

THE ROLE OF PROVINCIAL DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION
IN THE FORMATION OF MODERN OTTOMAN SCHOOLING, 1881-1908

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
ISTANBUL ŐEHİR UNIVERSITY

BY
MERYEM KARABEKMEZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN HISTORY

JUNE 2012

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science of Philosophy, in History.

Examining Committee Members:

Yard. Doç. Dr. Abdulhamit Kırmızı

(Thesis Supervisor)

Prof. Dr. Engin Deniz Akarlı

Yard. Doç. Dr. Nurullah Ardiç

This is to confirm that this thesis complies with all the standards set by the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Istanbul Şehir University:

13/06/2012

ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF PROVINCIAL DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION IN THE FORMATION OF MODERN OTTOMAN SCHOOLING, 1881-1908

Karabekmez, Meryem

MA, Department of History

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Abdulhamit Kırmızı

June 2012, 103 pages

In the late Ottoman Empire education was used as a means of training obedient and loyal subjects for the sultan. The number of foreign schools, which introduced nice facilities for all students, gradually increased in the provinces and it became a danger for the Ottoman Empire. The empire commenced to spread its own educational system by opening new schools and appointing directors of education to the Ottoman provinces. In this thesis roles of the directors of education in the development of the modern education in the empire are studied in terms of their responsibilities, academic backgrounds, and the problems they faced in the provinces. Documents from the Prime Ministry Archive formed the main source for the thesis. Also secondary sources concerning the modernization of education in the late Ottoman Empire were used. As a result it can be claimed that the biggest trigger for the empire to improve educational conditions was the growing number of foreign schools. The thesis shed light also on conditions, problems and advancement regarding education in the provinces. All these results can be regarded as part of the parameters of the transformation of the Ottoman Empire in the 19th and 20th centuries.

(Keywords: the Ottoman Empire, education and directors of education)

ÖZ

TAŞRA MAARİF MÜDÜRLERİNİN OSMANLI EĞİTİMİNİN MODERNLEŞMESİNDEKİ ROLLERİ, 1881-1908

Karabekmez, Meryem

MA, Tarih Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yard. Doç. Dr. Abdulhamit Kırmızı

Haziran 2012, 103 sayfa

Geç Osmanlı İmparatorluğu döneminde, eğitim kurumları sadık ve itaatkar bir tebaa yetiştirmek için bir araç olarak kullanıldı. İmparatorluk dahilinde öğrencilere maddi ve manevi kolaylıklar sağlayan yabancı okulların sayıları gittikçe artmaktaydı ve bu durum Osmanlı Devleti için bir tehlike haline girmekteydi. İmparatorluk, vilayetlere maarif müdürleri atayarak kendi eğitim sistemini yaygınlaştırmaya çalıştı. Bu çalışmada maarif müdürleri, Osmanlı devletinde modern eğitimin gelişmesindeki rolleri, onların görevleri, akademik hayatları ve taşrada karşılaştıkları sorunlar göz önüne alınarak incelenmiştir. Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivinde bulunan belgeler bu çalışmanın en önemli kaynağını oluşturmaktadır. Ayrıca Osmanlı'da eğitim modernleşmesi ile ilgili ikincil kaynaklar da kullanılmıştır. Sonuç olarak, Osmanlı devletini eğitim reformuna iten başlıca etmenlerden birinin bünyesindeki yabancı okulların çoğalması olduğu söylenebilir. Tezde taşranın eğitim şartları, eğitimle ilgili ilerlemeler ve problemler de ortaya çıkartılmıştır. Tüm bunlar Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun 19. ve 20. yüzyıllarda yaşadığı dönüşümü değerlendirmek açısından birer parametre olarak değerlendirilebilir.

(Anahtar Kelimeler: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, Eğitim, Maarif Müdürleri)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Before all, I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor Abdulhamit Kırmızı for his encouragement and priceless guidance during all my work. This thesis owes greatly to his patient, support, and trust. It has been a privilege to work with him.

I would like to thank Yunus Uğur for discussions with him about the modernization of education. I also would like to sincerely thank Professor Engin Deniz Akarlı for his advice, which led me to question every step of my thesis.

I am also indebted to David Reed Albachten at Şehir University Writing Center for his redactions. I have a deep gratitude to Semra for her friendship during all this process and before. I would like to thank all my graduate student colleagues for their support and friendship.

I have to express that I am forever in debt to my parents for supporting me with their affection and trust. I would like to sincerely thank my brothers, Ali and Muhammed Yasir for their genuine support that makes my life richer. Finally I am grateful for my love, my husband, Muhammed Erkan for his understanding, encouragement, and endless patience during my project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Öz	iv
Aknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	viii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Methods and Sources	4
2. EDUCATION AS A “WEAPON” AGAINST THE BIG THREAT	6
2.1. Development of Education in the Ottoman Empire	6
2.2. Development of Public Education in France	11
2.3. Establishment of the Councils of Education in the Ottoman Provinces	14
2.4. Missionary Schools as Target of the First Councils of Education	18
2.5. Additional Councils in Other Provinces	27
3. WHO WERE THE DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION?	35
3.1. Appointment of the Directors of Education to the Provinces	35
3.2. Inspection Reports as Duty of the Directors of Education	44
3.3. Preservation of Ancient Monuments and Architecture	49
3.4. Investigation of Books and Journals	51
3.5. Instructions for the Directors of Education	52
3.6. Voluntary Works of the Directors of Education	53
3.7. Displacement of the Directors of Education	57

3.8. The Salaries of the Directors of Education	60
4. THE PROBLEMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATION IN THE PROVINCES	62
4.1. Instructors and the Schoolmaster Against the Director of Education	64
4.2. Women Instructors Against the Director of Education	66
4.3. Illicit Relationships Between Civil Servants	68
4.4. The director's Ignorance of the Ottoman Schools	69
4.5. Misadministration of the Director of Education in Yannina	71
5. ACADEMIC CAREER PATHS OF THE DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION	74
5.1. The Life Story of a Director of Education	83
6. CONCLUSION	93
BIBLIOGRAPHY	96

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Contents of the <i>Maârif-i Umûmiyye Nizâmnâmesi</i> 1869	10
Table 3.1. Contents of the <i>Vilayât-ı Şâhâne Maârif Müdîrlerinin Vezâifini Mübeyyin Talimât</i>	38
Table 3.2. Categories of Directors of Education	61
Table 5.1. Directors of Education Graduated From the <i>Mekteb-i Mülkiye</i>	81

1. INTRODUCTION

Big events, revolutions, wars such as the Enlightenment, the Napoleonic Wars, Industrial Revolution and French Revolution changed the balance of power of the world as well as relations and interests of empires. The Ottoman Empire had internal problems as well as external problems on the eve of the 19th century. Changing east-west trade routes through geographical discoveries led the Ottoman Empire to incur heavy losses. Increasing defeats in wars, military and economic troubles resulted in the breakdown of *the tımar* system. The strengthening of the provincial notables (*the ayan*) became a major problem. Since its establishment, the Ottoman Empire maintained a classical status quo, but it had to launch out a great change because of the new troubles of the 19th century. In addition, traditional education could not respond to the need for well-qualified personnel for the growing bureaucracy, which was formed by the establishment of ministries as a part of this major transformation. Education is one of the significant institutions to direct the inevitable transformation and train well-qualified civil servants for the bureaucracy. Therefore in the Tanzimat era and the reign of Abdülhamid II many reforms were made in the education. The centralization policy of Abdülhamid II and expansion of the bureaucracy went hand in hand.

Bureaucratization and centralization of education can be seen as the core of the formation of modern nation-states. In the 19th century states began to found new schools and spread public education as a part of a centralization policy. Theodore Zeldin described the nineteenth century as “the Age of Education and it was one of the greatest stimulants of national uniformity.”¹ Eugene Weber shows that “the role played by war in promoting national awareness was reinforced by educational propaganda, by developing trade and commercial ties, and finally by something approaching universal service.”² A sense of nationality began to be learned in the schools at the end of the 19th century. People learned what it means to be a citizen as well as how to read and how to write. “Schooling becomes a major agent of

¹ Theodore Zeldin, *France 1848-1945 Intellect and Pride* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 139-141.

² Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen The Modernization of Rural France 1870-1914* (California: Stanford University Press, 1976), 298.

acculturation: shaping individuals to fit societies and cultures broader than their own, and persuading them that these broader realms are their own, as much as the pays they really know and more so.”³ Elementary schools were seen as a means of providing social unity and stability that was required to form a modern nation-state. Speaking for France, Weber states that “the teaching of reading, writing, and arithmetic, would furnish essential skills; the teaching of French and of the metric system would implant or increase the sense of unity under French nationhood; moral and religious instruction would serve social and spiritual needs.”⁴ Children were taught to like their states, to die for the state at the expense of their life, as well as consciousness of being citizen and necessity of paying the tax to the state citizens in public schools in the 19th century. In the Ottoman Empire, schooling was expanded for other reasons, as well as reasons that will be explained below.

According to Fortna, “it is important to see the Ottoman case as forming part of a much broader phenomenon that was nothing less than the worldwide expansion of state education of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.”⁵ Ottoman educational reforms aimed to give students the sense of obedience and loyalty to the Ottoman state and to create a social homogeneity.⁶ Hence the state began to reform educational institutions in the Tanzimat era.

Military engineering schools were founded for the navy in 1773 and for the army in 1793. Mahmud II established the military Medical school in 1827 and the Military Academy in 1834. Students were sent to Europe. An Ottoman school existed in Paris briefly (1857-64). Systematic efforts to train civil officials began with founding of the Translation Office in 1821.⁷

³ Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen*, 330-331.

⁴ *Ibid*, 331.

⁵ Benjamin C. Fortna, *Imperial Classroom Islam, the State, and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 27.

⁶ For details, see Selçuk Akşin Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire, 1839-1908 Islamization, Autocracy and Discipline* (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2001).

⁷ Carter Vaughn Findley, “The Tanzimat” in *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol.4, ed. Reşat Kasaba, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.2008), 22.

The Ottoman government began to finance the founding of new schools and spreading public education in all provinces of the empire by establishing the Ministry of Public Education (*Maarif Nezareti*) in 1857. The Minister was to administer schools and introduce new teaching method in addition to opening new schools. The enactment of the Regulation of Public Education (*Maârif-i Umûmiye Nizamnâmesi*) in 1869 was one of the most significant steps towards the bureaucratization and centralization of education in the Ottoman Empire. This Regulation stipulated the establishment of councils of education in the provinces to directly control educational conditions and schools. These councils were headed by directors of education, who became significant figures in the formation of modern education in the provinces. They were appointed to the provinces by the Ministry of Public Education and their responsibilities were to carry out the Regulation of Public Education and instructions of the Ministry.

Until now the modernization of public education in the Ottoman Empire has been analyzed from the point of view of the capital and the provinces were ignored in general. My thesis focuses on the directors of education (*maarif müdürleri*) in the reign of Abdülhamid II. The directors headed the provincial councils of education (*meclis-i maarif*) and the efforts to modernize and rectify education in the provinces. The first director of education was appointed in 1881. Their numbers gradually expanded to cover all provinces of the empire. The thesis examines the period from 1881 to 1908 in order to establish the role played by the directors of education in the expansion and modernization of public education in the Ottoman Empire. The Instruction Concerning the Duties of Directors of Education of the Imperial Provinces (*Vilayât-ı Şâhâne Maârif Müdürlerinin Vezâifini Mübeyyin Talimât*⁸) was promulgated in 1896 to explain the responsibilities of the directors of education. The thesis aims at shedding light on the implementation and effects of the educational reforms planned in Istanbul in the provinces through the directors of education. Whether they acted in their own initiatives or not and how they applied the rules of the Regulation of Public Education to modernize provincial education are among the central questions that the thesis tries to answer.

⁸ *Maarif Salnâmesi*, 1316, 136 and *Düstur*, 1st Tertip, vol.7. 118-129.

1.1. Methods and Sources

The *Maarif Nezareti* section in the Ottoman Archives of the Turkish Prime Ministry forms the core of the study. Especially the documents belong to the MF.MKT (*Maarif Mektubi Kalemi*) section construct touchstones of my thesis. Education Yearbooks (*Salnâme-i Maarif*) issued by the Ministry of Education in 1892, 1898, 1899 and 1903 were used. As a primary source and a biographical references Provincial Yearbook (*Salnâme-i Vilayet*) series, and *Düstur* (Collection of Ottoman Laws and Regulations) are investigated. The *Sicill-i Ahval Defterleri* (Personnel Records Registers) prepared by the Interior Ministry preserved in the Prime Ministry Archives of the Turkish Republic, are also used.

Many studies have been published on the modernization attempts and expansion of public education in late Ottoman history. Selçuk Akşin Somel, and Benjamin C. Fortna's works, cited in the bibliography, make significant contributions to our analytical understanding of the transformation of education in late Ottoman history. Somel's work shows how public schools helped building social discipline and modernization in the Ottoman Empire. Bayram Kodaman and Faik Reşit Unat's books⁹ provide a crucial base of knowledge and criticism for academicians interested in the history of education in the late Ottoman Empire. Eugene Weber's book, which focuses on the penetration of the educational system into French provinces, is helpful in providing a comparative framework regarding in the 19th century. Mahmud Cevad's study¹⁰ as well has been helpful as a main source. Kırmızı's *Abdülhamid'in Valileri*¹¹ is an important work to understand how bureaucrats of the reign of Abdülhamid II can be studied and to formulate the present structure of the thesis. Also Kırmızı's forthcoming book about *Avlonyalı Ferid Paşa*, the Governor of Konya, is used in the thesis to show the efforts of the director of education of Konya and Ferid Pasha himself to further develop education in Konya. I am grateful to Abdulhamit Kırmızı for sharing his work with me. The scarcity of studies about the

¹⁰ Mahmud Cevad İbnü'ş-Şeyh Nâfi'. *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti Târihçe-i Teşkilât ve İcrââtı-IXI. Asır Osmanlı Maarif Tarihi*, ed. Taceddin Kayaoğlu (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2001).

¹¹ Abdulhamit Kırmızı, *Abdülhamid'in Valileri: Osmanlı Vilayet İdaresi 1895-1908* (İstanbul: Klasik, 2007).

history of education in the late Ottoman Empire is a major problem that I faced in undertaking this work.

The first chapter, “Education as a “Weapon” Against the Big Threat”, discusses the expansion of public education into provinces of the Ottoman Empire as a reaction to the increasing number of the foreign schools in the empire as well as to join the global movement for educational development. Founding foreign schools to develop missionary activities and to attract Muslims will be defined as “the Big Threat”. My sources refer to the improvements in education and its expansion into Ottoman provinces by founding new schools and appointing of directors of education as a “weapon” to fight the big threat. Chapter two deals with the responsibilities of directors of education according to the regulations passed by the Ministry of Public Education, and their appointments, salaries as well as daily business. The chapter indicates that directors of education made efforts to improve educational conditions in the provinces although the regulations did not call for it. Chapter three covers the problems of school administration in the Ottoman provinces by concentrating on complaints about directors of education and directors’ criticism of schools and teachers. The final chapter attempts to understand the career paths of directors of education, especially those who graduated from the Civil Servant School (*Mekteb-i Mülkiye*).

2. EDUCATION AS A “WEAPON” AGAINST THE BIGTHREAT

This chapter covers the general circumstances of education in the Ottoman Empire before 1876, the Regulation of Public Education, the parallels between the Ottoman educational system and education in France, the founding of the councils of education, and the foreign threat to Ottoman subjects. It maintains that a competition emerged in the empire where the state expanded its school system as a response to the activities of the missionaries and the increasing number of foreign schools. The inspiration of the title of this chapter is from Benjamin C. Fortna, who described the development of school system as a “weapon the state used to fight back.”¹²

2.1. Development of Education in the Ottoman Empire

Until the 1860s, education was provided in *medreses*, which were established by charitable foundations in the Ottoman Empire. “Prior to the Regulation of Public Education (1869) traditional schools and *medreses*, as an educational network under the control of the *ulema*, remained a legitimate parallel structure side by side with the network of government secondary schools.”¹³

In 1254 (1838) the Directorate of Secondary Schools (*Mekâtib-i Rüşdiyye Nezâreti*) was established, to administer the first schools, *rüşdiyyes* [secondary schools] under the Ministry of *Evkaf*.¹⁴ The Directorate of Secondary Schools could not become a ministry¹⁵ controlling all *rüşdiyyes*. It supervised only two schools: *Mekteb-i Maarif-i Adliyye* and *Mekteb-i Ulum-i Edebiyye*¹⁶, which trained students to become a civil servant. After İ. Esad *Efendi*, the head of the Directorate of Secondary Schools, was appointed a member of the Supreme Council (*Meclis-i Vala*) in 1849, the Directorate of Secondary Schools was abolished.

A “Temporary Council” (*Meclis-i Muvakkat*) was established in Istanbul and other regions in the reign of Abdülmecid to consider educational issues, because the

¹² Fortna, *Imperial Classroom*, 88.

¹³ Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 15.

¹⁴ Osman Nuri Ergin, *Türk Maarif Tarihi* (İstanbul: Eser Matbaası, 1977), 386.

¹⁵ According to Unat, “At that time, meaning of “ministry” was not same with that of today. It was generally used instead of “*müdür*” to give importance to an office.”, 18

¹⁶ Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 36.

Directorate of Secondary Schools could not make the desired improvements in the area of education. Thanks to the proposals of a temporary council, the government established “Council of Public Education” (*Meclis-i Maarif-i Umûmiyye*) in June 1846. This body is considered to be a significant step toward the modernization of the educational administration¹⁷ because the chief religious official, the office of the *Şeyhülislam*, had controlled all educational institutions but members of the Council of Public Education were determined by the Sublime Porte¹⁸. By the proposal of the Council of Education, the Directorate of Public Schools (*Mekâtib-i Umûmiye Nezâreti*) was established to carry out the decisions of the Council of Public Education. The first *Dârülmualimîn*, Teacher Training College, was established in 1848 and the curriculum of the *rüşdiyyes*, secondary schools, was expanded to include science and religion courses. Also in order to translate and reconcile University textbooks and to prepare books on science education, Academy of Science (*Encümen-i Daniş*) was established in 1851. However it did not bring about the required benefits and disappeared in 1862.¹⁹

Reform Edict of 1856 extended the non-Muslim minorities’ educational autonomy without anticipating any reform for Muslims’ traditional education. This provided rapid development of new educational institutions among Armenians, Bulgarians, and Greeks. In face of such an expansion of non-Muslim schools the Porte needed to support the improvement of the Ottoman public school system even more than before.²⁰ The government began to establish new schools to train its subjects. The Directorate of Public Schools was not suitable to expand institutions for education. The Department of Public Education, which opened such new schools as *Mülkiye* Schools for the training of public officials, and secondary schools (*Rüşdiyye*) for girls, was formed by the *Bâb-ı Âli* in 1857.²¹ This department served as the basis of today’s Ministry of Public Education.

¹⁷ Ibid, 38.

¹⁸ Ali Akyıldız, *Osmanlı Bürokrasisi ve Modernleşme* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2004),68.

¹⁹ Unat, *Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış*, 20.

²⁰ Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 42.

²¹ For details, see Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, 12-20.

The instruction, including nine items, about the duties and authority of the Department of Public Education was issued in 1861. According to the instruction, all regular schools except *Harbiye* (military school), *Bahriye* (navy), and *Tıbbiye* (medical school) were put under the authority of the Department of Education. The department would be in charge of primary education, (*mekâtib-i sıbyâniye*), secondary schools education (*mekâtib-i rüşdiyye*), professional schools education (*mekâtib-i aliye*), reconciliation and translation, and printing houses.²² In 1869, The Regulation of Public Education reorganized the Ministry into four main offices; namely, the office of the Director of Public Education, the Sublime Council of Education (*Meclis-i Kebir-i Maarif*), the Secretariat (*Tahrirat Kalemi*), and the Accounting Office (*Muhasebe Kalemi*). The Sublime Council of Education had two major branches. One of these branches was the Department of Science (*Daire-i İlmiyye*), which translated schoolbooks, corresponded with the European universities, worked to develop Turkish language, and regulated the examinations of *rüüs*. The other branch was the department of administration (*Daire-i İdare*), which was in charge of the administration of schools, the educational councils that were to be established in the future in the provinces, museums, libraries, and the print houses of the state.²³ In addition, the “Commission for Inspection and Examination” (*Encümen-i Teftiş ve Muayene*) established in 1880 and the Ministry of Public Education inspected the schools of foreigners and non-Muslims.²⁴ Six years later, the Inspectorate of Schools for Foreigners and Non-Muslims (*Mekâtib-i Ecnebiyye ve Gayri Müslime Müfettişliği*) was established. This office inspected non-Muslim and foreign schools, their schedules, textbooks, and education quality to prevent them from harming state interests. It required teachers to instruct with a program approved by the office. In addition the foreign schools had to obtain a certificate from this office. If there was a corruption in these schools, the inspectors reported it to the

²² For details see Unat, *Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış*, 22-25.

²³ For details, see Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 90-92.

²⁴ Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, 32.

Minister of Public Education. Besides the Ministry of Education advised the directors of education about foreign schools.²⁵

One of the turning points in the area of education was passing the Regulation of Public Education in 1869. It strengthened the authority of the Ministry of Public Education in terms of the administration of schools and spreading education into the provinces. Institutionalization of provincial education was primarily discussed in the Regulation of Public Education shaped under the influence of Jean Victor Duruy, who was the minister of public education in France in 1869.²⁶ However many decisions of the regulation could not be immediately applied due to the wars and internal conflicts in the Ottoman Empire.

The official justification of the regulation, before September 1869, reflects the ideological impulse of Westernized educational reformists. According to Somel:

The document then criticized the paucity of educational institutions in the Empire. Though the “higher sciences” (*ulûm-ı âliyye*) were requiring a regular primary school system as a basis, the number of the existing *sıbyân* schools (elementary schools) was inadequate. Besides, only elementary religious knowledge was taught in the *sıbyân* schools. Instructors lacked pedagogical skills...²⁷

Thanks to this regulation, the Sublime Council of Education (*Büyük Meclis-i Maarif*) was established under the minister of public education. This council was divided in two parts, one of which was responsible for scientific works and the other was handled the administrative issues.

²⁵ For details, see Hasan Ali Koçer. *Türkiye’de Modern Eğitimin Doğuşu ve Gelişimi (1773-1923)* (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1974), 158.

²⁶ For whole text of the Regulation of Public Education: *Düstur*, 1st Tertip, vol.2, 184. As a second literature: Cevad, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti Târihçe-i Teşkilât ve İcrââtı*, 424-459.

²⁷ Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 87.

Table 2.1: Contents of the Maârif-i Umûmiye Nizamnâmesi (1869)

<p>Chapter I Departments and Degrees of Schools</p> <p>Part I Public Schools</p> <p>Phase 1 <i>Sıbyân</i> Schools (Elementary schools)</p> <p><i>Sıbyân</i> Schools for girls</p> <p><i>Rüşdiyye</i> Schools (Secondary schools)</p> <p><i>Rüşdiyye</i> Schools for girls</p> <p>Phase 2 <i>İdadî</i> Schools (High Schools)</p> <p><i>Sultânî</i> Schools</p> <p>Part 2 Professional Schools (<i>Mekâtib-i Aliyye</i>)</p> <p>Phase 1 Teachers' Seminary (<i>Dârulmuallimîn</i>)</p> <p>Literature Class</p> <p>Science Class (<i>Ulûm Sınıfı</i>)</p> <p>Woman Teachers' Seminary (<i>Dârulmuallimât</i>)</p> <p>University (<i>Dârülfünûn</i>)</p> <p>Part 3 Private Schools</p> <p>Chapter II Commission of Public Administration of Education (<i>Hey'et-i Umûmiye-i İdâre-i Maârif</i>)</p> <p>Part 1 The Supreme Council of Education (<i>Meclis-i Kebir-i Maârif</i>)</p> <p>Phase 1 Chamber of Science (<i>Dâire-i İlmiye</i>)</p> <p>Phase 2 Chamber of Administration</p> <p>The Councils of Education in Provinces</p> <p>Chapter III Exams and Diplomas and Their Allowances (<i>İmtihanlara, ve Şehadetnameler ve rüuslara ve bunların imtiyazatına dair</i>)</p> <p>Chapter IV Teachers</p> <p>Chapter V Works of Finance (<i>umûr-ı maliye</i>)</p>

Here France's educational system is discussed briefly in order to see the educational conditions in France in the nineteenth century and the parallels between the developments of education of France and that of the Ottoman government. This discussion should introduce a comparative perspective.

2.2. Development of Public Education in France

The teaching of even elementary reading, writing, and arithmetic was rare before the French Revolution, and teachers were little interested in broad public education.²⁸ The teachers could have been retired soldiers or a half-educated person's son. Most of them worked at another job in any case. In 1833 a law introduced by François Guizot, the Minister of Public Instruction,

It required every commune or group of neighboring communes to set up and maintain at least one elementary school; it prohibited the operation of a school without an official certificate that such standards had been met; it decreed that each department should set up, alone or jointly with its neighbors, a normal school to train primary school teachers.²⁹

This system produced immediate results. In 1837 one pupil in three participated into public elementary schools free of charge. After the Guizot Law passed, there were three types of schools; namely *l'école communale*, public schools run by the commune; *l'école privée autorisée*, private schools managed by the state and *l'école clandestine*, illegal schools, which were less expensive than the others and run by unauthorized teaching personnel. The poorer families preferred to send their children to the clandestine schools. Following the Guizot Law, many reforms such as Falloux Law of 1850 were enacted to increase the state authority at the local level. However attendance to schools was voluntary and education was influenced by the Church.³⁰

Most initiatives of the Minister of Education Victor Duruy could not be realized in the 1860s. The important reforms were introduced by Jules Ferry, who was the architect of the French primary education, and became widespread. "In 1881 all fees and tuition charges in public elementary schools were abolished. In 1882 enrollment

²⁸ Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen*, 304.

