

A Comparative Analysis of Educational Reforms in Ottoman And British Empires: Schooling And Curricular Issues (1870-1908)

Arzu M. Nurdoğan

Apart from the concern with the issue of whether it succeeded or failed, the schools were important in making a sense in this periods' historical and cultural contexts. This paper focuses on two aspects of elementary education in Ottoman and British Empires: the use of education by a state tool for achieving certain goals, and the reorganization of textbooks and schooling. The comparative analysis that was used in this study with the methodology of document analysis allows us to see the simultaneity of the educational experience across unexpectedly wide swaths of geography. This paper was written with several materials provided from Public Record Office and Ottoman Archaive. The paper presents the educational reforms in the Ottoman and British Empires were an integral part of a global phenomenon with their distinctive features and within the context of the centralising and modernising spirit. This article emphasize that the nineteenth century educational reforms should not only be considered in their different cultural context, these reforms should also be considered as an integral part of a global phenomenon.

Keywords: *elementary education, centralization, modernization, Ottoman Empire, British Empire.*

What was the difference with childhood perception which was based on elementary education system between Ottoman and British empires? How far and in which ways did the extension of the state power affect the structural organisation and the development of elementary schooling in comparison with two empires? To what extent did the bureaucratic leaders participate in the running of the administration, organizing schoolbooks in the state elementary schools in the Ottoman and British Empires?

The first part of this articles' titles is punctuated with a question mark in order to emphasize the issue whether the nineteenth century educational reforms should only be considered in their different cultural contexts, or whether these reforms were an integral part of a global phenomenon within the context of the centralising and modernising spirit, and whether the Ottoman educational reforms should be considered, at least to a certain extent, as a case of a piece with trends elsewhere in the world in this period, and as a development within the logic of the nineteenth century? This article was written so as to prove that the problem that is the subject of the research could be clarified with the fact that educational reforms in the Ottomans may be evaluated to an extent as the result of mentality of the nineteenth century and general tendencies of the world. In this context reforms of the Ottomans in elementary education in the last century were attempted to be analyzed in the scope of comparisons with modernization of British elementary educational system so as to allow for qualitative and quantitative comparisons. For this reason the question to what extent the central organizations in these empires affected the elementary educational system, was raised and reflections of such effects in schooling and history schoolbooks of those times were studied. The research was bound to be limited to comparisons of educational mechanisms related with elementary education and certain history books. In the comparisons of reforms of two countries in the educational mechanisms the matters concerning elementary education system were studied and certain history books were evaluated with the use of vertical method for samples of school books.

The keys to understanding the concept of childhood between Turkey and England is really provided very largely working on both religious and economical point of view. That's why it will be considered as another article subject. Although we do not expect any stability or assimilation of childhood perspectiveness between different societies, but this make the comparative analysis of child image more crucial.

Religious indoctrination would act as a social control, differentiating or reconciling the unskilled, undeveloped/working classes to their subordinate

place in societies. In the British Empire, education for the working classes was certainly not thought of as something good in itself, or children were naturally sinful and they should not let alone such as an individual child in terms of rights and independency (Anderson, 1971; Shuttleworth, 2004:107-113). At the beginning of the nineteenth century, starting work at so early an age brought an enforced end to infant irresponsibility. Although some researchers argue a concept of childhood in the early centuries, such as 16th and 17th, all concede that there was an increase in parental strictness in the early nineteenth century (Behlmer, 1982; Burnett, 1994; Middleton, 2004:419-435).

In contrast to English consideration of “childhood”, this concept is one of the most investigated issue in Ottoman world. It could be seen from the beginning that the subjects related with child had respected an independent research area by Muslim philosophers. This originated from Quran and the Sunna in which the child had not been considered as a “responsible individual” until his/her adolescence. That’s why undoubtedly accepted the accumulation of knowledge about physical development of children, psychological maturity of children, children’s illness and treatment in Islamic civilization (Giladi, 1992). According to the dominant sources of Muslim belief, verses and hadiths, the concept of childhood is described as a different and special “biological period” and after getting a definite preparatory and development supplies, child can be reached to adolescent. Moreover one can read some expressions on adults have the main responsibility of children education (Bilgin, 1991). These definitions show an obvious image of children in Ottoman point of view which involved some features – Muslim and sinless – come from birth of child (Bilgin, 1991:18,20) in contrast to British thought. The protecting of children within the ways of life, property, and education was arranged through the rights of guardianship (Canan, 1980:142). It can be considered, as a progressive regulation with many protective stimulations that involved the conditions of adolescents employment by their families, extended the period of childhood on Islamic cultural context (Giladi, 1992:151).

In British Empire, the movement of humanitarianism made considerable difference for society’s attitudes to children from the beginning of the nineteenth century. This movement was genuinely moral, involving new attitudes and emotions, and stimulating the development of a new ideal type, “the Man of Sentiment or Feeling” (Stone, 1979:237-239; Shuttleworth, 2004:108). This affected the growth of interest in the welfare of working classes and their children. The best known of this were evangelical movement whose members were active also the abolition of

slave trade, and Sunday School movement in Gloucester in the 1780s (Shuttleworth, 2004:108-109; Snell, 1999: 135). The difference between philanthropic endeavors in eighteenth century and in the 19th, is first one was often to quell unrest and maintain order or to reorganize poor law relief in a more economical way, but in the nineteenth century, various manifestations had been a particular significance in their attempts to reduce cruelty and to result vast social changes resulting from the Industrial Revolution (Snell, 1999:125; Smith, 2002:119-120).

To return our starting point: the difference of elementary education between two empires in the nineteenth century was not the consequence of philanthropic or compassionate motives at the beginning of the century, rather the main motive was at a time of unprecedented social change and together with a concern of social control – a swelling population, industrialisation, and urbanisation in British Empire; rivalry with foreign institutions, preventing to dissolution of empire, and a need of citizenship relation, and civil obedience in the Ottoman Empire. All provided a potentially explosive mixture, and seemed to threaten the destruction of pre-re-formed society.

