon Hungary).

While enrollment figures in general rose constantly in the period surveyed, inter-department enrollment ratios went roughly unchanged. In a specifically paradoxical way, ambitious plans for instant nationalization and integration compelled the ruling ethnic side to maintain the inherited structure. That is to say, law remained by far the largest department. It was followed by the medical school, albeit with considerable lacunae in its inter-war development. Letters and philosophy suddenly involved a large number of ethnic Romanians, an understandable switch if we keep in mind the former ethnic setup and the new acute need for teachers. Natural sciences was the least touched by the change of ownership in the sense that it continued to involve but a small number of students. On the whole, the period proved on average unfavorable for any modernizing of the scholarly structure. Rigidity of curricula is a matter of course in the rather stiff academic market that this curricula was intended to serve.

1. 1900–1920, the Hungarian Period

On the one hand, all through the period surveyed a clear distinction has to be made between law (and political science) students and others, the two halves having recruitment patterns that can be more or less traced down to some ethnic, denominational and social-group determinants.² For instance, Germans preferred engineering, Jews took up medical studies, Protestant Hungarians law, Jews and Germans showing a relative preference to vocational paths, the more ‘modern’ and academically demanding branches, Romanians demonstrating the lowest relative propensity for the same ‘modern’ courses of study, while the preference of Hungarian Christians, for obvious reasons lying in social profitability in a state-managed job-market, was for law and theology, to list but the most commonplace examples (Karády 1989: 301). Irrespective of the period in focus, all data in the tables presented in this paper are illustrative of the notorious predilection for legal studies, as well as of the fact that legal and medical studies made up the absolute majority as regards student enrollment shares according to study path.³

On the other hand, although to a varying extent, in most countries of East-Central Europe the state had characteristically overwhelming control of an unbal-

anced national job-market, becoming thus by far the largest employer. Owing to this, the political influence, social status and even direct income of any ethnic group depended largely on the extent to which it was able to secure itself positions in the state-sector. In other words, especially in the post-Monarchy setup, ethnic minorities were indirectly pushed towards the private sphere of employment.

Generational politics, combined with the natural liability of the university and its student body to politicize the issues of the day, made the universities 'workshops' of a national elite (Livezeanu 1995; Bíró 1992), so much the more since in countries like Romania or Hungary the educated depended far more heavily on the state via civil service employment than on the private sphere; hence the characteristically well-entrenched relationship between university training and state employment, a connection that refers both to Hungary and Romania, pre-and post war situations combined (Macartney 1937: 320). For the same reasons, legal studies were notoriously the most popular and swelled the ranks of university students to a far greater extent than any other study track in those periods. It is in this context that courses of study associated with the so-called free professions were less popular, while vocational training was the least so, and all that in a period marked by the under-development of the private sector in general, a noteworthy side-effect of belated modernization.

Irrespective of which ethnic group was dominant, there was a significant difference between majority and minority enrollment (implying career-choice) paradigms inter-ethnically, while intra-ethnic inter-departmental distribution of students is also meaningful, both in terms of the academically-based labor market supply and demand and in terms of ethnic strategies regarding such a labor market.

Invariably in the minority paradigm, Germans and Jews fared relatively well, since they tended to benefit from the opportunities opened in higher learning via the more 'modern' paths of study, or those that were basically out of the reach of the state-managed sector of the market. (The latter was crowded with members of the traditional Hungarian middle class anyway.) These two ethnic clusters were somewhat atypically 'modern' as regards ratio of urbanization, occupational strategies, level of 'embourgeoisement' and cultural orientation. In other words (and beyond situations when they felt compelled to do so), they could in general afford to compensate themselves via courses of study that moved them forward on the road of upward social mobility. The predilection of Germans for engineering, the massive over-representation of Jews in the medical profession (not to speak of their habitual over-investment in education), and the preference for legal studies on the part of the average Magyar element are just the few of the best-known examples of ethno-culturally based academic (and career) orientations (Karády 38).

As a minority, Romanians of Transylvania were in many respects placed on the other extremity of the above-mentioned modernization axis represented by Germans and Jews (Karády 36). The great majority of the Romanian population was of a markedly rural and traditional character (being only sporadically touched by the major changes that occurred elsewhere in Central, let alone Western Europe). Insularity and political apathy persisted until the end of the 19th century. Social grievances were all directed against the ruling Magyar element. There was scarcely any intra-ethnic clash among Romanians on the social plane. They tended to strive for self-preservation via passive resistance. Often their educational choices reflected and reinforced the same sense of group-solidarity and ethnically-minded strategy of social mobility via studies. They were on average not in any position to afford to break away from cultural traditions and ‘modernize’: instead of ‘compensating’ they ‘conserved’. The lowest relative ratio of academically-based lay career-paths displayed by this ethnic cluster is once again but one of the several examples that could be quoted to illustrate the point (see *Table 1*).

Again, while a relatively superfluous fulfillment of requirements in studies in the case of the Jewish contingent may be interpreted as being due to the urge of making the best of one’s studies as a channel towards assimilation, later ages of graduation and lower marks with the Romanians may, at least in part, be due to the linguistic hardships faced by these students in academic institutions in which the language of instruction was not their native tongue. Also, early graduation-age and excellence in school seem to be a largely cross-ethnic social class privilege, in which respect ethnic Romanians were on average disadvantaged if compared to the other major groups (Jews and Magyars). The age by which one had obtained a doctor’s degree was the lowest among the Jewish students, those belonging to the ‘dominant Christian confessions’ coming next, and the most advanced in age at the moment of their graduation were Romanian students of both confessions (Karády 36–37, 32, 47).

Beyond the ethnic composition of student contingents there were regional and geographical disparities as well, meaning, in general, that the probability of enrollment was greater, irrespective of nationality, for those who had been born in an urban community (the most characteristic segments of city-dwellers belonged to the mobile lower middle classes or the educated elite, that is, their willingness to seek higher education was much greater than that of the rural peasant masses, as were the opportunities available to them).⁴ Regionally speaking, there seems to have been relatively little inter-regional transfer. In other words, Greater Hungary’s second best university did not have a significant number of students (whatever their ethnic belonging) who had been born outside of Transylvania. This was by and large valid for the interwar period as well – see *Tables 4* and *5* (Karády 1989: 295).

