analyzes the social and political participation of women in Iranian society in the years of Mohammad Khatami.

Despite the fact that there are two essays on the Ottoman Empire and both the introduction and the first chapter frequently quote examples taken from contemporary Turkey, the absence of a specific contribution on "Public Islam" in Turkey is strongly felt. The clashes between secularism and Islam, as well as the long debate on the role of religion, may have provided interesting examples. Also the absence of a specific work on Egypt, probably the most important Arab state, is noticeable. Nevertheless, this volume represents an innovative contribution to the growing literature on the public sphere and particularly that on the study of public Islam in Muslim majority societies. This book can be inspiring for researchers and students both in Islamic studies and the sociology of religion.

Michelangelo Guida
Fatih University

The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire 1839-1908 Islamization, Autocracy and Discipline

Selçuk Akşin Somel

Leiden: Brill, 2001. xviii+414 pp.

The challenge of modernism during the nineteenth century was not only experienced in the Ottomans or in Asian countries such as Japan, but also in industrialized nations like North America as well. We can read in a plethora of resources how Americans faced profound challenges in their confrontation with modernity, and how they negotiated these challenges. Lawrence A. Cremen convincingly wrote how American Protestantism intellectually had to make its peace with modernism in culture, especially with modern science, and how it had to socially determine its position toward industrial capitalism and the class inequities that capitalism itself triggered.

Selçuk Akşin Somel has written a substantial work on how Turkish Ottomans faced the challenges of modernization, and how and why they have engaged with all these dramatic changes in the realm of public education during the final phase of the Empire. When we look at the reforms during the Tanzimat period, the program of public education seems, perhaps, the most important one compared to others in terms of establishing regularity, discipline

and efficiency in many aspects of society, as well as in the state structure, ranging from military to finance, as Somel argues. This should not surprise anyone since education was perceived at that time, and in fact it still is, to be the most critical medium through which all the characteristics of the modern world are created and achieved.

It is important to illustrate the socio-political context through which Somel has researched the process of the educational modernization of the Empire. When the treaty to end the Crimean War was signed in Paris in 1856, the Ottomans faced two great challenges, one internally and the other externally: the external challenge was the superior and dominating European modernity and power, while the formidable internal question was the evolving separatist nationalism of various Ottoman subjects in certain geographies. Surely, Ottoman statesmen were not there to watch silently the process of dismantling of their Empire; on the contrary, they were determined to engage enthusiastically in a series of reforms – military, economic, socio-cultural, educational, legal and political – to hold all the communities and geographies together and to revitalize the Empire. Their surest solution was the creation of common, public education for all Ottoman subjects under one unifying ideal.

In his book Selçuk A. Somel aims to examine the socio-political and cultural objectives of the Ottomans in developing a public education system during the *Tanzimat*-Reorganization period and the Hamidian era (1878-1908). He specifically focuses on the advancement of provincial education, i.e. the beginnings and the process of the institutionalization of government schools in the provinces, legal steps, educational councils, curricular issues, and the question of the integration of tribal, non-Sunni and non-Muslim populations under one common schooling system. The Ottomans made the necessary arrangements in this matter after the reform edict of 1856, in addition to opening the Office of Public Education (*Dâire-i Maârif-i Umûmiye*) in 1864 to coordinate all educational subjects regarding Muslims and non-Muslims. The officials appointed at the time consisted of six Muslims, two Greek Orthodox members, two Gregorian Armenian, two Catholic, one Protestant and one Jewish person (p.46).

If we wonder what the inspiration for this book is, it should be mentioned that Somel has successfully turned his doctoral dissertation into a readable book. After discussing "the myth of Westernization" in the introduction, where the author reveals the theoretical framework of the study, certain points of which I will later examine, he goes on to discuss the emergence of public education in Istanbul between the years of 1838 and 1869 in the first chapter,