Although the religious difference between two empires, this is not to say that the struggle for elementary education was uncomparatively different, especially in the realms of the establishment of national and secular system of schooling. Furthermore in both countries at the end of the nineteenth century, the need for improved measures to ensure national and imperial self-preservation – in terms of rivalry with foreign schools in the Ottoman Empire – also led to an increasing intervention to elementary education. But somehow, in one way or another, more civilized standards which were of benefit to society as a whole, emerged during the course of the century while in Turkey it was not became reality until the rectification of Turkish Republic.

Reforms in Elementary Education (1870-1908)

Reform in elementary education was motivated by pragmatic fears both in Turkey and England. In Turkey, the corruption of Ottoman centralist power and widespread of foreign school with superior education in Ottoman territories provided the specific endeavors to elementary education while the wake of social disruption and the need for moral strengthening in England. Under intense pressure from an array of foreign and domestic forces, the Ottoman state emphasized on Islam and an Islamically informed morality to inculcate the empires' young generation

from elementary education (Berker, 1945:3; M.Cevâd, 1338:1-3; Akyüz, 1994:131-132; Ahmet Cevdet Paşa, 1891:277-279). As a result of this in 1824, elementary education was made compulsory in Istanbul. At the beginning compulsory state schooling was intended to spread over the provinces, but in reality it was not accomplished either in capital of the empire (Kodaman, 1988:3; Sakaoğlu, 2003:58-59; Aksoy, 1968:58). Although the motive for sudden steps for state schooling was clear in following initiatives, one could assume that the difficulties in applying the reforms at the provincial level concerning with civil education which considered by both society and ulama in the realm of religious (Akyıldız, 1993:229-230; M.Cevâd, 1338:27-30; Ergin, 1977:440-441).

However, the period beginning with the Reform Edict of 1856 was a turning point in the history of Ottoman public education, including the foundation of the Ministry of Public Education with a great degree of administrative reform attempts were realized until 1869 (Berkes, 1978:152-154; Davison, 1961,Summer:289-301). During this period the extension of non-muslim schools whether or not we agree reciprocated with a reaction towards supporting the development of state schooling in the Ottoman Empire. This development with an approach to Islam in the context of modern education, directed to restore the image of the Ottoman Empire as the “sick man” of Europe. Hence the Ottoman state began to put its whole concentration on the establishment of a modern school system. That’s why rüşdiye schools would offer an education adopted to both muslim and non-muslim students, while the primary level should preserve its religious feature. This kind of mix-education was clear expression of “Ottomanism” parallel to historical role of education. Education is invariably treated as an agent of various predetermined changes, as if schools perform a uniform and mechanical function in England and Turkey. Military, diplomatic and economical overpressure obliged the Ottoman government which totally influenced to Regulation of Public Education in 1869 (Nurdoğan, 2005:74-82) to fight back first with the ideal of Ottomanism, than period of Abdülhamid II altered this content of educational system into the mixture of Ottoman policy with Islamic practice.

The institutional changes in the direction of overemphasis on the integration and collectiveness of all schools aimed at on the one hand increasing control against inculcating anti-regime values to Ottoman subjects, and on the other hand entegrating different subjects into an Ottoman society by getting muslim schools in a westernization and modernization processes.

It is relatively comparable with the impact of German educators to English schooling and the French pattern of Ottoman reform education project. The development of German educational theory and of the German school system by affecting decentralization and the cultural freedom had its beneficent influence also on some cities in England particularly in the field of secondary schools (grammar schools). Thomas Arnold of Rugby (1824 – 1842), Edward Thring of Uppingham (1853 – 1887), and others observed with a mixture of admiration and anxiety the development of secondary education in Germany and decided to change their schools from fashionable boarding places to institutions with truly scholarly as well as moral aims. Their example influenced similar schools all over the country and paved the way for further important investigations on German secondary education (Ulich, 1961:111-112; Sharpless, 1992:58,127). Moreover the report of Victor Cousin (Hamburger-Hamburger, 1985:56-62) which became the basis of the French education law and the national system of elementary education developed in France proved influential for English educators. After the investigation on Prussian education for the French Minister of Education Victor Cousin wrote the report that was both reviewed in British journals (Hamburger-Hamburger, 1985:56-57).¹ The translation of the reports of Mr. Cousin has made “the English public universally acquainted with the inquiry which Mr. Cousin executed by direction of the French government” (Shuttleworth-Kay, 1862:221). Hence the debates on elementary education were orientated elementary education were to be compulsory with a national curriculum, inspection, and accountability.

The French system was the one on which the Ottoman state patterned their own schooling project. We know that the French Ministry of Education under Victor Duruy, drafted the report upon which the Ottoman Education Regulation of 1869 (Maârif-i Umûmiye Nizâmnamesi) was based (Berkes, 1978:179; Kodaman, 1988:20-22). Although Abdülhamid II's educational strategy altered the schools' content and even the whole system, the 1869 Regulation was a legal and institutional framework until the twentieth century.

The tendency of imitating the French school system was quite natural. Centralized and hierarchical structure of French education that easily bridged to highly uniformed and centralized pedagogical and disciplinary regime in Ottoman policy. However the reform in the period between 1839

¹ *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, XX, pp. 139 – 166.

– 1869 could be assumed as permissive, short-term, and introduced without economical, social, institutional background aimed at adopting Western-style education to suit Ottoman needs. In Abdülhamid II's period (1876-1909) this goal was orientated to ward off Western encroachment into Ottoman territories. Faced with military and diplomatic overpressure constricting the empires' borders the Ottoman government felt obliged to fight back that education was one of the efficient weapons at this state. That's why the religious instruction became gradually changed into the aim of offering curriculum of Islamic practical-worldly content.

On the other hand “political authority was to be exercised by an intellectual elite, to whom the populus would need to defer on the basis of authority, testimony or trust” in the British Empire. Trust in authority was not, however, to be “blind” but based on understanding (Hamburger-Hamburger, 1985:37) which were to be supported by changes in pedagogy and teacher training with pensions for teachers to raise the status of the teaching profession (Rich, 1970; Robinson, 2003). But first of all on behalf of this aim compulsory school attendance legislation, which was the most important feature of a national education system was to be practised. But at this stage there was an uncomparable reality with Ottoman thought as the popular prejudice against the need for public education if not the belief of some intellectuals that the compulsory school attendance would be of infringement of liberty (Sanderson, 1963:138). On the other hand social and industrial developments had undermined a good deal of the old prejudice against educating the children of the poor in the British Empire. There were some who felt an education rate would save the prison rate and the pauper rate. Others, concerned with the challenge of foreign industries, looked to education to raise the efficiency of labor. Above all, “the recent rise of Prussia, the notion of schoolmasters, was an object lesson to those who remained doubtful. Thus the need for elementary education was generally admitted” (Sanderson, 1963:138; Shuttleworth-Kay, 1862:224).