Table 1. Distribution of students by native tongue at the University of Kolozsvár/Cluj
(sample years 1900–1901, 1905–1906, 1910–1911, 1912–1913)

Year	Department	Hungarian	German	Slavic	Romanian	Other	Total (100%)
1900/1901	Law and Pol. Sc.	661 80.90%	36 4.40%	11 1.33%	106 12.97%	3 0.36%	817
	Medicine	76 79.16%	3 3.12%	1 1.04%	16 16.66%	–	96
	Pharmacology	28 77.77%	6 16.66%	–	2 5.55%	–	36
	Philology	180 86.95%	23 11.11%	1 0.48%	3 1.44%	–	207
	Natural Science	69 82.14%	11 13.09%	1 1.19%	3 3.57%	–	84
	Total	1,014 81.77%	79 6.37%	14 1.12%	130 10.48%	3 0.24%	1,240
1905/1906	Law and Pol. Sc.	1,295 84.14%	67 4.35%	29 1.87%	144 9.35%	4 0.25%	1,539
	Medicine	134 76.13%	17 9.65%	5 2.83%	20 11.36%	–	176
	Pharmacology	69 84.14%	7 8.53%	4 4.86%	2 2.43%	–	82
	Philology	257 85.66%	19 6.33%	2 0.66%	22 7.33%	–	300
	Natural Science	99 86.84%	9 7.89%	2 1.75%	3 2.63	1 0.87%	114
	Total	1,854 84.23%	119 5.40%	42 1.90%	181 8.22%	5 0.22%	2,201
1910/1911	Law and Pol. Sc.	1,138 83.06%	57 4.16%	13 0.93%	160 11.67%	–	1,370
	Medicine	255 74.34%	30 8.74%	4 1.16%	53 15.45%	1 0.29%	343
	Pharmacology	94 87.03%	6 5.55%	–	8 7.40%	–	108
	Philology	174 89.23%	13 6.66%	1 0.51%	7 3.58%	–	195
	Natural Science	72 79.12%	14 15.38%	–	5 5.49%	–	91
	Total	1,733 82.24%	120 5.69%	18 0.84%	233 11.05%	3 0.14%	2,017

Table 1 (cont.)

Year	Department	Hungarian	German	Slavic	Romanian	Other	Total (100%)
1912/1913	Law and Pol. Sc.	1,059 83.71%	36 2.84%	8 0.62%	157 12.41%	5 0.39%	1,265
	Medicine	362 74.32%	37 7.59%	3 0.6%	83 17.04%	2 0.41%	487
	Pharmacology	85 79.43%	15 14.01%	2 1.86%	5 4.67%	–	107
	Philology	164 88.64%	12 6.48%	1 0.54%	7 3.78%	1 0.54%	191
	Natural Science	65 81.25%	10 12.50%	–	5 6.25%	– 80	–
	Total	1,735 81.68%	110 5.17%	14 0.63	257 12.09%	8 0.37%	2,124

Average Shares: by native tongue and by departments in the average of the four sample years

Year	Department	Hungarian	German	Slavic	Romanian	Other	Total (average)
1900–1914	Law and Pol. Sc.	1,041 83.31%	49 4.00%	15 1.20%	142 11.37%	3 0.24%	1,248 65.82%
	Medicine	206 74.35%	22 8.00%	3 1.00%	48 17.15%	1 0.25%	275 14.50%
	Pharmacology	69 83.13%	9 10.84%	1 1.20%	4 4.81%	– 4.37%	83
	Philology	194 86.35%	17 7.62%	1 0.44%	10 4.48%	– 11.76%	223
	Natural Science	76 82.60%	11 11.95%	1 1.02%	4 4.34%	– 4.85%	92
	Total	1,584 83.54%	107 5.64%	22 1.16%	198 10.44%	5 0.26%	1,896 (100%)

Source: Based on Sigmirean 2000: 119–125.

Of the total number of enrollments in all forms of higher education between 1900 and 1914, the Transylvanian university comprised but an average of around 13%. The Budapest university (without the Technical University) alone was more than three times the size of the Transylvanian one (2,112 on average) if measured in terms of enrollment figures. With its average in four sample years of 7,031 students, the former covered almost 45% of the whole Dual Monarchy higher education market (Ladányi 1999; Andorka 1979).

Within the larger Dualist framework the share of students with Hungarian as their native tongue grew from 84.9% to 88.9%. The low share of nationalities involved in higher education (that is, contrasted with their 48.6 among the total population in 1900 and 45.5% in 1910) is on the one hand due to a degree of suppres-

sion of ethno-national political movements. On the other hand, as in the case of Romanians gross under-representation is due to the social structure of this ethnic group: an overwhelming number of peasants, a very thin layer of urban middle class, and, consequently, a comparatively low cultural level and little propensity towards vertical social mobility through education. (The Magyars themselves were not much better off either in this respect.) The other extremity is manifest in the notorious over-representation of Jews in higher education, which they evidently found a major path towards emancipation and upward social mobility (Karády 1989: 285).

As the First World War neared, 'relative peace' at the multiethnic university of Transylvania was an impression eagerly nurtured by Hungarian onlookers alone. Irredentist, anti-Hungarian sentiments were there under the immediate surface. These were periodically pushed to the front by Romanian leaders active in politics (Bisztray et al. eds. 1941: 166; Márki 1922: 93). Indeed the issue of a separate Romanian university in Transylvania is at least as old as the history of the Kolozsvár Magyar university itself. Often the delegates of the Romanian minority asked for a Romanian line of study, especially in law. But the only concession was the creation of a department of Romanian language similar to the one that existed in the Budapest University (Sigmirean 1999: 36). As the first decades of the new century were marked by a strengthening of national sentiment on the part of ethnic minorities of the Monarchy in the face of the 'doom of assimilation', irredentism and nationalist resentments escalated. It is therefore no wonder that the issue of the university came up again in 1913–14, during the negotiations doomed to fail between Prime Minister István Tisza and the Romanian National Party, a failure symptomatic of the general irreconcilability between 'master nations' of the Empire and 'mastered' nations striving for one or another measure of national self-determination (Hitchins 1999: 399). Also, there is a similar antagonism, that of centralism versus federalism, as well as the idea that the minority-problem was no longer a matter of ordinary political give-and-take, but one of national survival itself.

There is evidently a gross discrepancy between Romanians as a slight majority in the population of Transylvania and the representation they had among the students. All through the pre-war history of the university the average number of Romanian students did not go above 10–12% of the total number. There was still a considerable number of ethnic Romanians among the students pursuing legal studies. The other faculty relatively favored by Romanians was medicine.⁵ (*Table 1* contains telling data in this regard.)

Romanians' intra-ethnic enrollment patterns according to social category (determined on the basis of the occupation of the father) betrayed noteworthy peculiarities in contrast with the 'dominant Christian' Magyar paradigm. The most important of these was that the father of virtually every third Romanian student was

in the category of peasants owing small or medium-size ‘estates’. In the case of both ‘Romanian’ confessions, a considerable number of parents belonged to the priesthood (34% in the case of the Greek Catholics and 24% in the case of the Orthodox faith) and to the small intellectual class, that is, primary school teachers (slightly above 10%). This means that from one third to one half of the medical students had such family backgrounds. Paralleling this ethnically based pattern of recruitment, there is the striking lack of representation of the Romanian petty bourgeoisie (3–4%), especially if we take into consideration the share of around 13% among the students of members of this social category in other denominational groups (Karády 36–37).

While unlike its Budapest counterpart the Transylvanian university did not have a department of theology, almost 50% of Greek Catholic and Orthodox (that is, Romanian) holders of a baccalaureate chose priesthood as a career, meaning three times as frequently as their counterparts in the other Christian faiths. Still, once they chose lay occupations, Romanians had a predilection for the free professions. The law and medical faculty were their first choices. There was no hindrance for them as ethnic Romanians to pursue other careers, but as doctors and lawyers they could more closely cooperate with their co-nationals in aiding them not only culturally, financially and socially, but at times politically as well. Unlike the obviously Romanian-minded Orthodox and (to a lesser extent) Uniate priesthood, those seeking a career in the free professions were often viewed as likely to assimilate both by their co-nationals and Hungarian onlookers, while the overcrowded civil service sector hardly presented ethnic minority candidates (especially Jews and Romanians) with any profitable opportunities (Karády 12, 37; Bisztray et al. eds. 1941: 298, 302).

