

INTRODUCTION

ANTISEMITIC ARITHMETIC

Michael L. Miller and Judith Szapor

Over a hundred years ago, in 1920, the Hungarian Parliament introduced an anti-Jewish quota for admission to universities, thus making Hungary the first country in Europe to pass antisemitic legislation in the post-World War I period. The centennial of law XXV/1920 (“on regulating enrolment at universities, technical universities, the Faculty of Economics, and the academies of Law”), colloquially called “the numerus clausus law,” offered an opportunity to explore the history of restrictive ethnic and racial quotas in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with a particular focus on anti-Jewish quotas at institutions of higher learning in Central and East-Central Europe.

The centennial of law XXV/1920 also served as the starting point for a conference with the aim of taking a closer look at the political and social history and repercussions of the 1920 law in Hungary at a time when in Hungary the legacy of the authoritarian, antisemitic nature of the interwar period has been revised. We also sought to cast a wider net on other instances of academic antisemitism in the East-Central European region during the interwar period and explore other cases of—both negative (“exclusionary”) and positive (“benign”)—quotas, in Central Europe and beyond, in higher education, as a tool to control social mobility in other countries and periods.

Delayed by the COVID-19 pandemic by half a year, by the time the conference finally took place in Budapest in November 2020, it had to be held online, as the newly introduced public health measures were reshaping education in yet other ways. Sadly, it was also marked by the absence of one of its co-organizers and the leading historian of the numerus clausus in Hungary, Mária M. Kovács, who died in June 2020. As an appreciation of her

Quotas

The “Jewish Question” and Higher Education in Central Europe, 1880-1945

Edited by Michael L. Miller and Judith Szapor

<https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/MillerQuotas>

Not for resale

ground-breaking work, we dedicate this volume to her memory and include one of her characteristically comprehensive and lucid articles, accompanied by an appreciation of her lifelong work on the topic.¹

In many ways, this enforced delay helped us reconceptualize our aims, substantially revise the papers, include additional contributions, and highlight common themes running through them, hopefully resulting in a more cohesive volume. The past two years also served to further highlight the timeliness of the broader subject of our volume on quotas in higher education. The US Supreme Court recently ruled in two cases that were brought against two elite American universities, questioning their right to make admission decisions based on race, in order to practice affirmative action. Unlike the instances of negative discrimination cited in our volume, these legal cases concern practices aiming at achieving more inclusion, rather than exclusion. And the heated public interest in them demonstrates the continuing significance—and the perception as such—of higher education as the site that crucially shapes social mobility.

In the event, the studies in this volume maintain a geographical focus on East-Central and Central Europe and a chronological framework that spans from the 1860s to World War II. During this period, the territories, empires, and nations covered in our chapters underwent seismic changes. On a fundamental level, these included the momentous historical and geopolitical changes—the shapeshifting, collapse, and dissolution of empires—that formed the basic narrative of modern European history.

But despite the important political, social, and intellectual historical differences of the empires and the nation states that emerged from them after World War I, all these societies, albeit in their own specific way, experienced the birth pangs of economic and social modernization. As well, all these societies had produced emerging middle classes and, within them, a distinct professional middle class—and along with these underwent a parallel process of a standardization of the professions associated with the emerging modern industries: the legal, medical, and technical fields. Modernizing economies required highly trained professionals, in turn leading to the expansion of secondary education and then higher education.

Universities were once reserved for sons of the traditional elite and were the privilege of a very few. From the late nineteenth century, they began accepting upwardly mobile, ambitious, hard-working sons of the middle classes in increasing numbers, and by the early twentieth century, daughters as well. On a small scale, university classrooms reflected the social changes that accompanied—and enabled—modernization, and in most East-Central and Central European countries, the emergence of this new, modern, well-trained professional elite was often perceived as a threat to the old, established elite.

The decades preceding World War I have often—and quite deservedly—been remembered and portrayed as the golden age of uninhibited progress and an era of almost unrestricted opportunities. The rapid social and cultural changes that accompanied economic modernization, however, were experienced by the rear-guard of the old regime, representatives of the churches and the political elite as a threat to their own privileges. The leading role of Jews and other (ethnic or religious) minorities in industrial enterprise, banking, and commercial activities was largely accepted, even expected—after all, members of the old elite in East-Central Europe were, more often than not, reluctant to enter these fields. However, the prevalence of Jews in prestigious professions and in the cultural fields associated with urbanization, the supposedly alien, parasitical nature of institutions and lifestyle of urban centers, and, generally, the growing influence of a confident, prosperous, professional middle class prompted antisemitic arguments from the late nineteenth century onward. In Germany, Austria, and Hungary, these arguments became political programs, characterized by a strong anti-modern and anti-liberal agenda, often accompanied by a militant political Catholicism and a militant defense of conservative social values against the perceived attack from the agents of modernity, increasingly associated with Jews.

The Russian Precedent

Any discussion of Jewish quotas naturally begins with Tsarist Russia, where the first “*numerus clausus*” was introduced in 1887, in response to the perceived encroachment of Jews into professional

areas that had traditionally been the reserve of the old, established elite. The Russian *numerus clausus* limited the admission of Jews to universities in the Russian Empire—10 percent in the Pale of Settlement, 5 percent outside the Pale of Settlement, and 3 percent in Moscow and St. Petersburg—home to the empire’s most prestigious universities. This quota—or *numerus clausus*—remained in force for the next three decades, until the February Revolution of 1917, and it became an enduring symbol of the reactionary, state-sponsored anti-Jewish discrimination in Tsarist Russia. This “cruel restriction” was “the source of sorrow and tears for two generations of Russian Jews,” wrote Simon Dubnow, in his lachrymose history of the Jews in Russia and Poland.² One Russian Jewish newspaper called it a “silent, invisible pogrom.”³

Jews, however, were not the only targets of admissions quotas in imperial Russia; nor were they even the first. In 1864, tsarist authorities limited the admission of Polish Catholic students to 10 percent in response to the anti-Russian January Uprising the year before. Quotas were also instituted for graduates of religious seminaries as well as the children of “coachmen, menials, cooks, washerwomen, small shopkeepers, and the like,” who were suspected of participating in the revolutionary movement.⁴ The alleged “disproportionate” participation of Jewish students in the revolutionary movement also raised concerns, especially after the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881, and this naturally informed the ongoing debates about an admissions quota for Jews. But revolutionary activity was only one of the concerns.

The introduction of a Jewish admissions quota was driven, above all, by concerns that Jews and other “non-Russians” would soon dominate the professions and the Russian civil service, eventually displacing ethnic Russians.⁵ Universities and secondary schools played a crucial role in the reproduction of elites in Tsarist Russia, where a university degree opened the door to a career in civil service. The noticeable influx of Jewish students in the early 1880s, especially at universities in Kiev, Odessa, and Warsaw, raised fears that the upward social mobility of Jews would outpace that of everyone else. There was a certain irony here, because, for decades, tsarist policy had aimed to facilitate—not restrict—Jewish access to secular education, seeing it as a means to foster integration. Now it seemed that this policy had been a little too successful. Already in the early 1880s, Russian state offi-

cials raised the idea of a Jewish quota (corresponding to the percentage of Jews in the general population). Others also wanted to limit Jewish admissions but hoped to attain this goal by less conspicuous means, “without noise and the breach of justice.”⁶

The impact of the 1887 *numerus clausus* could be felt immediately, not only at gymnasias and universities in the Russian Empire, where enrollment numbers declined precipitously, but also at foreign universities—especially in Switzerland, Germany, France, and Austria—where the “martyrs of learning” (Dubnow’s phrase) found more hospitable terrain. Universities in Switzerland proved to be particularly attractive to Russians in general, because they admitted women—who, until 1917, were excluded from most Russian institutions of higher learning—and also provided a degree of political freedom for radical students.⁷ Jewish women faced twofold discrimination in Russia—they could only study at special institutions in Moscow and St. Petersburg, where the quotas were strictly enforced—so it is hardly surprising that Russian Jewish women streamed to Swiss universities as early as the 1860s.⁸ Russian Jews also flocked to German universities, where admissions policies were particularly lenient until the early twentieth century. In Germany, the impact of the Russian *numerus clausus* was readily apparent and quite dramatic. There were fewer than sixty Russian Jews at German universities in 1888—by the following year, there were more than thirteen hundred at Prussian universities alone.⁹ And these Russian Jewish students were highly visible, not only because they gravitated to a few universities—Berlin, Breslau, Königsberg, Leipzig, and Munich—in the eastern parts of Germany, but also because they tended to concentrate (or overconcentrate, in the eyes of some) in particular fields of study, especially medicine.¹⁰

The influx of Russian Jewish students triggered a backlash in Germany, which prefigures some of the debates about Jewish quotas in Europe and North America after World War I. In Germany, the backlash took the form of a public controversy in academic, parliamentary, and government circles about the so-called “problem of foreigners” (*Ausländerfrage*), which was a not-so-subtle euphemism for the “problem of Russian Jewish students.” These students were pictured as “a dangerous and subversive element that threatened Germany’s political stability, academic prestige and industrial capability,” prompting calls, often quite vocifer-

ous, to limit the admission of “foreigners” at German universities. On the eve of World War I, in response to student agitation, some German states (e.g., Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony) introduced quotas against “foreigners” or “Russians,” but the preferred approach was a quota by other means, namely the introduction of stricter admissions requirements. These included higher academic fees for foreigners, fluency in the German language, and proof of graduation from a Russian gymnasium (which Russian Jews could often not furnish due to the very numerus clausus they were attempting to flee). Selective admissions did not bear the stigma of quotas or a numerus clausus, but they managed to accomplish the same goal “without noise and the breach of justice.”