²⁹ Ibid, 307.

³⁰ For details, see Deborah Reed- Danayah, *Education and Identity in Rural France- the politics of schooling*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 116-117

in a public or a private school was made compulsory. In 1885 subsidies were allotted for the building and maintenance of schools and for the pay of teachers.”³¹ His laws made primary education in France a public, secular, and obligatory experience for all children. With these laws, the village school and its teacher became linked to centralized national system promoting French language, culture, and civic values.³²

People on the verge of starvation could not afford to spend their time or money on education, but in many regions, education was a means to escape from poverty in France. Also the leaders of the working class placed great stress on education. In the nineteenth century they required education as a right in the same way as they wanted the right to form unions.³³ Many poor families wanted their children to be sent to work and contribute to the family budget. They were also discouraged by the distance the children had to walk to get the school. However, by the 1880s, many duties emerged in the government positions thanks to growth of the state bureaucracy. Government positions were secure, so they were in great demand. To fill the available posts, education was expanded. “Around the 1880s even rural laborers began to lend attention to the schools.”³⁴ Theodore Zeldin described the nineteenth century as “the Age of Education.”³⁵ In that period, education was seen as the solution to social and economic problems and as the opportunity to gain social prestige, prosperity and comfort.

There are different arguments about schooling in France. Some studies in the 1970s argued that universal schooling was related to the growth of the state in France. Peasants accepted schooling because of their own changing perceptions not because school was imposed upon them. Eugene Weber supported this claim. On the other hand, since the 1980s, John Meyer argues that mass schooling backdates the development of the state and schooling was common long before the Third Republic.

³¹ Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen*, 308-309.

³² Danayah, *Education and Identity in Rural France*, 111.

³³ For details, see Zeldin, *France 1848-1945 Intellect and Pride*, 145.

³⁴ Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen*, 328.

³⁵ Zeldin, *France 1848-1945 Intellect and Pride*, 139.

Jules Ferry's attempts to institutionalize primary education in France illustrate the point.³⁶

The function of modern schools in France was to teach children nationalist, and patriotic sentiments, explain what the state did for them and why it exacted taxes and military service, and show them their true interest in the fatherland.³⁷ In other words, national pedagogy was one of the most significant aims of popular education. Teachers were trained to help constitute the spirit of the nation. Lessons in school were standardized throughout France and focused on building associations that bound generations.

Schooling in most rural areas in France during most of the 19th century included conflict and was faced with a reluctant peasantry. Participation at schools was low and irregular throughout rural France at that time. Peasants were not respectful of the teachers, who were seen as peddlers and had low status in the provinces. The myth that the Third Republic overcame many obstacles to transform "peasants into Frenchmen" is not so straightforward according to Deborah Reed-Danayah. It is important to bear in mind that the history of schooling in rural France is the history of a particular social form involving deliberate means of inculcation and control. It was not until much later, in the mid-20th century, when family allowances were combined with school attendance, that universal enrollment in French primary education was accomplished.³⁸

The Ottoman government was affected by France especially in the Tanzimat period, in artistic styles, literature, and politics. France became a source of inspiration in educational matters as well. Victor Duruy, French Minister of Education, prepared the blueprints of the Regulation of Public Education in 1869. This regulation served as the master plan for education in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. We find the reasons of the emergence of the Regulation of Public Education in the official report about this regulation.

³⁶ For details, see Deborah Reed, *Education and Identity in Rural France*, 112.

³⁷ Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen*, 332-333.

³⁸ For details, see Deborah Reed, *Education and Identity in Rural France*, 110-130.

According to this report, making education compulsory, gradation of schools according to their level of education, regulation of the education system, increasing knowledge and respectability of the teaching staff, providing them with decent living conditions, the establishment of councils of education in provinces, development and spread of scientific institutions and setting up examination rules to encourage students- all these were reasons for the promulgation of the Regulation.³⁹

But systemic expansion of public education into the provinces was only realized in the Abdulhamid II's reign.

It was stipulated in the Regulation of Public Education that in each *vilayet*-center a local branch of the Sublime Council of Education was to be established, functioning as a local executive agency of the Sublime Council. The head of each local branch, the "director of education" of a *vilayet* was also the chairman of the *vilayet*'s Educational Council."⁴⁰

Here the process of the establishment of the provincial councils of education as a central policy and the reasons for setting up these councils will be mentioned briefly.

2.3. Establishment of the Councils of Education in the Ottoman Provinces

One of the significant items in the Regulation of Public Education to institutionalize education affairs was setting up councils of education as a local branch of the Sublime Council of Education (*Meclis-i Kebir-i Maarif*) in each province in order to control and promote education outside the capital. The director of education was also the head of the educational councils. The setting up councils of education in the provinces was a sign for centralization and bureaucratization of educational institutions in the Ottoman Empire.

The council consisted of not only Muslims, but also of non-Muslims. One of the two vice presidents of the educational council was a non-Muslim and two of the four investigators (*muhakkik*) were non-Muslim. Besides these four investigators, educational council consisted of at "least four and maximum ten Muslim and non-Muslim members without salary, and finally of one secretary, one accountant and

³⁹ Unat, *Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış*, 92. Also see İlknur Polat Haydaroglu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Yabancı Okullar*. (Ankara: Ocak Yayınları, 1993), 23-24.

⁴⁰ Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 92.

one cashier.”⁴¹ Moreover one of the two inspectors of the council was to be a non-Muslim and they were appointed to districts (*sancaks*).

According to Imperial decree, not only the director of education, investigators and two vice presidents, but also district inspectors were selected by the Ministry of Public Education. The members of the council were chosen from among the local notables by the administration of the province and their names were submitted to the Ministry of Public Education for approval and appointment. The director of education, the inspectors, the investigators, the vice president, the secretary, the accountant and the cashier were paid a regular salary but not the members from the local notables.⁴²

The councils of education were responsible to;

- carry out charges ordered by the Ministry of Public Education,
- choose good instructors and reform provincial elementary schools,
- conform to the provisions of the Regulation of Public Education of 1869,
- take care that the payment (*avarız*) collected by public or sent by the government was appropriately spent to establish new provincial schools and district schools.

Many of the endowments no longer served their original purpose. These were called *münderise*-foundations. Their revenues were transferred to the councils of education to be used appropriately according to the Regulation.

The educational committees in the districts were put under the responsibility of the provincial councils of education, located at provincial capital. The heads of these committees were to submit a semiannual report about the revenue (including *avarız*, *evkaf-ı münderise* and the charge taken from the parents) and expenditures to the directors of education.

⁴¹ Ibid, 92.

⁴² Item 143 of Maârif-i Umûmiye Nizamnâmesi, in Cevad, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti Târihçe-i Teşkilât ve İcrââtı*, 448 and Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 92-93.

In districts where a high school (*mekâtib-i idâdî*) existed, its schoolmaster, and one of its instructors were normal members of the district educational committee. In villages, senior instructors of secondary schools (*rüşdiyye* schools) were also natural members of the educational committee. The councils had to

- oversee the inspection of schools, libraries, print houses, and similar cultural institutions,
- choose or appoint proper instructors,
- administer examinations to issue diplomas,
- write an annual report about the general situation and problems of education.⁴³

The orders about the councils of education in the Regulation show the effort to draw local notables into spreading education in the provinces. Because of financial problems in the center, using local financial resources efficiently was important to further develop education. However, the Ottoman government controlled local participation in the councils and only people known for their allegiance to the Sublime Porte could become members of the educational council.⁴⁴

The first step to set up a council of education was taken by Governor Mithat Pasha, in Tuna in 1872. He suggested “establishing a council of education headed by Haydar *Efendi*. Also this council had two Muslim and two non-Muslim members.”⁴⁵ According to Bayram Kodaman the first councils of education were established in provinces of *Tuna* and *Baghdad* in 1872, but it is not clear if these councils continued to exist.⁴⁶ The Ottoman government could not carry out the Regulation of Public Education of 1869 in the provinces due to wars and political and financial problems.

⁴³ Maârif-i Umûmiye Nizamnâmesi in Cevad, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti Târihçe-i Teşkilât ve İcrââtı*, 424-459, and items 10-16 of Vilayât-ı Şâhâne Maârif Müdürlerinin Vezâifini Mübeyyin Talimât, in *Salnâme-i Maarif*, 1316, 139-141.

⁴⁴ See Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire*, 92-95.

⁴⁵ BOA, MF.MKT. 7/46, 1289 § 26 (26 October 1872).

⁴⁶ Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, 44.

In 1882 the Ministry of Public Education prepared an official circular (*tezkiye*) about opening councils of education in the provinces starting with Van, Sivas, Diyarbakir, Mamüretülaziz and Erzurum. According to the circular: “Although the establishment of a council of education in each province and its branches in accordance with the Regulation of Public Education is desirable, it is also necessary to take into account of the financial situation and that it is questionable to find well qualified officials for all places in such short notice.”⁴⁷ In other words, because of lack of well-qualified personnel and financial resources, the Ottoman government could not open an educational council in all provinces and districts of the Empire. Why did the Ottoman government establish a council of education in Sivas, Diyarbakır, Mamüretülaziz, Erzurum, and Van before anywhere else? The official document, mentioned above, provides clues to answer this question.

First, these were the provinces where education was more underdeveloped than other parts of Anatolia. Furthermore the rule of instruction and teaching was gradually passing into the hands of outsiders and foreigners. Therefore setting up a council of education in these provinces would help the conducting of these properly in the future. Thanks to these councils it would be possible to establish *Dârümuallimîn-i Sıbyân* (Teacher College for elementary schools) gradually and to set up their branches of the councils in the counties and districts to discharge duties as stipulated by the instructions of the Ministry. In 1882 a council of education was to be established in Sivas, Diyarbakır, Mamüretülaziz, Erzurum, and Van.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ BOA, Y.A.RES. 14/48, 26 S 1299 (17 January 1882) “eğerçi nizamname mucibince bilcümle vilayat-ı şahaneye mecalis-i maarif ve şubatının tamim ve tesisi arzu olunuyor ise de ahval-i hazıra-i maliye dahi daima piş-i nazarda tutulmak vecaibten olmakla bu kadar yere birden bire evsaf-ı matlubeyi cami memur bulunup bulunmayacağı pek ziyade şüphe götürür mesailden olmağla...” Kodaman had also used the document. *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, 45-46.

⁴⁸ Ibid “evvel emirde Anadolu’nun maarifçe cihat-ı saire-i memalike nazaran geri kalmış ve binaenaleyh oralarca emr-i tedris ve talim kaziyeye-i mühimmesi yavaş yavaş ağıyar ü ecânib eline geçmekte bulunmuş olan bazı vilayetlerinde mecâlis-i maarifin kaide-i tasarrufa riayette beraber hüsn-i tertib ve ihyası derece-i vücubda görünmüş olmağla ileride refte refte tamim olunmak ve... bu maarif meclisleri teessüs ettikçe onlar vasıtasıyla peyderpey Dârümuallimîn -i Sıbyânlar da küşad ve liva ve kazalarda şubeleri tesis ettirilme ve nezaretçe tanzim olunacak talimâtın havi

According to this report, many foreigners exploited the lack of government support for Christian schools by their “deceptive appearance of serving the respectable duty of disseminating knowledge and skills” (*neşr-i ilm ü marifet vazife-i muhteremesini rû-pûş-i hîle ve mekîdet ederek*). They opened new schools in various provinces by abusing the freedom provided by the Regulation of Public Education. Furthermore the report, pointed to the efforts and striving of non-Muslims to develop education, and suggested that the Ottoman government should meet the financial needs of the non-Muslim schools and keep these institutions under its inspection so that the education in these schools conformed to interests of the state.⁴⁹ Setting up councils of education in the provinces was an inevitable step toward addressing these perceived needs.

2.4. Missionary Schools as Target of the First Councils of Education

Foreign states such as Italy, Germany, France, England, and America, who pursued their missionary activities in many parts of Anatolia, especially in eastern Anatolia, tried to administer schools. The Reform Edict had had an effect on the development of education in the hands of foreigners, because it permitted each religious community a large degree of autonomy to open and run schools, hospitals, and churches. It enabled foreign countries, especially western countries, to help various religious communities to open their schools. Although rebuilding a church, a hospital, and a school required the government’s permission, many schools sought permission only after the fact.⁵⁰ Article 129 of the Regulation of 1869 was related to the private schools opened by foreign states or religious communities in the Ottoman Empire. According to this article, these schools’ expenditure was met by the respective communal organizations or foundation. Instructors of these schools must have diplomas taken from the Ministry of Education, their schedules, and textbooks should be in accord with the Ottoman state’s interest and approved by the Ministry.

olacağı vezâifi icra eylemek üzere bu senelik Sivas, Diyarbekir, Mamuretülaziz, Erzurum, Van vilayetleri merkezlerinde birer maarif meclisi teşkiliyle...”

⁴⁹ Also see Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 97-99.

⁵⁰ For details, Hidayet Vahapoğlu, *Osmanlı’dan Günümüze Azınlık ve Yabancı Okullar* (İstanbul: M.E.B., 1997), 104-105.

The authority to issue a certificate to these schools belonged to the Ministry in Istanbul and the educational administration in the provinces.⁵¹

However the regulation's provisions could not be implemented in most cases. According to the report of the Minister of Education Ahmet Zühdü Pasha written in 1894, In the Ottoman Empire there was 413 schools run by foreigners and 4,547 private schools run by non-Muslims minorities. 498 of all these schools were licensed but 4,049 of them were not.⁵² He discussed the precautions that were necessary to prevent foreigners' provocations: Foreign instructors should not be appointed to districts in which non-Muslims were living, Muslims should not attend foreign schools, Ottoman Turkish should be used in foreign schools and these schools should not be issued a license to set up schools in non-Muslim neighborhoods. According to Zühdü Pasha, foreign schools harmed the Muslim population. Since banning them was impossible, the Ottoman government had to make the necessary efforts to advance the educational services.

The governors and directors of education had to be vigilant against the danger of increasing the number of foreign schools. In 1896 the government issued Instructions Concerning the Duties of Directors of Education in the Imperial Provinces (*Vilayât-ı Şâhâne Maârif Müdürlerinin Vezâifini Mübeyyin Talimât*). These instructions gave authority to directors of education in the provinces. "Main idea was to incorporate private schools, including foreign schools, into the existing educational system and to minimize the differences between the opportunities offered to Muslims and non-Muslims."⁵³ The directors of education inspected foreign schools three times each year and reported their observations to the minister of education. Furthermore, the director of high schools and senior instruction in districts was expected to inspect Christian schools in his respective province and to report about the schools to the

⁵¹ For details, Şamil Mutlu, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Misyoner Okulları* (İstanbul: Gökkuşbu, 2005).

⁵² Atilla Çetin, "Maarif nazırı Ahmed Zühdü Paşa'nın Osmanlı imparatorluğundaki yabancı okullar hakkında raporu," *Güney-Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no.10-11, (1981-82): 192.

⁵³ Başaran, Betül. "The American Schools and the Development of Ottoman Educational Policies During the Hamidian Period: A Reinterpretation" in *International Congress on Learning and Education in the Ottoman World*, ed. Ali Çaksu (İstanbul: IRCICA, 1999), 192.

administration of education under whose jurisdiction.⁵⁴ If a director of education permitted non-Muslims and foreigners to open a school without a license, he would be dismissed or appointed to a different province. For instance thirty-nine of eighty-three schools that served the Serbian in particular in Kosovo did not have a certificate. The Serbian Consulate and the Serbian community financially supported these schools and paid the wages of their instructors. Such schools should be prohibited in the Ottoman territories. As these schools did not have a certificate; it was an outstanding matter for the Minister of Public Education. Kosovo's director of education, Abdül *Efendi*, who had permitted the establishment of these Serbian schools, was removed from his post and appointed to Bitola.⁵⁵

The Ottoman government tried to control all the non-Muslim and foreign schools strictly whether they had a license or not. According to the report of the governor of Konya, Ferid Pasha,

In 1901, there were about hundred schools belonging to non-Muslims in Konya and only seventeen of them did not accomplish the process of taking a license yet. At these schools it was definitely taken into account that education was not contradictory with the state's order and the Turkish language was learned at almost all of them. In addition there was not any regulation for the relationship between the officers of education and instructors at these schools and for the inspection of the schools. The number of students and teachers was not recorded there. For him, these schools should have sent a regular report about student attendance every three months and a report about the examination results should be sent to the center at the end of each year. To do this a regulation must be drafted and submitted in Turkish, French, Armenian, and Russian languages. Apart from the non-Muslim schools, there were not any schools that belonged to foreigners in Konya, except for a school that was established by French priests without acquiring permission from the center at the time when the director of education was Halil Kamil *Efendi*.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Items 39 and 51 of Vilayât-ı Şâhâne Maârif Müdürlerinin Vezâifini Mübeyyin Talimât, in *Salnâme-i Maarif*. 1316, 136-159.

⁵⁵ BOA, Y.MTV. 101/36, 24 M 1312 (28 July 1894).

⁵⁶ BOA, Y.PRK.UM. 56/21, 11 C 1319 (25 September 1901) was used by Abdulhamit Kırmızı, *Avlonyalı Ferid Paşa*, (forthcoming), 139-140.

Ferid Pasha also claimed that protestant preachers toured Anatolia as doctors, and that he saw many foreign doctors in Anatolia. So he focused on the foundation of new medicine schools to train native doctors.⁵⁷

Foreign states such as America, France, England, Italy, and Germany tried to open their own schools as well as dominating the institutions of non-Muslim Ottoman subjects such as schools and hospitals in order to control and protect non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire. According to an assessment from the end of the 19th century, foreign schools encompassed 72 French, 83 English, 465 American, 7 Austrian, 7 German, 24 Italian, 44 Russian and 2 Iranian schools in the Ottoman Empire.⁵⁸ “Missionaries became something of a *bête noire* for the Sultan, who saw them as extremely dangerous fifth column steadily increasing their influence in his already threatened domains.”⁵⁹ Non-Muslim schools should not be thought as the same with foreign schools that were founded by foreign states or missionaries, but non-Muslim schools were opened by non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire.

In 1899, two hundred households in the district of Maden and many people in Antakya, who had converted to Islam a century ago, wanted to become Christian under the influence of missionaries and other priests. The Ottoman government did not force non-Muslims to become Muslim; but it definitely did not permit its Muslim subjects to change their religion. Therefore many measures such as opening primary schools were taken by the Ottoman government to obviate illiteracy and to prevent Muslims to from attending the missionary and other Christian schools. The other example in 1892, the exhortation of many Armenian Protestants, who came from Mamüretülaziz to Erzurum to trade, led girls of Süleyman *Aga* and Yusuf *Aga*’s two

⁵⁷ Abdulhamit Kırmızı, “Usûl-i Tadrîs Hâlâ Tarz-ı Kadîm Üzre: Konya Valisi Ferid Paşa’nın Eğitimi Islah Çalışmaları,” *Divan*, no.19 (2005): 211.

⁵⁸ İlhan Tekeli and Selim İlkin. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Eğitim ve Bilgi Üretim Sisteminin Oluşumu ve Dönüşümü* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999), 112.

⁵⁹ Selim Deringil, “An Ottoman View of Missionary Activities in Hawai’i,” In *The Ottomans, The Turks, and World Power Politics-Collected Studies*, ed. Selim Deringil (İstanbul: ISIS PRESS, 2000), 131.

boys to go to the missionary schools in Erzurum. The girls went to America after graduating from the missionary school.⁶⁰

In 1892, the governor of Syria, reported that,

He had compiled a list of foreign schools ‘constituted by devious means’ such as converting dwellings to schoolhouses. He had established that there were 159 such establishments in his area. The vali noted that although the state had been making great effort to increase state primary schools, these were still insufficient and this meant that ‘Jesuit and Protestant schools therefore accept non-Muslim children free of charge, clothe and feed them and even pay subsidies to their parents.’The presence of these schools was also seen as the thin end of the wedge as far as the Muslim population was concerned. The vali continued: ‘It is therefore necessary that in the approaching holy month of Ramadan special ulema should be sent to preach secretly to the Muslim population about the ills that will occur to them if they send their children to Christian schools.’⁶¹

Actually many governors were concerned due to the activities of missionary schools and tried to protect the Ottoman subjects. Engin Deniz Akarlı explained the worry of the governor of Mount Lebanon (1883-1892), Vasa Pasha by saying that,

The “negative influence” on young minds of the schools and educational programs run by the missionaries and the Church was a major concern for Vasa. In order to counterbalance this situation, he urged the Porte to provide him with funds, teachers, and diplomatic support. He wanted to build additional public schools in Mount Lebanon, introduce the study of Ottoman-Turkish in a greater number of schools, give scholarships to talented students to encourage them to continue their higher education in Istanbul, and bring private schools under the government’s surveillance.⁶²

These events show that the missionaries were effective in recruiting Muslims to go to foreign schools and even the idea of possible conversion was seen abhorrent. There was a belief that missionary schools poisoned minds. Hence the Ottoman government tried to build new schools and appointed new instructors to attract the Muslims and to prevent them from going to the foreigners’ schools. As a reaction to

⁶⁰ BOA Yıldız Esas Defterleri, No: 1165 translated by Muammer Demirel, *Sultan İkinci Abdülhamid ile Erzurum Vilayeti ile Arasındaki Yazışmalar* (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2007), 125-128.

⁶¹ Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1909* (London: I.B.Tauris, 1999), 116-117.

⁶² Engin Deniz Akarlı, *The Long Peace: Ottoman Lebanon, 1861-1920* (London: University of California Press, 1993), 52.

the situation, the Ottoman government sent “Islamic clerics among the Muslim populace to preach against the evils of non-Muslim education.”⁶³ The Ottoman Empire created its own Islamic missionaries against Christian missionaries according to Benjamin C. Fortna.

Most of the Muslims were opposed to sending their children to missionary schools. They showed their reactions in different ways. For instance for Robert College, which was the –most significant American institution in Turkey, “the wife of the imam of the village of Rumeli Hisari on the Bosphorus, where the college was located, led the local opposition which sometimes advanced from rich verbal abuse to stone-throwing.”⁶⁴ The hostility was also expressed by the Ottoman government in bureaucratic ways “through harassment by official regulation and unofficial pressure, and sometimes Turkish students at the foreign institutions were forced by the Sultan to leave. Such harassment reached a peak under Sultan Abdülhamid II in the 1880’s and again in the 1890’s.”⁶⁵

Apart from the missionary schools, the schools of non- Muslim subjects also instigated the government to develop and spread its own educational system. Greeks, Armenians and Jews opened their own schools thanks to foreign financial support “from the Alliance Israélite for Jewish schools, from Greeks abroad and the University of Athens for Greek schools, and a little Armenian support from Russia for Armenian schools. Turks did not attend these schools, but the progress in non-Muslim education was a spur to the Turks.”⁶⁶

The activities of the neighboring states increased the Ottoman anxieties caused by missionary activities. In 1901, the governor of Konya, Mehmet Ferid, asked from the government to open two high schools in Nigde and Hamidabad, because the high school of Konya was very crowded and new students could not be admitted. However until the founding of the schools, many students especially non-Muslim

⁶³ Fortna, *Imperial Classroom*, 93.

⁶⁴ Roderic H. Davison, *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History 1774-1923 The Impact of the West* (U.S.A: University of Texas Press, 1990), 71-72.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, 168.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 174.

students had to go to the schools that were equivalent to the schools in Athens and Europe. The governor thought that these students did not have allegiance to the Ottoman government when they returned.⁶⁷ The neighboring Christian states' threat to the Ottoman Empire was taken no less seriously than that of the foreign missionaries in Macedonia, especially Bitola. According to Zühdü Pasha, the Bulgarian, Greek and Serbian governments competed with each other to be dominant in Macedonia.⁶⁸

In addition, the Ottoman government promised to undertake reforms in eastern Anatolia where most of the Armenian subjects of the Empire lived and were to be protected against Kurdish and Circassian elements according to the Treaty of San Stefano signed at the end of the Russian-Ottoman War, in 1877-78. This matter was addressed in the Berlin Congress, where the Ottoman government, Germany, Italy, England, Russia, France and Austria came together to revise the Treaty of San Stefano in 1878.⁶⁹ According to article 61 of the Treaty of Berlin, the Sublime Porte accepted to make local arrangements in the provinces where Armenians lived and to protect them against their Kurdish and the Circassian neighbors. Towards these ends, the Ottoman government took many measures that were noticed by England, France and Russia who presided over the application of the Berlin Treaty.⁷⁰

The Berlin Treaty of 1878 stipulated that reforms should be complemented in six provinces; namely, Erzurum, Van, Diyarbakır, Sivas, Bitlis and Mamüretülaziz, where most of the Armenians lived. The first educational councils were established in these provinces. According to Somel, Armenians developed their own educational system that triggered Abdülhamid II to take two main precautions; one of them was to open councils of education and to appoint directors of education to the provinces where the Armenians were in considerable numbers lived, in order to control their schools, textbooks, and courses. The second was the decision to provide financial

⁶⁷ Y.MTV. 221/114, 20 C 1319 (4 October 1901) was used by Fortna, *Imperial Classroom*, 68.