A very important segment of the Transylvanian ethnic Romanian student body was nevertheless not studying in Kolozsvár/Cluj but in Budapest, the major academic center of Dualist Hungary, having a much greater attraction for Romanians who could afford to study there. In approximate figures, while around 2,500 ethnic Hungarians attended the local Transylvanian university during its “Magyar” period, the number of those who chose Budapest (more cosmopolitan, less pitted against any particular ethno-confessional group) amounted to slightly more than 1,300. If we consider other higher learning centers that Transylvanian Romanians frequented in the Monarchy, we may well assume that roughly 50% of this ethnic contingent sought their academic credentials somewhere other than ‘at home’, but were most likely sponsored from there (and on evidently ethno-confessional basis) (Bisztray et al. eds. 1941: 299; Sigmirean 1999: 47).

In the same vein, we should not forget that a large number of Magyar, German and Jewish Transylvanians, to mention but the main ethnic contingents, also chose Budapest for their university studies for varying reasons. It is self-evident that a diploma earned in the capital had greater professional and symbolic pres-

tige. Beyond that, geographic proximity and students' favorable financial status could also be decisive in making the move (*Doctori nyilvántartások... 1900–1915*).

2. 1920–1940, the Romanian Period

Together with the territories ceded to the victorious successor states, Hungary lost two of its four universities. One was in Pozsony/Bratislava, taken over by Czechoslovakia, the other in Cluj/Kolozsvár, the second largest university of the country, which fell under Romanian sovereignty. In both cases, the take-over meant that most of their academic staff and virtually all their student body became refugees in post-Trianon Hungary even before the ratification of the Peace and Minority treaties. Ethnic proportions and exclusionary overtones were completely reversed: it was the members of the ruling majority that benefited from nationalizing state support in higher education. (See *Table 2* for ethnically based enrollment patterns in the early 1920s.) Thus, even after the first and biggest wave of refugee students (around 2,000, virtually the entire Magyar contingent) leaving Transylvania shortly after the war, Hungarian students from the 'lost territories' kept flocking, then trickling into universities of Trianon Hungary throughout the 1920s, especially to Budapest⁶ (Mócsy 1983; Szögi 1991).

From the Romanian official point of view, Romanianizing the Cluj/Kolozsvár and Cernăuți/Czernowitz universities was but a natural and lawful consequence of the political union of Transylvania and Bukovina with Romania. The Romanian state had not only the right but the duty to take them into its custody and administer them according to its national goals. In the situation Romanian academics found themselves in after 1918 the factors necessary for an integrative (and, as it were, integral) nation-state seemed quite fortuitously to come together. Universities themselves served as factors of integration of the new provinces. Yet the reform-minded Romanian faculty of the newly nationalized university of Cluj/Kolozsvár soon had to learn the lesson of Old Kingdom-type political involvement ('politicianism' in Romanian, meaning unscrupulous political clientelism imbuing all spheres of public life), it must be admitted, not in every case to their professional or national pride. On the other hand, they stressed the importance of autonomy in academic and even administrative proceedings. In the context soon to be created, the two goals seemed to contradict each other (Pușcaș 1995: 40–48).

Along with the all-encompassing attempt to integrate the suddenly enlarged state, in Romania political instability induced social and economic uncertainty. This in turn hampered the contradictory pursuit of modernization itself. Instead, nationalism and nationalization became both means and ends in creating a centralized homogenous nation-state. Beyond its effects on ethnic minority education,

Table 2. Distribution of students at the Cluj/Kolozsvár University according to ethnic extraction and choice of course of study in the 1923–24 academic year

Department	Law and Pol. Sc.	Medicine and pharma- cology	Philosophy And Letters	Natural Science	Sub-totals per department	TOTAL per nationality
Romanians	729 (78.0%)	355 (67%)	216 (71.0%)	156 (80%)	936 48.9%	1,455 (73.9%)
Hungarians	81 (8.6%)	40 (7.5%)	47 (15%)	20 (10%)	533 27.0%	188 (9.6%)
Jews	91 (9.7%)	104 (19.5%)	10 (3.0%)	14 (7.0%)	303 15.4	219 (11.1%)
Germans	32 (3.4%)	27 (5.0%)	25 (8.3%)	3 (1.5%)	195 9.9%	87 (4.5%)
Other	4	7	5	2	1,967 100%	18 (0.9%)
Sub-totals	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

... and according to confession and place of birth

Department:	Law and Pol. Sc.	Medicine and pharmacology	Philosophy and Letters	Natural Science	Total
	by Confession				
Orthodox	403	249+12	138	114	516
Greek Catholic	327	94+0	77	42	540
Roman Catholic	55	9+41	38	19	157
Protestant	36	15+0	16	3	70
Evangelical	18	3+0	22	1	44
Unitarian	6	2+0	1	2	11
Israelite	91	100+8	11	14	224
	by Birthplace				
Old Kingdom	6	115+2	42	28	193
Transylvania and 'parts'	910	288+59	229	123	1,509
Bukowina and Bessarabia	6	55	15	31	106
Neighboring States, W, S-W	14	13	15	9	51
Other countries	–	2	1	4	7

Source: Based on *Anuarul... 1923/24 1925: 36.*

and to the detriment of the so-called provincial universities, the centralization of the academic market tended to over-emphasize and over-size institutions of higher learning situated in the capital city. For instance, if we do not count the theological faculties, the distribution of the 29,666 (100%) students enrolled in the four universities of Greater Romania in the 1926–27 academic year is as fol-

laws: law has a relative majority (45.18%), curiously (and symptomatically) enough, philology comes in second place (22.60%), while medicine is third with 19.63% and natural sciences fall to their 'usual' fourth place (12.60%) country-wide. Taken separately, the four universities presented the following order of size as regards enrollment ratios: Bucharest accounted for more than half (18,400) of the whole market, while Iași came in second and Cluj third with roughly 5,000 and 2,500 students, respectively. Put together, the other universities were left with only a minor fraction of the overall student contingent. With insignificant fluctuations, this distributional setup was maintained throughout the inter-war period (*Statistica învățământului* 1931).

One of the long-term results of unifying nationalization was the overall politicization of the academic sphere. Beyond ethnically-minded recruitment patterns, the immediate consequence was to be felt in university finances through staff eligibility criteria to students' guided career-choices and perspectives of positioning in the academically-based job-market. It was in the thirties that anti-Semitic and xenophobic drives came to the fore, resulting in attempts to remove the 'alien' element, especially Jews but Hungarians as well, to the intended advantage of the 'autochthonous element' (that is, native Romanians both in the academic sphere proper and in the overall setup of the job-market depending on academic qualifications)⁷ (Pușcaș 1995: 30–33, 237–242).