and the development of provincial education in the second chapter, along with the socio-political and ideological aspects of this new epoch in the Ottoman Empire. In the passages concerned with the stages of development in public primary education which are concerned with the aforementioned dates, we stumble on some striking snapshots of events and remarkable stories of individuals who pioneered this whole process with their personal endeavors and sacrifices. Certainly Kemal Efendi is one of these individuals. He should be considered, as Somel rightly suggests, as one of the pioneers of the modern Ottoman-Turkish educational model. After his attempt to reform the Qur'an schools to improve the quality of education in the Empire were blocked by the Ministry of Pious Foundations, Kemal Efendi personally undertook a new step to establish two *rüşdiyye* schools in Istanbul in early 1847, using his own financial resources. He used innovative teaching methods in these schools to teach the basics of Arabic, Persian, arithmetic and geography – the last two added by himself – in a relatively short period of time. Students in these two schools learned all these subjects in a short period compared to other traditional schools, and this drew the attention of the Sublime Porte, the Ministry of Public Education (*Maârif-i Umûmiye Nezâreti*) would not be established until 1857 – and the Porte immediately agreed to establish five additional *rüşdiyye* schools in Istanbul in 1848. In addition, Kemal Efendi became very effective also in the establishment of *Dârülmuallimîn* – the teachers' college for the *Rüşdiyye* Schools in the same year. Kemal Efendi's educational reform reminds one of the similar attempt by Gaspirali İsmail Bey in Bahçesaray in 1884 when he claimed to a crowd that he could teach children how to read and write Turkish in forty days, a much shorter period than the usual. Both the teacher and his students were very successful and the new teaching methods were adopted in many places in Caucasus.

In the first chapter, however, there are some matters to which I feel a few points should be added. One of these is the paragraph on the "monitorial system" in schools, which is discussed under the theme of Western influence on the organization of educational institutions (p.54). This system, Somel says, benefiting from Western sources, emerged in Britain and in British India at the turn of nineteenth century as a way of mass education for the children of poor families. In fact, the monitorial system of education was not a new idea for Turkish Ottomans; furthermore, we can observe similar methods applied in certain circles of teaching in the Muslim geography if we look at closely at the history of Muslim education in earlier periods, particularly at the classical age of Islamic civilization. This teaching system is essentially based on the level of knowledge and experience of the students; according to the students' capacity

and capability, the instructor appoints some of the best students to be instructors for those at the lower levels. Abu Bakr ar-Razi, the prominent physician-philosopher, who Sigrid Hunke claims was originally Turkish (İskit), used to separate his students into three circles, with levels going from beginners to advanced; each circle, except for the beginners circle, was expected to teach and answer the questions of those in the lower circles (see İbn Ebî Useybia, *Uyûnu'l-Enbâ*, p.416; İbn Nedim, *el-Fihrist,* pp.355-356).

In Chapter Three, Somel analyzes the process of institutionalization of public education in the provinces, how Ottoman educational modernization was shaped and implemented with a top-down approach and without significant participation from below, and examines some of the other legal and educational challenges, such as a shortage of qualified teachers or adequate school buildings and the disharmony between the curricula of the teachers' seminaries and the socio-cultural context of the diverse geographies of the Empire. Some of the intriguing points that this chapter uncovers are the differences between the memorandum of 1839 and the Regulation of Public Education of 1869; the latter clearly affirmed that natural sciences (*fünûn*) and education (*maârif*) are the basic originator of welfare in the world. The memorandum of 1839 considered education to be a process that intertwined both religion and the world, but the document of 1869 gives us a new definition of education, establishing the process of the transmission of worldly natural knowledge to be virtually the only goal of education. Thus, the latter document condescendingly modifies the control of education by placing the supervision of teaching religious subjects under the government, and with this act, naturally, the document diminishes the power of the *ulemâ* over the process of Ottoman education (p.88). In the same chapter Somel discusses how primary education spread throughout the provinces using the "new method" (*usûl-i cedîd*) of Selim Sâbit Efendi, in connection with which the Ministry of Public Education ended up transforming all *sıbyân* schools into *ibtidâî-primary* schools. The decision to transform the schools was important, but the implementation was another matter altogether. We learn from *Hüdâvendigâr Salnâmesi* in 1907 that in one of the most developed provincial districts and the first capital of the Empire, the *kazâ* of Bursa of the *vilâyet-i Hüdâvendigâr*, that only 11 primary schools out of a total of 155 village schools implemented the new modern methods of education (p.110).