In fact the early factory laws stimulated the first compulsory education in England by introducing half-time system. Apart from the genuinely philanthropic ones, others saw the compulsory education is an instrument for “taming” and “training” a young workforce into habits of obedience and regularity. It was certainly not intended to give some ideas above their station (Shuttleworth-Kay, 1862:224-225; Silver, 1977:51; Alexander, 1954:93-94). That means in those schools for public education would be instructed basic literacy and religious instruction comparable with the Quran schools. These schools were also a useful place to corral youngsters and help them out of mischief in their non-working time.

A state of affairs hard to grasp in our day is that people looked to private philanthropy or the parish vestry to relieve the poor of their burdens in England. Society at this early stage of the nineteenth century was an ordered society with difference from the lower orders to the higher, and a sense of formality between the classes, was the norm acknowledged by all. In general, it has been noticed that the growth of political liberty has proceeded together with the increase of state regulation of educational facilities (Jordan, 1993:213-214).

The division of opinion as to the nature of the authority which was to undertake education appeared in the controversy. The following are some of the arguments which have been adduced in favor of state and of private supply of schools comparable with Ottoman State's controversy. In case of reforms at elementary education members of the ulama could frequently be found in positions associated with the strictly important ranks which could be interpreted as ulama had played a definite role in shaping educational policy. This was ranged from reconstructing educational structure, to reorganizing the curriculum. But the difference between Turkish and English controversy in the authority of elementary education was that ulama increased their role by using civil bureaucracy in terms of being heads or members of certain education commissions until the end of Abdülhamid II's period in the Ottoman State, and on the other hand in British Empire, civil initiatives as Church of England or denominational sects did not generally want the intervention of state to elementary education (McClelland, 1975:141-154).

Alike Ottoman state, English inspectors were mainly concerned with the monitoring of the states' own schools. By this similarity these inspectors were interested in guarding against politically subversive material and what they deemed immoral behavior in the schools. Both states offered satisfactory terms to traditional initiatives at elementary education such as giving the right of the Archbishops² and ulama to nominate members of the Inspectorate in the nineteenth century. These concordats were a skilful compromise between the claims of both the Office of Şeyhülislam-Church and States. In general consideration, the Ottoman and the British Empires had strengthened and consolidated their powers, for it had commonly established two fundamental principles;

1. The right to promote the extension and improvement of elementary education,

² Minutes, *P.P.* 1845 [22]I, 3 – 4.

2. The right to inspect its secular efficiency. Therefore governments had entered into a more active partnership with the members of ulama and the churches. The divergence of Ottoman case was the other type of inspection which was primarily interested in monitoring the schools run by foreigners and other non-Muslim organizations. Unlike the British Empire, the Ottoman Empire was almost completely in the dark about curricula, textbooks, moral character and behavior of the teachers in these institutions because of the lack of qualified inspectors with the knowledge of Greek, Serbian, French, and English etc.

The educational attainment until the first Education Act (1870) was impressive, and much of it was concentrated into the first half of the nineteenth century. Yet the acceptance of the idea of education as the responsibility of the state had been long hindered by conflicts between religious and secular education, between the religious parties and the state. However, the highest hopes of the social reformers who prompted this expansion were never fully realized. Alike on town and country, crime, brutality, violence, and drunkenness continued, though probably not so commonly as in earlier periods (Hurt, 1979:157-160).

It could be assumed that the main commonly motives affected to Ottoman and English educational modernization in the second half of the nineteenth century as below:

1. Getting the elementary education into the state machine by rescuing it from religious initiatives with the perspective on a national-unified educational system,
2. The training of a new generation with the equipment of practical and scientific knowledge,
3. The expansion of education was considered as a means of social and economic development,
4. The general belief that providing ordinary people more comprehensive instruction than basic literacy might lead to disobedience and rebelliousness,
5. The fear that one's neighbors penetrated one's country or deep anxiety of dropping down to the second place in the rivalry of world power – military, economically, politically, even culturally – was linked to educational failure and this fear was a frequent motivation.

But in Ottoman case the threats were more immediate, appearing inside the imperial borders in the various forms even if in the field of education.

The missionaries, neighboring propagandists, and minority groups were all injurious groups with practical purposes. Responding to alarms sounded by officials across the provinces, which were sought to forestall unrest and disaffection among the Muslim population, the central government increased its attempts in new-style education towards to promote loyalty to the Ottoman state within the process of modernization, secularization and Westernization. Just alike 1870 Education Act in British Empire, 1869 Regulation of Public Education was the first comprehensive legal text aimed to arrange public education all over the Ottoman Empire. In both regulations states began to place more importance on the organization of primary schools and the professional status of primary school instructors. The Forster Act of 1870 created school board which were the first units of local government dedicated to building and running secular elementary schools. Moreover this Act gave school boards permissive powers to make education compulsory to any age up to 13 in their districts. But on the other hand they could allow part-time or full-time exemptions from the age of 10 where the local learning age was set above 10 (Rich, 1970:58). Hence the state system in the field of elementary education started with 1870. The advent of state education in 1870 had strengthened the voice of critics; early opponents had no absolute proof of the harmful physical effects of combining work with schooling, but emphasized its dulling effect in the classroom (Hurt, 1979:33). The Royal Commission on Education in 1887 was satisfied of its dulling effects. Teachers found that part-timers disrupted school organization. They fell behind their full-time classmates and sat sleepily at their desks; compassionate teachers would turn a blind eye if they dozed off (Rich, 1970:112-113). The Ottoman case, provincial educational councils, where local notables were members and would ensure local public support were began to setting up from the Regulation of Public Education in 1869 (M. Cevâd, 1338:448-450). This attempt was quite important by means of development of provincial education with its executing, inspecting, and financial units. Moreover through these regulations the existing schools were in integrated into one comprehensive law.