⁶⁸ To understand particularly the threat of the neighbors, see Fortna, *Imperial Classroom*, 60-71.

⁶⁹ For details, Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi: Birinci Meşrutiyet ve İstibdat Devirleri (1876-1907)*, vol.8. (Ankara: TTK, 1977), 73-78.

⁷⁰ Kırmızı, *Abdülhamid'in Valileri*, 36.

support to the Armenian and other non-Muslim schools, so they could not resist the controlling of the state.⁷¹

Activities of the protestant missionary schools in the region and the consequent urge to control these activities as well instigated the government to establish councils of education in the aforementioned six provinces. Western countries provided Christians financial supports to develop missionary activities and education in Anatolia. Even Muslim children began to attend the schools of non-Muslims because of the dearth of government schools. In 1878 in eastern Anatolia there was a young Armenian generation who was well educated and could critically look at the Ottoman State. This improvement was realized by the successful academic and professional education offered by the American Protestant missionary schools.⁷² However the level of education of the Muslims in general and the Kurdish tribes in particular was not as high as that of the non-Muslims in the region. Foreigners abused the shortcomings of the existing system and “the failure to implement the 1869 Regulation in order to manipulate the education of the non-Muslims in the Empire.”⁷³ When the number of foreign schools increased in eastern Anatolia, the Ottoman government decided to establish councils of education in the six provinces in accordance with the the Regulation of Public Education of 1869. Its clear aim was to provide public education to Muslims while also supervising the activities of the missionary schools based on the reports of the directors of education, who were to head of the councils, the governors of the provinces and the Minister of Education. For instance, Şakir Pasha, who was the general inspector of the Anatolian Reforms (*Anadolu Islahatı Umum Müfettişliği*) from 1895 to 1900, wrote about the economic, educational, administrative, and security conditions of the three eastern Anatolian provinces of Van, Erzurum and Sivas. According to his report, in 1896, conditions of non-Muslim schools were much better than those of the Muslim schools. The number of schools and instructors and conditions in general favored the Armenians in Van.

⁷¹ Selçuk Akşin Somel, “Osmanlı Ermenilerinde Kültür Modernleşmesi, cemaat okulları ve Abdülhamid Rejimi,” *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, no.5 (2007): 86.

⁷² Selçuk Akşin Somel, “Maarif Müdürü Radovişli Mustafa Bey’in raporları ve müslim ve gayrimüslim eğitimi: II. Abdülhamid devri Selanik taşrasında maarif meselesi (1885-1886),” *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar* no.2 (2005): 114.

⁷³ For details, Başaran, “The American Schools,” 189.

He witnessed as well that the Catholic Jesuit schools were very active in Trabzon, Sivas, Tokat, Samsun, Diyarbakir, and Adana just as the American Protestant colleges performed well in Antep and Merzifon. He suggested many precautions including the establishment of schools for crafts (*sanayi mektepleri*) in order to contain the threat of missionary activities in the education of Ottoman subjects.⁷⁴

“One of the primary aims of founding councils of education in the provinces was to gain the upper hand in the education of the non-Muslim subjects and to prevent teachings contrary to the established policies of the government.”⁷⁵ According to Somel, the increasing foreign institutions weakened the loyalty of the Ottoman subjects toward the state and the sultan. In terms of Muslim students, undermining Islamic values formed an additional threat. Because of such worries to establish educational councils was a critical need.⁷⁶ Therefore the councils of education were established first in 1882, in Diyarbakır, Mamüretülaziz, Sivas, Van and Erzurum where the educational conditions were poor and foreigners’ educational activities were effective.

Bayram Kodaman and Selçuk Akşin Somel concur that councils of education were set up in Erzurum, Sivas, Diyarbakır, Mamüretülaziz and Van in 1881-1882. Before that date, councils of education existed in different parts of Anatolia but irregularly and not as the result of a central policy. They were set up by local administrators’ initiative and managed by them. Most of these councils did not include non-Muslim members, although the Regulation ordered that each council of education should have non-Muslim members.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ For details, see Ali Karaca, *Anadolu Islahatı ve Ahmet Şakir Paşa (1838-1899)* (İstanbul: Eren, 1993), 142-145, and 183-190. “... the number of instructors and students in the non-Muslims’ schools were higher than those of the Muslims. In the Muslim schools, instructors per school were 1.5 whereas this rate was 8.5 for the non-Muslim school in center of Van.”

⁷⁵ Başaran, “The American Schools,” 189.

⁷⁶ Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 90.

⁷⁷ For details, see Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 126-145.

2.5. Additional Councils in Other Provinces

After a while the government decided to set up a council of education in Edirne as well: given its circumstance and locality, Edirne needs many reforms. One of them is the organization of schools and the spreading and proliferation of the sciences and learning. Besides, schools in Edirne and its attached districts are dilapidated and observe old methods and education.”⁷⁸ Therefore a council of education was set up in Edirne. Emin *Bey*, a chief clerk in the Ministry of Public Education, was appointed as its director. Yunus *Efendi*, a graduate of the high school (*idâdîye*) branch of the *Dârülmüallimîn*, (the Teacher Training College), was appointed as an inspector.⁷⁹ A council of education was formed in the provinces of Syria, Aydın, Salonika, and Yannina in 1882.⁸⁰ A year later, a director of education, who was dismissed from his position as an instructor at the secondary school, *rüşdiyye*, in Bursa due to his bad habits, was appointed by the center to the head of the council of education in Konya. By 1887, almost every district (*sancak*) had a committee of education. This is a significant development compared to the situation before 1882. For instance, in Konya, the governor Mehmed Said Pasha headed the educational council. Its members included notables from judiciary and financial officials, sub-district governor of Konya, head of Mevlana Celaleddin order and other religious men and notables. They met each Sunday at a different place, such as Mehmed Said Pasha’s house, or the gardens of other members.⁸¹

Indeed many historical documents from the Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives, suggest that the Ottoman government ordered the foundation of councils of education in different parts of the state before 1882. For instance, although there was an educational commission in Konya, the official document to set up a council of education there was prepared in 1875. Importance of education is increasing day by day. In some order the establishment of a council of education is deemed necessary as a place of highest authority and to provide the Quran schools (*sıbyân mektebi*) and

⁷⁸ BOA, İ.DH. 846/67930, 22 Ra 1299 (11 February 1882).

⁷⁹ BOA, MF.MKT. 74/78, 1299 R 03 (22 February 1882).

⁸⁰ Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, 46 and for the official message see BOA, Y.A.RES. 14/48.

⁸¹ Ebubekir Hazım Tepeyran, *Hatıralar* (İstanbul: Pera Turizm, 1998), 25-39.

the secondary schools (*rüşdiyye* schools).⁸² However we do not know whether this council was appropriate for the Regulation of Public Education. “The head of the council was Hüseyin Calib *Efendi* and other members of the committee were hodja Muhammed, hodja Fehim *Efendi* and honorable Mehmed *Efendi* from among the dignitaries of the land.”⁸³ Another example is Hersek where a council of education was established because it does not have a connection with other provinces.⁸⁴ İbrahim *Efendi*, a local religious scholar, was appointed to the head of the council of education in Bitola in 1876. He received his salary from the municipal budget until the initiation of the educational fund (*Maarif Sandığı*).⁸⁵

Councils of education established in Baghdad and Tuna have disappeared by the mid-1870s. Those educational councils prior to 1881 reveal a rather irregular distribution at the provincial level. Whereas, for example the provincial center of the province of Ankara did not have any kind of a body similar to a council of education, the county (*kaza*) of Sivrihisar or the district

⁸² BOA, ŞD. 207/36, 26 Za 1292 (24 December 1875) “...merkez-i vilayette inşaatına mübaşeret buyurulmuş olan sıbyân mektepleri noksanı ikmal ettirilip bunların hoca ve bevvalarının tayin ve maaşlarının tertib ve tahsisi lazım geldiğine binaen iktizası meclis-i idare-i vilayette lede't-te'mil umûru maarifin suret-i matlubede cerayını maksadıyla liva ve kazaların dahi mercii olmak üzere merkez-i vilayette mukaddema divan meclisine reis ve heyetinden mürekkep bir maarif komisyonu teşkil olunmuş ise de maarif umûru gün be gün kesb-i ehemmiyyet etmekte olduğu gibi liva ve kaza ve karyelerde bulunan mekâtib-i sıbyâniyenin dahi suret-i muntazamada bulunması muktezi olmasıyla bil-cümle mekâtib-i rüşdiyye ve sıbyâniyyenin kemâkân mercii olmak üzere muttasıl bir maarif meclisi teşkiline lüzumu hususu görünüp...”

⁸³ BOA, ŞD. 207/36, 26 Za 1292 (24 December 1875) “...sabık divan reisi riyasetinde olarak saadetli Hüseyin Calib Efendi ile erkanı memalikinden Hoca Muhammed ve Hoca Fehim ve kaşif ve şerif Mehmed efendilerden mürekkep bir maarif meclisi teşkili bi't-tezkire tensib olunarak memuriyetlerini havi icab eden buyuruldu.”

⁸⁴ BOA, MF. MKT. 4/134, 9 B 1289 (12 September 1872) “mezkûr sancağın hiçbir vilayete irtibatı olmayacağı ve müşahafat ziyadece bulunduğu cihetle mahal-i mezburda dahi ayrıca maarif meclisi teşkili emr olunmasıyla...”

⁸⁵ BOA, ŞD. 207/42, 9 Ra 1293 (4 April 1876) “...Manastır vilayetinde derdest-i teşkil bulunan maarif meclisi riyasetine maarif müdürü namıyla mahalli ulemasından İbrahim Efendi'nin tayini ve mumaileyhe verilmesi lazım gelen 500 ve mahalli-i mezkûra --- tahsisi iktiza eden 250 kuruş maaşlarıyla şehri 50 kuruş mesarif --- maarif sandıkları küşad oluncaya kadar belediye sandığından ifası mahallinden inha olunduğundan ...”

(*sancak*)-center of Kırşehir, both located within the latter province, had their educational commissions.⁸⁶

Examination of local history sources points to different assertions about where the first council of education was established. According to Sadiye Tutsak, the organization of education was founded in Aydın most probably in 1882, because the head of the council of education was recorded as a director of education in that year.⁸⁷ Furthermore, she claims that there was a council of public education in the province of Aydın in 1856. This council prepared instructions for the rehabilitation of primary schools in İzmir and to open a secondary school (*rüşdiyye*). In 1872, the Province of Aydın had a council of education headed by *Evliyazade* Hacı Muhammed *Efendi*. Other members of the council were mostly merchants and instructors.⁸⁸ Çeşme and Kuşadası, *sancaks* in İzmir as well, had councils of education, headed by İsmail and Mehmet Nuri *Efendis*, respectively. In addition, when Balıkesir became an independent province of the Ottoman Empire in 1881, a council of education was established under the chairmanship of its mufti. First director of education of Balıkesir, *Hayri Efendi*, was appointed in 1882.⁸⁹

To develop educational administration in the provinces, educational commissions were established in the districts. These commissions consisted of local government officials including the *mufti* (jurisconsult), an Islamic judge (*naib*), the local financial director (*mal müdürü*) as well as local notables (*ağas*, *şeyhs*, etc). Balıkesir, İzmir, Aydın probably had educational commissions instead of councils of education, because *muftis* headed them in general. “The main objective of the councils of education and educational commissions was to raise funds in order to finance local

⁸⁶ Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 95.

⁸⁷ Sadiye Tutsak, *İzmirde Eğitim ve Eğitimciler (1850-1950)* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2002), 92.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, 100.

⁸⁹ *Cumhuriyet Dönemi ve Öncesi Balıkesirde Eğitim*, ed. Davut Güngör and Hüdayi Ertan (Balıkesir: T.C. Balıkesir Valiliği Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü, 1998), 22-23.

schools. Hence they made an important contribution to the expansion of education.”⁹⁰

On 8 B 1314/13 December 1896 the “Instructions Concerning the Duties of Directors of Education of the Imperial Provinces” (*Vilayat-ı Şahane Maarif Müdürlüğünün Vezâifini Mübeyyin Talimât*) regulated the responsibilities of the directors of education and the educational commissions.

Members of the educational commissions as well as their chairmen were to be selected by the administrative councils of the respective sancaks [districts] and *kazas* [villages] and appointed officially by the governor following the approval of the director of education. The duties of these educational commissions were the same as those performed by the council of education, but acting within administratively more limited areas and with lesser competence. The chairmen of the educational commissions were expected to send biannual registers to their superior, namely the director of education of the respective *vilayet* [province], about the revenues of those foundations which lost their original reason of existence (*evkaf-ı münderise*) as well as those registers concerning the *avarız akçesi*-tax, of other local revenues, school fees and the places of their expenditure, while compiling at the end of each educational year a general summary (*icmal-i umumi*) pertaining to the general educational situation in their locations. ...As we learn from the provincial yearbook of Bursa, a crucial responsibility of the educational commissions was to ensure the application in local schools of the curriculum as well as of the schoolbooks settled by the Ministry of Public Education, inspect the execution of the instructions sent by the Ministry of Public Education, to set up new schools in needed locations and finally, to select “appropriate” school teachers.⁹¹

Apart from local councils of education, Islamic benevolent societies were founded in various provinces such as Syria and Beirut before setting a council of education there. The main reason of the establishment of benevolent societies was to protect Muslim children against the threat of foreign schools. “Muhammed Abduh argued for Beirut that Muslim children who graduated from Christian schools were either

⁹⁰ Ibid, 103-105.

⁹¹ Ibid, 106-107. Also see Aziz Berker, *Türkiye’de İlk Öğretim: 1839-1908* (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1945), 148-149.

Christians in faith and Muslims in name only or atheists and materialists. After leaving school they went to work for foreign companies and consulates.”⁹²

The missionary schools made their schools attractive and provided the students relatively better facilities, so even Muslim families wanted to send their children to foreign schools in order to guarantee their employment. For instance, in 1900 a foreign high school in Beirut provided facilities for both the non-Muslim and the Muslim children who were accepted to the high school without payment. Their education was also good because it included courses on math, geography, languages, and commerce, which were taught by well-qualified teachers. Beirut was a port city, so courses on commerce became attractive for parents who wanted to send their children to foreign schools. The educational committee was aware of the situation and requested from the Ministry of Public Education to open a high school with good equipment. Actually there was a high school in Beirut but it was very crowded and accepted only four or five new students each year. The committee also focused on offering courses on commerce, geography, religion, and history in the high school, in keeping with the instructions of the Ministry. Therefore children could go to Ottoman schools instead of the foreign school.⁹³

In 1888 the governor of Beirut was worried about the threat of foreign schools so he reported his concerns to the center by suggesting that the Ottoman state should not permit Muslim children to go to the foreign schools that were financially supported by foreign countries, especially France. Instead these children should be oriented to the state schools. To do so, it was necessary to found a high school (*mekteb-i sultani*) with the financial support of charitable Muslim communities in Beirut, where about 5,000 students went to foreign schools in 1888. There was a connection between the existence of competition and the need to build Ottoman schools. According to the governor, the existence of foreign schools decreased the effects of other foreign institutions and stimulated the establishment of Ottoman schools. The logic behind this thinking is similar to the process known as import substitution in economy,

⁹² Strohmeier, Martin. “Muslim Education in the Vilayet of Beirut, 1880-1918” In *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Ceasar E. Farah (USA: Northeast Missouri State University, 1993), 216.

⁹³ BOA, Y.PRK.MF. 4/41, 24 C 1318 (19 October 1900).

which aims at decreasing the consumption of certain imported products by offering a domestically produced substitute. “In carrying out such a policy the state frequently offers incentives to the domestic concern and introduces disincentives to the foreign competitor. This policy naturally presupposes both the existence and reasonable similarity of a domestically produced alternative.”⁹⁴

The Ottoman government was concerned about its Muslims subjects and their religious identities because of the negative effects of the missionary schools. Therefore it tried to set up councils of education in various provinces and to open schools in order to educate Muslim subjects as loyal and faithful people. The state sent inspectors to various provinces to inquire about educational conditions and missionary activities. In 1891, “Mihran Boyacıyan, who was trained as a public servant in the governor’s office in Beirut while being employed at the local *idâdi* (high school), sent a report on the foreign schools in the province to the sultan.”⁹⁵ He and Abduh emphasized the unfavorable impact of foreign education on Muslims. Especially Boyacıyan expressed how the people of Beirut were wooed by the activities of European missionaries through their educational institutions. Boyacıyan’s recommendations to mitigate the situation were,

- Appointing officials to administer the educational system more efficiently,
- Intensifying instruction in the Turkish language and Ottoman history,
- Increasing the funding for education,
- Prohibiting Muslim children from attending foreign schools,
- Opening schools in the *kazas* (sub-districts) of Sidon, Sur, Akka, Haifa, and Tripoli,
- Promoting the teaching of Turkish in the schools of Mount Lebanon,
- Employing qualified teachers,
- Requiring all public servants to have a command of the Turkish language,

⁹⁴ For details, see Fortna, *Imperial Classroom*, 52-53.

⁹⁵ Strohmeier, *Muslim Education*, 219-220.

- Carrying on all official correspondence in Turkish.⁹⁶

Unfortunately, the Ottoman state could not get the upper hand in the competition between the foreign and Ottoman schools in Beirut according to the report of the governor of Beirut.

Coming to the districts appended to Beirut, there are many foreign schools in the Nusayri areas to the north of Latakia and Tripoli and in other provinces. Many students are being educated in them and since there are no (Ottoman state) schools in those areas apart from the *rüşdiye* [secondary] and the *ibtidai* [elementary] schools in the aforementioned places, the children of these areas are all growing up with foreign education and, consequently, foreign influence is easily increasing day by day.⁹⁷

There were civil initiatives to deal with the challenges of missionary schools to address the need to provide modern education. For instance, *Cemiyet-i Maqasid-i Hayriyye* (The Association for Charity) was founded in Beirut in 1878, and *Jami'iyat al-Fünûn* was established to arrange Islamic educational alternatives to foreign schools and to provide educational improvements where the state could not. In 1882 such benevolent societies were discontinued or combined with the official council of education. The council became the most eminent body in educational affairs.⁹⁸ Most of its members were common with those of the benevolent societies. In Tripoli and Homs the president of the local benevolent society was appointed as the director of education at the respective council of education.

The establishment of a council of education in each province and the appointment of directors of to these councils as a means to prepare the ground for educational improvements and to advance science can be seen as products of centralization and

⁹⁶ Ibid, 219. Also see Atilla Çetin, "II. Abdülhamit'e Sunulmuş Beyrut Vilayetindeki Yabancı Okullara Dair Bir Rapor," *Türk Kültürü*, no.253 (1984): 316-24.

⁹⁷ BOA, Y.MTV. 32/45, 19 Ş 1305 (1 May 1888) was used by Fortna, *Imperial Classroom*, 56.

⁹⁸ For details, see Strohmeier, *Muslim Education*, 215-41 and Donald J Cioeta, "Islamic Benevolent Societies and Public Education in Ottoman Syria, 1875-1882," *The Islamic Quarterly*, no.26/I, (1982), 40-55.

the bureaucratization of education.⁹⁹ While local leaders took into account educational affairs, the directors of education took charges of these issues after the setting up of the councils and they did so under the control of the central government.

In this chapter I also showed the parallel developments of education between the Ottoman Empire and France. “It is important to see the Ottoman case as forming part of a much broader phenomenon that was nothing less than the worldwide expansion of state education of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.”¹⁰⁰ Also, there were parallel developments about the system of education at same times in countries such as the Ottoman Empire and Russia, Japan, and Iran.¹⁰¹

However “we must proceed from a deceptively simple fact, namely, that the French system was the one on which the Ottomans patterned their own school building program.”¹⁰² According to Fortna, “The centralized, systematic quality of French-to-Ottoman transfer has stood out as its chief characteristic. This has reinforced the notion that the late Ottoman state was attempting to impose a highly uniform pedagogical and disciplinary regime, the better to control its disparate regions and ethnic groups.”¹⁰³

⁹⁹ “Similar to some eighteenth and nineteenth century European states such as France, Prussia and Russia, educational modernization went hand in hand with the bureaucratization of educational administration.” Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 85.

¹⁰⁰ Fortna, *Imperial Classroom*, 27.

¹⁰¹ For comparing and contrasting the Ottoman education and development of education in Asian countries, see Fortna, *Imperial Classroom*, 1-42.

¹⁰² *Ibid*, 15.

¹⁰³ *Ibid*, 15.

3. WHO WERE THE DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION?

3.1. Appointment of the Directors of Education

The establishment of the Ministry of Public Education in 1857 was a significant step in the course of the modernization of education. Building an organization for the administration of education in the provinces was the task of the Ministry. The institutionalization of provincial education was firstly mentioned in the 1869 Regulation of Public Education, which includes 198 articles. 143 and 146 referred to the establishment of the councils of education and their duties as it is already mentioned in the first chapter. Article 147 refers to the directors of education, who were to head the councils of education in the provinces. According to this article:

The director and his assistants must attend to the ongoing issues and oversee their settlement (*masâlih-i câriyenin tesviyesine*) and the implementation of decided reforms, the provisions of the regulation and the instructions issued by the Ministry of Public Education. Also they will inspect schools, libraries, high (*idadî*) schools, the *mekâtib-i sultâniye*, and the professional schools (*mekâtib-i âliyye*). They will spend and use the funds allocated to provincial education carefully according to the set arrangements and without wasting them. They will be firstly responsible in this matter.¹⁰⁴

The director of education was responsible to carry out the stipulations of the Regulation of Public Education promulgated in 1869. Article 25 and 26 of the Provincial Administration Laws of 1871 (*Vilayet Nizamnâmesi*) as well referred to the responsibilities of the directors of education.

In 1881, directors of education were appointed to Sivas, Mamüretülaziz, Erzurum, Diyarbakır and Van, as indicated in the previous chapter. Their monthly salary was 1200 *куруşes*. In the same year, Emrullah *Efendi* who had graduated from the *mekteb-i mülkiye* (Civil Servant School), was appointed to the province of Yannina as a director of education.¹⁰⁵ He was the first director of education who was a graduate of the *mekteb-i mülkiye* (Civil Servant School). Minister of Education,

¹⁰⁴ *Düstur*, 1st Tertip, vol.2, 184.

¹⁰⁵ Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, 40 and Ali Çankaya. *Yeni Mülkiye Tarihi ve Mülkiyeliler, Mekteb-i Fünûn-i Mülkiyye, Mekteb-i Mülkiyye-i Şâhâne me'zunları, 1860-1923*, vol.3. (Ankara: Mars Matbaası, 1969), 96-102.

Kamil Pasha, introduced a report to open educational councils in each province in 1881 and it was approved by the sultan in 1882. Hence in 1882 (27 *Rebiülevvel* 1299) Mehmed Emin *Bey*, was appointed to Van and Atif *Bey*, from member of the council of education of Bursa, was appointed to Sivas as a director of education.

On 12 June 1882, the Ministry of Education made an announcement about the Directorate of Education.¹⁰⁶ In keeping with this announcement, the Ottoman government tried to appoint directors of education and inspectors to all provinces of the empire. This was a matter of allocating scarce resources in order to develop the education and to provide children with a good discipline and learning. However the government was able to appoint director of education to every province only gradually.

According to the *Maarif Salnâmesi* which was prepared in 1892; provinces of Basra, Baghdad, Aleppo, Syria, Beirut, Bursa, Konya, Ankara, Aydın, Adana, Kastamonu, Sivas, Diyarbakır, Bitlis, Erzurum, Mamüretülaziz, Van, Trabzon, Rhodes, Edirne, Salonika, Kosovo, Yannina, Shkoder, and Bitola - each had a director of education in 1892.¹⁰⁷ According to the *Salnâme-i Maarif* written in 1899; without provinces mentioned above, Cezair-i Bahr-ı Sefid, Aleppo, Hüdavendigâr, Monastery, Mosul, Jerusalem, Benghazi, and Zor also had a director education in 1899. There was not a director of education in Bitlis. In Çatalca, Kale-i Sultaniyye, and Izmid the directors of *idâdî* schools (high schools) carried out the duties of the director of education. In the province of Van accountant Ahmet Behçet *Efendi* became the director of education. In addition, there was a *mütemayiz* (the head of the civil servants) instead of a director of education in Yannina.¹⁰⁸ In many provinces where the director of education was not appointed, directors of *idâdî* schools, accountants or other civil servants were responsible of duties of the directors of education.

Also according to *Salnâme-i Maarif* that was prepared in 1319, İsmail Hakkı *Bey* worked in Jerusalem, Mehmed Atıf *Efendi* in the district of Zor, Mehmed Amir *Efendi* in Benghazi, Mehmed Vehbi *Efendi* in Yemen, Celal *Bey* in Yannina, Hakkı

¹⁰⁶ Cevad, *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti Târihçe-i Teşkilât ve İcrââtı*, 197-198.

¹⁰⁷ *Maarif Salnâmesi*, 1310, see also Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, 40.

¹⁰⁸ *Maarif Salnâmesi*, 1317.