Chapter Four probes the financial difficulties, i.e. taxation measures, local resistance to taxation, local resources and salaries between 1869 and 1908. Chapter Five tackles one of the most important dimensions of education, ex-

ploring the issues of the curricula in public education and how deep the need for professional schools was in the last period of the Ottoman Empire. In this chapter the author explores the Hamidian policy of social disciplining, how the period became caught up in the dilemma of practical education vs. education for training civil servants, the impact of the Hamidian ideology on school textbooks, and foreign schools. The chapter also sheds light on how some of the important maxims, which dominated thinking in later periods, emerged in the process of establishing new schools, such as the conviction that "Islamic civilization is not an obstacle for material progress, but rather is perhaps the most convenient religion" and how these were taught in schools and promulgated everywhere to achieve excellence in agricultural, industrial and commercial situations in the Empire.

Chapter Six basically examines the varieties of issues and problems that such a diverse Empire as the Ottomans encountered when they tried to implement a common system of public education and curricula without closely or attentively examining the local conditions and peculiarities. There is no doubt that the initiation of modern public education in the Ottoman Empire started a new phase between the authorities and their subjects, an intriguing relationship between the ruling elite and the heterogeneous common people in the vast geography of the Empire. This was something new in the Empire, where to date almost all educational enterprises had been carried out independently by private institutions, such as foundations, charities or religious communities.

Even though the Ottoman elite was aware of this situation and tried to create new schools, such as the *Aşiret Mektebi* (Tribal Schools) to deal with the individual needs of the local people, the policy of uniformity did sometimes cause grievances; sometimes awkward situations occurred when the appointed instructors from Istanbul taught Arabic Grammar to native Arab students who knew the language better than the teacher (p.205). In this chapter, the author surveys the obstacles and pitfalls that the Ottoman Empire experienced when it implemented the policy of uniformity in public education as the central authority tried to integrate all its subjects; using Somel's classification, even though it might need some revisions, these were non-Turkish Sunni Muslims like Albanian Tosks, Pomaks, Muslim Wlachs, and Sunni Arabs, non-Sunni populations like Alevis, Crypto-Christians, twelver Shiites, Yezidis, Zaydis, and tribal populations such as Albanian Ghegs, Bedouins, Kurds and Circassians. The integration of such a diverse population under one unifying

ideal was carried out in an atmosphere where the rising spirit of the time was nationalism.

The final chapter adds an interesting dimension to the discussion of the topic: what did this new modern educational encounter mean for the students? How did this new process affect their early socialization? To do this, Somel examines several memoirs to assess children's impressions of public school system. It seems that the Hamidian generation did not like the school system. Instruction accompanied by physical punishment and the memorization of fixed texts all contributed to this antagonism. On the other hand, the memoirs show that the system did not trust the new generation. Therefore, it is not surprising that the atmosphere at that time was not ideal for any educational model. But the problem in education always starts from the top, i.e. either from administration, or the teacher or even the textbooks, not from children. The famous Ottoman proverb from the nineteenth century is fitting here: "The fish begins to stink at the head."

On the other hand, if we were to ask whether we can find a good, working modern Turkish school in the period or not, the answer would be yes. Based on the memoirs of different students who attended the school, we can say that the *Nümûne-i Terakki* was one of the successful modern schools that had an efficient curriculum and administration as well as gentle and patient instructors. Successful schools like this one, however, cannot change the general image of the failure of the Hamidian educational policy. Somel concludes that the Hamidian educational strategy basically did not work in terms of producing loyal, pious and obedient individuals, but rather it accelerated ethnic and national disturbances and upheavals in the Empire with inadequate and incorrect socio-educational policies that were inculcated in the public schooling system.

The author adds some valuable appendices at the end, such as copies of the Memorandum of the Council of Public Works (1839), the official justification for the Regulation of Public Education (1869), the curriculum of town and village *ibtidâî* schools, the curriculum of *rüşdiyye* schools and so on, with a total of 16 appendixes.