The great number of students attending the Cluj/Kolozsvár university at the beginning of the twenties is in part due to the peculiar positive discrimination this institution received in that period. In 1921–22 the Romanian government allocated more than three times as much money for student financial aid here than for all the rest of the university students of the country put together (Bisztray et al. eds. 1941: 326). A sizable autochthonous student body figured as an important piece of symbolic capital in the minds of the leaders of the university, not to mention the immediate practical result of producing state officials and trained personnel out of the midst of the ethnic Romanian population of the new province. (See data on Greek Orthodox and Greek Catholic students in *Tables 2, 4 and 5.*) Right before the war, in the four universities (Bucharest, Iași, Cluj/Kolozsvár and Cernăuți) that soon came together under Romanian rule, there were 8,632 registered students altogether. The figure grew at an astounding pace in the inter-war period: it was 22,379 in 1924–1925, 31,154 in 1928–1929, and reached an unprecedented peak of 37,314 by 1930. It was only by the late thirties that the efforts to curb the 'unscrupulous' overcrowding of the universities seemed to bring some palpable results. The effects of the measures taken were nevertheless more evident in the case of that segment of the student-body that was of non-Romanian extraction. The number of female students also dropped by one fifth (there were 672 female students in 1938). Except for this 'making way for the (male) autochthonous ele-

ment', the 'numerus Vallachicus' imposed in secondary and especially higher education bears no evidence of more rigorous selection within the Romanian group itself (Livezeanu 1995: 211, 235). (The contrasts between ethnic minority contingent sizes are self-evident in *Tables 4 and 5*.)

Overpopulation was a general concern of higher educational policies throughout Europe (Jarusch 1983). In addition to this perceived crisis, in countries like Greater Romania or Trianon Hungary the issue of education in general and that of over-production in higher education in particular acquired a strong ethno-national character. As soon as the 1920s rapid growth in student population nationwide resulted in overcrowding, a graduation record, and general frustration, distemper and uncertainty. Between 1914 and 1939 the population of Romania doubled, but the number of the students quadrupled (Pușcaș 1995: 46, 242). Yet overpopulation was neither unique, nor constituted the problem itself. It was the general backwardness that compelled most to consider the career of state official as the only feasible and profitable path that higher education entitled one to. Here, as in most of East-Central Europe, expansion of higher education meant no sizeable diversification, but rather was materialized in a heedless overcrowding of time-honored courses of study. Together with rigid centralization and dependence on state financial support, this blocked paths of curricular modernization and created extraordinary financial hardships affecting the majority of the students.⁸

While tendentious data-handling was by no means unheard of in the Dualist period, throughout the Romanian period of the university in Cluj there is a peculiar double-reading of enrollment data. While there was under-representation of minorities, especially of Magyars countrywide, Cluj Rectors repeatedly boasted about the considerable averages of non-Romanians – but also of women – among students, both coming as strong arguments as to how modern, tolerant and open to the Western way the university was. Meanwhile others stubbornly remind us of the 'outrageous' over-representation of minorities in the Cluj university. Willynily, one must admit that in terms of enrollment ratios – even if we discount the general enrollment ratio growth so characteristic of the period – Transylvanian Hungarians as a minority did twice as well as their Romanian counterparts during the Hungarian period of the university. Their middle-class constituency and propensity to make the most of higher education credentials were still at work in the inter-war period, even though they perceived it as a period of severe deprivation. Even more so since as hardly tolerated aliens, they tended to see to their academic endeavors and not to the overly shrill political ambitions of the day. Curiously enough, minority students were less liable to abandon school or do poorly on exams.

Overall, in the 1920s the numeric development of students with non-Romanian and non-Jewish background at the Cluj/Kolozsvár university was as follows: 105 in 1919–20, 183 in 1920, 189 in 1921, and growing to 606 by 1928, respectively.

Together with the Hungarians involved in higher education in Romania universities other than Cluj/Kolozsvár University, the figure amounted to 720 in 1928–29 and to around 1,000 in the next two years. Interestingly enough, in 1922–23 and 1928–29 (there were no data for 1919–21), the same source reveals the following figures concerning undergraduates who studied in Hungary and whose parents lived in Romania: in 1922–23, there were 2,104 such students, 1,751 the next year, dropping gradually to 901 by 1928. Thus, apart from smaller fluctuations, the increase in the number of Transylvanian ethnic Hungarians studying at home paralleled the decrease of the number of those who went to Hungary. Nevertheless, the first row of figures is continuously lagging behind the second, with a difference of about 300 (roughly 20% of the total) even in 1929, when the two contingents came closest to each other in size. (Albrecht 1930: 99) (*Table 3* refers specifically to ethnic Hungarian students.)

By the late 1920s there came a retrenchment of the ethnic Hungarian student population in two directions, denoting time-honored Magyar middle-class patterns. One is ‘horizontal’, that is, the tendency of growth encountered in the predilection for law studies goes in parallel with that of the Romanian students, and

Table 3. Enrollment in the Cluj/Kolozsvár University, with special regard to the ethnic Hungarian contingent, 1921–1939

Year	Department					Total	Hungarians
	Law	Medicine	Philology	Nat. Sc.	Pharm.		
1921/22	1,119	828	238	132	52	2,447	32
1922/23	1,256						
1923/24	936	427	303	195	61	1,967	
1924/25	967	524	404	214	66	2,175	
1925/26	1,073	577	489	218	--	2,357	
1926/27	1,185	622	527	220	--	2,554	
1927/28	1,147	509	578	355	152	2,741	
1928/29	1,079	646	709	455	132	3,021	
1929/30	1,519	769	735	625	111	3,757	753
1930/31	1,714	870	764	598	127	4,064	842
1931/32	1,691	955	684	463	331	4,124	935
1932/33	1,813	984	710	575	387	4,469	922
1933/34	1,779	1,048	691	554	--	4,072	1,127
1934/35	2,184	1,005	808	403	--	4,400	954
1935/36	1,827	956	570	337	--	3,690	753
1936/37	1,341	862	587	401	--	3,191	570
1937/38	1,321	895	582	357	--	3,155	566
1938/39	2,364	898	508	324	--	4,094	553

Note: spaces left empty mean that the respective data is uncertain or marked as unknown by the source. The enrollment figures for the first mentioned academic year are presumably erroneous.

Source: *Emlékkönyv* 1996: 30.

Table 4. The Cluj/Kolozsvár student body in 1930–31

Criteria of distribution		Department				Total		
		Law	Letters	Medicine	Nat. Sc.	Num.	%	
By sex	M	1,611	363	817	294	3,085	75.9	
	F	103	404	180	295	979	24.0	
TOTAL		1,714	764	997	589	4,064	100%	
Confession	Gr. Orthodox	519	310	466	217	1,566	38.5	
	Gr. Catholic	589	197	161	169	1,116	27.4	
	R. Catholic	205	103	134	77	519	12.7	
	Calvinist	155	76	69	30	330	8.1	
	Unitarian	33	6	5	4	48	1.1	
	Evangelical	68	46	35	31	180	4.4	
	Mosaic	145	26	92	7	302	7.4	
	Other	–	–	3	–	3		
Regional Origin	Romania	Transylvania and its Parts	1,498	539	607	380	3,024	74.4
		Old Kingdom	57	67	177	87	390	9.6
		The Banat	56	62	65	36	219	5.4
		Moldova	29	32	49	42	152	3.7
	Bessarabia and Bucovina	28	25	9	19	81	2.0	
	Neighboring countries	65	24	46	19	154	4.6%	
	Other countries	8	13	4	6	31		
	Ethnic Origin	Romanian	1,108	513	617	447	2,659	65.4
Hungarian		393	150	211	88	842	20.7	
German		68	57	41	41	207	5.0	
Israelite		145	26	124	6	301	7.6	
Slavic		–	14	1	7	22	0.5	
Other		–	4	2	–	6		
% by Department		42.1	18.8	24.5	14.5	100%		
Degrees Awarded	Lic.	19	92	36	59	206	8.3%	
	Ph. D.	96	2	30	4	132		

Note: The 'Medicine' column includes students in Pharmacology as well; there were 127 in this year (70 male and 57 female students, 36 were awarded a licentiate and one a doctorate, 42 were listed as ethnic Hungarians, 38 as Romanians, 14 as Germans and 32 as Jews, all students of this department were Romanian citizens).

