

# HUNGARIAN HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY IN THE INTERWAR PERIOD

NATASA FIZEL<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

*In my study I aim to show the circumstances of the inception of “ideological” or, to put it another way, “parallel” departments of Ferenc József (Francis Joseph, in English) University, the predecessor of the University of Szeged, in the 1920s and 1930s through an accurate and complete exploration of archival sources. Also, by using a historical–sociological perspective, the religious affiliation and composition of students is examined as a supposed basis for the transformation of the university system in the early 1920s.*

*The denominational composition of students enrolled in the University in the 1920s suggests that among the university students who moved from Kolozsvár to Szeged the Protestants were in a larger number than their proportion in contemporary Hungarian society.*

## INTRODUCTION

The goal of this study, beyond briefly introducing the higher educational policy of the Horthy era in Hungary, is to open a window on a less well-known episode in the history of higher education policies, which serves very well to symbolize the educational policy conditions of the time, namely the history of the parallel departments established at the Ferenc József (Francis Joseph) University of Szeged. My goal, besides an accurate and comprehensive exploration of archival sources,

has been to establish a historical–sociological perspective which, through the actual denominational division of the students of the period, sheds light on the rationale of the efforts to transform the university according to the denominational composition of the student body. In order to do this, after reviewing earlier literature I consider it necessary to show the contemporary departmental structure of the Faculty of Arts, Languages, and History<sup>2</sup> which was affected by the establishment of new “*ideological departments*”, and place the new departments within that context. The subject of my study also includes the presentation of the denominational composition of the students studying at universities in the 1920s, and especially the changes that may have taken place in that decade. Finally, relying on primary sources, I would like to reconstruct a coherent view of events which led to the establishment of parallel departments.

### HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The iconic figure of the cultural policy of the Horthy-era is unquestionably Kunó Klebelsberg, Minister of Religion and Public Education. During the ten years while István Bethlen was prime minister, from 1921 to 1931, he formed four governments. Klebelsberg was one to remain longest among his colleagues, and in December of 1921 entered the cabinet as Minister of the Interior, then from 1922 to 1931 was head of the ministry responsible for cultural affairs.<sup>3</sup>

He was given the post to lead cultural and educational policy during a time that was difficult historically and financially, and soon he came to bear great responsibility. First, he had to modernize the internal structure of the school system in the country, since at the time of the Austro–Hungarian Dual Monarchy several new types of schools were created, ones which were supposed to be in harmony with the organization of a new educational system. Besides this, there could be no avoiding the need to modernize the curriculum in each type of school.<sup>4</sup>

His educational reform – as his whole cultural policy – was based on the idea of neo-nationalism or, to use another term, cultural nationalism. According to the theory of “*cultural supremacy*” it was necessary to raise a new kind of national feeling in as many people as possible in an ever widening spectrum of society, based on a new realization: we, Hungarians may not have any special, significant material or economic resources but we possess a vast cultural repertoire of values, and in this respect, we stand above the neighbouring countries created in the wake of the Treaty of Trianon after World War I.<sup>5</sup> Culture was the single area in Hungary, which even in a most critical historical period was able to give the country some kind of a leverage, a chance to put an end to the situation at the periphery so that the country could catch up with mainstream development.<sup>6</sup> As C. H. Becker, the Prussian minister of public education writes about Klebelsberg: “*All of Europe was impressed by this intention*

*to advance culture, this unshakeable belief, that Hungary might again be great if the world were to regard it not as a small military power but a defining and essential cultural factor.*"<sup>7</sup> It is important for this to appear in the educational system based on a realistic national self-consciousness as well as an emphasis on sensible national self-esteem. This requires a modern system of educational institutions of a European standard.