The Proportionality Principle

The logic behind the numerus clausus was the principle of proportionality, namely that Jews—or any distinct group, for that matter—should be represented in economic, political, intellectual, cultural, and other spheres in accordance with their proportion within the population as a whole. The Russian numerus clausus of 1887 and the Hungarian numerus clausus of 1920 were both predicated on the conviction that Jews were enrolled at institutions of higher learning at a “disproportionately” high rate and that, on the basis of official statistics, it could be demonstrated that this “overrepresentation” was detrimental to the native, Christian population. This principle of proportionality permeated political antisemitism from its very inception; it ran through Wilhelm Marr’s antisemitic treatise *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum* (The victory of Jewry over Germandom, 1879) and became a fixture in the antisemitic tracts and diatribes of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

During World War I, the principle of proportionality—or rather disproportionality—was brandished in Germany and Austria-Hungary to measure “Jewry’s” contribution to the war effort, with the presumption that Jews were “overrepresented” among black marketeers and war profiteers and “underrepresented” among front-line soldiers. This was the impetus behind the “Jew count” (*Judenzählung*) conducted in the Germany army in 1916, and the census of Germany’s *Kriegsgesellschaften* (war

materials companies), which was planned for the same year but never implemented. In postwar Hungary, Alajos Kovács, head of Hungary's official statistics bureau from 1924 to 1936, published a small volume, entitled *A zsidóság térfoglalása Magyarországon* (The Jewish takeover of Hungary, 1922), which—rehashing the argument of militant antisemitic ideologues developed in the previous decade—meticulously documented the “overrepresentation” of Jews in Hungary's economic, educational, and professional spheres, contrasting this with their alleged “underrepresentation” among Hungary's war dead.¹¹

Jews were also reputedly “overrepresented” in the postwar revolutionary movements in Eastern and Central Europe, fueling the myth of “Judeo-Bolshevism” that animated the radical Right in the interwar period—and, to some extent, still does today.¹² In Hungary, as many as thirty of the forty-eight people's commissars in the 1919 Council Republic were “of Jewish origin,” prompting blanket condemnations of “Jewry” from the full spectrum of the political Right and the likes of Alajos Kovács, who accused the “triumphant race” of “putting its foot on the neck of the Hungarian nation, bleeding from a hundred wounds.”¹³ In defense, the Pest Israelite Community also entered the numbers game, pointing out that the revolutionaries represented an insignificant minority of Hungary's Jews. “Against every single Communist of Jewish origin,” the Jewish leadership claimed, “stand at least 1,000 Hungarian Jewish patriots, faithful to the Hungarian homeland in peace and war.”¹⁴

However, as Jeremy King demonstrates in this volume, the principle of proportionality was not always used as a cudgel against religious, ethnic, or national minorities, but often—especially in the case of Habsburg Austria—as a means to promote increased participation of disadvantaged national minorities in public institutions. As Mária M. Kovács has argued, the Hungarian *numerus clausus* was “demagoguery pursued by statistical means,”¹⁵ because it was not the statistics that demanded anti-Jewish measures, but rather their interpretation (and manipulation) at the hands of Alajos Kovács, Béla Bangha, Ottokár Prohászka, and other proponents of the *numerus clausus*. Indeed, in 1918, Ottokár Prohászka called on Hungary's Christian youth to use “the whip of statistics” to wake up the Hungarian people from their torpor and encourage them to “take back . . .

all that to which their being, their faith and their traditions tie them, and which they are in danger of losing."¹⁶

Postwar Developments

The war and its highly violent aftermath have long served as a convenient signpost for historians: on a most general level, they used World War I with which to demarcate fundamental political and social changes across Europe. They argued for the war's significance in completing the homogenizing process of nation formation in "Peasants into Frenchmen"¹⁷ and in finally putting an end to "the Persistence of the Old Regime."¹⁸ The rise of Fascism and Nazism had almost immediately prompted attempts by political scientists and historians to explain the rise of the extreme Right—and more often than not, they found it in the traumatic end of World War I. Most authors of the abundant scholarship devoted to the history, origins, definition, classification, and characterization of Fascism agree that it would be "impossible to understand fascism without taking into account the upheaval of the Great War and the subsequent crisis."¹⁹ And the fact that "experience of war and revolution crossed national boundaries, and was understood using a common fund of ideas" would result in the often independent emergence of remarkably similar paramilitary groups across Europe.²⁰ The way the war came to a conclusion in a given country—in victory or defeat or, in Italy's case, on the winning side but frustrated in its aims—helped historians understand the takeover of Fascism and Nazism in Italy and Germany but not elsewhere.

More recently, historians have come to emphasize the continuity between wartime and postwar violence. George Mosse and his pioneering (and common-sense) "brutalization theory" pointed to the internalization of wartime experience at the root of the continuing violence in Germany in the postwar era, as did the "culture of defeat," coined by Wolfgang Schivelbusch.²¹ And the postwar, "paramilitary violence," almost universal to Eastern and East-Central European countries and described in detail by Robert Gerwarth and John Horne,²² not only expanded the geographical scope of the narrative of World War I but provided a decisive argument to support previous suggestions—a "Second Thirty-Year War" or the "European civil war"—for a more fluid

understanding of its chronology, as well as the periodization of the interwar period.

General violence was one thing; antisemitic and genocidal violence, previously only associated with the Russian and Ottoman Empires, both perceived as outside of Europe proper, was quite another. And while there is no question about the increased level of violence and its social acceptance in postwar societies, a more nuanced explanation is needed to understand the reason for the overwhelmingly and vehemently antisemitic nature of this violence. Mosse's "brutalization theory" may explain the increased tolerance of the judiciary for the political assassinations that occurred with almost predictable frequency in Germany in the first years of Weimar or the rise in domestic violence documented in Austria.²³ But a more nuanced and specific exploration is needed to explain how World War I and its immediate aftermath accelerated and amplified already existing antisemitic arguments and practices in Central and East-Central Europe.

It is no accident that the chapters of this volume explore antisemitic measures, policies, arguments, and practices in the successor states that emerged on the ruins of Eastern and Central European empires—with two of the chapters, those of Miklós Konrád and Jeremy King, exploring the origins of antisemitic arguments and the ethnonationalist as well as alternative Imperial solutions offered in the Habsburg Monarchy before the war. With few exceptions, it was in these countries that the postwar rise of ethnonationalism and the "culture of defeat" would coincide with an expansion of higher education. This, in turn, made the universities into a battlefield between old and emerging elites.

In the immediate postwar period, political instability, revolution, and civil war were accompanied by widespread anti-Jewish violence.²⁴ In the fall of 1918, anti-Jewish violence was reported across the former Habsburg lands, from Bohemia to Galicia, where a three-day orgy of violence erupted in Lwów/Lemberg (today L'viv, Ukraine), claiming no fewer than seventy-three Jewish lives. The anti-Jewish violence reached its bloodiest extreme during the Russian Civil War (1918–20), when anywhere between fifty thousand and two hundred thousand Jews were killed on the territory of present-day Ukraine.²⁵ Significantly, anti-Jewish violence was not limited to the defeated states, but also erupted in the "victorious" states—such as reconstituted Poland, enlarged

Romania, and newly created Czechoslovakia—where national and political elites, driven by what we may call the “culture of victory,” sought to fulfill their fantasies of a new order—which often had no place for Jews in the body politic.²⁶ As a contemporary observer put it, there was a “general feeling” that Jews did not share in the risks of war and should therefore be “denied a share in the government and the privileges of government, including instruction in the state universities.”²⁷ Here, again, was the proportionality principle at work.