Source: Based on *Anuarul... 1930/31 1932*.

Table 5. Enrollment to the Cluj/Kolozsvár University in the 1934–35 academic year

Criteria of distribution	Department				Total		
	Law	Letters	Medicine	Nat. Sc.	Number	%	
By sex:							
Male	2,050	325	830	244	3,449	80.2%	
Female	134	383	175	159	851	19.8%	
TOTAL	2,184	708	1,005	403	4,300	100%	
By confession:							
Gr. Orthodox	800	235	471	126	1,631	38.0%	
Gr. Catholic	707	153	163	93	1,116	26.0%	
R. Catholic	260	127	96	89	572	13.3%	
Calvinist	167	97	58	56	378	8.8%	
Unitarian	32	13	8	6	59	1.3%	
Evangelical	60	41	29	11	141	3.2%	
Mosaic	157	40	178	21	395	9.1%	
Other	1	2	2	2	7		
By regional origin (country of birth):							
Transylvania and its Parts	1,630	490	506	268	2,893	67.3%	
Old Kingdom Countries	161	72	231	46	510	11.8%	
The Banat	192	43	76	31	342	8.0%	
Moldova	48	32	74	17	171	4.0%	
Bessarabia and Bucovina	52	14	51	15	132	3.0%	
Neighboring countries	79	35	44	18	201	add	
Other countries	22	22	23	8	47	6.0%	
By ethnic origin:							
Romanian	1,507	399	632	219	2,757	64.1%	
Hungarian	459	196	148	142	945	22.0%	
German	60	65	34	18	177	4.1%	
Israelite	157	40	178	21	396	9.2%	
Slavic	–	5	8	5	18	add	
Other	1	3	5	–	9	0.6%	
% by department:	50.8%	16.4%	23.4%	9.3%	100%		
Degrees	Lic.	35	102		96	233	add
Awarded	Ph. D.	197	1	98	4	300	12.4%

Note: 50% of the foreign-born contingent are ethnic Hungarians (registered as born in Hungary, though only one of them bore Hungarian citizenship).

Source: Based on *Anuarul... 1934/35 1936*.

even exceeds it. The other is ‘vertical’, in the sense that it goes back to pre-war enrollment patterns of the then dominating Hungarian group. Over 40% of the Magyar student body at the Cluj/Kolozsvár university chose law, this most time-honored study-track, and intended to pursue careers that were traditionally made available through a diploma in law (*Anuarul...1929/30* 1930). Quite a few of these students were to be found in the political science track, since this was (for reasons discussed above) almost exclusively reserved for members of the dominant ethnic group. Less than half as many ethnic Hungarians chose medicine than those engaged in law studies. This is a striking trend in the enrollment patterns of ethnic Hungarians, since one would expect them to attempt to adapt to the altered job-market. At this time, private employment would have been more enticing for minority graduates, since career-paths made traditionally available via law studies were getting more closely under the purview of the state than ever.

Meanwhile Jews seemed to go through an academic retrenchment process that is curiously similar to the one witnessed in the case of Hungarians choosing to enroll in Cluj. In 1929–30, for instance, a little more than half of the Jewish contingent (238), 129 students, were enrolled in the law department (yet least of all in the political science track); and there were but 50 would-be medical doctors and even less pharmacology students (23) among them (*Anuarul...1929/30* 1930). This again betrays new-old expectations as regards the ‘traditionally Jewish’ medical and pharmacology departments.

Finally, of the three mentioned ethnic minority student contingents, the Germans seem, once again, to be most evenly and strategically disposed among the four faculties. There are but 48 would-be lawyers among them, with the greatest relative number within the contingent to be found at the letters and philosophy department (67, the best ratio of philology students within any ethnically-based minority student echelon). Twenty-three pursued medicine and 15 studied pharmacology; finally, there were 23 ethnic German students in the natural science department. Once again, German minority students seem to follow the most practical and practicable paths as regards higher education and envisaged career-choices, with a relatively high degree of adaptation to the chances offered by the new situation. As for ethnic Hungarian students, it was only in the mid-thirties that they felt compelled to make a switch towards philology and natural sciences. (*Tables 4 and 5* are illustrative for ethnically based enrolment strategies in the interwar period, too.)

3. 1940–1944, the Period of Division⁹

The geopolitical shifts that temporarily but radically altered the Central European status quo in the late thirties and early forties were viewed by revisionist

states as a long-awaited and well-deserved opportunity for ‘historic reckoning’. Twenty years before, the Hungarian university had become a refugee in Trianon Hungary. It now returned, forcing the Romanian university of Cluj into exile. Re-nationalization, that is, internal expansion via the reiteration of previous ideologies and practices, was the order of the day, and relocation was once again mistaken for modernizing expansion in qualitative terms. The practice of closed national markets with closed enrollment figures prevailed yet again. As in the inter-war period, turn-of-the-century student migration practices tended to degenerate into student repatriation for many and for almost all those who belonged to former ethnic elites in former nation-states.

In its ‘second Hungarian period’, Transylvania’s university and its ethnically-based clientele shifted in political space and moved in geographical space. According to the Romanian point of view the ‘transfer’ of the Franz Joseph University to Szeged had been a political illustration of the refusal to accept the territorial and geopolitical changes that had taken place in Central Europe after the First World War (Márki 1922: 127–154). In its turn, the King Ferdinand I Romanian University sought refuge in Sibiu (in what was now termed Southern Transylvania, still belonging to Romania) at the beginning of the Second World War, a war meant to reconfigure the ‘Europe of Versailles’ and create a ‘new Europe’. According to prevailing public opinion (but also in the eyes of the political and intellectual elite) both cases were associated with the tragedy of territorial losses, and this turned the university into a powerful national symbol. The transfer of the King Ferdinand I University to Sibiu and the return in autumn of 1940 of the Franz Joseph University to Kolozsvár/Cluj suggested the existence of a bitter conflict between the ‘Romanian University of Cluj’ and the ‘Hungarian University of Kolozsvár’ (Puşcaş 1999: 288).

Just as the Romanian-run Sibiu (Herrmannstadt, Nagyszeben) refugee university fostered national ideals, the territorial reintegration of the country included, so the renewed Hungarian university in Kolozsvár/Cluj was penetrated by war-time political and ideological trends. Both universities hosted lecturers and student group leaders who cherished extreme right ideas, racial discrimination and nationalist views pitted against each other in matters of historical rights and, ultimately, political formulas concerning territorial exigencies. Yet these trends are not characteristic of the majority. The moral conduct and academic standards that in the end prevailed over political extremism in both universities were clear signs of resistance against the abnormal conditions with which war-time higher education was generally faced (Joó 1990: 22–23).