### **KLEBELSBERG'S EDUCATIONAL REFORM**

Between 1926 and 1930 Klebelsberg undertook a large-scale construction project for community public schools and teachers' housing: mostly from state funds, nearly five thousand community primary schools and homes for teachers were built in the rural areas of the Great Plains. In 1928 a bill was worked out proposing four-year rural elementary schools to be transformed into eight-year community primary schools. Due to the economic crisis the plan began to be implemented only in the early 1940s. In the 1920s primary schools received a new curriculum while the theoretical and practical programs of industrial as well as commercial apprentice schools were modernized, too. The reform of eight-year secondary schools was introduced in 1924 and 1926. From then on secondary school students could learn at one of six types of institutions, all providing general education though with different curricula.<sup>8</sup>

As minister in 1923, he created the five-year modern college of education for lower primary teachers, and in 1926 kindergarten teacher training was converted into a four-year institution. In 1928 in Szeged, he founded the Apponyi Kollégium, a college for the training of teachers of pedagogy, an entirely new institution in the history of Hungarian education. In 1928 the foundations of upper primary school teacher training were also upgraded along with the opening of the state-run Upper Primary School Teacher Training College in Szeged.<sup>9</sup>

He had a significant role in transplanting the Mining and Forestry Academy from Selmechánya to Sopron, and in establishing the College of Physical Education in Budapest. He created the National Scholarship Council, the Hungarian Historical Institution opened its doors in Rome, and the Collegium Hungaricum did so in Vienna, Berlin, and Rome. In 1930 a law was signed creating the National Natural Sciences Foundation as well as the National Natural Sciences Council, about the large-scale development of natural sciences departments at the universities of Budapest and Szeged, grand construction projects in Szeged, Debrecen, Pécs and Sopron. This is when the National Archives of Hungary's modern complex was built in the Castle District. Klebelsberg founded the Tihany Biological Institute and the Svábhegy Observatory in Buda.<sup>10</sup>

He had an unshakeable faith in the civilizing effect of universities and the intelligentsia.<sup>11</sup> He believed in the fruitful relationship between the middle class and the "people", that a national influence from above and a popular one from below would unite.<sup>12</sup>

## HISTORY OF THE FERENC JÓZSEF UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED

The development of the Ferenc József University in Kolozsvár (today named Cluj in Transylvania, Romania) was uninterrupted until the outbreak of World War I. A defining turn in its history occurred when the Romanian army entered Kolozsvár on December 24, 1918.<sup>13</sup> On May 12, 1919, the Romanian military occupied the university as well, then appointed the professor of the Romanian department as head of the rector's office.<sup>14</sup> After the Romanian occupation of the city, university instructors refused to take an oath necessary to attain Romanian citizenship, so they were expelled from the city. The teachers thus forced to flee first continued work in Budapest (typically in the Paedagogium). The exiled Hungarian university opened its first academic year on October 9, 1921, which marked the beginning of university education in Szeged. Legally, this took place within the framework of the University of Kolozsvár since it did not involve founding a new university. There was no change in the organization of the university, it continued operation with four faculties: liberal arts, law, natural sciences and medicine.<sup>15</sup>

Thus there were four universities in operation in Hungary between the two World Wars: in Budapest, Debrecen, Pécs, and Szeged.

## COMPOSITION OF THE STUDENT BODY AT THE FACULTY OF ARTS IN LIGHT OF RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

One of the striking structural consequences of the breakup of historic Hungary was ethnic unification, which led to the homogenization of religious affiliations. According to data from the censuses of 1920 and 1930 (*Table 1.*), the religion of nearly two-thirds of society was Roman Catholic. Besides this, the role of the Reformed denomination can be considered to be substantial, since one in every five Hungarians belonged to this faith. Finally, there was a nearly identical representation of the Evangelical/Lutheran (~6%) and the Jewish (~5.5%) faiths.

*Table 1. Confessional distribution of the population of Hungary 1920–1930.*

	Roman Catholic	Greek Catholic	Eastern Orthodox	Augsburg Evangelical	Reformed	Unitarian	Jewish	Other	Total
1920	63.9%	2.2%	0.6%	6.2%	21%	0.1%	5.9%	0.1%	100%
1930	64.8%	2.3%	0.5%	6.1%	20.9%	0.1%	5.1%	0.2%	100%

Source: Gyáni, Gábor – Kövér, György: *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a reformkortól a második világháborúig.* Budapest, 2001. pp. 212–219.