Bey in Tripoli, Vassaf *Bey* in Bitola, Abdülkerim *Bey* in Mamüretülaziz, Azmi *Bey* in Konya, Abdullah *Bey* in Kosovo, Mehmed Şerif *Efendi* in Kastamonu, Tevfik *Bey* in Trabzon, Ahmet Hulusi *Bey* in Sivas, Hüseyin Avni *Efendi* in Sivas, Reşid *Bey* in Salonika, Mehmed Hasib *Efendi* in Hüdavendigâr, Mehmed Celaleddin *Bey* in Aleppo, Sami *Bey* in Cezair-i Bahr-ı Sefid, Hüseyin Zeki *Bey* in Beirut, İsmail Nail *Efendi* in Aydın, Halil Kemal *Bey* in Ankara, Ahmet Feyzi *Efendi* in Adana, Mehmed *Bey* in Erzurum, and Ziver *Bey* worked in Edirne as a director of education in 1901.¹⁰⁹

According to the Maarif Salnâmesi of 1321, İsmail Hakkı *Bey* worked in Jerusalem, Mehmed Atif *Efendi* in the district of Zor, Mehmed Amir *Efendi* in Benghazi, Mehmed *Bey* in Yemen, Namık *Bey* in Yannina, Hakkı *Bey* in Tripoli, Ahmed Saib *Bey* in Bitola, Abdülkerim *Bey* in Mamüretülaziz, Abdullah *Bey* in Kosovo, Şerif *Efendi* in Kastamonu, Tevfik *Bey* in Trabzon, Azmi *Bey* in Konya, Hüseyin *Efendi* in Syria, Tahir Rüşdi *Efendi* in Sivas, Hulusi *Bey* in Hüdavendigâr, Rüşdi *Bey* in Salonika, Mahmud Celaleddin *Bey* in Aleppo, Sami *Bey* in Cezair-i Bahr-ı Sefid, Abdülkadir *Efendi* in Beirut, Halil Kemal *Bey* in Ankara, İsmail Nail *Bey* in Aydın, Ahmet Fevzi *Bey* in Adana, Mehmed Vehbi *Efendi* in Erzurum and Mustafa Celal *Bey* worked as a director of education in Edirne in 1903.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹ *Maarif Salnâmesi*, 1319.

¹¹⁰ *Maarif Salnâmesi*, 1321.

Table 3.1. Contents of the Instructions Concerning the Duties of the Directors of Education in the Imperial Provinces (*Vilayât-ı Şâhâne Maârif Müdîrlerinin Vezâifini Mûbeyyin Talimât*)

PART I	The directors of education
PART II	About the councils of education
PART III	Revenue of education
PART IV	Schools
PART V	Other items (<i>Mevâdd-ı Müteferrika</i>)

In 1896 the Instructions Concerning the Duties of Directors of Education in the Imperial Provinces (*Vilayât-ı Şâhâne Maârif Müdîrlerinin Vezâifini Mûbeyyin Talimât*¹¹¹) were composed and dispatched to each province in the Ottoman Empire. These instructions consisted of five parts, and sixty-one articles. First part was about the directors of education. According to the instruction;

- The directors of education were the authority of education in the provinces. They controlled that all the work about education should be carried out according to existing instructions, regulations, and orders.
- Because teachers, civil servants, and employment in the provinces did not have any right to directly get across with the Ministry of Public Education, they could contact with the directors of education if they have a problem.
- Due to the fact that directors of education were responsible for the education of others and their acquisition, they should not behave in ways that contradictory to their self-respect and dignity. If teachers behave in a disapproved and unsatisfactory

¹¹¹ Salnâme-i Maarif, 1316, 136.

manner, the director of education must warn him. If the teacher persists in his misbehavior, the director of education can fire him.

- The directors of education will submit a report to the Ministry of Public Education once in every three months and they will prepare another report about the state of education in the province where they work at the end of each year and send this report to the Ministry of Public Education. The annual report will also indicate the changes in the number of students and schools each year, and include information on expenditures and income pertaining to education in their reports.

- The directors of education can fire civil servants, teachers in the institutions of education, if they have a mistake by reporting reasons of this situation to the Ministry of Public Education in that day.

- Directors of education should take care in the officials' and instructor's being confident and having self-respect.

- They recorded degree of all schools from countries to the center of provinces and they sent these records to the Ministry in the end of each year. Also they prepared a statistic of education at the end of each year and send it to the Ministry without any delay.

- The directors of education were responsible for administration and preservation of allocation belongs to the education and they were responsible for collection of tax of education by means of educational fund. Also directors and accountant officials were responsible for deficiency and fault in the allocation.

- They must preclude any harmful publications, harmful books, and newspapers. In addition they were responsible to examine all schools and all print houses in the provinces.

Second part of the instruction was about the councils of education that also included items related with directors of education.

- They were heads of the councils of education in the center of provinces. The members of the educational committees and councils of education were appointed by the governor of a province after confirmation of the directors of education.

- They checked the accountant and the cashier as well as expenditure and income for education. If the accountant or the cashier made any misappropriation of the allocation of education, the directors of education take necessary precautions.

Third part of the instruction was related with schools.

- Schools were divided into two: the private and the formal schools. The formal schools (*mekâtib-i resmiyye*) were administered by the civil servants, and were divided into three degrees: elementary schools (*mekâtib-i ibtidâiye*), secondary schools (*rüşdiyye*) and high schools (*mekâtib-i idâdî*). The directors of education controlled the administration of these schools and instructors' discharging their duties according to regulations of these schools.

- They controlled instructors to teach lessons and to hold examinations according to the schedule as well as instructors' regularly carried out works.

- The private schools also divided in it. First of all private Islamic schools were founded by a committee, or people of a country, a district or a neighborhood. The director of education inspected that the course schedule of the private schools should be compatible with that of the formal schools and instructors in private schools should have a certification for their officials. In addition the allocation given to these schools was also controlled by directors who encouraged the instructors even if it was necessary, they rewarded teachers to develop further education in the private schools.

- Non-Muslim schools were divided into two: one of them belonged to a community or a patriarchate that met the schools' expenditure. The other was founded by people so profit and loss also belonged to them.

- The private schools, already founded before the emerging instructions about these schools, should have a certificate from the Ministry and their instructors' diplomas, their schedules, and course books should have an affirmation from the Ministry of Public Education.

- Schools founded by the foreigners were also private schools. Non-Muslim and foreign schools were given a certificate according to their degrees by the directors of education.

- Directors of education could dismiss instructors, schoolmasters and other officials in formal schools if they had incompetent management, wastefulness or discontinuity for their officials. If directors appointed these officials, they could directly dismiss them. However if officials were appointed by the Ministry of Public Education, the directors should explain reasons of the dismissing to the Ministry when they dismiss an official. In addition the directors of education could require from the manager of non-Muslim schools to ban employing instructors who did not have a confirmation from the Ministry of Public Education.
- Schedules and textbooks of all schools were deliberated by directors of education before they approved the schedules and books. Therefore if it was necessary to change a schedule or a textbook, it was required and asked from the directors of education.
- The director of education inspected the formal and the private schools firstly in terms of whether they had a certificate or not, secondly whether teaching was compatible with the certificate, and instructions given from the Ministry of Public Education, thirdly whether or not instructors had a diploma and they were confidential as well as text books whether were same with that in the certificate, fourthly whether there was improper meaning in the verbal teaching and finally courses' hours in schedule whether were changed or not.
- Directors of education must keep books of all schools according to the schools' degrees. When an instructor, a textbook or a schedule was changed in a school, directors must record the changing in the school's book and its certificate.
- Before a ceremony in a school, the director of education must look at the text and theatres that were read and played by an instructor, a manager or students in a ceremony in the schools.
- Directors of education three times each year inspected non-Muslim schools and foreign schools in terms of their teaching methods and their educational conditions in provinces, where they were appointed to, and in its surrounding districts and villages. Then they reported the results of the inspection to the Ministry of Public Education that could advise directors about these schools. Therefore directors informed managers of these schools or spiritual leaders of their communities about advice of

the Ministry. Because three times yearly examination could not provide to progress in education, managers of high schools, and senior teachers in districts were responsible to inspect Christian schools in provinces, where they were living. They reported their examinations' results to the administration of education that they belong to.

- If there was an inconsistent order, and method in these schools, they were warned and admonished according to their degrees. These schools' many instructors and managers could manipulate students towards foreign politics and method contrary to the Ottoman state's Islamic policy as well as bring harmful books and journals in secret to these schools. People, contacted with these instructors and managers, were investigated. Directors of education were also responsible to report the results of the inspection to the Ministry of Public Education.

Last part of the Instruction was about other issues.

- Directors of education were responsible from the items, related with the administration of education in the provinces, in the Regulation of Printing Houses (*Matbaalar Nizâmnâmesi*).

- People, who excavate in secret way inconsistent to the Regulation of Ancient Monuments (*Âsâr-ı Atîka Nizâmnâmesi*), were investigated by directors of education and the results were immediately written to the Ministry of Public Education.

- Libraries were controlled by the administration of education in the provinces.

- Directors of education were responsible for the budget of provincial education.

- They worked to make reforms and arrangements for formal schools.

- They tried to develop especially Islamic schools.

- They should be careful about foreign and non-Muslim schools. They controlled whether they had a certificate or not, whether their education was suitable to the Regulation of Public Education or not. The directors of education checked diplomas of teachers and teaching commitments in these schools.

- Finally, carrying out all items of the regulation was controlled by directors of education and officials of education. If many items should be changed, directors and

officials of education could explain the reasons of the changing to the Ministry of Public Education.

There were many responsibilities of director of education in different instructions. For instance in the Special Regulation of Managers of High schools and Instructors of Secondary schools and Education (*Maarif ve Mekâtib-i İdâdiye Müdürleriyle Rüşdiyye Muallimlerine Mahsus Talimât*¹¹²), the sixth, seventh, and eighth items were related with duties of directors of education. According to these items; managers of high schools and instructors in the secondary schools each fifteen days, reported the amount of Educational Contribution Tax (*maarif hisse-i ianesi*) to the administration of education in their districts and villages. Then schoolmasters of high schools sent the notebook, in which total amount of the tax was written, to directors of education. In addition when directors of education inspected their provinces and its surroundings, they checked the notebook sent to them, the account of the *Ziraat* bank and chest of education. If there was a deficit, they reported the situation to the Ministry and they could require the people who caused the deficit to pay the interest.

According to the Regulation of Administration of the Secondary Schools in Provinces (*Taşra Mekâtib-i Rüşdiyyesinin İdare-i Dâhiliyyelerine Mahsus Talimât*¹¹³), if advice of the senior instructors could not work, senior instructors complained the students, who committed a crime. Also senior instructors record all income and expenditure of schools in a notebook that was sent to directors of education after receiving approval of other instructors each year.

Moreover to the Temporary Law of Elementary Instruction (*Tedrîsât-ı İbtidâiye Kanun-u Muvakkati*) directors of education proposed to the governor of a province about which instructors should have been appointed to the public elementary schools.¹¹⁴ Their offers about punishment of dismissal or obligation were rendered by the governor by taking into account of the view of the council of elementary

¹¹² *Salnâme-i Maarif*, 1316, 106-109.

¹¹³ *Salnâme-i Maarif*, 1316, 311-319.

¹¹⁴ Item 31 of *Tedrîsât-ı İbtidâiye Kanun-u Muvakkati*, *Düstur*, 2nd Tertip, vol.5, 809.

instruction.¹¹⁵ They were one group of the examiners who surveyed private and public elementary schools.¹¹⁶ They were also authority for all schools' directors who had to turn to the directors of education in all respects.¹¹⁷

3.2. Inspection Reports as Duty of the Directors of Education

One of the most significant responsibilities of the directors of education was to inspect educational conditions in schools. According to the Instruction about Inspectional Reports (*Teftiş Lâyihaları Hakkında*)¹¹⁸ they were to prepare a report at the end of each inspection. In practice it was not known how regularly they wrote reports each year. Their reports should be divided into five categories: The first category covered teacher training colleges (*Dârülmualimîn*) and elementary schools (*mekâtib-i ibtidâiye*). The second category covered the high schools (*mekâtib-i idâdiye*) and *mekâtib-i sultaniye*. A third group of reports was expected to provide statistical information (*ihsaiyyat*). Fourth, the directors should prepare reports about geography, history, and quality (*hilkıyyat*). Finally, they were to write reports about libraries and ancient monuments. The instructions included regulations about physical features such as size of the paper and the size of margins so that reports could be bound neatly. The date of a report, its category (categories were written above), and seal of the author should be written on first page of the report that was directly sent to the Minister of Public Education. These reports were copied out and one of them was given from the predecessors to the successor and they were rebound every five years. When these reports were accessed by the Ministry, they were directly given to the Inspectoral Staff that investigated whether or not these reports were prepared according to the Instructions of directors and inspectors of education by taking into account of instructions of schools. Then this was written in the private notebooks of the inspected provinces. Deficient part of reports, explanations, and comments about the reports were written by Inspectoral Staff. These writings were

¹¹⁵ Item 54 of Tadrîsât-ı İbtidâiye Kanun-u Muvakkati. "Cezâen tahvîl veyahud azl cezaları vilayet maarif müdürünün teklifi üzerine vilayet tadrîsât-ı ibtidâiye meclisinin re'yi alınarak vali ve ya müstakil mutasarrıf tarafından icra edilir."

¹¹⁶ Items 31, 54 and 91 of Tadrîsât -ı İbtidâiye Kanun-u Muvakkati.

¹¹⁷ Item 2 of Maarif Nezareti Celîlesinden Şeref Vârid Olan Muharrerât. *Salnâme-i Kastamonu*, 1312, 119.

¹¹⁸ BOA, MF.HTF. 1/32, 1325 (1908).

added to the reports before sending them to the related administration. The related Ministry should take the necessary precautions according to the reports. Every report of five years of age was bound and they were preserved by their related chamber (*her beş senelik lâyhalar teclîd ve dairelerince muhafaza olunur*). Each chamber must finish investigating their reports in ten days.

The instruction about inspectoral reports continued by focusing that the directors of education send one copy of the reports of inspectors of education in Istanbul to the Ministry by adding their comments about the reports to the end. Also directors of education reported their inspections' results in accordance with general methods to the Ministry of Public Education. Every head of chambers was responsible to write a summary of the reports of directors of education, and they declared by providing evidences whether director of education carried out his responsibilities well, and made much more reforms in schools than other directors of education. The summaries were sent to the Sublime Chamber (*Bu hulasalar aliyye dairesine havale olunur*), and the head of the Sublime Chamber reported his remarks about competence, efforts, and the responsibility of directors of education to the Ministry of Public Education by taking into account of ideas of the directors of chambers in these summaries.¹¹⁹

Inspectorate reports of the directors of education included knowledge about the building of the schools; how many classes were included in a school? When was the school built? Was it necessary to rebuild according to its degree of being in ruin? Did the school need repairing? Was it a stone building or made by woodwork?

When directors of education went to their provinces and surrounding areas to inspect schools, their reports were also about necessary equipment for courses. These equipment were written by directors of education who investigated whether the equipment existed or not, and discussed the matter with the council of elders (*...tedariği kabil olanları heyet-i ihtiyariye ile görüşüp temin edecektir*) to provide the equipment as much as possible. Also directors of education should prepare a list of the tools needed and send the list to the provincial governor by post immediately. He should follow up the matter after delivering the lists. (*Noksanlarının pusulasını*

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

alacak ve derhal ilk posta merkezinden vilayete bildirecektir. Avdetinde de takib eyleyecektir.)

Directors of education also investigated financial records of schools, how schools supplied their expenditure as well as controlling libraries, and museums of schools. Every school must have a library, and a museum. Hence directors controlled the range and the number of books, conditions of libraries, and whether instructors attempted to develop further conditions of libraries and museums or not. Also directors investigated which books, sent by the Ministry of Public Education, existed and which of them did not. In addition they checked what precautions the instructors took to supply deficient of museums, to organize, and to ameliorate the conditions of museums that were founded in the districts or villages where a school also existed.

Directors of education controlled statistical knowledge, and record system in schools as well as recording the ages, and alma maters of instructors. For how many years instructors had been working? Were they married or not? Did they have respect among the people? If not, why? These are questioned by directors of education during the inspections. Did instructors take care for schools, students, necessity of classes and courses? Instructors should take care for religious values and morality of students.

In addition directors of education investigated whether the private schools existed in the relevant place or not. Directors inspected their certificates, and whether the managers, and instructors of the private schools had a diploma approved by directors of education. Also how the Ottoman language was thought in these schools was significant.

Out of educational conditions, directors of education investigated air conditions, climate of villages or districts. Which mountain, plain, and stream existed in the villages where directors went to examine? Also how villages' place of worship, shape of streets, and its health conditions were reported by directors of education. Moreover agriculture, animal husbandry and trade conditions; which agricultural production was the most famous in districts and villages, what the village exported

and imported, how people benefit from animals and which animal they used mostly were written in inspectorate reports of directors of education.¹²⁰

These issued instructions did not mean that all directors would carry out these instructions. The degree of the implementation of the instructions was not known.

In 1907, the director of education of Konya, Hulusi Bey, wrote a report about conditions of education in Konya, districts and villages that belonged to Konya. At the end of his inspection, he decided that in the district of Sille the secondary school's unfinished building should be accomplished with financial support. Also in Hamidiye, a new secondary school began to be built and the old school was repaired. It was decided to build totally one hundred fifteen elementary schools in districts and villages of Konya. Many schoolmasters were appraised due to their good services by the Ministry of Public Education.¹²¹

Another example is the report of Mustafa Bey.¹²² He focused on educational conditions of Muslims and non-Muslims in Salonica by suggesting new precautions and commenting the situation there. Muslims spoke in the Bulgarian language instead of Turkish that was not convenient with the state policy. Also directors made a point of harmful education of non-Muslim and foreign schools that provoked people against the Ottoman state's policy. Hence they were closed and were not given a certificate as well as a foreign manager and instructor should not be appointed. The Ottoman state should found new schools parallel to the non-Muslim schools and it should prevent its subjects to go to foreign schools. Finally he emphasized on financial problems of education and proposed his suggestions to develop further education in Salonika, its districts and villages.

The directors of education went to neighborhood provinces to inspect the schools when there was a complaint about the administration of education. For instance the director of education of Beirut, Kemal Bey, went to Nablus, because of a complaint

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ BOA, MF.MKT. 1055/64, 14 Teşrin-i sani 1323 (27 November 1907).

¹²² Somel, "Maarif Müdürü," 113-147, and see also his English version, "Mustafa Bey of Radoviş (1843-1893): Bureaucrat, Journalist and Deputy of Salonica to the First Ottoman Parliament." *The First Ottoman Experiment in Democracy*, ed. Christoph Herzog and Malek Sharif, (Istanbul: Orient- Institut Istanbul, 2010).

of Protestant spiritual leader, Filşer *Efendi*, who was discontent due to closing the Greek and Protestant schools in the environs of Nablus by the school inspector of Belka district, Mehmet *Efendi*. The Ministry of Public Education ordered to immediately open these schools, because Mehmed *Efendi* did not have any right to close schools by oneself. The situation and reason of the closing should be written to the Ministry. The director of education investigated and knew that although there were only two non-Muslim children in Jerusalem, the Protestant spiritual leader opened a school and sent an instructor with the wage of 300 *kuruşes* there. Actually there was not a need of school for only two non-Muslims, so this enterprising to open the school could be related to the illegal aim of attracting Muslim children to the school. Hence the school was closed. Kemal *Bey* was aware of Filşer *Efendi*'s being dishonest and liar during his staying in Nablus by seeing his efforts to open schools without a certificate, so the inspector and mufti of Nablus, Mehmet *Efendi* was right to close the schools.¹²³

Beside reports of inspections, directors of education must send regularly official messages that included conditions of education in the provinces. For example directors of education of Trabzon, Mehmed Celal *Bey*, wrote his activities to improve education and secondary schools in the districts of Görele, and Tirebolu to the Ministry of Public Education. The governor of Trabzon ordered Mehmed Celal *Bey* to go to the district of Tirebolu to open bids for tithe. It was interesting that although bidding of tithe was not a responsibility of directors of education, he went to Tirebolu to knock down tithe. The some amount of tithe might be given to education so directors of education were also related with the determining of the amount of tithe. Even if so, bidding of tithe was not real duty of directors of education. Celal *Bey* increased total amount of tithe in that year. Apart from this, he also carried out his actual responsibilities when he was staying there for one and a half months. He ordered to destroy the secondary school that was desolated; instead a new school was began to be built for two days with the purse in a wide area. Also Celal *Bey* required founding four new secondary schools thanks to the purse of the public in the districts

¹²³ BOA, MF.MKT. 131/12, 17 S 1309 (22 September 1891).

of Görele, Polathane and Tirebolu without financial burden to the chest of education. In addition he founded two hundred elementary schools in these villages.¹²⁴

3.3. Preservation of Ancient Monuments and Architecture

One of the responsibilities of the directors of education was architectural conservation. When the government decided to destroy, completely or partly, a city wall or a fortress in a town, it was necessary to form a commission, consisting of a civil servant, or military officer (*askeriyye*), engineers and an official of the local museum. The directors of education chaired the commission.¹²⁵ The directors of education also participated in committees for expositions. For instance in 1899, a carpet for the exhibition, organized to provoke the rug business in Konya, and its surrounding area, a commission was formed and one of the members of the committee was the director of education of Konya, Hulusi Bey.¹²⁶

Directors of education should directly communicate with the Directorate of the Imperial Museums (*Müze-i Humâyûnlar Müdüriyeti*) about ancient monuments and supervise the work of the directorate of local museums.¹²⁷ Whoever saw an ancient monumental object in his land, had to report it to the education official of ancient monuments or a civil or military official (*memurini mülkiye ve askeriyye*) within a week. Then the officer had to transmit this report to the Directorate of Education, which had an official of ancient monuments in the province.¹²⁸ In other words, many directors of education performed as an officer of ancient monuments in the province where he was appointed.

For instance, because ancient monuments and ancient buildings were shattered in Konya, a commission, which consisted of an engineer of public works (*nâfia*), the director of education and convenient people (*münasip zevât*), was formed to take necessary precautions about good preservation of mentioned monuments (*âsâr-ı*

¹²⁴ BOA, MF.MKT. 131/56, 1 Ra 1309 (5 October 1891).

¹²⁵ *Düstur*, 2nd Tertip, vol.4, 599.

¹²⁶ Gökhan Akçura. *Türkiye'de Sergicilik ve Fuarçılık Tarihi*, (Ankara: Tarih Vakfı, 2009), 49.

¹²⁷ Item 2 of *Âsâr-ı Atîka Nizâm-nâmesi*, *Düstur*, 1st tertip vol.8, 507.

¹²⁸ Item 9 of *Âsâr-ı Atîka Nizâm-nâmesi*.

mezkûrenin hüsn-i muhafazalarına aid tedâbir-i lâzimenin ittihaz olunması) in 1906.¹²⁹

In the province of Hudavendigâr, the director of education, Azmi Bey, exceptionally struggled to establish the branch of the Imperial Museum in Bursa, so his appointment to the voluntary administrator of the mentioned branch was promulgated by the directorate of the Imperial Museum in 1905.¹³⁰ Here Azmi Bey's great interest in the establishment of the museum was the result of working as a director of education in 1897-1903 in Konya where the first branch of the Imperial Museum was established in 1899 and Azmi Bey was closely related with this Museum's establishment and opening.¹³¹ However, the minister of education did not understand why Azmi Bey's appointment as manager of the branch of the museum was necessary since the directors of education were the natural heads of the respective branch of the Imperial Museum.¹³² In other words, the directors of education had to take a strong interest in the establishment of branches of the Imperial Museum and their administration. The minister of education also emphasized that branches of the Imperial museum were to be opened in Jerusalem, Yannina, Baghdad, Aydın, Trabzon and Salonika in order to prevent the passing of ancient monuments into the hands of foreigners.¹³³

¹²⁹ BOA, BEO 2749/206158. 30 Za 1323, (26 January 1906).

¹³⁰ BOA, MF.MKT. 836/47, 30 Z 1322 (7 March 1905), no.2 "Hüdavendigâr Vilayeti müze-i hümayun şubesine gerek hüsn-i tesisinde ve tanziminde ve gerek emr u muhafazasında fevkalade gayret ve faaliyet müşahid olan vilayet maarif müdürü saadetlu Azmi Bey'in şube-i mezkûre fahri müdüriyetine tayini müze-i hümayun müdüriyetinden inha edilmiş..."

¹³¹ Kırmızı, Avlonyalı Ferid Paşa, 152. Also see Hüseyin Muşmal, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Eski Eser Politikası: Konya Vilayeti Örneği (1876-1914)* (Konya: Kömen Yayınları, 2009), 89.

¹³² BOA, MF.MKT. 836/47, 30 Z 1322 (7 March 1905), no.4 "Maarif müdürleri zaten müze-i hümayun müdür-i tabîleri oldukları halde Hüdavendigâr Vilayeti maarif müdürünün şube-i mezbure müdüriyetine tayinine neden lüzum görüldüğü anlaşılamadığını..."