In Poland and Romania, extreme levels of anti-Jewish violence and the ongoing discrimination against Jews, gave rise to the forced segregation of Jewish students (such as the so-called “ghetto-benches”) and fueled the periodic beatings that grew in frequency—and in social acceptability—during the interwar period.²⁸ The chapters of Roland Clark, Andrei-Dan Sorescu and Raul Cârstocea, and Grzegorz Krzywiec detail the political, ideological, and socioeconomic agendas that drove antisemitic violence and the role of governments to incite it. As in Poland, Romania, Austria, and Germany, student-on-student violence in Hungary was most often perpetuated by student militias, organized along the lines of paramilitaries. Formed of either former students returning from the front or of students too young to have served, student paramilitaries in many ways represented the militant vanguard of the counterrevolution and turned the university entrances and lecture halls into a battlefield. Throughout the 1920s, they continued to exert pressure on governments and university administrators, demanding a numerus clausus and numerus nullus, and periodically turning to outright physical violence throughout the 1920s and 1930s. We included Andor Ladányi’s article precisely because of its evidence for the crucial role played by (and interplay between) right-wing student organizations, university administrators, and politicians in limiting—and eventually excluding—Jews from higher education throughout the entire interwar period.

Jewish students, in turn, not only organized in fraternities and trained in self-defense but also sought legal avenues, continuing to appeal to university and government officials. The chapters of Andreas Huber, Andor Ladányi, and Ágnes K. Kelemen offer examples of these defensive measures by Jewish students at universities in Austria and Hungary, respectively.

American Unexceptionalism?

In the interwar period, the drive to restrict Jewish admissions at institutions of higher learning was usually associated with Central Europe, but it also found a striking parallel in North America, where, even before World War I, administrators and alumni raised the specter of a Jewish “invasion” or “takeover” of their hallowed universities. As in Europe, traditional elites tried to preserve their hegemony at these institutions of higher learning and watched in dread as Jewish and other “upstarts” threatened to upend a system that had historically privileged wealth and class over scholastic achievement or academic promise. In the United States, scholarly research has focused primarily on Harvard, Yale, and Princeton (“the Big Three”), bastions of white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant (WASP) privilege and pillars of the northeastern establishment.²⁹ These were attended largely by graduates of elite private schools (“the emblematic institution of the Protestant upper class”) until the early twentieth century.³⁰ The historians Marcia Graham Synnott and Harold S. Wechsler—and, more recently, the sociologist Jerome Karabel—have exposed the dark “underside” of these and other elite colleges, showing how they developed selective admissions policies to exclude “undesirable” applicants.³¹ In fact, as Karabel has noted, Columbia University created the first Office of Admissions in 1910 in direct response to the “Jewish problem” at America’s universities.³²

Antisemitism at American universities was “chiefly social,” observed H. N. MacCracken, president of Vassar College, in 1923.³³ In the first decades of the twentieth century, university leaders were concerned lest the growing Jewish presence on campus lower the prestige of their universities, making them less attractive to the sons of the well-heeled and well-bred Protestant elite. Columbia University was a cautionary tale. There, the percentage of Jews had reached 40 percent in the 1910s, and the dean acknowledged that this had made his university “socially uninviting to students who come from homes of refinement.”³⁴ In fact, this bespoke a wider perception that there was “a ‘tipping point’ of Jewish enrollment beyond which the WASP elite would abandon a college.”³⁵ A similar logic also reigned at North American residential neighborhoods, summer resorts, boarding schools, and country clubs, where “gentleman’s antisemitism” was ram-

pant. And the WASP elite were not the only ones concerned about prestige. "I think if you were to let Dartmouth become predominantly Jewish," the president of Dartmouth College quipped to a reporter, "it would lose its attraction for the Jews."³⁶

By the 1920s, there was a growing consensus at the Big Three—even among some Jewish alumni and trustees—that Jewish enrollment had to be limited, lest Harvard, Yale, and Princeton be "ruined" like Columbia. But these universities faced a problem: admission was based solely on academic merit, that is, passing an entrance exam; and since there was no limit to the size of the freshman class, anyone with "determination, average intellect, and modest financial resources"³⁷ could make it in. In response, universities began limiting general enrollment numbers, and more importantly, overhauling their admissions policies in order to reduce the presence of "undesirables." When H. N. MacCracken visited Europe in 1922, he was "eagerly questioned by university professors about the means employed in America for the exclusion of Jews from the university."³⁸ At the time, the question of limiting Jewish enrollment was being hotly debated in the American press, due in large part to a decision by Harvard's president, Lawrence Lowell, to announce that "there should be talk about the proportion of Jews at the college."³⁹ Such talk, of course, had been going on for years but almost always discreetly—"whispered about at faculty meetings" behind closed doors.⁴⁰ By broaching the topic publicly—and frankly—Lowell prompted a discussion about the stealth measures that universities were already taking to limit the number of Jewish students. New measures—such as alumni interviews, letters of reference, and psychological tests—were used to screen applicants; supplemental personal data—such as parents' place of birth, father's occupation, and mother's maiden name—were required in order to identify (and weed out) Jewish applicants; subjective, nonacademic criteria—for example, "character," "leadership," "personality," and "public spirit"—were introduced to shift the emphasis away from objective, academic criteria that tended to favor Jewish students; and "regional balance" was used as a ploy to reduce the number of students from the Northeast—where most of the Jewish applicants lived.⁴¹ Some universities limited the size of the freshman class, thus creating a waiting list; and "with a waiting list," one director of admissions observed, "you can do almost anything."⁴²

Naturally, these restrictive measures in the United States drew unfavorable comparisons to anti-Jewish measures in prerevolutionary Russia and postwar Central Europe. "Only the Russia of the Czars did what our universities are beginning to do; only Poland, Rumania and Hungary do so today," declared *The Nation* in June 1922. "America cannot afford to class itself with the most backward in Europe."⁴³ To be fair, however, these comparisons were not entirely justified. In the United States, these "backward" policies had more to do with genteel "gentleman's antisemitism" than with ethnonationalism, right-wing political ideology, or a "culture of defeat." Moreover, they were introduced by private universities operating with a certain "market logic" and not by a centralized state seeking to limit access to state-funded and state-controlled institutions of higher learning.⁴⁴ In fact, most American Jews were not directly affected by these restrictive measures because they could hardly afford to attend private universities in the first place.⁴⁵ Instead, they flocked to public universities—like the City College of New York—where no enrollment obstacles stood in their way.⁴⁶

Only in the field of medicine did American Jews face enrollment obstacles at public as well as private universities in the interwar period. Victor Karady's chapter in this volume explores the significance of medicine in the upward mobility of Hungarian Jewry, and, by extension, in the modernization of Western societies. In the United States, as in Europe, Jews sought to be physicians "in far greater proportion" than did other segments of the general population, and, in the 1910s and 1920s, when American medical schools began raising their standards, curtailing student numbers, and—in the case of public universities—giving preference to in-state residents, Jewish enrollment declined precipitously.⁴⁷ Like their coreligionists in Tsarist Russia or interwar East-Central Europe, they would turn to other fields of study (e.g., dentistry, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy) or pick up the wandering staff and study abroad. Like Tsarist Russia's "martyrs of learning," these frustrated students went to Europe, Switzerland, Germany, and especially Scotland, in the 1920s and 1930s, to complete their medical studies. There, they encountered "numerus clausus exiles"—that is, the Jewish students from Poland, Romania, and, most of all, Hungary—who traveled abroad to circumvent the anti-Jewish quotas in their home countries.