The denominational affiliations of students at the university in Szeged (similar to other contemporary educational institutions) at this time was considered a matter of public record, at the time of enrolment the student's religious affiliation was recorded in the register. Among Roman Catholics, the proportion of university students (49.43%) was nearly 15% less than that in the population as a whole. (Table 2.) No doubt, the reason for this was that in Northern Transylvania the proportion of Roman Catholics was only 20%, and many of the students of Kolozsvár followed their alma mater and continued their studies in Szeged. This explanation is supported by the fact that in the academic year of 1926/27, the number of Roman Catholics was already approaching two thirds, almost 60%. Nevertheless, this proportion still did not reach the one measured in the population as a whole, although at the university in Szeged there was a conspicuously large number of students who were nuns. The reason for this was that upper primary school teacher training by female religious orders had been terminated by Kunó Klebelsberg, the minister in charge, and the higher education of nuns was to take place at the University of Szeged instead.<sup>16</sup>

The Transylvanian connection may also have been the reason for the high representation of Unitarians, since compared with their 0.1% share of the total population, in the academic year of 1922 they represented 2.19% of students at the university.

The third denominational group, which was greatly over-represented in higher education in comparison with the general population, was that of the Jewish faith. The changes in their number and percentage in time clearly show the effects of the discriminatory law called *Numerus Clausus*. While in 1922, 20.28% of enrolling students were Jewish, in 1926 this dropped to 12.1%.

Table 2. Confessional distribution of students at Ferenc József University.

Academic Year	Roman Catholic	Greek Catholic	Greek Orthodox	Augsburg Evangelical	Protestant	Reformed	Jewish	Total
1922/ 23. I.	563 stu. 49.43%	12 stu. 1.06%	7 stu. 0.62%	60 stu. 5.27%	241 stu. 21.15%	25 stu. 2.19%	231 stu. 20.2%	1139 stu. 100%
1923/ 24. I.	642 stu. 54.18%	18 stu. 1.52%	7 stu. 0.6%	68 stu. 5.73%	241 stu. 20.34%	23 stu. 1.94%	186 stu. 15.6%	1185 stu. 100%
1924/ 25. I.	578 stu. 53.03%	12 stu. 1.1%	9 stu. 0.83%	61 stu. 5.6%	257 stu. 23.58%	21 stu. 1.93%	152 stu. 13.93%	1090 stu. 100%
1925/ 26. I.	605 stu. 55.97%	11 stu. 1.02%	7 stu. 0.65%	50 stu. 4.63%	247 stu. 22.85%	19 stu. 1.75%	142 stu. 13.13%	1081 stu. 100%
1926/ 27. I.	697 stu. 58.57%	14 stu. 1.18%	7 stu. 0.59%	67 stu. 5.64%	250 stu. 21%	11 stu. 0.92%	144 stu. 12.1%	1190 stu. 100%

Source: Beszámoló a Szegedi M. Kir. Ferenc József Tudományegyetem 1922/23–1926/27. évi működéséről. Szeged, 1929. pp. 396–397.

Looking at the confessional distribution of students at the Faculty of Arts in Szeged (*Table 3.*) it becomes clear that in the first half of the 1920s their religious affiliations were similar to those of the student body as a whole, except for the fact that Unitarians did not show at this faculty. In the second half of the decade, however, following the process outlined earlier, the proportion of Roman Catholics rose by almost 10% (from 54.84% to 63.33%), and thus it nearly matches their percentage in the population as a whole (64.8%). Between 1922 and 1926, the representation of the Reformed faith fell by nearly the same proportion as that of the Roman Catholics rose, that is, by nearly 10 percentage points (from 25.8% to 16.67%).

Thus, not only at the university as a whole, but also within the Faculty of Arts we can see signs that the composition of the student body with regard to religious affiliation changed quite quickly and significantly in the years following the relocation of the university. This was a process which clearly favoured Roman Catholic representation.