¹³³ BOA, MF.MKT. 836/47, 1322 Z 30 (7 March 1905), no.4 "ve âsâr-ı atıkanın ecanib ellerine geçmemesi Beyrut, Kudüs, Aydın, Trabzon, Bağdat, Yanya, Selanik gibi vilayet merkezlerinde birer müze-i hümayun şubesi tesisi tevafuk olacağını..."

3.4. Investigation of Books and Journals

Another duty of the directors of education was the investigation of foreign books. Thus in Adana in 1893 that the post office was not the proper place for the examination of foreign books and brochures that arrive at the post office in Adana. The examination of such publications was the duty of the director of education and the educational committee, recruitment of a civil servant for this work was unnecessary.¹³⁴ Also the Police Ministry (*Zabıta Nezareti*) was cautioned in 1892 that provincial translators not the police should investigate harmful books and documents. The directors of education could investigate harmful publications in the absence of a provincial translator, because the governors delegated this duty to the directors of education in provinces.¹³⁵

Minister of Public Education, Zühdü Pasha, wrote a message to the Interior Ministry about the examination of foreign books and brochures sent to Skopje in 1894. He claimed that investigation and controlling such foreign books was one of the responsibilities of the directors of education and when they had to deal with a language, that they did not know, the books were examined by the translator of the government or people who knew the language in the province. Since the authority of the director of education in the mentioned province was adequate, the employment of an alternative director and a translator there was unnecessary. Besides, the educational budget did not have adequate funds that would be reallocated toward that end.¹³⁶

¹³⁴ BOA, MF. MKT. 163/2, 22 Ş 1310 (11 March 1891) “Postalarla vürud eden kütüp ve resail-i ecnebiyyenin postahane muayenesine meşguliyeti müsaid olmadığından...” and “bu misüllü muayene-i kütüp ve resail vazifesi vilayeti şahane de maarif müdürleriyle mahalleri maarif komisyonlarına aid olup bunun için müstakilen memur istihdamına ihtiyac olmadığı...”

¹³⁵ BOA, DH.MKT. 2010/71, 22 Ra 1310 (14 October 1892) “kütüb ve resail ve evrak-ı muzırranın vilayet tercümanları ve tercüman olmayan yerlerde maarif müdürleri tarafından tedkik ve muayene edilmekte olacağı halde şimdi bunun polise havalesi münasip olmayacağından...”

¹³⁶ BOA, DH. MKT. 201/7, 22 B 1311 (29 January 1894) “Bu misillü kütüb-i ecnebiyye muayene ve tedkiki maarif müdürlerinin cümleyi vezâifinden ve maarif müdür ve memurlarının vakıf olmadığı elsine üzerine müellef evrak ve resailin vürudunda hükümet-i mahalliye tercümanı veya o lisanı bilenler maarifetiyle muayene ettirilmesinin sair vilayeti şahane dahi meri olan muameleden

3.5. Instructions for the Directors of Education

The Ottoman government sometimes requested the directors of education to perform projects. For example the directors of education were cautioned so as not to fulfill their work by themselves in 1894. They were advised that moderation was in the interest of the state. When they had hesitations about a task, they should consult the Ministry.¹³⁷ In 1895, the Ministry of Public Education sent working guides to all directors of education. Many of the managers and deputy managers of high schools (*idâdî* schools), instructors, and other personnel continued to have morally and religiously inappropriate behavior and acts that contradicted the official instructions and admonitions that sent to them. Because these officials in the educational organizations were indigenous, they had to be careful of their expressions and manners and be the best representatives of religious and moral principles in their neighborhood. Instead many officials behaved contrarily and this caused the public to see the schools as a danger, whereas they were established at a great cost by sacrificing and spending scarce resources. The people did not have a desire to go to the schools. All this led the efforts to open schools and to spread education to fail and significant projects could not be completed. Officials, who perpetuated this situation, were to be punished. Although these civil servants were very well trained, they had immoral and improper acts. They disappointed the Ministry. Even many educational directors, who had a distinguished position in the province, had many inappropriate behaviors. If a civil servant who behaved inappropriately had not been

bulduğuna ve vilayet-i müşarunileyha maarif müdürünün iktidarı kafi olduğuna mebni nezareti acizece orada başkaca müdür ve tercüman muavini misillu bir memur istihdamına hacet olmadığı gibi yeniden tahsisatı itasına maarif bütçesinin müsaadesi de olmadığından...”

¹³⁷ BOA, BEO. 429/32105, 28 Z 1311 (2 July 1894) “...itidal üzere hareket daha ziyade muvafık-ı menfaat-ı devlet olacağından vilayet maarif müdürleri tarafına böyle bilup bilmesine ve hod be hod muamele ifa olunmayarak tereddüd eyledikleri işlerin nezareti celileden istizan-ı keyfiyyet etmeleri hususunda kendilerine tavsiye buyurulması siyakında tezkire.”

reported to the Ministry of education, the Ministry would consider the director of education who tolerated such acts as a collaborator.¹³⁸

In many sub-provinces, responsibilities of the directors of education were carried out by the schoolmaster of the high school (*idâdî* school) in the absence of a director of education. For instance, this was the case in Izmid in 1891.¹³⁹ Also in the same year, imported books and brochures were investigated by the manager of the high school and the revenue office in Izmid because it did not have a director of education.¹⁴⁰ This office and the schoolmaster were instructed to be vigilant and careful about preventing harmful brochures and works to enter the province.¹⁴¹

3.6. Works Voluntarily Carried out by Directors of Education

The directors of education performed tasks that were not among their formal responsibilities. For instance, Recep *Efendi*, the director of education in Van, was sent to the county of Adilcevaz to investigate administrative affairs.¹⁴² He was given

¹³⁸ BOA, MF.MKT. 84/132, 28 Z 1301 (19 October 1884).

¹³⁹ BOA, MF. MKT. 134/52, 29 Ca 1309 (31 December 1891) “maarif müdürü bulunmayan mahallerde o emre aid vezaif mekatib-i idâdî müdürlerine ihale edilmekte olduğundan İzmid sancağınca dahi maarif müdürünün bulunmaması hasebiyle vazife-i mezkûrenin idâdî müdürü tarafından ifası lazım geleceğinden keyfiyyetin muhasebe memuruna emru işar buyurulması ...”

¹⁴⁰ BOA, MF.MKT. 134/40, 27 Ca 1309 (29 December 1891) “mezkûre ithal olunacak kütüb ve resail ve evrak-ı matbuanın maarif müdürü olmamak hasebiyle idâdî müdüriyetine irat ve inzimam...” and “bu misillü kütüb ve resail hakkında rüsumatı memurlarıyla bil iştirak rey-i muayenelerinin inzimamıyla muamele olunmasını...”

¹⁴¹ Ibid. “Kütüb ve evrak-ı muzırranın duhulüne meydan verilmemesi zımında bi’l-iştirak kemal-i teyakkuz ve dikkat ile hareket olunması...”

¹⁴² BOA, BEO. 3071 /230318, 24 R 1325 (6 June 1907) “Adilcevaz Kazası Muamelatı mülkiyenin tahkikatı zımında izam olunan maarif müdürü Receb Efendi’ye mesarîf-ı fevkal’adesine mükabil inayet-i vuudat harcırahının müsaade-i dahiliye tertibinden maktu’an 500 kuruş i’tası münasib görüldüğü beyanıyla sarfına me’zuniyyet itası Van vilayeti aliyyesinden gelen 8 Nisan 1323 tarihli tahriratda izbar olunmuştur. Harcırah Kararnamesi lâyihasının mevki’i icraya vazına kadar tahkikat icrası zımında yahud başka bir sebeple izam olunacak memurlara mevcut kararname vechiyle verilmesi lazım gelen harcırahtan adem-i kifayeti tahkik ederek fazla bir şey itası icab eylediği halde miktarı mahallerince kararlaştırılıb istizanı keyfiyyet olunması Şura-yı Devlet kararı iktizasından olmasına ve suret-i işarı

500 *kuruşes* for travelling expenses. In fact Adilcevaz was a county of Bitlis, which did not have a director of education in 1907. Consequently, the director of education of Van, which was the nearest province to Bitlis, was sent there to carry out the examination.

Although instruction was not among the regular duties of the directors of education, in Yannina, teaching literature and ethics was assigned to the director of education in 1893 due to lack of qualified people.¹⁴³

An official, whose duty was to examine publications, was expected to be trustworthy Muslim. Thus the absence of such a person in Siird and Bitlis, translation and inspection of books and brochures that come to the post office in Siird, were assigned to a police man and to the director of education in Bitlis in 1902.¹⁴⁴ These civil servants were asked to be doubly diligent regarding especially the mailed documents (*o cihet posta evrakı hakkında bir kat daha takayyüdat icrası lüzumu*).

Another example of extraordinary tasks is that of Cezair-i Bahr-ı Sefid's director of education, Sami Bey. He was appointed as a representative of the Ministry in a legal suit about a piece of land that belonged to the Ministry in Missetopu village (*Missetopu karyesinde maarife ait tarla davası için*) in 1903. He took all court documents that were reported to the Ministry although this work was not among the formal responsibilities of directors of education.¹⁴⁵

vilayete nazaran muhasebe ifadesiyle istizan-ı muameleye ibtidar edildi. Ol babda emru ferman hazret-i veliyyülemrindir. Fi 22 rebiülahir 1325, Nazır-ı Umûr-ı Dahiliyye.”

¹⁴³ BOA, MF. MKT. 158/5, 21 C 1310 (10 January 1893) “Yanya Vilayeti Maarif Müdürlüğüne, Yanya idâdîsi edebiyat ve ahlak dersi muallimliği için oraca ve ehli münasib bulunamadığı uhdenizde ilave kılınmasına dair...”

¹⁴⁴BOA, DH. MKT. 539/70, 6 R 1320 (13 July 1902) “Siird postasına girip çıkacak mektuplarla gazete ve risalelerden lazım gelenleri muayene etmek üzere gerek Siird’den gerekse Bitlis’te İslam’dan şayan-ı emniyet bir memur bulunamadığından bahisle...” and “...tercüme ve muayenesi Siird’de hükümetten bir polise ve Bitliscede maarif müdürüne tevdi eylediği...”

¹⁴⁵ BOA, MF.MKT. 733/35, 13 C 1321 (7 August 1903).

Sometimes directors of education worked with local administrators to increase the revenue for education in the provinces. For instance the director of education of Salonika, Mustafa *Bey*, cooperated with the district governor (*kaymakam*) and a local judge (*naib*) to find financial resources in order to increase the number of the elementary schools. They confiscated “the ferries connecting the shores of the rivers Vardar and Karasu in the name of educational administration and to manage these on behalf of the latter body.”¹⁴⁶ These ferries had been controlled by notables and provided 30,000 or 40,000 *куруşes* revenue annually. Because the right to administer these ferries actually belonged to the state, the local notables and local directors met to ask a form from the notables to put these ferries under the control of the state in order to support public education. When the majority of notables refused this request, the ferries were confiscated.¹⁴⁷

It is also interesting that in 1900 the high school in Trabzon required chemistry equipment and tools to make cosmography lessons more pleasant and beneficial for the students. A microphone, a compass, a thermometer, a bobbin, a phonograph, a repair kit, sulfuric acid, potassium, and nitrogen were among the necessary implements, which were directly bought by Trabzon’s director of education from Paris.¹⁴⁸ Another example is that of Abdullah *Efendi*, director of education in Kosovo. He wrote a report about equipment and necessities for the building of *rüşdiyye* and required textbooks for students to the Inspector of the Rumelian Provinces (*Rumeli Vilayeti Şahanesi Müfettiş-i Umumiliği*) in 1903.¹⁴⁹ They tried to meet the requirements of the students and schools.

The Ministry of Public Education did not permit the directors of education to perform many tasks that were not within their officially specified responsibilities. For instance the Ziraat Bank’s manager in Erzurum was slack in controlling tax collection and behaved disobediently. The government and the director of education

¹⁴⁶ Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 154.

¹⁴⁷ For details *ibid*, 154.

¹⁴⁸ BOA, MF.MKT. 527/34, 6 C 1318 (1 October 1900).

¹⁴⁹ BOA, TFR.I.ŞKT. 12/1152, 17 Ra 1321 (13 June 1903) “İrade-i samileri vechiyle Prizren’de dârümuallimîn teşkili için rüşdiyye binasının tedârikâtı lâzimedede bulunması mutasarrıflığa bildirildiği ve icâb eden muallim intihâb edildiğinde kariben izam edileceği maruzdur, ferman. Kosova Maarif Müdürü Abdullah Bey.”

of Erzurum, Mehmed Tevfik Bey, became worried about the collection of Educational Contribution Tax (*maarif hisse-i iane*) in 1890. Mehmet Tevfik Bey sent a telegraph to the Ministry indicating that the manager of the bank was dismissed and the appointment of a new manager would take a long time. Therefore he requested permission to collect the tax directly to prevent the further delays in the collection of taxes allocated to education and consequent losses to the education budget. Also the governor of Erzurum, Hasan Samih Pasha, reported the situation to the Ministry that the amount of *educational contribution tax* was 550 *куруşes* but only 30 *куруşes* could be collected by the bank due to its officials' negligence and laziness. Therefore he asked for permission for the education officials to collect this tax. At the end, the Ministry of Public Education did not permit the director of education to collect the tax, because this would contradict the Regulation. This work was the duty of the bank official. When he behaved irresponsibly, he was reported to the proper authority.¹⁵⁰

When the directors of education were distinctly successful in their duties, they were rewarded by the government. For instance director of education, Tevfik Bey, was very successful in the collection of the tithe and tax award in 1311 as another manifestation of the diligence of dedicaton with which he conducted his duties. So an

¹⁵⁰ BOA, MF. MKT. 125/23, 5 C 1308 (16 January 1891) no.2 “Maarif nezaret-i celilesine, Bank müdürünün mültezimîni takibindeki rehâvette devam etmesi ve hareket-ı serkeşanesiyle hükümeti dilgir eylemesi hasebiyle hisse-i ianenin cibayeti kabil olmayacağını katiyyen taayyün eylemiştir. Merkezde ve icab ettikçe çakerlerinin veya muhasebe memurunun azimetiyle elviye ve kazalarda hulul eden takasid-i bedelatın muaveneti hükümetle doğrudan doğruya istihsaline tahsiline vakti geçmeden müsaade buyurulması, ferman. 1 Kanuni evvel 1306. Erzurum Maarif Müdürü Mehmet Tevfik”

No.3 “Maarif nezareti celilesine, Ziraat bankası müdürü infisal etti. Tayin olunacak müdürün vürudu bir hayli zamana mütevakıftır. Binaenaleyh 800 kuruş matlubat-ı masarîfın tahsili yine teehhürattan kurtulmayacağından ve bu teehhürat sebebiyle sülusanı mahv olacağından ol babda takdim olunan telgrafnameler mucebince müdüriyet istikraz ve muamelatı intizam-ı hal buluncaya değin hisse-i mezkûrun doğrudan doğruya istihsaline müsaade buyurulmasındaki lüzumu tekrar arz eylerim. Ferman, Erzurum Maarif Müdürü Mehmed Tevfik”

extra payment was given to Tevfik *Bey*.¹⁵¹ Also the director of education, Kemal *Bey*, was rewarded with the second degree in 1890, because of his contribution to the development of education in Syria and competent diligent management of the accounts in other matters.¹⁵²

3.7. Displacement of the Directors of Education

When the director of education wanted to change his work place, or to work in a different province, the government could agree to this change. Azmi *Bey*, director of education in Konya, wanted to leave Konya because he could not adjust to its cold weather. In 1903, he wrote a petition to the Ministry of Public Education to be appointed to Bursa where he could benefit from the thermal springs.¹⁵³ Did he actually suffer from the effects of cold weather? We do not know the real reasons of his desire to leave Konya. We only know what he wanted to tell the government about the reasons of his desire to leave Konya. This petition was addressed to the Sublime Porte. Exchange of offices, between Azmi *Bey* and Hulusi *Efendi*, who was

¹⁵¹ BOA, MF.MKT. 314/64, 24 Za 1313 (7 May 1896) “Edirne Maarif Müdürü Tevfik Beyefendi bendelerinin gerek aşar gerek mükafat vergisi hisse-i ianesinden geçen 311 senesindeki tahsilat ve irsalatın şayan-ı mahzuniyyet bir derecede olduğu gelen cedavil-i şehriyyeden müsteban olmuş ve bu da efendi-i mumaileyhin vazife-i memuriyetine olan ikdam ve gayretini teyid eylemiş olduğundan hüsn-i hidmetini takdiren bir kıta takdirname şerefbaş kılınması hususuna müsaade-i celile-i nezaret penahileri şayan buyurulmak babında emru ferman...”

¹⁵² BOA MF.MKT 118/11 (23 L 1307/ 12 June 1890) “Vilayet Maarif Müdürü Kemal Bey bendeleri müsaade-i aliyye-i nezaret penahileri vechiyle bu defa Dersaadet’e azimet etmiştir. Mumaileyh zaten teveccühat-ı mahsusayı daverilerine istihkakı derkar olan erbabı ehliyyet ve malumattan olduğuna ve Suriye’ye maarifin terakkisiyle muamelat-ı hesabiyye ve müteferrianın tanzim ve tensiki hususlarında gösterdiği ikdam ve gayretle dahi taltife ibrazı istihkak eylemiş olacağına binaen uhdesine rütbe-i saniye tevcihi hususuna müsaade-i celile-i asifanelerinin istid’ayı mahsusuna ibtidar olundu. Ol babda emru ferman hazreti men lehul emrindir.”

¹⁵³ BOA, MF.MKT. 747/76, 16 Ş 1321 (29 October 1903) no.1 “Altı seneyi mütecaviz bir müddetten beri Konya vilayeti maarif müdüriyetinde ala kadri’l-ittisa ifayı hüsn-i hidmet ifa etmekde isem de, buranın şiddet-i bürudetiyle vücudumun adem-i imtizacından naşi kaplıcalarından dahi istifade etmek üzere Bursa’ya tahvil-i memuriyet-i çakeraneme müsaade-i celile-i nezaretpenahilerinin şayan buyurulması babında emru ferman hazreti men lehul emrindir. Fi 16 teşrini evvel 1319, Konya Maarif Müdürü Azmi.”

the director of education in Bursa, was seen as appropriate.¹⁵⁴ There were certain procedures to the exchange. A telegraph, explaining the proper nature of the exchange, was sent to these directors, Azmi *Bey* and Hulusi *Efendi*, and reported to *Matbuat-ı Dahiliyye İdare-i Âliyyesi* (The Administration of Internal Press). The telegraph indicated that the sultan's approval of the exchange and that the directors would take an oath to serve the sultan loyally and to carry out their duties with integrity and without abusing their authority.¹⁵⁵ They would keep their current wages (*maaş-ı halileriyle becayış-i memuriyetleri hususuna*). In addition, according to traditional bail system, they would provide bail bond and validated copies of the respective accounting registers, which the predecessor had to deliver to his successor. Dates when they were to leave their former posts and to take charge of the new one were communicated to the governors of Bursa and Konya. Azmi *Bey* paid his bail bond to the government but the amount of the Hulusi *Efendi*'s bail bond was not clear. The Accounting Office of the Ministry of Education was consulted to determine this matter.¹⁵⁶ Hulusi *Efendi* paid his bail bond at the end. These steps

¹⁵⁴ Ibid, no.2 “Bab-ı aliye, tezkire-i alliyeye, Konya vilayeti maarif müdürü saadetlu Azmi Bey’in oranın şiddet-i bürudetiyle vücudunun adem-i imtizacından naşı Bursa’ya tahvil-i memuriyetini istida etmiş becayış-i memuriyetleri münasib görülmüş ve ifayı muktezayı esbabının istihsali mütevakıf müsaade-i celile cenab-ı sedaretpenahileri bulunmuş ve mumaileyhümanın tercüme-i halileriyle müteallık ale’l-ula tanzim edilen iki kıt’a izahat varakası lefen takdim ol babda kılınmış olmağla.”

¹⁵⁵ Ibid, no.4 “Matbuat-ı dahiliyye aliyyesine, Hüdavendigâr vilayeti maarif müdüriyetine Konya vilayeti maarif müdürü saadetlu Azmi Bey’in ve Konya vilayeti maarif müdüriyetine Hüdavendigâr vilayeti maarif müdürü izzetlu Hulusi Efendi’nin tayinine irade-i seniyye-i hazret-i hilafetpenahi şerefsudur buyurulmuş ve mumaileyhümanın velinimet-i bîminnet padişahımız efendimiz hazretlerine sadaketten ayrılmayacaklarına ve uhdelere tebliğ buyurulan hizmetleri de emniyet-i su-i istimal ve hilafı namus ve sadakat-i ahvali irtikab etmeyeceklerine dair yeminlerinin icrası mahalline derdest işar buyurulmuş olduğu.”

¹⁵⁶ Ibid, no.7 “Maarif müdür-i sabıkı saadetlu Azmi Bey’in kefalet senedi Dersaadet’e ita edilmiş olmasından dolayı muma ileyh Hulusi Efendi için tanzim olunacak kaç kuruşa havi olacağında tereddüd edildiğinden bu cihetle de istifsarı maarif muhasebe memurluğundan ifade edilmiş olmağla.”

show how exchange of offices and appointments were done in the Ottoman bureaucracy.

What were the criteria of the Ministry of Public Education while deciding whether or not it was convenient to exchange these offices with each other? Hulusi *Efendi* might not have wanted to leave Bursa. Did the Ministry take account of his preference? Actually Hulusi *Efendi*'s wish was not important, because Grand Vizier Ferid Pasha issued the order regarding this exchange. He and Azmi *Bey* became close friends, when Ferid Pasha was the governor of Konya in 1898-1902. In his official correspondence with the Minister of Public Education, Ferid Pasha as the governor of Konya praised the director of education, Azmi *Bey* for his endeavors to develop, and expand public education in Konya and Antalya.¹⁵⁷

The directors of education had to past the bail bond before taking charge of a new position. In addition the government checked their finances to see whether or not they had any debt. When they did not have savings or properly to show as a bail, their acquaintances could voucher for them. For instance director of education in Shkoder, Abdullah *Bey* appointed Mustafa *Efendi*, who owned two hundred thousand square meters of land, as a guarantor.¹⁵⁸

The government could change an officer's place of employment. For instance Abdül *Efendi*, director of education in Bitola, was sent from Bitola to Shkoder because of his incompetent management (*Manastır maarif müdürü Abdül Efendi'nin idaresizliğinden bahisle*). Daver Şükrü *Efendi*, director of education in Shkoder, left Shkoder in 1895. Alaeddin *Efendi*, director of education in Adana, was appointed to Bitola instead of Abdül *Efendi* with the salary of two thousand *kuruşes*.¹⁵⁹ Although the salary of the directorate of education in Shkoder was one thousand *kuruşes*, Abdül *Efendi*'s salary became one thousand *kuruşes* more when he moved to Shkoder. In other words his salary was the same with that of Alaeddin *Efendi*.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷ For details see KIRMIZI, Avlonyalı Ferid Paşa, 106.

¹⁵⁸ BOA, MF.MKT. 322/50, 16 M 1314 (17 June 1896).

¹⁵⁹ BOA, MF.MKT. 296/11, 8 C 1313 (26 November 1895).

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, "mucebince İşkodra maarif müdüriyetine mahsus bin kuruş maaş Manastır maarif müdüriyeti maaşından bin kuruş daha ilavesiyle hasıl olan iki bin kuruş maaşla Manastır maarif müdürü Abdül Efendi'nin ve Manastır maarif müdüriyetine

Besides salary of Daver Şükrü *Efendi* was having been one thousand *kuruşes*, funded from the *münderise* foundations (*evkaf-ı münderise*), was increased to two thousand *kuruşes*.¹⁶¹ They had to pay the bail bond, (*kefaletle mükellef memuriyetinin itasına mecbur oldukları kefalet senedatının*) and keep to the dates of the beginning of their new job. The end of former job communicated to the government. Their travelling expenses were paid and registered in the official report.¹⁶²

3.8. The Salaries of the Directors of Education

The salaries of directors of education differed according to the province in which they worked. In general, the provinces were divided into three categories.¹⁶³

müdüriyeti mezkûreden ----bin kuruş Adana Maarif müdüriyeti maaşından bin kuruş zammıyla kezalik 2000 kuruş maaşla Adana maarif müdürü Alaeddin Efendi'nin nakil ve tayiniyle muamelesi ifa kılınmış olduğundan...”

¹⁶¹ Ibid, “Daver Şükrü Efendilerin infikakı tarihinin arz ve izbarı ve hisse-i ianeden mahsus maaşı bin kuruş olmasından naşi İşkodra maarif müdür-i sabıkı Daver Şükri Efendi'ye evkaf-ı münderise hasılatından verilmekte olan bin kuruşun müdüriyete mahsus maaşın bu kerre iki bin kuruşa iblağ olunması üzerine kıta ile işar-ı ahire değin mevkuf tutulması hususlarının Manastır ve İşkodra vilayetlerine işarı zımında...”

¹⁶² Ibid, “emirnamede gösterilen miktar üzerinden alınacak kefalet senedatı asıllarının sürat takdimi ve kefaletle rabt edildikten sonra işe mübaşeret ettirilerek tarihi mübaşeretlerinin işarı ve Abdül Efendi'nin Manastır'dan Kosova'ya kadar olan mesafe üzerine itası icab eden harcırahının meclis-i idare-i vilayetten istihsal olunacak mesafe mazbatasına ve Aleaddin Efendi'nin de Dersaadet'ten memuriyyet hazırası beynindeki mesafenin harcırah kararnamesine tevfikan tesviye ve ifa ve harcırahları miktarının...”