Similar to Forster Act the justification text of the Regulation of Public Education urged regulations for compulsory school attendance. In contrast to British Empire elementary education, particularly traditional primary schools had quite popular support. Although this effective popular support, it could not be managed to transfer widespread civil backing to new-style elementary education named *ibtidai* and *rüşdiye* schools (Nurdoğan, 2005:677-678).

Afterwards the Regulation of Public Education in 1869, elementary education ceased to be regarded as an educational stage belonging to religious realm, and with the only goal to provide pupils literacy. Hence it could be followed not only the courses with utilitarian / practical subjects, but also elementary school teachers were gained a legal and administrative status as government officials, while their rank and salary were arranged. Moreover provincial administrative institutions with their units, personnel and working methods were designed for the development of education all over the Ottoman Empire. Parallel to this it was firstly established at the level of vilâyet-center local branches of the Sublime Council of Education, from 1880 these were set up on the level of sancaks and kazâs with the members of both government official and notables among provincial population. As a main agent of the Ministry of Public Education at the provinces, the responsibilities of Educational Councils were; (i) the execution of the decisions and orders of the Ministry of Public Education, (ii) the supervision of the schools, libraries, printing presses etc. in the provinces, (iii) the preparation reports for the Ministry of Public Education about general educational provision and educational problems in the provinces. Furthermore the observation of educational progress related with foreign, missionary or non-Muslim institutions and the realization or the estimation of some alternative programmes with intentions specific to Ottoman objectives under the permission of Ministry of Public Education, (iv) the execution of encouraging local participation to new-style elementary schools (Berker, 1945:128).³

In contrast to Ottoman Empire, there is no doubt about the formative structure of educational administrative bodies in the provinces in the British Empire with centrally planned policy from the Forster Act. Under the Act of 1870 the provision of a school board in the provinces was made mandatory. These school boards were getting its power by a kind of new-system election in parishes – among councils of boroughs or ratepayers – for triennial period. The first board was set up in Liverpool 1870 (Nurdoğan, 2006:802-806).

The first responsibility of the new boards was to survey their ideas, and by means of a census of the child population and of existing school provision, estimate the extent of educational destitution. The results of this survey were; (i) apart from Ragged schools and Roman Catholic schools the poor children were completely ignored, (ii) voluntary effort on elementary

³ 1300 / 1882 – 1883, MF.VRK., 2/52.

education was patchy, unorganized, and of varying quality.⁴ Secondly school boards had to open their new board schools which was executed not until the summer of 1873, and had to gather all children in their areas into the elementary schools. The fourth they had to organize school departments and irregular attendance by executing byelaws in favor of compulsory education (Rich, 1970:127-128). But in the British Empire it was a complex problem which was not only a question of getting the poor children into the schools, but it was also a question of making such provision that respectable parents would not take offence at their own children contacting with those who were both dirty and uncivilized (Rich, 1970:128).

That means in the British Empire elementary schools were not merely for instruction but for civilization. In other words similar to Ottoman objective, the new-style schools which had to civilize as well as instruct the children who were brought up in “surroundings”. In fact Regulation of Public Education was designated to make “community of civilization” by transmission of positive and practical subjects in the schools. Also one of the main concern of the official letters from provinces was education for getting population “civilized” with the capable of “distinguishing good from evil” (Somel, 2001:178fn) with the conservative ideology of the Hamidian regime as individuals were considered the need for “correcting the morality”, “awakening from agitations innocent minds”.⁵ In Somel’s term this policy namely social disciplining (Somel, 2001:271,275) was orientated especially to tribal and peripheral populations. The Ottoman bureaucracy considered these populations as “uncivilized” and “savage” way of life needed to be directed “to the area of civilization”⁶ because of the lack of the central power and administration in the periphery (Deringil, 1998:82-83). The policy of social disciplining was combined with principles of loyalty and pioucity. Parallel to this policy the schoolbooks were required by a centrally organized educational administration or the several inspection networks established with the surveillance of a wide variety of areas.

⁴ Report, *P.P.* 1873 [C. -812] 25.

⁵ BOA., BEO., 1 September 1880 (26 N 1297) AD., Nr. 1419, p. 66; 6 November 1889 (25 Teşrin-i evvel 1305), AD., Nr. 1422, p. 107; 21 April 1890 (1 N 1307), AD., Nr. 1422, p. 297.

⁶ BOA., 11 November 1892 (20 R 1310), YMTV., Nr. 72143.

The Comparison of Curricular Issues (1870 – 1908)

Although there existed approaches to introduce or practices a more practical oriented educational philosophy, there was an increasing emphasize on publication of schoolbooks and curricular content by centrally controlled administration. The state expended considerable effort to keep unauthorized texts out of its students' hand and to ensure that they read works that had been properly vetted instead. On the one hand the continuity of "millet system" with the perception of the equality of all subjects, and on the other hand public education was seen as a means of loyalty to the empire from 1880s. Several commissions were created to inspect and control the state schools generally were also responsible for inspecting the schoolbooks. One of these bodies is Sublime Council of Education (Meclis-i Kebir-i Maarif) and particularly its Department of Science which was responsible for translating schoolbooks, developing the Turkish language etc (Binark, 1996, Ocak-Şubat:484). However, the considerable effort to inspection of schoolbooks or even study sheets, similar inspections occurred especially in secondary and high schools rather than elementary ones. Although this, the effort of Hamidian state towards reemphasization of "Ottomanism" as a construct intended to garner allegiance to the state and to its ruler, the sultan, the content of schoolbooks and curriculum had increased its weight to the role of process of the education in the elementary schools.

We can deduce from the studies on these books that in the Ottoman Empire alike in the British Empire, the elementary schools could not rescue for political object and win the liberal of process of the education. The content of schoolbooks clearly displayed a tendency toward the promotion of authoritarian and religious values such as the loyalty towards the state and the sultan, the belief in Islam and its rituals. In relation with such sentiments there was a strong tendency from the 1870s for the inclusion of a number of professional courses in the elementary school curricula. These courses imparted practical knowledge and aimed at material progress and modernization (Nurdođan, 2005:189-232). Although the Hamidian regime devoted a considerable attention to the schoolbooks, in fact it could not be managed to realize a complete uniforming of these. The content of several schoolbooks completely displayed religious and central values (A.Sıdıka, 1313; Usûl-i Kıraat, 1314), on the other hand some of them were written under the consideration of modernizing reforms aimed at reconstruction of the Ottoman Empire and its strength (Mûlahhas Tarih-i Osmani, 1315; İ.Hakkı, 1308).