Hungary in the Vanguard

At first sight, Hungary, with its history of decades of liberal constitutionalism and advanced Jewish assimilation was an unlikely setting for postwar Europe's first anti-Jewish legislation in 1920. And yet there is no question that Hungary came to play a prominent role as a pioneer in antisemitic legislation, its policies becoming a model for other East-Central and Central European countries in ways Tsarist Russia could never have been. Pioneering anti-Jewish legislation was also a badge of honor of sorts that Hungarian politicians and intellectuals touted and exploited when cementing the country's alliance with Nazi Germany. "After the World War, we were the first state in Europe that tried to remove the Jews from the leading intellectual and economic position that they had assumed at the end of last century," the head of Berlin's *Collegium Hungaricum* boasted in 1942. "The Hungarian law of 1920, which aimed to limit the number of Jewish students was the first break with the unified liberal, democratic order in Europe." He lamented that Hungary was "alone back then," but he relished the fact that Nazi Germany eventually followed Hungary's lead.⁴⁸

There had been signs that, in retrospect, could have been read as warnings: the country's ambiguous accommodation within the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, its traditional elite's troubled relationship with modernization, and the efforts of its political ruling class to maintain, at all costs, its own multiethnic empire. The Jews of Hungary did receive full citizenship in 1867, Judaism became one of the "received" religions in 1895, and already in the last decades of the nineteenth century, Hungarian Jews assumed a leading role in the country's rapid economic and cultural modernization. This process also manifested itself in the gradually increasing number of Jews at universities and in the liberal professions. Like in the Austrian half of the Monarchy, assimilation was encouraged and rewarded with prominent economic and even political positions and social acceptance—to a certain degree. Historians often refer to a tacit prewar "social contract" between the nationalist Hungarian political elite and assimilated Jews as the latter's numbers were crucial to maintain a slim Hungarian majority in the multiethnic Hungarian half of the Monarchy. There is much merit to the argument that the "contract" lost its usefulness and thus was broken by the Hungarian polit-

ical and social elite, once the Trianon Treaty transformed Hungary into an ethnically largely homogeneous country. But there were signs that the unwritten alliance—assimilation in exchange for social acceptance—was already showing cracks well before the war. Miklós Konrád's chapter describes the rise of a powerful antisemitic, anti-assimilationist political force well ahead of World War I; contemporary observers noted the "parting of the ways" of progressive and nationalist political thinkers and social scientists around the 1906 political crisis; and influential Catholic ideologues formulated arguments about a supposed "Jewish takeover" of Hungarian society, attributed mainly to their hold over the "Jewish press," as early as 1912.⁴⁹

All of these factors, combined with the country's disastrous exit from the collapse of the Monarchy, made postwar Hungarian society a model case for the "culture of defeat." Following military collapse, the dissolution of the Monarchy, a liberal and a Bolshevik-inspired revolution, and the looming threat of a punishing peace treaty that would be signed at the Grand Trianon palace in June 1920, the counterrevolutionary government introduced the most comprehensive White Terror in Central Europe. A vicious antisemitic rhetoric and murderous antisemitic violence was part and parcel of the counterrevolutionary terror—it was grounded in the scapegoating of Jews for the postwar disaster, representing an early version of the Judeo-Bolshevik conspiracy theory.⁵⁰

During the first two years of its rule, paramilitary officers' detachments under the command of the leader of the National Army—and from March 1920 head of state—Miklós Horthy unleashed counterrevolutionary violence in the countryside and on the streets of Budapest, targeting left-wing activists and sympathizers, as well as ordinary Jews. Violence reached the Budapest universities at the beginning of the 1919/20 academic year when beatings of Jewish or Jewish-looking students became commonplace, preventing them, along with students accused of left-wing activities from entering university buildings and lecture halls, and prompting many to leave the country. The *numerus clausus* law enacted in Hungary in 1920 was, to a degree, the government's answer to this violence, an attempt to placate and reward the radical Right, including the militant right-wing student militia.

If that was the aim, it did not succeed: militant right-wing student organizations would continue the practice of regular

“Jew-beatings” and other forms of intimidation throughout the 1920s. As the rhetoric of leading government politicians and the overwhelmingly right-wing press, the tone of the parliamentary debate, and the violence against Jewish and left-wing students made it abundantly clear, a far more important objective of the law was to stem and reverse the perceived “Jewish takeover” of the professions, the professional and intellectual elite—and, more broadly, to solve the “Jewish question” once and for all. But what exactly did the law contain? Its defenders and apologists—then and since—have argued that the law’s text did not even mention Jews and that, rather than introducing a Jewish quota, it simply put an end to the system of open admissions, until then guaranteed for every high school graduate. They also claimed that—as in many other European countries—it was a measure necessitated by the return of soldiers who had to be accommodated and by the widely perceived “intellectual overproduction,” which, in Hungary’s case, was further aggravated by the influx of refugees—including the families of former civil servants—from the “lost” territories.

True, Article 3 of the law avoided any mention of Jews—it did, however, establish two conditions that should guide university admissions: applicants’ “loyalty to the nation and upstanding moral stance” and a newly introduced nationalities quota. The former led to an instant ban of any applicant, and as specified in Article 2, the expulsion of any already enrolled student of known or suspected participation in the revolutions. In practice, representatives of right-wing paramilitary students sitting on the admission boards fingered and expelled any student with as much as a membership in a left-wing or liberal student organization. As for the “nationalities quota,” it was so obscurely worded that it needed clarification, which was provided in an “enacting clause.” The table, attached to the clause, based on the 1920 census of post-war Hungary, contained the law’s only mention of Jews—listing them alongside Hungary’s other ethnic minorities (Germans, Slovaks, Romanians, Ruthenians, Serbs, and Croats) and classifying them as a “nationality” rather than as adherents of a denomination. Here was the crux of the law: by reclassifying Jews as an ethnic minority or nationality, heretofore considered “Hungarians of the Israelite religion,” it set their maximum university enrollment at 6 percent, which was their share in the general population.

This seemingly unnecessarily complicated justification for the exclusion of Jews was inserted at the suggestion of Ottokár Prohászka, the influential Catholic bishop, antisemitic ideologue, and a leading proponent of the *numerus clausus* during his tenure as an MP. It was meant to disguise the anti-Jewish intent of the quota, and keep it hidden from foreign eyes in order to avoid “any difficulties for the country or the nation from anywhere,”⁵¹ because it represented a breach of the minority-protection clause of the Paris Peace Treaties. Beyond the immediate barriers it placed on the path of Jewish students and the wide-ranging implications it had on individual lives, the law represented a fundamental shift away from the prewar liberal order: it breached the principle of equal citizenship, one of the main tenets of liberal constitutionalism, as it applied to education.

Hungarian Jews had gained full citizenship rights in 1867; and the seemingly minor change in their status to that of a national minority in 1920 may have only applied to education, but in the long term, as leading historians of the *numerus clausus* in Hungary have argued, it found its logical conclusion in further antisemitic discrimination, in a series of anti-Jewish laws in the late 1930s and early 1940s. These, by then openly discriminatory laws, which introduced similar quotas in the economic and cultural fields, were quite clearly inspired by the spirit and practice of the *numerus clausus* law and were introduced and supported by politicians who had previously championed the *numerus clausus*. They followed its precedent to establish a discriminatory quota based on the logic of proportionality and the argument of “Jewish takeover,” and they extended the effort to reverse Jewish emancipation to the entire spectrum of the economy, social life, and culture. The historians Mária M. Kovács and Andor Ladányi, among others, have underscored the continuity between the 1920 *numerus clausus* law and the subsequent antisemitic laws of 1938, 1939, 1941, and 1942, which Hungarian historiography refers to, respectively, as the First, Second, Third, and Fourth Jewish laws.⁵² The emphasis on the direct line running from the *numerus clausus* law to the openly antisemitic legislation of the later decades in interwar Hungary is important, for it undercuts the revisionist argument voiced by pro-government Hungarian historians today that denies any responsibility of Hungary’s governing elite and authorities for the Holocaust in Hungary.

The Impact of and Reaction to the Numerus Clausus

In its immediate effect, the law achieved its main objective and drastically reduced the previous, substantially higher representation of Jewish students from the prewar 25–28 percent to around 10 percent during the first decade of its application. Yet it failed to fulfill its other goal, that is, to fill the vacated university spots with non-Jewish students. In another blatantly discriminatory step, detailed in the chapter of Ladányi, universities substantially lowered the required entrance criteria for non-Jewish applicants; doing away with all pretenses, all that was required for admission was a high school diploma with a passing grade. Meanwhile, if Jewish applicants wished to apply, they could only do so if they earned an “outstanding” grade on their high school diploma (i.e., the highest grade in every subject of a notoriously rigorous exit examination)—but even that was not enough to guarantee acceptance.