¹⁶³ BOA, MF.MKB. 35/36, 26 S 1306 (1 November 1888).

Table 3.2. Categories of Directors of Education

First Class of Directors of Education (2,500 <i>kuruşes</i>)	Second Class of Directors of Education (2,000 <i>kuruşes</i>)	Third Class of Directors of Education (1,500 <i>kuruşes</i>)
Syria	Cezair-i Bahr-ı Sefid	Shkoder
Baghdad	Kosovo	Mamüretülaziz
Erzurum	Bitola	Kastamonu
Aydın	Salonika	Mosul
Beirut	Yannina	Bitlis
Aleppo	Sivas	Trabzon
Edirne	Diyarbakır	
Hedjaz	Adana	
Yemen	Van	
Tripoli	Ankara	
	Bursa	
	Konya	

For instance, the total annual expenditures of the directorate of education in Sivas added to 47,160 *kuruşes*. The directorate of education collected 2,000 *kuruşes*, and an accountant 1,000 *kuruşes* each month, 500 *kuruşes* were paid for a secretary, 150 *kuruşes* for a cashier, and 100 *kuruşes* for an attendant each month.¹⁶⁴

As a consequence, the directors of education were interested in many issues and problems about education in the provinces by using their authority or by obtaining permission from the government, although many of these works were not among their formal responsibilities in the Regulation of Public Education. While they were working, they faced many complaints about them and educational conditions, which will be mentioned in the next chapter.

¹⁶⁴ Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, 41.

4. THE PROBLEMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATION IN THE PROVINCES

Despite the state's financial crises,¹⁶⁵ Abdülhamid II tried to invest in education by the hand of the state to save the Ottoman subjects from the harmful influence of missionary schools and to educate its people as faithful subjects for the Ottoman state. He sent the directors of education to various provinces from the Balkans to the east of the Empire to spread and improve education. He wanted to believe that these directors provided the subjects with an education that was compatible with Islamic religious identity. This chapter touches upon the conflicts and problems that emerged in the provinces between the instructors, the public, and the directors of education.

The correspondance between the directors of education and the Ministry of Public Education points to many problems in educational institutions. For instance the director of education in Benghazi complained about the lack of well-qualified teachers. According to the "Special Instruction for the Elementary Schools in Istanbul" (*Dersaadet Mekâtib-i İbtidâiyyesi için Talimât-ı Mahsûsa*) instructors must have a diploma from the Teacher Training College, or they must pass a proficiency examination. However there was a shortage of qualified instructors. A different problem was that instructors, who were appointed to schools in non-Turkish speaking regions of the empire, were trained to teach in Turkish. There was not any Teacher Training College to train instructors to teach non-Turkish students, so it caused tension between the non-Turkish students and teachers.¹⁶⁶ In 1894 the director of education of Prizren complained about the professional competence of teachers, who earned a living by working as leader of prayers (*imam*) and funeral services. They were unaware of the new methods and technics of education. The governor of Kosovo reported the situation and requested from the Ministry to give

¹⁶⁵ To see the fiscal problems in the reign of Abdülhamid II, see Engin Deniz Akarlı, "Economic Policy and Budget in Ottoman Turkey, 1876-1909" *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.28, no.3 (1992): 443-476.

¹⁶⁶ For details, see Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 123-124.

educational funds for the elementary schools in Kosovo, but the educational budget of the Ministry did not have the means to meet this request.¹⁶⁷

There were many obstacles hampering on the formation of a public educational system in the Ottoman Empire. “The most basic [obstacle] was money. Although all local administrations were expected to contribute a share of their revenues as the ‘education budget’ (*maarif hissesi*), very often this money was not forthcoming, and schools were not built and teachers left unpaid.”¹⁶⁸

Many directors of education collaborated with the missionaries to help foreigners carry out their missionary activities and spread their educational institutions. For instance in Kosovo there were eighty-three schools particularly for the Serbs and only forty-four of them had a license in 1894. Also these schools were founded without a certificate due to the fact that the director of education of Kosovo, Abdül *Efendi*, permitted the situation and did not inspect these institutions. He recently was appointed to Bitola where the majority of the population was Christian.¹⁶⁹ Although one of the responsibilities of the directors of education was to inspect and control foreign schools, Abdül *Efendi* ignored the schools without a license. He might have had a relationship with the missionaries or he simply could not carry out his responsibilities. When we read another document about Abdül *Efendi*, the situation becomes clearer.

In 1892 when he was a director of education in Kosovo, he was complained about to the Minister of Education for his irregular and corrupt practices. Thus he had allowed foundation of a Serbian school in Skopje and had issued certificates to other Christian schools improperly. The Minister investigated the situation upon such complaints. As a result of this examination it emerged that the Serbian school was opened without a license and Abdül *Efendi* did not comply with formal procedures and methods. Therefore he was sent to another province as a director of education and Hafez Mehmed Fehmi *Efendi* was appointed to Kosovo as a director of

¹⁶⁷ Arzu M. Nurdoğan, “II. Abdülhamit Döneminde Devletin Kosova’da Açtığı Okullar,” *Türk Kültürü İnceleme Dergisi*, no. 25 (2011): 55.

¹⁶⁸ Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains*, 107.

¹⁶⁹ BOA, Y.MTV. 101/36, 24 M 1312 (28 June 1894).

education in Abdül *Efendi*'s place 1892.¹⁷⁰ Perhaps Abdül *Efendi* failed to comprehend foreign schools that, they tried to change the mind of the Ottoman subjects, hence they had to be controlled and inspected closely to make their programs and purposes compatible with those of the Ottoman educational system. Another possibility is that he was aware of all of these but remained an advocate of missionary activities. The final possibility is that he was lazy and neglected his responsibilities. Probably he could not administer educational issues well. In 1895, he was appointed from Bitola to Shkoder due to his incompetent management.¹⁷¹

4.1. Instructors and the Schoolmaster Against the Director of Education

Another complaint about a director of education came from the schoolmaster of the high school of Aleppo in 1899. He claimed that Hüsni Zeki *Bey*, Aleppo's director of education, negatively affected everybody's self-respect and sense of honor since he came to Aleppo. Thus he had shamed the schoolmaster without justification. The director bombarded the schoolmaster of the high school with many absurd instructions, which he did not want to carry out. The director became very angry, smacked the schoolmaster and scolded him by using abusive language that not even the common people would use (*avam-ı nassdan birinin bile ağzına almağa teeddüb edeceği bir takım elfazı galizayı serd ederek birden bire üzerime hücum ederek acizlerini darb etmiştir*). The traces of his blows still existed and many people witnessed the incident. The schoolmaster took his case to the courts and the situation was investigated. This was the schoolmaster's perspective.

The director of education argued that when he tried to explain issues of procedures in accordance with his duties, the schoolmaster objected by saying that he was not a police superintendent but a schoolmaster. The director warned him not to be ill-mannered (*müdür-i mumaileyh hasbe'l-vazife bazı tefhimatta bulunduğum sırada ben zabıta müdürü değilim demesine karşı terbiyesizlik etmemesini ihtar etmiştim*). A witness, the accounting officer, Ali *Efendi*, said in the court that he did not know whether the director said "ill-mannered" or "immoral". However, when the court

¹⁷⁰ BOA, Y.PRK.A. 8/3, 14 Ra 1310 (6 October 1892).

¹⁷¹ BOA, MF.MKT. 296/21, 15 C 1313 (3 December 1895).

wanted to learn the exact words the director used, Ali *Efendi* asserted that “immoral” was the word. Therefore the director was fined. The director argued that because of Ali *Efendi*’s anger and hostility towards the director influenced his testimony against him in the court.

Hüsni *Bey* defended his accomplishments in his correspondence with the Ministry of Public Education. In his two years in Aleppo, he had established new schools and provided them new funds to improve the quality of education they offered. Furthermore, he had completed the building of schools that had been established but not finished, by resorting to charity from the general public. Thanks to his directions, many schools were repaired and the revenue coming from the government to the province increased. He worked day and night and encouraged elementary school instructors to attend classes in the high schools to learn about the new methods of teaching and implement them in the elementary schools. Hüsni *Bey* did not neglect to check the conduct of unjust officials and to appeal to the courts to that end. Ali *Efendi*, according to Hüsni *Bey*, had worked first as a cashier and an accounting official in Aleppo. He won an influence over notable people. He used his influence to ruin many directors of education who did not suit his purpose. He opposed Hüsni *Bey* as well, because Hüsni *Bey* complied with the procedures of the allocation of educational funds. According to Hüsni *Bey*, the postal and telegraph clerk, Hamdi *Efendi* as well, tried to cause his dismissal by telling very inaccurate things about him, because he had opposed the employment of many people who were close friends of Hamdi *Efendi*. The Minister tried to appoint the schoolmaster of Üsküdar high school to replace Hüsni Zeki *Bey*, the director of education in Aleppo reported all this information to the Minister, in the belief that the Minister decided objectively. At the end, the director of education was punished based on the court decision.¹⁷²

It was an interesting story. It is possible that there was already hostility between the schoolmaster of the high school, Hazım *Efendi*, and the director of education, Hüsni Zeki *Bey*. When the director of education made a mistake, the schoolmaster saw it as an opportunity to complain to the director to the Ministry of Public Education. However we do not know the realities behind the conflict between the two. The

¹⁷² BOA, MF.MKT. 439/50, 8 Za 1316 (27 December 1899).

Ottoman government did not want to dismiss Hüsni Zeki *Bey*, because he contributed to the development of education in Aleppo successfully for two years. Actually there was also a conflict between the director and the clerk of the postal and telegraph office, Hamdi *Efendi*, apparently because the director did not care to please Hamdi *Efendi*. How should be their relationship; one of them was a director of education and the other was an officer at the postal and telegraph administration? Why and how did Hamdi *Efendi* interfere with Hüsni Zeki *Bey*'s work? Ali *Efendi*, an accountant, too, was hostile towards the director of education. The notables in the provinces supported and respected. By using this support he tried to remove Hüsni Zeki *Bey*. Were these notables sufficiently influential to dismiss a director?

4.2. Women Instructors Against the Director of Education

Sometimes directors of education complained about instructors or a schoolmaster because they must report, in accordance with their responsibilities, one who did not do his job well in a school, to the Ministry of Public Education. For instance in 1899 the director of education of Bitola, Vassaf *Efendi*, reported that Huriye *Hanım*, the senior woman instructor, in the secondary school for girls, caused distress and complaints by quarrelling with officials and notables' wives due to her lack of harmony with them (*inas rüşdiyyesi muallime-i ulası Huriye Hanım'ın imtizacsızlığı hasebiyle ekabir ve memurin hanımlarıyla münaza'a ederek suda şikayete sebebiyyet vermekte*). Also she practiced violence towards the students. She ignored the warnings against such conduct. In addition she claimed frequently that she will leave the school in the future to give private lessons to the children of the outstanding families. Consequently, moving her to another place is deemed necessary (*Bazı müteneffizan çocuklarını suret-i hususiyede tedris etmek üzere ikide birde mektebi terk eylemekte olacağına bahisle mumaileyhanın aher mahalle nakle lüzumu iş'ar olunuyor*). The situation was written to the administration of the province to decide objectively.

After twenty days, Emine Huriye *Hanım* wrote to the Ministry of Public Education stating that she was a graduate of the Teacher Training College in Istanbul and worked in Bitola for two years with utmost effort. She expected the director of education to praise her and to treat her fairly. Yet she was sent to work at the high

school without her knowledge and put out on the sheet with her mother like a bird with broken wings (*kanadı kırılmış kuş gibi validemle beraber sokağa atmağla kanaat etmeyerek güya emrine adem-i ita'atim hasebiyle...*). Furthermore, the director fined half of her salary wrongly accusing her for disobedience to her superiors. She believed she obeyed all orders until now, but if she didn't, she would be warned first, before being punished. She claimed that she did not commit any mistake, and the director's charges and holding her with contempt were unfair. She asked for an investigation regarding her situation. When her good conduct became clear the fined part of her salary should be paid back to her. Emine *Hanım* added that Vassaf *Efendi* ordered her to leave the room where she lived with her mother in the school she worked, thereby augmenting the losses inflicted upon her wrongly.

The situation was reported to the administration of Bitola. Vassaf *Efendi* claimed that the instructor should resort to advice in order to discipline students and to install good moral values in them. Instead, she treated them violently and horrified them. Also she did not cover the majority of the lessons she ought to teach. Two years back, parents complained to the management of the school for girls not only about her method of teaching but also her bad and violent treatment to the students. She was cautioned by advising her to treat the students properly. When the poor quality of the education of her students became clear in their answers in an examination, she was warned again. Despite all these admonitions, she continued to behave in the same way. She even cursed students. They hated the school and learning because of her behavior. Then the director of education ordered that Emine Huriye *Hanım*'s half salary was fined in accordance with the Regulation, that which stipulate instructors, and schoolmasters will be fined, if they do not carry out their responsibilities well and break rules commandment.

Vassaf *Efendi* added that two and a half years ago, the owner of the house that had been given to the school for girls died and it shared among inheritors. Huriye *Hanım* and her mother also were dispossessed by these inheritors. She and her mother began to stay at the school when they left the house. However instructors' boarding at schools was contradictory to the Regulation.

Finally Emine Huriye *Hanım* and another instructor, Apasya *Hanım*, who too had many conflicts with the director of education, complained about Vassaf *Efendi*. They claimed that he would dismiss them if they did not accept his illegal proposals. Indeed, he dismissed one of us and fined the other. Therefore they requested from the Ministry to dismiss the director.¹⁷³

Ministry of Public Education initiated an inquiry into the situation. There remains many questions about the incident. Nevertheless, it sheds some light on the relationship between administrators and teachers, educational conditions, as well as problems of schooling in the provinces.

4.3. Illicit Relationships Between the Civil Servants

Relationship between woman instructors and directors of education was not always so conflictive. Indeed, sometimes their close relationship caused problems in educational institutions. For instance, the director of education of Trabzon, Mehmet Tevfik *Bey*, and Macide *Hanım*, the senior woman instructor of the secondary school for girls in Trabzon were close friends. Sometimes she stayed at Tevfik *Bey*'s house and they had a great time playing the lute. However this relationship was not a good example for other woman instructors. One of them, Hasibe *Hanım*, too, began to stay with a telegraph official by claiming that he was her foster brother. When Hasibe *Hanım* became pregnant, Tevfik *Bey* was afraid that his relationship with Macide *Hanım* too would attract criticism. He has encouraged Macide *Hanım* to beat Hasibe *Hanım* in public view and threw her out of the school. This situation was reported to the Ministry of Public Education by "a citizen from Trabzon". Both the Ministry of Public Education and the governor of Trabzon investigated the situation. They asked the director of education to banish both women. Tevfik *Bey* objected to the idea of sending Macide *Hanım* away. He argued that such an act would mean his admission of guilt and he would rather commit suicide because this was an honesty issue. At the end, he continued to work in Trabzon at the same position, whereas Macide and Hasibe *Hanıms* were appointed to different provinces with reduced ranks. The Minister of Education warned all instructors and directors in Trabzon and the areas

¹⁷³ BOA, MF.MKT. 462/44, 19 R 1317 (27 August 1899).

surrounding it to carry out their duties properly and to avoid situations that caused gossip in public.¹⁷⁴

The Ministry did not change Tevfik Bey's work place presumably, because he carried out his responsibilities well and helped to improve educational conditions in Trabzon.

4.4. The Director's Ignorance of the Ottoman Schools

Sometimes directors of education did not give sufficient attention to developing educational opportunities for Muslims while educational institutions referring primarily to non-Muslim improved. This annoyed the Muslim people whose children had to go to non-Muslims schools. For instance in 1899, Yusuf, an instructor, complained about the director of education in Shkoder Mahmut *Efendi*, because Muslim schools were closed since Mahmut *Efendi* was appointed to Shkoder. These schools had been in ruins for three years. When he came there, he immediately held a meeting with the schoolmasters and instructors of Orthodox, Catholic, and Jesuit schools. Also, he permitted many instructors and priests to enter Shkoder from Austria, Italy, and Montenegro and to open new schools.¹⁷⁵ In addition he cooperated with the owners and the editorial committee of a newspaper was published in Geneva and was hostile to Muslims and Islam (*Cenevre'de Devlet-i Âliyye-i Osmaniye ve millet-i necibe-i İslamiyye aleyhinde neşr edilmekte olan gazetenin sahibi imtiyaz ve komiteleriyle bi'l-iştirak ihbarat-ı mel'anetkaranede bulunduğu*). He caused divisions and jealousy between Muslims and Christians, as everybody knew. Moreover people of the region were uneducated so they had a tendency to go to foreign schools. Many facilities were provided to foreigners, so in order to prevent the emergence of jealousy between the Muslims and the Christians, the director of education must be dismissed or appointed to a different province.

¹⁷⁴ BOA, MF.MKT. 504/4, 15 M 1318 (15 May 1900).

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, "Maarif Müdürü Mahmud Efendi buraya geldiği günden beru maarif-i islamiyye kamilen mahvu muzmahil oldu. Üç senedir mekâtib-i İslamiyye masdur kaldı. Bu zat gelir gelmez hiçbir işe bakmaksızın cizvit (jezvit) ve ortodoks ve katolik mekteplerinin müdür ve muallimleriyle bi'l-muşavere merkez vilayetle mülhakatı ve kurada ve Nemçe, İtalya ve Karadağ'dan bir çok muallim ve rahiplerin duhul ve mektep küşadına müsaade..."

The governor of Shkoder and its commander advocated in favor of Mahmud *Efendi* by claiming that when Mahmud *Efendi* worked there, Muslim schools were closed because salaries of instructors were overdue (*tedahül-i maaşlarından dolayı mektepleri sedd eylemek*). The schools were repaired and new ones were founded thanks to the efforts of Mahmud *Efendi*, who was among religious scholars (*ulema*). He met with foreign schoolmasters and instructors to evaluate their demands and accepted their inappropriate requests. This was not contradictory with his position and responsibilities. Also, he avoided any a consultation with the owners of a newspaper that was hostile to Muslims and Islam. Therefore it was impossible that he had attempted to induce jealousy between Muslims and Christians. According to the governor of Shkoder and its commander, some instructors made accusations, about Mahmud *Efendi*, because they wanted a local director of education. Despite the governor's defense, Mahmud *Efendi* was appointed to a different province.¹⁷⁶

It was interesting that the governor and the commander supported the director and their explanation helped to clarify the situation. The people of Shkoder wanted a local director of education. However the Ottoman government sent a director from a faraway province, because of the possibility that a local director would treat students and instructors preferentially. The government tried to prevent such indulgent behavior. Nevertheless, Mahmud *Efendi* was moved to different province to prevent the emergence of conflict between the Muslims and Christians. It shows that the government sometimes passed a decision in a region according to its regional needs. If the government believed that Mahmud *Efendi* closed Muslim schools while the number of foreign schools was increasing, the director of education would be dismissed. On the other hand "the director of education in Adana demeaned Islam and deteriorated the students' morals so the Ministry of Public Education began to inspect the situation."¹⁷⁷ The Ottoman government was keen about the Muslim schools.

¹⁷⁶ BOA, MF.MKT. 451/17, 24 M 1317 (4 June 1899).

¹⁷⁷ BOA, AD 1/1422, no. 479, 26 M 1308 (11 September 1890) used by Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 105.

Directors of education could regulate instructors' teaching period in a week. How and according to what did the director regulate the teaching hours? He could decrease course hours of the instructors whom he did not like, or vice versa, he could increase course period of the teachers who get on with the director. A historical document about the organization of course hours of instructors and the schoolmaster of the school could help to answer these questions.

4.5. Misadministration of the Director of Education in Yannina

One day the director of education inspected the high school in Yannina and he decided to diminish weekly course hours of the schoolmaster from eighteen hours to fifteen hours, because the schoolmaster could not carry out his real work. However the schoolmaster of the school reacted angrily to the reduction of his course load (by three hours in this case) because this meant a reduction in his pay and a charge of incompetence. He reported the situation to the Ministry of Public Education by adding that his salary was also decreased due to lowering course hours, so he had many financial problems. He requested to take his complete pay without a reduction.

The schoolmaster explained his conditions in detail: He had taught in this school for seventeen years. Normally he taught Persian for fourteen hours a week and took 425 *kuruşes* payment in a month for doing so. There were not any complaints about him and until now his salary had reached to this level thanks to the appreciation of the previous directors of education. However the new director of education of Yannina, Mahmud Celaleddin Bey, considered his salary high and he decreased his course load and reduced his salary to 240 *kuruşes*. The director transferred the schoolmaster's old lessons to other instructors. Also the schoolmaster had taught in the same school but after interference of the director of education, he taught lessons in different schools. In addition Celaleddin Bey changed the schedule of almost all instructors in the mid-term when students were accustomed to their teachers and they could benefit from them. Despite the schoolmaster should be awarded, he was victimized like other instructors. He wanted to take his old schedule and wage from the Ministry of Public Education. He did not accept the changes made by the director of education.

Mahmud Celaleddin Bey changed not only which lesson was taught by instructors but also their amount of course hours in a week. Almost all instructors' schedules were changed so they had many troubles. The governor of Yannina accepted the changes made by the director. The director of education promoted himself by claiming that dismissing an instructor or changing his working place could be carry out by directors of education in the provinces that was second article of the regulation of the high schools.

The director of education changed the lessons of sixteen instructors at the mid-term that caused an irregularity in the schooling. It had been demonstrated that these changes actually were regulated by the committee that consisted of all instructors of the school, but it was carried out at the meeting where only one teacher was present.¹⁷⁸ Moreover the changes were decided for the instructors who were not present at the meeting. The schoolmaster was present there and his changing schedule was completely reregulated in a different way after the meeting by Mahmud Celaleddin *Efendi*. In the official report signed by this committee, many changes were not convenient for the development of education in the school. For instance Süleyman *Efendi* had taught religious science, moral, and Turkish lessons until the meeting where he was given responsibility for different lessons. Although he did not any experience to teach new lessons, he must teach these lessons.¹⁷⁹

At the end the director of education, Mahmud Celaleddin *Bey* was dismissed. The story was also an example of the reasons for the dismissing of the directors of education. Mahmut *Bey* reorganized schedule according to his own will without depending on a reasonable background. It became clear by the story that schedules were not organized by only a director of education, but by a committee that included a wide range of the instructors and schoolmaster of a school. The director did not have a right to change decisions that were taken in the committee.

¹⁷⁸ Maarif müdürü iş bu tebdilatı mekteb memurin ve muallimin hazır oldukları halde cereyan eden müzakere neticesinde onların mühürlerini havi mazbata mündericatına tevfikân icra kılındığı beyan edilse de evrak-ı melfufe meyanında bulunan mezkûr mazbatanın müsteban olduğu üzere muallimin-i müstakileden yalnız birisi müzakerede hazır bulundurulmuş.”

¹⁷⁹ BOA, MF.MKT. 925/66, 2 Ra 1324 (26 April 1906).

Another example of the dismissing a director of education was from Mamuretülaziz where the number of foreign schools was increasing so the operations of the administration for education as controlled by the Ministry of Public Education. The director of education was dismissed instead, the secretary (*mektubcu*) of the province of Dersim, Hayri *Efendi*, who knew local conditions well, was appointed, because the former director did not sent any report about the foreign schools to the center.¹⁸⁰ The foreign schools' activities were one of the most significant factors that the Ottoman government dealt with, and the state had emphasized decreasing their negative effects on its subjects.

All complaints show education in the reign of Abdülhamid II could not be completely systematized and bureaucratized. Abdülhamid II tried to put people in charge who well-qualified to develop further education in provinces, but many directors of education neglected their duties. They became a disappointment for the Abdülhamid II because of their cooperating with missionary activities to spread foreign education instead of Ottoman education system, in the Ottoman Empire.

¹⁸⁰ BOA AD No.1 1422/345, 17 Za 1307 (5 June 1890) used by Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 104-105.

5. ACADEMIC CAREER PATHS OF THE DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION

The directors of education had different social and educational backgrounds. Only directors of education graduated from the Civil Servant School (*Mekteb-i Mülkiye*), which was opened in 1859¹⁸¹, will be mentioned in this chapter. They worked in different provinces of the Ottoman Empire and their ranks were ascended gradually. For instance some of them became a governor of a province after being directors of education in various provinces or they were selected as a deputy in the council in the second Constitutional period. Many directors of education participated in the “struggle for constitutionalism” while they were working as director in the reign of Abdülhamid II, who attached great importance to the Civil Servant School and its graduates.¹⁸² According to Carter Findley, the aim of founding of the Civil Servant School was “to train a new type of civil official.”¹⁸³ He focused on emerging of a new professionalism, intellectual and numerical depth.¹⁸⁴ “The Committee of civil servants of the *mülkiye* and committees of selecting officers provided the Ottoman Empire a system of recording personnel, a new and modern retirement system in the reign of Abdülhamid II.”¹⁸⁵ The book “*Mülkiye tarihi ve mülkiyeliler: 1860-1923*”¹⁸⁶, written by Ali Çankaya, will be used to mention about the directors, who graduated from the Civil Servant School.