Refugee-universities and the reasoning behind the decision to take the road of exile bore striking similarities, as did the manner of the takeovers.¹⁰ Takeover arrangements were peculiarly swift, and, beyond their content, their speed bore the symbolic message of ‘national redemption’ (Bisztray et al. eds. 1941: 373–375).

Each time the takeover had ample and well-aimed political resonances, while the consequences of the shift in terms of the local educational market seemed to come in second place. In times of crisis, the student-body of either university in Transylvania is conceived of as a ‘fifth column’ in the political clash over national territories. In a similar vein, the presence, quality and size of the national middle class was in both cases a main legitimizing factor of the presence and size of this or that nation-state.

The ‘new’ Hungarian university of Kolozsvár/Cluj offered opportunities for study for a total of 2,572 students in its first year of activity, 2,405 in the following year, 2,745 in 1943–44 and only 742 in 1944–45. Law no. 39 of 1940, issued on December 31, formulated the rules of admittance to higher education. These included considerations concerning ratios of admittance into the various departments according to the country’s ‘actual needs’ and the compulsory criteria of national loyalty and moral reliability. To avoid overcrowding at certain universities, it also reformulated the idea that enrollment policies should take into consideration the regional setup, that is, the place of origin or current place of residence of would-be students. If we estimate that for the 1942–43 year the average number of students (2,500) was maintained, the total number of students at the Franz Joseph University of Kolozsvár/Cluj in its last five academic years amounts to 10,800, even if each student studied for only one academic year there. Owing to the general political climate, minority students were present in only very small proportions. For instance, in 1943–44 those of Jewish origin made up only 3% of the student body and Romanians only 4.8% (*A kolozsvári magyar királyi Ferenc-József-Tudományegyetem Almanachja*, 1943: 83; Cseke et al. eds. 1999: 48).

Once again, tendencies towards gross over-sizing in the law department are obvious: it started with 1,480 students (1,368 in the spring), while medicine was chosen by a mere 359 (340), letters by 202 (200), and mathematics and natural sciences by 107 (111). Against all expectations economics, the only new department in the academic setup, drew only 301 (317) students. Again, less than half of the students chose courses of study that were less tied to state-administered career-possibilities for which educational credentials constituted entitlement. In other words, the new setup clearly bore the mark of the change of sovereignty on the one hand – filling the gap created by foreign rule in ethnically-based state-bureaucracy –, and represented a complete continuation of former orientations on the other hand (*A kolozsvári magyar királyi Ferenc-József-Tudományegyetem Almanachja* 1943; Gaal 2001: 121–124)

Beyond an implicit fostering of the cause of the traditional Magyar middle class (once again conceived of as the backbone of the Hungarian nation), the manner of handling registration data for 1941–42 (*Table 6*) betrays an increased social awareness and a keen preoccupation on the part of leaders with student backgrounds in terms of social class (implicitly, probable career orientations). Com-

Table 6. The student body of the Kolozsvár/ Cluj University in the 1941–42 academic year: distribution according to social background (parents' occupation), confession, and citizenship

Country of birth of students	Sem. II.	Parent's (tutor's) main category of occupation					Total per country
		Agriculture	Industry, mining	Commerce, banking	Intellectual (state/education/army/private/pensioned)	Other or unknown	
Hungary		201	225	201	1,054	230	1,911
Romania		24	50	38	271	64	447
Other neighboring country		4	1	–	20	2	27
Other country		2	2	2	7	8	21
Total per occupation of parents in Sem. 2		233	278	242	1,352	304	2,405

Confession:	Department						Total by confession
	Law and Pol. Sc.	Medicine	Letters and Phil.	Natural Sciences	Pharmacology	Economics	
R. Catholic.	615	207	98	59	9	202	1,190
Gr. Catholic	40	41	9	11	2	11	114
Gr. Orthodox	4	6	4	1	–	1	16
Calvinist	363	107	100	27	3	143	743
Evangelical	38	12	21	5	–	23	100
Unitarian	55	17	23	2	2	22	120
Mosaic	44	16	13	20	2	26	121

Citizenship (all figures refer to Semester II. and include both ordinary and extraordinary students)							Total by citizenship
Hungarian	1,118	390	253	117	16	410	2,304
From territory annexed to Slovakia	2	–	–	–	–	–	2
From territory annexed to Romania	38	13	11	8	2	17	89
Of foreign citizenship	1	3	3	–	–	3	10
Total, Spring Semester 1941/42: 2,405							

Source: *Beszámoló* 1942/44: 158, 184, 186.

bined data refer to place of birth and parents' occupation, while confession and citizenship of students are also noted.

In the same academic year (1941–42) the Romanian refugee university in Sibiu had 2,208 students, less than 10% of whom had some non-Romanian ethnic origin (most of these were Germans). Most conspicuously, Jews are altogether absent from the student contingent, and only a little more than half of the students indi-

cated Transylvania as their region of origin. Again, this is one of the few occasions when there were fewer students (690) engaged in legal studies than in medical studies (1,029), evidently as a side-effect of the war (*Anuarul ...1941/42* 1943).

In 1940–41 Hungarian sources indicated a total number of 101 ethnic Romanian students (with mother-tongue as the criterion) enrolled in the Kolozsvár/Cluj university, which once again had been remolded along ethnic lines. This number rose to 146 in 1941–42. With all the official lip-service paid to the idea of tolerance towards ethnic minorities, few Romanian classes, courses and topics were preserved at the university, and the average percentage of ethnic Romanians among the students in the first two years was a meager 2–2.5%. Even though the demographic belonging to this ethnic background had been halved by the Vienna Award and many of the Romanian students of the formerly Romanian university of Kolozsvár/Cluj had naturally opted to take the road of exile to Sibiu, the figures mentioned nevertheless indicate a gross under-representation of the Romanian community of Northern Transylvania at the Franz Joseph University. No doubt the Sibiu university mistreated Southern Transylvanian Hungarians in the same manner and for the same reasons. These parallelisms speak eloquently about the often emphasized ‘parity-basis’ that comes into effect in war-time minority affairs (Pusztai – Popovits 31–32).

Conclusion

Radical turnovers induced by geopolitical shifts left the academic framework proper and the scholarly content of Transylvanian higher education almost unchanged. Each time a rupture occurred, only a limited number of the elements seem to have been changed, while the main ‘organizing idea’ behind the whole was ethnic composition of student body and staff. Thus, the Romanian university of Cluj maintained the academic structure of the Hungarian university of Kolozsvár almost untouched, only professors and students came and went. The Sibiu university made a resounding commitment to keep up the scholarly integrity of the institution under dire circumstances. The temporarily returning Hungarian authorities themselves did their best to make the message clear: it was Transylvania’s ‘historic Hungarian’ university that they were now duly restoring to the returned ‘historic land’.