*Table 3. Confessional distribution of students at the Faculty of Arts.*

Academic Year	Roman Catholic	Greek Catholic	Augsburg Evangelical	Reformed	Jewish	Total
1922/23. I.	17 stu. 54.84%	–	1 stu. 3.23%	8 stu. 25.8%	5 stu. 16.13%	31 stu. 100%
1923/24. I.	22 stu. 55%	–	2 stu. 5%	10 stu. 25%	6 stu. 15%	40 stu. 100%
1924/25. I.	30 stu. 60%	1 stu. 2%	2 stu. 4%	11 stu. 22%	6 stu. 12%	50 stu. 100%
1925/26. I.	37 stu. 64.91%	1 stu. 1.75%	2 stu. 3.51%	11 stu. 19.3%	6 stu. 10.53%	57 stu. 100%
1926/27. I.	57 stu. 63.33%	–	8 stu. 8.89%	15 stu. 16.67%	10 stu. 11.11%	90 stu. 100%

Source: *Beszámoló a Szegedi M. Kir. Ferenc József Tudományegyetem 1922/23–1926/27. évi működéséről. Szeged, 1929. pp. 396–397.*

### The creation of parallel departments

In 1921, when the university was relocated to Szeged, positions remained vacant in 20% of the 15 liberal arts departments of the Faculty of Arts. The reason for this could be that a certain number of the professors did not relocate with the university from Kolozsvár to Szeged. Although the departments were set up in the first academic

year, they still needed to be staffed with appropriate experts who first had to be found and invited to the university. The remaining 12 departments were also staffed by a total of only 10 professors.

As we saw in the previous section, from year to year an ever greater percentage of students belonged to the Catholic denomination, and there were a large number of nuns as well. During this period both Lajos Dézsi, director of the Institute of Hungarian Literary History, György Bartók, director of the Philosophical Institute, and Sándor Imre, director of the Pedagogical Institute, were Protestants.<sup>17</sup>

On October 20, 1926, at the second annual meeting of the Faculty of Arts, Dean György Bartók announced that the minister of religion and public education wished to establish new departments at the university. The faculty considered Sándor Imre's proposal for a pedagogical–psychological department, Árpád Buday's proposal to organise an art history department and a department of ethnography to be the most urgent and the most important.<sup>18</sup>

These proposals helped Klebelsberg to push through his earlier plans, and so that this would not hurt knowledgeable and hardworking professors, the minister wanted to solve the issue by creating parallel departments.

On June 29, 1928, at a special session of the Faculty of Arts, the question of parallel departments was discussed. The chair, Dean Antal Horger asked for the faculty's opinion as to requesting the minister to establish a second philosophical or a second pedagogical department. Sándor Imre and György Bartók did not recommend establishing parallel departments, they asked for the establishment of a pedagogical–psychological department instead, which proposal was eventually accepted by the faculty.<sup>19</sup>

Based on decree No. 51.587-1928. IV. of the Royal Hungarian Ministry of Religion and Public Education it seemed that the debate was closed, and the minister made the decision that "*Ferenc József University of Szeged shall have four new departments organised, namely for ethnography, for a second philosophy, a second Hungarian literary history and for a second pedagogy department*".<sup>20</sup>

Despite the issuance of the decree there was continued resistance by the faculty to creating new departments. In December 1928, Gedeon Mészöly, dean of the Faculty of Arts informed the minister that the members of the committee tasked with filling the second philosophical department had resigned their posts on the committee for "*a wide set of reasons*".<sup>21</sup> Among these reasons was an editorial in the December 16, 1928 issue of the *Nemzeti Újság* newspaper, which quoted Klebelsberg making the following statement: "*At the university in Szeged, I am ready to establish parallel departments besides those filled by non-Catholic men, and to name Catholic teachers to those positions so that the lady mother superiors*

*of the province should have no concerns. Let the female religious orders educate teachers here for their primary and secondary schools as well as for their (lower primary) teacher training colleges.”*<sup>22</sup>