The first director of education, trained in the *mekteb-i mülkiye*, was Emrullah *Efendi*. He was appointed as a director of education in Yannina in 1882, in Salonika in 1884,

¹⁸¹ Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, 502-503.

¹⁸² For the reason of the significance of the *mülkiye mektebi*, see Şerif Mardin. *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri: 1895-1908* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1992), 48-53.

¹⁸³ C. Vaughen Findley, *Ottoman Civil Officialdom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 243.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid*, 243

¹⁸⁵ Kırmızı, Abdulhamit. “Osmanlı Taşra İdaresinde Kariyer Çizgisinin Modernleşmesine Dair Bazı Gözlemler,” in *Eski Çağdan Günümüze Yönetim Anlayışı ve Kurumlar*, ed. Feridun M. Emecen (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2009), 227.

¹⁸⁶ Ali Çankaya. *Yeni Mülkiye Tarihi ve Mülkiyeliler, Mekteb-i Fünûn-i Mülkiye, Mekteb-i Mülkiye-i Şâhâne me’zunları, 1860-1923*, vol.3. (Ankara: Mars Matbaası, 1969).

in Aleppo in 1887, and in Izmir in 1891. When he worked in Izmir, he went to Switzerland to participate in struggle for constitutionalism “*Hürriyet Mücadelesi*”. He returned to Istanbul by the order of Abdülhamid II as member of the council of education in 1900. He became a minister of education and in the same year he was a member of the parliament representing Kırklareli (*Kırkkilise*). His submitted works were *Muhit’ül Maarif*, *Yeni Muhit’ül Maarif* and *Osmanlı İttihad ve Terakki Cem’iyyetinin 1327 Senesi Dördüncü Kongresinde Tanzim Olunan Siyasi Programa Dair İzahname*.¹⁸⁷

Said (Gelenbevioğlu) also graduated from the *mekteb-i mülkiye* and he became a writer at the internal affairs ministry in 1884. After a year he was a writer at the trade ministry and in 1888 he was appointed as a director of education in Bursa place of Ahmed Rıza, who went to Paris to participate in the struggle of constitutionalism. In 1893 he worked as a director of education in Edirne. He was promoted to the under secretariat (*müşteşarlık*) of the Ministry of Education and then he became the minister of education in 1912. Eleven years later he became the deputy of Trabzon in the election in the Turkish National Assembly.¹⁸⁸

Abdullah Hilmi (Okyay) also graduated from the *mektebi mülkiye*. He became a teacher of math, and the science, and the schoolmaster of the high school (*Idâdî School*) in Trabzon and Salonika in 1893 and in 1894. Then he was promoted to the directorate of education in Salonika in 1901. After the second constitutional monarchy, he began to work at administrative positions. In 1923 he became a member of Turkish National Assembly by representing Trabzon.¹⁸⁹

Mehmed Reşid Pasha was another graduate from the *mekteb-i mülkiye*. In 1890 he began to work as an instructor of French, Geography, Economy, Science, and accounting at the high school (*Idâdî School*) in district of Serez. He was also the manager of this school. In 1894 he was appointed as the schoolmaster of the high school in Salonika, and after a year he began to work as a director of education in Trabzon and for additional work he became an instructor of literature, morality, and

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, 96-102.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, 145-152.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid, 310-312.

accounting in the high school of Trabzon. In 1896 he became a director of education in Salonika, and an instructor of chemistry at the high school. When his competence and success was taken into account, he was promoted as an administrator of district of Serez in 1906. When he had been in Salonika, he secretly and actively participated into the Union and Progress Community. He dared to write Abdülhamid II that if the Constitutional Monarchy is not declared, people in the district of Serez will be submitted to Reşad Efendi, who was heir to the throne. After the declaration of Constitutional Monarchy, he was immediately promoted as a governor to Edirne in 1908; in Cezair-i Bahr-ı Sefid in 1910; in 1911 in Bitola; in Ankara in 1912; and in Kastamonu in 1914.¹⁹⁰

Mehmed Hasib graduated from the Civil Servant School in 1890 and he was the schoolmaster of high school in Izmir in 1892, in Gümülcine in 1894, and in Sivas in 1897. In 1899 he was appointed as a director of education to Cezair-i Bahr-ı Sefid and in 1902 he worked as a director of education in Bursa.¹⁹¹

Mehmed Tahir, Mustafa Azmi Ömer Akalın, İsmail Hamid, and Hasan Tahsin graduated from the mekteb-i mülkiye in 1883, and they became a director of education in different provinces. Also they wrote important works.¹⁹² Abdülkadir Halil Kamil, Ahmed Hilmi Kurtbay, Mehmed Tefvik, and Ahmed Hulusi graduated from the civil servant school in 1887, and they directed education in various provinces.¹⁹³ Mehmed Ali Ayni, Ahmed Saib, Hüseyin Celal graduated from the civil servant school in 1888. Mehmed Ali had been a director of education in Diyarbakır for two years since 1893. He became a governor of Trabzon in 1912. He had twenty-five written works. Hüseyin Celal was also a director of education in Diyarbakır in 1896. He became a governor of Edirne in 1918.¹⁹⁴

Ahmed Müfid Saner graduated from the *mekteb-i mülkiye* in 1890. During his youth ages, he worked as an instructor of chemistry, math, and economy respectively in the high school of Izmit, Bursa, Edirne, and Izmir. He gained many experiences in the

¹⁹⁰ Ibid, 315.

¹⁹¹ Ibid, 360.

¹⁹² Ibid, 155-164.

¹⁹³ Ibid, 257, 326, 327, and 340.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, 295-303.

various provinces of the Ottoman Empire. In 1906 he was promoted to being director of education in Yannina, and in 1908 in Ankara. After the second constitutional monarchy he was elected as a deputy for Izmit province. In 1912 he became an administrator of Kütahya and in 1915 in Bolu.¹⁹⁵

Mehmed Tevfik was also a graduate of the *mekteb-i mülkiye* in 1890. He worked as a teacher of geography, and math in the high school of Manisa. In 1892 he was appointed as an assistant schoolmaster of the high school and an instructor of history, French language, Turkish, and math in Sivas. In 1895 he was appointed as a schoolmaster of the high school in Mosul. After eight years he was promoted to being director of education in Musul. He was a director of education in Bolu in 1910, and in Sivas in 1912. He stayed as a director in Sivas until 1921 when he retired.¹⁹⁶

Mahmud Şahabeddin was a director of education in 1908 but after two years, he became ill and went to Istanbul for treatment. In 1911 he was died. He had been one of the students of the *mekteb-i mülkiye* in 1890s when Mehmed Tevfik was thought to be there. He became a writer of the inspectorship of secondary schools of the Ministry in 1893. He wrote *Ravza-ı Ahlak* in 1886.¹⁹⁷

Mehmed Musa Adiga was born in 1869 and graduated from the *mülkiye mektebi* with a high degree in 1889. He worked as a teacher of different courses such as Geography and Turkish and as a schoolmaster of a high school orderly in Konya, Rhodes, Diyarbakır, Trabzon, and Sivas. In 1908 he was promoted to being director of education with the wage of 2500 *kuruşes* in *Cezair-i Bahr-ı Sefid*, and in 1910 he became a director of education in Trablusgarb with the salary of 3000 *kuruşes*. In 1911 he worked as a director of education in Trabzon, and he was appointed to Sivas directorate of education but he could not go there due to his illness. His published work was *İslam'da İki Facia*.¹⁹⁸

Abdi Namık İmre became a schoolmaster and a teacher in the high school of Erzurum, Manisa, and Izmir after graduating from the *mülkiye mektebi* in 1889. He

¹⁹⁵ Ibid, 417-418.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid, 439-440.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid, 440.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid, 404-405.

was promoted to being director of education in Yannina in 1900, in Edirne in 1902, in Izmir in 1910. In 1913 he became a manager of the university's science branch (Darülfünun'u Fen Şubesi) in Istanbul. After the proclamation of Republic, he worked as a teacher in the high school of Istanbul.¹⁹⁹

Mehmed Vassaf was born in Yannina in 1864 and he was a schoolmaster of the high schools of Bitola, and Yannina in 1890 and 1891. He was promoted to the directorate of education in Aleppo in 1896 and in Bitola in 1899. Then he began to work as an administrator in different provinces and districts. It is interesting that although he was born in Yannina and knew there well, he was appointed to Aleppo as a director of education.²⁰⁰

Hüseyin Zeki, who was a director of education in Aleppo in 1896; in Beirut in 1900, was also graduated from the *mekteb-i mülkiye* with a good degree in 1891 and after his graduation he worked at Ziraat Bank, and then at the high school of Izmir as a schoolmaster. After 1902, he worked as an administrator of different districts such as Şamiye, Beylan, Birecik and Trablusgarb.²⁰¹

Mehmed Muhiddin was from the *mekteb-i mülkiye*, and he became a director of education in 1908 in Diyarbakır, in Aleppo in 1913, in Ankara in 1914, and in Aleppo secondly in 1916. In 1919 he became secondly director of education in Ankara. In 1920 he was retired. Before being a director of education, he worked as an instructor of French, Geography, math, economy, and literature in the high school of Nablus in 1895. In 1897 he became a director of the high school in Kırşehir. After two years he worked as a schoolmaster of the high school and a teacher of different courses in the high school of Erzurum.²⁰²

Halil İbrahim was born in Divriği and he became an instructor of history, and chemistry in the high school of Beirut. He worked as a schoolmaster and teacher in

¹⁹⁹ Ibid, 373.

²⁰⁰ Ibid, 375.

²⁰¹ Ibid, 484.

²⁰² Ibid, 487.

Aleppo, Hama, and Tripoli. In 1907 he was appointed as a director of education in Baghdad and in 1909 in Jeddah (*Cidde*).²⁰³

Tahir Lütfi was a secretary at the Ministry of Public Education in 1883 when he graduated from the *mekteb-i mülkiye*. After two years he became an instructor of math, French, and astronomy in the high school of Erzurum. Then he directed the school, and he was promoted in 1898 to being director of education in Erzurum from where he went to Bulgaria to join to the group of young Turks. In 1909 he was selected as a deputy in the Bulgarian Nation Council. He returned to the Anatolia after the declaration of Republic, and he became a writer in the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Then he became an ambassador of Tiran and Belgrade. He was retired due to the limit of age in 1935. He knew French, Bulgarian, and Arabic languages.²⁰⁴

Selçuk Akşin Somel claims that individual characteristic of the directors of education changed.

While the directors of education in the Balkans, as in the case of the province of Janina, could be appointed among civil officials graduated from the school of the Civil Servant (*mekteb-i mülkiye*) still at the beginning of the 1880s, İsa Ruhi *Efendi*, a sheikh of the Sufi Rifai order who lacked formal government education, was appointed to Baghdad in 1889.²⁰⁵

Somel continued to criticize this situation by arguing that non-uniform qualities of the directors of education caused differences in the development of public schools. Also such differences shows that there were different government interests and policies changed according to the regional conditions. However it is seen above that the directors of education, who graduated from the school of civil servant, were not generally appointed to the provinces in Balkans, they were also sent to the Eastern provinces. For instance Mehmed Tevfik worked in Mosul, Mahmud Şehabeddin in Benghazi, Tahir Lütfi Togay in Erzurum, Osman Safvet Ceylangil in Kastamonu, Hüseyin Zeki in Aleppo and Beirut, Mehmed Şükri in Baghdad and Erzurum, Mehmed Muhiddin in Diyarbakır, Aleppo, and Ankara, Halil İbrahim in Jeddah and Baghdad, Selim Sami in Baghdad, Mehmed Ali Ayni in Diyarbakır, Sinop and

²⁰³ Ibid, 504.

²⁰⁴ Ibid, 523.

²⁰⁵ Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 101.

Trabzon, Hüseyin Celal in Diyarbakır, Ahmed Hulusi in Konya, Bursa, and Sivas, İsmail Hamid worked as a director of education in Adana, Syria, and Trabzon.

There were about thirty directors of education, who graduated from the Civil Servant School, between 1876 and 1908. Many of them, Mehmed Reşid Pasha, Emrullah *Efendi*, Tahir Lütfi, Ahmed Saib, and İsmail Hamid went to abroad to participate in the struggle for constitutionalism and cooperated with the Committee of Union and Progress. Tahir Lütfi Togay went to Bulgaria to participate the struggle for constitutionalism when he was a director of education in Erzurum in 1898. Also Emrullah *Efendi* went to Switzerland to be a participant of the struggle for constitutionalism when he was a director of education in Izmir, in 1891.²⁰⁶ Apart from the graduates of the *mekteb-i mülkiye*, many of other directors of education cooperated with the Union and Progress Committee. For instance Ahmed Rıza, who was the president of the Ottoman Parliament in 1908, had become a director of education in Bursa in 1892. Then he went to Paris to engage with the struggle for constitutionalism. When he was a director of education of Bursa, he prepared reports that focused on the training well-qualified teachers, and to restore devastated school buildings.²⁰⁷

In the Ottoman Empire career paths of directors in the provinces were not uniform. Graduates of Civil Servant School also participated in the appointment system in the Ottoman Empire. Being a civil servant in provinces did not differ from other officers in other ministries.²⁰⁸ Directors of education could be a governor of a province, deputy of a province or an administrator of a district. They worked in different provinces instead of staying at the same place. This was the incorporation of the bureaucracy in a hierarchical order. The table 5.1. shows where directors of education graduated from the *mekteb-i mülkiye* worked. This table was prepared by using Ali Çankaya's work "*Yeni Mülkiye Tarihi ve Mülkiyeliler*".

²⁰⁶ Çankaya, *Yeni Mülkiye Tarihi*, 96, 161, 301, 315, and 523.

²⁰⁷ Osman Kafadar. *Türk Eğitim Düşüncesinde Batılılaşma* (Ankara: Vadi Yayınları, 1997), 180. Also see Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri*, 175.

²⁰⁸ The same pattern was also seen at the appointment of governors to the provinces in the Ottoman Empire. For details see Kırmızı, "Osmanlı Taşra," 227-237.

Table 5.1. The directors of education graduated from the *mekteb-i mülkiye*

Aleppo	Emrullah (1887-1891)	Hasan Tahsin (1892-1893)	Mehmed Vassaf (1896-1899)	Hüseyin Zeki (1899-1900)	Ahmed Hulusi (1909-1914)	
Izmir (Aydm)	Mehmed Tâhir (1889-1891)	Hasan Tahsin (1891-1892)	Mehmed Tefik (1908-1910)	Abdi Namık (1910-1913)		
Erzurum	Tahir Lütfi (1898)					
Edirne	Said Gelenbevioglu (1893-1894)	Abdi Namık (1902-1910)	Mehmed Şükri (1909-1912)			
Baghdad	Hüseyin Zeki (1897-1899)	Halil İbrahim (1907-1909)				
Trabzon	İsmail Hamid (1893-1894)	Mektûbi-zâde Mehmed Reşid Paşa (1895-1896)	Mehmed Musa (1911-1912)			
Yannina	Emrullah (1882-1884)	Abdülkadir Halil (1888-1889)	Abdi Namık (1900- 1902)	Ahmed Müfid (1906-1908)		
Salonika	Emrullah (1884-1887)	Abdülkadir Halil (1889-1890)	Hasan Tahsin (1890-1891)	Mehmed Tâhir (1891-1893)	Mektûbi-zâde Mehmed Reşid Paşa (1896- 1908)	Abdullah Hilmi (1901-1908)
Cezairi Bahr-ı Sefid	Mehmed Hasib (1899-1902)	Mehmed Musa (1908-1910)				
Kosovo	Abdullah Hilmi (1889-1901)					
Bursa		Said Gelenbevioglu (1892-1893)	Mehmed Hasib (1900-1906)	Ahmed Hulusi (1904-1906)	Mustafa Azmi Ömer (1906-1908)	Ahmed Hilmi (1908-1914)

Konya	Abdülkadir Halil (1891-1894)	Mustafa Azmi Ömer Akalm (1897-1906)	Ahmed Hulusi (1906-1909)			
Monastır	İsmail Hamid (1887-1888)	Mehmed Emin (1891)	Mehmed Vassaf (1899-1903)	Ahmed Saib (1904-1908)		
Adana	İsmail Hamid (1888-1893)	Ahmed Saib (1908-1909)				
Ankara	Ahmed Müfid (1908)					
Mosul	Mehmed Tefik (1908-1910)					
Bolu	Mehmed Tefik (1910-1912)					
Sivas	Ahmed Hulusi (1895-1904)					
Benghazi	Mahmud Şahabeddin (1908)					
Beirut	Hüseyin Zeki (1900-1902)					
Diyarbakır	Mehmed Ali (1893-1895)	Hüseyin Celal (1896-1899)	Mehmed Muhiddin (1908)			
Balıkesir	Hasan Tahsin (1887-1890)	Hüseyin Rasih (1909-1912)				
Jeddah (Cidde)	Halil İbrahim (1909)					

5.1. The Life Story of a Director of Education

The academic career of Mehmet Tevfik *Bey*, who became a director of education in different provinces, will be mentioned more broadly to show which schools a director of education graduated from, and what his job was before becoming a director and which status he was promoted from to be a director. His official personnel record²⁰⁹ in the *Sicill-i Ahval Defterleri* was investigated to find reliable information about Mehmet Tevfik *Bey*.

Mehmet Tevfik *Bey* was born as the son of Tosun Pasha, an administrator in *Üsküdar*, in 1860 (1277 h.).²¹⁰ Mehmet Tevfik was educated by private teachers. He read courses in the *rüşdiyye* of *Üsküdar* (the secondary school of *Üsküdar*) and then he graduated from the high school of *mekteb-i sultani* (Galatasaray Lisesi) that was founded in 1868 under French influence.²¹¹ He was one of the best students of his class thanks to his strenuous efforts, manners and good behaviors. He was proficient in Turkish and French languages.

He was appointed as instructor of French and Persian with a salary of 600 *kuruşes* to the department of high school education of the *mekteb-i sultani* when he was twenty-three years old, 13 September 1883. After one and a half months, he also began to work as a French teacher in *mekteb-i mülkiye* as well with an additional salary 800 *kuruşes*. However after five days, he resigned from being instructor of French language in *mekteb-i mülkiye* and worked as an instructor of Persian with a salary of 300 *kuruşes* in the same school. In 1884, he began to work as a civil servant of accounting in the administration of the *mekteb-i sultani* as an additional work with a salary of 1,000 *kuruşes*. On 13 March 1887, he was transferred from being instructor of French in the *mekteb-i mülkiye* to being instructor of Persian and French in the department of high school education of *mekteb-i mülkiye* with a salary of 800 *kuruşes*. A year later being instructor of Persian and French languages was conjoined

²⁰⁹ BOA, DH.SAİD. 47, 25-26.

²¹⁰ According to the book of *II. Meşrutiyet Öncesi Osmanlı Rüşdiyeleri (1897-1907) Programlar, Ders İçerikleri, İstatistikler*. (Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi, 2008) written by Uğur Ünal, Tevfik Bey was born in 1870, but his source is only *maarif salnâmeleri* (yearbooks of education).

²¹¹ Adnan Şişman, *Galatasaray Mekteb-i Sultanisi'nin Kuruluşu ve İlk Eğitim Yılları (1868-1871)* (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1989), 12.

with the wage of 600 *куруşes*. His salary which decreased from 800 *куруşes* to 600 *куруşes* was paid from the cashier of education. On 3 December 1889, Tevfik *Bey* was appointed as a director of education to Erzurum with a salary of 2,500 *куруşes*. Seven months later, he also worked as a teacher of French language at the Erzurum high school with a salary of 600 *куруşes*. On 2 June 1892, he was appointed to Aleppo as its director of education with a salary of 2,500 *куруşes*. He began to work there in a month. He worked also an instructor of Persian language at the Aleppo high school (*mekteb-i idâdî*) for two months with a salary of 250 *куруşes*. Then he taught math for a month with a salary of 300 *куруşes* in addition to his other responsibilities. In 1892 he was promoted to a higher rank.

When he worked in Erzurum, his diligence, efforts, and ability to win public approval were written in the official documents of the governor of Erzurum. He was promoted to a higher rank due to his good projects and conduct.²¹² The governor of Erzurum went to Erzincan as a part of his duty to inspect the neighboring provinces of Erzurum in 1891. Tevfik *Bey* also wanted to go there because there were significant projects relating to education there. Therefore, he was permitted to go and he was required to report on the results of the inspection.²¹³ However there were many complaints about Tevfik *Bey* when he was a director of education in Erzurum. For instance a teacher of geography, Şevki *Efendi*, at the military *rüşdiyye* (military degree of the secondary school) wrote many deficiency letters about Tevfik *Bey*, so a special committee was established to investigate complaints of Şevki *Efendi*. As a result of the inspection, reported events had not any veracity, hence it was not necessary to punish Tevfik *Bey*. Şevki *Efendi* was dismissed due to his manner, and instead of him, another instructor was appointed.

Some time after his appointment to Aleppo as a director of education in May, 1892, the government realized that when Tevfik *Bey* was a director of education in Erzurum, some equipment for chemistry bought for the high school, was missing. Tevfik *Bey* affirmed this situation when he was in Istanbul to go to Aleppo, so a quarter of his wages was cut and delivered the treasury of education (*maarif sandığı*)

²¹² BOA, DH.MKT. 1797/124, 25 Ca 1308 (6 January 1891).

²¹³ BOA, MF.MKT. 131/77, 5 Ra 1309 (9 October 1891).

to cover the deficit.²¹⁴ This situation shows that directors of education were responsible of protection of educational tools and equipment bought for benefit of students' education.

Directors of education sometimes did not know for which organization one should pay the tax. For instance *Tevfik Bey* did not give the subsidy to holy places, Mecca, and Medina (*Haremeyn İkramiyesi*) from this wages in March, 1888 and in March, 1889. In 1888 the subsidy was instead given to the revenue authorities of the province (*vilayet-i aliyeleri mal sandığına*) and subsidy of 1889 was instead sent to the cashier of education (*maarif sandığı*). The government wanted the governor of the province to report why the premium was not withhold in the necessary office. The subsidy should be taken with its overdue interest from who gave rise to the delay.²¹⁵ He might not know exactly where he should give the subsidy, so he paid it to different offices. It should not be understood as a robbery or as a misappropriation misuse of funds.

Tevfik Bey, was appointed as a director of education to Edirne in 1894 with a salary of 2500 *kuruşes*. He sought to permission to go to Istanbul for eight or ten days to follow up and to introduce many projects related to education. The Ministry of Public Education accepted his request, giving him a permission of ten days without reimbursement of his travel expenses.²¹⁶ *Tevfik Bey* was recognized as a diligent official. Although it was not obligatory, he wanted to go to Istanbul to deliberate many issues about education. In addition he tried to increase revenue of education in Edirne. Both of tithe and amount of benevolent contribution were raised by *Tevfik*

²¹⁴ BOA, MF.MKT. 151/141, 27 Ra 1310 (19 October 1892) “Haleb Vilayeti Aliyyesine, Vilayet-i aliyeleri Maarif Müdürü *Tevfik Bey*, Erzurum maarif müdürlüğünde bulunduğu esnada mekteb-i idâdî için mübayaa ve irsal kılınan alât-ı hikemiye ve kimyeviyeden zuhur eden noksanın ---- olmak hasebiyle mumaileyhten tazmini lazım gelmiş ve bu hususa Haleb’e gitmek üzere *Dersaadet*’de bulunduğu esnada kendisi de muvafakat eylemiş olduğundan noksan-ı mezkûrun esmanı olan mecdiye on dokuz kuruş hesabıyla 995 kuruşun tesviyesine değin rüb’ı maaşının bit-tevkif maarif veznesine irsali hususunda savb-ı alilerine işarı muhasebeden ifade kılınmış olmağla icabının icrasına himem-i aliyeleri derkar buyurulmak babında.

²¹⁵ BOA, MF.MKT. 180/145, 3 Ra 1311 (14 September 1893).

²¹⁶ BOA, MF.MKT. 269/2, 22 Z 1312 (16 June 1895).

Bey, and this proves that he patiently and constantly discharged his business. Therefore an extra payment was given to him due to his ardent endeavor.²¹⁷

In addition when he was a director of education in Edirne, he went to Tekfurdağ to inspect its high school, which was converted from a madrasah (*medreseden münkalib olduğu vesilesiyle Tekfurdağı Mekteb-i İdâdîsi binasının*). Because the directors of education went to examine the schools at neighborhood provinces three times each year, *Tevfik Bey* went to Tekirdag to inspect educational conditions there (*Maarif müdürlerinin senevi ---üç defa mülhakat-ı vilayeti devr-i teftiş etmeleri ol babdaki ta'limat ahkamından olduğu cihetle, müdür-i mumaileyhin bu vesile ile Tekfurdağı'na azimetinde bir beis görülememiş olduğundan*).²¹⁸

In 1899, the director of Education in Trabzon, *Ziver Bey*, left his work and *Mehmed Tevfik Bey* was replaced him. Both of them submitted the account registers of their respective offices to the Ministry of Public Education which inspected and approved them.²¹⁹

In Trabzon there emerged many public complaints about *Tevfik Bey*. For instance, one of complaint refers to the relationship between the instructors and the director of education in Trabzon where the department of education had become highly elaborate. The document refers to the close relationship that emerged between the senior instructor of women, *Macide Hanım*, who worked at the Trabzon *rüşdiyye* for girls and the Director of Education, *Tevfik Bey*, as well as to the relationship between the junior instructor of women, *Hasibe Hanım*, and *Süleyman Efendi*, who was a civil servant at the Telegraph Office. The event was reported by a citizen, “Dursun from Trabzon”, to the Ministry of Public Education in 1900.