Throughout the period the academic field was part and parcel of the clash over which ethnic group was authorized to rule. Meanwhile, student enrollment patterns betrayed a tendency towards social conservatism in the sense that, beyond the short periods of ‘democratic opening’ that occurred after ‘academic turnovers’, the major tendencies of selection by social background were cyclically re-

trenched. Depending on who gained the upper hand, both the Hungarian and the Romanian academically trained elites carried out an inter-ethnic 'revolution' against each other, both failing in the long run to carry through the limited intra-ethnic social emancipation that higher education may in theory promise.

The series of measures aiming at Romanianization in cultural and educational affairs were part and parcel of the general social revolution intended to be carried out along national lines and interpreted as a matter of life and death by many Romanian leaders of the time. In social terms, the Hungarian 'cultural warfare' was not much better off, and much of what has been said about Romanian nationalizing efforts is valid for the Magyarizing strife in the academe as well. A true market-orientation in the academic market never prevailed in the first part of the 20th century. Market-restrictions did instead, but these were invariably imposed from above, that is, they were politically conditioned.

For most of the first part of the 20th century Transylvania's university followed a basically unilateral national paradigm in recruitment, organization and promotion of elites through educational credentials or scholarly endeavors. This was a pluri-ethnic setup, reluctantly admitting non-dominant ethnic and social group clusters in addition to the politically sponsored, relatively over-represented dominant ethnic contingent, whatever that happened to be. Just as the overall circumstances never really allowed for a multi-cultural arrangement in society, the local educational market seldom, if ever, represented more than a pluri-ethnic arrangement of a restricted scope. At best, there were parallel universities, like in the latter part of the period under scrutiny. These and their older counterparts were far from being bilingual. It went as a matter of course that one or the other 'national culture' prevailed. Whether assimilative or dissimilative, cultural domination was repeatedly reiterated as the 'foremost mission' of the university.

Notes

- ¹ As a matter of convenience, the references are made not to the so-called historic Transylvania or Transylvania proper, but to all the Eastern Hungarian territories ceded to Greater Romania in the 1920 Trianon agreement.
- ² In pointing out the general tendencies regarding recruitment patterns according to ethnic background, a combination of data referring to nationality (mother tongue) and religion seems the handiest. Usually statistics produced in the Dualist period and even after did not have a 'nationality' category as we understand the term today, but the two others mentioned above. Ethnic belonging nevertheless can be deduced from the combination of two markers, mother-tongue and confession.
- ³ Also, tables are illustrative for several eloquent phenomena: sharp changes in ethno-confessional composition of the student body; inter- and intra-ethnic shares according to study-track; the general growth of the student population; shares of ethnic groups within the student body

and the dynamics of rising figures and ethnic shares within and outside the temporal sections presented.

- 4 This is all the more important since the hierarchy of excellence attained in studies as expressed by age of graduation – as a rule, earlier ages of graduation both from high-school and from university were paralleled by a greater degree of excellence regarding the ethnic and denominational backgrounds combined (Karády 1989).
- 5 Beyond the statistics, though, there is a sizable group of Romanian intellectuals that has been trained at the Hungarian university of Kolozsvár/Cluj in the prewar period: altogether, 646 Romanians obtained a doctoral degree here, of which 519 were in law and political science (roughly equivalent with a licentiate, and relatively easy to obtain according to the conjuncture of the period, 99 in medicine, 10 at the faculty of philosophy, 8 in mathematics and natural sciences (Bisztray 1941).
- 6 Transylvania's university is not a unique case of post-war nationalization: similar take-over-situations occurred within the same short period: Czernowitz/Cernauti on the Romanian side, Pozsony/Bratislava on the Hungarian one, while Lemberg/Lvov and especially Strasbourg (going from German to French possession) are farther examples also worth recalling.
- 7 Once again, Romanian was not unique in that universities became hotbeds of Rightist movements. Hungary had its numerus clausus law, introduced as early as 1920 in a moment of shock and effective till 1928 (though to a lesser extent in the country's provincial universities). Here too, overcrowding went hand in hand with political radicalization towards the Right. The series of measures aiming at Romanianization in cultural and educational affairs were part and parcel of the general social revolution intended to be carried out along national lines, and interpreted as a matter of life or death by many Romanian leaders of the time (Kovács 1994; Livezeanu 1995).
- 8 Interestingly enough, most affected were Romanian students, since theirs was a more markedly rural background anyway, while Hungarians and Jews still kept most of their positions as town-dwellers, especially in Cluj/Kolozsvár. The other reason for the striking disadvantage ethnic Romanian students themselves were faced with comes from the direction of their economic background. It so happened that the Great Depression cut more deeply at the economic foundation of Transylvanian Romanians in general. This is not to say that Hungarians or Jews were so much better off. The discrepancy resulted mainly from the simple fact that the restricted economic networks ethnic minorities of Transylvania in general, and Hungarians in particular were compelled to resort to were less affected by the depression, since they depended less on the centralized resources of the state, which so massively promoted the Romanian socio-economic cause in Transylvania in the early twenties. Hence the relative decrease in the number of ethnic Romanian students, to the unexpected advantage of those with non-Romanian ethnic background. Needless to say, such side-effects of the 1929–1933 university crisis were soon heavily over-politicized, giving yet another push to the already existent xenophobia and Rightist-nationalist extremism (Pușcaș 1995).
- 9 This was when Transylvania was split into a Northern (Hungarian) and Southern (Romanian) part by the Second Vienna Award. Similarly, the region had two universities, clearly organized on ethnic bases and with clear political messages in mind.
- 10 Nevertheless, dislocation of student contingents, either as mass refugee-contingents or as a sum of individual choices has nevertheless radically different meanings in the first two periods under scrutiny: while pre-war ethnic Romanians enroll to the newly Romanianized Cluj university to return home, inter-war Transylvanian Magyar contingents chose to study in the 'mother-country' to move definitely to Hungary.