Through informal channels Klebelsberg learned that a petition was being prepared against the changes in Szeged and he addressed a resentful letter to the rector of the university, who in 1928–1929 happened to be Lajos Dézsi. In his letter, the minister remarked that the Savings Committee had recommended the complete closing down of the whole university in Szeged, an intention which was supported by the low number of enrolled students. As one member of the committee sardonically noted, *“the Faculty of Arts departments have more teachers than students”*.<sup>23</sup> Klebelsberg also stated in his letter, that without his intervention the Faculty of Arts in Szeged would have hardly survived his ministerial term. What had he done to preserve the University? He had initiated the construction of university buildings; *“one of the reasons I moved the Paedagogium and the college of the Erzsébet Women’s School to Szeged was to help fill the Faculty of Arts.”*<sup>24</sup> and this is how the upper primary school teacher training of the nuns got to Szeged. *“My motivations were again pedagogical, namely raising the standard of education by female religious orders since for a significant proportion of Hungarian girls this is the only source of education. But besides this, I also had in mind to further popularize the liberal arts departments in Szeged because these departments can only flourish if they have a truly large number of students.”*<sup>25</sup> He also mentioned the fact that although the article that had appeared in *Nemzeti Újság* presented the plan to create the ideological departments as his own, in fact, it was the position of the bishops. He rejected the charge of denominational bias in the most forceful possible terms, referring to recent changes in the staff: *“I have just named (...) József Baló, Gyula Darányi, Endre Jeney, and Albert Szent-Györgyi (...), all of whom are Protestant men. This is not a consideration when it comes to making my choice, but it may also not be a consideration when discussing the interests of the university in Szeged, or the interests of other denominations, which are equally justified.”*<sup>26</sup>

The claims about the size of the student body are not exaggerated. In the first academic year after the institution was relocated, in contrast with the total size of the student body in all of the different faculties (1007 students), there were surprisingly few students enrolled at the Faculty of Arts. There were only 29 regular and 10 irregular students registered in the yearbooks. Over the following years this number slowly rose, and so, for instance, in 1924/25 there were 48 regular and 2 irregular students, and in 1930/31 there were 215 regular and 3 irregular students enrolled at the faculty. As a consequence of the number of enrolled students, in the 1920s institutes (departments) at the Faculty of Arts were made up of the heads of the institutes. They taught all the courses by themselves.<sup>27</sup>

In January 1929, as suggested by Bishop László Ravasz the presidium of the ecumenical convent of the Reformed Church, and in accordance with Bishop Ravasz and chief caretaker Jenő Balogh, the ecumenical convent also submitted a proposal to the prime minister on the issue, but a proposal was also submitted to the government by the leadership of the Evangelical Church in this matter.<sup>28</sup>

Klebensberg did not retract the decree made earlier to establish parallel departments, and so in the end the administrative process to fill the departments of the Faculty of Arts did take place. On June 13, 1929, the applications that had been received were presented at the faculty meeting. A total of nine applications had been received for the three newly organized departments. For the Second Philosophy Department Dr. János Mester, Dr. Cecil Bognár, Dr. József Somogyi and Dr. István Boda submitted applications. For the Second Pedagogy Department Dr. Hildebrand Várkonyi, Dr. János Mester, Dr. Lajos Berenkay applied; for the Second Hungarian Literary History Department Sándor Sík and Dr. Gyula Földessy submitted applications.<sup>29</sup>

By the beginning of the academic year 1929/30, the applications had been judged. The faculty chose Dr. József Somogyi as head of the Second Philosophy Department in the first place, Dr. Cecil Bognár in the second and Dr. János Mester in the third. For the Second Pedagogy Department Dr. Hildebrand Várkonyi was selected as the first and Dr. János Mester as the second candidate. Sándor Imre continued to feel it important to emphasize his disapproval of the establishment of new departments, and so he moved to have all the documents related to the creation of the new departments to be made public. He asked the faculty to end the secrecy of these documents. Following the decision of the faculty, he put his request before the University Senate.<sup>30</sup> According to the University Senate's decision, however, the records of the faculty would not be made public.<sup>31</sup>

In December of 1929, the first "*ideological*" department was filled. Kunó Klebensberg appointed the Benedictine monk Dr. Hildebrand Várkonyi to head the Department of Pedagogy–Psychology.<sup>32</sup> Catholic professors also became the heads of the other two parallel departments. Sándor Sík became the head of the Second Literary History Department, and János Mester became the head of the Second Philosophy Department.<sup>33</sup> (*Table 4.*)

The parallel departments did not last long. After the death of Lajos Dézsi in 1932, the Piarist professor Sándor Sík united and led the two Hungarian literary history departments. After Sándor Imre left for Budapest, the new Pedagogy–Psychology Department merged with the earlier Department of Pedagogy in 1934; later when Hildebrand Várkonyi moved to Kolozsvár (Cluj) in 1940, the Second Philosophy Department ceased existence and János Mester took over of the Department of Pedagogy–Psychology.