While a viciously antisemitic rhetoric became widely accepted and remained the hallmark of the political and public life of the interwar period, in the mid-1920s the government—under the more moderate István Bethlen—managed to rein in everyday antisemitic violence. At the same time, it did little to tame right-wing student organizations. Their continuing demands for a more strictly applied numerus clausus, its extension to high schools, and even a numerus nullus received encouragement from powerful, leading politicians, such as the Minister of Religion and Education Bálint Hóman, the successor of Count Kunó Klebelsberg. In 1928, under international pressure, the government introduced an amendment to the law, removing the nationalities quota (including for Jews) but replacing it with a carefully calibrated occupational quota; based on the father’s profession, this kept Jewish students out of universities nearly at the previous rates. The occupational quota was a “neo-numerus clausus,” in the words of one of its critics; it aimed to “fool the world into thinking that discrimination against the Jews had stopped, even though Bethlen himself assured his domestic audience that this was not the case.”⁵³

Throughout the 1920s and early 1930s, the political elite of Hungary had reserved its blatantly antisemitic rhetoric for domestic consumption, but presented a more acceptable, *salonfähig*

image when representing the country abroad. Michael L. Miller's chapter describes this "doublespeak" in illuminating detail in the case of Hungarian cultural diplomacy in interwar Berlin. After the Nazi takeover in Germany, however, right-wing Hungarian politicians became suddenly prone to bragging about their pioneering efforts to curtail Jewish economic and cultural influence in their own country. And despite the transparent opportunism of such claims, the 1920 *numerus clausus* law in Hungary may very well have inspired, at least in part, the April 1933 antisemitic law in Germany for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service (*Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums*); and, as Roland Clark, Andrei-Dan Sorescu and Raul Cârstocea describe in their respective chapters on interwar Romania, the Hungarian *numerus clausus* law served as a major inspiration for the extreme-Right movements in that country. Anti-Jewish demands, apart from the periodic flare-ups of antisemitic violence and normalized practices at institutions of higher learning became common place in Austria and Poland—the chapters of Grzegorz Krzywiec and Andreas Huber explore both the ideological and organizational sources of these demands and their impact on Jewish students' lives. Even Czechoslovakia, the most democratic country of the region, did not prove immune to the easy logic of numbers and quotas. As the chapters of Miroslav Szabó and Ágnes K. Kelemen reveal, university administrators used a barely modified terminology—although, importantly, supplanting the anti-Jewish intent with a political or ethnonational one—when proposing restrictions on enrollment and higher tuition fees, to reduce the number of foreigners, members of ethnic minorities, or political subversives at Czechoslovak universities.

As for the reaction of the intellectual leaders of the assimilated, Neolog Jewish community in Hungary whose children were most immediately affected by the law, they proved to be at once preternaturally prescient and curiously shortsighted. Commenting on the parliamentary debate of the *numerus clausus* in the political and cultural weekly *Egyenlőség* (Equality), the community's most influential outlet, the editor, Lajos Szabolcsi (1889–1943), warned that the proposed restrictions in education amounted to nothing less than the end of the liberal era and its core principle of equal citizenship, granted to Hungary's Jews in 1867.⁵⁴ Szabolcsi's fiery editorials—often substan-

tially redacted by the censor—in the immediate aftermath of the introduction of the law struck a millennial tone, lamenting the end of the successful, mutually advantageous symbiosis of Hungarians and Hungarian Jews. In the early 1920s, *Egyenlőség* laid the ground for the arguments—some newly minted, some recycled, from the prewar period—that would continue to be voiced throughout the entire interwar period, culminating in the Holocaust in Hungary. Initially formulated in defense of the Jewish community against the numerus clausus, by the end of the interwar period these arguments were used to fend off legislative attacks against the participation of Hungarian Jews in all areas of economic and cultural life.

The arguments articulated in *Egyenlőség* appealed to a set of liberal principles the Hungarian political elite had already jettisoned. Ultimately and futilely, they confronted antisemitic violence, politically and economically motivated hatred with appeals to reason and a sense of fairness, as well as protestations of patriotism and loyalty. Some of the elements of these arguments harked back to the nineteenth century, such as the solidarity of Hungarian Jews with the Hungarians during the 1848–1849 Revolution and War of Independence against the Habsburgs. Another point often raised on the pages of *Egyenlőség*, deemed especially pertinent to address what was, after all, a matter of higher education, was the preeminent role of Hungarian Jewish scholars in the country's academic and educational achievements and infrastructure, thereby raising the international reputation of country.

Jewish intellectual leaders, however, had to forge new arguments to confront the most popular myths that fueled much of the antisemitic ideology and violence of the post-1919 period: the canard of Jewish shirkers, the lumping together of all Jews with the liberal and Bolshevik revolutions, and the accusation that the Trianon Peace Treaty was the result of these revolutions—and as such the blame for it should be assigned to Jews. The manner of their defense against the first two accusations showed that the writers of *Egyenlőség*, however reluctantly, joined their enemies in the latter's numbers game: as we have already mentioned, as early as the end of 1919, the editors of *Egyenlőség* stressed the majority of Hungarian Jews' opposition to—and suffering under—the short-lived Council Republic, trying to dispel the myth of a

supposed all-Jewish solidarity cutting across class lines. Needless to say, the insistence that most Hungarian Jews, law-abiding, solidly bourgeois, and patriotic, had nothing in common with the Communist revolution's leaders ("the infinitely few Jews, when compared to the overall numbers in the population, who in any case long abandoned their faith")⁵⁵ fell on deaf ears; the myth, initially endorsed by the Right, quickly became common political currency.

The Hungarian Jewish intellectual leadership also took up the gauntlet to confront the myth of the "Jewish shirker"—like in Germany, it emerged in 1916, becoming especially popular after the military defeat in 1918. In the early 1920s, *Egyenlőség* ran a column dedicated to Jewish servicemen, listing their name, year and place of birth, rank, unit, length and place of service, and, if applicable, injury or death. This was meant to counter the false statistics and blatant lies, grossly diminishing the bloodletting of Hungarian Jews widely circulated in the right-wing press but also affirmed by such influential political leaders as the bishop Prohászka.⁵⁶ Last, Szabolcsi and other Jewish political leaders, including the liberal parliamentarians Pál Sándor and Vilmos Vázsonyi tried, unsuccessfully, to beat them at their own game: if the Jews were going to be considered an ethnic minority under the Paris Peace Treaties minorities rights' protection, they argued, then they should be entitled to their own, Jewish university. The proposal was voted down by Parliament even before the vote on the numerus clausus itself, and although floated throughout the early 1920s, not pursued.

Perhaps because it would have meant to turn for legal protection outside, in this case to the guarantor of minority rights, the League of Nations—a line representatives of Hungarian Jews never crossed. As Michael L. Miller explains in his chapter, they were extremely careful to keep their complaints within limits. Hungarian Jewish intellectual and political leaders had very little room to negotiate. Already branded anti-Hungarian in a country whose political leadership perceived itself persecuted by the great powers, being surrounded by enemies plotting for its demise, they opted for affirming their loyalty to a country that trampled on their citizenship rights. This dilemma was eloquently expressed by a young Hungarian Jewish woman whose account was published under a pseudonym in Hungary. The

author was part of a small group of young women who went to Florence, Italy, to study medicine. She recalled a conversation with an Italian acquaintance who marveled at their undying loyalty to Hungary, the country that denied them the right to attend university and condemned them to a life of penury in a foreign country. "One can disown a political orientation but cannot disown the motherland,"⁵⁷ responded the author, likely expressing a common sentiment.

This leads us to one of the most consequential—and entirely unintended—consequences of the *numerus clausus* law for its prime targets, young Hungarian Jews: the phenomenon that came to be known as the "*numerus clausus exiles*," the movement of Hungarian and other East-Central European Jewish youth, men and women, to universities abroad. Their key destinations were Germany, Austria (especially the University of Vienna), Czechoslovakia (especially the German universities and polytechnics in Prague and Brno), Paris, and—mainly for their medical schools—the universities of Rome, Milan, Bologna, and Florence. Of course, the "peregrination," to use a term familiar from late medieval and early modern times, of young scholars between the old, hallowed European centers of knowledge was an age-old tradition, especially prevalent during the Protestant Reformation. As already mentioned, young Jews from Imperial Russia flocked to Swiss universities in the late nineteenth century; just as young Jews from Galicia flocked to Viennese universities in the early twentieth century (and young Jews from the United States flocked to Western European medical schools in the 1920s and 1930s).