References

- A kolozsvári magyar királyi Ferenc-József-Tudományegyetem Almanachja, 1871/72–1918, 1940/41–1944/45* (Évenként) [Almanach of the royal Hungarian Franz Joseph University of Kolozsvár, 1871/72–1918, 1940/41–1944/45 (Yearly issues)]
- A kolozsvári magyar királyi Ferenc-József-Tudományegyetem Almanachja, 1941–1942* [Almanach of the royal Hungarian Franz Joseph University of Kolozsvár, 1941–1942] Kolozsvár: n.p., 1943.
- A Magyar Királyi Ferenc József Tudományegyetem Évkönyve az 1940–41 tanévről* [Yearbook of the royal Hungarian Franz Joseph University for 1940–41] Kolozsvár: M. Kir. F. R. Tudományegyetem, 1942.
- Albrecht, Dezső. “Az erdélyi magyar főiskolai hallgatóság” [The Transylvanian higher-education student body]. In *Erdélyi magyar évkönyv, 1918–1929* [Transylvanian Hungarian yearbook, 1918–1928] Edited by István Sulyok and László Fritz. Cluj/Kolozsvár: Juventus, 1930.
- Andorka, Rudolf. “Az egyetemi és főiskolai hallgatók társadalmi összetétele, 1898–1942” [The social background of students in higher education, 1898–1942]. *Statistikai Szemle*, 57, no. 2 (1979): 176–198.
- Anuarul Universității Regele Ferdinand I Cluj-Sibiu în al doilea an de refugiu, 1941–1942 [Yearbook of the King Ferdinand I University Cluj-Sibiu in the second year of its refuge, 1941–1942]. Sibiu, 1943.
- Anuarul Universității ‘Regele Ferdinand I’ pe anul școlar 1923–1924 [Yearbook of the King Ferdinand I University for the 1923–24 academic year]. 1925.
- Anuarul Universității ‘Regele Ferdinand I’ pe anul școlar 1920/21–1939/40 [Yearbook of the King Ferdinand I University for the academic years 1920/21–1939/40].
- Anuarul Universității ‘Regele Ferdinand I’ pe anul școlar 1929–1930 [Yearbook of the King Ferdinand I University for the 1929–1930 academic year]. Cluj, 1930.
- Anuarul Universității ‘Regele Ferdinand I’ pe anul școlar 1930–1931 [Yearbook of the King Ferdinand I University for the 1930–1931 academic year] Cluj, 1932.
- Anuarul Universității ‘Regele Ferdinand I’ pe anul școlar 1934–1935 [Yearbook of the King Ferdinand I University for the 1934–1935 academic year]. Cluj, 1936.
- Beszámoló a kolozsvári M. Kir. Ferenc József Tudományegyetem 1940/41–1943/44. évi működéséről [Report on the proceedings of the Kolozsvár royal Hungarian Franz Joseph University in the 1940/41–1943/44 academic years]. Kolozsvár: M. Kir. Ferenc József Tudományegyetem, 1942–44.
- Biró, Sándor. *The Nationalities Problem in Transylvania, 1867–1940: A Social History of the Romanian Minority under Hungarian Rule, 1867–1918 and of the Hungarian Minority under Romanian Rule, 1918–1940*. Boulder, Colorado: Atlantic Research and Publications, 1992.
- Bisztray, Gyula, Attila Szabó T. and Lajos Tamás, eds. *Erdély magyar egyeteme: Az erdélyi egyetemi gondolat és a M. Kir. Ferenc József Tudományegyetem története* [The Hungarian university of Transylvania: The Transylvanian university idea and the history of the royal Hungarian Franz Joseph University]. Cluj-Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Tudományos Intézet, 1941.
- Bolyai Egyetem Barátainak Egyesülete, ed. *Emlékkönyv a Magyar Királyi Ferenc József Tudományegyetem létesítésének 125. évfordulója alkalmából* [Memorial book on the 125th anniversary of the founding of the Royal Hungarian Franz Joseph University in Kolozsvár]. Budapest: Bolyai Egyetem Alapítvány, 1996.
- Cseke, Péter, and Hauer, Melinda, eds. *125 éves a kolozsvári egyetem: A Babeş-Bolyai Tudományegyetem magyar tagozatának 1997 november 21-én tartott emlékülés előadásai* [The 125 years of the Cluj university. Papers presented in the memorial conference of the Hungarian depart-

- ment of the Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj, November 21, 1997] Kolozsvár/Cluj: Komp-Press, 1999.
- Doctori nyilvántartások. Doctorok származási lapjai, 1.–15. kötet 1900–1915* [Doctors' registers. Doctors' provenience files, volumes 1–15. for 1900–1915]. Budapest University.
- Gaal, György. *Egyetem a Farkas utcában* [University in the Farkas Street]. Cluj: Erdélyi Magyar Műszaki Tudományos Társaság, 2001.
- Hitchins, Keith. *A Nation Affirmed: The Romanian National Movement in Transylvania, 1860–1914*. Bucharest: The Encyclopaedic Publishing House, 1999.
- Jarausch, Konrad, ed. *The Transformation of Higher Learning 1860–1930: Expansion, Diversification, Social Opening, and Professionalisation in England, Germany, Russia and the US*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Jóó, Rudolf. "Bevezető" [Introduction to] *A kolozsvári magyar egyetem 1945-ben: A Bolyai Egyetem szervezésének válogatott dokumentumai* [The Hungarian university in Kolozsvár in 1945: Selected documents of the organisation of the Bolyai University] Edited by Béla Barabás and Rudolf Jóó. Budapest: Magyarságkutató Intézet, 1990.
- Karády, Viktor. *A kolozsvári egyetem orvostanhallgatói, 1872–1918* (Kézirat) [The student body of the Kolozsvár Medical School, 1872–1918 (Manuscript)] 58 pp.
- Karády, Viktor. "Assimilation and schooling: National and denominational minorities in the universities of Budapest around 1900." In *Hungary and European Civilization*. Edited by György Ránki and Attila Pók. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Kovács, Mária M. *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Ladányi, Andor. *A magyar felsőoktatás a 20. században* [Hungarian higher education in the 20th century]. Budapest: Akadémiai Könyvkiadó, 1999.
- Livezeanu, Irina. *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation Building, and Ethnic Struggle, 1918–1930*. London: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Macartney, A. C. *Hungary and her Successors: The Treaty of Trianon and its Consequences 1919–1937*. London–New York–Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1937.
- Márki, Sándor. *A M. Kir. Ferenc József Tudományegyetem története, 1872–1922* [History of the royal Hungarian Franz Joseph University, 1872–1922] Szeged: M. Kir. Ferenc József Tudományegyetem, 1922.
- Ministerul Instrucțiunii, al Cultelor și Artelor, ed. *Statistica învățământului din România, pe anii școlari 1921/22 – 1928/29*. [The statistics of education in Romania, for the years 1921/22 – 1928/29] București: Tipografia Curții Regale, 1931.
- Mócsy, István. *The Effects of World War I. The Uprooted: Hungarian Refugees and Their Impact on Hungary's Domestic Politics, 1918–1921*. New York: Brooklyn College Press, 1983.
- Puşcaş, Vasile. *Universitate, societate, modernizare: Organizarea și activitatea științifică a Universității din Cluj, 1919–1940* [University, society, modernization: The organisation and scientific activity of the university of Cluj, 1919–1940]. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 1995.
- Puşcaş, Vasile. "The Cluj/Sibiu University, 1940–1945." In *University and Society: A History of Higher Education in Cluj in the 20th Century*. Edited by Vasile Puşcaş. Cluj-Napoca: Cluj University Press, 1999.
- Pusztai-Popovits, József. Az erdélyi románok kulturális helyzete a bécsi döntés után [The cultural situation of Transylvanian Romanians after the Vienna Arbitration Treaty]. Budapest: n.p., n.d.
- Sigmirean, Cornel. *Istoria formării intelectualității românești din Transilvania și Banat în epoca modernă* [The history of the formation of the Romanian intelligentsia from Transylvania and the Banat in the modern era] Cluj: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2000.

- Sigmirean, Cornel. "The Cluj University, 1872–1919." In *University and Society: A History of Higher Education in Cluj in the 20th Century*. Edited by Vasile Pușcaș, Cluj-Napoca: Cluj University Press, 1999.
- Szögi, László. "Párhuzamos utak: A kolozsvári és a pozsonyi egyetem válságos időszakának történetéhez" [Parallel roads: To the critical period of the history of the Kolozsvár and Pozsony university]. In *Tanulmányok a magyar felsőoktatás XIX–XX. századi történetéből* [Studies on the 19th and 20th century history of Hungarian higher education]. Edited by József Mihály Kiss. Budapest: ELTE, 1991.