Overall, Somel attempts to theorize the process of modernization of public education in the Ottoman Empire using certain concepts such as the Neo-Stoic concept of "social discipline," the "enlightened despotism" of central Europe, in which the "enlightened" leaders attempted to rebuild their societies based on rational principles, and Bentham's formulation of "panopticon" to control and discipline people in public institutions such as prisons, schools, hospitals

etc. In fact, here and there, there are some resemblances, but I personally am not convinced that all these concepts can explain the entire process, i.e. the state, the people and the modernization of Ottoman education. It is true that late Ottoman rulers aimed to establish social discipline through education, and tried to control what was going on in this vast geography. In fact they desired to empower the state and its apparatuses. This control/surveillance or uniformity, however, does not remind one of Bentham's panopticon or enlightened despotism; there were many other educational institutions, such as *medreses* or foreign schools which were not associated with the Ministry of Public Education, and thus not controlled by the state. These institutions were associated with private foundations. This twofold nature of Ottoman education created a well-known dualism in the society; and for this reason the Unification of Education Act in 1924 ended up by connecting all educational institutions to the Ministry of Public Education, and thus eradicating the educational dualism in the country.

In addition, as Somel meticulously reveals some of the important statistics of the period, it is questionable how efficient the public schooling was, given the shortage of professionally trained instructors, the lack of schools outside of Istanbul that could fully implement the curricula and the new style of teaching designed by the Ministry of Education, and finally, perhaps most importantly of all, the lack of financial resources. There is no doubt that a new model of education with a new purpose was designed in the center, but clearly its influence was diffused to the periphery for many reasons.

Moreover, I should mention that it is tempting to use Michel Foucault's concept of knowledge and power, or Pierre Bourdieu's formulation of education in modern states, such as education as domination and so on, in connection with the topic of this book; however, in any event, it is important to be mindful of the complete picture in the late period of the Ottoman Empire and to accept that the raw power of the modern state was not yet there.

Let me write a few more sentences about the format of the book. First of all, I must congratulate the author for the excellent job that is evident in his English translation of long sentences, words and socio-cultural concepts from nineteenth century Ottoman Turkish such as *usûl-i infırâdiyye*-the method of tutorial instruction, *ilâhiciler*-hymn singers, *âminciler*-amen chanters, *âmin alayı*-amen procession and so on, but I am not sure about the word *keramet*, which Somel chose to translate as "wonder"; however, I was unable to find a better word. In addition, I am aware that Brill is very meticulous in publishing well-edited and corrected books, but there are a few words that the publisher

should correct in this book, for instance "Magna Charta" on page 1 should be spelled as Magna Carta, I believe, and "responsibity" on page 125 should be responsibility.

And finally, the study of the modernization period of the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire "is still in its infancy," as Roderic H. Davison wrote in 1962 in the preface to his monumental work, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire*. Davison justifiably argues that numbers of monographs and a great deal of research, with the full use of the Turkish archives and the wide range of resources that are available in several languages waiting to be uncovered, must be carried out in order to reach a definitive history of the period. After his successful preliminary attempt to analyze the paramount reforms in the Empire that focus on the period between 1856 and 1876, there are many new monographs and research papers that have appeared in various fields of specialization in the following years. There is no doubt that Selçuk A. Somel's book is one of the works which will help to raise the period from its infancy to childhood, perhaps to puberty, on the path of arriving at a well-defined Turkish history.

Seyfi Kenan
İSAM

Religious Freedom, Multiculturalism, Islam (Cross-Reading Finland and Ireland)

Tuula Sakaranaho

Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2006, XVI+468 pp.

In today's world it is well known that the increasing social role of religion in society in the global and local context has made multiculturalism and religious plurality ever more important. Growing multiculturalism and multireligiosity forces the international and national communities to find some sort of minimum criteria for religious freedom. This book gives precedence to the social perspective due to the sociological nature of religion and consists of three parts. In the first part, the author discusses religious freedom and multiculturalism from a conceptual point of view within the context of Western Europe. In the second part, she explores the establishment of Muslim communities in Europe, Finland and Ireland. In the third part she analyzes Islam and education in Europe.