But while the destinations of the Hungarian Jewish *numerus clausus exiles* may have been shared with other young Jewish men and women from Romania, Poland, and Yugoslavia, their position was quite unique; unlike their counterparts from other countries, their "exile" was, for the most part, regarded as strictly temporary, as most of them planned to return to Hungary. Not only did they have family they left behind, but in many cases, a supporting community to which they were indebted in every sense—the Neolog Jewish leadership pursued an energetic campaign to provide financial support to the students abroad. Often, they were drawn back by a commitment to political and social change, pursued within left-wing movements. Following earlier

studies tracing the itineraries and magnitude of the phenomenon⁵⁸ the chapters by Ágnes K. Kelemen, Michael L. Miller, and Judith Szapor provide examples of the range of impulses and influences that led young men and women to pursue their education abroad.

These chapters also highlight the fleeting nature of the refuge abroad for Hungarian and other Jewish students, as by 1933 German, and by 1938 Austrian and Italian universities were no longer open to them. But the road back to Hungary was equally fraught: anecdotal evidence shows that the recognition of diplomas acquired abroad was a procedure deliberately made nearly impossible, consequently denying graduates gainful employment in their field; for instance, most newly minted medical doctors could only hope for an unpaid internship at one of the Jewish hospitals.

Estimates of the Hungarian Jewish students studying abroad between 1920 and 1938 vary between eight thousand and ten thousand—and it is also estimated that only about 10 percent of the *numerus clausus* exiles were young women. As the chapter by Judith Szapor demonstrates, their choices and limitations should be explored with a focus on the highly gendered nature of their experiences and the broader changes their almost complete exclusion from higher education meant for the long-term trends of women's emancipation and the internal dynamic of Jewish families.

The Hungarian *numerus clausus* law of 1920 was, in many respects, a law of unintended consequences. The proponents of the law had a well-defined, albeit discreetly worded, objective: to push Jews out of the intellectual and professional elite. And while they did achieve the primary aim of reducing the enrollment of Jews (and, until 1926, women) at Hungarian universities, they did not anticipate the phenomenon of Jews moving abroad to pursue their studies at foreign universities. Nor did they foresee the reaction of Hungarian Jewish women, who, after being excluded from the fields they had flocked to prior to World War I, entered, invigorated and revolutionized modern fields, such as photography, psychoanalysis, and Montessori pedagogy. Moreover, the *numerus clausus* law, contrary to the intentions of its exponents, also contributed to the political radicalization of subsequent cohorts of young Jewish men and women, who were often more

likely to embrace universalist ideologies, such as Socialism and Communism, than particularist ideologies, such as Zionism.

The Numerus Clausus One Hundred Years Later

The current volume focuses on the ideologies of quota regimes and the ways they have been justified, implemented, challenged, and remembered. The chapters examine the historical origins of quotas; the moral, legal, and political arguments developed by their supporters and opponents; the domestic and international debates surrounding anti-Jewish quotas; and the consequences—both intended and unintended—of their implementation. The chapters address bureaucratic classification systems and the ways in which they shaped quota policies and the wider logic of positive and negative discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, race, national origin, religion, citizenship, class, and gender. Most of the chapters deal with the post-1920 period, focusing on the role played by the Hungarian numerus clausus, not only as a model for other restrictive quotas but also as a touchstone in the larger debates about liberalism, the “Jewish Question,” the “Woman Question,” and the “Refugee Question” in the interwar period.

This volume is firmly grounded in earlier and more recent scholarship⁵⁹ on academic antisemitism in Europe and North America, a testament to the sustained interest in—and the contemporary relevance of—this topic, as scholars in East-Central Europe and North America revisit the legacies of selective (and exclusionary) admissions policies at institutions of higher learning. While these studies had tended to place an emphasis on the political and legal aspects of anti-Jewish quotas, the chapters in our volume pay special attention to the dimensions of identity, exile, and gender and address anti-Jewish quotas in a comparative and contextualized manner.

Our volume is mainly concerned with “discriminatory” or “negative” quotas that aimed to establish strict limits on the number of Jewish students at institutions of higher learning in Central and East-Central Europe during the interwar period. Curiously, much of the scholarly literature on Jewish quotas at North American universities harks back to the Russian numerus clausus of 1887, seeing it as an ominous—and reactionary—

precedent to the unofficial quotas that Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, Columbia, McGill, Johns Hopkins, and other private universities introduced after World War I, primarily in the 1920s. Mária M. Kovács was always on the lookout for a “smoking gun” that would personally link the Ivy League quotas in America to the *numerus clausus*.⁶⁰ Despite the divergent political contexts and climates, the traditional elites in Central Europe and North America shared a common belief that their hegemony could be preserved only by fending off a perceived “invasion” or “take-over” of universities, which were the primary pathways to social respectability and social mobility. Indeed, in the first decades of the twentieth century, quotas were justified, first and foremost, as defensive measures against “foreign” encroachment. Whether in Russia under the Romanovs, Wilhelmine Germany, Horthy-era Hungary, or Coolidgean America—they were intended to shore up an establishment that perceived itself to be under siege.

Interestingly, the logic of quotas changed dramatically after World War II, shifting from exclusionary to inclusionary, from reactionary to progressive. At universities in the United States, Brazil, Indonesia, the Soviet Bloc, and elsewhere, “positive” quotas were introduced, not in order to preserve the hegemony of the old, privileged elite, but rather to shake it and rattle it. Policies of “affirmative action” or “positive discrimination” employ the same principle of proportionality that undergirded the Russian *numerus clausus* of 1887 and the Hungarian *numerus clausus* of 1920, but with a “progressive,” “subversive,” or “anti-establishment” goal of increasing—rather than decreasing—the participation of underprivileged or disadvantaged racial, ethnic, and national minorities. Following the Stalinist period and the subsequent elimination of the all-important socioeconomic origins criteria in university admissions, the countries of the former Soviet Bloc established yearly quotas for each faculty, especially in years of demographic glut, in an attempt to control the number of diplomas issued, and, by extension, the labor market. Today, arguments for and against affirmative action sometimes echo earlier justifications of quotas, and the continuities between the exclusionary quotas of the early twentieth century and the inclusionary quotas of the late twentieth century certainly merit further examination.

Remarkably, in the post-1945 period countries in Europe—Germany in particular—have also introduced a *numerus clau-*

sus at universities with seemingly little or no awareness that this Latin term had once been the rallying cry of antisemites across the continent. Granted, today's *numerus clausus*, first introduced in West Germany in 1968, is not a quota but rather a limit on the total number of students who can be admitted to certain "overcrowded" fields, particularly medicine and dentistry.⁶¹ Similar policies, although not always referred to as a *numerus clausus*, exist in many other countries—such as Norway, Sweden, France, and Israel—that lack sufficient hospital training capacity to admit an unlimited number of medical, veterinary, or dental students.⁶² These countries have produced new generations of *numerus clausus* exiles, though with one important difference. In Tsarist Russia and Horthy-era Hungary, it was often the most accomplished students who were forced to travel abroad, while in this postwar iteration, it is often the less accomplished students who failed to achieve high enough grades on their admissions exams. Ironically, many of today's "exiles" end up at medical schools in Romania, Poland and Hungary, three of the countries that "exported" the most Jewish talent in the 1920s and 1930s.⁶³

In the end, quotas—both "positive" and "negative"—are mechanisms for allocating resources perceived as scarce or highly valuable; and in this volume, the resource in question is access to a university education and all the benefits it confers.⁶⁴ Historically, quotas have served as an instrument for social engineering, employed for both reactionary and progressive goals, sometimes to establish a new professional elite, or—as in the case of the Hungarian *numerus clausus* (and supporters of the more radical *numerus nullus*)—to restore or reinstate an old one. Proponents of anti-Jewish quotas aimed to bring about a "changing of the guard" that would remove Jews from positions of influence, power, and prestige. Anti-Jewish quotas were rooted in antisemitic arithmetic, but their desired outcome was anything but mathematically predictable. In fact, the measures that ostensibly aimed at limiting access to higher education resulted in the marginalization and stigmatization of a substantial segment of the population, setting the stage for their complete social, economic, and legal exclusion. Quotas sometimes achieved their short-term objectives, but they could also produce paradoxical or unintended results. In the end, they proved to be a blunt instrument for social change.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the Tom Lantos Institute for providing valuable support for this project. We are grateful to János Kőbányai, editor of *Múlt és Jövő*, for granting permission to publish an English translation of Andor Ladányi's "A numerus clausustól a numerus nullusig," which originally appeared in *Múlt és Jövő* 1 (2005): 56–74. We would also like to thank Balázs Trencsényi, Victor Karady, and Péter Tibor Nagy for granting permission to republish (and reedit) Mária M. Kovács's chapter "The Hungarian Numerus Clausus: Ideology, Apology, and History, 1919–45," which originally appeared in *The Numerus Clausus in Hungary: Studies on the First Anti-Jewish Law and Academic Anti-Semitism in Modern Central Europe*, edited by Victor Karady and Péter Tibor Nagy (Budapest: Pasts, 2012), 27–55. We would like to express our appreciation to Sulaiman Ahmad, editorial associate at Berghahn Books, who guided us smoothly through the publication process. We are grateful to the two anonymous reviewers of the volume for their detailed, thoughtful, and helpful comments. Above all, we would like to thank Dr. Nicholas Warmuth, our consummate copy editor, whose untiring assistance helped make this a much better volume.