Table 4. Changes in the institutional structure of the Faculty of Arts

Academic year 1921/22	Head	Academic year 1930/31	Head
Department of Philosophy	György Bartók	Department of Philosophy I.	György Bartók
		Department of Philosophy II.	János Mester
Department of French Philology	Lajos Karl	Department of French Philology	Béla Zolnai
Department of Greek Philology	Gyula Hornyánszky	Department of Classical Philology	Aurél Förster
Department of Indo-Germanic Linguistics	Unfilled	Department of Indo-Germanic Linguistics	Henrik Schmidt
Department of Latin Philology	János Csengery	Department of Classical Philology	Aurél Förster
Department of Mediaeval and Modern History	Sándor Márki	Department of Mediaeval and Modern History	József Fögel
Department of Hungarian Literary History	Lajos Dézsi	Department of Hungarian Literary History I.	Lajos Dézsi
		Department of Hungarian Literary History II.	Sándor Sík
Department of Hungarian Cultural History	László Erdélyi	Department of Hungarian Cultural History	László Erdélyi
Department of Hungarian Linguistics	Antal Horger	Department of Hungarian Linguistics	Antal Horger
Department of Hungarian History	László Erdélyi	Department of Hungarian History	Elemér Mályusz
Department of German Linguistics	Henrik Schmidt	Department of German Philology	Henrik Schmidt
Department of Ancient Cultural History	János Csengery	Department of Cultural History	Árpád Buday
Department of Ancient History	Unfilled	Department of Ancient History	Aurél Förster
Department of Pedagogy	István Schneller	Department of Pedagogy	Sándor Imre
		Department of Pedagogy–Psychology	Hildebrand Várkonyi
Department of Ural-Altai Philology	Unfilled	Department of Ural-Altai Linguistics	Gedeon Mészöly
		Department of Ethnography	Sándor Solymossy

Source: Szentirmai, László – Ráczné Mójzes, Katalin (ed.): *A Szegei Tudományegyetem múltja és jelene, 1921–1998*. Szeged, 1999.

**SUMMARY**

In my study, I aimed to show an interesting episode in the history of the Royal Hungarian Ferenc József University, by briefly presenting the educational policy of the time along with the history of the establishment of some “ideological” departments. In addition to the circumstances under which the university was relocated to Szeged, my study showed the political and social environment in which these events occurred.

Results show that although most of the city of Szeged which was the new home of the university was of the Catholic faith, the confessional distribution of members of the university at the beginning of the 1920s did not match that of the whole country following the Treaty of Trianon. Within a few years this situation changed radically, and the representation of Catholics in the student body came close to matching their representation in the population as a whole. Besides a desire to maintain the status quo in the composition of the staff since the university had been removed from Kolozsvár, a religious shift may have been another reason for the development of a conflict between the university and the minister, as far as the establishment of parallel departments is concerned. Klebelsberg’s educational policy strove above all to strengthen the position of higher education, and in particular the role of higher education in Szeged, and for that he needed university students. Since a part of these students came to the university from religious schools or in lack of religious higher education, the minister made concessions to the Catholic lobby.

However, the story does not end there. In 1940, the university moved back to Kolozsvár, and pursuant to the reorganization of the university that was “left in Szeged” the Philosophy Department remained again without a Catholic professor. A Protestant, Dr. József Halasi Nagy from the University of Pécs was appointed professor to follow the papal prelate János Mester.<sup>34</sup> However, this episode expands the scope of this study and it may be a subject of further research.

**NOTES**

<sup>1</sup> Natasa Fizel is a PhD-candidate at the Faculty of Arts, University of Szeged.

<sup>2</sup> Henceforth: Faculty of Arts.

<sup>3</sup> Romsics, Ignác: *Bethlen és Klebelsberg*. (Henceforth: Romsics, 1995.) In: Zombori, István (ed.): *Gróf Klebelsberg Kunó emlékezete*. Szeged, 1995. (Henceforth: Zombori, 1995.) p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Mészáros, István: *Klebelsberg Kunó, az iskolareformer*. (Henceforth: Mészáros, 1995) In: Zombori, 1995. p. 46.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 48–50.

<sup>6</sup> T. Kiss, Tamás: *Állami művelődéspolitika az 1920-as években*. Budapest, 1998. pp. 13–14.