Though the specific-practical subjects, like history, geography even like algebra, chemistry, botany, French, and domestic economy were introduced from 1870s in the British elementary schools, but according to Lord Norton these were “only a piece of window-dressing, a feeble attempt to imitate middle-class education; working-class children were being introduced to these pretentious extras when they were still wanting in the more basic skills” (Ellis, 1971:121).

In fact the Education Secretary Robert Lowe introduced more stringent criteria for subsidy as an economy measure to ensure “value for money” called as “Payment by Results”. Also the elementary school children were ranked in six Standards, according to age alone, from Standard one at age 7 to Standard 6 at age 12 (Ellis, 1971:119; Sutherland, 1973:123-124). Modifications were made under different codes to what skills did the Standards demand at different ages. For example, at Standard 6 the children were expected to be able to read a passage from Shakespeare or other standard authors (like Milton). Textbooks were geared to the examinations and did commonly “readers” comprise a miscellany of extracts from different sources, so that children would not get a chance to go through a complete Shakespeare play, for example. Attached to the extracts were exercises in parsing, etymology, and spelling. The backs of the books might contain a few pages of potted history and geography – data lists of the names and dates of kings, wars, and battles, the names of countries, their sizes, populations, main cities, capes, bays, rivers, and products.

Henry Major who was a prolific compiler of school textbooks, in his *New Code Readers* displayed what educationalists believed children could learn at different ages. For example, a book for 9 year-olds has a passage on ferns containing this interminable sentence:

“At this sweet season of the year, when the sap is rising in the gnarled knotted oak, the pure lily and purple violet and creamy primrose draw their beautiful tints, it seems if the hands which had restrained all the forces of nature during the long, hard winter, were suddenly withdrawn, and life and joy were having a grand birthday again, and what a chorus the birds ring out.” (Ellis, 1971:125).

Another typical historical fragment Book 4 (for 10 year-olds) covering the history of Britain from 55 BC to AD 1066 relates the reign of Ethelred the Unready thus:

“Reign – He succeeded his step-brother and reigned from 978 to 1016; thirty-eight years. Wars 980 – 993. A Danish invasion took place on the

south coast of East Anglia: the English under Brithnot were defeated at Maldon.

993 – First payment of £10.000 to the Danes to induce them to leave England.

994 – Attack on the east coast of Sweyn and Olave, King of Sweden – Second payment of £16.000 to Olave.

1001 – Third payment of £24.000.

1001 – Alliance of England and Normandy....” (Ellis, 1971:129-131).

It is not difficult to understand such passages, must have rapidly killed of any burgeoning interest a child might have in good literature or history. The rote-learning, dictation, subjects which dried up pupils’ interest killing or stifling their imaginations and was totally irrelevant courses to character development were the common elements between Turkish and English elementary schooling. Beside those in the Ottoman Empire elementary schoolbooks were almost completely prescribed under central-political opinion/ideology. Especially the content of history textbooks was totally reflected political attitude of the period and perceptions which must be inculcated new generations at their early ages. Among the expressions of prophets and four Caliph in the first chapter, the sources of the emergence of the Ottoman Empire were the mid-point explanation as a lineage of Muhammad, his Caliphes, and the Ottoman Sultan. Through this approach it was displayed that Islam was the standpoint of the Ottoman Empire and sultans’ sovereignty was based on Islamic heritage. The chapters related with history of Islam and history of the Ottoman Empire was expressed one inside the other. That’s why the history of four Caliphes would be prescribed only as a part of the Ottoman history which could already be considered from the book titles like “Tarih-i Osmani”. This provenance of closer relation between Ottoman and Islamic history also displayed Islamic policy of the Hamidian state (Mülahhas Tarih-i Osmani, 1315; Çıkar, 2001:39-53).

It can be totally alleged that the religious identity and central approach appear through both form and substance in the Ottoman Empire much more than in the British Empire. On the other hand these discourses of schoolbooks were also reinforced by a pragmatist approach to integration of Ottoman population and to reinforce of Ottoman power. At one side by inculcating values both in schoolbooks and classroom and at another side by imparting practical knowledge to schoolbooks the following stimulations

are all commonly derived from the Ottoman and British elementary school curriculums:

1. The perspective of elementary schooling were totally irrelevant to pedagogical developments,
2. The rote-learning, dictation, discipline, and obedience were the concepts which reflected the qualification of curriculum and teaching methods,
3. The courses killed child's' interests to higher levels of education,
4. The pragmatism-practical approach effected the concept of elementary education,
5. The uniforming of education system with the concepts of "equality" and "generality" throughout the empires was not accomplished.

Conclusion

I am skeptical therefore about the strength of financial weakness of any long-term and continuance influence of modern elementary schooling in the Ottoman Empire. So much of what children had to learn at school was irrelevant to their lives and ephemeral in their memories. It is more therefore appropriate, we would argue, primarily in terms of social effects as well as teacher training programs, teaching methods, and school curriculum similar to reconstruction of schooling in the British Empire. The comparative analysis of educational reforms is crossing the direct intervention of the states by reconstructing elementary school system. This technic was used firstly by Royal Commission in England and Council of Education (Meclis-i Maârif) in the Ottoman Empire, afterwards this transferred to Education Department and Ministry of Public Education (from the second half of the nineteenth century). The clear involvement by the states had been its full significance in terms of development of elementary education from the point when the state was directly involved in making curriculum and financial grants or taking control of inspecting to such schools particularly from the foundation of Education Department / Ministry of Public Education to administer of elementary education systems.

On the other hand the results of this interventions were not the same with the states had planned in defining characteristic of its educational agendas. The pettiness of curriculum values may well have produced a reaction in many cases once they had an connection with "other" environment and had started to think about the regime of Hamidian era in

the Ottoman Empire or once they had thrown of the “yoke of school” (Rose, 1991:205) and had started earning in the British Empire. After all, the Young Turks who were against to be “subject”s by founding the current regime would want them to serve the state with the absolute political loyalty; and in the British Empire the “hooligans” (Rose, 1991:205) of the turn of the century were products of the elementary schools. Although the results in youngsters’ mind, was managed to take religion in terms of fundamental theme in elementary schooling, out of the schools and restructured many of the practical objectives in the curriculums. It is quite predictable the difference of these objectives identified at different cultural contexts. To overall observation of these objectives consist in relationship with the aim of staving off the challenge that the West represented in the Ottoman Empire.