According to *Dursun's* complaint,²²⁰ *Macide Hanım*, was an acquaintance of *Tevfik Bey* and she stayed in the director's home as a guest when she arrived at Trabzon

²¹⁷ BOA, MF.MKT. 314/64, 24 Za 1313 (7 May 1896).

²¹⁸ BOA, MF.MKT. 361/38, 25 S 1315 (26 July 1897).

²¹⁹ BOA, BEO. 1273/95467, 18 L 1316 (1 March 1899) and MF.MKT. 450/24, 19 M 1317 (30 May 1899).

²²⁰ BOA, MF. MKT. 504/4, 15 M 1318 (15 May 1900).

upon her appointment as the senior of women instructor (*muallime-i ula*) of the Trabzon *Rüşdiyye* for girls. She continued to stay there and they had a great time in the evenings playing the lute and enjoying themselves. Taking them as her example, the junior instructor of women (*muallime-i saniye*), Hasibe *Hanım*, moves in with one of the telegraph officers, Süleyman *Efendi*, by saying that he is my foster brother.

Hasibe *Hanım* and Süleyman *Efendi* became so close as to be expecting a baby within two months. As Hasibe *Hanım*'s pregnancy became evident, the director of education, Tevfik *Bey*, was worried that his relationship with Macide *Hanım* too would attract attention. He encouraged Macide *Hanım* to beat Hasibe *Hanım* in public view and throw her out of the school about a month later. This incident came to the attention of the governor's office which initiated an inquiry. The inquiry established the misconduct of both the senior and the junior instructors of women. The office of the governor asked the director of education to banish them both. Tevfik *Bey* objected to sending Macide *Hanım* away. He argued that such an act would mean his admission of guilt and he would rather commit suicide because this would be an honesty issue. The governor of the province believed that such dissolute conduct could not be tolerated and public gossip should be arrested. He insisted to send both of the woman instructors away from Trabzon. But the Director of Education's resistance dragged the issue. Consequently the honorable people of the city took their children away from this school.

Dursun wanted to make a point of this event. He asked for an investigation by the governor and the *müftü* of the province, in order to establish the truth and to bring clarity to the situation. The Ministry of Education dispatched a copy of Dursun's complaint to the governor of the province, İbrahim Kadri *Bey*,²²¹ requesting a thorough investigation. Furthermore the Ministry of Education admonished the director of education in Trabzon. Its letter emphasizes that instructors women, and men, should work in harmony to fulfill their duties and avoid situations that could

²²¹ Abdulhamit Kırmızı. "Haysiyet-i Hükümeti Muhafaza: Trabzon Valisi Kadri Bey'in İdare Tarzı (1892-1903)" in *Karadeniz Tarihi Sempozyumu (25-26 Mayıs 2005)*, vol.2. (Trabzon: KTÜ Yayınları, 2007), 758.

instigate gossip among the public. The director of education should see that they got on well together and avoid harming the administration of education not only in Trabzon but also in its sub-provinces such as Canik and Samsun.

The office of the governor of Trabzon looked into this issue and Governor Kadri *Bey* sent an instruction²²² indicating his decision about the event to the Minister of Education. According to his instructions, the senior woman instructor, Macide *Hanım*, and the junior instructor, Hasibe *Hanım*, should be appointed to different provinces. The director of education, Tevfik *Bey*, and other instructors could continue to work at their schools but they should be strictly warned to preoccupy themselves with their duties and not to behave in ways that invited gossip about the instructors among the people. Moreover, the governor wanted the director to send instructions to the same effect to Trabzon's sub-provinces, especially Canik.

Actually we do not know how Macide Hanım and Tevfik Bey were seen by others. They were playing the lute together according to Dursun, a Trabzon resident. How did he acquire all this detailed information about the instructors and the director? Historians should not accept Dursun's account without criticism. Macide Hanım fell in love with Tevfik Bey. How did he perceive their relationship? Tevfik Bey could have been married at the time because we know he went to Istanbul for the treatment of his daughter three years after this incident.²²³ He might have been divorced. At any rate, what were the real concerns of the public regarding the relationship between Macide Hanım and Tevfik Bey? How intense or widespread was this reaction?

Be that as it may, the incident did not affect Tevfik *Bey*'s career adversely? He continued to work in Trabzon. Seven years later, he was promoted and appointed to Baghdad as an inspector of education with the charge to increase the resources devoted to education in Baghdad, Basra and Mosul.²²⁴ The difference in the bureaucracy's reactions to male and female officials should not go unnoticed. The state encouraged the women subjects to participate in the bureaucracy that created

²²² BOA, MF.MKT. 504/4, 15 M 1318 (15 May 1900).

²²³ BOA, MF.MKT. 767/5, 20 Z 1321 (7 February 1904).

²²⁴ BOA, MF.MKT. 1020/71, 29 Ş 1325 (7 October 1907).

new social dynamics and transformations.²²⁵ The women were exiled to the different provinces, and demoted whereas the man only rebuked and eventually promoted by the Minister of Education. Women's participation in the bureaucracy brought new social dynamics and transformations.

The other complaint was about the administration method of Tevfik *Bey*. Tayyar, who was from Trabzon, wrote a report about disorder of education to the Ministry of Public Education in 1900. According to Tayyar's writings, while the number of workers, and their charging with a duty was determined according to their abilities and academic degrees by the Ministry of Public Education, in Trabzon these were executed with a way, which had not been seen before anywhere. The wages of the instructors and other workers, who were appointed by the Ministry, were improperly reduced to regulate the educational budget in Trabzon. For instance in Trabzon the wage of the stock clerk in the high school was normally 250 *kuruşes*. However it was reduced to 100 *kuruşes* by underbidding and this duty was charged to who would accept 100 *kuruşes* as a wage. Also many methods, that led the students to be hungry, were carried out to regulate the budget for education. Many students, the boy and the relatives of the director of education, Tevfik *Bey*, participated in the education free of charge, so the situation become more confused in terms of satisfaction of student and budget of education. In terms of education there were improper practices in the high school. For example the instructor of math in the high school was said that "we reduced your salary as amount of 50 *kuruşes*, and we gave it to the other worker. Be silent, otherwise think its result." The directorate of education carried out underbidding and this occupation was charged to an instructor from the secondary school of military (*rüşdiyye-i askeriyye*) in return for 80 *kuruşes*. Therefore the half of the salary of being instructor of math was shared between the master teacher of math and the instructor who take being math instructor as a result of the underbidding. In that case for which the other half of the salary was spent? It was not clear. The garden of the school was leased in consideration of 20 or 25 *lira*.

²²⁵ For changing roles of the women in the Ottoman society, see Elif Ekin Akşit, *Kızların Sessizliği: Kız Enstitülerinin Uzun Tarihi* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2005) and Selçuk Akşin Somel, "Osmanlı Modernleşme Döneminde Kız Eğitimi," *Kebikeç*, no.10 (2000): 223-237.

To sum up there were many mistakes in the directorate of education in Trabzon. Tayyar was sure that these were not convenient for the order and the development of education in Trabzon. Therefore he complained the situation to the Ministry.

The governor of Trabzon argued that there was not a mistake of the director of education, *Tevfik Bey*, without administrating of educational organization according to his ideas, (*vilayet maarif müdürü Tevfik Bey'in biraz fikrine tabi* ') and being rather hasty. In the governor's period of being civil servant, along nine years, he did not meet a director of education whose manner was more regular and well-intentioned than those of *Tevfik Bey*. If *Tevfik Bey* do not warn and take necessary measures, the circumstance of the educational institutions became maleficent. In the time of *Tevfik Bey*, (or, when *Tevfik Bey* was a director of education in Trabzon,) a secondary school (*rüşdiyye*) for girls and elementary schools were found in Trabzon and environs of Trabzon. Also courses were managed in an efficient way. *Tevfik Bey* worked day and night according to the governor. The Ministry began to investigate educational institutions in Trabzon and it emerged that complaints about *Tevfik Bey*'s managing the educational organizations without base and procedure were not true. In addition in 1904 the director of high school in Trabzon complained about *Tevfik Bey* to the Ministry of Public Education because of his misusing the fund of the night branch of the high school. (*Leyli mekteb-i idâdiye tahsisatının sureti sarfına müteallık nizamat ve evâmiri ahkamının Trabzon maarif müdürü izzetlu Tevfik Bey tarafından pa- mal edilerek...*) Hence the Ministry started to examine the situation.

Tevfik Bey was a successful civil servant for the governor, but Tayyar claimed that he carried out his responsibilities in an improper way and he did not efficiently spend the fund for education. It is possible that the governor and *Tevfik Bey* met each other, so the governor supported the director. Also Tayyar's boy might take low grades, so his father might complain the director to the Ministry. These are predictions and *Tevfik Bey* was actually an hardworking director who developed education, because he was sent from Trabzon to Baghdad to improve educational conditions in terms of both of the budget of education and quality of education in 1907.

In 1902, *Tevfik Bey* requested permission to go to Istanbul for the performances of the works about the establishment of trade and agriculture branches at the department

of high school of the mekteb-i mülkiye (the administration school) and for the educational works in Trabzon. However the Ministry of Public Education did not accept the desire of Tevfik *Bey*.

After two years, Tevfik *Bey* went to Istanbul for the treatment for himself. Then he wanted to prolong his leave for the cure of his girl in *Dersaadet* (Istanbul). He stayed there for about a year. Instead of him, in Trabzon the Ministry substituted and Tevfik *Bey* took half of his salary during his staying in *Dersaadet*. On 4 August 1907, French government gave Tevfik *Bey* a medal of education (*maarif nişanı*).

In 1907, a group of people went to the border of Iran to investigate and Tevfik *Bey* was ordered to go to Iranian border with this group by the Ministry of Public Education. He was given 100 *lira* for the travel expenses by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but it was not enough for Tevfik *Bey*'s return to Trabzon. It was enough for only for the needs of the travel, so the Ministry of Public Education ordered the directorate of education in Basra to give Tevfik *Bey* extra fare payments. After a month, Tevfik *Bey* was appointed as a director of education at Baghdad to advance and spread education there.

An appointment to Baghdad from Trabzon was not good for civil servants, because Baghdad was further than Trabzon to the capital. Moving away from Istanbul generally was not desirable for the officers. The reason for the appointment of Tevfik *Bey* to Baghdad was to improve and to ameliorate educational conditions according to historical documents, but the reality could be different. Tevfik *Bey* could be appointed to Baghdad due to the complaints. Therefore historians should not believe a definite conclusion about the reason of Tevfik *Bey*'s appointment to Baghdad. Tevfik *Bey* also worked as the director of the law school, (*mekteb-i hukuk*) which was founded in Baghdad, as an additional employ with the salary of 1,000 *kuruşes*. He was promoted as an administrator (*mutasarrıf*) of *Erzincan* with the wage of 5400 *kuruşes* in 1908. After a year, he died.

Tevfik *Bey*'s academic career began to be an instructor in the high school and terminated being an administrator of *Erzincan*. He worked as a director of education

in different places from Edirne to Baghdad, indicating the anonymity of the modern Ottoman bureaucracy of his time.

6. CONCLUSION

The nineteenth century required centralization and bureaucratization in the state affairs that gave the authority of intervention and penetration to the center on the provinces. The increasing number of posts emerged in the bureaucracy due to the gradual growth of bureaucracy to meet the needs of the transformation of the 19th century in the Ottoman Empire. Education was also taken into consideration by the state that developed further educational conditions not only in the center but also in the provinces.

Actually states began to give importance to education by founding new schools and appointments of many instructors to train their subjects with public education, so they aimed to have social homogeneity and discipline in their states in the world of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Ottoman Empire became a part of this global transformation of education by establishing new schools, councils of education in all provinces, appointing directors of education to the provinces from the east to the west of the Empire. In addition the foreign states could easily found their schools to spread their missionary activities in the Ottoman Empire because they gained rights to establish schools, churches, and hospitals there through the Treaty of Berlin (1878), and many items of the Regulation of Public Education. Sometimes even Muslim children went to foreign schools because of the scarcity of Ottoman schools, of the financial facilities introduced by foreigners. The Ottoman government was aware of the situation, so it spread its system of education in provinces by appointing the directors of education to Ottoman provinces, to prevent its subjects from going to foreign schools. It was afraid of losing its subjects' identity and obedience to the state, so taking necessary precautions such as increasing the number of schools, and training many instructors gained importance. The Ottoman government like other states in the world purposed to form loyalty and obedience in the minds of its subjects thanks to the penetration of the state's schooling in provinces. Benjamin C. Fortna believed that the Ottoman system of education emerged as a repercussion of the infiltrating of the foreign schools in the Empire. He also wrote:

Although it shared many of the practical objectives of the previous period, for example, the imperative of filling the posts of a rapidly expanding bureaucracy and the broader notion of attempting to educate as much of the population as possible, Abdülhamid II's policy sought selectively to borrow Western pedagogical techniques in order to stave off the challenge that the West represented. The moral component of Hamidian educational policy was critical, in that it marked a desire to repulse the challenge of the West by drawing on the Islamic and Ottoman basis of the state.²²⁶

The directors of education were the products of the interference of the Ottoman state to the educational issues in the provinces. They formed the main position between the center and the provinces in terms of efforts to improve and modernize education in the Empire. Directors of education could be appointed to different provinces from which they lived. It can be true that they were the second representatives of the state after the governors in the provinces. They were responsible to carry out issues and works, written in the Regulation of Public Education (1869) and Instructions Concerning the Duties of Directors of Education in the Imperial Provinces (*Vilayât-ı Şâhâne Maârif Müdîrlerinin Vezâifini Mübeyyin Talimât*, 1896). They were responsible to expense the allocation, and subsidies for education to the inconvenient places. Many of them discharged affairs such as buying new technological tools to properly teach and used local financial sources to contribute to the allocation for education, although they were outside of their formal duties. It shows that they could take their own initiatives in improving educational conditions by using local opportunities.

Directors of education should regularly write inspection reports to the Ministry of Public Education, so these documents illuminated the necessities of the provinces for the amelioration of educational conditions. However it was not known yet how regularly they sent reports to the Ministry. Predicting exactly the needs of the provinces from Istanbul was difficult, so directors of education assisted the center to understand conditions of provinces thanks to sending these reports. Directors of education were faced with various problems of schools, instructors, students, and teaching methods in the Ottoman provinces. By examining the historical documents

²²⁶ Fortna, *Imperial Classroom*, 241.

about these problems, educational conditions are also understood as well. Participation of the women instructors in the bureaucracy created new problems and changed the balance of bureaucratic relations, so their position should be studied in terms of their pioneering roles in the modernization of schools, bureaucracy and society. Many directors neglected their duties and the public complained about them to the center that began to investigate the accusation by trying to be objective between the directors and the complainers.

Directors of education had different educational and social backgrounds; approaching thirty directors of education in the reign of Abdülhamid II graduated from the Civil Servant School, that shows the significance given by the Sultan to the *mekteb-i mülkiye*. A career path of a director of education could be end with being a governor of a province, or of a district.

The history of modernization and centralization of education in the late Ottoman Empire should be studied further to understand the near past and to provide better perspective on contemporary issues of education in Turkey.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

BOA, AD. (Ayniyat Defteri, No.1)

BOA, BEO.

BOA, DH.MKT.

BOA, DH.SAİD.

BOA, İ.DH.

BOA, MF.HTF.

BOA, MF.MKB.

BOA, MF.MKT.

BOA, ŞD.

BOA.TFR.I.ŞKT.

BOA, Y.MTV.

BOA, Y.A.RES.

BOA, Y.PRK.A.

BOA, Y.PRK.MF.

BOA, Y.PRK.UM.

Salnâmeler

Salnâme-i Maarif, 1310, 1316, 1317, 1321

Salnâme-i Kastamonu, 1312

Published Documents

BOA Yıldız Esas Defterleri, No: 1165 translated by Demirel, Muammer. *Sultan İkinci Abdülhamid ile Erzurum Vilayeti ile Arasındaki Yazışmalar*. İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2007.

Regulations and Instructions

“Âsâr-ı Atıka Nizâmnâmesi”, *Düstur*, 1st Tertip, Vol.8, 507

“Maarif ve Mekâtib-i İdâdiye Müdürleriyle Rüşdiyye Muallimlerine Mahsus Talimât”, *Salnâme-i Maarif*, 1316, 106-109.

“Maârif-i Umûmiyye Nizâmnâmesi”, *Düstur*, 1st Tertip, Vol.2, 184.

“Taşra Mekâtib-i Rüşdiyyesinin İdare-i Dahiliyyelerine Mahsus Tâlimat”, *Salnâme-i Maarif*, 1316, 311-319.

“Tedrîsât-ı İbtidâiye Kanun-u Muvakkati”, *Düstur*, 2nd Tertip, Vol.5, 809.

“Vilayet Nizâmnâmesi” *Düstur*, İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Amire, 1289, Vol.1, 608-624.

“Vilayât-ı Şâhâne Maârif Müdürlerinin Vezâifini Mübeyyin Talimât”, *Düstur*, İstanbul: Matbaa-ı Amire, 1289, Vol.7, 118-129.

Books, Articles and Theses

Akarlı, Engin Deniz. *The Long Peace: Ottoman Lebanon, 1861-1920*, London: University of California Press, 1993.

-----“Economic Policy and Budget in Ottoman Turkey, 1876-1909” *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.28, no.3 (Jul., 1992): 443-476.

Akçura, Gökhan. *Türkiye’de Sergicilik ve Fuarçılık Tarihi*, Ankara: Tarih Vakfı, 2009.

Akşit, Elif Ekin. *Kızların Sessizliği: Kız Enstitülerinin Uzun Tarihi*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2005.

Akyıldız, Ali. *Osmanlı Bürokrasisi ve Modernleşme*, İstanbul: İletişim, 2004.

Başaran, Betül. "The American Schools and the Development of Ottoman Educational Policies During the Hamidian Period: A Reinterpretation." In *International Congress on Learning and Education in the Ottoman World*, edited by Ali Çaksu, 185-207, İstanbul: IRCICA, 1999.

Berker, Aziz. *Türkiye'de İlk Öğretim: 1839-1908*, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1945.

Cevad, Mahmud İbnü'ş-Şeyh Nafi'. *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti Târihçe-i Teşkilât ve İcrââtı-IXI. Asır Osmanlı Maârif Tarihi*, edited by Taceddin Kayaoğlu. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2001.

Cioeta, Donald J. "Islamic Benevolent Societies and Public Education in Ottoman Syria, 1875-1882" *The Islamic Quarterly*, no.26/I, (1982): 40-56.

Çankaya, Ali. *Yeni Mülkiye Tarihi ve Mülkiyeliler, Mekteb-i Fünûn-i Mülkiye, Mekteb-i Mülkiye-i Şâhâne ve Mekteb-i Mülkiye Me'zunları, 1860-1923*, Vol.3. Ankara: Mars Matbaası, 1969.

Çetin, Atilla, "Maarif nazırı Ahmed Zühdü Paşa'nın Osmanlı imparatorluğundaki yabancı okullar hakkında raporu," *Güney-Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no. 10-11, (1983): 189-220.

----- "II. Abdülhamit'e Sunulmuş Beyrut Vilayetindeki Yabancı Okullara Dair Bir Rapor", *Türk Kültürü*, no.253, (1984), 316-24.

Danayah- Deborah Reed. *Education and Identity in Rural France- the politics of schooling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Davison, Roderic H. *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History 1774-1923 The Impact of the West*. U.S.A: University of Texas Press, 1990.

Deringil, Selim. *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire. 1876-1909*. London: I.B.Tauris, 1999.

-----“An Ottoman View of Missionary Activities in Hawai’i.” In *The Ottomans, The Turks, and World Power Politics-Collected Studies*, edited by Selim Deringil, 131-137, İstanbul: ISIS PRESS, 2000.

Ergin, Osman Nuri, *Türk Maarif Tarihi*. İstanbul: Eser Matbaası, 1977.

Güngör, Davut and Ertan, Hüdayi. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi ve Öncesi Balıkesirde Eğitim*, edited by Davut Güngör and Hüdayi Ertan. Balıkesir: T.C. Balıkesir Valiliği Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü, 1998.

Findley, Carter V. *Ottoman Civil Officialdom*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941.

-----“The Tanzimat” *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, Vol.4, edited by Reşat Kasaba, 11-37, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Fortna, Benjamin C. *Imperial Classroom Islam, the State, and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Haydaroğlu, İlknur Polat. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Yabancı Okullar*. Ankara: Ocak Yayınları, 1993.

Kafadar, Osman. *Türk Eğitim Düşüncesinde Batılılaşma*. Ankara: Vadi Yayınları, 1997.

Karaca, Ali. *Anadolu Islahatı ve Ahmet Şakir Paşa (1838-1899)*. İstanbul: Eren, 1993.

Karal, Enver Ziya. *Osmanlı Tarihi: Birinci Meşrutiyet ve İstibdat Devirleri (1876-1907)*, Vol.8. Ankara: TTK, 1977.

Kırmızı, Abdulhamit. *Abdülhamid’in Valileri Osmanlı Vilayet İdaresi 1895-1908*. İstanbul: Klasik, 2007.

-----“Osmanlı Taşra İdaresinde Kariyer Çizgisinin Modernleşmesine Dair Bazı Gözlemler.” In *Eski Çağdan Günümüze Yönetim Anlayışı ve Kurumlar*, edited by Feridun M. Emecen, 227-237. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2009.

----- Avlonyalı Ferid Paşa (Forthcoming Book).

----- “Usûl-i Tadrîs Hâlâ Tarz-ı Kadîm Üzre: Konya Valisi Ferid Paşa'nın Eğitimi Islah Çalışmaları,” *Divan*, no.19 (2005): 195-229.

-----“ Haysiyet-i Hükümeti Muhafaza: Trabzon Valisi Kadri Bey'in İdare Tarzı (1892-1903)” In *Karadeniz Tarihi Sempozyumu (25-26 Mayıs 2005)*, Vol.2. Trabzon: KTÜ Yayınları, 2007: 757-768.

Koçer, Hasan Ali. *Türkiye'de Modern Eğitimin Doğuşu ve Gelişimi (1773-1923)*, İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1974.

Kodaman, Bayram. *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991.

Mardin, Şerif. *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri: 1895-1908*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1992.

Muşmal, Hüseyin. *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Eski Eser Politikası: Konya Vilayeti Örneği (1876-1914)*. Konya: Kömen Yayınları, 2009.

Mutlu, Şamil. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Misyoner Okulları*. İstanbul: Gökkuşbu, 2005.

Nurdoğan, Arzu M. “II. Abdülhamit Döneminde Devletin Kosova'da Açtığı Okullar.” *Türk Kültürü İnceleme Dergisi*, no. 25 (2011): 35-76.

Somel, Selçuk Akşin. *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire, 1839-1908 Islamization, Autocracy and Discipline*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2001.

-----“Mustafa Bey of Radoviş (1843-1893): Bureaucrat, Journalist and Deputy of Salonica to the First Ottoman Parliament.” *The First Ottoman Experiment*

in Democracy, edited by Christoph Herzog and Malek Sharif, 129-151, Wirzburg: Orient- Institut Istanbul, 2010.

-----“Maarif Müdürü Radovişli Mustafa Bey’in raporları ve müslim ve gayrimüslim eğitimi: II. Abdülhamid devri Selanik taşrasında maarif meselesi (1885-1886).” *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, no.2 (Autumn 2005): 113-147.

-----“Osmanlı Ermenilerinde Kültür Modernleşmesi, cemaat okulları ve Abdülhamid Rejimi.” *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, no.5 (Spring 2007): 71-92.

-----“Osmanlı Modernleşme Döneminde Kız Eğitimi.” *Kebikeç*, no.10 (2000): 223-237.

Strohmeier, Martin. “Muslim Education in the Vilayet of Beirut, 1880-1918” In *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire*, edited by Ceasar E. Farah, 215-243, Northeast Missouri State University, 1993.

Şişman, Adnan. *Galatasaray Mekteb-i Sultanisi’nin Kuruluşu ve İlk Eğitim Yılları (1868-1871)*, İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi,1989.

Tekeli, İlhan and Selim İlkin. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Eğitim ve Bilgi Üretim Sisteminin Oluşumu ve Dönüşümü*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999.

Tepeyran, Ebubekir Hazım. *Hatıralar*, İstanbul: Pera Turizm, 1998.

Tutsak, Sadiye. *İzmirde Eğitim ve Eğitimciler (1850-1950)*. Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2002.

Unat, Faik Reşit. *Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1964.

Ünal, Uğur. *II. Meşrutiyet Öncesi Osmanlı Rüşdiyeleri (1897-1907) Programlar, Ders İçerikleri, İstatistikler*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi, 2008.

Vahapoğlu, Hidayet. *Osmanlı’dan Günümüze Azınlık ve Yabancı Okullar*. İstanbul: M.E.B., 1997.

Weber, Eugen. *Peasants into Frenchmen the Modernization of Rural France 1870-1914*. California: Stanford University Press, 1976.

Zeldin, Theodore. *France 1848-1945 Intellect and Pride*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

I here by declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declared that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.