<sup>7</sup> Translation by Natasa Fizel. Original: “*Imponierend war für ganz Europa dieser Wille zur Kultur, dieser unerschütterliche Glaube, dass Ungarn nur wieder gross werden könne, wenn die Welt in ihm nicht eine kleine Militärmacht, sondern einen grossen und unentbehrlichen Kulturfaktor zu würdigen lernen würde.*” (*Gróf Klebelsberg Kunó emlékezete (1932–1938.)*. Budapest, 1938. p. 78.)

<sup>8</sup> Mészáros, 1995. pp. 52–56.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 53.



*Image 1. Franz Joseph University of Szeged*



*Image 2. Dóm Square, Szeged*



*Image 3. István Tisza University of Debrecen*

- <sup>10</sup> Ibid. pp. 56–59.
- <sup>11</sup> Romsics, 1995. p. 42.
- <sup>12</sup> Romsics, 1995. p. 43.
- <sup>13</sup> Benda, Kálmán (ed): *Magyarország történeti kronológiája*. III. kötet. Budapest, 1982. p. 846.
- <sup>14</sup> Makk, Ferenc – Marjanucz, László (ed.): *A Szegedi Tudományegyetem és elődei története (1581–2011.)*. Szeged, 2011. p. 10.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid. p. 12.
- <sup>16</sup> Pukánszky, Béla: *Pedagógia és Pszichológia*. (Henceforth: Pukánszky, 1999) In: Szentirmai, László – Ráczné Mójzes, Katalin (ed.): *A Szegedi Tudományegyetem múltja és jelene, 1921–1998*. Szeged, 1999. (Henceforth: Szentirmai – Ráczné, 1999.) p. 219.
- <sup>17</sup> Péter, László: *A magyar Göttinga. Klebelsberg és a szegedi egyetem*. In: Zombori, 1995. pp. 124–128.
- <sup>18</sup> Jegyzőkönyv. Bölcsészettudományi Kar II. rendkívüli ülés, October 20, 1926. CSML 167. bk. 8 7.
- <sup>19</sup> Jegyzőkönyv. Bölcsészettudományi Kar V. rendkívüli ülés, June 29, 1928. CSML 651 bk 1927/28.
- <sup>20</sup> M.Kir. Vallás- és Közoktatásügyi Minisztérium 51. 587–1928. IV. sz. rendelet
- <sup>21</sup> Mészöly Gedeon dékán levele Klebelsberg Kunó miniszterhez. Szeged, December 21, 1928. MOL K636-1929-30-410-05
- <sup>22</sup> Nemzeti Újság, December 16, 1928. p. 1.
- <sup>23</sup> Klebelsberg Kunó miniszter levele Dézsi Lajos rektornak. Budapest, January 4, 1929. MOL K636-1929-30-410-05
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>27</sup> Szentirmai – Ráczné, 1999. p. 127.
- <sup>28</sup> Ladányi, Andor: *A polgári iskolai tanárképzés reformja Klebelsberg minisztersége idején*. In: Kiss, Róbert Károly – Vajda, Tamás (ed.): *Az Állami Polgári Iskolai Tanárképző Főiskola Története (1928–1947)*. Szeged, 2010. pp. 75–76.
- <sup>29</sup> Jegyzőkönyv. Bölcsészkar X. rendes ülés, June 13, 1929. CSML 689. bk 1928/29.
- <sup>30</sup> Jegyzőkönyv. Bölcsészkar II. rendes ülés, October 29, 1929. CSML 174 bk. 1929/90.
- <sup>31</sup> Egyetemi Tanácsi Jegyzőkönyv. December 11, 1929. CSML 1111-1929/30.
- <sup>32</sup> Várkonyi Hildebrand kinevezése. Budapest, December 27, 1929. dr. Petri István államtitkár s.k. MOL 410-11-2078/1929.
- <sup>33</sup> Pukánszky, 1999. p. 219.
- <sup>34</sup> Szerédi Jusstinián bíboros, hercegprímás, esztergomi érsek levele Hóman Bálint Vallás- és Közoktatásügyi miniszternek. Esztergom, October 29, 1940. MOL K636-1937-41-5-3