Other distinctive impulses of reforms at elementary schooling were related with the imperative of filling the posts of a rapidly expanding bureaucracy. Beside this, the broader notion of attempting to educate as much of the population as possible was the common impulse of the new systems of the elementary education. In particular, the growth of an industrial and commercial middle-class and with the growth of factory production of the working-class or proletariat was one of the most considerable force of reforms at elementary education in the British Empire. This was mediated through changes in the occupational structure which directly led to new demands on, or requirements of an educational system that reflected the needs of an earlier dispensation. Such features as boarding schools centralized curricular planning became standard fare in the late nineteenth century both in the two empires. In fact these elements were incorporated with the Western approach in the Ottoman Empire.

The issue of the level of literacy in connection with educational reforms was to be considered with facing many struggles to raise elementary school levels. Despite the executing the form of teaching method under the name of “New Method” (Usûl-i Cedid) or pounding in the three Rs, literacy standards below the level of which regulations were stimulated.

In fact the different ways of structural and economical changes with each other both the empires had a great effort to give financial support to new-style elementary schools. Although the tremendous financial and political difficulties, the late Ottoman educational efforts was nothing less than an attempt to safeguard the empires’ future. And towards the endeavor to stave off threatening Western influences and to combat with indigenous minority and missionary groups, neighboring states, the state

elementary schools reflect an earnest and entirely logical perspective to the demands of the present similar to the British Empire. Apart from the concern with the issue of whether it succeeded or failed, the schools – in both empires – were important in making a sense in this periods' historical and cultural contexts. That means the educational reforms in the Ottoman and British Empire were an integral part of a global phenomenon with their distinctive features. The comparative analysis allows us to see the simultaneity of the educational experience across unexpectedly wide swaths of geography.

Osmanlı İmparatorluđu ve İngiliz İmparatorluđu'ndaki İlköğretim Reformlarının Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analizi: Okullaşma ve Ders Programları (1870-1908)

19. yüzyıldaki ilköğretim reformlarının, her ne kadar hedeflerine ulaşım ulaşımadıkları noktasında ciddi soru işaretleri bulunsa da, gerek Türkiye'nin gerekse İngiltere'nin tarihsel ve kültürel analizlerinde anlamlı bir yeri vardır. Bu makalede, imparatorlukta merkez teşkilatlarının hangi düzeyde ve etkinlikte ilköğretim sistemini etkilediđi ve bu etkinin kimi tarih kitaplarına yansımaları araştırılmıştır. Osmanlı ve İngiliz arşivlerindeki belgelerden yararlanılan ve döküman analizi metoduyla kaleme alınan bu makalede kullanılan karşılaştırmalı analiz, ilköğretimdeki yenileşme sürecinin farklı siyasal sistem ve coğrafyalarda birbirlerine benzerliklerini gösterme olanađı sağlamıştır. Söz konusu yaklaşım, 19. yüzyılda İngiltere ve Türkiye'deki ilköğretim reformlarının, yalnızca kendi ulusal-kültürel bağlamlarında değil, fakat dünyadaki modernleşme ve merkezleşme akımlarında görülen genel eğilimin bir parçası olarak algılanması gerektiđini ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar sözcükler: İlköğretim, Merkezleşme, Modernleşme, Osmanlı İmparatorluđu, İngiliz İmparatorluđu.

Özet

John Dewey'e göre, eğitimin bir amacı yoktur, bunun yerine ailelerin, öğretmenlerin ve siyasi sistemlerin amaç ve hedefleri vardır. Bu nedenle eğitimin amaçları konusu tartışıldığında, gerçekte kastedilen demokratik rejimlerde vatandaşlık eğitimi, entellektüel gelişim, duygusal olgunluk ve aydınlanmacı bir düşünce yapısının tekâmülüdür. Başka bir deyişle her toplum veya her millet eğitimi, genç kuşaklara kültüründe muhafazasına gereksinim duyduğu değerleri, gelişmesini arzu ettiği sanat ve meslekleri aktarma aracı olarak kullanmaktadır. Sözelimi İngiltere'de ilköğretimin modernleşme sürecindeki temel unsurlarından birisi çocukların din bilgisinden habersiz olmalarıdır. Öyle ki 1860'lı yıllarda Kraliyet Komisyonu'nun hazırladığı raporlara göre çocukların, şeytan ve İsa'yı tanımlayacak düzeyde dinden haberleri yoktur. Bunun sonucunda din bilgisi ilköğretimin temel kriteri haline getirilmiştir. Her ne kadar ülkedeki ilköğretim seviyesini yükseltmeye yönelik 1833'ten itibaren Fabrika ve Eğitim yasaları çıkarılmışsa da, söz konusu metinlerde çocukların uğradıkları suiistimalden veya içinde buldukları cehalet çukurundan kurtarılması gibi ortak bir hedefin –en azından 1918 Fisher Kanunu'na dek– belirdiği söylenemez. Gerçekte asıl amaç, hızlı sanayileşme sürecindeki yeni gereksinimler paralelinde çocukların okulda “tutulmasına” (to corral) yöneliktir. Sözelimi yarım günlük temel eğitimi öngören yasalardaki esas motivasyon unsuru, çocukların zihinsel vb. gelişimini sağlamaktan çok, onları işyerlerinde daha uysal hale getirebilecek bir “evcilleştirme” programını uygulamaktır. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda ise bu hedef, sünni-islami değerlerin, devlete bağlılık/sadakat ilkelerinin kazandırılması ve bağımsız bir özne olarak algılanan çocuğun kamusal bir özne haline getirilmesi şekline dönüşmüştür. Esasen, tarih boyunca hiçbir iki toplum/devlet gösterilemez ki, kurumsal eğitimin amaç ve hedefleri konusunda “aynılık” bulunsun. Bu noktada dikkate alınması gereken temel düşünce bütün uygarlıkların farklı geleneksel değer ve inançlara sahip olmasıdır. Ancak bütün bu farklılıklara rağmen, devletlerin kimi dönemlerde eğitim felsefesi ve öğretim anlayışlarındaki yorumları ve uygulamaları arasında benzerlik görülebilmektedir ki, bu durum karşılaştırmalı eğitim çalışmalarının önemini ortaya koymaktadır.