Michael L. Miller is head of the Nationalism Studies Program at Central European University in Vienna, Austria. He is the author of *Rabbis and Revolution: The Jews of Moravia in the Age of Emancipation* (2011) and other works on Habsburg and Habsburg-Jewish history. He is currently completing a book manuscript entitled "Manovill: A Tale of Two Hungarys."

Judith Szapor is an associate professor in the Department of History and Classical Studies at McGill University in Montreal, Canada. Her latest monograph, *Hungarian Women's Activism in the Wake of the First World War: From Rights to Revanche*, was published in 2018. In her current project, she explores the intended and unintended impact of the numerus clausus on Hungarian Jewish women and families.

Notes

1. Kovács, "The Hungarian Numerus Clausus." The article was previously published in Karady and Nagy, *The Numerus Clausus in Hungary*, and we thank the editors for granting us the right to republish the article in this volume.
2. Dubnow, *History*, 350.
3. *Nedel'naia Khronika Voskhoda*, 835; cited in Nathans, *Beyond the Pale*, 272.
4. Nathans, *Beyond the Pale*, 267.
5. Nathans, 267.
6. Hausmann, "Der Numerus clausus," 519.
7. Wertheimer, "The 'Ausländerfrage' at Institutions of Higher Learning," 187–215; Dudgeon, "The Forgotten Minority," 1–26.
8. Masé, "Student Migration of Jews."
9. Wertheimer, "The 'Ausländerfrage' at Institutions of Higher Learning," 187, 209.
10. In 1911, 85 percent of Russian Jews at Prussian universities studied medicine. See Wertheimer, 190.
11. Kovács, *A zsidóság térfoglalása Magyarországon*.
12. For recent scholarship on the myth of Judeo-Bolshevism, see Hanebrink, *A Specter Haunting Europe*; and Ablovatski, *Revolution and Political Violence in Central Europe*.
13. Kovács, *A zsidóság térfoglalása*.
14. "A pesti zsidó hitközség nyilatkozata," 1. Cited in Hanebrink, *A Specter Haunting Europe*, 16–17.
15. Kovács, *Törvénytől sújtva*, 104, trans. Mark Baczoni.
16. Cited in Kovács, *Törvénytől sújtva*, 96.
17. Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen*, treats 1914 as the turning point in French society's modernization.
18. Arno J. Mayer's influential *The Persistence of the Old Regime* interprets World War I not as the first modern war but as the product of the surviving old-regime forces.
19. Passmore, *Fascism*, 43.
20. Passmore, 43.
21. Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat*.
22. Gerwarth and Horne, "Vectors of Violence," 489–512.
23. Healy, "Civilizing the Soldier in Postwar Austria," 47–69.
24. Miller, "The Forgotten Pogroms, 1918," 648–53; Veidlinger, *In the Midst of Civilized Europe*.
25. Budnitskii, *Russian Jews*, 216–17.
26. Konrád, "Two Post-War Paths," 759–75.
27. MacCracken, "A University Problem," 286.
28. On "ghetto benches," see Rabinowicz, "The Battle of the Ghetto Benches," 151–59; and Trębacz, "'Ghetto Benches' at Polish Universities," 113–35.

29. Synnott, *The Half-Opened Door*; Wechsler, *The Qualified Student*, updated edition published by Routledge, 2014; Oren, *Joining the Club*; Karabel, *The Chosen*.
30. Karabel, *The Chosen*, 25.
31. Synnott, "The Half-Opened Door," 176.
32. Karabel, *The Chosen*, 129.
33. MacCracken, "A University Problem," 286.
34. Karabel, *The Chosen*, 87.
35. Karabel, 86.
36. Buchsbaum, "A Note on Antisemitism in Admissions at Dartmouth," 82.
37. Steinberg, "How Jewish Quotas Began," 69.
38. MacCracken, "A University Problem," 287.
39. Starr, "The Affair at Harvard," 271.
40. "May Jews Go to College?," 708.
41. Steinberg, "How Jewish Quotas Began," 72.
42. "May Jews Go to College?" 708.
43. *Ibid.*, 708.
44. Karabel, *The Chosen*, 129.
45. Wenger, *New York Jews and the Great Depression*, 23.
46. In 1918, Jews made up more than 80 percent of the students at CCNY, which was jokingly called the College of the Circumcised Citizens of New York. See Gurock, "The Depth of Ethnicity," 145–62.
47. Sokoloff, "The Rise and Decline," 497–518.
48. Papp and Szent-Iványi, "Hundert Jahre Bund Ungarischer Hochschüler Berlin," 21. Cited by Miller, "Numerus Clausus Exiles," 217–18.
49. *Plus ça change*: The arguments of the Catholic ideologue Béla Bangha articulated in 1912 find their echo in European populist, right-wing politicians' "replacement theory," much in vogue today, as well as in the speeches of the current Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán.
50. Hanebrink, *A Specter Haunting Europe*.
51. Cited in Kovács, *Törvénytől sújtva*, 16–17, 90.
52. Kovács, "The Numerus Clausus in Hungary 1920–1945," 88 *passim*; Ladányi, "A numerus clausustól a numerus nullusig," 56–74, translated into English in the present volume.
53. "Der neue numerus clausus in Ungarn," *C.V.-Zeitung* (23 March 1928): 154.
54. "Elvégeztetett . . ." *Egyenlőség*, 25 September 1920, 1.
55. "Hogy tette tönkre a kommunizmus a zsidó egyházi életet?" *Egyenlőség*, 6 December 1919, 4. Cited in Szapor, "Between Self-Defense and Loyalty," 29.
56. Kovács, *Törvénytől sújtva*, 44.
57. Fenyő, *Pillanatfelvételek a külföldön élő magyar diákság életéből*, 20.
58. Karady, "Egyetemi antiszemitizmus," 3, 21–40; Miller, "From White Terror to Red Vienna," 307–24; *op. cit.* Miller, "Numerus clausus Exiles,"

- 206–18; Frank, *Double Exile*; Kelemen, “Leaving an Antisemitic Regime for a Fascist Country”; and “Peregrination in the Age of the Numerus Clausus.”
59. Ladányi, *Az egyetemi*; Szegvári, *Numerus clausus*; Kovács, *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics*; Natkowska, *Numerus clausus*; Rudnicki, “From ‘Numerus Clausus’ to ‘Numerus Nullus,’” 246–68; Kovács and Cârstocea, *Modern Antisemitisms in the Peripheries*; Molnár, *Jogfosztás—90 éve*; Karady and Nagy, *The Numerus Clausus in Hungary*; Hanak-Lettner and Spera, *Die Universität*; Fritz, Rossolinski-Liebe, and Starek, *Alma mater antisemitica*.
 60. MacCracken, “A University Problem,” 287.
 61. Spence, “Access to Higher Education,” 285–92.
 62. Socha and Lafortune, *Recent Trends*; Huguier and Romestaing, “Numerus Clausus,” 1367–78.
 63. Socha and Lafortune, *Recent Trends*.
 64. Sebbagh, “Quotas,” 323–24.