Bu makalenin amacı, 19. yüzyıldaki eğitim reformlarının yalnızca kendi ulusal-kültürel bağlamlarında mı, yoksa merkezileşme ve modernleşme akımlarının ayrılmaz bir parçası olarak mı ya da Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki ilköğretim reformlarının 19. yüzyılın mantığına uygun ve dünyadaki genel eğilimin bir dereceye kadar sonucu olarak mı değerlendirilip değerlendirilemeyeceği sorusuna cevap aramaktır. Bu

çerçevede imparatorluğun son yüzyılındaki ilköğretim reformları, nitelik ve nicelik yönünden karşılaştırmaya imkân veren verileri içeren İngiliz ilköğretim sistemiyle, modernleşme süreciyle kıyas çerçevesinde analiz edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Bu amaçla iki imparatorlukta merkez teşkilatlarının hangi düzeyde ve etkinlikte ilköğretim sistemini etkilediği ve bu etkinin kimi tarih kitaplarına yansımaları araştırılmıştır.

Devletin yeniden yapılandırılması sürecinde ulusal, askeri, ekonomik ve toplumsal kalkınma projesinin bir parçası olarak uygulanmaya başlanan ilköğretim hareketi, her iki toplumda da hümanist ve filantropist düşüncelerin peşinde koşan birtakım liderlerin teşebbüsü olmaktan ziyade, bu yüzyılda hiç de öngörülmeyen bir toplumsal değişim sürecine girilmesi ve sosyal yapıdaki düzeni koruma kaygısından ileri gelmiştir. Söz konusu toplumsal değişim İngiltere’de nüfusun hızlı artışı, sanayileşme, şehirleşmeden kaynaklanmış iken, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda yabancılarla rekabet, devletin içine girdiği çözülme süreci ve vatandaşlık kavramının yeniden tanımlanması ihtiyacından ileri gelmiştir. Bu değişim aynı zamanda makineleşme, demokrasi ve serbest düşünme hareketleriyle; 19. yüzyıldaki siyasi, iktisadi ve entellektüel dönüşümle de yakından ilintilidir. Siyasette bu dönüşüm toplumsal statüsü, ekonomik durumu ve milliyeti dikkate alınmaksızın insan olmanın değeri ve önemi temelinde gelişen, her bireyin siyasi aktör olabilmesi yönünde gerçekleşmiştir. Ekonomik düzlemde bu dönüşümün etken faktörü buhar makinesidir. Buhar makinesinin etrafında fabrikalar açılmış, fabrikaların etrafında sanayi kentleri kurulmuş ve bu kentlerin etrafında bütün milletleri yekpare bir ekonomik üniteye dönüştüren yoğun ticari bağlar teşekkül etmiştir. Entellektüel platformda ise, Aydınlanma düşüncesinin geleneklere ve geleneksel düşünceye olan tepkisinden hareketle insan aklına güvenmenin ve bilimsel veriler ışığında insanın kendi kaderini kendisinin çizmesinin önemi anlaşılmıştır. Söz konusu değişim doğal olarak farklı ihtiyaçları gündeme getirmiştir. Bu ihtiyaçlardan bir kısmı devlet tarafından karşılanırken (okullar, sağlık hizmetleri vs.) bir kısmı da değişen toplum tarafından karşılanmıştır.

İmparatorluklar arasındaki radikal farklılıklara rağmen pragmatik düşüncelerle milli ve laik bir ilköğretim kurulması yönünde verilen mücadele ve yapılan girişimler birbirine benzer niteliktedir. Sözgelimi Türkiye’de merkezi gücün çözülmeye başlaması ve imparatorluk sınırları içerisindeki yabancı okulların faaliyetleri, İngiltere’de ise toplumsal düzenin bozulması ve ahlaki çöküşün/değersizliğin başgöstermesi, ilköğretim mekanizmalarının örgütlenmesindeki en önemli motivasyon unsurlarını oluşturmaktadır. Ayrıca her iki imparatorlukta kendini, başka bir deyişle düzeni ve otoriteyi koruma kaygısı merkez tarafından ilköğretime yapılan

doğrudan müdahalelerin en önemli sebebidir. Bu noktada yönetici elitlerin üzerinde mutabakata vardıkları husus, modern merkezi devletlerin gelişimi ve konsolidasyonu sürecinde özellikle ilkokulların hayati bir rolü olduğu yönündedir. Böylece bu yüzyıla kadar okuma-yazma, ahlak ve dinin temel ilkelerini kazandırmak olarak belirlenmiş ilkokulların hedefi yeniden çizilmiş ve okul programlarına, kendiliğinden bir dönüşüm sürecine giren toplum ve devlet hayatında beliren yeni değerler ve kişisel davranış kuralları dahil edilmiştir. Nitekim ilköğretime yönelik ders kitapları, “vatan”ın bilgisini ve ona yönelik “aşk”ı geliştirmede ya da ortak bir “aidiyet duygusu”nu yaratmakta – ayrıca İngiltere’de toplumsal sınıflar arasındaki mesafeyi kapatmada – temel bir işlev kazanmıştır. İlkokul programları aracılığıyla bir taraftan pratik-yararlı ilkelere, diğer taraftan Tanrı’ya, ebeveyne, otoriteye saygıya dayalı yeni bir ahlâk geliştirilmeye çalışılmıştır.

Okullaşmanın hız kazandığı ve eğitimin giderek kitleleştiği bu yüzyıldaki ilköğretim reformları için kullanılan kaynaklar arasında her iki ülkenin arşivleri önemli bir yer teşkil etmektedir. Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi’ndeki Bâbiâli Defterleri ve Bâbiâli Belgeleri ile Public Record Office’deki Parliamentary Papers bu çalışmada en fazla istifade edilen referanslar olmuştur. Gerek söz konusu belgeler gerekse anı ve otobiyografik eserler gibi basılı malzemeler dikey yöntem kullanılarak, kendi tarihi bağlamları çerçevesinde analiz edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Arşiv vesikalarından sonra yararlanılan kaynaklar arasında özellikle Harold Silver’in *The Concept of Popular Education: A Study of Ideas and Social Movements in the Early Nineteenth Century* ve James Shuttleworth-Kay’in *Four Periods of Public Education as Reviewed in 1832-1839-1846-1862* adlı çalışmaları ile M. Cevâd ibnü’ş-Şeyh Nâfi’nin *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti* ve Osman Ergin’in *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*’ni zikretmek gereklidir.

References/Kaynaklar

Primary Sources

PRO

Minutes, *P.P.* 1845 [22]I, pp. 3 – 4.

Report, *P.P.* 1873 [C. -812] 25.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd & 4th Series.

BOA

Bâbiâli Defterleri

Ayniyât Defterleri

Bâbiâli Belgeleri

Maârif Nezâreti Evrak Odası (MF.VRK.)

Yıldız Mütenevvi Maruzat Evrakı (YMTV)

Secondary Sources

A. Sıdika (1313/1895). *Usûl-ı Talim ve Terbiye*, İstanbul.

Ahmet Cevdet Paşa (1891). *Târîh-i Cevdet*, V. 10, İstanbul.

Aksoy, Ö. (1968). *Osmanlı Devri İstanbul Sıbyân Mektepleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme*, İstanbul.

Akyıldız, A. (1993). *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Merkez Teşkilâtında Reform (1836 – 1856)*, İstanbul.

Akyüz, Y. (1994). *Türk Eğitim Tarihi (Başlangıçtan 1993'e)*, İstanbul.

Alexander, W.P. (1954). *Education in England. The National System and How It Works*, New York.

Anderson, M. (1971). *Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire*, Lancashire.

Berker, A. (1945). *Türkiye'de İlk Öğretim I: 1839 – 1908*, Ankara.

Berkes, N. (1978). *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, İstanbul.

Bilgin, B. (1991). *İslam ve Çocuk*, Ankara.

Binark, İ. (1996, Ocak-Şubat). "Maarif Tarihimize Ait Bir Rapor", *Yeni Türkiye. Özel Eğitim Sayısı 2-7*, s. 477-493.

Çıkar, M. (2001). *Von Der Osmanischen Dynastie Zur Türkischen Nation. Politische Gemeinschaften in osmanisch-türkischen Schulbüchern der Jahre 1876 – 1938*, Stuttgart.

- Davison, R.H. (1961, Summer). "Westernized Education in Ottoman Empire", *The Middle East Journal*, pp. 289-301.
- Deringil, S. (1998). *The Well – Protected Domains: Ideology and Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876 – 1909*, London.
- Ellis, A. (1971). *Books In Victorian Elementary Schools*, London.
- Ergin, O. (1977). *İstanbul Mektepleri ve İlim, Terbiye ve San'at Müesseseleri Dolayısıyla Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, V. 1 – 2, İstanbul.
- Giladi, A. (1992). *Children of Islam: Concepts of Childhood in Medieval Muslim Society*, London.
- Hamburger, J.-Hamburger, L. (1985). *Troubled Lives: John and Sarah Austin*, Toronto.
- Hurt, J. (1979). *Elementary schooling and the working classes, 1860 – 1918*, London.
- İ. Hakkı (1308/1891). *Küçük Osmanlı Tarihi*, İstanbul.
- Jordan, T. (1993). *The Degeneracy Crisis and Victorian Youth*, New York.
- Kodaman, B. (1988). *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi*, Ankara.
- M. Cevâd ibnü's-Şeyh Nâfi (1338/1920). *Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti. Târîhce-i Teşkilât ve İcrââtı*, İstanbul.
- McClelland, V.A. (1975). "The "free schools" issue and the general election of 1885: a denominational response", *History of Education*, 5, pp. 141–154.
- Mûlahhas Tarih-i Osmani* (1315/1897). İstanbul.
- Nurdoğan, A.M. (2005). "Osmanlı Modernleşme Sürecinde İlköğretim (1869 – 1922)", Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, The Marmara University, İstanbul.
- _____ (2006). "Osmanlı Modernleşme Sürecinde İlköğretim: Türkiye ve İngiltere Üzerine Bir Karşılaştırmalı Araştırma", Unpublished Project Paper, The Marmara University, İstanbul.
- Rich, E.E. (1970). *The Education Act 1870*, Londra.
- Rose, L. (1991). *The Erosion of Childhood. Child oppression in Britain 1860 – 1918*, London.
- Sakaoğlu, N. (2003). *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Eğitim Tarihi*, İstanbul.
- Sanderson, M. (1963). "Social change and elementary education in industrial Lancashire", *Northern History*, 3, pp. 131 – 154.

Arzu M. Nurdođan

- Sharpless, I. (1992). *English Education In The Elementary And Secondary Schools*, Pennsylvania.
- Shuttleworth-Kay, J. (1862). *Four Periods of Public Education as Reviewed in 1832-1839-1846-1862*, London.
- Shuttleworth, S. (2004). "Victorian Childhood", *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 9:1, pp. 107 – 113.
- Silver, H. (1977). *The Concept of popular education: A Study of Ideas and Social Movements in the Early Nineteenth Century*, Oxford.
- Snell, K. (1999). "The Sunday-School Movement in England and Galler: child labour, denominational control and working-class culture", *Past and Present*, 164, pp.122-168.
- Somel, S.A. (2001). *The Modernization of Public Education In The Ottoman Empire, 1839 – 1908. Islamization, Autocracy and Discipline*, Leiden.
- Stone, L. (1979). *The Family, Sex and Marriage In England 1500 – 1800*, London.
- Sutherland, G. (1973). *Policy Making in Elementary Education 1870 – 1895*, Oxford.
- Ulich, R. (1961). *The Education of Nations. A Comparison in Historical Perspective*, Cambridge. Usul-i Kiraat (1314/1896). İstanbul.

Address/ İletişim:

Arzu M. Nurdođan
Marmara Üniversitesi
Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Göztepe Kampüsü
34750 Kuyubaşı
İstanbul-Turkey
E-mail: nurdogana@yahoo.com