Bibliography

- Ablovatski, Eliza. *Revolution and Political Violence in Central Europe: The Deluge of 1919*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- Buchsbaum, Tamar. “A Note on Antisemitism in Admissions at Dartmouth.” *Jewish Social Studies* 49, no. 1 (Winter 1987): 79–84.
- Budnitskii, Oleg. *Russian Jews between the Reds and the Whites, 1917–1920*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Dubnow, Simon. *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland: From the Earliest Times until the Present Day*, vol. 2. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1916.
- Dudgeon, Ruth A. “The Forgotten Minority: Women Students in Imperial Russia, 1872–1917.” *Russian History* 9, no. 1 (1982).
- Fenyő, Lili. *Pillanatfelvételek a külföldön élő magyar diákság életéből*. Budapest: Author’s edition, no date [1929].
- Frank, Tibor. *Double Exile: Migrations of Jewish-Hungarian Professionals through Germany to the United States 1919–1945*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2009.
- Gerwarth, Robert, and John Horne. “Vectors of Violence: Paramilitarism in Europe after the Great War, 1917–1923.” *The Journal of Modern History* 83, no. 3 (September 2011): 489–512.
- Gurock, Jeffrey S. “The Depth of Ethnicity: Jewish Identity and Ideology in Interwar New York City.” *American Jewish Archives Journal* 61 (2009): 145–62.
- Hanak-Lettner, Werner, and Danielle Spera, eds. *Die Universität: eine Kampfzone*. Vienna: Jüdisches Museum Wien, 2015.
- Hanebrink, Paul A. *A Specter Haunting Europe: The Myth of Judeo-Bolshevism*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018.

- Hausmann, Guido. "Der Numerus clausus für jüdische Studenten im Zarenreich." *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 41, no. 4 (1993): 509–31.
- Healy, Maureen. "Civilizing the Soldier in Postwar Austria." In *Gender and War in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe*, edited by Nancy M. Wingfield and Maria Bucur, 47–69. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Huguier, Michel, and Patrick Romestaing. "Numerus clausus and Medical Demographics in France." *Bulletin de l'Académie Nationale de Médecine* 198 (2014): 1367–78.
- Karabel, Jerome. *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006.
- Karady, Victor. "Egyetemi antiszemitizmus és érvényesülési kényszerpályák: magyar-zsidó diákság a nyugat-európai főiskolákon a numerus clausus alatt." *Levéltári Szemle* 42, no. 3 (1992): 21–40.
- Kelemen, Ágnes Katalin. "Leaving an Antisemitic Regime for a Fascist Country: The Hungarian Numerus Clausus Refugees in Italy." Master's thesis, Central European University, 2014.
- . "Peregrination in the Age of the Numerus Clausus: Hungarian Jewish Students in Interwar Europe." Doctoral dissertation, Central European University, 2019.
- Konrád, Ota. "Two Post-War Paths: Popular Violence in the Bohemian lands and in Austria in the Aftermath of World War I." *Nationalities Papers* 46, no. 5 (2018): 759–75.
- Kovács, Alajos. *A zsidóság térfoglalása Magyarországon*. Budapest: Author's edition, 1922.
- Kovács, Éva, and Raul Cârstocea, eds. *Modern Antisemitisms in the Peripheries; Europe and Its Colonies 1880–1945*. Vienna: New Academic Press, 2019.
- Kovács, Mária M. "The Hungarian Numerus Clausus: Ideology, Apology and History, 1919–1945." In *The Numerus Clausus in Hungary: Studies on the First Anti-Jewish Law and Academic Anti-Semitism in Modern Central Europe*, edited by Victor Karady and P. T. Nagy, Research Reports on Central European History 1. Budapest: Pasts, Centre for Historical Research, History Department of the Central European University, 2012.
- . *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1994.
- . "The Numerus Clausus in Hungary 1920–1945." In *Alma Mater Antisemitica*, edited by Fritz Rossolinski-Liebe et al.
- . *Törvénytől sújtva: a numerus clausus Magyarországon, 1920–1945*. Budapest: Napvilág Kiadó, 2012.
- Ladányi, Andor. *Az egyetemi ifjúság az ellenforradalom első éveiben (1919–1921)*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1979.
- . "A numerus clausustól a numerus nullusig." *Múlt és Jövő* 16, no. 1 (2005): 56–74.
- MacCracken, H. N. "A University Problem." *The Menorah Journal* 9 (February 1923).

- Masé, Aline. "Student Migration of Jews from Tsarist Russia to the Universities of Berne and Zurich, 1865–1914." In *East European Jews in Switzerland. New Perspectives on Modern Jewish History*, vol. 5, edited by Tamar Lewinsky and Sandrine Mayoraz. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013.
- Mayer, Arno J. *The Persistence of the Old Regime: Europe to the Great War*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.
- Miller, Michael L. "The Forgotten Pogroms, 1918." *Slavic Review* 78, no. 3 (Fall 2019): 648–53.
- . "Numerus Clausus Exiles: Hungarian Jewish Students in Inter-War Berlin." In *The Numerus Clausus in Hungary*, edited by Victor Karady and Péter Tibor Nagy.
- . "From White Terror to Red Vienna: Hungarian Jewish Students in Interwar Austria." In *Wien und die jüdische Erfahrung 1900–1938: Akkulturation, Antisemitismus, Zionismus*, edited by Frank Stern and Barbara Frank-Eichinger, 307–24. Wien: Böhlau, 2009.
- Molnár, Judit, ed. *Jogfosztás—90 éve: tanulmányok a numerus claususról*. Budapest: Nonprofit Társadalomkutató Egyesület, 2011.
- Nathans, Benjamin. *Beyond the Pale: The Jewish Encounter with Late Imperial Russia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Natkowska, Monika. *Numerus clausus, getto ławkowe, numerus nullus, "paragraf aryjski": antysemityzm na Uniwersytecie Warszawskim 1931–1939*. Warsaw: Żydowski Instytut Historyczny, 1999.
- Oren, Dan A. *Joining the Club: A History of Jews and Yale*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Passmore, Kevin. *Fascism: A Very Short Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Rabinowicz, H. "The Battle of the Ghetto Benches." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 55, no. 2 (October 1964): 151–59.
- Rudnicki, Szymon. "From 'Numerus Clausus' to 'Numerus Nullus.'" In *Jews and the Emerging Polish State*, edited by A. Polonsky. *Polin* 2 (2008).
- Schivelbusch, Wolfgang. *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning and Recovery*, trans. Jefferson Chase. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003.
- Sebbagh, Daniel. "Quotas." In *Dictionnaire des inégalités*, edited by Alain Bihr and Roland Pfefferkorn, 323–24. Paris: Armand Colin, 2014.
- Socha, Karolina, and Gaetan Lafortune. *Recent Trends in Internationalisation of Medical Education*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2019.
- Sokoloff, Leon. "The Rise and Decline of the Jewish Quota in Medical School Admissions." *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 68, no. 4 (November 1992): 497–518.
- Spence, Jill. "Access to Higher Education in the Federal Republic of Germany: The Numerus Clausus Issue." *Comparative Education* 17, no. 3 (October 1981): 285–92.
- Starr, Harry. "The Affair at Harvard." *The Menorah Journal* 8, no. 5 (October 1922): 271.
- Steinberg, Stephen. "How Jewish Quotas Began." *Commentary* 52, no. 3 (September 1971): 67–76.

- Synnott, Marcia Graham. *The Half-Opened Door: Discrimination and Admissions at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, 1900–1970*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1979.
- Szapor, Judith. “Between Self-Defense and Loyalty; Jewish Responses to the Numerus Clausus Law in Hungary, 1920–1928.” *S:I.M.O.N. Shoah: Intervention. Methods. Documentation* 6, no. 1 (2019): 21–35.
- Szegvári, Katalin N. *Numerus clausus rendelkezések az ellenforradalmi Magyarországon: a zsidó és nőhallgatók főiskolai felvételéről*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988.
- Trębacz, Zofia. “‘Ghetto Benches’ at Polish Universities. Ideology and Practice.” In *Alma mater antisemitica. Akademisches Milieu, Juden und Antisemitismus an den Universitäten Europas zwischen 1918 und 1939*, edited by Regina Fritz, Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, and Jana Starek, 113–35. Vienna: New Academic Press, 2015.
- Veidlinger, Jeffrey. *In the Midst of Civilized Europe: The Pogroms of 1918–1921 and the Onset of the Holocaust*. New York: Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt and Company, 2021.
- Weber, Eugen. *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870–1914*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1976.
- Wechsler, Harold S. *The Qualified Student. A History of Selective College Admission in America*. New York: Wiley, 1977. Updated edition. London: Routledge 2014.
- Wenger, Beth S. *New York Jews and the Great Depression: Uncertain Promise*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Wertheimer, Jack. “The ‘Ausländerfrage’ at Institutions of Higher Learning: A Controversy over Russian-Jewish Students in Imperial Germany.” *The Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 27, no. 1 (January 1982).